

RCPAQAP

The Royal College of Pathologists of Australasia
Quality Assurance Programs

RCPAQAP Validator

Validation Report Guide

Author: RCPAQA

Document ID: QAPVVRG
Version: 1.0
Date: 07/01/2025

WORK-IN-PROGRESS

Document History

Version	Date	Changes	Author
1.0.0	20/12/2024	Initial document	MCz
1.0.1	07/01/2025	Add content	MCz

WORK-IN-PROGRESS

Table of Contents

1	Introduction	6
2	Validation Report Overview	7
2.1	Preliminaries	7
2.2	Interpretation of Validation Reports	7
2.2.1	Report Structure	7
2.2.1.1	Report Sections	7
2.2.1.1.1	Introduction and Validation Status	7
2.2.1.1.2	Message Identification Details	8
2.2.1.1.3	Message Validation Results	9
2.2.1.1.4	HL7 Message	11
2.2.1.1.5	PDF Embedded in the HL7 Message	11
2.2.1.1.6	References	11
2.2.2	Common Message Issues	12
2.2.2.1	General	12
2.2.2.1.1	Key fields and components of the MSH Segment are missing or invalid 12	
2.2.2.1.2	ADRM 2021.1 required specific literals in specific fields, components, and subcomponents are missing or invalid	12
2.2.2.1.3	Values in specific parts of the message are not following expected patterns, e.g., date/time formats.	12
2.2.2.2	MSH Segment-related issues	12
2.2.2.2.1	Key fields and components of the MSH Segment are missing or invalid 12	
2.2.2.2.2	ADRM 2021.1 required specific literals in specific fields, components, and subcomponents are missing or invalid.	12
2.2.2.2.3	Values in specific parts of the message are not following expected patterns, e.g., date/time formats.	12
2.2.2.3	PID Segment-related issues	12
2.2.2.3.1	Specific data types must have values in all their components.	12
2.2.2.3.2	Coded values must be defined in specific validation tables used by the validator but are not.	12

2.2.2.3.3	ADRM 2021.1 requires values or specific values in specific fields, components, or subcomponents which where appropriate should have values drawn from specific HL7 Tables	12
2.2.2.4	PV1 Segment-related issues.....	12
2.2.2.4.1	Coded values should be found in specific tables used by the validator but are not.12	
2.2.2.4.2	Date/Time values are not in expected format. More specifically, if the date includes the time component that in most cases it must include the timezone specification	12
2.2.2.4.3	ADRM 2021.1 requires specific structure or values for specific fields, components, or subcomponents; Where appropriate values should be drawn from specific HL7 Tables	12
2.2.2.5	ORC Segment-related issues	12
2.2.2.5.1	All components of specific fields must be populated but are not.....	12
2.2.2.5.2	Required timestamps are missing or are not matching the expected format. 12	
2.2.2.5.3	ADRM 2021.1 requires specific structure or values for specific fields, components, or subcomponents; Where appropriate values should be drawn from specific HL7 Tables	12
2.2.2.6	OBR Segment-related issues [TODO]	12
2.2.2.7	OBX Segment-related issues [TODO]	12
2.2.2.8	Notes.....	12
2.2.2.8.1	Formalisms.....	12
2.2.2.8.2	Explicitly Disabling Conformance Profiles.....	12
2.2.2.8.3	Results Messages intended for electronic submission for RCPAQAP EQA Programmes.....	12
2.2.2.8.4	Other Issues	13
2.2.3	Examples of Message Issues	13
2.2.3.1	General.....	13
2.2.3.2	MSH Segment-related issues	13
2.2.3.2.1	Message Parsing Failure.....	13
2.2.3.2.2	MSH.3 Sending Application	14
2.2.3.2.3	MSH-6 - Receiving Facility.....	14
2.2.3.2.4	MSH.7 - Date/Time Of Message	15

2.2.3.3	PID Segment-related issues [TODO].....	15
2.2.3.4	PV1 Segment-related issues [TODO].....	15
2.2.3.5	OBR Segment-related issues [TODO]	15
2.2.3.6	OBX Segment-related issues [TODO]	15

