Information Modeling Project/FHIM Meeting

Summary of Call

Date/time of call: Friday, June 20, 2014 2:30 - 4:30 PM

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Attendees - Agency | Invited, but Unable to Attend | Invited, but Unable to Attend |
| Steve Wagner- FHA | Caitlin Ryan-FHA |  |
| Jay Lyle – FHA | Mead Walker- HL7 |  |
| Sean Muir - FHA | Lynn Sanders-VHA |  |
| Steve Hufnagel- DoD | David Bass- VHA |  |
| Bill Hess – FDA | Gregory Zektser- VHA |  |
| Rob McCLure – FHA | Jay Sykes- FHA |  |
| Galen Mulrooney – FHA | Krystol Shaw- DHA |  |
| Jackie Mulrooney- FHA | Sean Kopka – VHA |  |
| Alberto Llanes - FHA | Iona Thraen- Utah Dept. of Health |  |
| Loren Stevenson- VA | Huma Munir – US Arlington |  |
| Ben Bovee - DoD | Robert Crawford – VHA |  |
| Kathleen Connor- VA |  |  |
| Ioana Singureanu- FHA |  |  |

Updates on S&I and FHA Initiatives *Steve Wagner*

* Galen talked about how S&I initiatives will start by grabbing from existing data requirements from other S&I initiatives as they won’t start from scratch. FHIM compared resulting standard to what was in FHIM. Question arose: use original data from initial spreadsheets or final data elements from resulting standards. Choice was to use final. 75% of mapping already done due to CEDD mapping already done. They still wanted to see coverage in FHIM as identified in previous initiatives that could be "reused".
* Core data element work will be a "separate" mapping work. S&I Simplification workgroup has a strong interest. Interest from other workgroups in S&I unknown. Bottom Line: New S&I initiatives will be able to look at FHIM and identify data elements used in previous S&I initiatives, e.g. vocabulary bindings.
* Galen explained how main issue is confirming value set bindings are accurate, e.g. that value sets truly match to items being mapped to the FHIM structural "AND" FHIM terminology models.
* Ioana@eversolve.com joined in the discussion, particularly in regards to S&I initiative priorities.
* Steve noted that S&I Framework initiative requirements lists we have aren't complete but we are getting closer.
* Nancy Orivs was asking if we could pull values directly related to particular standards, e.g. HL7, X12, etc. Whether descriptions could be pulled to a separate metadata field to perform queries and see which items are mapped to which standards. Is there an automated way to do this now? No but Steve is working on it. According to Galen most is currently mapped to HL7v2 due to MU influence with additional partial maps to CDA and CCDA. Galen is mapping using SQL to HL7 v2 up to v2.8 and automating it (UML profiles to database) so comparisons to previous versions (since most new standards are backwards compatible) can be done quickly so that Galen can focus on only those items that are "different" to manually confirm that mappings are correct.
* Can database of mappings be shared online?
* Galen: I am nowhere near that far yet but can post it on GITHUB or Callabnet. Was done on Interbase but can be changed to any SQL database. Right now it's rather experimental but in a few weeks we should have something sharable.
* Metadata necessary to generate FHIR metamodels?
* Galen is trying to get a copy of the model. Sean is digging into it in comparison to MDHT to see what transforms can be created to generate XML. Galen estimates 4-5 months away to being able to generate FHIR profiles in a fairly automated fashion "he said 'button to push', 'generate FHIR profiles on the fly'".
* FHIM to FHIR properties need to be defined with information regarding constraints, e.g. from 0..\* to 1..1, etc. That's where the hard work actually is. He mentioned another group was working on similar but where hard coding in C# whereas our work is more "data driven".

Terminology Modeling Update and Discussion *Jay Lyle*

* Finished looking at content of reaction set. Ready to submit. Drafting a definition for review then submitting.
* Coming up next week subsets value sets of adverse reactions or may confirm what's been done regarding problem domains, process work, etc.

