WHITE PAPER

Building an Interoperability Roadmap

A Practical Guide for Health Systems

A step-by-step framework for assessing current data connectivity, prioritizing integration projects, and implementing HL7 FHIR-based data exchange.

4W Sciences | Health IT Strategy & Interoperability

2025

Contents

Executive Summary

Health systems today operate in a fragmented data environment. Electronic health records, laboratory systems, imaging platforms, pharmacy systems, referral networks, and an expanding universe of remote monitoring and consumer health applications all generate patient data — yet that data rarely moves cleanly between them. The result is duplicated tests, delayed diagnoses, clinician burnout from manual data entry, and patients who are asked to repeat their history at every stop in their care journey.

Interoperability is no longer a technical nice-to-have. Regulatory mandates such as the ONC Cures Act Final Rule and CMS Interoperability and Patient Access Rule, payer requirements, value-based care contracts, and rising patient expectations have made seamless data exchange a strategic imperative. Yet many health systems approach interoperability reactively — responding to individual vendor requests, one-off integration demands, or compliance deadlines — rather than through a coherent, prioritized roadmap.

This white paper presents a practical, step-by-step framework that health system leaders — Chief Information Officers, Chief Medical Information Officers, interoperability program managers, and IT architects — can use to build a durable interoperability roadmap. The framework covers four core phases: assessing current data connectivity, defining a strategic vision, prioritizing integration projects using a structured impact-versus-effort model, and implementing HL7 FHIR-based data exchange in a phased, governed manner.

Organizations that follow a structured roadmap rather than an ad hoc approach typically see faster time-to-value on integration investments, fewer redundant point-to-point interfaces, stronger compliance posture, and measurably better clinical and operational outcomes. This guide is designed to be immediately actionable: each section includes practical tools, assessment questions, and a maturity model that can be applied within existing governance structures.

1. Introduction: The Interoperability Imperative

Interoperability is the ability of different information systems, devices, and applications to access, exchange, integrate, and cooperatively use data in a coordinated manner, within and across organizational boundaries, to provide timely and seamless portability of information and optimize the health of individuals and populations. That definition, drawn from HIMSS, captures both the technical and the human dimensions of the challenge: interoperability is not simply about connecting two systems — it is about enabling the right information to reach the right person, in the right format, at the right time, to support a clinical or operational decision.

Most health systems already have some degree of connectivity in place. HL7 v2 interface engines route lab results and ADT (admission-discharge-transfer) feeds between the EHR and ancillary systems. Health Information Exchanges (HIEs) provide community-level record sharing. Direct Secure Messaging supports referrals and transitions of care. But these connections were frequently

built incrementally, interface by interface, over fifteen or twenty years, and rarely with a unifying architecture. The result is what many CIOs describe candidly as "interface spaghetti": hundreds of point-to-point connections, inconsistent data models, and a support burden that grows every time a new system is added.

HL7 FHIR (Fast Healthcare Interoperability Resources) has emerged as the industry's consensus path forward. Unlike HL7 v2's message-based, loosely structured approach, FHIR defines discrete, well-structured "resources" — Patient, Observation, Medication Request, Encounter, and more — that can be exchanged via modern, RESTful APIs. FHIR is the standard underpinning ONC's certification requirements, the CMS Patient Access API mandate, Da Vinci Project payer-provider exchange implementation guides, and the US Core Data for Interoperability (USCDI). Building a roadmap around FHIR is therefore not only a technical best practice, but also increasingly a regulatory necessity.

This paper does not assume a green-field environment. Most health systems will need to bridge legacy HL7 v2 and CDA-based exchange with a growing FHIR footprint for several years to come. The roadmap framework below is designed for that reality: it treats interoperability as an evolving portfolio of investments rather than a single "rip and replace" project.

2. Understanding the Interoperability Landscape

Before prioritizing any project, a health system needs a shared, precise vocabulary for what interoperability actually means in practice. HIMSS and ONC commonly describe four levels of interoperability, and it is useful to locate every current and planned data exchange within this model.

Foundational interoperability

Data can be sent from one system to another, but the receiving system cannot interpret it without manual intervention — for example, a scanned referral document or a PDF lab report received via fax or unstructured email.

Structural interoperability

Data is exchanged in a consistent format with defined fields, so the receiving system can parse it (for example, an HL7 v2 ADT message), but the underlying clinical meaning may not be uniformly represented across sending and receiving systems.

