20170302\_LOI\_Notes

Attendees: Andrea, Freida, Bob Y, Riki, Austin, Carolyn, Cindy, David, Craig, John R, Leanna, Sheryl, Walter, Clem, Shennon, Nancy

Andrea sent recap of issues she has seen and Virginia sent a comment that it would be difficult to have the information at all times, since we don’t require specimen type information in the order – paper orders for example where the types might even be listed, but not necessarily linked to the sample

How do you manage when you have more than one specimentype for the test – how do you know what was tested for each result

You can use a different message that uses a specimencentric approach that links the tests to the specimen; industry is not using it, possibly since the LIS does not track that.

Hard to believe that the labs don’t have the information on specimen

Need to solve as standard approach, not per regulation

ELR 2.5.1 now has been widely adopted through MU incentivized locations, which often is inpatient labs.

Quest invested money for LRI implementation, but could not get vendors to implement

issue with labs not covered in MU don’t have that capability

Even in stage 1 certified vendors could not really produce the micro related results for ELR

Original IG for ELR predate MU implementation; originally developed ELR guide was built on older PH IGs, that evolved over 25 years to address requirements to submit results to PH

Original intent is that we have specimen information for at least the parent result – by making the Specimengroup required you are forcing the lab to provide information when you don’t have it.

Currently not using v2.5.1, but OBR-15 was required then, so you enter a term for unspecified specimen – that covers SPM-4; for specimen collection date is required, specimenID, which accordingly could be not assigned, or not able to extract from the system (older code – takes 6 month to 1 year to make any change) – use the filler ID in the SPM-2.2, when unknown

There may also be a problem that these IDs are then no globally unique – that is not the same problem – not too worried as long as PH can use the ID provided can be used for follow up on that particular result.

Create draft language to put in state regulation – that can be moved to another call

And if not followed will stay with paper

Against: 5 (Virgina), abstain: 2, in favor: 9

#432: related to #436 now added the OG\_02 and #227 added the CWE\_0x – that should satisfy this comment – Motion to find persuasive with mod- resolved by resolution to #436 and #227 Clem, Bob Y, no further discussion, against: 0, abstain: 0, in favor: 16

We still need to figure out where to make the declaration where to use the

#257: Only do that if there are Conformance statements needed – answered

NDBS comments to be reviewed by COB tomorrow and shared resolution to use of

PLEASE IF ANYONE HAS TIME TO CREATE PROPOSED MOTIONS, FIND DUPLICATES etc.