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| **Security/CBCC and EHR WG****Vocabulary Alignment****Tuesdays 11A Eastern** | **VocabAlign****Meeting Agenda/Summary****September 22, 2015** |
|  |
| **Subject:** Security/EHR Vocab Alignment**When:** Occurs every Tuesday effective 11/25/2014 from 11:00 AM to 12:00 PM (UTC-05:00) Eastern Time (US & Canada).**Where:** <https://provider-resources.webex.com/provider-resources> Host key: 362921 [Join WebEx meeting](https://provider-resources.webex.com/provider-resources/j.php?MTID=m0468ace08b2bcc3b545676e3bee5a076) Meeting number:  731 143 084      Join by phone  **1-866-469-3239** Call-in toll-free number (US/Canada)  **1-650-429-3300** Call-in toll number (US/Canada)   |
| **Attendees: Gary Dickinson, John Ritter, Diana Proud-Madruga, Reed Gelzer, Mike Davis, Chris Shawn, Suzanne Gonzales-Webb, Rick Grow** |  |
| **Organizers/Diana Proud-Madruga, Reed Gelzer Note Taker: RGelzer** |
|  |  |  |  |
| **TOPIC / DISCUSSION ITEMS** | **TIME** | **Responsible** | **Summary** |
| Welcome | 5 min | All |   |
| 1. 1. Review, update
 | 45 min |  | Materials (Worksheet and “Terminology Confusion) distributed again for today.Revisited how the “Terminology Confusion” notes Diana circulated (source still pending) pointed to means to reconcile differences in Lifecycle Event Verb definitions and definitions in general.Mike Davis noted a “heretical” option and proposed:* Compile and propose a definition or definitions for each Lifecycle Event
* However, the objective will be to support normative tests (of distinguishing attributes or properties) of Lifecycle Events

In sum, not aligning ourselves with a particular definition or set of definitions, but have the functional descriptions, which are the test for the Event be the Normative description of what we intend for the Event.John: For clarification, take two instances of similar but different uses of the term “Capture” where one use passes our test and the other does not.Mike: What is being described (in John’s example) is a situation where you have a term that is under a Class, so that at the Class level the function would fit a sub-term. That sub-term and each sub-term, each of the terms that we pick here must have definitions with sufficient descriptions in the functions to make them unique. We will make the definitions unique for each term that we include in the Lifecycle Events.So the test for a particular term is that test and that test is unique to the term. Otherwise if we cannot distinguish (any given pair of terms) then there is no distinction and they are not unique. They are the same, if the same test applies to both (and the test result is the same for both).John: Makes sense that we make Normative the test for that context (for our purposes here “context” = Lifecycle Events definitions). Gary: So, Mike you would propose that we set up a test, or it could be more than one test, for each of the Lifecycle EventsMike: Yes. Diana and I looked at this and at the draft definitions so far and we are already doing that. We haven’t called it that (a test) but it’s the same thing, by indicating (properties or characteristics, as in Format guideline 1.2.3 “Differentiating characteristics”). We had stumbled on this solution that ISO had come up with anyway (in the “Terminology Confusion” excerpt text).We can stop fighting over definitions and reference one or more that seem reasonably close to the test purposes and let the test be the criteria for the evaluations (of Lifecycle Events). That gets us out of the business to picking the ISO definition or spec which is probably not going to entirely acceptable to us for one reason or another.Gary: In the current 10781 for each of the Lifecycle Events, we have an “Occurs When” statement. Description, “Occurs when a Record Entry is origined typically originated during the course of an action to record the action and context.” So we have an Occurs When statement for the 24 Lifecycle Events in the Functional Model. Is that the sort of thing you’re talking about?Mike: I think so. Diana has a document that has some of the ones we’ve done. Diana: Unfortunately I had to reboot my computer (so cannot show now). We have the Action (the term) and we look at what it acts on (the object). Then Mike what we did was that we looked at what happens, what is the starting point when you apply that Lifecycle Event and what is the result.Mike: It sounds similar to what you’re talking about Gary (Diana agrees).Gary: OK then, what I would like to do then is if you can circulate that material you captured (Diana) we can then see how we can incorporate that into the ISO 21089 draft. That way we are sure that we’re getting it in a place where it will be recognized going forward That won’t get it into the FM immediately (but will get it there in time and in the meantime it ) establishes the pattern or sets the example in 21089 so we can build from there.Diana: