

# Sevocity, Real World Testing Results

SEV-RWTR-25.01

## Table of Contents

General Information .....	2
Changes to Original Plan .....	2
Withdrawn Products .....	2
Summary of Testing Methods and Key Findings.....	2
Standards Updates (including SVAP and USCDI).....	4
Care Settings .....	4
Applicable Real World Testing Certification Criteria and Relied Upon Software .....	4
Metrics and Outcomes.....	4
<b>170.315(g)(7)(9)(Cures Update) Application access .....</b>	<b>5</b>
Use Case 1: Query Patient Data .....	5
Use Case 1 - Query Patient Data: Collected Results .....	5
Use Case 1 - Query Patient Data: Summary.....	5
<b>170.315(g)(10)(Cures Update) Standardized API for patient and population services.....</b>	<b>5</b>
Use Case 1: Query Patient Data .....	5
Use Case 1 - Query Patient Data: Collected Results .....	5
Use Case 1 - Query Patient Data: Summary.....	5
Key Milestones.....	6

## General Information

**Plan Report ID Number:** SEV-RWTR-25.01

**Developer Name:** Conceptual MindWorks, Inc.

Product Name	Certified Health IT Product List (CHPL) ID	Real World Testing URLs
Sevocity, Version 13.0	15.04.04.2324.Sevo.13.01.1.221230	<a href="https://www.sevocity.com/resources/onc-certifications-rwt/">https://www.sevocity.com/resources/onc-certifications-rwt/</a>

## Changes to Original Plan

Summary of Change	Reason	Impact
The RWT Plan included a range of interoperability criteria.  This RWT Results submission was reduced to API criteria g.7, g.9-g.10.	In 2025, ASTP/ONC issued an Enforcement Discretion regarding Real World Testing (RWT) requirements for 2025 and 2026. The formal requirement for RWT Results submission was reduced to API criteria g.7, g.9-g.10.	None.

## Withdrawn Products

None.

## Summary of Testing Methods and Key Findings

### Executive Summary

The 2025 results of Real-World Testing (RWT) conducted for the pertinent API criteria (g)(7), (g)(9), and (g)(10) demonstrated high availability and reliability.

Currently, Sevocity EHR offers two distinct API's for interoperability purposes. The original version of the API supports (g)(7) and (g)(9) requirements and produces output in CCD format. The newer version of the API supports (g)(10) requirements and produces output consistent with the FHIR standard.

The (g)(7),(g)(9) API does not have any current user adoption; perhaps, due to other options made available within the Sevocity system to obtain CCD output. Nevertheless, Sevocity maintains this service offering should it be requested. For the purposes of this RWT iteration, the Sevocity team directly exercised this API and recorded the results.

The (g)(10) API has relatively few implementations, but they utilize the API consistently and frequently for their real-world purposes. The successful applications of the initial API adopters are encouraging and the Sevocity team is formulating approaches to promote further adoption.

In summary, the metrics gathered during RWT demonstrated the service offerings are highly reliable and readily available. These RWT results once again demonstrate that the services offered are readily fulfilling their objectives when customers engage.

### **Composition of 2025 Participants**

Sevocity's customer base consists of ambulatory clinics, with small to mid-sized practices composing many constituents. These smaller practices tend to adapt more gradually to new services than larger practices with more available resources. Gradual adaptation also tends to occur on a service-by-service basis, rather than integrating all available services simultaneously.

For interoperability services of wide adoption, customers selected to participate in RWT are through an arbitrary methodology. Due to limited adoption of the (g)(7), (g)(9), and (g)(10) APIs thus far, all activity during a pre-determined duration are included in the RWT results.

### **Participant Engagement and Metric Gathering**

Another RWT process improvement that is continued this year is to rely on programmatic metric gathering built into the application workflow. This significantly reduces the burden of user participation, as participants contribute meaningful metrics simply by performing their routine activity. Participants were in no way incentivized to engage in any activity simply for the sake of exercising a Use Case. It was our goal to observe only true real-world utilization of the pertinent services.

The RWT results presented in this report were programmatically collected based solely on the usage of the pertinent service. The programmatic tracking included indicators of attempts - both successful and unsuccessful, if applicable. Participants were in no way incentivized to engage in any activity simply for the sake of exercising a Use Case. It was our goal to observe only true real-world utilization of the pertinent services.

The collected metrics were useful as indicators of: (1) customer adoption and (2) service reliability.

