

Code Management Project Minutes

5-OCT-2017
CET 14.00-17.30

Attendees: Ken Holman (KH), Gerhard Heemskerk (GH), Anders Grangard (AG), Mary Kay Blantz (MK), Edmund Gray (EG), Hisanao Sugamata (HS), Gait Boxman (GB), Sue Probert (SP), Jostein Frømyr (JF), Rolf Wessel (RW), Michel Bormans (MB), Michael Dill (MD), Enjo Hidekazu (EH)

Regrets: Akio Suzuki (AS), Niki Dieckmann (ND), , Frans van Diepen (FD), , Lance Thompson (LT), Jorg Walther (JG)

Presentation Final Drafts

Remarks:

1. The project scope & exit criteria specify the term “technical specification” although the final drafts, a ‘technical specification’ (NDR) and a ‘guide’ (possible solutions) fit in the project scope “*procedures, rules and methodologies.....guidance to end users should be added when appropriate*“. Should the project proposal be changed?
2. The change of NDR 205 rule is contradicting, it should be changed into:
“*[R205] If a coupled design approach is used, then the qdt:QualifiedDataType schema module MUST import all code list and identifier scheme schemas used in the module.*”
3. Can the change of the NDR Rule be considered as a maintenance activity instead of an activity of developing the NDR which needs a project? Is it a new functionality?
4. The solutions for the second phase validation process should be positioned as annexes (as examples to solve the identified issues).
5. What are the business benefits for having code lists in a genericode representation format?

Decisions:

- (1) [AG] will ask the Bureau if a change in the project proposal is needed.
- (2) [GH] will change the draft accordingly
- (3) [AG] will ask the Bureau if the NDR Rule change needs another project or could be regarded as a maintenance activity.
- (4) [GH] will create annexes containing the two-phase validation process solutions.
- (5) [GH] will add more (business) benefits for genericode
- () [RW] will organize a call within 2/3 weeks to have a final look at the updated drafts

AOB

-

Next Meeting
MONDAY 23 OCT 14.00 – 15.30 CET