Information Modeling Project/FHIM Meeting

Summary of Call

Date/time of call: Friday, November 15, 2013 2:30 - 4:30 PM

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Attendees - Agency** | **Attendees-Agency (cont’d)** | **Invited, but Unable to Attend** |
| Steve Hufnagel – DoD | Galen Mulrooney – FHA | Holly Miller - VHA |
| Robert Crawford - VHA | Steven Wagner – FHA | Catherine Hoang - VHA |
| Peter Rush-VA | Jay Lyle – FHA | John Kilbourne - NLM |
| Iona Thraen - Utah Dept. of Health | Sean Muir - FHA | Coco Tsai - FDA |
| Jay Sykes- VA | Caitlin Ryan-FHA | Kevin Coonan- IHS |
| Gregory Zektser- VHA |  | Lynn Sanders-VHA |
| Sean Kopka - VHA |  | Robert Crawford – VHA |
| Benton Bovee- DHA |  | David Bass – VHA |
| Bill Hess- FDA |  | Bill Hess –FDA |
| Susan Matney - 3M |  |  |

**Updates on S&I Framework integration/initiative and FHA work- Steve Wagner**

Steve said that he hoped to finalize the feedback for Person and Data types’ domain on this call.

All of the comments from the federal partners have been addressed. On the MDA Implementation Modeling Process guide, he is waiting for feedback. The FHIM team continues to participate in the DAF and SDC calls. Steve provided an update to the FHA Architecture and Modeling Work Group last week and discussed the feedback received on the validation artifacts as well as the various modeling guides.

**Terminology Modeling update- Jay Lyle**

There was no meeting on Wednesday.

Jay had a meeting at DoD about the credentialing system. They drilled down on provider licensing data values; they were knowledgeable about the business domain but not on the implementation of it; he will go over this with them.

He hopes to speak with the VA to get some resolution on provider values.

**Other business- Jay Lyle**

Jay updated that he was still waiting for the login information for the VSAC authoring tool.

Before continuing with Peter’s feedback regarding the Person domain Galen mentioned that he had found a group called the Enterprise Architecture Council who wants to create an Enterprise Database Data Model. Galen wants the group to be aware of their efforts and vice versa so that the EAC team can make an informed decision and leverage work that has already been done. This also lead to discussion of the VHIM and its status. Galen will get in contact with the EAC group.

**Review and discussion of feedback on FHIM validation artifacts- Galen**

The group continued with the word document that Peter sent on 11/01/2013 and picked up with Issue 6, the question regarding, OccupationalHistory, bullets c - e.

**Decision:** There was a lengthy discussion regarding what exactly the requirement was. Is it current job? Is it occupational history? The definition is not clear and the group does not understand what the requirement is. Other models were looked at and the group talked through various use cases to try and understand what is being asked. It was decided that we need to ask the source group what the definition of the requirement is and why it was needed. The definition was changed to “the kind of work in which the Person has been engaged the most amount of time.” The stereotype was renamed to “OccupationalHistoryObservation”. Galen noted that the definition property needed to be redefined. This was marked as unfinished; it will be reviewed at a later date and Galen will discuss this with Public Health SMEs.

**Issue 7:** Galen - I think for the very last 2 items on the Disposition spreadsheet, Issues #100 and 101; I believe the comments were reversed. Were the dispositions also reversed, as it would seem?

**Decision:** The disposition for this was corrected and made persuasive.

**Issue 8:** Galen - The new “triangle” between Person, Contact Person and Related Person, has me unable to fully wrap my brain around how this is modeled. I think I “get” the new way that ContactParty is modeled, and way that the new class RelatedPerson is modeled, but I want to describe it explicitly, to make sure we are all on the same page on this one:

1. Is “ContactParty” still one of the six types of contacts in the FHIM: Agent, Caregiver, Emergency Contact, Guardian, NOK and Personal?

**Decision:** The terminology team will be tasked with deciding this; see issue 102

1. If so, the person for whom another person is the contact is represented by the directional arrow FROM Person TO ContactPerson, right?

