20170727\_LabUSRealm\_Notes

Attendees: Carmen, Riki, John R, Erin, Andrea, Kathy, Freida, Walter

Next week is AACC – no Andrea

The NDBS folks would like to discuss the comments related to ordering provider with this large group next week Thursday 8/3, seems like we will still have a fairly good group on, so will have that discussion then – related to LOI#104, LOI#134 and LOI#135

Wil resend reminder for Block #2 vote out again and do it on Tuesday

LRI:

LRI#111: Need to review DSTU comments to figure out why PID-18 from O to RE – Riki to do

LRI#157: Homework to review the FR guide for cancelation handling – Kathy will do for Tuesday ☺

Brief review of the specimen reject handling for folks that were not on the Tuesday call when we discussed LRI#156

LRI#165: CNE not listed as part of datatypes – CNE is used only in CG - will send over to them, need to know if that is required to keep, or just update the examples - have CNE in eDOS, so could ask them if that is what they expect, or they need to define it for addition - Riki to email Clem

LRI#166: Why is CX\_02.4 RE, not R? In current systems that do not use OIDs, they don’t always get an assigning authority, hence RE – Question answered

LRI#167: CP for CWE\_02.7 is different from all other CWE.7 statements as well as from CWE.8 statements – reviewed HL7v2.5.1 – that field is C but has no CP, in v2.6 added the descriptive CP, that excludes need for versioning of HL7nnnn tables or user defined tables, with the caveat, that for HL7nnnn tables if not sent, assumes same version as in MSH-12; proposal is to match CP to all others and use user defined tables, instead of user defined – should be the same in CWE.8 as in CWE.7, because we have no preference for where the standard vs local codes go in these IGs - Motion to find persuasive for adding "and user defined table" here and add "table" to all instances of this CP – Walter, John R, no further discussion, against: 0, abstain:0, in favor: 7 – mark as cross guide

LRI#177 – what is the base datatype for component definition = the base standard, was clarified in another comment – withdrawn by submitter

LRI#202: Request for sections describing how to report paired sera – in the same fashion would also be good to include section on reporting derived specimen – for example submission of isolates for testing by reference lab, when it is important to know what source the isolate was collected form in the first place – that is also of primary importance to PH, not just clinically – the LabMCoP had started to come up with a solution for paired sera, but has not finalized decision – Riki to circulate that document to lab realm and PHER listserve; also had tried to tackle derived specimen, but no solution there yet, either – Riki to write up that use case and proposed choices and circulate to the same lists – will create a summary document –Motion to in principle agree this section as well as the derived specimen handling section would be good to add - want to see draft and will make final decision about inclusion here or in a future release – Walter, John R, no further discussion, against: 0, abstain:0, in favor: 7

LRI#203: Requirement to have parent OBR in same message as child OBR – if they are reported in separate messages, then it may not be possible to link to the correct occurrence of the parent OBR – snapshot is at the OBR group level, BUT not grouping these together makes support for parent-child linking on the receiver side very hard - Rationale was that we wanted to support snapshot that includes reflex – pick back up here on Tuesday