FM US Realm Binding Vocabulary Review Notes

**From:** Kathleen Connor [mailto:kathleen\_connor@comcast.net]   
**Sent:** Wednesday, November 16, 2011 8:00 PM  
**To:** 'W. Ted Klein'  
**Cc:** 'Woody Beeler'; 'Mary Kay McDaniel'; Heggli Beat  
**Subject:** RE: US Realm bindings

Thanks Ted for this –

I think FM should spend time in the next calls reviewing the use of these US realm value set bindings.

Of course, FM needs to collaborate with PA where appropriate, e.g., where the encounter and demographic code systems may be used in PA CMETS that FM models use.

I think we will find that there will be a need to update the value set bindings for more current US billing requirements.  So simply deprecating all bindings won’t be the correct way to move forward.

FM review will likely uncover a number of questions that we should get on Vocabulary WG agenda.  For example:  I’m not sure how best to handle the situation where we know in advanced that the value set bindings will be updated as code systems are updated (e.g., UB 92 upgraded to UB 04) while there will remain a need to continue using previous version – because billing cycles are multi-year and for historical purposes.

Happily, Mary Kay is a well-known expert on these administrative/financial code systems and how they are used by trading partners to providers with HL7 v.2 billing systems.

P.S. Wondering if there’s an automated approach to finding out where these are used other than brute force search on the Normative Edition as I did with the Confidentiality Codes.  Please pass on any suggestions.

-K

**From:** W. Ted Klein [[mailto:ted@tklein.com]](mailto:[mailto:ted@tklein.com])   
**Sent:** Wednesday, November 16, 2011 7:23 PM  
**To:** Kathleen Connor  
**Cc:** Woody Beeler  
**Subject:** US Realm bindings

Kathleen,

As promised, here are the 8 bindings in the repository that are marked 'US Realm'.  Some of them are ancient, some may be erroneous, some or all may

be fine.   I think they are all FM, but may be PA.   I do not know if they are used in models, but may well be.

Whichever ones (maybe all of them) we end up wanting to keep, we will have to work with Publishing and the TSC to figure out how we are going to

manage such US objects, since we have never been able to get an official US Realm formed to be able to deal with things like this as Canada and

other HL7 Realms are dealing with their Realm-specific content.  Whatever can be worked out, we'll figure out how to implement it.  But the first thing

is to figure out what is going on with these 8 items.

Feel free to ask me any questions about this.  The best way to look at the vocabulary is probably RoseTree.

-Ted

US Realm Bindings

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Concept Domain | ValueSet OID | ValueSet Name | code system OID | code system name | appliesInContext |
| Diagnosis | 2.16.840.1.113883.1.11.15931 | DiagnosisICD9CM | 2.16.840.1.113883.6.2 | ICD-9CM | US |
| EducationLevel | 2.16.840.1.113883.1.11.19175 | EducationLevel | 2.16.840.1.113883.5.1077 | Education Level | US |
| EmploymentStatus | 2.16.840.1.113883.1.11.15930 | EmploymentStatusUB92 | 2.16.840.1.113883.6.21 | nubc-UB92 | US |
| EncounterDischargeDisposition | 2.16.840.1.113883.1.11.19453 | USEncounterDischargeDisposition | 2.16.840.1.113883.6.21 | nubc-UB92 | US |
| EncounterReferralSource | 2.16.840.1.113883.1.11.19454 | USEncounterReferralSource | 2.16.840.1.113883.6.21 | nubc-UB92 | US |
| MaritalStatus | 2.16.840.1.113883.1.11.15929 | MaritalStatusUB92 | 2.16.840.1.113883.6.21 | nubc-UB92 | US |
| OrganizationIndustryClass | 2.16.840.1.113883.1.11.19298 | OrganizationIndustryClassNAICS | 2.16.840.1.113883.6.85 | naics | US |

------------------------------------------------------------

W. Ted Klein

[ted@tklein.com](mailto:ted@tklein.com)