WORK-IN-PROGRESS

1 Introduction

To standardise HL7 v2¹ messaging used in Pathology requesting and reporting in Australia, Australian Commission on Safety and Quality in Health Care regulations, the pathology messaging standard and the pathology peak body guidelines provide guidance on the expected structure and content of HL7 v2 messages to be exchanged between test requesters and test results providers. It is expected that the orders/requests and results messages conform to the expectations of the “National Pathology Accreditation Advisory Council Requirements for information communication and reporting, Fifth Edition”² (NPAAC RICR5), which require that orders and results messages conform to the expectations of the "Australian Diagnostics and Referral Messaging - Localisation of HL7 Version 2.4" standard³ and the Royal College of Pathologists of Australasia Standardised Pathology Informatics in Australia (SPIA), Guidelines v4.0 for e-Requesting⁴ and Reporting⁵ (where applicable to electronic communications).

The RCPAQAP developed a validation infrastructure to support the industry in adoption of standards-based pathology orders and results messaging. This infrastructure consists of the backend service which accepts HL7 v2 messages for validation and produces validation reports, and the Web Browser-based application that allows a user to submit a HL7 v2 orders or results message and obtain a validation report that indicates whether the submitted message satisfies the expectations and provides detailed diagnostics if it does not.

This document is a guide to the validation report produced by this infrastructure with discussion of frequently observed issues and potential resolutions.

¹ “HL7 Messaging Standard Version 2.4 – Product Brief”,
http://www.hl7.org/implement/standards/product_brief.cfm?product_id=142, Accessed: 16/07/2024

² Australian Commission on Safety and Quality in Health Care, “National Pathology Accreditation Advisory Council Requirements for information communication and reporting, Fifth Edition”
https://www.safetyandquality.gov.au/sites/default/files/2023-04/key_changes_-_requirements_for_information_communication_and_reporting.pdf, Accessed: 20/12/2024

³ “Australian Diagnostics and Referral Messaging - Localisation of HL7 Version 2.4 - HL7 Australia Standard Document - Normative Standard”,
<https://hl7v2wgau.atlassian.net/wiki/spaces/OOADRM20211/overview> (OOADRM20211), Accessed: 20/12/2024

⁴ “Royal College of Pathologists of Australasia Standardised Pathology Informatics in Australia (SPIA), Guidelines v4.0, e-Requesting, Section 2”, <https://www.rcpa.edu.au/getattachment/f306b1de-0ac5-411b-946e-fdeacccd07c8/RCPA-SPIA-GUIDELINES-V4-0.aspx>, Accessed: 20/12/2024

⁵ “Royal College of Pathologists of Australasia Standardised Pathology Informatics in Australia (SPIA), Guidelines v4.0, Reporting, Sections 3, 5, 6 and 8”,
<https://www.rcpa.edu.au/getattachment/f306b1de-0ac5-411b-946e-fdeacccd07c8/RCPA-SPIA-GUIDELINES-V4-0.aspx>, Accessed: 20/12/2024

2 Validation Report Overview

2.1 Preliminaries

Submitting a file containing a HL7 v2 Delimited message to the RCPAQAP Validator for validation for conformance with the expectations of the NPAAC Requirements for information communication and reporting, Fifth Edition (NPAAC RICR5), the ADRM 2021.1 Standard and the RCPA SPIA Guidelines v4.0 for e-Requesting and Reporting in areas where conformance can be verified produces the Validation Report, as a HTML document that can be viewed immediately or downloaded for off-line viewing.

For a specified message, the same kind of report is produced whether the HL7 v2 message is submitted via the QAP Validator Application⁶ or via an internal batch submission mechanism.

The Validation Report produced using the QAP Validation Orchestrator analyses the HL7 v2 orders and results messages for conformance with the expectations of one or more of the selected conformance profiles.

If a message subject to the report fails to conform, then a diagnostics table is included in the report. This table provides a list of conformance failures with brief diagnostics for each.