Other Business

* None

Modeling the Privacy and Security Domain *Galen Mulrooney*

* Kathleen Connor shared her screen and describing her VISIO model whose filename is listed below.
* Determining what to bring over from DAM R2. (Draft HL7 Composite Security and Privacy Domain Analysis Model (DAM) Overview Diagram 2. (FHIM relevant.vsd [Visio]).
* Kathleen said sequence diagrams make sense but doesn't know how to correlate them to FHIM. Galen said in regards to "collaboration/sequence diagrams" he could do that. Kathleen was unsure if needed but Galen said it would have to be to ensure it was complete.
* On this part of the call Kathleen suggested putting lists of "items done, items left to do" into the minutes.
* 1. Collaboration diagrams
* 2. Expert modelers to edit Kathleen's current work and business requirements.
* 3. Get RSA model from Ioana.
* Steve noted in previous work we had consenter and grantee but "not" grantor". Galen said grantee is hanging off delegation "policy" in the current FHIM which can grant rights but 'no' grantor.
* Kathleen: delegation policy is a security policy to whom the role can be delegated.
* Galen: If something is granted based on a corporate policy, it’s done by policy and not a particular person. Grantor in that case could be an organization.
* Kathleen said grantor can be an organization and grantee some type of entity whom grantor enables.
* Consent directive - how does it relate to grantor being consenter?
* Reg was to track components that were critical to basic policy required security rule, resource, policy, context being a pretty important component of that as well.
* Q: Is it possible to export the Visio model in a format for import to say, SPARX EA? Can we "reuse" the model in a sandbox way?
* Kathleen stated she didn't see that being an issue, whatever works for this group. She said it isn't worth it, it isn't appropriately modeled. She tried to use VISIO UML but it was more trouble than it was worth. Galen said importing is a pain between tools and its only 40-50 classes so easier to hand redo it.
* Galen will be "refactoring" Kathleen's VISIO diagram in FHIM. Before starting vocabulary portion Galen wants to check vocabulary in FHIM pertaining to this. Kathleen says some of this is already done by HL7.
* Kathleen went through diagram pointing out those items which are likely already in FHIM or available in HL7, e.g. coverage type. Galen asked, "Where in HL7?" Kathleen replied, "In v3 vocabulary". She can share where coverage codes are in HL7, etc.
* Different resources were discussed with labels at lower level rolling up to high water security label for the resource (roll-up of all of them). Could be a nesting of resources - Kathleen didn't get into that, e.g. sub-resources similar to CDAs, at entry level/section level, etc., which gets rolled up to the "high water mark" (enclosing higher class containing components). Kathleen was discussing most restricted vs high water mark (confidentiality level/security level) going down to the lowest level - with these security labels based on algorithms.
* Galen pointed out they would have to be computed "on the fly", which Kathleen confirmed, with access control system rolling these up and computing security levels/security labeling systems (HL7 standard) similar to DoD security labels (security label information files) providing rules on how to do this in any one domain.
* Kathleen discussed HIPAA and HIV triggering higher confidentiality depending on state vs veteran, etc. Key field in "SLS Security Label & NIST 188 Security Label Structures" typically trigger it with security category, handling, and trust label fields with different confidentiality codes. Under privacy policy there is a whole vocabulary of which one is ActSenstivityPolicyType and PrivacyLaws and HL7 Observations.
* In this case Provenance refers to who asserted it and reported it, related to Data Provenance work at S&I now. Patient reported it, doctor asserted it. Unreliable but PCP needs to know what patient is thinking. Galen stated, "This is what I referred to as clinical provenance".
* Kathleen said, if resource was provenance CDA, we could quickly see there a provenance entry that states, "reported by a patient, asserted by a doctor" .. a flag .. Access control system.
* ISO 22600 contains ContraintPolicy Kathleen used as consent directive constraint on privacy policy and security rules using to enforce it. Authorization, Delegation, Obligation, Refrain and Constraint Policies feed into the Composite Policy with each one or combination comprising (rolling up) into a BasicPolicy. Steve interpreted it as the other way around where basic policies Authorization, Delegation, Obligation, Refrain and Constraint Policies feed into the Composite Policy which makes a decision about an AccessRequest. They agreed to latter interpretation.
* Visio model to be "broken up"/incorporated into FHIM.

Meeting terminated at 4:02 P.M.

Next Meeting: Friday, June 27, 2014 at 2:30 EDT

| Action Item Description | Responsible Individual | Due Date |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

Information for future FHIM information and terminology modeling calls:

1) Information Modeling (IM) project 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>

2) Terminology Modeling calls (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>