



R4 Resource Modeling Query and Discussion Topics

This page list all the queries that Child Health Project team wants to discuss with CHWG and decide a path forward.

Generic Query

Serial Number	Query	Date and Decision	Members Present
G1	<p>At this moment NCDHC uses only a handful of elements from the default FHIR profiles. This gives an option to the implementer to supply more data than originally supported by NCDHC. We want to decide whether we should restrict the data set or leave as it is with some control.</p> <p>I think we have two options on this:</p> <p>Option 1: Remove all non-supported elements from the profile. This may introduce strict boundary on the profile and loose re-usability.</p> <p>Option 2: Use must support flag to indicate what is supported by NCDHC. If the source system supplies more data, then NCDHC will not remove them but will not process them or take any ownership of that additional data. They will remain as-is in the supplied resources.</p>	<p>28-07-2020: It was decided to continue with Must Support flag with providing adequate details to the implementer about the meaning of the flag.</p> <p>Status: Closed</p>	<p>Nichol Hill, Richard Townley-O'Neill Lakshmi Sing, Michael Bainbridge</p>
G2	<p>NCDHC uses International Bundle resource to represent FHIR document and search result. Any suggestion to use project specific Bundle profile? if yes, then how would it look like and advantage?</p>	<p>11-08-2020: The group suggested that a Bundle Profile could be useful. This will give a better guidance to the implementer about what to send/expect in a FHIR document supported by NCDHC. Shovan to try modeling a Bundle profile and share with the CHWG in the next meeting</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 25-08-2020: Shovan presented the Bundle profile to the CHWG. No further comments.  08 Sep 2020 : Suggestion given to slice entry and add NCDHC Composition lists as one slice. <p>Status: Open</p>	<p>Reuben Daniels Richard Townley-O'Neill Danielle Tavares-Rixon Brett Esler Blair Thompson, Linda</p>
G3	<p>Which Version of R4 based AU profiles should be used 2.1.0 or current? When is the plan to release R4 AU Device profile?</p>	<p> 08 Sep 2020 Brett Esler suggested to use 'current' version to get advantage of the latest and greatest things happening in Au Base. 'current' version is likely to be published before December which aligns with NCDHC Timeline.</p> <p>Status: Closed</p>	<p>Reuben Daniels Richard Townley-O'Neill Danielle Tavares-Rixon Brett Esler Blair Thompson, Linda</p>


Resource: Observation

Serial Number	Description	Resource Path	NCDHC Approach	Date and Decision	Members Present
---------------	-------------	---------------	----------------	-------------------	-----------------

O1	<p>Shall we make effective[x] as mandatory in the profile when there any value[X] provided?</p> <p>in what situation effective[x] can not be provided (other than historical observations which we are not dealing with in NCDHC)?</p>	Observation.effective[x]	Add Invariant to check the existence of effective[x] if the absentReason is not provided	<p>28-07-2020: Shovan to talk to NCDHC CI team for more clinical guidance.</p> <p>Status: Open</p>	Nichol Hill, Richard Townley-O'Neill Lakshmi Sing, Michael Bainbridge
O2	Use of component or hasMember along with dataAbsentReason	Observation.absentReason	Do not allow dataAbsentReason along with component and/or hasMember in the same Observation instance.	<p>28-07-2020: Change Invariant to ask for dataAbsentReason only when neither of value[x], component, hasMember or interpretation is present in the Observation but the observation is sent.</p> <p>Status: Closed</p>	Nichol Hill, Richard Townley-O'Neill Lakshmi Sing, Michael Bainbridge
O3	Use closed slice vs open slice in coding	Observation.code.coding	NCDHC recommends to use open slice. The sender SHALL send the code as required in the Observation. However they can send additional codes (local codes). The Hub doesn't guarantee about processing the additional code but will not reject the request.	<p>28-07-2020: Proposal accepted by the group.</p> <p>Status: Closed</p>	Nichol Hill, Richard Townley-O'Neill Lakshmi Sing, Michael Bainbridge
O4	What is recommended to use for Observation.category	Observation.category	NCDHC to use 'procedure' or 'exam' as category (as applicable)	<p>28-07-2020: Not to put Must Support for category. If the implementer sends it, the it stays with the Observation.</p> <p>Status: Closed</p>	Nichol Hill, Richard Townley-O'Neill Lakshmi Sing, Michael Bainbridge
O5	<p>There are some Observation profiles under NCDHC which points to http://build.fhir.org/ig/hl7au/au-fhir-childhealth/ValueSet-ncdhc-observation-completion-status-1.html just to record if the Procedure was performed or not.</p> <p>The main objective of these types of Observations are to capture the Observation.interpretation and comments (if any)</p> <p>The ValueSet includes the following values:</p> <p>443938003 - Procedure carried out on subject</p> <p>416237000 - Procedure not done</p> <p>439495000 - Counselling declined</p> <p>Example: http://build.fhir.org/ig/hl7au/au-fhir-childhealth/StructureDefinition-ncdhc-observation-anus.html</p>	Observation.value[x]	<p>Proposal: Remove this valueset and implement the following changes</p> <p>Observation.value[x] make it valueBoolean to allow true/false</p> <p>move "Procedure not done" and "Counselling declined" as part of Observation.dataAbsentReason</p>	<p>Ongoing discussion with Internal Terminology SME.</p> <p>Status: Open</p> <p>Collaborative internally decided to put the 439495000 - Counselling declined as a data absent reason.</p> <p>NCDHC Terminology SME suggested to use Procedure Carried Out/ Not Carried Out codes instead of boolean Observation value.</p> <p>Status: Closed</p>	
O6	Use of au-practitionerrole to record "Examiner" in Observation instead of current implementation where we are using au-practitioner	Observation.performer	Use of au-practitionerrole to record "Examiner" in Observation. This provide the option to record the Examiner and associated Organisation along with practitioner's role.	<p>28-07-2020: Proposal accepted by the group</p> <p>Status: Closed</p>	Nichol Hill, Richard Townley-O'Neill Lakshmi Sing, Michael Bainbridge

Resource: Composition & FHIR® Document

Serial Number	Description	Resource Path	NCDHC Approach	Date and Decision	Members Present
---------------	-------------	---------------	----------------	-------------------	-----------------

CM11	Composition section: Use entry slicing or list of profile?	Composition.section.e ntry	At this moment Collaborative profiles are sliced with entry slicing due to lack of tooling support. Any alternative option implemented and benefit realized would be helpful to change the approach	<p>11-08-2020: CHWG suggested to try alternative option and remove profile=<code>this.resolve()</code>. This method is non good for fhir validation performance reason. Shovan to try options and keep the group posted</p> <p> 08 Sep 2020</p> <p>Shovan presented a option paper showing the performance comparison of using <code>profile=this.resolve()</code> vs <code>pattern=this.resolve().code.coding</code>.</p> <p>it was noticed ~6% performance benefit of using <code>pattern=this.resolve().code.coding</code>. Collaborative R4 profile will follow this pattern.</p> <p>Link: Option Paper: Composition Slicing Style</p> <p>Status: Closed</p>	Reuben Daniels Richard Townley-O'Neill Danielle Tavares-Rixon Brett Esler Blair Thompson , Linda
------	---	-------------------------------	---	---	--