Minutes: HL7 Templates WG Q1 Friday, May 9, 2014

Chair: John Roberts

Scribe: Mark Shafarman

HL7 WGM 2014-05-09 Friday Q1 Templates

Attendance:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Name | Affiliation |
| Marla Albitz | Wolters Kalwer |
| Elaine Ayres | NIH/CC |
| Calvin Beebe | Mayo Clinic |
| Stephen Chu | NEHTA |
| George Cole | AllScripts |
| Kevin Coonan | Individual |
| Rick Geimer | Lantana |
| Kai Heitmann | HL7 Germany |
| Alexander Hemet | HL7 the Netherlands |
| Wendy Huang | Canada Health Infoway |
| Helmut Koenig | Siemens  |
| Austin Kreisler | Leidos |
| Laura Heermann Langford | Intermountain HealthCare |
| Russell Leftwich | Tennessee eHEALTH |
| Lisa Nelson | LOTS LLC |
| John Roberts | Tennessee DOH |
| Mark Shafarman | Shafarman Consulting, Inc. |
| Vijay Shah | JBS International |
| Harry Solomon | GE Healthcare |
| Andy Stechishin | HL7 Canada |
| Michael Tan | HL7 the Netherlands |
| Pat Van Dyke | Delta Dental |

1. Administrative notes:

Agenda approval: Agenda (as amended at the opening of the meeting).

1. Ballot Reconciliation.
2. Conformance Syntax.
3. Bidirectional Interoperability between Templates and FHIR profiles.

4.ART-Decor update.
5. Follow up to other meetings held during this working group.
6. From medication WG: validating templates in slightly different ways depending on their positions in various workflows.

7. Planning for the next WGM

Motion: Agenda approval as amended, made by John, seconded by Kai. Vote: 15 in favor; 0 abstain; 0 negative . Motion passes.

1. Ballot reconciliation for the Templates DSTU.
	1. Kai reported that all 350 of the ballot comments were resolved in discussion with their authors. But the WG needs to vote to approve them. Important changes requested included: The addition of a class diagram for templates.

There was then a motion to approve all of the persuasive and persuasive with mod ballot comments as a block. Rick G moved; Lisa seconded. Vote 10 in favor, 5 abstain, 0 negative. Motion passed.

* 1. Motion: to approve the use of a block vote for Rick’s and Lisa’s non-persuasive and all of Frank Oemig’s comments. To be sent to the list and block voted at a subsequent conference call, to be held one week from next week’s call (May 20, 2014) . Kai moved, Rick seconded, vote: 3 abstain. 12 in favor. 0 negative: The motion passes
	2. Motion: All other ballot comments (especially those from people not present, will be dealt with on conference calls. Kai moved, Rick seconded, vote: 3 abstain. 13 in favor. 0 negative: The motion Passes
1. Kai : introduces the discussion of conformance syntax from the new appendix in the current Templates DSTU.
	1. The main point is that the textual CDA conformance statements should not be the primary source of truth the templates definitions. The tabular view is the primary (and computable) representation of the conformance requirements following the Templates DSTU.
	2. The basic reason is that the scoping of multiple text-base conformance statements (using the verbs SHALL, SHOULD and MAY etc.) for a single attribute often leads to several different interpretations by various implementers and designers, and this ambiguity needs to be resolved in a way that supports computable processing.
	3. Wendy also noted that there were 6 to 8 specific CGIT issues that were not explicitly supported by the current DSTU. She will work with Kai to ensure that they will be resolved in the final version.
	4. There was also a discussion of the formal references defining the use of Shall, Should and May conformance verbs. Andy noted that the CCDA usage (and the version 3 core principles) of the conformance verbs needs to be made consistent with RFC 2119). The IEC RFC 2119 specification should be the basis for resolving the ambiguities of the meaning of the textual conformance statements.
	5. The tabular representation removes the ambiguities. Lisa and Harry noted that each template also needs a business name, and that this needs to be added to the appendix. Kai confirmed that templates do have a business name (and a display name).
	6. Lisa also noted that the IHE usage of constraints needs to be explicitly supported.
	7. Calvin noted the tabular form missed a number of descriptive elements in the narrative. Kai answered that narrative descriptions are supported by the DSTU. Also, the implementers need to be able to know when to issue a ‘warning’ or an ‘error’. This has to be added to the DSTU (also a ballot comment) as the “severity” feature. Kai added that whether an error or a warning is to be thrown is also highly dependent from the underlying model.
	8. Kai will coordinate resolving all of these issues and ensuring that the appendix has a full guide to the tabular semantics that supports them at the needed level of detail.
2. Joint discussion bidirectional interoperability between structured documents templates and FHIR profiles.
	1. Rick Geimer presented a Project Scope Statement (PSS) which was recently approved by SD and suggested that Templates sign on as a co-sponsor. This issue needs to be coordinated between the two WGs, and also internationally.
	2. Kai mentions that an important part of this is synchronization of the metadata (already started). Lisa adds that the Templates WG has done a lot of work on governance issues that can be an important contribution. The *HL7 Templates Registry Business Process Requirements Analysis, Release 1 December 2013 HL7 Informative Document* contains much of this work, and the HingX (OHT project) has implemented this.
	3. The Art-Decor project is added to the PSS’ list of implementers at Lisa’s suggestion.
	4. Several members of the Templates WG are also added to the PSS.
	5. Rick moves that Templates becomes a co-sponsor of the PSS. Kai seconds. The motion passes with 3 abstentions, zero negatives, and 19 in favor. The updated PSS will be forwarded to the TSC (and the Templates WG). Rick will coordinate the PSS plans and schedules with the Templates WG.
3. ART-DECOR update:
	1. Recent developments include:
		1. 2 template editors: one for prototyping based on the MIF or other templates, the second is XML-based.
		2. The ability to apply template constraints from ART-DECOR template models to MIF CDA template models to generate code that can be used for input and/or output to the given template(s) instances.
		3. See the AID (formerly RIMBAA) WG minutes from this WGM for further details.
			* 1. presentations:

The first presentation was given by Justin Fyfe (and created by his team) at Mohawk College, Hamilton Ontario, Canada). (See
“Demonstration of the Sherpas toolkit for representing ART- DECOR based CDA templates in C#”, recorded at the HL7 WGM Phoenix (US), May 2014. [Watch video at YouTube](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=p5oasVIQaNE).)

The next presentation was given by Kai Heitmann: ART-DECOR Creating Templates with Prototypes and Building Block Repositories. [Download PDF](http://art-decor.org/mediawiki/images/b/b6/ART-DECOR-tooling-kheitmann-web-20140507.pdf)

the HL7 EU Newsletter #4 [http://www.hl7.eu/download/eun-04-v2014.pdf](http://www.hl7.eu/download/eun-04-v2014.pdf%20%20)  (page 24)

* + - 1. This approach will work with any MIF model and any template model.

iv. The release Version 1.0 of ART-DECOR is planned for Spring 2014.

1. .ART-DECOR has a colon cancer screening project implemented (and expressed) in the current Templates DSTU format. See <http://www.marcdegraauw.com/presentations/ART%20DECOR%20-%20XML%20Amsterdam%202013.pdf> .
2. Harry Solomon described a project between structured documents and DICOM to create a guide for radiology templates that has a number of requirements for the Templates DSTU including:
	1. Explicit representation of nesting of XML elements.
	2. Ability to specify vocabulary conformance at several successive nested levels within an existing valueset. This may involve the creation of vocabulary domains.
	3. The necessity to create business names for the elements if one is using GreenCDA tools.

Most of these are already present in the DSTU, but Kai suggested that Harry provide the full list of requirements so that the Templates WG can review them in detail. We can then describe which requirements are currently supported, and how they are implemented. We can also make plans to support any needed new functionality.

1. Calvin discussed an important emerging issue with the medication administration entry in the CCDA: implementers need functionally different text descriptions of the medication administration order as it moves through different parts of a hospital system (and/or from a physician’s office to a pharmacy to a patient). E.g.: the prescribing physician uses a standardized format called a “SIG”; the hospital pharmacy (or retail pharmacy) needs a format that includes the coded drug name and manufacturer’s packaging; the hospital nurse needs any special usage or administration instructions; and the patient and/or family member needs a format that is in ordinary language describing the drug form, dosage and any special usage or administration instructions. An additional requirement (in the CDA r-2 and v3 expressions) also requires (at the formal model level) a different value for the attribute act.moodCode. Is it possible to have the sectional or entry templates themselves support different and/or further constraints and hence less ambiguity?
	1. Kai mentioned that one possible solution would be to have a hierarchy of templates created as successive specializations of the initial template. This would require template metadata that describes such relationships between templates, as well as explicit support for such use cases in the Templates DSTU. The ART-DECOR vital signs templates metadata already supports hierarchically constrained relationships between its component templates: e.g. sometimes only the heart rate template is specialized to support various use cases. The medication administration text requirements are an example of detailing relationships and hierarchies among templates. However a detailed analysis of these use cases must be made to ascertain whether additional metadata is needed and how such metadata needs to be included in the Templates DSTU.
	2. Harry mentioned that we also need to look at vocabulary bindings relationships in the hierarchy.
	3. Calvin suggested that we may need to create a more explicit way to define context of use.
	4. Mark and Robert suggested that the templates registry functionality may be extended to support these use cases. (See <http://www.hl7.org/implement/standards/product_brief.cfm?product_id=328> )
	5. Calvin suggested that we follow-up with the medication work-group on this issue.
2. Scheduling for the September 2014 HL7 WG meeting: Same as the May 2014 WGM with the following changes:
	1. Move Templates for Monday Q1 to Monday Q3 (Plenary).
	2. Add Q3 Wednesday (joint, hosted by CGIT or Vocab.
	3. Retain Thursday Q2 (hosted by PC, with SD)
	4. Retain Templates hosting Friday Q1with PC, SD, Vocab/CGIT, and Tooling joining.
	5. Open question: Retain Templates hosting Q2 for Friday? John and Mark think we should retain this, for at least the two of them to start work on the minutes.