20170321\_LOI\_Notes

Attendees: Freida, Bob Y, Rebecca, Riki, Andrea, Cindy, Kathy, Carolyn

Both BlockVotes:

We will be sure to fix all typos prior to copy pasting, especially those in LRI#183 (NEG), LRI#360, and LRI#365 per Cindy's submitted list (LRI#322 is already listed above) and per Kathy LRI#377 - I hope we don't also need to pull these - I have identified them in the spreadsheet with " - TypoFix"

Motion to accept typos as documented – Bob Yencha, Cindy, no further discussion, against: 0, abstain: 1 in favor: 7

BlockVote #2:

Included Items:

LRI#19, 51, 74, 175, 178, 182, 269, 270, 271, 272, 275, 276, 282, 287, 289, 302, 303, 306, 308, 309, 330, 346, 347, 348, 349, 350, 387, 388, 391, 392, 398, 399, 400, 407, 411, 416, 417, 450, 451, 452, 460, 467, 487, 493, 497, 505, 990

Note LRI#505 has already been applied per LOI#149

Motion to accept as proposed – Kathy Walsh, Andrea Pitkus, no further discussion, against: 0, abstain: 2 in favor: 6

Pulled items:

* **LRI#22** and **LRI#23**: Cindy to provide updated verbiage to review
	+ see document “V251\_IG\_LRI\_R1\_D3\_2017JAN Proposed Revisions Comments 22+23.docx”
	+ LOINC code available that matched the test = appropriate LOINC – this is background information
	+ What about discouraged – sometimes those codes are appropriate – discouraged is not prohibiting the use, but it is not recommended, add TRIAL
	+ Do you create your own LOINC codes?
		- Have codes that identify when we don’t have LOINCs
		- Some others do use xLOINC codes – for example CA does that
		- APHL has PLT codes that are used as initial codes that can be used across PHLs until a LOINC has been assigned, at which point they are deprecated
		- NHSN has some codes that look like LOINC
	+ Note LRI23 is similar concept, but in different location in guide

Motion to approve as edited Cindy, Andrea, no further discussion, against: 0, abstain: 0, in favor: 8

* **LRI#322**: The reason to make this changes is that the CWE display requirements now supersede this requirement by the rule, that CWE\_01.9 is ONLY to be used, when it is different from CWE\_01.2 or CWE\_01.4 per these rules:

Display of CWE content is context dependent; the requirements when conveying results derive from CLIA and other sources. The resulting processing, storage, and display requirements are defined in the EHR-S Lab Functional Profile.

Note the following rules for display purposes only when more than one triplet is available in the specific flavor of CWE in use:

1) CWE.9 (Original Text) should not contain an entry unless it is different from what is in either triplet and then it must be used for the display.

2) If there is only one triplet, use it;

3) If two triplets, use the triplet containing the local code;

4) Where two triplets are present with two local or two non-local codes, the receiver should use the first triplet.

5) Additional constraints may apply, see individual elements using CWE.

We will have to pull comment about the datatype - use in OBX-5 into the document as Clin genomics is different

Motion to go with the originally proposed Motion, with the addition of adding in the Clin Genomic CWE datatype flavor – the text means that OBX-5.9 is ONLY valued when it is different from OBX-5.2 - Bob Y, Andrea no further discussion, against: 0, abstain: 4, in favor: 4

* and LRI#323 - should be pointing to LRI#322 instead of LRI#22

Other open Negatives:

* **LRI#43:** Why DSC = X?

Ask Hans and Ken

* **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?
	+ Mother’s Maiden Name
	+ Still retain some optionality in the NDBS profile
	+ Just using the XO component will not work for NDBS

Motion to find not persuasive – Rebecca, Bob Y, no further discussion, against: 0, abstain: 0, in favor: 6

* **LRI#458 + LRI#459**: reorganization of the guide – how to handle? Might be good but not for this ballot round -

Motion to find persuasive with mod – will include it in work prior to normative publication but not prior to second round of balloting now – Bob Y, Freida, no further discussion, against: 0, abstain: 1, in favor: 7

 **LRI#492** – remove note about SCT not being required under organism table in SNOMED CT section – this note was made to re-inforce that SNOMED CT is not required in the common component – so may be adjust to list that; or just delete the entire table and the note – Motion to find persuasive with mod, Freida, Cindy, no further discussion, against: 0, abstain: 0, in favor: 8

Also look at LRI#407 – we already removed the notes per the block vote

* **LRI#419** – Conformance statements or changed usage for AOE in some OBX elements;
	+ And related already approved comment: LRI#418: Updated LRI with the AOE section from ELR R2 document and added the requested additions of use of OBX-29 and OBX-30 (since those were not part of ELR R2) - Review

The section on how to constrain it – if that is from the base, should not be in here, else move up out of PH component? But the title for the AOEs is limited to Epidemiological Information – in Common we have other reasons for the AOEs – so bump back down to LRI\_PH\_Component

