**HL7 CDS Work Group Meeting Minutes – Review of Publication Candidates for HL7 vMR DAM and HL7 vMR XML IG**

**July 30, 2013 – 3pm ET**

Attendees: Dave Shields, Paul Knapp, Atanu Sen, Bryn Rhodes, Elaine Ayres, Maiko Minami, Mark Roche, Aziz Boxwala, Rita Torkzadeh, Thomson Kuhn, Ken Kawamoto , Julie Crouse, Amy Helwig, Rob Mc Clure, Russ Leftwich, Virginia Riehl

Minute Taker: Virginia Riehl

Paul Knapp: Was confused in the original ballot because it was named an implementation guide. ITS is responsible for ensuring that technical specifications are implementable. They have reviewed the IG. They are concerned that the IG is actually doing a specification. Found that the actual specification is in the DAM published last spring. In the specifications, what is specified is a modification of data types R2 and these have not been reviewed by the appropriate committee. Should not have a normative document that stands on the shoulders of a DSTU. Based on a call this morning found out that a DAM is not considered to be implementable. Cannot do an implementation guide on a domain model.

Dave Shields: The vMR was balloted as normative in May and this is the basis for the implementation guide.

Ken joined the call

Paul Knapp: There are changes in data types. Thinks that the ones he has seen would not be approved. Problems are ITS related, some is templates, MnM, and structured documents. Recommends that there be a meeting in Q3 in Cambridge. We should hold off on these documents until after the meetings in Cambridge.

Ken – This is a challenge in S&I initiatives. We need to get something out there soon.

Paul – Do not want to slow down what the group is working. There were some go forward decisions that were given in error.

Ken – We would have been fine if we had received the proper guidance at the beginning.

Paul – If there is something that is wrong, should we correct it? It is in HL7’s global interest to make corrections as quickly as possible.

Ken – How about committing to making corrections in the January ballot cycle. Make a note in this ballot that we anticipate making these changes in January and still ballot and publish this version. It is likely that there will be two ballot cycles, so there will be opportunities to make the corrections.

Paul – ITS is not the decider on this issue. From an ITS perspective some of the data element changes that they have seen will not be approved.

David Shields – Is this in reference to the low is inclusive/high is inclusive. This would be easy to correct.

Paul – Could the review by ITS be allowed till the end of September? Since Null Flavor was removed it will be necessary to get MnM involved.

Ken – It was intentional to remove null flavors. We have FHIR because we are trying to get something that leverages the semantics that HL7 has developed in a more implementer friendly manner. vMR is the same concept, and started before FHIR.

Paul – ITS is not the decider. The TSC will look at the emerging data types in FHIR and CDS and others and determine if this is a sensible approach. There is more stuff going on that requires a broader review. It would be great if this had been identified as a problem earlier on. This is a result of not having a detailed PSS. That is why he is recommending that all parties get together in Cambridge. The purpose of a DSTU is to provide latitude.

Ken – Harmonizing wherever possible is a good thing. Agrees that the relevant groups should come together in September or possibly sooner. The project risk for this effort is that harmonization is challenging because it is slowed down if one group does not have the cycles to work on it. The ballot is an opportunity to engage. The point about the TSC is well taken and this issue will need to be dealt with. Suggest that we try to see if there are quick things that can be addressed, e.g., changing attribute names and do these for publishing. Have a firm commitment from CDS and HeD to work on resolving the issues in the next release.

Paul – Want to support what CDS is trying to accomplish. CGIT would like to be involved too. The TSC is planning to have CDS WG Co-Chairs join their call next Monday to discuss these issues. They want to resolve this. CDS could ask on this call to get the commitment of the other committees to support harmonization in the desired timeframe. Not clear if the TSC will accept the proposal to ballot and correct problems and allow the ballot to move forward. Vocabulary should also be engaged.

Amy Helwig and Julie Crouse joined the call

Ken – Summarized the issues. Suggestion is that CDS work toward harmonization, but also publish the draft standards. The ballot will provide an opportunity to get comments. The suggestion is to involve a number of groups in harmonization. This could take so long that the MU3 window of opportunity will be missed.

Julie – It sounds like the call has outlined the options for moving forward. Will let Ken determine if we can submit in time or if we need a new timeline.

Amy – We can set up some time to discuss this tomorrow.

Ken – There will be a TSC call on Monday. We will need high level ONC leadership on this call. We worked on the VMR to do a FHIR-like simplification of HL7 content before there was FHIR to simplify implementation.

Paul – Departures need to be justified and explained to the community. The problem is that if every committee does this, there will not be a standard set of data types. ONC will also want a consistent set of data types. Intent is laudable. Problem is that people were not aware of what was being done because information was in informative documents.

Ken – The issues are fairly clear. We need direction from the TSC. If this work is not allowed, might have to ballot through a different standards organization. Need to resolve as quickly as possible.

Paul – Can get the TSC to support moving the resolution forward as quickly as possible, e.g., getting Templates to respond. TSC wants things to move forward.

Ken – We need to determine a way forward and go with that for now.

Aziz – We do want to publish this soon. Supports the approach of getting everyone on board as quickly as possible.

David – Would changing the names of the attributes have a big impact?

Aziz – No

David – These changes can be made quickly. There are two instances of original text and items that were promoted. We had reasons for doing this. The only thing that would be a big change would be the null flavors.

Aziz – If null flavors were in the schema and ignored in the IG, would this able acceptable?

Paul – That would be a better approach.

Aziz – VMR data types conform to ISO standards.

Paul – VMR is not rigidly consistent. Need to make clear where it is not consistent. There is a big difference in market impact if you keep creating diversity.

Aziz – Could we bring the null flavors back in to the DAM and not use in IG?

Paul – Might be acceptable to ITS, but not to other groups.

Ken – We will review the data types. If there are simple fixes that can be made, these will be done prior to ballot submission.

Paul – We can fix things now and agree to fix them in the final form. This would be clarified in the DSTU. This might mitigate risk from the TSC’s perspective.

Ken – Can make explicit differences with data types R2 and indicate that we are working on harmonization and that this may change in the future. Procedurally, we should put the wording in and submit for publication. Also ask for comments on these issues in this ballot cycle. Want to get this version available for piloting.

Paul – Some of the groups that need to be involved may say this is a waste of a cycle. Paul will be on the call to be supportive. Does not know what the TSC will decide. Might suggest that there be more cleanup and have an out of cycle ballot.

Motion: Submit request for publication for VMR DAM R2 and XM IG R1. Submit ballot proposals for VMR DAM R3 and XML IG R2, with wide request for comments. Moved by Ken.

Vote – 10 affirmative, 0 negative, 5 abstentions. Vote passes.

Elaine – Is criticality included in the adverse event section and the problem section? Want to make sure that the CDS is consistent with the Patient Care model.

David Shields – Criticality was added in both places based on the feedback in Atlanta.

David reviewed additional edits to the DAM and XML IG:

* Include publication month/year in specifications
* Remove dangling empty required element from CompositveIVProposalClass
* Add Directionality to BodySite
* Remove Encounter Code
* Add Maximum Sample Rate to CDS Input Specification
* Organization/facility names changed to ST data type

Rob McClure – Value sets have been entered. Need to make sure that the spreadsheet content is in the proper syntax.

Vote to accept changes – 8 affirmative, 0 negative, 0 abstentions. Vote passes.