FHIMS WG Terminology Modeling Sub-Project Meeting

Summary of Call

Date/time of call: Wednesday, April 25, 2018, 2:00 – 3:30 PM

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Attendees** | | | |
| Bill Hess – FDA |  | Mulikat Sarumi |  |
| Carol Bickford |  | Rachael Howe – 3M |  |
| David Bass – VA |  | Rob McClure – ONC/FHA |  |
| Deniz Akkor |  | Sean Muir | Y |
| Galen Mulrooney - VA/VHA | Y | Steve Hufnagel | Y |
| Huma Munir |  | Steve Wagner – FHA | Y |
| Jacee Robison |  | Susan Campbell |  |
| Jay Lyle - FHA PMO | Y | Susan Matney – Intermountain | Y |
| Joey Coyle | Y | Gail Kalbfleisch |  |
| Liz McCool |  | Kevin Mundy – FHA |  |
| Loren Stevenson – VA | Y | Suzanne Gonzales-Webb |  |
| Kathleen Connor |  |  |  |

**Agenda**

1. Care Plan status
   1. Confluence page up
   2. Tour of gap analysis next Wednesday
      1. Use case, scope, design assumptions (i.e., terminologies)
2. Assessment of alignment & transformation between UML OCL and CIMI ADL
   1. Preview skin color ADL
      1. Statement, topic files
      2. Properties, bindings
   2. What does it mean for an archetype to have an (about) terminology binding
      1. We don’t know what’s the right thing to do.
         1. PhysicalEvaluationResult[id1.1.1.1.1.1]
            1. ID refers not to PhysicalEvaluationResult class (in which case it should have binding to result concept), but to PhysicalEvaluationResult *as constrained here*, i.e., to the archetype root node, so binding to semantics of this archetype is correct, if needed.
            2. So binding to the same concept as the key code seems correct.
      2. About binding – what the property means
      3. Value binding – constrain value of element to one. By a value set of one.
      4. Value set binding - constrain value of element
   3. What does it mean for an archetype to have more than one terminology binding
      1. For topic: must use value set if it constrains a parent value set. The archetype itself doesn’t, so a direct binding to a concept code is ok.
      2. Operationally: they are synonymous, and it won’t matter which one you use. Both for convenience.
   4. What does it mean for an archetype to have the same terminology bindings as another archetype
      1. Currently redundant; could be changed. Needs to be consistent.
      2. Workbench Tools can show inherited stuff but not contained stuff
         1. Archie (Java, for parsing, writing ADL) should do better
            1. Designed to work against any BMM
            2. Maintained by a company in the Netherlands
            3. Claude contributed
            4. Parses ADL into AOM in memory
         2. Claude’s current effort: View UML class, any ADL file against it; create a new ADL file, compile/generate and write.
   5. What does it mean for an archetype to have the same terminology binding as one of its elements
      1. Binding for logical operations
      2. Model or property? Property to support instances. Model may not be necessary but we think it is.
      3. Elements typically have value bindings in evaluations; could have about bindings to ‘question’ or ‘observable’ and ‘answer’ or ‘value’
   6. What is the distinction between ID, AT, and AC bindings
      1. ID = about binding.
      2. AT = value code constraint. One code.
      3. AC = value set
   7. In "term bindings", what is the significance of the system headers (grouping bindings by system)
      1. May have an effect in tooling. Not clear at this time.
   8. How is the value set constructed (example of single-code, but not of set)
      1. Internal in-line sets for structural purposes, but for value sets, use standard, public services. Refer to them; don’t replicate.
      2. SCT URI
      3. If also VSAC, a separate entry in the Term Binding
   9. Is the URI just an identifier, or should it be resolvable? Are other forms valid? Versioned, edition-specific
      1. Identifier. VSAC id is OID URI.
      2. Version – tbd
      3. SCT builds version in
   10. SOLOR lists “skin color enumerated reference set” (7) and “skin color simple type reference set” (55)
       1. Which one is ours; why are there two (four)
       2. The short one
       3. CIMI HSPC published. Using FHIM value sets.

ADL is here: <https://github.com/HL7/hl7-cimi-model>

Next Call

Care plan

Issues

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Issue** | **Status** | **Owner** |
|  |  |  |

**Action items**

| Item Description | Responsible Individual | Due Date |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Look into data on actual system usage in NCPDP instances | Sue Thompson |  |
| Discuss stewardship with NCPDP | RM, SW |  |
| Research reactants with IMHC, VA, KP  Naveen Maram, Holly Miller helping | JL | PC project in ballot Sept 2017 |
| Research V2 lab coded value frequencies  Tom Oniki no longer at IMHC; possibly Susan | JL |  |

**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 (773) 897-3018, Access Code: 585-151-437

Web Meeting URL: <https://global.gotomeeti​ng.com/meeting/join/5851​51437>

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 1 (773) 945-1031 Access Code: 849-124-653

Web Meeting URL: https://global.gotomeeti​ng.com/join/849124653