20170316\_LOI\_Notes

Attendees: Bob Y, Riki, Kathy, Cindy, Andrea, Craig, Freida, John R, Carolyn, Hans

Cindy sent some items to pull for the blockVote

Also she found some typos in the disposition column

LOI Block Vote:

Item# - Submitter

#152, 161, 173, 176, - Craig Newman

#101, 103, 109, 110 - John Roberts

#186, 188 - Ruth Berge

#112, 114 - Hans Buitendijk

#82, 83 - Lori Dieterle

#1, 7, 8, 38, - Ulrike Merrick

#178 - Clem McDonald

#146, 147 - David Burgess

Pull #82:  or actually change disposition to see LOI#156 for resolution, as we have adjusted that last sentence to read: The subject shall be a person except when LOI\_PH\_Component is invoked.

Kathy and Cindy had issue not seeing the email, Frieda just forwarded

Motion accept BlockVote as proposed including #82, Hans, Bob Y, no further discussion, against: 0, abstain: 3, in favor: 7

LOI#999 = LRI#987: XPN flavors – there are 4 different versions

XPN datatype flavor harmonization:

In LOI we are not using custom flavor for FN but we are in LRI

Motion to add FN\_01 to LOI

XPN\_02 is used in NK1-2, NK1-30, IN1 and GT1

Change FN to FN\_01 for LOI\_XPN\_02

In PID-5 is R; XPN\_01.1 is RE, Once you value it, then use the surname, so also change to FN\_01

Used in Patient Name and Mother’s maiden name

Motion to add FN\_01 to LOI and change FN to FN\_01 for XPN datatype - Riki, Craig, no further discussion, against: 0, abstain 0, in favor: 10 – substantial change for LOI

LRI-XPN\_01: used for ALL fields for all but the NDBS profile which created LRI-XPN\_02

Change LRI-XPN\_01 to LRI-XPN\_03

and LRI\_XPN\_02 to LRI\_XPN\_04

Cindy drops off

PID-5 is not repeating in either guide

Right now typeCode is RE in LOI, but is R in LRI, so might not have anything to send it back

If a field is required can you just send the ^^^^^^^?

Make LOI\_XPN\_01.7 from RE to R

What is the use case for not just using the middle name – C usage is too strict, so just sync with LRI

Motion for LOI to adopt LRI-XPN\_01 – Craig, Riki, no further discussion, against: 0, abstain 0, in favor: 9

This is a substantial change for LOI

Change LRI-XPN\_02 to LRI-XPN\_03

What about using Safehaven as last name – what typecode would that be – not U and not masked or pseudoneumoinzed? – leave as RE

What about LOI-XPN-02 condition on name type code

In GT1 segment we have a requirement to use “” as a name, when the guarantor is an organization.

Motion to change LRI-XPN\_02 to LRI-XPN\_03 – Kathy, Riki, no further discussion, against: 0, abstain 1, in favor: 8

LOI AND LRI items:

*COPIED FROM 3/14 discussion: ACK related:*

* + *LOI#155: Draft of section – Kathy / David to provide – Riki shared John Roberts’ document as a starting point for background (numbers changed since we move the section down in the document) – Hans will take a look at this before Thursday’s call*
	+ *LRI#361: How to use MSH-21 with the ACK components*
		- *Only the Application level ACK uses the End to End component, the Communication level is not using the End to end component*
		- *Motion to clarify that Application ACK is the ONLY one using the end to end MSH-21 value, while the Communication level is only between two immediate points – Bob to wordsmith from here – Riki, Freida, no further discussion, against: 0, abstain:1, in favor: 8*
	+ *LRI#41: use application level ACKS*
		- *Yes we have not used it before and has caused issues knowing if messages arrived, having the end to end profile allows us to verify receipt, when desired; allow parties to choose the level of CK that best suits their environment, – question answered*
	+ *LRI#39 / LRI#40 (the retry is internally in the lab, not part of the message) diagrams for ACK flow – mark both as questions answered; considered for future use/ LRI#52 mark as considered for future use and request a starting verbiage*
	+ *Sync these ACK related comments:*
		- *LOI#105: John shared document: Section 2 dot 3 ACKs rewrite.docx*
		- *LRI#174 = LRI#44 John Roberts cannot get the writing done = LRI#263 = LRI#428 = LRI#175 = LRI#366*
			* *In notes to balloters we want to invite comments on the ACK section and will consider all the ACK related comments that have not been addressed as well as new comments will be addressed as ballot recon process*
		- *Motion to rather than delaying the ballot we want to proceed and seek further comments and will address the resolutions to be part of the next ballot reconciliation round – still persuasive with mod – this motion applies for LRI#439, LRI#40,LRI#52, LRI#174, LRI#44, LRI#263, LRI#428, LRI#175, LRI#366 and will add note to balloters to that effect into the document, Riki, Cindy, no further discussion, against: 0, abstain:1, in favor: 7*