Semantic interoperability

Exchanged data uses standardized vocabularies and code sets — LOINC for labs, RxNorm for medications, SNOMED CT for clinical findings — so that both systems interpret the data identically, enabling automated clinical decision support and analytics.

Organizational interoperability

Interoperability is supported by governance, policy, legal agreements, workflow alignment, and trust frameworks that allow secure, timely, and appropriate data exchange across organizational and business boundaries.

A mature interoperability roadmap advances a health system along all four dimensions simultaneously — the technology (structural and semantic) and the governance (organizational) must move together. A common failure mode is investing heavily in FHIR APIs (a structural and semantic advance) while neglecting the data-use agreements, consent management, and cross-department governance needed to operationalize that connectivity. The framework in this paper addresses both.

3. Step 1: Assess Current Data Connectivity

The first phase of any credible roadmap is a rigorous, honest inventory of the current state. Skipping this step — moving straight to vendor selection or a FHIR pilot — is the single most common reason interoperability programs stall: teams discover mid-project that they don't actually know how many interfaces exist, who owns them, or what data quality issues are lurking in source systems.

Key Assessment Activities

Interface and integration inventory

Catalog every existing interface: source system, target system, standard used (HL7 v2.x, CDA, FHIR, flat file, proprietary API), data domains exchanged, transaction volume, business owner, and technical owner. Many health systems are surprised to find several hundred interfaces once shadow IT and departmental point solutions are included.

Data quality and standards assessment

For each major data domain (demographics, encounters, labs, medications, allergies, problem lists, immunizations), assess adherence to standard terminologies. Inconsistent use of LOINC or local lab codes, free-text medication entries, and duplicate patient records are common findings that will constrain any future FHIR implementation if left unaddressed.

Infrastructure and platform review

Document the interface engine(s) in use, API gateway or FHIR server capability (if any), identity and access management architecture, and network/security posture, including whether systems sit behind a common Master Patient Index (MPI) or Enterprise Master Patient Index (EMPI).

Regulatory and contractual baseline

Confirm current compliance status against the ONC Cures Act Information Blocking provisions, CMS Patient Access and Provider Directory APIs, TEFCA participation (if applicable), and state-level HIE requirements. Identify any open findings, self-disclosures, or upcoming attestation deadlines.

Stakeholder and workflow mapping

Interview clinical, operational, and IT stakeholders to surface pain points that data connectivity gaps create in daily workflow — for example, care managers manually re-keying data from a referral partner's portal, or emergency department clinicians lacking visibility into recent outside encounters.

Building an Interoperability Maturity Baseline

A useful output of this phase is a simple interoperability maturity score, rated 1 (ad hoc, largely manual/foundational exchange) to 5 (FHIR-native, semantically standardized, governed exchange across the full data domain set) for each major data domain and each key trading partner category (affiliated providers, payers, labs/reference labs, HIEs, post-acute and behavioral health partners, patients/consumer apps). This creates a defensible, visual baseline that later prioritization decisions can be measured against — and gives leadership a concrete way to track progress year over year.

4. Step 2: Define the Strategic Vision

With the current state understood, the roadmap needs a destination. A strong interoperability vision connects technical investment directly to the organization's clinical and business strategy — value-based care performance, network growth, patient experience, clinician efficiency, and regulatory compliance — rather than treating interoperability as a purely technical initiative.

Anchor to strategic priorities

Translate enterprise priorities into interoperability objectives. For example, a system pursuing risk-based contracts needs real-time admission notifications and closed-loop referral data from post-acute partners; a system focused on patient experience needs a robust Patient Access API and integrated patient-generated health data.

Define target-state architecture principles

Establish guiding principles the organization will hold to across every project — for example: "FHIR R4 is the default standard for all new integrations," "a single EMPI is authoritative for patient identity," "all external data exchange flows through an API gateway with centralized logging," and "consent and purpose-of-use are enforced at the point of exchange, not after the fact."

Set a 3-year interoperability target state

Describe, in concrete terms, what "good" looks like three years out: percentage of trading partners connected via FHIR, average time to onboard a new integration, real-time versus batch exchange ratio, and patient-facing API adoption. This target state becomes the north star against which individual projects are prioritized.

5. Step 3: Prioritize Integration Projects

Most health systems have far more candidate integration projects than they have budget or engineering capacity to deliver in a given year. Without a structured prioritization method, the loudest stakeholder or most recent vendor pitch tends to win, regardless of actual organizational value. A simple, transparent scoring framework brings discipline and defensibility to these decisions.

