FHIMS WG Terminology Modeling Sub-Project Meeting

Summary of Call

Date/time of call: Wednesday, June 13, 2011, 2:00 - 3:30 PM

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Attendees** | **Invited, but Unable to Attend** |
| Steve Wagner - FHA PMO | Sean Muir - VA/VHA |
| Jay Lyle - FHA PMO | Dave Collins - VA/VHA |
| Ioana Singureanu - SAMHSA | Doug Hopler - VA/VHA |
| Holly Miller - VA/VHA | Jim Case - NLM |
| Galen Mulrooney - VA/VHA | Maryann Niesen - IHS |
| John Kilbourne - NIH/NLM | Mike Fitch - DoD |
| Rob McClure - VA/VHA | Mike Lincoln - VA/VHA |
|  | Neelima Chennamaraja - VA/VHA |
|  | Senthil Nachimuthu - Dod |
|  | Xingfang Li - FDA |
|  | Yiyting (Coco) Tsai - FDA/OC |
|  | Bill Hess - FDA/OC |
|  | Nikolay Lipskiy – CDC |
|  | Neal Richards – FHA |
|  | Steve Hufnagel - DoD |
|  | Susan Matney – 3M |
|  | Ling Qiu - VA/VHA |
|  | Rob Savage - CDC |
|  | Anand Shukla - VA/VHA |
|  | Pam Banning - DoD |
|  | Kevin Coonan - DoD |
|  | Cindy Vinion - CDC |

**Agenda**

1. UAF access
2. Metadata review, requests
3. Policy review
   1. Modeling threshold issue
   2. Policy for re-publishing value sets
   3. Mixing systems in value sets (Rob’s suggestion for compositional sets)
   4. VADS not just distribution but promotion
   5. New value approach
4. Lab values
   1. Event (LOINC sample): Confirm
   2. Status
      1. Reportable result (~ OBX-11/table 85)
         1. Scope of FHIM: static representation, or include, e.g., “delete,” “update”?
      2. Healthcare Order (~ ORC-5/table 38 or OBR-25/table 123?)
         1. Lab test request
         2. Specimen collection request
      3. Collection promise
      4. Lab test promise
      5. Lab referral
   3. Reject reason (two candidates)
   4. Container type (no candidates)

Summary of Discussions

1. UAF access:
   1. Rob has access
   2. Jay to send screen shots
2. Metadata review, requests
   1. We could overload the “description” field with tagged values, if necessary.
      1. UAF team has offered to consider field additions
   2. Concern: keeping external value sets up to date: who’s responsible
   3. Keep track of source value set if ours is based on another
      1. Where – in publication, or in work product record?
         1. Steve: in publication (we should request this of the UAF team)
         2. Question: how closely must a value set resemble a precursor before it is deemed “based on” it? Should all sources be documented this way?
      2. Or—for additions—do we compose value sets? Look into *HL7 Core Principles* discussion on this
         1. *CP* does propose nested value sets: “A *nested Value Set* definition in which a *Value Set* entry references another *Value Set* (a child *Value Set*). There is no preset limit to the level of nesting allowed within *Value Set*s. *Value Set*s cannot contain themselves, or any of their ancestors (i.e., they cannot be defined recursively). A *Value Set* whose definition includes *nested Value Set*s is always considered intensionally defined. (e.g. "Include the Value Set of Category A NIAID agents and the Value Set of Category B NIAID agents")” 5.1.3.1
         2. No formalism is proposed for expressing composition of value sets.
         3. *CP* did not pass ballot: current status of reconciliation not clear.
3. Policy review
   1. No chairs present; tabled
4. Lab values
   1. Event (LOINC sample): Confirm
      * 1. Pending confirmation of concept. It seems broader than “Challenge”; may include admission, discharge, convalescence(?), e.g.
        2. Galen to run question by Mike Fitch; Jay to ask Susan
   2. Status
      1. Clarification of ORC-5 vs OBR-25: ORC-5 is the order; OBR-25 is the promise.
      2. Reportable result (~ OBX-11/table 85)
         1. Scope of FHIM: static representation only; i.e., don’t include null query values, definition mood (“O”), or commands (“Delete”).
         2. Subset V3 states in status modifier
            1. State rules for what modifiers are valid with what statuses
            2. Not the full V3 state machine: not Held or Cancelled (for result); but we do need Nullified & Aborted
            3. Confirm with Cindy

**Schedule of Future Meetings**

1) The weekly general Information Modeling (IM) project call is held each Friday from 2:30 to 4:30 PM Eastern Time.

Information for participating in the calls:

Name: FHIMS WG Information Modeling Project Call

Recurring Weekly Call Every Friday

Time of Call: 2:30 to 4:30 PM Eastern Time

Dial-in Information: 1-866-502-8312, participant code 981771

Web Meeting URL: <https://webmeeting.nih.gov/imp/>

2) The weekly Terminology Information modeling calls are held on Wednesdays from 2-3:30 PM Eastern Time.

Information for participating in the calls:

Name: FHIMS WG Information Modeling Project Call

Recurring Weekly Call Every Wednesday

Time of Call: 2:00 to 3:30 PM Eastern Time

Dial-in Information: 1-866-502-8312, participant code 981771

Web Meeting URL: <https://webmeeting.nih.gov/imp/>

**Action Items**

| Item Description | Responsible Individual | Due Date |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Question for lab team: do we need collection site?  >No. To confirm in SME review when all sets are drafted. | Galen | Closed |
| How to model relationships: Mother/fetus; air conditioner/legionnaire group  >Lab domain question, not terminology management. | Galen | Closed |
| Bring use cases that differentiate source site and collection site value sets, if they exist  Closed: none found | All | 4/4  Closed |
| Assess how closely we can align with APHL work   * We agree on current state; happy to work with/wait on abnormality & device | Jay | 4/11 |
| Acquire sample messages   * In process: values, not messages, which have not been scrubbed | Jay | 4/11 |
| Bring use cases for lab to provide spectrum of requirements for comparison with APHL work | All | 4/25  Closed |
| Reach out to ICLN contacts in agency | Pam, Susan  Bill  Anne | 4/25 |
| Determine value set OID approach  >Use HL7. Subset (design tbd). Keep a registry. | Galen | Closed |