2018-07-31 - SNOMED on FHIR Meeting (TS)

Date

20:00 UTC on Tuesday 31 July 2018 - 90 minutes.

Meeting Details

Online: https://snomed.zoom.us/my/snomedhl7

Phone: See https://zoom.us/zoomconference for available phone numbers (meeting id **242-348-6949**)

Chat: https://chat.snomedtools.org/channel/snomed-fhir
(instructions and guide here - Getting Started with Rocket Chat)

Objectives

- FHIR Terminology Services and Resources

Attendees

Dion McMurtrie, Rob Hausam

Apologies

Peter G. Williams

Meeting Recording - Not Available

Discussion items

Item	Description	Mins	Owner	Notes & Actions
1	Welcome and introductions	5	Rob Hausam	Recording, notes & attendance. SNOMED on FHIR meeting planned during the business meeting - closed session (observers space dependent).
2	October Expo - Vancouver	5	Jane Millar	Call for abstract - presentation on the work of this group (2 presenters max). ☐ Rob Hausam to work with Jane. ☑ Jeremy Rogers also planning to present.
3	Summary of previous week	5	Rob Hausam	• 2018-07-17 - SNOMED on FHIR Meeting (TB)
4	Work suggestions from last meeting		Dion McMurtrie	Proposals for expand Options for validate code - mapping between various data issue scenarios and true/false result flag.
5	Zulip discussion on Post Coordinated expressions	50	Dion McMurtrie	Summary: Expression**s** filter on CodeSystem Resource - Dion asked Graham about origin of these two items. GG clarified true = permit PCE eg for use in validate-code and similarly for expand. Default = true also. Suggested that expand call should then return every possible post coordinated expression (!!) which is a) hard and b) probably not useful. Such expressions could be available if an expression library had been implemented. However, validate code should handle arbitrary PCEs since this will be a finite set. Note that people do post coordination for other code systems eg UCUM and MIME. Update: Difference between two positions - when expanding value sets defined intensionally, expectation that any existing pre-coordinated concept or PCE would be included. Graham expects server to return "Too Costly" as logical behaviour would be to return every possible PCE. **Suggestions:** • Possible valid use case in calculating lateralized expressions (even at runtime). • Principle could be applied that in general SNOMED Pre and Post coordinated expressions should be interchangeable. • Incomplete response should be labelled as such. • That we should return "published" content, which might include post coordinated content in some cases. ML suggested "at least" this content. • We could make a statement in the "Using SNOMED with FHIR" page. Clarify with the HL7 Vocabulary group. **Questions / Discussion** • In the "membership" query, does a PCE that is equivalent to a pre-coordinated that is part of the value set match? RH: If the value set says that PCE is included, then yes it should handle that. **Update 26 June** • PCE validation would be expected to take into account MRCM rules. • PCE would not necessarily have a term associated with it - arguably useless in an EHR. • No know use cases for expression libraries (JC) PJ: Could change excludePostCoordinated to includePostCoordinated (and default to false) in operation-valueset-expand.html to better reflect the current capabilities of 99% of systems. Option for finer grained enumeration ("PostCoordination" / "Composition Behaviour"?)for varying efforts in PCE generation. RH: Remember these changes would apply to all code systems. **Suggested Enumeration:** • None (returning a valueset in this case would indicate that it's a subset) • Pre-defined (eg library) PCEs - this would be the default setting. • Generated PCEs eg Laterality ☑ Dion McMurtrie to capture this discussion into a page, for review by the rest of the group followed by progression into a tracker item. Target 10 July for hand over to Rob. (see link below) SNOMED CT, post coordination and ValueSet $expand

6	$validate-code behaviour Note this discussion is specific to the response to Term during validation.	20	Dion McMurtrie	Current behaviour doesn't allow for distinction to be made in responding to quality of term queried. Note: Since server returns display term, if the query just checks for membership then the *client* could check its term against that returned. This waters down the usefulness of the server but would simplify if functionality is not in the 80% of features required. See GForge issue #17218 (ML's). Also #16586. See also https://chat.fhir.org/#narrow/stream/48-terminology/subject/Validation.20for.20foreign.20language.20resources ☐ @All contribute to tickets. Can also comment on page: $validate-code behaviour **Discussion**
7	Main item for discussion	30	Dion McMurtrie	SNOMED CT Canonical CodeSystem resource • Review and attempt to resolve detail questions • Issue around extensions and what this CodeSystem resource actually represents Update: URIs populated. Intention to provide short URLs for normalForm and normalFormTerse to point to appropriate definition of terms.

8	Current items	10	Dion McMurtrie	• SNOMED CT "Universal" Edition
				  ○ Definitely useful to have a catalogue of all concepts ever issued if not a proper edition which may be much harder?
				  ○ Is this work for this group, or should this be handed on to a more appropriate SI group?
				• Check and fix ECL in the FHIR spec
				  ○ Is there a way to systematically identify all ECL expressions in the FHIR spec?
				  ○ If we run these through validation is there appetite/volunteers to review and fix them as feedback to the spec?
				  ○ Is there a way to integrate ECL validation into the FHIR spec tooling to prevent recurrence?
				
				☐ Rob Hausam to progress Michael's tracker item on this issue.
				
				• Normal form and normal form terse definition
				
				☐ Rob Hausam to progress returning NormalFormTerse to the page.
				
				• Linda Bird to progress defining Terse Normal Form with the Family of Languages group (Rob Hausam confirms needed for July)
				  ○ SLPG agreed that the Languages group is not the appropriate forum for this definition. Instead, we believe this should be defined in the DL subgroup of the Modelling Advisory Group.
				  ○ Also agreed that the terms that need defining are "Canonical Normal Form" (which is terse by definition) and "Necessary Long Normal Form"

9	Review of "Using SNOMED with FHIR" page	5	Dion McMurtrie	All participants are invited to review this local copy of that page. ☐ Section 4.2.1.0.5 suggestion that we terse Normal Form properties (Peter J disagreed). Clarity needed on which Normal Form is being represented (eg breaking sufficiently defined concepts down to their primitive components, unlike what is supplied in the browser). Further discussion needed on what these properties are being used for. Perhaps only 1 is necessary since terms can be added/removed as required ☐ Supplements are a possible way to allow language reference set type functionality.
10	Review of TS Collaborative Work	5	Dion McMurtrie	Collaborative Work
11	Any other business			**Next Meeting: Tuesday 14 August** Actions for next week:

Meeting Files

File	Modified

No files shared here yet.