1/10/13

To be fixed for feb 2013 ballot

1. from Lynne email 11/16/12 -Add "t" into "not" in annotation

<xsd:element name="FMTVersion" type="datatypes:an">

<xsd:annotation>

<xsd:documentation>If using structured Sig but not needing to send any of the elements that use dose form, send a valid FMT version using by the application for other sigs.</xsd:documentation>

</xsd:annotation>

</xsd:element>

2. from sent email 11/16/12

<xsd:complexType name="SigCode">

<xsd:annotation>

<xsd:documentation>NCPDP Vocabulary Constraint supporting Code and Qualifier with Required Text. If code not available from source, must use Code = C38046, Text of “Unspecified” and appropriate Clarifying Free Text. See section “Use of Clarifying Free Text Elements”. See imp guide for more information.</xsd:documentation>

</xsd:annotation>

<xsd:sequence>

<xsd:element name="Text" type="datatypes:an"/>

<xsd:element name="Qualifier" type="ecl:SigCodes"/>

<xsd:element name="Code" type="ecl:Code"/>

</xsd:sequence>

</xsd:complexType>

o I believe these two annotations need to be flipped; DoseFormCode uses FMT codes of which C38046 is an example. SigCode uses SNOMED codes.

LG:

You are correct. Since the sig based schema is still in the publication process, we will correct. Thanh, will you update please? TC – OK will be updated.

DoseFormCode should have the annotation

<xsd:documentation>NCPDP Vocabulary Constraint supporting Code and Qualifier with Required Text. If code not available from source, must use Code = C38046, Text of “Unspecified” and appropriate Clarifying Free Text. See section “Use of Clarifying Free Text Elements”. See imp guide for more information.</xsd:documentation>

And SigCode should have the annotation

<xsd:documentation>NCPDP Vocabulary Constraint supporting Code and Qualifier with Required Text. If code not available from source, must use Code = 10003008, Text of “Unspecified” and Dose Clarifying Free Text. See section “Use of Clarifying Free Text Elements”. See imp guide for more information.</xsd:documentation>

3. same email as 2

• “Structures” schema – unnecessary “choice”?

o “DoseAdministration” begins with an <xsd:choice> that includes only one <xsd:sequence>

 There is no second option to choose from

o It seems the initial choice is irrelevant, and perhaps a leftover from a more elaborate prior version --- the sequence annotation labels this one sequence as “Specified”; perhaps there was an “Unspecified” alternate choice contemplated at one time. That alternative is either missing in error, or the xsd:choice is no longer needed because it was purposely removed.

LG:

Sean and Thanh – could you assist please? Sean, from your creation of the grammar? I know sometimes it is confusing when there are repetitions of the Sig; the choice may occur in a subsequent repetition. I may not be following, but a choice is between the AdministrationIndicator and DoseAdministration. The AdministrationIndicator is “ManufacturersInstructions” so that you can skip the administration details. There is an example in the SCRIPT guide. This is likewise shown in InstructionIndicator which is “MedicalEncounter” to skip the instruction details. Maybe this helps?

TC – Agree, see diagram2 attached. I will get rid of the choice box. Thank you for letting us know.

To do: Doseadministration - get rid of choice box