

Type:	Change Request	Priority:	Highest
Reporter:	Steven Nichols	Assignee:	Steven Nichols
Resolution:	Unresolved		

Issue Links:	Relates relates to FHIR-39244 SFCU value set includes "Specified". ... Triaged
	Vote is voted on by BALLOT-41617 Affirmative - Steven Nichols : 2022-S... Balloted
	is voted on by BALLOT-43874 Affirmative - Mahesh Shinde : 2022-Se... Balloted
	is voted on by BALLOT-43958 Affirmative - Tamas Varjas : 2022-Sep... Balloted
	is voted on by BALLOT-43960 Affirmative - Bill Felski : 2022-Sep... Balloted
	is voted on by BALLOT-43962 Affirmative - Charlie Andrew : 2022-S... Balloted
Specification:	FHIR Core (FHIR)
Raised in Version:	R5
Work Group:	Vocabulary
Related URL:	http://build.fhir.org/codesystem-sex-for-clinical-use.html
Related Page(s):	Terminologies - Systems
Grouping:	GH-Core, GHP, SFCU

Description

Since "specified" may also be undefined, it seems similar to "unknown". The definition for "specified" in Table 0828 of the v2.9..1 specification is clearer.

Comments

Comment by [Cooper Thompson](#) [2022-11-15]

Here is the definition from the HL7v2 spec as a reference:

specified / Specified sex for clinical use / Available data indicates that diagnostics, analytics, and treatment best practices may be undefined or not aligned with sex-derived reference populations. Additional information (usually, but not always, in the form of comments and/or observations) is available, but does not align with male sex for clinical use or female sex for clinical use.

Comment by [Cooper Thompson](#) [2022-11-15]

[Steven Nichols](#) - the definition of "specified" looks identical between HL7v2 and FHIR. Can you clarify what definition you prefer, and where it is located?

[OTHER-2452] **Sex diagnosed at birth or infancy** Created: 2022-10-11 Updated: 2022-10-20

Status:	Triaged
Project:	Other Specification Feedback

Type:	Change Request	Priority:	Highest
Reporter:	Steven Nichols	Assignee:	Unassigned
Resolution:	Unresolved		

Issue Links:	Vote is voted on by BALLOT-41620 Negative - Steven Nichols : 2022-Sep... Balloted
	is voted on by BALLOT-42583 Negative - Mahesh Shinde : 2022-Sep-H... Balloted
	is voted on by BALLOT-42587 Negative - Charlie Andrew : 2022-Sep... Balloted
	is voted on by BALLOT-42591 Negative - Bill Felski : 2022-Sep-HL7... Balloted
	is voted on by BALLOT-42658 Negative - Abderrazek Boufahja : 2022... Balloted

	is voted on by	BALLOT-42662	Negative - Tamas Varjas : 2022-Sep-HL...	Balloted
Specification:	Cross-Paradigm Gender Harmony (OTHER)			
Raised in Version:	1.0.0-ballot			
Work Group:	Vocabulary			
Outstanding Negatives:	STU			
Related URL:	https://build.fhir.org/ig/HL7/fhir-gender-harmony/branches/main/model.html#sex-for-clinical-use-sfcu			
Related Page(s):	Model			
Grouping:	SFCU			

Description

Please add profiling to encode sex at birth (e.g., as sex diagnosed at birth or infancy, sex identified in infancy, or as an observed SFCU in infancy). Sex at birth is a proxy reference for other variables, and necessary for proper treatment throughout a patient's lifetime (esp. in the domains of neurology and cardiology).

For example:

<https://www.valleyhealthlink.com/patients-visitors/for-patients/mychart/importance-of-documenting-sex-at-birth-in-medica/>

<https://www.patientcare.va.gov/LGBT/docs/FAQ-BirthSex-SelfIdentifiedGenderIdentityFactSheet.pdf>

Sex at birth should also be supported for backwards compatibility. Machine processing algorithms, like EKG signal processing, that have evolved over the past 40 years, rely on a binary deterministic representation of sex. Since a consensus method to determine SFCU has not yet been established, it is not yet clear if SFCU can be applied in a consistent manner to meet the essential performance needs of such algorithms. In the meantime, many established algorithms rely on sex at birth.

Comments

Comment by [Cooper Thompson](#) [2022-10-17]

Would a SFCU value with an effective period starting on (or near) the patient's date of birth not be sufficient to represent the "sex at birth"?

Also, your second paragraph mentions both "sex at birth" and "binary deterministic representation". Sex at birth isn't binary, so are those two separate comments? One about sex at birth, and another about the established bad assumptions about binary sex?

Comment by [Steven Nichols](#) [2022-10-18]

A SFCU as you proposed is feasible, but could result in complex mapping for some integrators. An example of such a SFCU in the IG would be very helpful.

The second paragraph is a single comment. Put another way, while the industry migrates towards a contextual SFCU, there still needs to be support for legacy systems that follow prior conventions based on administrative sex, in order to maintain continuity of care.

Comment by [Cooper Thompson](#) [2022-10-19]

Regarding the second paragraph, that makes sense with respect to administrative sex. You'd mentioned sex at birth though. So you meant administrative sex rather than sex at birth in that comment?

Start of SFCU issues from Canada reported by RP

[OTHER-2617] SFCU *can* reference Observations Created: 2022-10-15 Updated: 2022-10-31

Status:	Triaged		
Project:	Other Specification Feedback	miscellaneous-technical?	
Type:	Change Request	Priority:	Highest
Reporter:	Ron G. Parker	Assignee:	Unassigned
Resolution:	Unresolved		
Issue Links:	Vote		
	is voted on by	BALLOT-44037	Affirmative - Ron G. Parker : 2022-Se... Balloted
Specification:	Cross-Paradigm Gender Harmony (OTHER)		

Raised in Version:	1.0.0-ballot
Work Group:	Vocabulary
Related URL:	http://hl7.org/xprod/ig/uv/gender-harmony/2022Sep/fhiringenderharmony.html#explicit-decisions
Related Page(s):	FHIR Gender Harmony
Related Section(s):	11.3.1
Grouping:	GH-Core, GH-IG-Text, GHP, SFCU
Change Category:	Correction

Description

The SFCU extension includes a supportingInfo CodeableReference which provides the ability to reference an Observation if needed. This discussion should be updated to reflect that.

Existing Wording:

We opted to include the Sex for Clinical Use value in-line rather than as a reference to Observation after discussion on tradeoffs between two options. We felt that the in-line option was simpler while being sufficiently expressive. An extension with a reference to Observation allows for the expression of complex metadata associated with the value, however we expect the need for that complex metadata would be sufficiently rare to not outweigh the benefits of the simpler in-line extension option.

Note to balloters: Input on the approach of an extension with an in-line value vs. an extension with a reference to an Observation is appreciated.

(Comment 59 - imported by: Lloyd McKenzie)

Comments

Comment by [Jira Admin](#) [2022-10-15]

Imported from spreadsheet by lloyd - comment #59

Comment by [Cooper Thompson](#) [2022-10-17]

Our question was really about whether the primary value of the SFCU extension should be a reference to Observation. Supporting Info is not a reference to the SFCU itself, but rather to the other clinical evidence that informed the determination of the SFCU value.

For example, if we did an "observation" SFCU, then:

SFCU.value 0..1 reference(Observation) <-- This observation would have a value of "male".

SFCU.supportingInfo 0..* CodeableReference(Any) <-- Any observations in here would be for stuff like organ inventory that would support the conclusion that the .value Observation said "male".