We recommend scoring every candidate project against two axes — clinical/business impact and implementation effort — and plotting the results on a 2x2 prioritization matrix.

Impact Factors

- Patient safety and clinical quality impact (e.g., does this close a known safety gap, such as missing allergy or medication data at transitions of care?)
- Regulatory or contractual urgency (e.g., is there a compliance deadline, an information-blocking risk, or a payer contract requirement?)
- Financial impact (e.g., revenue tied to value-based contracts, cost of manual workarounds being eliminated, avoidance of duplicate testing)
- Breadth of impact (number of patients, encounters, or care sites affected)
- Strategic alignment (how directly the project advances the 3-year target state defined in Step 2)

Effort Factors

- Technical complexity (data mapping effort, availability of standard FHIR resources versus custom mapping, source system API maturity)
- Trading partner readiness (does the partner already support FHIR, or does this require a custom v2 interface or manual file exchange?)
- Governance and legal lift (new data-use agreements, BAAs, consent workflow changes)
- Organizational change management required (workflow redesign, training, clinician adoption)

The Prioritization Matrix

Quick wins (high impact, low effort)

Prioritize these first — they build momentum, demonstrate value to executive sponsors, and often involve trading partners who already support FHIR or well-established HL7 v2 patterns.

Strategic investments (high impact, high effort)

Sequence these into the roadmap deliberately, often broken into phased sub-projects (for example, building FHIR-based bidirectional exchange with a large payer partner across multiple data domains over several quarters).

Fill-in projects (low impact, low effort)

Useful for balancing team capacity between larger initiatives, but should not consume a disproportionate share of roadmap bandwidth.

Reconsider (low impact, high effort)

These projects warrant scrutiny — often they persist on the backlog due to a single vocal stakeholder rather than clear organizational value and should be revisited or descoped.

This scoring exercise should be run collaboratively with an interoperability governance committee that includes clinical informatics, IT architecture, compliance, and representatives from major service lines — not by the integration team in isolation. The output is a ranked, twelve- to twenty-four-month project backlog that becomes the working roadmap.

6. Step 4: Architect for HL7 FHIR-Based Exchange

With priorities set, the roadmap moves into architecture and delivery. This is where the shift toward HL7 FHIR-based exchange becomes concrete. FHIR should be understood as the target standard for new and re-platformed integrations, layered thoughtfully over the HL7 v2 and CDA-based exchange that will continue to carry significant transaction volume for years.

Core Architecture Components

FHIR server / API gateway

A central FHIR-compliant server (whether native to the EHR, a standalone platform, or an integration-engine module) exposes standardized RESTful APIs for Patient, Encounter, Observation, Condition, Medication Request, Allergy Intolerance, and other core resources. An API gateway layered in front provides authentication, rate limiting, logging, and a consistent developer experience for internal teams and external trading partners.

Master Patient Index alignment

Reliable FHIR exchange depends on confident patient matching. Health systems should validate (or invest in) an EMPI capable of probabilistic matching across trading partners, since a mismatched Patient resource undermines every downstream exchange, regardless of standard used.

Terminology services

A centralized terminology service or mapping layer normalizes local codes to standard vocabularies (LOINC, RxNorm, SNOMED CT, ICD-10) at the point of exchange, rather than leaving this work to be duplicated by every downstream consumer.

SMART on FHIR app support

For patient-facing and clinician-facing applications, SMART on FHIR provides a standardized authorization and launch framework, enabling third-party apps — care management tools, patient portals, clinical decision support modules — to securely access FHIR data with appropriate, scoped consent.

Bulk FHIR (Flat FHIR) for population-level exchange

For payer data exchange, quality reporting, and population health analytics, Bulk FHIR ($export operations) allows efficient extraction of data for large patient cohorts, avoiding the overhead of resource-by-resource API calls.

Implementation guides and profiles

Rather than building bespoke FHIR profiles for every partner, teams should adopt existing implementation guides wherever possible — US Core for baseline USCDI conformance, Da Vinci guides (PDex, CRD, DTR, PCDE) for payer-provider exchange, and CARIN Blue Button for consumer-directed exchange — to maximize reuse and reduce partner-specific customization.

Bridging Legacy and FHIR Exchange

For existing HL7 v2 interfaces that are not immediate priorities, a pragmatic "wrap and transform" pattern is often more efficient than wholesale replacement: the interface engine continues to receive v2 messages, but a transformation layer converts them into FHIR resources for consumption by newer applications. This allows the organization to expose a consistent FHIR API surface to consumers without requiring every legacy source system to be re-platformed on day one.