### **Participant Reported Errors**

There were no errors observed during RWT activities.

If an error had been detected, the process would have gone as follows. In instances where programmatically gathered metrics indicate unsuccessful attempts, an additional source of insight is an internal helpdesk system where customer-reported issues are documented contemporaneously. If an issue was reported by a participant, this qualitative data source is a valuable supplement to the quantitative metric data.

### **Customer Rate of Adoption**

RWT metrics continue to provide insight into general usage trends. As we currently support two versions of the API for interoperability services, the data shows a clear preference for the most recent version. The early adopters of the latter API are a positive indicator. This is useful data that will weigh into future courses of action. The Sevocity team remains committed to promoting interoperability features as opportunities for customers to enhance their workflow.

## Standards Updates (including SVAP and USCDI)

The product evaluated in the 2025 Real-World Testing period did **not** include voluntary standards updates.

## Care Settings

The four clinical settings of care represented in the 2025 Real-World Testing results are: Family Practice, Specialist/Surgical, Geriatrics, and Obstetrics & Gynecology. The table below indicates which care settings were considered per measure.

	Family Practice	Specialist/Surgical	Geriatrics	OB/Gyn
<b>170.315(g)(7) Application access – patient selection (API)</b>	X	No RWT	No RWT	No RWT
<b>170.315(g)(9) Application access – all data request (API)</b>				
<b>170.315(g)(10) Standardized API for patient and population services – Query patient data</b>	X	X	X	X

## Applicable Real World Testing Certification Criteria and Relied Upon Software

Certification Criteria	Relied Upon Software, if applicable
<b>170.315(g)(7) Application access – patient selection (API)</b>	Google Authenticator
<b>170.315(g)(9) Application access – all data request (API)</b>	
<b>170.315(g)(10) Standardized API for patient and population services – Query patient data</b>	

## Metrics and Outcomes

## 170.315(g)(7)(9)(Cures Update) Application access

### Use Case 1: Query Patient Data

#### Use Case 1 - Query Patient Data: Collected Results

	<b>Participants</b>	<b>Number of Data Requests Invoked</b>	<b>Number of Errors Encountered</b>	<b>Success Rate of Data Requests Executions</b>
1	Product Developer	6	0	100%

#### Use Case 1 - Query Patient Data: Summary

This Use Case required the following software external to the Sevocity EHR application:

- API Test Harness

This Use Case was not applicable to any existing customer workflows. Therefore, the Sevocity team executed this Use Case directly. The exercise was performed using synthetic data in a production-like environment in December 2025.

The available service performed as expected with no issues encountered.

## 170.315(g)(10)(Cures Update) Standardized API for patient and population services

### Use Case 1: Query Patient Data

#### Use Case 1 - Query Patient Data: Collected Results

	<b>Participants</b>	<b>Number of Data Requests Invoked</b>	<b>Number of Errors Encountered</b>	<b>Success Rate of Data Requests Executions</b>
1	SEVCUMC2	245,555	8	99.99674%
2	SEVDRHW	2,656	0	100.0%
3	SEVDRUO	3,584	0	100.0%
4				
5				
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>251,795</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>99.999968%</b>

#### Use Case 1 - Query Patient Data: Summary

The metrics documented for this use case were collected from system logs covering a period of 30 days in April 2025. The participants represent actual customers utilizing the standardized API service for specialty purposes. Each call to the API requesting a specific FHIR resource that is included in baseline (g)(10) requirements was counted as a distinct data request.

Though there are few implementations, the results indicate the participants utilize the service at a high frequency.

The results also confirm that the service is readily available and highly reliable.

## Key Milestones

Key Milestone	Timeframe	Achieved
<b>Revision of scripts/tools to gather 2025 metrics</b>	2025, Q1	Yes
<b>Identification of the RWT environment (production when practical, or production-like settings otherwise) for 2025 RWT evaluation</b>	2025, Q1	Yes
<b>2025 RWT production usage period</b>	2025, Q2 – Q3	(g)(10) – Yes  (g7)(g9) – No. Intentionally delayed until Q4 due to lack of real-world usage.
<b>Gather and analyze 2025 RWT production usage data</b>	2025, Q4	Yes
<b>Submit 2025 RWT Results Report to ONC-ACB for review</b>	2026, Q1	Yes
<b>ONC-ACB publishes 2025 RWT Results in CHPL</b>	NLT March 15, 2026	On Track