Errata Review, using C-CDA R2.1 by example

# Overview

This content shows by example how to:

1. Download the current C-CDA R2.1 Package
2. Review Errata and compare to the published Implementation Guide

# Important concepts

1. The balloted and published Implementation Guide, once referenced in federal law, is never changed.
2. Of course, errors and issues are discovered and corrected – this is the errata process.
3. The Implementation Guide package always contains:
   1. The Implementation Guide as originally published
   2. An Errata Letter from the HL7 CTO
   3. A spreadsheet of published STU Comments (having previously been balloted and approved)

# Walkthru

Here are the steps to take;

## Download the current Implementation Guide Package

This can actually be found on the HL7 site in a couple of different ways, all pointing to the same resource.

### From [HL7 Comments page](http://www.hl7.org/dstucomments/)

There is a  for each Trial Standard.

### From the STU Comments Page for a specific Standard.

[C-CDA R2.1 Comments Page](http://www.hl7.org/dstucomments/showdetail.cfm?dstuid=168)

Again, ether is a  link.

### Having clicked

1. There is an HL7 License Agreement Reminder
2. A zip file is downloaded: in this case it is: CDAR2\_IG\_CCDA\_CLINNOTES\_R1\_DSTUR2.1\_2015AUG.zip

## Processing the ZIP

Extract the contents where your Implementation Guides are saved.

Open the spreadsheet of changes: as of this writing it is: R2.1\_C-CDA\_Errata\_list\_2016\_03\_01.xlsx

Read the Introduction worksheet – it points to the list of approved errata requests.

The Errata worksheet contains details of changes.

Each row of the spreadsheet needs to be examined for the changes to the original published Implementation Guide. Note again that these changes are not made into the copy that is delivered, because that version is referenced by federal law and is in the Federal Registry.

## One Compare of the Implementation Guide vs a published errata

Let’s take row 1 of the Errata Worksheet: this is from DSTU Comment 710, and has to do with the Substance of Device Intolerance observation and important updates concerning the Criticality Observation and the Severity Observation.

Take a look at the Substance or Device Allergy - Intolerance Observation (V2) [observation: identifier urn:hl7ii:2.16.840.1.113883.10.20.24.3.90:2014-06-09 (open)] in the published Guide, and note:

* + There is no mention of the Criticality Observation in the table, nor in the list of constraints
  + Severity Observation (V2) is still in the table and is listed as a MAY in the constraints

Now review the text of the STU Comment, from the After Update column:

* Constraint 13 gets changed from a MAY to a SHOULD NOT
* Constraint 14, a SHOULD on the Criticality Observation, is newly added

These changes have been balloted, approved, are incorporated into Certification Validators, and should become a part of your local copy of the Implementation Guide.

You’ll need to repeat this process, comparing Guide and Errata Worksheet, for every row of the spreadsheet.