

# 2020-03-23 DoF PoCD Subgroup

## Agenda

Further discussion of mapping issue concerning measurement status and validity mapping continued from [2020-03-18 Weekly Meeting Agenda and Minutes](#)

## Attendance

Peter Muir - <a href="#">PjmConsultingLlc</a>
Stefan Karl - consultant
Björn Andersen - Univ. Lübeck
Kathrin Riech - Univ. Lübeck
Stefan Schlichting - <a href="#">ornet.org</a>
Brian Reinhold - <a href="#">Inihealth</a>
Javier Espina - <a href="#">philips</a>
Michelle Barry - <a href="#">availity.com</a>
John Rhoads - Philips

## Meeting Notes

On today's call we resumed last week's discussion (see below) on measurement status and validity mapping and agreed on mapping the values in question to both the `Meta.security` and the `Observation.interpretation` fields. Our rationale for not using a `modifierExtension` (which could arguably be seen as the cleanest solution) is that we all agree that we do not want to restrict the interpretation of the device-reported resources to those few systems that are expected to support such an extension.

To accommodate the expressiveness of both the 10201 and 10207, we therefore agreed on mapping to both of the fields mentioned above, i.e. the IG will require implementers to populate `Meta.security` AND `Observation.interpretation` consistently (!) when mapping from either 10201 measurement status or 10207 measurement validity. The only apparent drawback to this solution seems to be the redundancy, but we think that this is outweighed by the advantages described earlier.

We are going to move forward with this, but still welcome additional thoughts on the matter.

-Björn