20170214\_SNI\_LOI\_Notes

Attendees: Andrea, Carolyn, Cindy, Hans, Kathy, Hans, Riki, Bob Y, Sheryl,

#130 – Riki to talk to Rob S about listing SAC as R, when the group is R

#133/#134 – Bob Y will do – if not send to Hans

#190 – David provided a suggestion – doc has been posted for a while, add in (ORL), unless that is in the section reference text – Motion to accept as proposed: Riki, Kathy, no further discussion, against: 0, abstain: 0, in favor: 7

(keep the hyperlink to the wiki page, where the document is kept – also add a separate tab with the document and list the file name)

#33: for the TS flavors when the TO\_Component is invoked – in this case DTM\_13 – Motion to change DTM\_13 ZZZZ from RE to C(R/X) with CP: If DTM\_13 HH is present and modify the title – see option 2 in proposed wording – Riki, Bob Y, no further discussion, against: 0, abstain: 1, in favor: 6

#31: for the TS flavors when the TO\_Component is invoked – in this case DTM\_03 – Motion to change DTM\_03 ZZZZ from RE to C(R/X) with CP: If DTM\_03 HH is present and modify the title – see option 2 in proposed wording – Riki, Bob Y, no further discussion, against: 0, abstain: 1, in favor: 6

Motion to reopen: Bob Y, Riki, , no further discussion, against: 0, abstain: 1, in favor: 6

#32: for the TS flavors when the TO\_Component is invoked – in this case DTM\_07 – Motion to change DTM\_07 ZZZZ from RE to C(R/X) with CP: If DTM\_07 HH is present and modify the title – see option 2 in proposed wording – Riki, Bob Y, no further discussion, against: 0, abstain: 1, in favor: 6

Mark all issues listed as same as # - retracted in column AF

#172: looks like we need to include these segments – find persuasive with mod – add in the segment definitions for SGH and SGT – Hans to provide draft for review, also remove the note and make the SGH RE and 0..1 and add note that only needed when sending prior results groups (But is not computable form the message, even if folks declare the PR\_Component – as that only means it is supported, not necessarily populated every time – Riki, Bob Y, further discussion: what is missing – similar to tables like we have for PID, against: 0, abstain: 0, in favor: 7

#117 and #192: Is there a clear definition in the base standard for accommodating this type of information – so need a base standard proposal – once there is more clarity on conveying this information and appropriate guidance on usage has been created, then can consider for future use – find not related, that means now that is will become a recommendation for new proposal in this case for the base – Riki, Cindy, no further discussion, against: 0, abstain: 0, in favor: 7

Have 4 open NEG with follow ups

Look at Affirmatives – AS first

#86 - add OML^O21^OML\_O21 row to the first diagram and change the cell fill for the top rows in both diagrams – move the sentence that stats with Requisition before the first of the diagram – Hans will take a pass at this re-arranging

Hans drops off, Riki chairs

#87 – suggestion is to add orders to PHLabs as listed example – the sentence before that still lists ambulatory – so take out “ambulatory” in the sentence – Motion to find persuasive with mod – Kathy, Andrea, further discussion: could this also be used for lab to lab testing? What about federal care setting like military – covered under hospital-based or PHLab – no disagreement

#77: make the LOI context diagram look like LRI if we have the original artwork, else just add the arrow heads – no disagreement

#78: for style purposes when you have lists of ‘;’ then the statement ends with ‘.’, the second to last are joined by ‘and’ – may be we should change all ‘;’ to ‘.’ – no disagreement

#79: not persuasive – no disagreement

#90: find persuasive – no disagreement

#152: Reach out to Craig to get clarification what he means by granularity

#154: Reach out to Rob Snelick about nomenclature for core vs common

#155: Need to draft new language – should vote on this one once we have draft language – David B to draft

#156: allow PID to be used for non-persons – since in LRI we allow results from persons and animals – change to LOI\_PH\_Component – no disagreement

#157: suggestion is to make usage RE for all – originally was set to O for receiver, since the labs do not routinely keep that in the LIS – LabCorp just added it for orders on children – IN1 elements cover employer name and address which might be needed for worker’s comp – labs still disagree – so leave as is find not persuasive – no disagreement in the group for the disposition

#158: find persuasive, do we need to go find use of the word repeat elsewhere where we need to replace it? Just for this location – no disagreement

#104: find persuasive with mod – just remove the reference to ordering provider initiated, to match the section title – no disagreement

#159: both tables follow the same convention – not persuasive – no disagreement

#160: This seems to be related to <http://www.hl7.org/dstucomments/showdetail_comment.cfm?commentid=1112> – but for the ones he points out they are inside the order group – ORC\_1 within the same order group is the wording we want to use. – verify with Craig – mark yellow – Riki would like to vote on this one

Call adjourned 5:07 PM ET