Notes in sections below elaborate on some of the common issues found in many of the HL7 v2 orders and results messages analysed in the last several months. This is to provide context and elaboration where it seems advisable.

Section Interpretation of Validation Reports discusses the structure of validation reports and the content of various sections.

Section Common Issues discusses classes of issues that occur in many messages processed through the conformance validator.

Section Examples of Message Issues provides examples of various issues and discusses potential steps that could be taken to resolve them

2.2 Interpretation of Validation Reports

2.2.1 Report Structure

2.2.1.1 Report Sections

2.2.1.1.1 Introduction and Validation Status

This section provides a list of conformance profiles chosen for conformance validation of this message, the outcome of validation and links to the relevant reference documents.

Please note that only HL7 v2 Orders (ORM^O01) and Results (ORU^O01) messages are considered for conformance validation. While the ADRM 2021.1 Standard also defines conformance expectations for Referrals (REF^I12 and RRI^I12) these were not implemented.

Below is an example of this section.

⁶ See “QAPValidatorApp_User_Guide_v1.0.0.pdf” for details of the application.

The title displays icons whose shapes and colours reflect the status of conformance validation for the conformance profiles used in validating the message, one for each profile used.

HL7 v2 Message Validation Report ⚠️ ❌ ✅

Message validation was performed on 2024-02-21, at 08:12:02.

The message was checked for conformance with the requirements of the RCPAQAP HL7 Conformance Profile for the [Australian Diagnostics and Referral Messaging - Localisation of HL7 Version 2.4 \(ADRM-2021.1\)](#) Standard. The HL7 Message **does NOT conform** to the requirements of the ADRM-2021.1 Standard.

The message was checked for conformance with the requirements of the RCPAQAP HL7 Conformance Profile for the [Royal College of Pathologists of Australasia RCPA Standardised Pathology Informatics in Australia \(SPIA\), Guidelines v4.0](#) for e-Requesting. The HL7 Message **conforms** to the requirements of the e-Requesting SPIA Guidelines v4.0.

Section body states that validation was performed for conformance with the expectations of the ADRM 2021.1 Standard and the RCPA SPIA Guidelines 4.0 for e-Requesting, and that ADRM validation failed and SPIA for e-Requesting validation produced no errors.

2.2.1.1.2 Message Identification Details

This section provides details of the HL7 message extracted from the HL7 v2 MSH Segment and the name of the file provided to the validator for batch validation. When a message is submitted for validation using the QAP Validator Web Application the actual name of the file will not be included in the report.

Below is an example of this section.

Message Identification Details

- Sending Facility: RCPAQAP - 14863
- Message Control Id: RCPAQAP_20230912.3
- Date/Time of Message: 20230912000817+1000
- HL7 Message Source: 07_ormO01_01_LW_short+orc2_1_orc2_2_orc2_3_orc2_4_missing.hl7
- Conformance Statement Id: "00ADRM" / "TTTTTTTT"

The table below enumerates properties whose values are shown in the report and identifies the source of these values.

Property	Data Source
Sending Facility	Concatenation of the values of MSH.4.1, " - ", and MSH.4.2
Message Control Id	The value of the field MSH.10
Date/Time of Message	The value of the field MSH.7
HL7 Message Source	The name of the file whose content was validated. If the message body was embedded in a service invocation request, therefore the name of the original file whose content was validated is not available, a literal text to that effect will be shown instead
Conformance Statement Id	The QAP Conformance Validator is instrumented to consider the content of the field MSH.21, Conformance Statement Id, as a specification of which conformance profiles to enable for validating the message it is about to process. Discussion of this topic is beyond the scope of this document. Consider contacting the RCPA QAP IT Department if this topic is of interest to you.

2.2.1.1.3 Message Validation Results

If validation is successful, this section will not be present.

If validation fails for one or more conformance profiles, this section includes a table of issues identified in the message. Diagnostic entries use HL7 v2 terms to identify locations in the message where issues are found. The terms are HL7 v2 terms and name parts of the message at increasing granularity. This document assumes the knowledge of HL7 v2 messaging. Resources discussing the topic at various level are readily available on the Internet.