Hans took John’s start of re-organization and prepared re-write – see document name:

General description about ACKs

diagram for LRI or LOI whichever is applicable

Accept ACK Level ACK, based on MSH-15 / MSH-16 information in OML/ORU

message structure and MSH-15/16 values

Application Level ACK

Batch

No changes to the message structure and MSH valuations – but big change in flow so are we ready to vote on this now – better to put this in, since we are going back to ballot and since there may be some unintended consequences from the moving

Craig drops off

Motion to include write up for LOI#105 (pages 1 – 6) – Riki, John, no further discussion, against: 0, abstain 0, in favor: 8

LOI#155 (page 7):

Add all the components under that diagram in section 3.2.1 – it comes from the response profile component sections - Motion to accept – Riki, Carolyn, no further discussion, against: 0, abstain 0, in favor: 5

For LRI#44, #174, #263, #366, #428 – Motion to use as presented (page 8 – 14) in LRI – Riki, Kathy, no further discussion, against: 0, abstain 0, in favor: 5

To ponder as part of ballot review in LRI – has base ACK profile and end to end profile – do we need to add that for LOI as well? Make comment in next ballot, if desired

LRI#44:

Related to batch – move 7.2 after 7.3 currently – for individual ACKS of messages received as batches encourage use of enhanced mode, but still up to implementers for final decision

In use case there is talk about not sending a response or just using a single ACK to the entire batch – this clarifies that we are using enhanced mode

“When using Acknowledgments, we strongly encourage the use of enhanced mode to be …

Motion to use the updated sentence – Riki, Kathy, no further discussion, against: 0, abstain 0, in favor: 5

LRI NDBS Block Vote pulled items:

* LRI#18: we don’t want to accommodate some folks for some things and not others for others – so make this use for PID-7 only - how to adjust the LOINC table in this case to O or to X or?

In order to have a single way to report birth time, mark as X – list as TS\_06 orTS\_07 – Riki, Andrea, further discussion: Kathy would give them optional, how will this be handled in LOI? – will match usage in LOI, against: 0, abstain 1, in favor: 4

Time check – final decisions will need to be done by 3/23 at the latest

Call adjourned 4:31 PM EDT

Start here Tuesday:

* LRI#286:
* LRI#198

More LRI:

* LRI#142 – security related items – DoD vote withdrawal email has been sent – no answer so far – this is not exact wording as the others from Kathleen, but related
* LRI#442: NDBS use of X – the following elements are intentionally left O in NDBS\_Component – would it be a solution to list all of these in the NDBS component with a remark that NDBS programs should decide if they want to constrain these and then make a statement, that after these and any other O element that has been further constrained have been agreed upon by data exchange partners to apply the XO\_Component rather than list all of them in the respective tables?
* Found items:
	+ LRI#989: Typo on CNN – should be CNN\_01 – what do we need to do here?
	+ LRI#988: the SN datatype mislabeling – Proposed motion use definition of LOI SN\_01

PREP THIS

* LRI#54: parent child linkage across messages?
* LRI#43: Why DSC = X?
* LRI#458 + LRI#459: reorganization of the guide
* LRI#376: deprecated CS handling

For Thursday’s LRI Discussion –PH items:

* LRI492 – remove note about SCT not being required under organism table
* LRI419 – Conformance statements or changed usage for AOE in some OBX elements
* LRI#381 / LRI#177 / LRI#163 = Batch message and ACKs