| Recommendation for HL7 RIM and/or Vocabulary Changes | | | | | | **RECOMMENDATION ID[[1]](#footnote-1):** | |  | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| For Harmonization During: | | | | NOV2013 | | FlawedDescriptiveMarkup | | | |
| Sponsored by[[2]](#footnote-2): | | Modeling and Methodology | | | | Sponsor’s Draft[[3]](#footnote-3): | 1 | | |
| Date Approved by Sponsor: | | | | | Sept 2013 WGM | Sponsor’s Status[[4]](#footnote-4) |  | | |
| Editor/ Author: | | Woody Beeler | | | | | | | |
| **PROPOSALNAME:** | | | | Correct Flawed xhtml Markup that causes descriptions to be incorrectly rendered. | | | | | |
| Class Model Change  Structural Vocabulary Change  Datatypes Change  Other Vocabulary Change | | | | | | | | | |

## SUMMARY RECOMMENDATION

Recent analysis of the descriptions in the Core Mif revealed five descriptions that are rendered with the xhtml markup “escaped” as &lt;p&gt; rather than <p>. These occurred because the source files used to update the data base contained invalid xhtml markup. This proposal seeks to correct those five.

**VOCABULARY OBJECTS CHANGE SUMMARY**

<<REQUIRED – fill in the numbers in the rightmost three columns that total the number of vocabulary changes in the proposal. This is used to cross-check the accuracy of capturing and applying the requested changes>>

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Abbrev.** | **Description** | **# to add** | **# to remove** | **# to change** |
| D | Concept Domains |  |  | 1 |
| S | Code Systems |  |  |  |
| C | Concept Codes in a Code System |  |  | 4 |
| V | Value Sets |  |  |  |
| B | Context Bindings |  |  |  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **POSITION OF CONCERNED ORGANIZATIONS:**  <<REQUIRED - This table should contain one row for each organization (e.g., TC, SIG, other SDO) known to be interested, and should outline any consultation with – and feedback from – the organization. Overwrite the examples below. >> | | |
| **ORG** | **RECOMMENDATION APPROVAL STATUS** | **AFFECTED ELEMENTS OF INTEREST TO ORG** | |
| Modeling and Methodology | Not yet submitted | N/A | |

**ISSUE:**

**CURRENT STATE:**

Five elements (one concept domain and four codes) contain escaped markup.

**OPTIONS CONSIDERED**:

Fix it

**RATIONALE:**

1. Fixit because its ugly and wrong.

**RECOMMENDATION DETAILS:**

**The five elements that need fixing are:**

* I already deleted the first one, which is correct.
* **Concept**: ActCode.\_ActPrivacyLaw. Replace the existing description with the following. ***NOTE: This will fix the markup, but the structure of the text still seems flawed, with “Note:” and “Description:” embedded in the text***
  + <p> A mandate, obligation, requirement, rule, or expectation characterizing the value or importance of a resource and may include its vulnerability. (Based on ISO7498-2:1989. Note: The vulnerability of personally identifiable sensitive information may be based on concerns that the unauthorized disclosure may result in social stigmatization or discrimination.) Description: Types of Sensitivity policy that apply to Acts or Roles. A sensitivity policy is adopted by an enterprise or group of enterprises (a policy domain) through a formal data use agreement that stipulates the value, importance, and vulnerability of information. A sensitivity code representing a sensitivity policy may be associated with criteria such as categories of information or sets of information identifiers (e.g., a value set of clinical codes or branch in a code system hierarchy). These criteria may in turn be used for the Policy Decision Point in a Security Engine. A sensitivity code may be used to set the confidentiality code used on information about Acts and Roles to trigger the security mechanisms required to control how security principals (i.e., a person, a machine, a software application) may act on the information (e.g., collection, access, use, or disclosure). Sensitivity codes are never assigned to the transport or business envelope containing patient specific information being exchanged outside of a policy domain as this would disclose the information intended to be protected by the policy. When sensitive information is exchanged with others outside of a policy domain, the confidentiality code on the transport or business envelope conveys the receiver's responsibilities and indicates the how the information is to be safeguarded without unauthorized disclosure of the sensitive information. This ensures that sensitive information is treated by receivers as the sender intends, accomplishing interoperability without point to point negotiations.</p>
  + <p><i>Usage Note: </i>Sensitivity codes are not useful for interoperability outside of a policy domain without an out-of-band agreement on semantics because sensitivity policies are typically localized and vary drastically across policy domains even for the same information category because of differing organizational business rules, security policies, and jurisdictional requirements. For example, an employee sensitivity code (EMPL) would make little sense for use outside of a policy domain. The code "taboo" (TBOO) would rarely be useful outside of a policy domain unless there are jurisdictional requirements requiring that a provider disclose sensitive information to a patient directly. Sensitivity codes may be more appropriate in a legacy system's Master Files in order to notify those who access a patient's orders and observations about the sensitivity policies that apply. Newer systems may have a security engine that uses a sensitivity policy criteria directly. The specializable InformationSensitivityPolicy Act.code may be useful in some scenarios if used in combination with a sensitivity identifier and/or Act.title.</p>
* **Concept**: ActCode.SDE Replace existing description with:
  + <p>Comparison of results across strata can be used to show where disparities exist or where there is a need to expose differences in results. For example, Centers for Medicare &amp; Medicaid Services (CMS) in the U.S. defines four required Supplemental Data Elements (payer, ethnicity, race, and gender), which are variables used to aggregate data into various subgroups. Additional supplemental data elements required for risk adjustment or other purposes of data aggregation can be included in the Supplemental Data Element section.</p>