[FHIR-39231] It isn't clear why a new unknown element is included in the Sex for Clinical Use code system rather than using unknown from the null flavours. Created: 2022-10-14 Updated: 2022-10-31

Status:	Triaged	value options
Project:	FHIR Specification Feedback	

Type:	Change Request	Priority:	Highest
Reporter:	Ron G. Parker	Assignee:	Unassigned
Resolution:	Unresolved		

Issue Links:	Vote		
	is voted on by	BALLOT-42091	Affirmative - Ron G. Parker : 2022-Se... Balloted
	is voted on by	BALLOT-43475	Affirmative - Ken Sinn : 2022-Sep-FHI... Balloted
	is voted on by	BALLOT-43527	Affirmative - Joan Harper : 2022-Sep-... Balloted

Specification:	FHIR Core (FHIR)
Raised in Version:	R5
Work Group:	Vocabulary
Related URL:	https://www.hl7.org/fhir/2022Sep/valueset-sex-for-clinical-use.html
Related Page(s):	Terminologies - Valuesets
Related Section(s):	4.4.1.24.2
Grouping:	GH-Core, GH-Term, GHP, SFCU
Change Category:	Clarification

Description

It isn't clear why a new unknown element is included in the Sex for Clinical Use code system rather than using unknown from the null flavours.

(Comment 39 - imported by: Ron G. Parker)

Comments

Comment by [Carmela A. Couderc](#) [2022-10-17]

FYI [Caroline Macumber](#) and [Rob McClure](#)

[FHIR-39223] Forcing trans and non-binary people to fit into these narrow views is the opposite of being apolitical. . Created: 2022-10-14 Updated:

2022-11-15

Status:	Waiting for Input	use or not use
Project:	FHIR Specification Feedback	

Type:	Change Request	Priority:	Highest
Reporter:	Ron G. Parker	Assignee:	Ron G. Parker
Resolution:	Unresolved		

Issue Links:	Relates			
	relates to	FHIR-39222	SFCU is discriminatory	Triaged
	Vote			
	is voted on by	BALLOT-42083	Negative - Ron G. Parker : 2022-Sep-F...	Balloted
	is voted on by	BALLOT-43483	Negative - Ken Sinn : 2022-Sep-FHIR R...	Balloted
	is voted on by	BALLOT-43535	Negative - Joan Harper : 2022-Sep-FHI...	Balloted

Specification:	FHIR Core (FHIR)
Raised in Version:	R5
Work Group:	Vocabulary
Related URL:	https://www.hl7.org/fhir/2022Sep/valueset-sex-for-clinical-use.html
Related Page(s):	Terminologies - Valuesets
Related Section(s):	4.4.1.24.2
Grouping:	GH-Core, GHP, SFCU
Change Category:	Correction

Description

By adhering to outdated understanding of sex and gender, by reinforcing stereotypes and a binary of sex and gender, by using language that continues to perpetuate outdated beliefs, stigma and discrimination, by forcing trans and non-binary people to fit into these narrow views is the opposite of being apolitical. "don't find the argument of discrimination being persuasive". I find this offensive. Discrimination, and the impact of discrimination, is best defined by the the people who actually experience it every day. It is real. It is profound. And because of that discrimination and stigma which this approach reinforces, means, once again, we will be continually harmed and at some point just not come back. There is a reason why suicide attempt rates are 50% among our community. Each time we see these microaggressions in our community, in our healthcare system, draws a bit more from our

tank. Until there is nothing left. My very existence is political. And quite frankly, I'm tired of having to prove over and over my existence, experiences ignored, and made to try to fit a system that was not designed for me rather than finally making a system designed by the very people we aim to care for. I'm tired. So tired of this.

(Comment 31 - imported by: Ron G. Parker)

Comments

Comment by Cooper Thompson [2022-11-15]
Ron G. Parker - can you help me understand what the specific feedback is here?

[FHIR-39224] We may want to frame our response of this being a patient safety and quality of care issue. Created: 2022-10-14 Updated: 2022-11-15

Status:	Waiting for Input
Project:	FHIR Specification Feedback use or not use

Type:	Change Request	Priority:	Highest
Reporter:	Ron G. Parker	Assignee:	Ron G. Parker
Resolution:	Unresolved		

Issue Links:	Relates			
	relates to	FHIR-39222	SFCU is discriminatory	Triaged
	Vote			
	is voted on by	BALLOT-42084	Affirmative - Ron G. Parker : 2022-Se...	Balloted
	is voted on by	BALLOT-43482	Affirmative - Ken Sinn : 2022-Sep-FHI...	Balloted
	is voted on by	BALLOT-43534	Affirmative - Joan Harper : 2022-Sep-...	Balloted

Specification:	FHIR Core (FHIR)
Raised in Version:	R5
Work Group:	Vocabulary
Related URL:	https://www.hl7.org/fhir/2022Sep/valueset-sex-for-clinical-use.html
Related Page(s):	Terminologies - Valuesets
Related Section(s):	4.4.1.24.2
Grouping:	GH-Core, GHP, SFCU
Change Category:	Clarification

Description

My understanding of the SFCU is that it importantly separates sex from gender; and in this way, I believe, it is an important step. My sense is that there will be an important role for SFCU in supporting computable care guidelines (CCG) and other important digital health innovations that will rely on unambiguously knowing the biological sex of the subject of care. I fear that we are basing our proposed response related to SFCU on a concern that it is "political" to frame the value set as it has been proposed. This should not be political. I think we may want, instead, to frame our response in the context of this being a patient safety and quality of care issue. An accepted definition for cisnormativity is the sometime offensive "assumption that all human beings are cisgender, i.e. have a gender identity which matches their biological sex". But we're not talking about gender, here. As a practical matter, one's biological sex does match their biological sex – and we want the SFCU to reflect this apolitical data element as simply as possible. I believe the proposed value set is mercifully simple – and for this reason I would advocate for us voting AFFIRMATIVE.

Existing Wording:

This value set contains 4 concepts ...

Code -----Display

- female ----Female sex for clinical use
- male -----Male sex for clinical use
- specified --Specified sex for clinical use
- unknown --Unknown

(Comment 32 - imported by: Ron G. Parker)**Comments**Comment by [Cooper Thompson](#) [2022-11-15][Ron G. Parker](#) - was this is meant to be an affirmative comment, not a change request, right?**[FHIR-39225] need a clear and simple way to code SFCU values** Created: 2022-10-14 Updated: 2022-11-15

Status:	Waiting for Input		
Project:	FHIR Specification Feedback	value options	

Type:	Change Request	Priority:	Highest
Reporter:	Ron G. Parker	Assignee:	Ron G. Parker
Resolution:	Unresolved		

Issue Links:	Vote		
	is voted on by	BALLOT-42085	Affirmative - Ron G. Parker : 2022-Se... Balloted
	is voted on by	BALLOT-43481	Affirmative - Ken Sinn : 2022-Sep-FHI... Balloted
	is voted on by	BALLOT-43533	Affirmative - Joan Harper : 2022-Sep-... Balloted
Specification:	FHIR Core (FHIR)		
Raised in Version:	R5		
Work Group:	Vocabulary		
Related URL:	https://www.hl7.org/fhir/2022Sep/valueset-sex-for-clinical-use.html		
Related Page(s):	Terminologies - Valuesets		
Related Section(s):	4.4.1.24.2		
Grouping:	GH-Core, GHP, SFCU		
Change Category:	Clarification		

Description

Please appreciate that I do not have an agenda except insofar as this ballot item may either support or undermine efforts that I've been involved in related to the use of digital health standards to systematically improve care delivery. To be clear – my concern is purely related to the correct and unambiguous recording of sex for clinical use in a medical record. This is needed so that patient safe data processing can be done in support of Computable Care Guidelines, and other promising initiatives that can systemically improve care quality and safety. I remain wholeheartedly supportive of the clear distinction between the sex data element and the separate data element that will capture gender – and I've been an advocate of this clear distinction for a very long while, now, and have devoted time and energy to helping important changes get made (as have so many others on this thread). Each of these distinct data elements is equally important – and each should contain the correct information. It remains my fervent hope that we will not put at risk our ability to provide patient-safe care – to everyone – by not adopting a clear and simple way to code SFCU values. It remains my equally fervent hope that no one will refuse to present for care if, in their electronic record, both the gender data element and SFCU data element are correctly recorded in order to support the use cases for which they're intended.

(Comment 33 - imported by: Ron G. Parker)**Comments**Comment by [Cooper Thompson](#) [2022-11-15][Ron G. Parker](#) - can you help me understand what is being requested here? Is the [value set for SFCU](#) not sufficient for coding SFCU values in some way?