7. Step 5: Establish Governance, Security, and Compliance

Technical architecture alone does not make data exchange safe, compliant, or trusted. Governance is what allows interoperability to scale beyond a handful of pilot integrations into an enterprise capability.

Data governance and stewardship

Establish clear data ownership for each domain (who is accountable for the accuracy of the problem list, medication list, allergy list, etc.), along with data quality monitoring and remediation processes that operate continuously, not just at project kick-off.

Privacy, consent, and information blocking compliance

Implement a consent management approach that supports granular, purpose-of-use-based sharing where required (particularly for sensitive data categories such as behavioral health and substance use records under 42 CFR Part 2), while ensuring the organization does not engage in practices that could be construed as information blocking under the ONC Cures Act rule.

Security architecture

All external-facing FHIR APIs should be protected with OAuth 2.0 / SMART on FHIR authorization, mutual TLS where appropriate, comprehensive audit logging, and regular penetration testing. Interoperability expands the organization's attack surface, and security review should be embedded in every project's design phase, not appended at the end.

Trading partner agreements

Standardize data-use and business associate agreement templates for common partner categories (payers, HIEs, referral partners, digital health vendors) to avoid a lengthy, bespoke legal negotiation for every new connection.

Interoperability governance committee

A standing, cross-functional body — spanning IT, clinical informatics, compliance, legal, privacy, and key clinical/operational stakeholders — should own the prioritization framework from Step 3, review architecture decisions, and monitor the roadmap's progress against the target state defined in Step 2.

8. Step 6: Sequence the Implementation Roadmap

A roadmap is only useful if it is sequenced into a realistic, resourced delivery plan. We recommend structuring delivery into overlapping phases rather than a single linear sequence, since foundational, quick-win, and strategic projects typically need to progress in parallel.

Phase	Focus
Phase 1 — Foundation (Months 1-4)	Complete the current-state assessment, stand up or upgrade the EMPI and API gateway, finalize governance charter and prioritization framework, and deliver one or two quick-win FHIR integrations (for example, a Patient Access API to satisfy CMS requirements, or a real-time ADT feed to a key referral partner) to build organizational confidence.
Phase 2 — Scale (Months 4-12)	Execute the top-ranked quick-win and early strategic projects from the prioritization backlog: expand FHIR resource coverage across core clinical domains, onboard priority payer and HIE connections, and implement terminology normalization for the highest-volume data domains.
Phase 3 — Optimize and extend (Months 12-24)	Tackle the larger strategic investments — full bidirectional payer exchange, Bulk FHIR for population health and quality reporting, SMART on FHIR app ecosystem enablement, and legacy interface consolidation through the wrap-and-transform pattern.
Phase 4 — Continuous improvement (Ongoing)	Establish an annual re-assessment cycle: refresh the maturity scoring from Step 1, revisit strategic priorities from Step 2, and re-run the prioritization exercise from Step 3 to onboard the next wave of trading partners and use cases, including emerging areas such as remote patient monitoring data and social determinants of health exchange.

Each phase should have an executive sponsor, a named program lead, clear success criteria, and a budget tied to the organization's capital and operating planning cycle. Publishing the roadmap — even in summary form — to clinical and operational leadership builds transparency and helps surface conflicting priorities before they derail delivery.

9. Step 7: Lead Change Management and Stakeholder Engagement

Interoperability projects fail more often from organizational friction than from technical limitation. A deliberate change management approach is therefore a core roadmap component, not an afterthought.

Executive sponsorship

Secure a visible executive sponsor — typically the CIO or CMIO — who can resolve cross-departmental conflicts, protect budget and staffing commitments, and communicate progress to the board and medical staff leadership.

Clinical champion network

Identify clinical champions in each major service line who can validate that new data flows genuinely improve workflow (rather than simply adding another screen or alert), and who can advocate for adoption among their peers.

Communication cadence

Establish a regular reporting rhythm — a monthly steering committee update and a quarterly organization-wide progress summary — that ties roadmap milestones back to the strategic priorities defined in Step 2, so stakeholders see tangible connection between technical work and organizational goals.

Training and workflow integration

Any new data becoming available (for example, outside encounter notifications appearing in the EHR) requires deliberate workflow design and end-user training; simply exposing more data without guidance on how to act on it can increase alert fatigue rather than reduce it.

10. Measuring Success: Metrics and KPIs

A roadmap should be measured, not just executed. We recommend tracking a small set of metrics across three categories, reviewed at each governance committee meeting.

