

Quality Data Model (QDM) User Group Meeting | AGENDA/MEETING MINUTES

Meeting date | 10/1/2015 2:00 PM EDT | Meeting location | Webinar link: <https://attendee.gotowebinar.com/register/867214877050672641>

Attendees: Lisa Anderson, Balu Balasubramanyam, Cynthia Barton, Howard Bregman, Cathy Campbell, Jennifer Crandall, Cindy Cullen, Jean Fajen, Jay Frails, Kim Garman, Sharon Giarrizzo-Wilson, Deb Hall, Ben Hamlin, Kendra Hanley, Michelle Hinterberg, Jamie Jouza, Joseph Kunisch, Cindy Lamb, Rute Martins, Chris Moesel, Lisa Nelson, Karen Nelson, Michael O'Keefe, Nadia Ramey, Stan Rankins, Stephanie Rodriguez, Juliet Rubini, Jessica Smail, Anne Smith, Jenna Williams-Bader, Lindsey Wisham

Time	Item	Discussion/Options/Decisions
2:00 PM	QDM-124 : QDM Elements w/ Single LOINC Codes	<p>MITRE introduced the topic by reminding participants that this discussion was started during the September QDM User Group Meeting. Since that time, it has also been discussed in other groups. As most measure developers know, QDM is designed such that QDM data types are always paired with value sets (e.g., “Medication, Administered: Warfarin”). In some cases, however, only a single code is applicable or desirable. Some common use cases for a single code might be to identify a specific survey question / answer, or to identify a specific lab test or result (in a specific unit of measurement). In the current QDM, the only way to accomplish this is to create a value set with a single member (the code of interest)—which effectively creates a value set OID that is an <i>alias</i> for the code. Creating external aliases for codes is prohibited by LOINC and likely by other code systems as well. As a result, QDM elements cannot currently reference a single code without violating the LOINC (or some other) terms of use. This affects current and future measures.</p> <p>MITRE then went on to enumerate four options for dealing with this issue:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Update QDM to support data elements with codes2. Request permission from Regenstrief to continue until CQL is adopted3. Find a work-around that is agreeable to all parties4. Withdraw all measures that use a single-member value set <p>Given infinite time and resources, the solution described in option #1 would be ideal. That said, it presents problems for the current eCQM landscape. Option #1 would have a measurable impact on specifications (QDM, QDM-based HQMF IG, QRDA Cat I), tools (Measure Authoring Tool, Bonnie, Cypress), and services (NLM APIs for code lookup and validation). As a result, the timeline for CQL adoption would be significantly affected (likely pushing it back a year). It's also worth noting that option #1 would only be temporary since CQL largely obsoletes it.</p>

Time	Item	Discussion/Options/Decisions
<p>2:00 PM</p> <p>(con't)</p>	<p>QDM-124: QDM Elements w/ Single LOINC Codes</p> <p>(con't)</p>	<p>MITRE introduced the topic by reminding participants that this discussion was started during the September QDM User Group Meeting. Since that time, it has also been discussed in other groups. As most measure developers know, QDM is designed such that QDM data types are always paired with value sets (e.g., “Medication, Administered: Warfarin”). In some cases, however, only a single code is applicable or desirable. Some common use cases for a single code might be to identify a specific survey question / answer, or to identify a specific lab test or result (in a specific unit of measurement). In the current QDM, the only way to accomplish this is to create a value set with a single member (the code of interest)—which effectively creates a value set OID that is an <i>alias</i> for the code. Creating external aliases for codes is prohibited by LOINC and likely by other code systems as well. As a result, QDM elements cannot currently reference a single code without violating the LOINC (or some other) terms of use. This affects current and future measures.</p> <p>MITRE then went on to enumerate four options for dealing with this issue:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Update QDM to support data elements with codes 2. Request permission from Regenstrief to continue until CQL is adopted 3. Find a work-around that is agreeable to all parties 4. Withdraw all measures that use a single-member value set <p>Given infinite time and resources, the solution described in option #1 would be ideal. That said, it presents problems for the current eCQM landscape. Option #1 would have a measurable impact on specifications (QDM, QDM-based HQMF IG, QRDA Cat I), tools (Measure Authoring Tool, Bonnie, Cypress), and services (NLM APIs for code lookup and validation). As a result, the timeline for CQL adoption would be significantly affected (likely pushing it back a year). It’s also worth noting that option #1 would only be temporary since CQL largely obsoletes it.</p> <p>Option #2 requires the blessing of Regenstrief, so it is not a guaranteed option. That said, it presents the least interruption to the eCQM landscape. This would allow us to continue as-is until CQL is adopted (hopefully 2017 AU), at which point measure logic could refer to single codes (without using value sets). This would still affect the QDM-based HQMF IG and QRDA Cat I, in that they would need to relax SHALL requirements on value set attributes.</p> <p>Option #3 would seek to find a work-around agreeable to everyone. MITRE indicated they were open to ideas about what such a workaround might look like.</p>