[FHIR-39220] "No Additional Information Specified" and "Additional Information Specified" be the only necessary and the appropriate indicators Created: 2022-10-14 Updated: 2022-10-31

Status:	Triaged
Project:	FHIR Specification Feedback data element name, value options

Type:	Change Request	Priority:	Highest
Reporter:	Ron G. Parker	Assignee:	Unassigned
Resolution:	Unresolved		

Issue Links:	Vote			
	is voted on by	BALLOT-42080	Negative - Ron G. Parker : 2022-Sep-F...	Balloted
	is voted on by	BALLOT-43486	Negative - Ken Sinn : 2022-Sep-FHIR R...	Balloted
	is voted on by	BALLOT-43538	Negative - Joan Harper : 2022-Sep-FHI...	Balloted
Specification:	FHIR Core (FHIR)			
Raised in Version:	R5			
Work Group:	Vocabulary			
Related URL:	https://www.hl7.org/fhir/2022Sep/valueset-sex-for-clinical-use.html			
Related Page(s):	Terminologies - Valuesets			
Related Section(s):	4.4.1.24.2			
Grouping:	GH-Core, GHP, SFCU			
Change Category:	Clarification			

Description

If SFCU is useful (many clinicians must think that it is because we are still talking about it), would not "No Additional Information Specified" (which a clinician can interpret as "Same as Gender Identity" for clinical purposes) and "Additional Information Specified" be the only necessary and the appropriate indicators? I like the suggestion of "Parameters for Clinical Use" except that it might hide clinically important information in an area of the chart in which no-one ever looks. Maybe, "Additional Information Specified" points to "Parameters for Clinical Use" for more details. We should have somewhere to record the organ inventory (which is going to have to include "organ ABC removed") and genetic information. There are only six viable biological karyotype sexes, as far as anyone knows, but there are also documented chimaera (February 2015 Nature article, "Sex Redefined") and myriad clinical conditions that change the generation and interpretation of hormone signals and all sorts of other things that might fall into "SFCU" territory but would not be captured by the proposed value set. I support voting Negative on this section. It seems half baked, even all these years on in the discussion. I mean no offence to everyone who has been working and negotiating hard to get to this point! I also do not offer myself as an expert on any of this

(Comment 28 - imported by: Ron G. Parker)

[FHIR-39219] Data element is discriminatory Created: 2022-10-14 Updated: 2022-10-28

Status:	Triaged
Project:	FHIR Specification Feedback use or not use

Type:	Change Request	Priority:	Highest
Reporter:	Ron G. Parker	Assignee:	Unassigned
Resolution:	Unresolved		

Issue Links:	Vote			
	is voted on by	BALLOT-42079	Negative - Ron G. Parker : 2022-Sep-F...	Balloted
	is voted on by	BALLOT-43487	Negative - Ken Sinn : 2022-Sep-FHIR R...	Balloted
	is voted on by	BALLOT-43539	Negative - Joan Harper : 2022-Sep-FHI...	Balloted
Specification:	FHIR Core (FHIR)			

Raised in Version:	R5
Work Group:	Vocabulary
Related URL:	https://www.hl7.org/fhir/2022Sep/valueset-sex-for-clinical-use.html
Related Page(s):	Terminologies - Valuesets
Related Section(s):	4.4.1.24.2
Grouping:	GH-Core, GHP, SFCU
Change Category:	Clarification

Description

Some SGWG members felt strongly that this data element is discriminatory that promotes cisnormativity, implying anything outside of female and male need to be somehow specified; so we propose to vote NEGATIVE for this section. As an alternative, we suggest to change the label to Parameters for clinical use and separate it from Sex altogether, since other non-sex related clinical conditions may require special/specific considerations as well. Another suggestion is to use Organ inventory with a defined value set to remove having to make assumptions about sex status altogether.

Existing Wording:

This value set contains 4 concepts ...

Code -----Display

female -----Female sex for clinical use

male -----Male sex for clinical use

specified --Specified sex for clinical use

unknown --Unknown

(Comment 27 - imported by: Ron G. Parker)

[FHIR-39213] What is the usage-note code that is listed? The URL does not resolve. How does it relate to the SFCU Code System? Created: 2022-

10-14 Updated: 2022-10-31

Status:	Triaged		
Project:	FHIR Specification Feedback	miscellaneous	
Type:	Question	Priority:	Highest
Reporter:	Ron G. Parker	Assignee:	Unassigned
Resolution:	Unresolved		

Issue Links:	Vote		
	is voted on by	BALLOT-42073	Affirmative - Ron G. Parker : 2022-Se... Balloted
	is voted on by	BALLOT-43493	Affirmative - Ken Sinn : 2022-Sep-FHI... Balloted
	is voted on by	BALLOT-43545	Affirmative - Joan Harper : 2022-Sep-... Balloted
Specification:	FHIR Core (FHIR)		
Raised in Version:	R5		
Work Group:	Vocabulary		
Related URL:	https://www.hl7.org/fhir/2022Sep/codesystem-sex-for-clinical-use.html		
Related Page(s):	Terminologies - Systems		
Related Section(s):	4.3.2.188.1		
Grouping:	GH-Core, GH-Term, GHP, SFCU		

Description

What is the usage-note code that is listed? The URL does not resolve. How does it relate to the SFCU Code System?

(Comment 21 - imported by: Ron G. Parker)


Comments

Comment by [Carmela A. Couderc](#) [2022-10-17]

[Rob McClure](#) [Caroline Macumber](#) FYI

[FHIR-39211] [Can the definition be formatted better to make it easier to read?](#) Created: 2022-10-14 Updated: 2022-11-15

Status:	Triaged		
Project:	FHIR Specification Feedback	miscellaneous	
Type:	Change Request	Priority:	Highest
Reporter:	Ron G. Parker	Assignee:	Unassigned
Resolution:	Unresolved		

Issue Links:	Duplicate			
	duplicates	FHIR-39204	SFCU descriptions repetitive and exce...	Triaged
	Relates			
	relates to	FHIR-39204	SFCU descriptions repetitive and exce...	Triaged
	Vote			
	is voted on by	BALLOT-42071	Affirmative - Ron G. Parker : 2022-Se...	Balloted
	is voted on by	BALLOT-43495	Affirmative - Ken Sinn : 2022-Sep-FHI...	Balloted
	is voted on by	BALLOT-43547	Affirmative - Joan Harper : 2022-Sep-...	Balloted
Specification:	FHIR Core (FHIR)			
Raised in Version:	R5			
Work Group:	Vocabulary			
Related URL:	https://www.hl7.org/fhir/2022Sep/extension-patient-sexforclinicaluse.html			
Related Page(s):	Extension Registry			
Related Section(s):	http://hl7.org/fhir/2022Sep/extension-patient-sexforclinicaluse.html			
Grouping:	GH-Core, GHP, SFCU			
Change Category:	Enhancement			
Duplicate Issue:	 FHIR-39204 SFCU descriptions repetitive and excessive			

Description

Can the definition be formatted better to make it easier to read?

I see that it exists a second time below the table and is easier to read in that location.

(Comment 19 - imported by: [Ron G. Parker](#))

Comments

Comment by [Lloyd McKenzie](#) [2022-10-17]

This is a gender extension and related to the gender spec

[FHIR-39201] [Don't indent "clinical observations about sex characteristics"](#) Created: 2022-10-14 Updated: 2022-10-31

Status:	Triaged		
Project:	FHIR Specification Feedback	miscellaneous	

Type:	Change Request	Priority:	Highest
Reporter:	Ron G. Parker	Assignee:	Unassigned
Resolution:	Unresolved		

Issue Links:	Vote			
	is voted on by	BALLOT-42061	Affirmative - Ron G. Parker : 2022-Se...	Balloted
	is voted on by	BALLOT-43505	Affirmative - Ken Sinn : 2022-Sep-FHL...	Balloted
	is voted on by	BALLOT-43557	Affirmative - Joan Harper : 2022-Sep-...	Balloted
Specification:	FHIR Core (FHIR)			
Raised in Version:	R4			
Work Group:	Patient Administration			
Related URL:	http://hl7.org/fhir/2022Sep/patient.html#gender			
Related Artifact(s):	Patient			
Related Section(s):	8.1.8			
Grouping:	GH-Core, GHP, SFCU			
Change Category:	Correction			

Description

"Clinical observations about sex characteristics" should not be indented under SFCU.