OKMike: The advantage of this is that then we are not talking about these terms so much. It allows that in a different context somebody else might use the terms but that’s a different context and (therein) they can write their own test for their own Use Case. I think it gives us (a path forward disentangled from the words themselves). The words mean things and mean different things in a different context. (We will simply focus on our context.)Reed: This seems very productive, purposeful, and has immediate utility in the work going on in the S&I Lab Results (LRI) work. In that context they are mapping the FM (verbs) to Use Cases with existing specifications for originating and persisting records as well as for how they must be presented in display to meet well-fleshed out requirements in Lab environments. This direction seems to support the proposition that use contexts (like LRI) illustrate how writing definitions is facilitated and clarified when you have to write something that has to also function as a test. Was there some existing language from the Worksheet that you started out with from our work so far, from draft Definitions or Extended Definitions that offered itself as something like what you are talking about?Mike: Yes, unfortunately I don’t have it in front of me. Diana: (We looked at Originate)Mike: I think that was one of them. So we said let’s try this word so then we made up the test and then we looked back at the Model and looked at the definition as the Functional Class description or whatever that was there. It looked like the same thing we were doing and it had the same criteria. It matched perfectly.We kind of did this and then looked back to see what was already there (in the Worksheet) and it matched perfectly.We looked at Originate and the test is:* It is new
* It is potential content
* It is an interim State (to be acted upon)

Third bullet, though, is not entirely clear in the definition but the test made it clear. That’s the one I (Mike) thought was very close to what we came up with, independent of looking at “Class differentiating characteristics” (as in the definition format as currently written).This (the concept of Normative Tests) is different, but conceptually very close. The “Class differentiating characteristics” are, in effect, the functional test. So (for “To Originate” it is new, it is potential, and it is an interim state, not committed.You apply (Originate) and you have a new object or a potential new object that is in an interim State.As we develop others, it is likely that (like To Originate) each will have no more than two or three characteristics. Reed: This summation and synthesis of lengthy discussions can be included as our updated intended work product: The Lifecycle Events, each with one or more tests, and each test supported by one or more definitions. This may be what we offer up for ballot or this offers a path to something that is intended to be ballotable.Diana: Please confirming when we’ll meet as a group in Atlanta (with this as a topic)All: (Summarized)Wednesday Q1 is the Joint Meeting, to present this workWednesday Q3 is set aside for this workThursday QConsensus: OK to proceed, plan for a smaller group, smaller room.Mike’s current passion… <http://www.w3.org/TR/prov-primer/>Item 2. Intuitive overview of PROVNote descriptions of Agent, Entity, and Activity in the reference materialMike: Hoping that when we get done with our work here I can go back to mapping between Lifecycle Events and Provenance and complete that table in a more authoritative way.W3C Specification for Provenance is one of the best Standards I’ve ever read.Includes:Extended definitionsInversesAddendum:Diana’s notes from referenced discussion with MikeActions happen on objects and can change the state of an object.Properties:Object (stateA)-> Action -> object (stateB)Eg:UpdateProperty:Data object A (original) is updated resulting in Data object B (new) and data object A (obsolete). Receive (v)Property:Data object A from entity A is introduced into entity B's temporary address space possibly resulting in the sending of a receipt back to entity A.Verify (v): to evaluate the compliance of data objects with regulations, requirements, specifications, or other imposed conditions based on organizational policy. Contrast with *validate*.Property:Data Object A(un-verified) is compared with policy-based imposed conditionsBelow is a first attempt at diagramming “Verify.”cid:image002.png@01D0F536.EAF1AB10  |
|  Adjourn  |  |  | Next meetings at HL7 Atlanta, restart weekly meetings the following week. |
| Other sources |  |  | Current “Creating Definitions” draft (not yet including recommendations from “Terminology Confusion” document. )Most recent Lifecycle Event Worksheet |
|  |
|  |  |  |  |
| Next Meeting | 5 min |  | Our 10/13/2015 meeting will be to review and summarize work from the Atlanta WG meetingOur next regular business meeting will be 10/20/2015 |