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

## Attendees

* Boris Brodsky, FDA
* Jean-Henri Duteau, Duteau Design
* Hugh Glover, Blue Wave/Parexel
* Smita Hastak, Samvit Solutions
* Ed Helton, NCI
* Wendy Ver Hoef, Samvit Solutions
* Julie James, Blue Wave/Parexel
* John Keiser, AbbVie
* Bob Milius, NMDP
* Armando Oliva, FDA
* Jane Pollack, NMDP
* Diane Wold, GSK

## Agenda:

### BRIDG alignment with other HL7 DAMs –a proposal for discussion

* Elect a BRIDG POC to interface with the specific ‘owner’ WG.
* Determine BRIDG use cases (e.g. imaging) of potential overlap.
* Explore the current model developed by the owner group (e.g. Imaging Integration WG).
* Between the BRIDG and owner POCs, jointly determine overlaps and BRIDG extensions.
* Between the BRIDG and owner POCs, jointly design the ‘super-classes’ for the owner WG, to include the attributes common to both models.
* Represent extensions to the shared super-class in BRIDG, *explicitly* referencing the super-class.
* Monitor the owner model (BRIDG POC), and initiate harmonization process if a super-class needs to change.

GROUP DISCUSSION – regarding the proposal continued from last week

* Several points were raised in regards to the proposal. Following is a summary of each discussion point:
* There was a concern raised regarding the level of resources needed to potentially implement this proposal – keeping up with multiple HL7 work groups and align with their semantics (even if only in overlapping areas) is a resource intensive task and should not be underestimated. We need to make sure there is a return on investment for doing this work and would this distract us from focusing on other more specific BRIDG tasks, such as adding new semantics to BRIDG or other items on BART agenda?
* Another point to note is that how we operationalize this plan will have to be discussed with the other HL7 groups (of interest to BRIDG) and get their input too. Working together on common concepts and agreeing on a higher level concept which can be extended by each group will take time and needs both work groups to support the process. This proposal will only work if BRIDG and the other relevant DAM wg is interested – cannot do this only from BRIDG perspective. The commitment has to be from all (relevant) work groups.
* What are we saying in this proposal – is it that BRIDG modeling team is making a commitment to stay aligned or reconcile with all other (relevant) HL7 DAMs? Doing this on a continual basis maybe too much work. Maybe we can say that BRIDG will align (on common semantics) every 6 months.
* Rather than aligning or harmonizing any concepts, maybe we should socialize BRIDG (like we did in December and January this year), but make no commitment to harmonize. If we do this, then we cannot really reference other DAMs – harmonization by reference only works when we have taken the time to at least harmonize on core/common concept at higher level (superclass level).
* Questions raised on why would BRIDG not take the time to review other DAMs and provide comments to make sure the other DAMs support BRIDG use cases? This takes time and resources and our intent is not for other DAMs to support BRIDG use cases, but keep the BRIDG use cases in BRIDG as long as the higher level class is the same in relevant DAMs from other HL7 work groups.
* Should BRIDG look at how US handles SNOMED process? In the US, users add extensions to SNOMED and start moving forward. US does not wait on SNOMED to reconcile their requirements. This is a US specific process. Rest of the countries do not add extensions and move forward – they reconcile with SNOMED. BRIDG may not be able to leverage the US SNOMED process.
* Overall there is a recognition of the fact that in theory, harmonizing on common concepts (superclass level) would be good, but not clear on how it could get operationalized practically. The resources needed to support this process, the commitment from other HL7 WG, the impact of this task on other (more) critical tasks are all factors to consider.
* Will need to figure out what we want to say in the BRIDG 4.0 ballot. For now, we may just acknowledge the fact that BRIDG is aware of similar work in other WG and are planning to work with those teams in the future.