Provenance / Mapping Questions

- Many of the issues encountered relate to authorship
  - **Provenance Domain** - mapping workspace
  - Propose that this group consider a methodology similar to Examples Task Force
    - As mappings are ready to be "blessed", bring those specific mappings to SDWG for review and approval
    - We need to determine what the public location would be where those "blessed" mappings would be published
    - **John D'Amore** recommends that for each mapping to be reviewed, it helps to also provide an applicable set of samples showing representation in CDA and representation in FHIR
    - **This project may want to also have SDWG scrutinize the completeness of the mappings (e.g., does it include all of the CDA source elements/concepts that should be mapped to FHIR)**
  - What about best practices for use of Provenance in FHIR?
    - The Security WG is the caretaker of the Provenance resource, so that workgroup should dictate best practices
    - This mapping exercise might inform best practices, based on what can be conveyed/mapped

Expansion of CDA schema extensions

- Should we be planning to expand the CDA schemas that are available, to include non-sdtc schema extensions
  - I'm not sure we understand the demand for consolidated CDA schemas that incorporate
  - SDWG manages the sdtc namespace - other entities have created their own namespaces and manage extensions in those areas
  - When there's demand to incorporate other namespace content into the "official" CDA schemas, we'll
  - Separately - does it make sense to have a namespace (not sdtc) where we could create extensions (particularly those needed for alignment with FHIR) that are not RIM-based
    - This process is driven by the need to model concepts in parallel both in FHIR and CDA
    - When we decouple from the RIM our problems are:
      - Should we allow it or not
      - Where should it fit within the schema
      - We had the RIM semantics that helped define the meaning of any extensions defined
  - If we're developing FHIR-focused extensions:
    - Can we define a method to simply allow the representation of FHIR extensions (rather than defining our own extensions).
      - FHIR extensions already have a url where the meaning is defined
      - The risk is lack of control over where it might be appropriate to use such extensions within a CDA data model
    - **Brett Marquard** whenever there's a concept in FHIR that we haven't been able to represent in CDA, we've generally defaulted to creating a template on Observation, rather than an extension.
      - Another area where alignment between CDA and FHIR is nullFlavors vs. dataAbsentReason
    - **Decision on current position:**
      - SDWG would be receptive to creating a new namespace to house extensions necessary for alignment to FHIR, but we do not have a use case for it yet.
        - We might want to consider limiting the scope of extensions allowed in the namespace to those driven by a regulatory requirement?
    - We would only create this extensions in this new namespace if:
      - The requestor could show that the extension needed could not be represented with existing RIM semantics (e.g., template on Observation)
      - The burden on implementers of creating this extension is deemed acceptable