20170323\_LOI\_Notes

Attendees: Cindy, Freida, Bob Y, Erin, Riki, Craig, Carolyn, Freida, John,

• Grouping option related – need to update the spreadsheet with the resolution from the 3/14 minutes:

o LRI#8 / LRI#131 / LRI#200 / LRI#344 /LRI#501 – grouping option related – on 3/14 we decided to add Notes to reviewers that we want to re-evaluate the issue of having OBRs without OBX segments, so looking for more input during next ballot round and will consider these again during that resolution cycle

#8: inside section 5 CG re-wrote that section – so would need to

Motion to find persuasive with mod – section 5 has been re-written and will address with Notes to balloters Bob Y, Freida, no further discussion, against: 0, abstain: 2, in favor: 4

Riki to write these notes to reviewers section

**LRI#43**: Was done to sync with ELINCs and also in the belief that systems today will not have as much of a size issue anymore – can look at more details in – Motion to find not persuasive Freida, Carolyn, further discussion: If we were to change it to O, we would have to explain how to implement it, as it is not commonly used – it has been X since 2012, may be they can comment again this ballot round with suggested change, if desired, against: 0, abstain: 1, in favor: 6

**LRI#61**: This is related to the grouping discussion - will rename the section to Grouping results and also add notes under OG datatype and OBR pointing to that new section and include Notes in the section as well – Motion to do that –Bob Y, Freida , no further discussion, against: 0, abstain: 0, in favor: 7

**LRI#240**: Motion to find not persuasive as the newly adopted datatype supports the e=current exampels – Freida, Cindy, no further discussion, against: 0, abstain: 0, in favor: 7

**LRI#286**: deliver the result to the institution – the program does consider a single person a facility – probably not quite correct Freida, Cindy, further discussion – will represent as 2 separate lists, as the datatypes are different, against: 0, abstain: 0, in favor: 7

**LRI#375** – Use of “PA” in ORC-1 – remove CS of requirement of ONLY using RE – that is not good enough, we need to also describe how to properly use PA and CH – or allow ONLY use of RE how would you know that an OBR is a parent – Inadvertently copied the block vote into that element – remove – no need to re-open; Motion to leave CS make PA ‘E’ for both LRI and PH\_Component - Craig, John, further discussion – now PH is not different than LRI, so we need to delete the LRI\_PH column in HL70119 table and should the CS become an LRI-XXX CS instead of LRI\_PH-92 – yes – motioners fine with adjustments, against: 0, abstain: 2, in favor: 5

**LRI#172 = LRI#364** -> **LRI#991 –** usage of specimen group / SPM segment has been discussed on 3/2 call and voted on – here are the minutes: <http://wiki.hl7.org/index.php?title=File:20170302_LOI_Notes.docx>

**LRI#172:** is about usage column – that got fixed – no objections

**LRI#364:** is about usage column – that got fixed – no objections

Erin and John drop off – they will make announcement that LRI is going back to ballot – hence the LRI\_PH\_Component also goes back

**LRI#127**: I don't think this predicate changes the fact that you don't need a version, when HL7 table or user defined - it just adds that CWE.01.3 is actually populated - will discuss and then adjust

Since CWE\_01.3 is required – find not persuasive with mod -

**and LRI#128**: Thank you for catching that – For CWE\_01.8 find persuasive to add the “is present” present – adjust the motion to cover all CWE flavors where applicable –

Should we also include in both, that this applies to ALL CWE - flavors, where usage of these fields is C(RE/X):

- for CWE.7 these are: CWE\_01, CWE\_02, CWE\_03, CWE\_04 and CWE\_0x

- for CWE.8 these are: CWE\_01 (after LRI#128 passes), should LRI#128 also be applied to CWE\_03

Craig, Bob Y, no further discussion, against: 0, abstain: 1, in favor: 4

Craig and Cindy drop off, we loose quorum

Call adjourned 4:05 PM EDT

**LRI#267**: Suggested NEW verbiage in 8.1.1:

The MSH-21 (Message Profile Identifier) field shall identify exclusively one lab results interface profile and shall not be populated with conflicting LRI profile or LRI profile components. Additional compatible profiles or components can be present in MSH-21; for example, if an LRI profile or component is further constrained.

**LRI#291** - will review the value set file for HL70078

Other Affirmatives:

* LRI#54: parent child linkage across messages
* LRI#135 / LRI#376: how to handle deprecated Conformance Statements?
* LRI#381 / LRI#177 / LRI#163 = Batch message and ACKs
* LRI#164: Support for CG as part of LRI\_PH\_Component?
* LRI#180: Clinical Information sharing using OBX segment, where OBX-29 = SCI and OBX-30 empty
* LRI#286:
* LRI#198
* LRI#376: deprecated CS handling

Follow up items:

* Security related:
	+ LRI#142 – security related items – DoD vote withdrawal email has been sent – no answer so far – this is not exact wording as the others from Kathleen, but related
	+ LRI#141 / LRI#454 – sent email to submitter