



# Outstanding issues in ICF

Marijke W. de Kleijn - de  
Vrankrijker

&

Huib Ten Napel

WHO-FIC Centre NL

Halifax, ICF tutorial, June 1, 2004



# Issues presented

- A & P clarification issues
- Capacity and performance
- Qualifiers



# A & P clarification (1)

- Revision ICIDH to ICF
- Agreement on A vs P definition:
  - activity is .....(limitation)
  - participation is .....(restriction)
- Disagreement on A vs P as classifications:
  - 1 classification (d-codes, domains)
  - to be used in A or P mode (a-codes, p-codes)



## A & P clarification (2)

- Options for A vs P use, in annex 3:
  - 1 distinct A vs P sets (no overlap)
  - 2 partial overlap between sets of activities and participation domains
  - 3 detailed categories as A and broad categories as participation
  - 4 same domains for A and P (total overlap)



## A & P clarification (3)

- Option 1:  
distinct sets of activities domains  
and participation domains (no  
overlap) e.g.:
  - chapter 1 (learning)- 4 (mobility)  
= a-codes
  - chapter 5 (self care) - 9 (community  
etc life) = p-codes



## A & P clarification (4)

- Option 2:  
partial overlap between sets of activities  
and participation domains, e.g:
  - chapter 1 (learning) - 2 (general  
tasks) = a-codes
  - chapter 3 (communication) - 6  
(domestic life) = a-codes and p-codes
  - chapter 7 (interpersonal interactions)  
- 9 (community etc) = p-codes



## A & P clarification (5)

- Option 3:  
detailed categories as activities  
and broad categories as  
participation with or without  
overlap, e.g:
  - crawling (d4550) as activity (a-code)
  - and moving (d455) as participation  
(p-code)



## A & P clarification (6)

- Option 4: use of same domains for both activities and participation with total overlap of domains:
  - all chapters as a-codes
  - and p-codes




## A & P clarification (7)

- Original plan:
  - evaluation of use in practice of the 4 options
  - leading to a recommended way of distinction
- Research
  - of NACC
  - NL research




## A & P clarification-NL research: (8)

- Creation of a clear distinction between A & P
  - based on information from daily practice (expressions)
  - develop CEN-EN1828 type definitions to check reliability
- **Method:** Structured collection of data
  - expressions on A or P with codes
  - from records, surveys & questionnaires
  - electronic processing  ICF Response Centre



# A & P clarification (9)

<b>ICF Response Centre</b>	
	<b>ICF-EV (Eds. H ten Napel, EJ van der Haring, PE Zanstra)</b> <i>release: 1.00.01</i>
User	<a href="mailto:h.tennapel@mi.umcn.nl">h.tennapel@mi.umcn.nl</a>
Selected Class	d4500 : Walking short distances
Assigned Code	<input type="text" value="d4500.23"/> <input type="checkbox"/> Concept from questionnaire
Assigned Name	<input type="text" value="moderate restriction in mobility and severe limitation to walk short distances because of obstacles"/>
Questionnaire Name	<input type="text" value="test"/>
Comment	<input type="text" value="we have the intuition that this is not 'one' thing, but two concepts combined, depending on what needs to be assessed: the activity concept of the person or, the participation concept related to the environment, as the personal perceived restriction in moving around, in fact being an emotional construct, or both simultaneous? the question is, what does the code capture from this context dependent event?"/>
<input type="button" value="Submit Comments"/>	Enter your comments on class <b>d4500</b> here above



# A & P clarification (10)

- Analysis of submitted terms → codes?
  - using Medical Terminological Analysis method
    - experience in French CCAM development
  - modelling of class concept diagram
    - using UML
- Are A & P distinct concepts?
  - what defines A explicitly?
  - what defines P explicitly?
  - can the A & P list be reconstructed and the items separated?
  - sensible or not?



# A & P clarification (11)

- Who do we want to comment?
  - controlled group
  - interested parties
  - invited on personal title
  - experts
- Requires
  - funding
  - criteria
    - to be formulated
  - equipment
    - tools ,electronic or paper based



## A & P clarification (12)

- May I have your votes please:
  - 1 distinct sets, no overlap
  - 2 partial overlap between sets
  - 3 detailed as A and broad as P
  - 4 total overlap of domains as A and P



# Capacity vs performance (1)

- A and P classification 2 qualifiers:
  - capacity (ability to do in a standard environment)
  - performance (does do in current environment)
- Confusing:
  - WHO
  - activity = capacity
  - participation = performance



## Capacity vs performance (2)

- activity + • capacity
- activity + • performance
- participation + • capacity
- participation + • performance



## Capacity vs performance (3)

- What is your preference:
  - for A vs P and
  - capacity vs performance



# Qualifiers (1)

- body functions:
  - extent/magnitude of impairment
  - no impairment - complete impairment
  - 0-4% ..... 96-100%
- body structures:
  - extent/magnitude impairment (idem)
  - nature of change in body structure
  - localization



# Qualifiers (2)

- Activities and participation:
  - performance
  - capacity
  - with or without assistive devices or personal assistance
  - no difficulty - complete difficulty
  - 0 - 4 % ..... 96 - 100 % ???????



## Qualifiers (3)

- Environmental factors:
  - negative scale, barriers
  - positive scale, facilitators
  - both scales 0-4% ..... 96-100 %



## Qualifiers (4)

- To be done:
  - mapping existing scales to qualifiers
  - clarification and validation of scales 0-4% ... 96-100%
  - ACC + Nordic centre



# Thank you for your attention



- [www.rivm.nl/who-fic](http://www.rivm.nl/who-fic)