(Comment 9 - imported by: Ron G. Parker)

Comments

Comment by [Cooper Thompson](#) [2022-10-17]

The intent was to indicate that those clinical observations could be supporting info for the SFCU. But I see why it is confusing / awkward. I'll look at restructuring that to be more clear.

[FHIR-39204] SFCU descriptions repetitive and excessive Created: 2022-10-14 Updated: 2022-11-16


Status:	Triaged		
Project:	FHIR Specification Feedback	miscellaneous	

Type:	Change Request	Priority:	Highest
Reporter:	Ron G. Parker	Assignee:	Unassigned
Resolution:	Unresolved		

Issue Links:	Duplicate			
	is duplicated by	FHIR-39211	Can the definition be formatted bette...	Triaged
	Relates			
	relates to	FHIR-39211	Can the definition be formatted bette...	Triaged
	Vote			
	is voted on by	BALLOT-42064	Affirmative - Ron G. Parker : 2022-Se...	Balloted
	is voted on by	BALLOT-43502	Affirmative - Ken Sinn : 2022-Sep-FHL...	Balloted
	is voted on by	BALLOT-43554	Affirmative - Joan Harper : 2022-Sep-...	Balloted
Specification:	FHIR Core (FHIR)			
Raised in Version:	R5			
Work Group:	Vocabulary			
Related URL:	http://hl7.org/fhir/2022Sep/extension-patient-sexforclinicaluse.html			

Related Page(s):	Extension Registry
Grouping:	GH-Core, GHP, SFCU
Change Category:	Clarification

Description

Clean up markdown  in definition. Consider whether all of the content (including definition of vocabulary) is needed in the definition of the extension. The definition in the table appears to duplicate the content below the table and largely duplicate the content in the resource tree – consider what content is most appropriate in each location and remove redundancies.

There should be a break before "Sex for Clinical Use (SFCU) History and Practices" (in both the overview text and in the resource tree).

(Comment 12 - imported by: Ron G. Parker)

Comments

Comment by [Lloyd McKenzie](#) [2022-10-17]

This is a gender extension and related to the gender spec

Comment by [Cooper Thompson](#) [2022-11-15]

In the extension itself, the definition is only included once. However, the publisher renders that definition three times, twice using markup, and once without. I'm checking on what options there are to prevent that duplicate display.

<https://chat.fhir.org/#narrow/stream/179165-committers/topic/Publishing.20-.20prevent.20duplicate.20content.20in.20extensions.3F>

Comment by [Cooper Thompson](#) [2022-11-16]

I've submitted this as an issue against the publisher: <https://github.com/HL7/kindling/issues/103>

[FHIR-39199] Consider whether SFCU terminology should be expanded to address use cases in, for example, psychiatry Created: 2022-10-14 Updated:

2022-10-28	
Status:	Triaged
Project:	FHIR Specification Feedback value options

Type:	Change Request	Priority:	Highest
Reporter:	Ron G. Parker	Assignee:	Unassigned
Resolution:	Unresolved		

Issue Links:	Vote		
	is voted on by	BALLOT-42059	Affirmative - Ron G. Parker : 2022-Sep... Balloted
	is voted on by	BALLOT-43507	Affirmative - Ken Sinn : 2022-Sep-FHI... Balloted
	is voted on by	BALLOT-43559	Affirmative - Joan Harper : 2022-Sep-... Balloted
Specification:	FHIR Core (FHIR)		
Raised in Version:	R5		
Work Group:	Vocabulary		
Related URL:	http://hl7.org/fhir/2022Sep/codesystem-sex-for-clinical-use.html#content		
Related Page(s):	Terminologies - Systems		
Related Section(s):	4.3.2.188		
Grouping:	GH-Core, GHP, SFCU		
Change Category:	Enhancement		

Description

For many clinical uses limiting sex to male or female (or specified) makes sense – drugs are dosed for, or appropriate for males and females differently; radiation shielding must be placed differently; baseline lab results may differ; surgery will depend on specific organs. However, in psychiatry and similar situations, might there be a need for more nuanced SFCU? I understand the need for a small selection of SFCU values to drive decision making, and that

using values other than M/F in contexts where the only reasonable SFCUs are M/F will cause confusion; however, please consider whether the SFCU valueset should be expanded

(Comment 7 - imported by: Ron G. Parker)

[FHIR-39195] Consider allowing gender identity extension on PractitionerRole Created: 2022-10-14 Updated: 2022-10-28

Status:	Triaged
Project:	FHIR Specification Feedback miscellaneous

Type:	Change Request	Priority:	Highest
Reporter:	Ron G. Parker	Assignee:	Unassigned
Resolution:	Unresolved		

Issue Links:	Vote			
	is voted on by	BALLOT-42055	Affirmative - Ron G. Parker : 2022-Se...	Balloted
	is voted on by	BALLOT-43511	Affirmative - Ken Sinn : 2022-Sep-FHI...	Balloted
	is voted on by	BALLOT-43563	Affirmative - Joan Harper : 2022-Sep-...	Balloted
Specification:	FHIR Core (FHIR)			
Raised in Version:	R5			
Work Group:	Vocabulary			
Related URL:	http://hl7.org/fhir/2022Sep/extension-individual-genderidentity.html			
Related Page(s):	Extension Registry			
Related Section(s):	http://hl7.org/fhir/2022Sep/extension-individual-genderidentity.html			
Grouping:	GH-Core, GHP, GI			
Change Category:	Correction			

Description

Statements in the Gender Harmony IG indicate that patients may have preferred gender identities depending on context (clinical vs. work). It is not hard to extrapolate that some practitioners may want to express different gender identities in some work contexts compared to others. Please reconsider allowing this extension on PractitionerRole, or allowing an indication of context for the gender identity extension on Practitioner

(Comment 3 - imported by: Ron G. Parker)

Comments

Comment by [Lloyd McKenzie](#) [2022-10-17]

This is a gender extension and related to the gender spec

[FHIR-39196] Is SFCU at the resource level precise enough? Created: 2022-10-14 Updated: 2022-10-20

Status:	Triaged
Project:	FHIR Specification Feedback miscellaneous

Type:	Change Request	Priority:	Highest
Reporter:	Ron G. Parker	Assignee:	Unassigned
Resolution:	Unresolved		

Issue Links:	Vote			
	is voted on by	BALLOT-42056	Affirmative - Ron G. Parker : 2022-Sep...	Balloted
	is voted on by	BALLOT-43510	Affirmative - Ken Sinn : 2022-Sep-FHI...	Balloted
	is voted on by	BALLOT-43562	Affirmative - Joan Harper : 2022-Sep-...	Balloted
Specification:	FHIR Core (FHIR)			
Raised in Version:	R5			
Work Group:	Vocabulary			
Related URL:	http://hl7.org/fhir/2022Sep/extension-patient-sexforclinicaluse.html			
Related Page(s):	Extension Registry			
Related Section(s):	http://hl7.org/fhir/2022Sep/extension-patient-sexforclinicaluse.html			
Grouping:	GH-Core, GHP, SFCU			
Change Category:	Enhancement			

Description

Consider whether there are cases where an extension on the resource is not precise enough. For example, if SFCU is applied to Observation, does it indicate the SFCU of the Observation.subject, or the Observation.focus (perhaps a RelatedPerson)? How can we differentiate? There may be other similar gaps.

