# BRIDG Architecture Review Team Meeting minutes – March 27th, 2015

# Attendees

* Ed Helton, NCI
* Boris Brodsky, FDA
* Hugh Glover, Blue Wave/Parexel
* Smita Hastak, Samvit Solutions
* Wendy Ver Hoef, Samvit Solutions
* Julie James, Blue Wave/Parexel
* Bob Milius, NMDP
* Armando Oliva, FDA
* Diane Wold, CDISC
* Terry Hardin, Parexel

# Agenda: Terminology identification and development methodology

Julie’s presentation (see [slide](http://wiki.hl7.org/index.php?title=File:BRIDG_TERMINOLOGY.pptx)):

1. As part of the architectural review, we will definitely need to address the requirement for “structural terminology” to support BRIDG
	1. Will need to find an external source (rather than doing it ourselves).
	2. Probably the best option would be the NCI-Thesaurus, but we will have to be very careful with using that to avoid many of its pitfalls.
	3. Starting by removing empty BRIDG classes and maintaining their semantics with the use of type codes or similar is an good place to start
2. We cannot mandate value sets for domain specific (“descriptive”) terminology, but we are mindful that by not doing so, we reduce the value of BRIDG a little in terms of semantic interoperability.  We should (somehow) provide links to exemplar value sets when possible
3. There would be value in working on the BRIDG dynamic models to support the “status” terminology and its associations with the “milestone activities” described in BRIDG

Standard terminologies – LOINC, MedDRA, etc – are standalone artifacts (domain-based terminologies).

Can’t use BRIDG unless can instantiate terminologies. (If the goal is to make BRIDG implementable, we have to have terminologies).

Structural vs descriptive terminology: Loose semantic interoperability without the former.

Need to define principles, e.g. rules when something becomes a type code.

E.g. empty classes (like administrative activity class which is a type of activity) do not add attributes, so we can drop them – but need a vocabulary to represent the semantics (e.g. administrative activity types).

Some attributes carry rich semantics (organization, activity, document types require defined value sets).

For some domain-specific data (e.g. lab observations), BRIDG will not prescribe which codes to use (that binding would be provided by users/organizations), just provide recommendations, based on structural terminology. E.g. discussion within CDISC on the nomenclature for viruses; each virus has a committee developing a nomenclature for one. BRIDG would encourage using nomenclature, but leaving it up to the committees to determine one. Can specify the most current recommendations in BRIDG (a description or a link to the source), but even to keep them updated for every data element would be a challenge.

Architecture is linked to terminology: E.g. an implementer’s concern is to express the accepted a terminology binding, which is an architectural issue (how to specify a code system and value set), critical for Meaningful Use. Deferred to the following discussion (value set binding).

Crossover of information and terminology models.

Individual organization have different implementation on child-by-child basis, but it is expected to be consistent (e.g. status codes matching up).

Due to several participants being unavailable on April 3rd, recommended to cancel next week meeting.