**DISCUSSION:**

.

**ACTION ITEMS:**

**RESOLUTION:**

MOTION by Wendy Huang to accept the proposal as amended; seconded by Russ Hamm. The motion carried unanimously.

# Checklist for HL7 Vocabulary Harmonization Submissions

The following checklist must be completed **for each submission** and attached as part of the submission posting for every HL7 harmonization proposal that proposes a change to any HL7 terminology artifact. (Submit your proposal as a zip containing the base proposal and this form, or copy this form onto the end of your proposal.) If a revised proposal is submitted (e.g. detailed proposal after cover page), a new copy of the checklist must be attached confirming that the revised proposal has been re-reviewed. The failure to attach a completed checklist will result in the tabling or deferral of the proposal to a subsequent harmonization meeting with the assumption the proposal will be re-introduced with a completed form.

The proposal has been constructed in such a way that the “correct” answer to each question is either “Yes” or “N/A”. In the event that the answer is “No”, please provide an explanation at the end noting the question number and the reason why the checklist item has not been met. Harmonization proposals that do not satisfy all checklist items may still be considered at harmonization at the discretion of the harmonization group and the vocabulary maintenance team if there is a satisfactory reason the checklist item could not be met. Lack of time to complete the form does not constitute a satisfactory reason.

A section of the form may be marked as “N/A” and all checklist items within that section ignored if none of the terminology items submitted apply to that section.

In most circumstances, this checklist should be completed by the sponsor committee’s vocabulary facilitator, but it may be completed by any submitter.

**Note**: When checking for existing codes, code systems, value sets, etc., please make sure that your RoseTree configuration options are set to display Retired and Deprecated elements, as the “no duplicates” rule applies to those as well.

Before completing this checklist, please consult the following “best practices” and guidelines documents. (They will be updated from time to time, so please review the documents for changes prior to each harmonization.)

**Concept domain & Value set naming:** <http://wiki.hl7.org/index.php?title=Concept_Domain_Naming_Conventions>

<http://wiki.hl7.org/index.php?title=Value_Set_Naming_Conventions>

**Definitions:** <http://wiki.hl7.org/index.php?title=Annotations_Best_Practices>

**Terminology Good Practices:** <http://wiki.hl7.org/index.php?title=Good_Terminology_Practices>

## General

1. Has the proposal, in its final form, been reviewed by the sponsor committee’s vocabulary facilitator (mark N/A if there is no facilitator)? (  - Yes;  - No;  - N/A)
2. Have you completely filled out header section for the proposal and checked that the dates are correct and the submission number is unique across all of your submissions for this harmonization cycle? ( - Yes;  - No;  - N/A)
3. Have you filled out the summary form identifying the number of created, updated and deprecated objects of each type? ( - Yes;)
4. Has your proposal been submitted to and reviewed by all relevant WGs and been formally endorsed (with a vote recorded in the WG minutes) to be brought forward to harmonization? (For harmonization submissions from international affiliates, approval by an appropriate affiliate level committee or project is sufficient, though submission to the relevant HL7 UV WG is strongly recommended.) ( - Yes;  - No;  - N/A)

## New Concept Domains ( - N/A)

For all concept domains being created by this proposal:

1. Have you done a key-word search for equivalent or similar concept domains and, if any exist, identified appropriate parent and child relationships to position your concept domain? ( - Yes;  - No;  - N/A)
2. Have you provided a name for your concept domain that follows the naming guidelines?( - Yes;  - No;  - N/A)
3. If your concept domain is not associated with a new RIM attribute or datatype property, have you identified a parent for your concept domain? ( - Yes;  - No;  - N/A)
4. Have you checked whether any existing concept domains are proper specializations of your concept domain and, if so, identified those new specialization relationships as part of your proposal? ( - Yes;  - No;  - N/A)
5. If your concept domain is in the ActCode, RoleCode or EntityCode hierarchy, have you identified the classCode that acts as the “root” for the concept domain? ( - Yes;  - No;  - N/A)
6. Have you verified that all concept domains referenced as parent or child concepts actually exist in the most recent vocabulary repository and are correctly spelled in your proposal using U.S. language settings? ( - Yes;  - No;  - N/A)
7. Have you provided a concise, non-tautological definition for your concept domain and confirmed that the definition follows the best practices for definitions? ( - Yes;  - No;  - N/A)
8. Have you checked the name of your concept domain and associated definition for appropriate spelling and grammar using U.S. language settings, and consistency with the current Concept Domain naming conventions? ( - Yes;  - No;  - N/A)
9. Have you either: Provided 3 distinct examples; identified a binding to an example value set with 3 distinct example codes; identified a representative binding; or identified a universal binding? ( - Yes;  - No;  - N/A)

## Revised Concept Domains ( - N/A)

For all concept domains being revised by this proposal:

1. Have you identified the name of the existing concept domain, and verified that the concept domain does in fact exist in the most recent vocabulary repository with the name spelled as referenced? ( - Yes;  - No;  - N/A)
2. Have you verified that any additional concept domains identified as parents or children and any code referenced as the anchor for the concept domain actually exist and are spelled properly? ( - Yes;  - No;  - N/A)
3. Have you confirmed that any change to the definition would not cause backwards compatibility issues with any models that reference the Concept Domain under the old definition? ( - Yes;  - No;  - N/A)
4. Have you confirmed that any changes to the Concept Domain definition continue to comply with best practices for definitions? ( - Yes;  - No;  - N/A)
5. Have you spell-checked and grammar checked your revised definition using U.S. language settings? ( - Yes;  - No;  - N/A)

## New/Revised Code System ( - N/A)

For all code systems created or whose metadata is updated by this proposal:

1. For new HL7-maintained code systems, have you confirmed that no other terminology maintenance organization is a more appropriate organization to maintain the code system and codes within it? ( - Yes;  - No;  - N/A)
2. For new external code systems, have you confirmed that the code system follows the good terminology practices and is therefore appropriate for use in HL7 instances? ( - Yes;  - No;  - N/A)
3. For external code systems where there is a desire for HL7 to publish codes from the external code system, have you verified that there are no copyright issues associated with the publication and provided a justification for why HL7 should take on this administrative effort as well as identified how the HL7 published versions will be kept in sync with the source? ( - Yes;  - No;  - N/A)
4. Have you provided a short-name for the code system that is unique among all other code systems found in the HL7 OID registry? ( - Yes;  - No;  - N/A)
5. For all code systems, have you provided:
   1. A long, unique “descriptive” name for the code system? ( - Yes;  - No;  - N/A)
   2. A description of the intended use and scope of the code system ( - Yes;  - No;  - N/A)
6. For external code systems, have you provided:
   1. OID for the code system (if already registered in the HL7 OID registry or otherwise assigned an OID)? ( - Yes;  - No;  - N/A)
   2. Licensing information ( - Yes;  - No;  - N/A)
   3. URL information for the official source of the vocabulary ( - Yes;  - No;  - N/A)
   4. Contact Information ( - Yes;  - No;  - N/A)
   5. The “short name” for the code system is consistent with the following rules (ISO Secondary Identifier rules plus some HL7 constraints)
      1. No spaces
      2. Only the characters 0-9, a-z, A-Z and hyphens
      3. Cannot have multiple consecutive hyphens or end with a hyphen
      4. Leading character must be a lower-case alpha
      5. Must be unique from among all registered code systems in HL7’s OID registry
      6. Should not match any code system in HL7’s OID registry even when treating both as upper-case

## Revised Code in Code System ( - N/A)

For all new codes created by this proposal:

1. Have you searched the code system in the most recent repository using keywords to verify that an equivalent code doesn’t already exist? ( - Yes;  - No;  - N/A)
2. Have you searched the code system in the most recent repository to confirm that no code already exists with the same code? ( - Yes;  - No;  - N/A) Note that you must also check existing retired and/or deprecated codes for existence.
3. If adding a code from an external code system for HL7 publication (where HL7 has agreed to publish codes from the external code system), have you confirmed that the code has actually been accepted by the external code system and confirmed the code, print names and definition are identical to those in the most recent version of the external code system? ( - Yes;  - No;  - N/A)

## Added or Revised Code in Code System ( - N/A)

For all new codes created or updated by this proposal:

1. When adding a code or changing a print name, have you search searched the code system in the most recent repository that no code already exists with the same print name? ( - Yes;  - No;  - N/A)
2. Have you provided a code values and (where appropriate) print names that align with the naming convention for the code system? (Generally all upper case, no spaces for codes, lower case for print names. Depending on the code system, the code may be mnemonic or not). ( - Yes;  - No;  - N/A)
3. Have you provided a definition for the code that follows the best practices for definitions? ( - Yes;  - No;  - N/A)
4. Have you spell-checked (and for definitions grammar-checked) the definitions and print names using U.S. language settings? ( - Yes;  - No;  - N/A)
5. Have you defined all required properties for the code system in which the code is being added? ( - Yes;  - No;  - N/A)
   1. ActClass: “specialized by concept domain”, Formal class name, formal name for association from participation to Act
   2. ActCode: “specialized by concept domain”
   3. ActMood: Formal name
   4. ActRelationshipType: “is document characteristic?”; applies to; how applies; Formal name from Act to outbound ActRelationship, ActRelationship to source Act, ActRelationship to target Act and Act to inbound ActRelationship; Sort for Act to inbound ActRelationship and Act to outbound ActRelationship
   5. CompressionAlgorithm: howApplies (mandatory, deprecated, other)
   6. EntityClass: “specialized by concept domain”, applies to determinerCode, Formal class name
   7. EntityDeterminer: Formal name
   8. GTSAbbreviation: Equivalent expression
   9. ObservationMethod: how applies?
   10. ParticipationType: “specialized by concept domain”, “is document characteristic?”, Formal name from Act to Participation and Role to Participation; Sort from Act to Participation and Role to Participation
   11. RoleClass: “specialized by concept domain”, Formal name, Participation to Role name, Role to player Entity name, Entity to played Role name, Entity to scoped Role name, Role to scoper Entity name, Entity to played Role sort, Entity to scoped Role sort
   12. RoleCode: conceptStatusQualifier
   13. RoleLinkType: Formal name from Role to outbound RoleLink, RoleLink to source Role, RoleLink to target Role and Role to inbound RoleLink; Sort for Role to inbound RoleLink and Role to outboundRoleLink
6. Have you checked the current version of the code system and identified all code(s) that should be parents and/or children of the new concept and verified that you have listed them all appropriately (and spelled correctly) in your proposal? ( - Yes;  - No;  - N/A)
7. Have you identified whether the code should be considered abstract or not? ( - Yes;  - No;  - N/A)
8. If deprecating a code, have you identified a reason for the deprecation and provided guidance for what should be used instead? ( - Yes;  - No;  - N/A)

## New Value Sets ( - N/A)

For all new value sets created as part of this proposal:

1. Have you verified that the value set is appropriate to be registered in the HL7 Inc. repository (created against structural code systems, used in a UV, Example or Representative binding)? ( - Yes;  - No;  - N/A)
2. Have you identified whether the value set definition is immutable? I.e. It is a definition that must never be changed. ( - Yes;  - No;  - N/A)
3. Have you verified that the name for the value set does not already exist in the existing HL7 repository? ( - Yes;  - No;  - N/A)
4. Have you named the value set using the naming guidelines found here: <http://wiki.hl7.org/index.php?title=Value_Set_Naming_Conventions> ( - Yes;  - No;  - N/A)

## New or Modified Value Sets ( - N/A)

For all value sets created or modified as part of this proposal:

1. That any modified value sets are not flagged as immutable. ( - Yes;  - No;  - N/A)
2. For non-immutable value sets, have you provided a description that explains the scope of the value set and the “owning” WG that should be responsible for determining how the value set definition evolves over time? ( - Yes;  - No;  - N/A)
3. Have you defined all required properties for value sets drawn from one of the following structural code systems? ( - Yes;  - No;  - N/A)
   1. ActClass: Formal class name, formal name for association from participation to Act
   2. ActMood: Formal name
   3. ActRelationshipType: Formal name from Act to outbound ActRelationship, ActRelationship to source Act, ActRelationship to target Act and Act to inbound ActRelationship; Sort for Act to inbound ActRelationship and Act to outbound ActRelationship
   4. EntityClassFormal class name
   5. EntityDeterminer: Formal name
   6. ParticipationType: Formal name from Act to Participation and Role to Participation; Sort from Act to Participation and Role to Participation
   7. RoleClass: Formal name, Participation to Role name, Role to player Entity name, Entity to played Role name, Entity to scoped Role name, Role to scoper Entity name, Entity to played Role sort, Entity to scoped Role sort
   8. RoleLinkType: Formal name from Role to outbound RoleLink, RoleLink to source Role, RoleLink to target Role and Role to inbound RoleLink; Sort for Role to inbound RoleLink and Role to outboundRoleLink
4. Have you checked that your value set name and description are correctly spelled (and for descriptions, have correct grammar) using U.S. language settings, and is consistent with the current Value Set naming conventions? ( - Yes;  - No;  - N/A)
5. Have you checked that all references to codes in your value set definition identify their associated code system and actually exist within the current version of their respective code systems (both HL7 and external code systems)? ( - Yes;  - No;  - N/A)
6. Have you verified that if your value set content definition is enumerated (extensional) that there is no appropriate or better way to define it as an expression-based (intentional) definition? ( - Yes;  - No;  - N/A)
7. For expression-based value set content definitions, have you confirmed that your expression is expressed in a way that is fully defined against the HL7 metamodel? ( - Yes;  - No;  - N/A)
   1. For code-based value sets, identify whether the head-code is included or not
   2. For code-based value sets, identify whether the included codes should be children, all descendants or leaf nodes only
   3. For code based value sets, that the specific type of association to be navigated is identified if it is something other than the subsumption relationship
   4. For complex value sets, that they are expressed as a combination of unions, intersections and exclusions where “order of operations” is clearly documented
   5. For property-based value sets, that the referenced property names actually exist in their respective code systems and are spelled correctly
   6. That for mnemonic-based value sets, that the reg-ex expression to be evaluated against the codes is a valid reg-ex expression
8. If deprecating a value set, have you identified a reason for the deprecation and provided guidance for what should be used instead? ( - Yes;  - No;  - N/A)

## New Binding Realms ( - N/A)

For all new Binding Realms created as part of this proposal:

1. Have you identified the owning affiliate and the superset binding realm? ( - Yes;  - No;  - N/A)
2. Have you received official permission from the affiliate t create the new binding realm ( - Yes;  - No;  - N/A)
3. Have you identified a proposed code for the binding realm that is unique amongst all binding realms in the most recent version of the repository following binding realm naming conventions (i.e. starting with the code for the affiliate)? ( - Yes;  - No;  - N/A)
4. Have you provided a unique descriptive name for the new binding realm? ( - Yes;  - No;  - N/A)
5. Have you provided a description that explains the scope of the new binding realm and spell-checked and grammar-checked it? ( - Yes;  - No;  - N/A)

## New Context Bindings ( - N/A)

For all new Context Bindings created as part of this proposal:

1. Have you declared the name of the concept domain, the binding realm and the value set name or OID? ( - Yes;  - No;  - N/A)
2. Have you checked that the concept domain name, binding realm code and value set name or OID actually exist in the most recent version of the repository? ( - Yes;  - No;  - N/A)
3. If the binding is not to be effective immediately upon harmonization approval and application of approved changes, have you identified the effective date? ( - Yes;  - No;  - N/A)
4. Have you checked whether there is already a binding for the same concept domain and binding realm and if so, either specified a new sequence number (to allow parallel bindings) or a date to on which the old binding should end and the new one should become effective? ( - Yes;  - No;  - N/A)
5. If binding in a realm other than “example”, have you conformed that the set of codes in the valueset being bound provides full coverage for the concept space defined by the concept domain? ( - Yes;  - No;  - N/A)

## Explanation for N/A Items

1. identifier by which proposal is known to sponsor [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. must be sponsored by an HL7 TC, the HL7 International Committee, an HL7 SIG, or an ANSI or ISO accredited SDO [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. for sponsor tracking only; not for Harmonization identification [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. for sponsor tracking only, Sponsor’s status **must** be “Approved” for submission to Harmonization [↑](#footnote-ref-4)