(Comment 4 - imported by: Ron G. Parker)

Comments

Comment by [Lloyd McKenzie](#) [2022-10-17]

This is a gender extension and related to the gender spec

[FHIR-39236] Client should be allowed to choose more than one Gender Identity Created: 2022-10-14 Updated: 2022-12-07 Resolved: 2022-11-14

Status:	Triaged		
Project:	FHIR Specification Feedback	value options for GI	
Type:	Change Request	Priority:	Highest
Reporter:	Ron G. Parker	Assignee:	Unassigned
Resolution:	Not Persuasive		

Issue Links:	Vote			
	is voted on by	BALLOT-42096	Negative - Ron G. Parker : 2022-Sep-F...	Balloted
	is voted on by	BALLOT-43470	Negative - Ken Sinn : 2022-Sep-FHIR R...	Balloted
	is voted on by	BALLOT-43522	Negative - Joan Harper : 2022-Sep-FHI...	Balloted
Specification:	FHIR Core (FHIR)			
Raised in Version:	R5			
Work Group:	Vocabulary			
Related URL:	http://hl7.org/fhir/2022Sep/extension-individual-genderidentity.html			
Related Page(s):	Extension Registry			
Related Section(s):	http://hl7.org/fhir/2022Sep/extension-individual-genderidentity.html			
Grouping:	GH-Core, GHP, GI, Ready-for-main			
Resolution Description:	Gender Identity is already 0..*. Note that a patient can have multiple gender identities, which can be included in the list of gender identities in the extension. Each gender identity in the list can only have one <u>value</u> .			
Change Category:	Enhancement			

Description

Increase max cardinality to *.

Existing Wording:

Cardinality 1..1

Proposed Wording:

Cardinality 1..*

(Comment 44 - imported by: Ron G. Parker)

Comments

Comment by [Lloyd McKenzie](#) [2022-10-17]

This is a gender extension and related to the gender spec

Comment by [Cooper Thompson](#) [2022-11-30]

GHP FHIR Subgroup - Nov 30 2022

Reviewed by the subgroup that this is already possible in the current extension.

[FHIR-39241] SFCU value set includes "Specified". This is meaningless. We need a meaningful value as alternative to male, female and unknown. Created: 2022-10-14 Updated: 2022-12-07 Resolved: 2022-12-07

Status:	Triaged		
Project:	FHIR Specification Feedback	value options	
Type:	Change Request	Priority:	Highest
Reporter:	Ron G. Parker	Assignee:	Unassigned
Resolution:	Persuasive with Modification		

Issue Links:	Relates relates to FHIR-38893 Definition of Specified SFCU Waiting for Input Vote is voted on by BALLOT-42101 Negative - Ron G. Parker : 2022-Sep-F... Balloted is voted on by BALLOT-43465 Negative - Ken Sinn : 2022-Sep-FHIR R... Balloted is voted on by BALLOT-43517 Negative - Joan Harper : 2022-Sep-FHI... Balloted			
Specification:	FHIR Core (FHIR)			
Raised in Version:	R4			
Work Group:	Vocabulary			
Related URL:	http://hl7.org/fhir/2022Sep/extension-patient-sexforclinicaluse.html			
Related Page(s):	Extension Registry			
Related Section(s):	http://hl7.org/fhir/2022Sep/extension-patient-sexforclinicaluse.html			
Grouping:	GH-Core, GHP, Ready-for-main, SFCU			
Resolution Description:	For the GHP group, there are a few options we might consider as alternatives to "specified": <ul style="list-style-type: none"> not-clinically-binary not-categorized undetermined 			
Change Category:	Clarification			

Description

SFCU value set includes "Specified". This is meaningless. We need a meaningful value as alternative to male, female and inknown.

(Comment 49 - imported by: Ron G. Parker)

Comments

Comment by [Lloyd McKenzie](#) [2022-10-17]

This is a gender extension and related to the gender spec

Comment by [Cooper Thompson](#) [2022-11-15]

There has been much debate about what code to use here. For some history, we'd considered these codes:

1. **Other** – This has been used historically and is used by Epic today when exchanging our reliable sex concept with third parties but was rejected due to "othering" connotations.
2. **Complex** – rejected due to the word also having negative connotations with respect to phycological conditions.
3. **Specified** – the current term we are using, but many folks (including myself) don't like it. The *intent* was to indicate that the details about the patient are specified somewhere else in the chart (e.g., organ inventory). Regardless of the explanation, many folks have been confused by this term, so in practice, it hasn't been helpful.

Some recent suggestions include:

- non-binary (though possible confusion with gender identity is a problem)
- not-clinically-binary

Comment by [Cooper Thompson](#) [2022-11-16]

Another option: Undetermined

Comment by [Cooper Thompson](#) [2022-12-07]

Another option: not-categorized

[FHIR-39222] SFCU is discriminatory Created: 2022-10-14 Updated: 2022-12-08

Status:	Triaged		
Project:	FHIR Specification Feedback	use or not use	

Type:	Comment	Priority:	Highest
Reporter:	Ron G. Parker	Assignee:	Unassigned
Resolution:	Unresolved		

Issue Links:	Relates			
	relates to	FHIR-39223	Forcing trans and non-binary people t...	Waiting for Input
	relates to	FHIR-39224	We may want to frame our response of ...	Waiting for Input
	Vote			
	is voted on by	BALLOT-42082	Negative - Ron G. Parker : 2022-Sep-F...	Balloted
	is voted on by	BALLOT-43484	Negative - Ken Sinn : 2022-Sep-FHIR R...	Balloted
	is voted on by	BALLOT-43536	Negative - Joan Harper : 2022-Sep-FHI...	Balloted
Specification:	FHIR Core (FHIR)			
Raised in Version:	R4			
Work Group:	Vocabulary			
Related URL:	https://www.hl7.org/fhir/2022Sep/valueset-sex-for-clinical-use.html			
Related Page(s):	Terminologies - Valuesets			
Related Section(s):	4.4.1.24.2			

Grouping:	GH-Core, GHP, SFCU
------------------	--------------------

Description

In response to comments about biological sex and patient safety and quality care, here are more comments ... "For example, someone assigned male at birth, who no longer has testes, does not produce Testosterone and with HRT has typical levels of estrogen in their body. Not sure how that matches their 'biological' (not a good word by the way) sex." Also "this IS about safety and quality of care, that someone is seen as who they are and information regarding the organs they have and their hormone compliment etc is available." and "being apolitical seems to equate with accepting the historical status quo and disregarding gender diversity as a fundamental truth wholly ignored by a cisnormative system. Discrimination tends to be best understood by those who are discriminated against. It is the health system as a whole and digital health systems in particular that are the problem, not the patients."

(Comment 30 - imported by: Ron G. Parker)

Comments

Comment by Carmela A. Couderc [2022-10-17]
Rob McClure Caroline Macumber FYI
Comment by Cooper Thompson [2022-11-15]
Ron G. Parker - can you help me understand what the requested change was for this ticket?
Comment by Craig Parker [2022-12-08]
No additional information needed. This is a Comment, not a Change Request. We acknowledge the concerns of the commenter and will address this.

[FHIR-39221] SFCU is a patient quality and safety issue. Created: 2022-10-14 Updated: 2022-12-08

Status:	Triaged
Project:	FHIR Specification Feedback use or not use

Type:	Comment	Priority:	Highest
Reporter:	Ron G. Parker	Assignee:	Unassigned
Resolution:	Unresolved		

Issue Links:	Vote		
	is voted on by	BALLOT-42081	Negative - Ron G. Parker : 2022-Sep-F... Balloted
	is voted on by	BALLOT-43485	Negative - Ken Sinn : 2022-Sep-FHIR R... Balloted
	is voted on by	BALLOT-43537	Negative - Joan Harper : 2022-Sep-FHI... Balloted
Specification:	FHIR Core (FHIR)		
Raised in Version:	R5		
Work Group:	Vocabulary		
Related URL:	https://www.hl7.org/fhir/2022Sep/valueset-sex-for-clinical-use.html		
Related Page(s):	Terminologies - Valuesets		
Related Section(s):	4.4.1.24.2		
Grouping:	GH-Core, GHP, SFCU		

Description

In response to comment about patient safety and quality care, here is another comment: If I came in to a clinic and saw my gender or anything in my file as anything but a woman, I would never come back. This isn't a politics. This is who I am. A system trying to tell me otherwise is the problem we are trying to fix. Indeed, this IS a quality of care issue. And this IS a patient safety issue. I haven't felt safe sharing my opinions here for some time now which is why I've pretty much silenced myself of late. Imagine how a patient feels about their safety. So yes, I do agree this is a patient safety issue. Calling me anything other than a woman. Not providing me care based on my organs and what I present with, is the exact opposite of patient safety.

