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Attendees: Hans, Riki, Mike, Ron, Serafina, Rob H, Andrea, Ed, JD

We are using some R4 features, do we want to create R4 based extensions to see what they are looking like

Hans slides –slide 9

Right now we are just mapping the codes – do we need the additional attributes in observationDefinition – only once we move past the current LIVD

The observatonDefinition right now is based on lab related test and related attributes

What is coming out of analyte is not the same as observationDefinition (that describes what is exchanged with outside partners)

Could there be multiple linkages between IVD test code and observationDefinition

Device -> observation -> conceptMap

Set up an example – there are so many variations for the Glucose tolerance that the vendor would have to support that they wouldn’t know the information (1 mg bolus of Glucose, 1 mg of Lactose bolus vs 2mg etc)

how to deal with other clinical context that could be communicated from the POC device – that is not what we are modeling here - this is for catalog of possible LOINCs for the specific IVD test code

device manufacturer provide what the device can do – list of range what device can do – the actual narrowing falls outside the scope of this project

green elements are input for the observationDefinition

LOINC code and IVD codes go to the code system, but codes system to observationDefintion will be dotted , since that is out of scope of this

Different cut-offs based on specimen types; LIVD provides the possible sources from which to pick the one correct LOINC for each observationDefinition

On slide 9 create labDeviceProfile that can have linkage to all the observationDefintions the instrument in the specific lab can support

Dan proposed to use observationDefintion can provide the attributes to codify some of the elements that we are currently only having free text, in order to help with using automated mapping as a future scope, we currently ONLY have text, because those elements are not standardized across vendors – see slide 11

Consider using structureMap if we go further and map resources to each other

in forge:

extensions are identified with “-“ in the file name

composition extension:

SD approved loosening the requirement to have a subject be a person / or be required – will have to check the WGM minutes

Can copy the definitions from the document on the website: <http://ivdconnectivity.org/livd/>

PublicationIdentifier definition: This can be any globally unique or non-unique as the manufacturer sees fit, Having one helps with management f publications, when there are multiple versions.

.value = use the FHIR definition

.assigner = use FHIR definition

Must have system when you have value, because without system value is not unique, but system = namespace is not easily readable, so support assigner.display (the definition comes from the referenced resource – we really only need the manufacturer name = organization.name

Do we need to constrain the attributes inside the identifier datatype? If we have an optional element can we rely folks know that these require agreement with partners; agree to making not supported at the resource attribute level, but not sure that applies to the datatype attributes

Rob likes to leave datatype attributes optional, while Ed likes to constrain out all that we don’t need

How hard is it to expand back out to include elements that were previously constrained out, because it will be a new version for the extension – depends if we are expecting version 2 supporters to exchange with version 1 supporters – the organization could invoke the specific version that is being declared in the transaction, since these are profiles

Status = set to ONLY FINAL = The status of the publication. – can always be adjusted, if we plan to expose the preliminary versions – no plan to do that yet

Type want to state this is a publication – Riki drops off 1:59 PM ET