**Specimen Project Conference Call**

**15 November 2012**

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

**Attendees:**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Name | Organization |
| Lorraine Constable | Constable Consulting |
| Riki Merrick | IConnect |
| Ron van Duyne | CDC |
| Rob Hausam | Hausam Consultng |
| Lori Dieterlie | Kaiser |
| Joan Knapp | CDC |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

**Co-Chair**: Lorraine Constable

**Scribe:** Riki Merrick

**Minutes**

* October 4 – set aside to next call
* October 18 – corrected the missing sentence, Motion to approve as corrected: Riki Merrick, Seconded by Ron van Duyne. No further discussion
	+ Against 0; Abstain 0; In Favour: 4
* November 1 – Motion to approve as distributed: Riki Merrick, seconded by Rob Hausam. No further discussion
	+ Against: 0; Abstain: 0; In Favour: 4

**Question from the listserv:**

Jim: Submitted a question about specimen quality parameters in version 3 messaging and CDA and was wondering how your group was handling it. According to Austin, all of these qualities (i.e. specimen condition, appropriateness, handling, etc.) will be handled using observations. However, I do not know what terminology will be used to provide the Observation.code values. Do you have some insight into this?

Looking for domain binding in the LSDAM model

PerformSpecimenQualityReview domain is listed, but no attributes captured

For handling terms – not defined yet – came from FHIM; they do have MaterialProcessStep – probably have PerformedActivity to match – no concepts identified yet.

Answer: We assume we will draw from SNOMED, but have not actually identified the values – could check if there are concept domains defined in v3

**Continue Model development:**

Ask at Order Entry questions – identified as entity attributes at time of specimen collection. So far we only have fasting status – pulled those out into a separate class in the model

Started pulling in container and storage equipment from LSDAM (storage equipment dimension is more of an address within the storage, not a real dimension)

The specimenID model does not differentiate between container and storage equipment, but rather just another container, which may include other containers.

In regards to specimenIDs discussed carrying forward parent specimenID to all descendants

Specimen handling use case does not further help to answer questions of storage nor parent identifiers.

We may need to wait for Lori’s use case from Kaiser to finish the storage piece

No Lorraine on 11/29 – let’s cancel that call.

**Next call 12/13** – Lorraine will see if JD Nolen is available for that call.

Discussed the derived specimen that needs to get transferred to a different system – that’s when the link to the parent ID is no longer sufficient and attributes will need to be send explicitly.

Add “Is Derived” indicator – we possibly have concept domain indicating what kind of derivative.

We may also need some information on specimen handling. For example, additives / virus passages.

If anyone on the team would like to contribute to the model effort, let one of the co-chairs know, and you can obtain to use Enterprise Architect for HL7 use. There is also a free viewer for model files, or we can export as pdf, gif, XML.

We also need to review flow diagrams of what information needs to get exchanged.