**Orders & Observations Conference Call**

**6 January 2016**

**+1 770 657 9270, Passcode: 398652#**

**WebURL:** [**https://join.me/vernetzt.us**](https://join.me/vernetzt.us)

**Attendees:**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Name | Organization |
| 1 | Kathy Walsh | LabCorp |
| 2 | Andrea Pitkus | IMO |
| 3 | Riki Merrick | APHL |
| 4 | Jean Lightwood | SAS |
| 5 | Kamalini Vaidya | IPO |
| 6 | Wendy Ver Hoef | Samvit Consulting |
| 7 | Ron Van Duyne | CDC |
| 8 |  |  |
| 9 |  |  |
| 10 |  |  |
| 11 |  |  |
| 12 |  |  |

Regrets:

**Co-Chair**: Riki Merrick

**Scribe:** Riki Merrick

Agenda/Minutes:

1. Agenda Review
2. Approve minutes from
   1. November 4, 2015: <http://wiki.hl7.org/index.php?title=File:SPM_Minutes_20151104_ConCall.docx>
   2. November 18, 2015: <http://wiki.hl7.org/index.php?title=File:SPM_Minutes_20151118_ConCall_v1.docx>
   3. December 2, 2015: <http://wiki.hl7.org/index.php?title=File:SPM_Minutes_20151202_ConCall.docx>
   4. December 16, 2015: <http://wiki.hl7.org/index.php?title=File:SPM_Minutes_20151216_ConCall.docx>

Motion to approve as corrected Ron van Duyne, Kathy Walsh, no further discussion, against: 0, abstain: 0, in favor: 6

1. WGM session is Wed Q2 – OO hosting
2. Compare Specimen DAM to biologic specimen model in BRIDG - map specification source is BRIDG and the map to is specimen – stored here:

<http://www.hl7.org/documentcenter/public/wg/bridg/BRIDG%20to%20Specimen%20DAM%20Mapping%20Spreadsheet%2020151216.xls>

* 1. Link to BRIDG model: <http://bridgmodel.nci.nih.gov/files/BRIDG_Model_4.0_html/index.htm> - chose VIEW:BSP - biospecimen
  2. Link to Specimen DAM: <http://wiki.hl7.org/index.php?title=Specimen> – scroll to bottom for image

Discussion:

Focus on blue concepts for biologic entity /subject… and others that are specific to the biologic specimen?

Subject and biologic entity are “smushed together” in BRIDG – also in DAM

Wendy drops off 10:17 AM ET

Reviewing the spreadsheet:

Decided to focus on elements that are more likely to be needed in the specimen DAM:

DefinedProcedure - DAM might use some of these attributes, but not this high level term

DefinedProcedure.approachAnatomicSiteCode - Map to SpecimenCollection.approachAnatomicSiteCode in DAM

DefinedProcedure.approachAnatomicSiteLateralityCode - Map to SpecimenCollection.approachAnatomicSiteCodeModifier in DAM

DefinedProcedure.methodCode - Map to SpecimenCollection.methodCode in DAM

DefinedProcedure.nameCodeModifiedText - Not in DAM, not sure this is needed

DefinedProcedure.targetAnatomicSiteCode - Map to SpecimenCollection.AnatomicSiteCode in DAM

DefinedProcedure.targetAnatomicSiteLateralityCode - Map to SpecimenCollection.AnatomicSiteCodeModifier in DAM

DefinedProcedure.Is a(n):DefinedActivity - Not sure this link is needed to the higher class of activity in DAM

DefinedProcedure.usedProduct(Product) - not currently in DAM - would an example be a Dacron swab etc? If so, should add; depends if there is another place to capture this kind of information (under container possibly)

DefinedSpecimenCollection - SpecimenCollection in DAM

DefinedSpecimenCollection.instantiatingSpecimenCollectionGroup(SpecimenCollectionGroup) - this seems to be the difference between logical in BRDIG and concept level in DAM

DefinedSpecimenCollection.producedSpecimen(Specimen) – Map to Specimen in DAM

Device - does this cover container?

Device.age - not needed in DAM

Device.availableForEvaluationIndicator - not needed in DAM

Device.ceMarkIndicator - not needed in DAM

Device.handlingCode - we do cover temperature under ProcessingActivity in DAM - would that be the same as this one?

Device.manufactureDate - possibly needed - may need to add DAM, if applicable to container, else falls outside the DAM

Device.overTheCounterProductIndicator - not needed in DAM

Device.reprocessedDeviceCode - not needed in DAM

Device.returnedToReprocessorDate - not needed in DAM

Device.riskCode - not needed in DAM

Device.singleUseDeviceIndicator - not needed in DAM

Device.Is a(n):Product - difference between logical level in BRDIG and concept level in DAM

Device.specifiedSoftware(Software) - might be needed on testing side, but is outside of DAM

Laboratory - outside of DAM

Laboratory.identifier - outside of DAM

Laboratory.performingOrganization(Organization) - outside of DAM

Material - Map to Material in DAM – (spreadsheet has this note: difference between the logical level in BRIDG and the concept level in DAM – we should updated to the proper mapping)

Material .actualIndicator - DAM is focused on actual / instance representation, so not sure this is needed (default would be "true")

Material .characteristicBehaviorCode - not needed in DAM

Material .code – Map to Material.typeCode in DAM

Material .description – add to DAM

Material .effectiveDateRange - That seems to be dependent on the test the specimen is used for, so outside of the DAM

Material .formCode – Map to Material.formCode in DAM

Got to Material.producingDefinedMaterialProcessStep(DefinedMaterialProcessStep) – start here next call

**Next call is January 20, 2015**

Call adjourned 11:58 AM ET

Spreadsheet at end of call: <http://www.hl7.org/documentcenter/public/wg/bridg/BRIDG%20to%20Specimen%20DAM%20Mapping%20Spreadsheet%2020160106.xls>

1. Next Steps:
   1. Compare Specimen DAM to biologic specimen model in BRIDG = Identify issues, if any find resolution – doing that on our calls
   2. IHE AP domain is working on structured AP report in CDA and has some requirements, we might not yet have considered – have added the concerns identified to the spreadsheet above - Identify issues, if any find resolution