(Comment 29 - imported by: Ron G. Parker)

Comments

Comment by [Cooper Thompson](#) [2022-11-15]

[Ron G. Parker](#) - can you help me understand what the requested change is here?

Comment by [Craig Parker](#) [2022-12-08]

No additional information required. This is actually a Comment, not a Change Request.

[V2-25427] SFCU and its value sets are discriminatory and promote cisnormativity Created: 2022-10-14 Updated: 2022-12-08

Status:	Triaged
Project:	V2 Specification Feedback use or not use

Type:	Change Request	Priority:	Highest
Reporter:	Ron G. Parker	Assignee:	Unassigned
Resolution:	Unresolved		

Issue Links:	Relates			
	relates to	OTHER-2631	Is it possible to change the term Sex...	Triaged
	Vote			
	is voted on by	BALLOT-42019	Negative - Ron G. Parker : 2022-Sep-V...	Balloted
	is voted on by	BALLOT-42231	Negative - Joan Harper : 2022-Sep-V29...	Balloted
is voted on by	BALLOT-42267	Negative - Sheridan Cook : 2022-Sep-V...	Balloted	
is voted on by	BALLOT-42303	Negative - Ken Sinn : 2022-Sep-V291 R...	Balloted	

Specification:	V2.x Message Specification (V2)
Raised in Version:	V2.9
Work Group:	Infrastructure & Messaging
Related Page(s):	Control (Chapter 2)
Related Section(s):	CH02C_Tables_2022SEP_nomarkup PDF, Table 0828 on page 788
Grouping:	GH-Term, GH-V2, GHP, SFCU
Change Category:	Correction

Description

Some SGWG members felt sex for clinical use and its value sets are discriminatory that promotes cisnormativity, so we propose to vote NEGATIVE for this section As an alternative, we suggest to change the label to Parameters for clinical use and separate it from Sex altogether, since other non-sex related clinical conditions may require special/specific considerations as well. Another suggestion is to use Organ inventory with a defined value set to remove having to make assumptions about sex status altogether.

(Comment 8 - imported by: Ron G. Parker)

[V2-25429] Issues with SFCU. 2 Created: 2022-10-14 Updated: 2022-11-08 **use or not use**

Status:	Triaged
Project:	V2 Specification Feedback

Type:	Change Request	Priority:	Highest
Reporter:	Ron G. Parker	Assignee:	Unassigned
Resolution:	Unresolved		

Issue Links:	Vote			
	is voted on by	BALLOT-42021	Negative - Ron G. Parker : 2022-Sep-V...	Balloted
	is voted on by	BALLOT-42229	Negative - Joan Harper : 2022-Sep-V29...	Balloted
	is voted on by	BALLOT-42265	Negative - Sheridan Cook : 2022-Sep-V...	Balloted
	is voted on by	BALLOT-42301	Negative - Ken Sinn : 2022-Sep-V291 R...	Balloted
Specification:	V2.x Message Specification (V2)			
Raised in Version:	V2.9			
Work Group:	Infrastructure & Messaging			
Related Page(s):	Control (Chapter 2)			
Related Section(s):	CH02C_Tables_2022SEP_nomarkup PDF, Table 0828 on page 788			
Grouping:	GH-V2, GHP, SFCU			
Change Category:	Correction			

Description

In response to comment about patient safety and quality care, here is another comment: If I came in to a clinic and saw my gender or anything in my file as anything but a woman, I would never come back. This isn't a politics. This is who I am. A system trying to tell me otherwise is the problem we are trying to fix. Indeed, this IS a quality of care issue. And this IS a patient safety issue. I haven't felt safe sharing my opinions here for some time now which is why I've pretty much silenced myself of late. Imagine how a patient feels about their safety. So yes, I do agree this is a patient safety issue. Calling me anything other than a woman. Not providing me care based on my organs and what I present with, is the exact opposite of patient safety.

(Comment 10 - imported by: Ron G. Parker)

[V2-25430] Issues with SFCU.3 Created: 2022-10-14 Updated: 2022-11-08

Status:	Triaged	use or not use
Project:	V2 Specification Feedback	

Type:	Change Request	Priority:	Highest
Reporter:	Ron G. Parker	Assignee:	Unassigned
Resolution:	Unresolved		

Issue Links:	Vote			
	is voted on by	BALLOT-42022	Negative - Ron G. Parker : 2022-Sep-V...	Balloted
	is voted on by	BALLOT-42228	Negative - Joan Harper : 2022-Sep-V29...	Balloted
	is voted on by	BALLOT-42264	Negative - Sheridan Cook : 2022-Sep-V...	Balloted
	is voted on by	BALLOT-42300	Negative - Ken Sinn : 2022-Sep-V291 R...	Balloted
Specification:	V2.x Message Specification (V2)			
Raised in Version:	V2.9			
Work Group:	Infrastructure & Messaging			
Related Page(s):	Control (Chapter 2)			
Related Section(s):	CH02C_Tables_2022SEP_nomarkup PDF, Table 0828 on page 788			
Grouping:	GH-V2, GHP, SFCU			
Change Category:	Correction			

Description

In response to comments about biological sex and patient safety and quality care, here are more comments ... "For example, someone assigned male at birth, who no longer has testes, does not produce Testosterone and with HRT has typical levels of estrogen in their body. Not sure how that matches their 'biological' (not a good word by the way) sex." Also "this IS about safety and quality of care, that someone is seen as who they are and information regarding the organs they have and their hormone compliment etc is available." and "being apolitical seems to equate with accepting the historical

status quo and disregarding gender diversity as a fundamental truth wholly ignored by a cisnormative system. Discrimination tends to be best understood by those who are discriminated against. It is the health system as a whole and digital health systems in particular that are the problem, not the patients."

(Comment 11 - imported by: Ron G. Parker)

[V2-25432] Issues with SFCU. 5 Created: 2022-10-14 Updated: 2022-11-08

Status:	Triaged	use or not use
Project:	V2 Specification Feedback	

Type:	Comment	Priority:	Highest
Reporter:	Ron G. Parker	Assignee:	Unassigned
Resolution:	Unresolved		

Issue Links:	Vote			
	is voted on by	BALLOT-42024	Affirmative - Ron G. Parker : 2022-Se...	Balloted
	is voted on by	BALLOT-42226	Affirmative - Joan Harper : 2022-Sep-...	Balloted
	is voted on by	BALLOT-42262	Affirmative - Sheridan Cook : 2022-Se...	Balloted
	is voted on by	BALLOT-42298	Affirmative - Ken Sinn : 2022-Sep-V29...	Balloted
Specification:	V2.x Message Specification (V2)			
Raised in Version:	V2.9			
Work Group:	Infrastructure & Messaging			
Related Page(s):	Control (Chapter 2)			
Related Section(s):	CH02C_Tables_2022SEP_nomarkup PDF, Table 0828 on page 788			
Grouping:	GH-V2, GHP, SFCU			

Description

My understanding of the SFCU is that it importantly separates sex from gender; and in this way, I believe, it is an important step. My sense is that there will be an important role for SFCU in supporting computable care guidelines (CCG) and other important digital health innovations that will rely on unambiguously knowing the biological sex of the subject of care. I fear that we are basing our proposed response related to SFCU on a concern that it is "political" to frame the value set as it has been proposed. This should not be political. I think we may want, instead, to frame our response in the context of this being a patient safety and quality of care issue. An accepted definition for cisnormativity is the sometime offensive "assumption that all human beings are cisgender, i.e. have a gender identity which matches their biological sex". But we're not talking about gender, here. As a practical matter, one's biological sex does match their biological sex – and we want the SFCU to reflect this apolitical data element as simply as possible. I believe the proposed value set is mercifully simple – and for this reason I would advocate for us voting AFFIRMATIVE.