The table below describes column names and their content.

Name	Description
Entry Id	The sequence number of the entry row, starting at 0.
Element Type	To what type of element the issue relates, e.g., Message, Segment, Field, Component, Sub-component.
Position	<p>The “position” in the message, for example the segment id, and possibly the field number, and possibly the iteration of the field is a repeating field, and possibly the component number within the field, and possibly the sub-component number within the components in which the issue has been identified.</p> <p>Where the Element Type is “Field”, the “position” starts with the 3-character mnemonic that identifies the HL7 message segment - for example OBR, Observation Request - and the following integer identifies the field number within the segments, with the mnemonic OBR being field 0.</p> <p>Where the Element Type is “Component”, the “position” Starts with the 3-character mnemonic that identifies the HL7 message segment, followed by the field number within the segment, and the following integer identifies the component within the field which is 1-based.</p> <p>Iterations of segments, fields, component, etc., are identified by an integer in square brackets, for example OBR[1] specifies the OBR segment in which the OBR.1 field has the value of 1, and if the message is structured correctly is the first OBR segment in the message. When in doubt, look at the value of the Message Line No to locate the segment in question.</p>
Message Line No	The line number of the message as shown in the “HL7 Message” section of the report that follows this section. Lines are numbered starting at 1. Line numbers are not a part of the message and are added by the report generator to allow the reader to relate each diagnostic message to the segment in the message where it occurs, if possible.
Validation Diagnostic	Issue description, including the text that describes the issue, the Conformance Point or Guidelines that failed, the conformance point or guideline text that describes the expectations that were not met, and potentially additional text intended on aiding in understanding the issue and considering the resolution.

The following is an example of a validation results table.

Message Validation Results

This message **Does NOT** conform to the requirements of the [HL7AUSD-STD-OO-ADRM-2021.1 - Australian Diagnostics and Referral Messaging - Localisation of HL7 Version 2.4 Standard](#), profiled in the RCPAQAP HL7 Conformance Profile for Pathology Ordering and Observation Reporting in Australia.

This message **Does NOT** conform to the requirements of the [Royal College of Pathologists of Australasia RCPA Standardised Pathology Informatics in Australia \(SPIA\), Guidelines v4.0](#) for e-Requesting profiled in the RCPAQAP HL7 Conformance Profile for Pathology Ordering and Observation Reporting in Australia.

The table below describes issues identified in the message.

Entry Id	Element Type	Position	Message Line No	Validation Diagnostics
0	Field	OBR.4	5	ERROR: CE.1 is not valued but CE.3 is valued Failing HL7AUSD-STD-OO-ADRM-2021.1 conformance point HL7au:00044.4.2 Conformance Point Text: If no <identifier (ST)> component is specified then no (primary coding system) must be specified
1	Field	OBR.4	5	ERROR Component CE.1 has no value - cannot determine whether it is valid Failing HL7AUSD-STD-OO-ADRM-2021.1 conformance point HL7au:00044.4.4 Conformance Point Text: When multiple codes are used LOINC codes (LN) must be placed first using the identifier rather than the alternate identifier.
2	Component	OBR.4.1	5	ERROR Component OBR[1].4.1 Identifier is not populated - Failing validation for conformance with the expectations of the SPIA_Guidelines_v4.0, Section 2 - e-Requesting, Guideline G2.01 Guideline Text: Codes for terms used to request pathology tests should be sourced from well maintained and recognised international terminologies. SNOMED should be the first choice and used where it is adequate.
3	Component	OBR.4.1	5	ERROR Component OBR[1].4.1 Identifier is not populated - Failing validation for conformance with the expectations of the SPIA_Guidelines_v4.0, Section 2 - e-Requesting, Guideline G2.02 Guideline Text: If the specimen type is not explicitly specified, then blood, serum, or serum/plasma is the assumed specimen type unless there is a more common specimen type for the particular test e.g., the specimen type for Frozen section is always tissue.
4	Message	OBR[1]	0	ERROR (EQA) OBR[1] is expected to have at least 2 OBX segments but has 1
5	Message	MSG	0	ERROR (EQA) The number of OBX segments must be equal to or greater than twice the number of OBR segments - have 5 OBXs for 3 OBRs
6	Message	MSG	0	ERROR (EQA) The message is missing key information required by RCPAQAP - it will not be processed

