

# 2023-12: Review of Pre-ballot Profile and Template designs going to January 2024 ballot

## Date

28 Nov 2023  
(November and December preballot review)

## Attendees

Attendee	Name	Affiliation
	<a href="#">Alex Kontur</a>	ONC Public Health Analyst (COR)
	<a href="#">Brett Marquard</a>	HL7 US Realm Senior Advisor
	<a href="#">Matthew Rahn</a>	Director, Standards Division
	<a href="#">Gay Dolin</a>	HL7 US Realm PM
	<a href="#">Carmela Minicucci Couderc</a>	ONC - Branch Chief, Terminology and Content Delivery
	<a href="#">Albert W. Taylor</a>	ONC - Medical Informatics Officer

## Goals

- Confirmation of ONC understanding of USCDI Design in US Core and C-CDA that is going to ballot
- Link to public [HL7 Core Tracker](#) (USCDI v4 only)
  - [US Core Build Site](#)
- Link to public [HL7 C-CDA Tracker](#) (USCDI v1-V4)
  - [C-CDA Build Site](#)

## USCDI v4 QA Table

		QA - ONC Assessment of Ballot Design in US Core		QA - ONC Assessment of Ballot Design in C-CDA	
Cat ego ry	Fields	USCDI Terminology Present?  (Do Terminology bindings agree with what is declared in USCDI)	Design covers USCDI Definition?	USCDI Terminology Present?  (Do Terminology bindings agree with what is declared in USCDI)	Design covers USCDI Definition?
Alle rgie s and Intol era nces					
	Subst ance (Non- Medi catio n)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Enc ount er Info rma tion					
	Enco unter Identi fier	yes	yes	No terminology required in USCDI	Yes
Faci lity Info rma tion					
	Facilit y Identi fier	yes	yes	No terminology required in USCDI	Yes

	Facilit y Type	yes	yes	No terminology required in USCDI	Yes
	Facilit y Name	yes	yes	No terminology required in USCDI	Yes
Goals and Pref erences					
	Treat ment Interv entio n Prefe rence	<p>IG notes that the 'treatment-intervention-preference' will be added to LOINC. I assume this means the 'system' value under .code is a placeholder and will be fixed to LOINC when the code is available?</p> <p>GD Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>"75773-2" Goals, preferences, and priorities for medical treatment Should be used at Category.code in US Core (used in C-CDA and the AD Guides)</li> <li>Observation value MS text and codable concept</li> <li>Confirmed on and found in meeting notes that 2023-08-15+Meeting+notes that the recommendation of LOINC is associated with the category or question. Other codes systems are allowed (for example) SNOMED as the answers</li> <li>Treatment Intervention Preferences (if found in the EHR) are often text (and not often encoded in EHRs) and in US Core should (start) to be queried for by looking for "75773-2" Goals, preferences, and priorities for medical treatment category code</li> <li>The actual Preference would be found most likely in text at observation.value</li> </ul> <p>The IG also notes that implementers can include additional codes where appropriate (in .code or .category), however it is unclear where these codes would go. The system and code elements of the coding are fixed, is the intent that any additional codes would go in the text element of the codeableConcept?</p>		<p>Goal obs SHOULD use LOINC</p> <p>GD Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Generic (aka) Patient Goals (including SDOH goals): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>USCDI Requires SNOMED OR LOINC</li> <li>US Core and C-CDA reuse Gravity which uses SNOMED for Goals</li> <li>Goals are often text (and not often encoded in EHRs) and should be queried for by looking for MoodCode GOL or "8689-2" History of Social function" @observation.code (which is LOINC)</li> </ul> </li> <li>Treatment Intervention Preference <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>LOINC is used at Observation.code "75773-2" Goals, preferences, and priorities for medical treatment</li> <li>Confirmed on and found in meeting notes that 2023-08-15+Meeting+notes that the recommendation of LOINC is associated with the category or question. Other codes systems are allowed (for example) SNOMED as the answers</li> <li>Treatment Intervention Preferences (if found in the EHR) are often text (and not often encoded in EHRs) and in C-CDA should (start) to be queried for by looking for "75773-2" Goals, preferences, and priorities for medical treatment</li> <li>The actual Preference would be found most likely in text at observation.value</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	unclear
	Care Exper ience Prefe rence	Similar issue as above: The IG notes that implementers can include additional codes where appropriate (in .code or .category), however it is unclear where these codes would go. The system and code elements of the coding are fixed, is the intent that any additional codes would go in the text element of the codeableConcept?		<p>Goal obs SHOULD use LOINC</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Generic (aka) Patient Goals (including SDOH goals): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>USCDI Requires SNOMED OR LOINC</li> <li>US Core and C-CDA reuse Gravity which uses SNOMED for Goals</li> <li>Goals are often text (and not often encoded in EHRs) and should be queried for by looking for MoodCode GOL or "8689-2" History of Social function" @observation.code (which is LOINC)</li> </ul> </li> <li>Care Experience Preference <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>LOINC is used at Observation.code "95541-9" Care Experience Preference <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Note when ADVault changes the name and scope of Care Experience Preferences at End of Life LOINC value set - we can use</li> </ul> </li> <li>Confirmed on and found in meeting notes that 2023-08-15+Meeting+notes that the recommendation of LOINC is associated with the category or question. Other codes systems are allowed (for example) SNOMED as the answers</li> <li>Care Experience Preferences (if found in the EHR) are often text (and not often encoded in EHRs) and in C-CDA should (start) to be queried for by looking for "95541-9" Care Experience Preference</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	unclear
Health Status Assess ments					
	Alcohol Use			yes	yes

	Substance Use			yes	yes
	Physical Activity			yes	yes
Laboratory					
	Result Unit of Measure	The IG provides guidance about "Using UCUM codes in the <a href="#">Quantity datatype</a> ". The guidance begins by saying some quantity types are bound to UCUM, however the quantity type in this profile is not bound to UCUM. Should it be bound to UCUM? Does the guidance still apply in cases where a quantity type is not bound to UCUM?		yes	yes
	Result Reference Range	Profile doesn't appear to have any guidance indicating that implementers should use UCUM for this element.		Template doesn't appear to have any guidance indicating that implementers should use UCUM for this element.	yes
	Result Interpretation	yes	yes	yes	yes
	Specimen Source Site	yes	yes	yes	Members of Specimen type 2.16.840.1.113762.1.4.1099.54 concatenate Specimen Type and Specimen Source Site
	Specimen Identifier	yes	yes	No terminology required in USCDI	
	Specimen Condition Acceptability	yes	yes	yes	yes
Medications					
	Medication Instructions	yes	yes	No terminology required in USCDI	yes
	Medication Adherence			no?	no?
Procedures					
	Performance Time	yes	USCDI definition references medication administration... should the USCDI table point to an appropriate profile?	No terminology required in USCDI	yes
Vital Signs				yes	yes
	Average Blood Pressure				

## Action items