(Comment 13 - imported by: Ron G. Parker)

[V2-25433] Issues with SFCU. 6 Created: 2022-10-14 Updated: 2022-11-08

Status:	Triaged	use or not use
Project:	V2 Specification Feedback	

Type:	Change Request	Priority:	Highest
Reporter:	Ron G. Parker	Assignee:	Unassigned
Resolution:	Unresolved		

Issue Links:	Vote			
	is voted on by	BALLOT-42025	Negative - Ron G. Parker : 2022-Sep-V...	Balloted
	is voted on by	BALLOT-42225	Negative - Joan Harper : 2022-Sep-V29...	Balloted
	is voted on by	BALLOT-42261	Negative - Sheridan Cook : 2022-Sep-V...	Balloted
	is voted on by	BALLOT-42297	Negative - Ken Sinn : 2022-Sep-V291 R...	Balloted
Specification:	V2.x Message Specification (V2)			
Raised in Version:	V2.9			
Work Group:	Infrastructure & Messaging			
Related Page(s):	Control (Chapter 2)			
Related Section(s):	CH02C_Tables_2022SEP_nomarkup PDF, Table 0828 on page 788			
Grouping:	GH-V2, GHP, SFCU			
Change Category:	Correction			

Description

Please appreciate that I do not have an agenda except insofar as this ballot item may either support or undermine efforts that I've been involved in related to the use of digital health standards to systematically improve care delivery. To be clear – my concern is purely related to the correct and unambiguous recording of sex for clinical use in a medical record. This is needed so that patient safe data processing can be done in support of Computable Care Guidelines, and other promising initiatives that can systemically improve care quality and safety. I remain wholeheartedly supportive of the clear distinction between the sex data element and the separate data element that will capture gender – and I've been an advocate of this clear distinction for a very long while, now, and have devoted time and energy to helping important changes get made (as have so many others on this thread). Each of these distinct data elements is equally important – and each should contain the correct information. It remains my fervent hope that we will not put at risk our ability to provide patient-safe care – to everyone – by not adopting a clear and simple way to code SFCU values. It remains my equally fervent hope that no one will refuse to present for care if, in their electronic record, both the gender data element and SFCU data element are correctly recorded in order to support the use cases for which they're intended.

(Comment 14 - imported by: Ron G. Parker)

[V2-25431] Issues with SFCU. 4 Created: 2022-10-14 Updated: 2022-11-08

Status:	Triaged	use or not use
Project:	V2 Specification Feedback	

Type:	Change Request	Priority:	Highest
Reporter:	Ron G. Parker	Assignee:	Unassigned
Resolution:	Unresolved		

Issue Links:	Vote			
	is voted on by	BALLOT-42023	Negative - Ron G. Parker : 2022-Sep-V...	Balloted
	is voted on by	BALLOT-42227	Negative - Joan Harper : 2022-Sep-V29...	Balloted
	is voted on by	BALLOT-42263	Negative - Sheridan Cook : 2022-Sep-V...	Balloted
	is voted on by	BALLOT-42299	Negative - Ken Sinn : 2022-Sep-V291 R...	Balloted
Specification:	V2.x Message Specification (V2)			
Raised in Version:	V2.9			
Work Group:	Infrastructure & Messaging			
Related Page(s):	Control (Chapter 2)			
Related Section(s):	CH02C_Tables_2022SEP_nomarkup PDF, Table 0828 on page 788			
Grouping:	GH-V2, GHP, SFCU			
Change Category:	Correction			

Description

By adhering to outdated understanding of sex and gender, by reinforcing stereotypes and a binary of sex and gender, by using language that continues to perpetuate outdated beliefs, stigma and discrimination, by forcing trans and non-binary people to fit into these narrow views is the opposite of being apolitical. "don't find the argument of discrimination being persuasive". I find this offensive. Discrimination, and the impact of discrimination, is best defined by the the people who actually experience it every day. It is real. It is profound. And because of that discrimination and stigma which this approach reinforces, means, once again, we will be continually harmed and at some point just not come back. There is a reason why suicide attempt rates are 50% among our community. Each time we see these microaggressions in our community, in our healthcare system, draws a bit more from our tank. Until there is nothing left. My very existence is political. And quite frankly, I'm tired of having to prove over and over my existence, experiences ignored, and made to try to fit a system that was not designed for me rather than finally making a system designed by the very people we aim to care for. I'm tired. So tired of this.

(Comment 12 - imported by: Ron G. Parker)

[V2-25428] Issues with SFCU. 1 Created: 2022-10-14 Updated: 2022-12-08

Status:	Triaged	data element name
Project:	V2 Specification Feedback	

Type:	Change Request	Priority:	Highest
Reporter:	Ron G. Parker	Assignee:	Unassigned
Resolution:	Unresolved		

Issue Links:	Vote			
	is voted on by	BALLOT-42020	Negative - Ron G. Parker : 2022-Sep-V...	Balloted
	is voted on by	BALLOT-42230	Negative - Joan Harper : 2022-Sep-V29...	Balloted
	is voted on by	BALLOT-42266	Negative - Sheridan Cook : 2022-Sep-V...	Balloted
	is voted on by	BALLOT-42302	Negative - Ken Sinn : 2022-Sep-V291 R...	Balloted
Specification:	V2.x Message Specification (V2)			
Raised in Version:	V2.9			
Work Group:	Infrastructure & Messaging			
Related Page(s):	Control (Chapter 2)			
Related Section(s):	CH02C_Tables_2022SEP_nomarkup PDF, Table 0828 on page 788			
Grouping:	GH-V2, GHP, SFCU			
Change Category:	Correction			

Description

If SFCU is useful (many clinicians must think that it is because we are still talking about it), would not "No Additional Information Specified" (which a clinician can interpret as "Same as Gender Identity" for clinical purposes) and "Additional Information Specified" be the only necessary and the appropriate indicators? I like the suggestion of "Parameters for Clinical Use" except that it might hide clinically important information in an area of the chart in which no-one ever looks. Maybe, "Additional Information Specified" points to "Parameters for Clinical Use" for more details. We should have somewhere to record the organ inventory (which is going to have to include "organ ABC removed") and genetic information. There are only six viable biological karyotype sexes, as far as anyone knows, but there are also documented chimaera (February 2015 Nature article, "Sex Redefined") and myriad clinical conditions that change the generation and interpretation of hormone signals and all sorts of other things that might fall into "SFCU" territory but would not be captured by the proposed value set. I support voting Negative on this section. It seems half baked, even all these years on in the discussion. I mean no offence to everyone who has been working and negotiating hard to get to this point! I also do not offer myself as an expert on any of this

(Comment 9 - imported by: Ron G. Parker)

[OTHER-2631] Is it possible to change the term Sex for Clinical Use to something that does not contain the word "Sex". Created: 2022-10-15 Updated:

2022-12-08	
Status:	Triaged
Project:	Other Specification Feedback data element name

Type:	Change Request	Priority:	Highest
Reporter:	Ron G. Parker	Assignee:	Unassigned
Resolution:	Unresolved		

Issue Links:	Relates			
	relates to	V2-25427	SFCU and its value sets are discrimin...	Triaged
Issue Links:	Vote			
	is voted on by	BALLOT-44051	Affirmative - Ron G. Parker : 2022-Se...	Balloted

Specification:	Cross-Paradigm Gender Harmony (OTHER)
Raised in Version:	1.0.0-ballot
Work Group:	Vocabulary
Related URL:	http://hl7.org/xprod/ig/uv/gender-harmony/2022Sep/terminology.html#sex-for-clinial-use-sfcu
Related Page(s):	Terminology
Related Section(s):	13
Grouping:	GHP, SFCU
Change Category:	Enhancement

Description

Is it possible to change the term Sex for Clinical Use to something that does not contain the word "Sex". In a conversation in a Sex and Gender Working group meeting, there was a lot of concern over the SFCU term. It might be better to call it something like "parameters for clinical use" thus removing the word sex entirely. The main issue was that transgender people don't want their "sex" to be represented as other than their gender identity in any context. There was also a feeling that SFCU is specifically targeted at transgender people which could be deemed discriminatory. In terms of hormonal representation, there could also be additional degrees of hormonal representation, such as peri-menopausal, menopausal, post-menopausal, among others, that would fit into a 'Parameters for clinical use' representation.