Time	Item	Discussion/Options/Decisions
<p>2:00 PM</p> <p>(con't)</p>	<p>QDM-124: QDM Elements w/ Single LOINC Codes</p> <p>(con't)</p>	<p>Option #4 is not likely a viable option as withdrawing affected measures would have a very significant impact on the MU program – and would also not be popular with vendors and institutions who have invested in measures that were withdrawn.</p> <p>After describing the problems and potential options, MITRE opened up the meeting for conversation. One participant suggested that option #2 (waiting for CQL) seemed the only sane option. That said, the participant urged the group to ensure that the implementation was a “one size fits all” solution – and not just designed to address LOINC. The participant also noted that the solution should support the ability for vendors to quickly and easily identify the vocabularies and codes needed by the measure (similar to what exists today for value sets). MITRE indicated that the CQL / ELM is structured in such a way that the necessary codes and code systems can be easily extracted in a programmatic fashion. Last, the participant asked if measure developers would have to lock in a particular code system version or not. MITRE indicated that it believed that CQL allowed a code system to be defined without locking down a version, but would check to confirm. After checking, MITRE can now confirm that CQL allows code systems to be identified and used <i>without</i> specifying a specific version.</p> <p>There was then some discussion regarding whether or not there have been any conversations with Regenstrief to indicate their willingness to allow single-member value sets until CQL is adopted. There appeared to be mixed reports regarding what discussions were had, with whom, and what the outcomes were. MITRE indicated with would follow up with the involved parties to try to gain some clarity.</p> <p>Another participant then asked whether this affects single-member value sets that exist only to be used in a grouping value set. For example, if there is a concept that has one applicable code in LOINC, one applicable code in SNOMED-CT, and one applicable code in ICD10, then authors would usually create extensional value sets for each vocabulary and then group them in a grouping value set. Each of these extensional value sets would have a single member, but the value set used in the measure would consist of three codes. If this was not allowed, then a grouping value set would not be possible and the measure logic would have to accommodate all three possible codes explicitly (using “or” logic). The user group felt that this would likely still be a violation of the terms (since those extensional value sets would have OIDs), but also agreed that this would result in additional complexity for measures. This is a problem that needs to be considered.</p>

Time	Item	Discussion/Options/Decisions
2:00 PM (con't)	QDM-124 : QDM Elements w/ Single LOINC Codes (con't)	<p>When MITRE asked if any participants had other ideas for solutions to the single-member value set problem, one participant suggested that some measures might be able to be re-specified to avoid the value sets that cause these problems. Other participants agreed that this might be a possibility, but felt that most affected measures probably couldn't be re-specified in that way. Another participant indicated that her investigation has shown that <i>many</i> measures are affected and would have to be re-specified.</p> <p>Lastly, one more participant suggested another possible option: Would LOINC be willing to modify their terms to be more specific about what particular <i>intents</i> were not allowed. Perhaps a redefinition of the terms could address LOINC's concerns while still allowing some uses in eCQMs (assuming the eCQMs are within the <i>allowed</i> intent). This may be a good option to include in the discussion with Regenstrief.</p> <p>The outcomes of this discussion will be relayed to interested parties and the discussion will continue as necessary.</p>

Action item	Assignee
None	NA