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Attendees: Riki, Kathy, Freida, Andrea, David B,

LRI Ballot reconciliation

LRI#156:

From last week discussion: Goal is to not fish differently typed data when results are not available – we need to make sure what the doc reads is what the labs sent regardless of what the result format normally is

Coded reasons may be more important for analysis on the sender end – but that would be in different areas in the LIS.

Code still helpful to keep the result short for report display

ALWAYS PUT something in OBX-5, because EHR-s vendors cannot take empty OBX-5, which is why we created those rules in the EHR-S FR

Options considered:

Change datatype for OBX-11 to CWE, and use OBX-11.9 for free text

Add a new field to OBX for data absent reason that must be filled in when OBX-5 is empty

Have panel:

3 results are pending – send a code for pending or use OBX-11 = I

3 have results – OBX-11 = F

3 don’t have results – how would that different from pending?

Discuss this with more folks on.

LRI#20 – Reviewing this document Section 2.2: 

Motion to accept changes per document "LRI#20 on document tab (plus replacing the tables with screenshots) - Freida Hall, David Burgess, no further discussion, against: 0, abstain: 1, in favor: 3

Create a shorter version of just this section of the document to include on the “Documents” tab of the ballot spreadsheet in final form

LRI#202 – looking at this document: 

Changing message structure

Use OBX with OBX-4 linkage can be done now

REL needs some work in the base to accommodate the elements

Would need to decide where to place the REL segment in the new message structure

Since we already have OBX-21 – can we use it to reference it in SPM in a new field – this field might have to be repeating

Or new field in OBX that points to SPM-2 of the related specimen – this field might have to be repeating, but this will be fewer repeats than the other way (pointing to the target of the observation)

Would SPM-2 be unique enough – would it have to be unique just for the OBR group – or across the message?- we think SPM-2 would be sufficient across messages

Motion to recommend the addition of field in OBX to allow pointing to SPM-2 of the related specimen(s) – datatype EIP, allow repeat, usage O – for the base

David, Hans, further discussion: for LRI usage O or RE? Or make Conditional when OBX-29 is valued “RSLT” = C (RE/O), because in instances we have only 1 SPM it is superfluous; also does NOT necessarily apply to calculated results – also need to consider testing on derived specimen; summary reports for ED datatype; we will need to distinguish if this points to the analyzed sample vs the tested sample? Example susceptibility testing on isolates – point to the isolate ID or the collected specimen ID?

Is it the clinically relevant specimen, or would you need to ensure the proper linkage to the processed specimen? Assume it is the specimen that is tested that is identified here. Let the lab identify what specimen should go in here – this should be **the specimen that the observation is relevant** for and let the lab figure out what is appropriate. Against: 0, abstain: 0, in favor: 5

Someone needs to write the v2.10 proposal – David to draft, Hans will review and upload

LRI#204 – wait for all other comments before closing this one

LRI#226: Since we did not get any answers from receivers, and since some lab tests prescribe reporting requirements so both options should be retained. Motion to find persuasive Freida Hall, Kathy Walsh, no further discussion, against: 0, abstain:0, in favor: 5

For Thursday: Hans will be around – will keep coordinates as is

Next Tuesday is Cerner client conference – will update to join me – done ☺