FHIMS WG Terminology Modeling Sub-Project Meeting

Summary of Call

Date/time of call: Wednesday, September 18, 2013, 2:30 - 4:00 PM

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Attendees** | | | |
| Jay Lyle - FHA PMO | Y | Robert Crawford – VA |  |
| Rob McClure - VA/VHA | Y | LuAnne Barron |  |
| Bill Hess – FDA |  | John Carter |  |
| Galen Mulrooney - VA/VHA | Y | Riki Merrick | Y |
| Susan Matney – 3M |  | Kevin Coonan |  |
| Jim Case – NLM |  | Holly Miller – VA |  |
| Steve Wagner – FHA | Y | Pam Banning |  |
| David Bass – VA |  | Ted Klein | Y |
| Mark Roche |  | Steve Hufnagel – DoD |  |
| Sean Muir – VA | Y | Charles |  |
| Jerry Sable – CDC |  | Catherine Hoang |  |
| Ioana Singureanu |  | Charles Gabriel |  |
| Ben Bovee – DoD (iEHR) |  | Greg Rehwoldt – IPO | Y |
| Jeff Jacobs – IPO |  | Coco Tsai – FDA |  |
| Eric Rothschild – IPO |  | Frank Switzer – FDA |  |
| Dornn Harris – IPO |  | Steve Emrick – NLM |  |
| Caitlin Ryan |  | Iona Thraen | Y |

Agenda

1.  How closely do we want to align FHIM terminology to HL7 designs as specified in Core Principles? Do we have the same requirements?

See specific questions, below

2. Should coded property bindings to value sets be static or dynamic?

Earlier, we had opted for static bindings to value sets defined by other organizations, but reserved the option to bind dynamically to our own, as well as to certain sets we felt should be more fully delegated to their stewards (e.g., RadLex).

We may wish to consider deferring this specification to the use case specification.

Static and dynamic binding are not to be confused with static and dynamic stability, which refers to whether a value set changes when the system from which it draws content changes.

The following use case was offered:

|  |
| --- |
| Albert defines a value set “Salmonella\_ValueSet” as all of the descendants of the “Salmonella” concept in SNOMED CT from January 2013.  When IHTSDO releases the August version of SNOMED CT, it includes 5 new concepts under “Salmonella.” These are not included in Albert’s value set, which is statically defined on the January release.  Albert reviews the August SNOMED CT release and decides that he agrees with four of the concepts but not the fifth. He defines a new version of “Salmonella\_ValueSet” as all of the descendants of the “Salmonella” concept in SNOMED CT from August 2013 excluding the one.  In March, Bernard needed a value set for Salmonella. He found Albert’s, and it met his requirements. He then had to decide whether he believed Albert’s requirement could diverge from his in the future, just as Albert had to decide concerning SNOMED CT. If so, he would want to bind statically, and remember to check for new versions to review in the future; if not, he could bind dynamically (in which case his model will automatically pick up Albert’s changes in version two of the value set). |

The team agreed that the use case reflects real requirements. Core Principles reportedly addresses both value set definition stability and value set binding definition. Binding (assertion) found at 5.2.2.3; definition reference not found

We can use language like “current and future descendants” of a concept to make dynamic stability explicit.

FHIM has flexibility of an *ad hoc* release schedule.

We confirmed that the default binding stability will be “static.” (Health eDecisions has come to similar decision). Rationale: we want to maintain control of the semantics of our model, and we wish to review changes before admitting them.

Rob reports that VSAC policy is to insert a governance process into the management of dynamically defined value sets as well: “You can stop a dynamically bound change with a governance process without changing it to a static set.” This seems to mean that a dynamic set is functionally similar to a static set (with some differences in how version identifiers are handled). It also means that a dynamic definition cannot be used to infer the expansion of a value set, as VSAC may intervene: value sets must be sourced from VSAC, not cached or independently computed.

Ted had a proverb [origin?] “Identifier of the VS should be the sole source of truth”: identifier being a URN, not an OID.

<Discussion closed, but at this point, functional difference between static and “governed dynamic” VS definition remains unclear>

3. Should bindings be specified as CNE or CWE? Or should that depend on the property?

We could bind CWE at the model level and constrain that to CNE at the use case level where appropriate.

“Coding strength.”

Your standard will be easier to implement & interoperate & validate if you use CNE. Reserve CWE for exceptional cases.

CNE preferred.

4. Are we interested in specifying levels of implementation with the "max min ignore" scheme?

Has been used to differentiate provincially defined requirements; we don’t have that. (Also professional practice organizations.) We can ignore.

5. Other topics

When we decide static vs. dynamic, how do we document that consistently? FHIR has a wiki page for each binding.

FHIR pages – value sets or bindings?

Generated from model

\*Check FHIM model binding object for necessary metadata

Coordinate with Dave on his 11179 plans for MDHT

Woody & Ted: ISO effort to standardize CP binding for use with ISO HL7 datatypes

**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

**Action Items**

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