**Decision:** Correct

1. If so, then what is the “id” property in Contact Party? It is defined as SSN, driver’s license, etc. BUT, isn’t this redundant of the “id” property in the “Entity” class (and also of SSN in Person)?

**Decision:** The “id” property has been deleted.

1. If so, then the information about the contact person is provided by the directional arrow that goes FROM ContactParty TO Person, right?

**Decision:** Correct

1. If so, then the ContactParty class’s purpose is to hold the type of contact (the 6 values), the reason for the contact, the date range for the contact association, and whether the contact is primary. Is this correct?

**Decision:** Correct

1. Presumably, the same applies, except e. above, to Related Person, which in this instance shows ONLY the name of the relationship.

**Decision:** Correct

1. First problem/question I have: since technically, ContactParty and RelatedPerson, as classes, do not actually contain the associations between the Person and the contact party or related person, respectively, what do the relationship lines between them actually mean? That is, the content of Related Party is the relationship of a person (the related person) to the person to whom he/she is related. It can only be the attribute of a person. A wife, a child, a guardian, etc. (examples of relationship category values) can only be attributes of a single person. But Contact Party is NOT a single person. How can Related Person be a child of Contact Party (and vice versa)?

**Decision:** The association identifies the instances (i.e., The “records”)

1. Second problem/question: I can see that if one is searching to find the contact party or related person of a person in the Person table, one would go to the Contact Party or Related Person classes, look for all records of that Person as communicated to the class via the incoming relationship line from Person to the class, and see all the relationships via the relationship lines pointing back to Person to see who the contact parties’ related persons are. But I don’t see how it works the other way. If one wanted to know whom a person was a contact party for or related person to, if one goes to the record in the Person table of a related person, there are NO outgoing relationships to the RelatedPerson class, and the incoming relationship would not be accessible or visible. This would seem to be a problem.

**Decision:** Correct; the FHIM is a logical model and is only concerned with reciprocal contact. The associations will point to different “instances” of the person.

**Issue 9:** AdvanceDirective is now just an attribute of Person, with POA a specialization. But what does the incoming relationship line from Person to POA mean? The relationship from POA to Person is the attorney, and the relationship line from Person to AdvanceDirective is the person to whom the POA applies. What is the Person-POA relationship line? Also, if the person who holds POA is NOT an attorney, how is this person identified?

**Decision:** The relationship line has been removed as it was agreed by all to be redundant.

**Issue 10:** I am confused by the interrelationship between the colors and the stereotypes. For SOME, but not all, of the classes, the colors (yellow = role, green = entity, red = act, blue = participation) match the stereotypes, but for others, they do not. Should they be consistent, or doesn’t it matter? Also, what is the meaning of the purple class (language)?

**Decision:** Galen described how the color scheme worked in the FHIM and explained how and why it differed from other models. The purple classes are “language communications”; it was modeled this way because it is modeled this way in HL7.

Peter discussed the FHIM is currently modeled with all of personal information in the person class; he wants to be sure that the group is comfortable with the way that contact person/party is modeled as it differs from other models and could present compatibility issues. Galen agreed with Peter’s concern. The understanding was that the two should be disconnected; when a person is acting as a contact party we do not want them to be in the same table because we do not need nor want certain information (i.e., social security number). The group ran out of time and was unable to finish the discussion.

**Wrap Up:** The meeting ran over by 10 minutes; they will continue addressing the contact party issue at the next meeting.

**Next Meeting:** Friday, November 22, 2013 at 2:30 EDT

| **Action Item Description** | **Responsible Individual** | **Due Date** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Clear up issues with “OccupationalHistory” | Galen | 11/22/2013 |
| Have the team review questions regarding Issue 8a. (see above) | Rob and terminology team | 11/22/2013 |
|  |  |  |

**Information for future FHIM information and terminology modeling calls:**

**1) Information Modeling (IM) 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.gotomeeting.com/meeting/join/585151437**](https://global.gotomeeting.com/meeting/join/585151437)

**2) Terminology Modeling calls**

**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.gotomeeting.com/join/849124653**](https://global.gotomeeting.com/join/849124653)