In the case of the ADRM 2021.1 standard, conformance points are identified using the identifier of the form HL7au:00nnnn[n.[n.[n]]] where the major number may be followed by minor numbers, For definition of conformance points see “Appendix 5 Conformance Statements (Normative)” in the [Australian Diagnostics and Referral Messaging - Localisation of HL7 Version 2.4 \(ADRM-2021.1\) Standard](#).

In the case of RCPA SPIA Guidelines, guidelines are identified by their Guideline Id in the relevant section of the Guidelines document, see [Royal College of Pathologists of Australasia RCPA Standardised Pathology Informatics in Australia \(SPIA\), Guidelines v4.0](#).

In the case of Results messages intended as electronic submissions for RCPA QAP EQA programmes, diagnostics for failures in conformance to the RCPA QAP EQA expectations are identified with the literal '(EQA)'.

Some diagnostic messages do not identify specific conformance points but instead specify the code table which should include the code in question and is a “follow on” to the earlier diagnostic in which the conformance point is identified or specify that the field must have a value without going into details, see example below.

Entry Id	Element Type	Position	Message Line No	Validation Diagnostics
0	Segment	OBR.4	5	The field is required.
8	Component	PV1.20.1	3	Invalid table entry value : 'pay' for the tables '0064 - Financial class'.
10	Field	MSH.17	1	Invalid table entry value : 'NZ' for the tables '0399 - Country code'.

Diagnostics of this kind are generated by the HL7 specification embedded in the validator that defines particular fields as mandatory or having to be populated with a value from one or another of the HL7 tables embedded in the specification.

"Invalid table entry value" diagnostic names the HL7 table from which the code is expected to be drawn and the code that fails this test. These kinds of diagnostics may not necessarily invalidate the message as code sets are only in part established by the standard and are in part a matter for agreements between participants in message exchanges.

2.2.1.1.4 HL7 Message

This section includes the rendition of a HL7 message whose conformance was analysed. Each segment line is prefixed with a line number used in the corresponding diagnostic table, if any, as a reference between diagnostics and message segments to which they apply.

If the message contains a display segment with an embedded unencoded HTML document than that document will be rendered inside the message, which may produce unintended side effects

```

1: MSH|^~\&|LAB|LAB^0000^AUSNATA|Labware|RCPAQAP^14863^AUSNATA|20230807052705+1000||ORU^R01^ORU_R01|LABG_20230807.2|P|2.4^AUS&Aust
2: PID|1||999999^RCPAQAP^QA||Surname^Given names||19780808|M||Suite 201, Level 2, 8 Herbert Street^St.Leonards^Sydney^NSW^2065^
3: PVI|1|U
4: ORC|RE|999999^RCPAQAP^14863^AUSNATA
5: OBR|1|999999^RCPAQAP^14863^AUSNATA|12345678-13^Performing Laboratory^0000^AUSNATA|250637003^Alanine aminotransferase^SCT|||||F
6: OBX|2|FT|TXT^Display Format in TEXT^AUSPDI||Empty comment - required by ADRM-2021.1 but ignored for QAP purposes|||||F
7: ORC|RE|999999^RCPAQAP^14863^AUSNATA
8: OBR|2|999999^RCPAQAP^14863^AUSNATA|12345678-13^Performing Laboratory^0000^AUSNATA|104485008^Albumin^SCT|||||CP999999 CP-GC-
9: OBX|1|NM|61151-7^Albumin^LN||4|g/L^g/L^UCUM|3.5-5.0|||||F||||40025064^Performing Person^AUSHICPRAL^AQA|MTH^Abbott Alinity
10: OBX|2|FT|TXT^Display Format in TEXT^AUSPDI||Empty comment - required by ADRM-2021.1 but ignored for QAP purposes|||||F
11: ORC|RE|999999^RCPAQAP^14863^AUSNATA
12: OBR|3|999999^RCPAQAP^14863^AUSNATA|12345678-13^Performing Laboratory^0000^AUSNATA|271234008^Alkaline phosphatase^SCT|||||C
13: OBX|1|NM|6768-6^Alkaline phosphatase^LN||50|U/L^u/L^UCUM|30-110|||||F||||40025064^Performing Person^AUSHICPRAL^AQA|MTH^A
14: OBX|2|FT|TXT^Display Format in TEXT^AUSPDI||Empty comment - required by ADRM-2021.1 but ignored for QAP purposes|||||F
15:
    
```

