**Orders & Observations Conference Call**

**3 July 2014**

**+1 770 657 9270, Passcode: 653212#**

**Attendees:**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Name | Organization |
| 1 | Lorraine Constable | Constable Consulting |
| 2 | Diane Vaughan | Kaiser Permante |
| 3 | Kathy Walsh | LabCorp |
| 4 | Riki Merrick | Vernetzt, LLC |
| 5 | Mark Jones | Orchard |
| 6 |  |  |
| 7 |  |  |
| 8 |  |  |
| 9 |  |  |

 Regrets: Rob Hausam

**Co-Chair**: Lorraine Constable

**Scribe:** Riki Merrick

**Agenda/Minutes:**

1. **Agenda Review**
2. **Announcements:**
3. **Approve Minutes from last calls:**
	1. **3/23/2014, 6/5/2014, 6/19/2014** – were sent on 6/19/2014: Motion to approve minutes as distributed Kathy Walsh, Riki Merrick, no further discussion, against: 0, abstain: 0, in favor: 4
4. **Ballot Reconciliation:**

**#103:** Answer to email inquiry for clarification:

Text was dropped in consolidation process - here is the original: The model in figure 3 is good. But it lacks a harmonization with other information.

So, on the previous page "section" is mentioned, but I cannot find it in this figure.

We should provide an overall drawing including all stuff.

Mark as see #100 and #101

**#116:** 6/23: Review of OO minutes found related item#2 accepted at WGM has different name - need to reconcile between SpecimenCollection and SpecimenCollectionProcedure.

7/3/2014: Motion to re-open item and approve SpecimenCollection as the new term Riki Merrick, Diane Vaughan - Add examples to both the definitions, mark as persuasive with mod, no further discussion, against:0, abstain:1, in favor: 3

**#123:** From vote count and comment they seem to imply not desirable - we added them because in v2 they are separated, in v3 they are combined. In the conceptual model we could keep these separately as concepts and allow the logical model to decide if they want to use the information model approach or the terminology approach respectively. Kathy prefers to keep modifiers separate. Sites should be modeled the same way - in SPM we have a modifier for targetsite, but not for approach site - Motion to defer decision to logical modeling step and add explanation on the considerations that would need to be made for each decision. Mark the Qualifiers as 0..\* in the model. Mark Jones, Riki Merrick, no further discussion, against:0, abstain:1, in favor: 3

**#124:** They seem to agree with our approach - mark as persuasive - Mark Jones, Diane Vaughan no further discussion, against:0, abstain:0, in favor: 4

**#125: split into 3 comments**

**#990:** Derived specimen field is not really needed when a parent code is present, but we decided to be explicit about it in the conceptual model. Are slide from a section of a block be derived - yes, they all have a parent specimen code. This was added as a flag to indicate for folks to pay attention to the parent specimen. - Motion to retain the Boolean and add explanatory text why, not persuasive with mod Riki Merrick, Kathy Walsh, no further discussion, against:0, abstain:0, in favor: 4

Ballot reconciliation spreadsheet at end of this call – unfiltered: 

Call adjourned 1:00 PM EDT

Next call is July 17, 2014 12-1 PM EDT