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Attendees: Bob Y, Riki, Andrea, Erin, Craig, Kathy, Sheryl, Tim, John R, Cindy, Rita, Nancy

#418: Reference to Section 13.3 – that section was not ported over from published R2 version before

Motion to add the missing section from section 8.1 in R2 May2014 document and update the example to current LRI way of handling AOEs – update the section and review the material prior to final approval Bob Y, Cindy, further discussion: Start with the existing document, track changes to review = need volunteers – would be persuasive with mod, abstain: 0, against: 0, in favor: 11

#44: LRI is not describing how to handle batching – what controls ACK behavior for batches? In LRI use of MSH-15 and MSH-16 so there is no original = do you ACK at the batch level, the file level or the message level – if at message level – just declare that here; else we may need to ask INM

IF you receive a batch of ACK message and the MSH-10 is not present in any MSA-2, that does not have an ERR

ACK to a batch would be a batch of ACK messages, one for each message that was included in the original batch, since MSH-15 is set to AL; we are not expecting an application level ACK in the LRI\_PH\_

From base HL7 v2.7.1 = 2.10.3.3: A batch containing zero ACK messages implies ALL MESSAGES are ok, but permissible to send 1:1 ACKs;

Why not just refer to the base standard for the batch ACK handling and not make additional statements here? Would prefer to not create a separate profile to handle this.

Not a lot of experience with ACKs and batch handling – allow flexibility to do either of the described options in the base standard.

Motion to find persuasive with mod – defer to a small group to revisit the section and prepare it to be as close as possible to the underlying section in the standard – closest would be a direct reference John R, Nancy, further discussion: if the same as the standard, then we are better off not list it here – rather than leave the section out, since we have previously made statements about this section, that we are now changing, should at least refer to the standard section we want them to read, volunteers: John R, reach out to David B and submitter Ruth – abstain: 2, against: 0, in favor: 10

Looking at affirmatives

#156: #157 – same section, different comment, same submitter: combine both suggested statements and state living and once living, this is in scope section – results from specimen obtained from living or once living subjects (persons and animals)

Will pick up here next week -