**Specimen Project Conference Call**

**13 December 2012**

**+1 770 657 9270, Passcode: 653212#**

**Attendees:**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Name | Organization |
| Lorraine Constable | Constable Consulting |
| Riki Merrick | IConnect |
| Ron van Duyne | CDC |
| Rob Hausam | Hausam Consultng |
| Joan Knapp | CDC |
| JD Nolen | Cerner |
|  |  |
|  |  |

**Co-Chair**: Lorraine Constable

**Scribe:** Riki Merrick

**Minutes**

* Lorraine apologizes that minutes were unavailable – personal circumstances intervened.

No Call December 27th, next schedule call is Jan 10, 2013

**Walk through Specimen ID model document, JD Nolen representing the Anatomic Pathology Group.**

Anatomic pathology does have a unique ID, but they are local to individual systems. For example, Cerner LIS and shipping tracking system do not share the same identifiers – they create their own for the whole set up. This makes data exchange difficult.

As well, research applications needs to be able to anonymize identifiers – not identify which hospital it came from for example, as an additional requirement. In other respects, caBIG model similar to this model

The planned identifiers are not replacing the human readable ID – only the machine-readable ID will be standardized, that ID is then associated with the human readable.

The project used the DICOM definition of a specimen, and allowed for separate identifiers for the container and for the specimen, generally there is 1 specimen to 1 container, but multiple specimens per container are accommodated.

Question: do you allow nested containers? For most AP systems the container nesting was handled at a higher level

A lot of specimens are unique and being derived – not capturing the container here.

LocationID and containerID remain married within this model.

locationID = root and specimenID is extension of the II in v3 world

in v2 = locationID = assigning authority

They have also discussed locationID using GS1 possibly – register with the standard you get the locationID assigned

Want this to be international – there may be a large number of labs

A key problem is the real estate on the 2D barcodes for a good ID – more complex identifiers may only be suited for RFID technology

Considered OIDs – have not decided what to use yet – will get some discussion about register of OIDs – use what is already available, but not have a new thing assigned yet again

Looking for technology to use with current 2D plus the new RFID - prefer to not limit the standard

Currently in informative ballot for Jan 2013

Next steps: want to merge with specimen model – need to focus on one part of the lab, but want to be sure that it matches up with OO and CLSI (Ken McCaslin) and CAP (Alexis Carter) requirements. The OO model is at conceptual level, and the Specimen ID model is closer to logical

The OO model needs to be able to handle the cardinality and have right number of IDs you have identified – the location ID may be inherent in the datatype we are using for our specimenID and containerID.

Hope to move this forward to DSTU and start implementing in AP

Next project would then be the structured report in AP if we can get the ID issue worked out - will be working with the folks in France at IHE – need to get a structured document beyond the report, needs to include the processing data, tracking data etc (all the metadata – for example to describe the detail about the slide that is being scanned etc)

We work with AP at IHE when they come to town – we need more generic set up than what they are doing in Europe (SYNOPTIC).

Data migration between different LIS systems should be easier then, too

**Review WGM Agenda regarding specimen**

OO WG agenda specimen project Tue Q3 and joint with II and AP Wed Q1 – may also be Tue Q2.

Lorraine will look at the specimen model prior to WGM to make sure it has the identifiers needed (think we already do, but will double check)

Call adjourned 12:50 PM ET