The message above is not acceptable as an electronic submission for a RCPA QAP EQA programme. The diagnostic table below states why this is the case.

Entry Id	Element Type	Position	Message Line No	Validation Diagnostics
0	Message	OBR[1]	5	ERROR (EQA) OBR[1] is expected to have at least 2 OBX segments but has 1
1	Message	MSG	0	ERROR (EQA) The number of OBX segments must be equal to or greater than twice the number of OBR segments - have 5 OBXs for 3 OBRs
2	Message	MSG	0	ERROR (EQA) The message is missing key information required by RCPAQAP - it will not be processed

2.2.1.1.5 PDF Embedded in the HL7 Message

If the message contains a Base64-encoded PDF document than the report will include an additional section containing a “button” which when clicked will endeavour to open the extracted PDF document using the system's default PDF Viewer. Button's colour reflects validation status of the message - Green is success, Red is failure.

PDF Embedded in the HL7 Message

The message contains an embedded PDF report.

View Embedded PDF Report

2.2.1.1.6 References

This section provides links to reference material.

References ⓘ

- [SPIA Terminology Reference Sets and Information Models](#)
- Relevant Requesting Pathology SPIA resources:
 - [RCPA SPIA Requesting Allergens Terminology Reference Set v4.0](#)
 - [RCPA SPIA Requesting Pathology Terminology Reference Set v4.2](#)

2.2.2 Common Message Issues

2.2.2.1 General

2.2.2.2 MSH Segment-related issues

2.2.2.3 PID Segment-related issues

2.2.2.4 PV1 Segment-related issues

2.2.2.5 ORC Segment-related issues

2.2.2.6 OBR Segment-related issues [TODO]

2.2.2.7 OBX Segment-related issues [TODO]

2.2.2.8 Notes

2.2.2.8.1 Formalisms

Most MSH Segment-related issues relate to ADRM 2021.1 formalisms that are likely to be readily resolved by the inclusion of expected literal values in the expected MSH Segment's fields, components, and subcomponents.

2.2.2.8.2 Explicitly Disabling Conformance Profiles

It is possible to control which conformance profiles are enabled for a message by populating the MSH.21 Conformance Statement Id field with the correct incantation. Specific profiles and profile options can be enabled and disabled in this manner.

Some of the incantations cap for example, disable validation against the expectations of the RCPA SPIA e-Requesting Guidelines. If this is the case, then a diagnostic message with the following text will be included in the diagnostics table:

Entry Id	Element Type	Position	Message Line No	Validation Diagnostics
0	Segment	MSH	1	INFO Not validating the message for conformance with RCPA SPIA for e-Requesting. The value of the field MSH.21 Conformance Statement Id, [03], disables e-Requesting SPIA Codes validation for conformance with the expectations of the SPIA_Guidelines_v4.0, Section 2 - e-Requesting, Guideline G2.01 Guideline Text: Codes for terms used to request pathology tests should be sourced from well maintained and recognised international terminologies. SNOMED should be the first choice and used where it is adequate.

Please note that this will prevent discovery and diagnosis of potential issues with conformance with the expectations of the RCPA SPIA Guidelines for e-Requesting and/or other conformance profiles.

