## CQ Items for ARB Review

**Thursday, February 5, 2004. ARB meeting**

**Number of items:** 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Ballot</th>
<th>Disposition</th>
<th>Change</th>
<th>Significant Change</th>
<th>Change Applied</th>
<th>Question to ARB:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Namespace Extension</td>
<td>XML-I</td>
<td>Vote</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Can this additional content be removed without going back to the membership?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Background:

There was an additional mechanism added in the last round for including rim-based informal extensions in the same namespace as the HL7 content in a message, but flagged by an attribute as non-conformant. This mechanism was regarded by the committee upon reflection as needlessly complex, and that the same end could be achieved by using a foreign namespace, as had been agreed in earlier ballot rounds.

### ARB Assessment:


### CQ Disposition Comment

CM -- 130104 You will know whether it is an extension to the static model defined for the interaction that you are claiming that this is an instance of -- it is the same as calling a Z segment a Z segment -- if you do not have this attribute then you have the same problem that exists with XPath -- any typo errors in element names will result in legitimate instances (the faulty elements will look like legitimate extensions. This would increase the implementation challenges for most.

In V2 there was the "extend at the end" rule -- and that could be used instead.

However the other attraction was that with the attribute it is far easier for receivers to strip out extensions (in the same way that foreign namespaces can be simply stripped (though the simple transform has a problem with ED datatypes -- hence the rule discussed above to exclude ED from the foreign namespaces approach).

CM/GG/GS 150104 to be discussed in the sig -- GS suggested that the attribute flagging the extension was not needed, and that any valid RIM content not in the specification should be taken as an extension and (?by local agreement) ignored by receiving applications -- CM said that this drastically reduced the ability for tight conformance testing where such extensions were used. There was agreement that the extension rules when using HL7 structures should be specified more clearly in an ITS independant document.

CM 170104 does this apply to classes -- or to attributes as well? -- also what happens when a cardinality is extended so that the receiving system only expects one value -- is this a valid extension with the receiver taking the first attribute in document order -- or should the message be rejected?? -- open extension is too loose -- propose that this be transferred to Conformance for resolution, and that it be removed from the ITS.

XML SIG -- 2.8.1 -- 1 -- when you see something outside of the hl7 namespace in an ED --

### Communications


### Existing Wording

Extensions in the HL7 namespace

-- Where there is a requirement to extend a message definition with attributes or associations that could be derived from a valid HL7 refinement of the RIM but which have been excluded in the message definition the content
should be included in the HL7 namespace, but with an "HL7extension" attribute used to indicate that it is an extension. The XML attribute "HL7extension" with non-empty content must be included in any element representing an HL7 class, association, or attribute that is not included in the abstract definition of the interaction

Balloter Comments

This is useless. If you are the sender using v3.1 you may not even know that you are sending an attribute that a receiver using v3.0 regards as an "hl7 extension." What is the purpose? It's just a hassle for both of them. Just have all the same rules to allow such HL7 extensions to happen and say that the receiver can ignore and must not reject, but don't require this attribute that doesn't do anything.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Ballot</th>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Artifact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>default representation</td>
<td>XML-I</td>
<td>2.7.1</td>
<td>XML Implementation Technology Specification - Struct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disposition</td>
<td>Vote</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change</td>
<td>603</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significant Change</td>
<td>Non-controversial</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question to ARB:**

Is it acceptable to change this to meet the expectations of balloters as set in earlier ballots

**Background:**

Default RIM attributes that are represented as elements can be omitted from the instance, rather than the requirement that the element (but not the value) be always included in the instance. This counter-intuitive clarification was added to the ballot document in the last round (to help schema users), and it was accepted by the committee that the clarification should have said that the XML element may be omitted. This would be consistent with the expectations of balloters commenting in earlier rounds, and so is seen to be a removal of new content rather than the adding of substantial content.

**CQ Disposition Comment**

CM -- 130104 I agree that this will reduce the ability to support backwards compatibility -- personally I do not like it because it is ugly, and I think that schema will be fixed by the time this is needed -- and the defaults can be added in using a transform if needed for processing -- or more likely the receiver will get them from somewhere else anyway. --

CM/GG/GS 150104 gunther and paul to discuss

XML propose to accept the negative ballot proposed wording change

**Communications**

**Existing Wording**

In the case of HL7 attributes that are represented as elements, when a default or fixed value is specified the XML element corresponding to the attribute must be sent, but it may be empty.

**Proposed Wording**

In the case of HL7 attributes that are represented as elements, when a default or fixed value is specified the XML element corresponding to the attribute need not be sent, but if sent may even be empty.

**Balloter Comments**

This is a big issue. I know you are working around the XML schema here, but it has a big impact on extensibility and future versions. If we add an attribute that wasn't there before, we might give it a default (whatever was assumed for it when the attribute was not even included in the HMD) and everyone is happy. With this rule however, the default would not work. This is a very big deal.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Ballot XML-I</th>
<th>Section 2.7.6</th>
<th>Artifac</th>
<th>Submitter Track</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disposition</td>
<td>Vote</td>
<td>Withdrawn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significant Change</td>
<td>Negative magnet if change not applied</td>
<td>Change Applied:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question to ARB:**

Background:

Four negative ballot items -- three individuals

**ARB Assessment:**

**CQ Disposition Comment**

CM -- 130104 I disagree that there is a problem with multiple relationships between different CM/GG/GS 150104 part of the stub/stubID debate that will be held in 3rd/4th quarter Monday XML -- propose that nesting be reinstated

**Communications**

**Existing Wording**

**Proposed Wording**

**Balloter Comments**

I do not agree with this unnesting technique between ControlAct and RMIM entry-point class. Why are you doing this? The ControlAct is part of the domain model and you get into trouble with this fixed ControlAct if you have multiple relationships into the domain model.
Existing Wording

Where the class is a stub standing in for another component of an interaction, it is represented as an element in the XML instance with one required attribute called “stubId”. This is of type “uid” and must have a value that corresponds to the value of exactly one “stubRef” attribute in the root class of one of the interaction components.

Proposed Wording

Balloter Comments

Is it acceptable to revert to the previous approach without going back to the membership?

Background:

Reverting to the nesting of components of the interaction, rather than having them as siblings in the interaction element (linked together with stub/stubid. This change was made in the last ballot round as a result of a miss-understanding of the implementation impact of the nested representation, and all those who promoted the change (including myself) have expressed support for this revision.

ARB Assessment: [ ]

CQ Disposition Comment

CM -- 130104 If you mean the RIM attribute id then this would mean a change to the models to include an ITS specific pointer mechanism -- if you mean the id attribute that was added to everything in earlier versions of the its then I agree that the (other) use cases for this should be dealt with using the hl7 ID attributes -- CM/GG/GS 150104 review with the sig xml sig 190104 How did we get to where we are now? - Problem for implementers with schemas as they were then is that there were multiple schemas for same message - Now the root element is specific to the interaction - The root element name should be the interaction ID

Schema Caching
- MSXML, MS.Net and Xerces all use schema caching
- A fragmented schema cache it is considerably smaller than a nested schema cache

Balloting normative pieces, the instances, look better nested, not flattened. There needs to be a section in the implementation guide on how to port route etc.

Resolution is that the Stub / Stub ID is removed and nesting re-instated.

200104 CQ WGM xml position was presented, and the change was accepted

Communications

Thursday, February 05, 2004
This is rather unusual: are you *really* saying that the @stubId contains the foreign key and @stubRef the key? Isn't it the other way round?

But more importantly, I thought this was disputed by Paul. I agreed with him that object stubs should be object stubs using the id that they have anyway instead of special attributes.