**Draft Meeting Notes from the HAVE Telecon – EDXL-Hospital Availability (HAVE) Standard**

Date: Jan 11, 2011 – 4:00 P.M.

Dial in 1-888-325-3989 PIN: 561413 Tuesdays

**ATTENDEES**:

Lee Tincher

Solomon Freeman

**Meeting Notes:**

1. Lee Tincher took meeting notes.
2. Draft meeting notes from 1-4-2001 reviewed and approved as final.
3. Errors found in schema – Lee will fix and update Kavi.
4. Lee has begun drafting the errata document for review.
5. Meetings will be bi-weekly until further notice.

**Action Items & Next Steps – STATUS UPDATE 1/11/2011**

| # | **Action Item** | **Assigned** | **Status** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Meeting notes | Lee Tincher | **Complete and Posted** |
|  | Vote on 11/2 Draft Meeting notes – accepted as final | Lee Tincher | **Adopted and posted.** |
|  | Identify comments from all known sources and post to Kavi | Lee Tincher with input from all SC Members. | Posted to Kavi – initial list completed. |
|  | Define all known Stakeholders. | All Members | Accomplished |
|  | Artifacts – such as Schemas and XML Examples must match the document. We elected to try a bottom up approach – make the schema first – ensure a technical map to the examples and then finish the document last.Examples will be separate from the main document – although snippets will be allowed.All will be encapsulated as a single deliverable. | All members discussed and agreed upon these items | Approved unanimously. This is the approach that the HAVE SC will take. |
|  | Need to determine if this effort will be a Major release (2.0) or a Minor release (1.1)This will be defined by evaluating the comments and determining if this effort will be backwards compatible with HAVE 1.0 | All members discussed and agreed upon these items | In-process. |
|  | Sukumar informed us that CIQ and GML have been updated – we need to determine if that newer versions will be updated in this effort. | All members discussed and agreed upon these items. | Unanimously determined that the latest versions of CIQ and GML will be referenced in the next HAVE release. |
|  | A “Bare bones” DOM needs to be depicted to display the “Section” approach and the “List Element” approach (depicted below) | All agreed | Lee will do the “List Element” Done and circulated…Rob will do the “Section” parts of the DOM and we will then combine them. |
|  | A pro’s/Cons list will be developed as part of the information for the TC – as well as a brief mapping against the comments to ensure that the concepts will work. | All agreed | To-Do |

*DOM Overview against Comments discussion:*

Lee mentioned that Hospital Availability may be better served by changing the name to Health Facility Availability. Other members thought that this was unnecessary and would confuse the HAVE “brand”. This action was voted down.

Lee Tincher suggested that <Parameter> as defined in the Common Alert Protocol (CAP) specification be evaluated to be placed at key locations in the HAVE specification to address the perceived lack of list expansion. Parameter is defined as:

(1) Any system-specific datum, in the form:

<parameter>

<valueName>*valueName*</valueName>

<value>*value*</value>

</parameter>

where the content of “valueName” is a

user-assigned string designating the

domain of the code, and the content of

“value” is a string (which may represent a

number) denoting the value itself (e.g.,

valueName ="SAME" and value="CIV".)

(2) Values of “valueName” that are

acronyms SHOULD be represented in all

capital letters without periods (e.g., SAME,

FIPS, ZIP).

(3) Multiple instances MAY occur within a….