Technical / operational metrics

Number and percentage of trading partners connected via FHIR versus legacy formats; average integration onboarding time; API uptime and latency; percentage of data domains meeting semantic standardization targets (e.g., percentage of lab results mapped to LOINC).

Compliance metrics

Patient Access API utilization and response times against CMS thresholds; information-blocking complaint volume and resolution time; audit findings related to consent and access controls.

Clinical and business outcome metrics

Reduction in duplicate testing (e.g., repeat imaging or labs within a defined window); care manager and clinician time saved on manual data reconciliation, measured through workflow time studies; performance on value-based contract quality measures that depend on timely data exchange, such as admission notification-triggered follow-up rates; patient-reported experience related to having to repeat their medical history.

Where possible, baseline each metric during the Step 1 assessment so that improvement can be demonstrated credibly to executive leadership and, where relevant, to payer and regulatory stakeholders.

11. Common Pitfalls and How to Avoid Them

Across health systems at varying stages of interoperability maturity, several recurring pitfalls consistently derail otherwise well-intentioned programs.

Treating interoperability as a single project rather than a portfolio

A roadmap needs standing governance and recurring investment, not a one-time budget line that ends when the first FHIR API goes live.

Underinvesting in data quality and patient matching

No amount of API sophistication compensates for unreliable patient matching or inconsistent source data; these foundational issues should be addressed early, even though they are less visible than a new interface.

Building bespoke integrations for every partner

Skipping standard implementation guides (US Core, Da Vinci, CARIN) in favor of one-off, partner-specific data mappings creates long-term maintenance burden and slows future onboarding.

Excluding compliance and legal from technical design

Consent, privacy, and information-blocking considerations are far cheaper to address during architecture design than after a connection is already live.

Measuring activity instead of outcomes

Counting interfaces built is not the same as demonstrating improved safety, efficiency, or compliance; the metrics framework above should be tied to the organization's actual strategic priorities from the outset.

Neglecting change management

Even a technically flawless integration will underperform if clinicians and staff are not trained on the new workflow and do not trust the data being presented to them.

12. Case Snapshot: The Framework in Practice

Consider a mid-sized regional health system with a mix of an established EHR, several affiliated independent physician practices on differing systems, a growing value-based care contract portfolio, and a history of manual, fax-based referral exchange with post-acute partners. Applying this framework, the organization's Step 1 assessment revealed over 240 active interfaces, inconsistent LOINC mapping for reference lab results, and no formal consent management process for behavioral health data.

> *240+ active interfaces identified; two quick-win FHIR projects delivered within the first four months of the roadmap.*

Using the Step 3 prioritization matrix, the governance committee identified two quick wins: a FHIR-based Patient Access API to close a looming CMS compliance gap, and a real-time ADT feed to the

system's three largest skilled nursing facility partners, both scored as high impact and comparatively low effort since the EHR vendor's FHIR server already supported the required resources. These were delivered within the first four months, building credibility for the broader program.

In parallel, the organization began Phase 1 foundational work: consolidating patient matching under a single EMPI and establishing the interoperability governance committee. By month twelve, the system had onboarded FHIR-based exchange with its two largest payer partners using Da Vinci implementation guides, reducing prior-authorization turnaround time and improving quality measure reporting accuracy. The Step 1 maturity scoring was refreshed at the twelve-month mark, showing measurable advancement from largely foundational/structural exchange to semantic interoperability across core clinical domains — providing a concrete, board-reportable measure of progress.

13. Conclusion

Interoperability is a journey best navigated with a clear map, not a series of disconnected sprints toward the nearest deadline. The framework outlined in this paper — assess the current state honestly, anchor the vision to organizational strategy, prioritize transparently using impact and effort, and implement HL7 FHIR-based exchange in governed, sequenced phases — gives health system leaders a repeatable structure for what is ultimately a multi-year, continuously evolving capability.

The health systems that succeed are those that treat interoperability governance as a permanent organizational function, reassess their roadmap on a regular cadence, and stay disciplined about measuring outcomes rather than activity. Done well, this work delivers on interoperability's core promise: the right clinical information, available at the point of care, without friction for patients, clinicians, or the teams supporting them.

About 4W Sciences

4W Sciences partners with health systems, payers, and digital health organizations to design and implement practical, standards-based interoperability strategies — from current-state assessment and governance design through HL7 FHIR architecture and implementation. For more information on building an interoperability roadmap tailored to your organization, contact our team.