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Statistics

• General
  – 42 child code systems (each with its own child page)
  – 30 (~71%) code systems have an object identifier.
  – 30 (~71%) code systems have a URI.
  – “Current as at” date:
    • 5 code systems do not have a current as at date.
    • 11 code systems in 2019
    • 26 code systems in 2020
  – Observations on individual code system pages
    • Notes advising that the content is draft, subject to approval, or awaiting a response from IP owner.
    • Comments suggesting errors which seemingly have not been followed up.
    • Unclear whether some canonical URLs are actually canonical URLs or rather links for information about the code system.
    • Some individual code systems represent a family of code systems as one (e.g. ICD).
Statistics

- **Number of code systems with “no content” for key fields**
  - Terminology owner / maintenance organisation: 3
  - Formal name of code system: 1
  - Short name or abbreviation: 2
  - Technical Identifiers:
    - Canonical URL: 12
    - OID: 12
  - Scope/domain: 3
  - Link to information: 5
  - Arrangement or agreements with HL7 for use of content: 22
  - Version management, timing and version identification: 25
  - IP information and licensing information: 10
  - HL7 users (if known): 22
  - Process to request content change: 17
  - Other useful information: 32
  - Information current as at (date): 5
Statistics

• OID comparison
  – OID registry:
    • 27/30 code systems have a matching OID.
    • 1/30 code system does not have a matching OID.
    • 2/30 code systems do not have records in the OID registry
  – UTG / HL7 Terminology:
    • 18/30 code systems have a matching OID
    • 1/30 code system does not have a matching OID.
    • 11/30 code systems do not have records in UTG.
  – FHIR external terminologies table:
    • 8/30 code systems have a matching OID.
    • 22/30 code systems do not have entries in the FHIR external terminologies table.
Statistics

- Canonical URL comparison.
  - UTG / HL7 Terminology:
    - 3/30 code systems have a matching URL
    - 18/30 code system does not have a matching URL.
    - 9/30 code systems do not have records in UTG.
  - FHIR external terminologies table:
    - 4/30 code systems have a matching URL.
    - 7/30 code systems do not have a matching URL.
    - 19/30 code systems do not have records in the FHIR external terminologies table.
Overall

- Code system information pages have varying levels of content completeness (key fields).

- Code system information pages are not always complete and fit for purpose as “authoritative”.

- It is unclear from the pages which code systems have “authoritative” information and which are still in development.

- Code system information is not always regularly updated.

- The information provided is only provided for human consumption and is not available in a machine processible format to facilitate automated use of the information e.g. to validate copyright statements where these code systems are used.
Recommendations

• A set of mandatory minimum data elements should be determined for code systems in this collection.

• A mandatory status for each code system should be added to clearly state whether the information may be considered authoritative for use by HL7 stakeholders. Alternatively, code system pages which are not to be considered authoritative should be moved elsewhere and clearly flagged as non-authoritative.

• A mandatory next review date element should be added and populated for all code systems.

• Where canonical URLs are declared (along with other required information for a code system to be deemed authoritative), mismatching with other sources (e.g. HL7 Terminology) should be actively addressed

• Adopting the FHIR CodeSystem resource (potentially with required extensions) to represent the information in these pages in a structured format should be investigated as a means to provide the information in a machine processable format.