* + Added text in AOE FOR EPI section

**LRI#419**: Motion to consider for future use: Freida, Kathy, no further discussion, against: 0, abstain: 0, in favor: 7

Questions from applying prior resolutions:

* **LRI#405** - the newly created XON datatype for LRI\_PH\_Component - ballot comment only called out ORC-21 and OBX-23, but XON is also in LRI\_PH\_Component for NK1-13 and SFT-1 - listed there are XON = base - but SFT is ONLY used in LRI\_PH\_Component, so should that be XON\_01 or XON\_03?
	+ Editor to change datatype in SFT-1 to XON\_03 – will leave NK1-13 as XON\_01 for now

Found Items:

* + **LRI#989**: Typo on CNN – should be CNN\_01 – what do we need to do here?
		- Editor already applied
	+ **LRI#988**: the SN datatype mislabeling – Proposed motion use definition of LOI SN\_01
		- Motion to apply the recommendation from 3/9 Bob Y, Kathy , no further discussion, against: 0, abstain: 0, in favor: 7

BlockVote#3:

Included Items:

LRI# 1, 26, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 45, 53, 59, 62, 75, 77, 93, 95, 96, 98, 101, 102, 103, 104, 105, 106, 107, 108, 109, 110, 111, 112, 113, 114, 115, 117, 119, 120, 121, 133, 143, 145, 153, 162, 171, 173, 179, 181, 186, 187, 188, 189, 204, 206, 210, 211, 212, 234, 258, 263, 264, 265, 277, 279, 280, 288, 290, 293, 295, 305, 312, 315, 316, 317, 318, 319, 325, 329, 338, 339, 340, 345, 351, 353, 355, 357, 362, 363, 366, 369, 370, 371, 382, 389, 390, 402, 403, 404, 410, 420, 421, 428, 457, 461, 462, 463, 465, 474, 475, 476, 477, 478, 479, 480, 481, 482, 483, 486, 488, 489, 490, 494, 496, 502

* Motion to accept as proposed – Kathy, Bob Y, no further discussion, against: 0, abstain: 1, in favor: 5

Pulled Items:

* For items **LRI#56**, **LRI#57** and **LRI#58** we will change the dispositions from persuasive to Considered - no action required, as they relate to Notes to Balloters section
	+ Motion to change the disposition as suggested – Freida, Andrea, no further discussion, against: 0, abstain: 0, in favor: 6
* **LRI#97 / LRI#139 / LRI#429**: We will review the document Freida Hall sent to the list titled “LRI #97\_139\_429\_KW Cmnt.docx”
	+ Motion to accept the comments per Kathy’s suggestion and add into the last paragraph “Copy-to“ – Kathy, Freida, no further discussion, against: 0, abstain: 0, in favor: 5

Call adjourned 5:00 PM EDT

* **LRI#127**: I don't think this predicate changes the fact that you don't need a version, when HL7 table or user defined - it just adds that CWE.01.3 is actually populated - will discuss and then adjust
* **and LRI#128**: Thank you for catching that - the CWE\_01.8 Condition Predicate would need to point to CWE\_01., not CWE\_01.3.

Should we also include in both, that this applies to ALL CWE - flavors, where usage of these fields is C(RE/X):

- for CWE.7 these are: CWE\_01, CWE\_02, CWE\_03, CWE\_04 and CWE\_0x

- for CWE.8 these are: CWE\_01 (after LRI#128 passes), should LRI#128 also be applied to CWE\_03?

* **LRI#267**: Suggested NEW verbiage in 8.1.1:

The MSH-21 (Message Profile Identifier) field shall identify exclusively one lab results interface profile and shall not be populated with conflicting LRI profile or LRI profile components. Additional compatible profiles or components can be present in MSH-21; for example, if an LRI profile or component is further constrained.

* **LRI#291** - will review the value set file for HL70078
* **LRI#375** – Use of “PA” in ORC-1
* **LRI#172 = LRI#364** -> **LRI#991 –** usage of specimen group / SPM segment has been discussed on 3/2 call and voted on – here are the minutes: <http://wiki.hl7.org/index.php?title=File:20170302_LOI_Notes.docx>

Other Affirmatives:

* LRI#54: parent child linkage across messages
* LRI#135 / LRI#376: how to handle deprecated Conformance Statements?
* LRI#381 / LRI#177 / LRI#163 = Batch message and ACKs
* LRI#164: Support for CG as part of LRI\_PH\_Component?
* LRI#180: Clinical Information sharing using OBX segment, where OBX-29 = SCI and OBX-30 empty
* LRI#286:
* LRI#198
* LRI#376: deprecated CS handling

Follow up items:

* Security related:
	+ 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#141 / LRI#454 – sent email to submitter
* Grouping option related – need to update the spreadsheet with the resolution from the 3/14 minutes:
	+ LRI#8 / LRI#131 / LRI#200 / LRI#344 /LRI#501 – grouping option related – on 3/14 we decided to add Notes to reviewers that we want to re-evaluate the issue of having OBRs without OBX segments, so looking for more input during next ballot round and will consider these again during that resolution cycle