20170307\_SNI\_LOI\_Notes

Attendees: Emily, Riki, Bob Y, Andrea, Ashleigh, Cindy, Freida, Leanna, Kathy, Rebecca, Brendan, Sheryl, Shennon,

LOI #133: need to follow up on the location of TS\_4 in the document – Bob Y needs to

LOI#175: SN\_01 in LRI does not match the definition of SN\_01 in LOI – shouldn’t they behave the same in both documents – prefer the LOI definition; LRI is too loose – Hold till Craig is on Thursday

LRI#442: NDBS – can the NDBS Component declare the requirement to add the XO-Component and then remove all the optional elements – which is an issue, because we have made a few elements optional so that we can allow the jurisdictions to make it more restrictive, without forcing folks to have to support a few of these fields; only make the fields that might cause issues X, all others make O and allow the receiver to ignore any data that is sent in O elements; write a note indicating which of the optional elements are of interest to the NDBS program, while others left as optional are only there to not interfere with the underlying guide and would be considered - discuss for resolution on Friday call

LRI#454: Need to invite commenters – Riki to do

LOI#3: agree to fix

LOI#149: agree to the proposed verbiage

LOI#125: agree – Editor to verify the reference here; make persuasive with mod

LOI#84: started wordsmithing

LRI#131: once we have the option fixed

Using the Clin Genomics OBX-4 requires the LOINC panel knowledge in order to have

Labs are sending it in the order that they want it displayed, but there was discussion that that is not binding

In order to nest you just use the another panel that was an OBR in the result message, that it has the original order code as its parent.

Can still need the “naked OBRs” when you have a panel, where the first part of the panel is itself a panel then you have again the naked OBRs

Similar things happen in the PH reporting for Susceptibility testing

Use OBR-26 for this as the next order was only done on the resulted organism.

Why was LRI not supporting the naked OBRs

The OBX-4 solution still does not resolve the ordering issue

The nesting with the OBRs would be more along the line of FHIR – FHIR currently does not have the solution for the parent child linking – still needs to be worked out and tested with the

Clem will talk to Hans if he remembers the reason for not allowing naked OBRs and that the fact that the message order does not count – labs need to make sure calculations are kept together as well – that is an accreditation requirements

Quest prefers option 1 = OBX-4 solution

Labs usually send the results in the order they send the data

If we need the OG for ordering

OBX-4 in CG is not describing the order of the panels

LabCorp is sending the original OBR and all OBXes under the different panels , but do not create the OBRs for grouping (would have to look up which OBXes go for what panel, BUT they do not have repeating panels

In CG uses the LOINC panel algorithm so you can look up the naming for the groups or sections

Beginning – overall info for the test, then have a gene mutation with multiple OBXes and these repeat for each mutation that was found

Try to finalize NEXT WEEK