2.2.2.8.3 Results Messages intended for electronic submission for RCPAQAP EQA Programmes Results messages (ORU^R01) intended for electronic submission for RCPAQAP EQA Programmes must meet the expectations of RCPAQAP's conformance profile. The conformance profile for such messages is enabled explicitly if the value of the component OBR.2.2 - Placer Order Number - Namespace Id is the literal "RCPAQAP" or if the incantation in the field MSH.21 Conformance Statement Id specifies so.

If there are any diagnostics from validation of a message then in addition to specific diagnostic messages a diagnostic message stating whether the message would be acceptable for submission will be included.

A message failing validation for conformance with EQA requirements will have a trailing diagnostic like the following:

Entry Element Id Type	Position	Message Line No	Validation Diagnostics
0 Field	MSH.3	1	ERROR (EQA) MSH.3 Sending Application is missing
1 Message	MSG	0	ERROR (EQA) The message is missing key information required by RCPAQAP - it will not be processed

A message failing validation **other than for conformance with EQA requirements** will have a trailing diagnostic like the following:

Entry Element Id Type	Position	Message Line No	Validation Diagnostics
0 Segment	MSH	1	ERROR Component MSH.12.2 Internationalization Code is not valued Failing HL7AUSD-STD-OO-ADRM-2021.1 conformance point HL7au:000040.2 (r2) Conformance Point Text: MSH-12 Version ID component must be valued "AUS&Australia&ISO3166_1"
1 Segment	MSH	1	ERROR Component MSH.12.3 internal version ID is not valued Failing HL7AUSD-STD-OO-ADRM-2021.1 conformance point HL7au:000040.3 Conformance Point Text: MSH-12 Version ID component must be valued as "HL7AU-OO-201701&&L"
2 Message	MSG	0	INFO: RCPAQAP EQA: The message includes key information required by RCPAQAP

2.2.2.8.4 Other Issues

Other issues may have an easy resolution or not, depending on their clinical significance. How readily all issues can be resolved depends on the ability of the system that produced these HL7 messages to adapt to change.

2.2.3 Examples of Message Issues

2.2.3.1 General

Please review comments in section "Common Message Issues".

2.2.3.2 MSH Segment-related issues

2.2.3.2.1 Message Parsing Failure

If the content provided to the validator cannot be parsed as a HL7 v2 message the validation report will emit a diagnostic message to that effect.

The following message is not parseable:

```
MSS|^~&|LAB|LABG^0000^AUSNATA|Labware|RCPAQAP^14863^AUSNATA|20230807052705+1000
PIX|1
```

The diagnostic message will look like the following:

Entry Id Element Type	Position	Message Line No	Validation Diagnostics
0 Message	MSG	0	ERROR File 00_fubar.hl7 is not parseable as a HL7 message

In the above example the reason for the failure is the absence of the required MSH segment, which prevents the content being parsed as a HL7 message.

For example, when sending EQA results to RCPA QAP, the value of the field MSH-6 could be “RCPAQAP^14863^AUSNATA”, i.e., both the MSH-6.1 - Namespace ID, the MSH-6.2 – Universal Id and the MSH-6.3 – Universal Id Type are populated. Here 14863 is the RCPA QAP NATA Accreditation Number.

When using SMD with NASH certificates the content of the MSG-6 field could be “EHEALTH^1.2.36.1.2001.1003.0.0000000000000000^ISO”, where MSH-6.1 is what is EHEALTH, MSH-6.2 might be the Healthcare Provider Identifier – Organisation (HPI-O) and consequently MSH-6.3 is the identifier issuer code.

Locally defined identifiers are acceptable. For example, “EHEALTH^A202^L”.

2.2.3.2.4 MSH.7 - Date/Time Of Message

The MSH.7 - Date/Time Of Message must be populated.

The timezone must be included if time component of the timestamp is included.

2.2.3.3 *PID Segment-related issues [TODO]*

2.2.3.4 *PV1 Segment-related issues [TODO]*

2.2.3.5 *OBR Segment-related issues [TODO]*

2.2.3.6 *OBX Segment-related issues [TODO]*

WORK-IN-PROGRESS