20170131\_LOI\_Notes

Attendees: Bob Y, Kathy, Freida, Riki, Sheryl, Andrea, Carolyn, Cindy, David b

There are several comments that seem to be related that folks may be looked at an older version – those are marked as could not find in triage

#507: remove the period after all the table numbers – not sure this is worth the effort – will affect ALL tables in all documents

Several need information for Swapna – Riki to share with Bob Y

Red strikethrough were for deprecated Conformance statements – do we need to keep them, and if so for how long? – that may be a question for Rob Snelick – conformance – Bob Y to do

#394 and 395 – heck on why there is nothing in proposed wording – Riki to follow up

eDOS:

#1: CPT modifiers – if you have repetitions of a CPT code do not list the CPT code and list it with the number of repeats, but rather just list the CPT code as often as it needs to appear, so propose we change the note above the table to what is in the comment – Motion to find persuasive with mod David B, Freida, no further discussion, against:0, abstain: 0, in favor: 8

#39 and #40: Need to make the DPS segment RE, and then also define it in the guide as to what elements we want to support:

DPS-1 = R CWE\_08 using HL7051, which we also would need to define

DPS-2 = R CWE\_08 using HL70941, which we also need to define – limit to CPT codes = any codes required and ICD 10 procedure codes = any codes required – and allow any other code system as permitted, motion to find persuasive with mod Freida, David B, no further discussion, against:0, abstain: 2, in favor: 6

Only one open is the AOE from the DSTU comment #1066

LOI:

#190: Section 4.4 describes the message structure used for the unable to cancel or cancel as requested while the section 5.3.2 is mislabeled – should be 4.3.2, which is the accept level ACK – both should point to the same section – as the only difference is the ORC-2 code used - David B will write explanation text to go in that same section and then we will vote on it next time

Andrea drops off

#6: LAB\_NB\_Component needs to use same verbiage in both LOI and LRI guide – find persuasive change to read “LAB\_NB\_Comonent: TS\_03” in LOI Bob Y, Freida, no further discussion, against:0, abstain: 0, in favor: 7

#130: agree - remove the ‘X’ in Container End row for usage; may be just leave the children blank for the group when it is X? – will ask Rob Snelick about best way to publish this, Riki to follow up on rules for segments within a group (section 2.12.6.3 in v2.5.1) – can we just add the excluded from this IG note

#106: not persuasive – the first column depicts the usage in the base standard, which is O repeating, while all other columns indicate usage per this IG – Bob Y, Kathy, no further discussion, against:0, abstain: 0, in favor: 7

Sheryl drops off

#131: same resolution as #130

#113: Find persuasive – would be next to the vertical red dashed line in the EHR box – Bob Y, Kathy, no further discussion, against:0, abstain:0, in favor: 6

#133: is related to TS – group all TS comments together and review – need some research first

#134: also part of TS group

#17: If the CS applies to the Financial Profile Component, then this is correct and should NOT make a CS for optional group, which is what it is in the Common – not persuasive with mod – change the Profile this CS applies to – Bob Y, Freida, no further discussion, against:0, abstain:2, in favor:4

#55: same as #17

#18: Move the note that is below the example ahead of the example box – and delete the first Note – persuasive with mod Freida, Kathy, no further discussion, against:0, abstain:0, in favor: 6

#56 – same as #18

 #190: Proposed wording for the clarification: the laboratory determines whether the test can be canceled (ORC-1 = CR) or whether the order has progressed to far to cancel (ORC-1 = UC). In either case the lab should reply using the 2 offending sentences

#33: TZO should not be RE for DTM\_13 and DTM\_03 since TO Component requires the offset, but really only useful when hours are populated, so make C(R/X) – also David would like HL7 to have a code identify unknown TZO –that would have to be in the base