(Comment 73 - imported by: Lloyd McKenzie)

Comments

Comment by [Jira Admin](#) [2022-10-15]

Imported from spreadsheet by Lloyd - comment #73

[OTHER-2585] Correct link or identifier grammar Created: 2022-10-15 Updated: 2022-10-20

Status:	Triaged
Project:	Other Specification Feedback miscellaneous

Type:	Change Request	Priority:	Highest
Reporter:	Ron G. Parker	Assignee:	Unassigned
Resolution:	Unresolved		

Issue Links:	Vote			
	is voted on by	BALLOT-44005	Affirmative - Ron G. Parker : 2022-Se...	Balloted
Specification:	Cross-Paradigm Gender Harmony (OTHER)			
Raised in Version:	1.0.0-ballot			
Work Group:	Vocabulary			

Related URL:	http://hl7.org/xprod/ig/uv/gender-harmony/2022Sep/model.html#linked-clinical-observation
Related Page(s):	Model
Related Section(s):	3.2.3.1.4
Grouping:	SFCU
Change Category:	Correction

Description

Existing Wording:

Link or identifier to observation(s) or report(s)

Proposed Wording:

Link to, or identifier of observation(s) or report(s)

(Comment 27 - imported by: Lloyd McKenzie)

Comments

Comment by [Jira Admin](#) [2022-10-15]

Imported from spreadsheet by lloyd - comment #27

[OTHER-2584] **Provide example of two concurrent different SFCU** Created: 2022-10-15 Updated: 2022-10-20

Status:	Triaged		
Project:	Other Specification Feedback	value options?	
Type:	Change Request	Priority:	Highest
Reporter:	Ron G. Parker	Assignee:	Unassigned
Resolution:	Unresolved		

Issue Links:	Vote is voted on by BALLOT-44004 Affirmative - Ron G. Parker : 2022-Se... Balloted		
Specification:	Cross-Paradigm Gender Harmony (OTHER)		
Raised in Version:	1.0.0-ballot		
Work Group:	Vocabulary		
Related URL:	http://hl7.org/xprod/ig/uv/gender-harmony/2022Sep/model.html#sex-for-clinical-use-sfcu		
Related Page(s):	Model		
Related Section(s):	3.2.3		
Grouping:	SFCU		
Change Category:	Enhancement		

Description

Please expand this example to show a case when two SFCU could concurrently apply (radiation shielding based on one SFCU, anesthetic dose based on another SFCU?)

Existing Wording:

For example an SFCU value and linked comment or specific observation could be summarized as "male, based on hormonal measurement."

(Comment 26 - imported by: Lloyd McKenzie)

Comments

Comment by [Jira Admin](#) [2022-10-15]

Imported from spreadsheet by lloyd - comment #26

[OTHER-2583] Confirm SFCU multiplicity Created: 2022-10-15 Updated: 2022-10-20

Status:	Triaged
Project:	Other Specification Feedback miscellaneous

Type:	Change Request	Priority:	Highest
Reporter:	Ron G. Parker	Assignee:	Unassigned
Resolution:	Unresolved		

Issue Links:	Vote is voted on by BALLOT-44003 Affirmative - Ron G. Parker : 2022-Se... Balloted
Specification:	Cross-Paradigm Gender Harmony (OTHER)
Raised in Version:	1.0.0-ballot
Work Group:	Vocabulary
Related URL:	http://hl7.org/xprod/ig/uv/gender-harmony/2022Sep/model.html#sex-for-clinical-use-sfcu
Related Page(s):	Model
Related Section(s):	3.2.3
Grouping:	SFCU
Change Category:	Enhancement

Description

Change to "restrictions on this element for specific protocols..."

I envision that there are protocols and target where SFCU is irrelevant, as well as the above-mentioned administrative use. Can SFCU be constrained to 0..0?

(Also "site specific" should be hyphenated.)

Existing Wording:

There may be restrictions on specific protocols or for specific targets. The value multiplicity for a specific protocol or target may be 1..1 or 0..1.

(Comment 25 - imported by: Lloyd McKenzie)

Comments

Comment by [Jira Admin](#) [2022-10-15]

Imported from spreadsheet by lloyd - comment #25

[OTHER-2582] SFCU definition and usage should be more forward looking. Created: 2022-10-15 Updated: 2022-10-20

Status:	Triaged
Project:	Other Specification Feedback miscellaneous

Type:	Change Request	Priority:	Highest
Reporter:	Ron G. Parker	Assignee:	Unassigned

Resolution:	Unresolved
Issue Links:	Vote is voted on by BALLOT-44002 Affirmative - Ron G. Parker : 2022-Se... Balloted
Specification:	Cross-Paradigm Gender Harmony (OTHER)
Raised in Version:	1.0.0-ballot
Work Group:	Vocabulary
Related URL:	http://hl7.org/xprod/ig/uv/gender-harmony/2022Sep/model.html#sex-for-clinical-use-sfcu
Related Page(s):	Model
Related Section(s):	3.2.3
Grouping:	SFCU
Change Category:	Correction

Description

This definition focuses on where the determination of sex comes from. Similarly, the usage note focuses on using SFCU to help interpret observations. Both definition and useage note text should be corrected to better encompass the forward-looking or contemporaneous use of the element for choosing or providing appropriate care in particular contexts.

Also applied to 3.2.3.1.1 definition

Existing Wording:

Definition: A categorization of sex derived from observable information such as an organ inventory, recent hormone lab tests, genetic testing, menstrual status, obstetric history, etc.

(Comment 24 - imported by: Lloyd McKenzie)

Comments

Comment by [Jira Admin](#) [2022-10-15]

Imported from spreadsheet by lloyd - comment #24

[OTHER-2581] Unclear SFCU expectations Created: 2022-10-15 Updated: 2022-10-20

Status:	Triaged		
Project:	Other Specification Feedback miscellaneous		
Type:	Change Request	Priority:	Highest
Reporter:	Ron G. Parker	Assignee:	Unassigned
Resolution:	Unresolved		

Issue Links:	Vote is voted on by BALLOT-44001 Affirmative - Ron G. Parker : 2022-Se... Balloted
Specification:	Cross-Paradigm Gender Harmony (OTHER)
Raised in Version:	1.0.0-ballot
Work Group:	Vocabulary
Related URL:	http://hl7.org/xprod/ig/uv/gender-harmony/2022Sep/model.html#sex-for-clinical-use-sfcu
Related Page(s):	Model
Related Section(s):	3.2.3
Grouping:	SFCU
Change Category:	Correction

Description

Existing wording is clunky and may suggest copying patient-level SFCU to each observation. I think the intent of this statement is that a SFCU assertion at the patient level is assumed to cover all observations (within the validity period) unless an observation-specific SFCU assertion exists. Tighten up existing wording.

Existing Wording:

The expectation is that the patient level SFCU is the default value used in all observations in a report and have an individual SFCU for individual observations when that observation was performed using a different SFCU.

(Comment 23 - imported by: Lloyd McKenzie)

Comments

Comment by [Jira Admin](#) [2022-10-15]

Imported from spreadsheet by lloyd - comment #23

[OTHER-2578] SFCU "should be omitted" for administrative use Created: 2022-10-15 Updated: 2022-10-20

Status:	Triaged
Project:	Other Specification Feedback miscellaneous

Type:	Change Request	Priority:	Highest
Reporter:	Ron G. Parker	Assignee:	Unassigned
Resolution:	Unresolved		

Issue Links:	Vote is voted on by BALLOT-43998 Affirmative - Ron G. Parker : 2022-Se... Balloted
Specification:	Cross-Paradigm Gender Harmony (OTHER)
Raised in Version:	1.0.0-ballot
Work Group:	Vocabulary
Related URL:	http://hl7.org/xprod/ig/uv/gender-harmony/2022Sep/model.html#sex-for-clinical-use-sfcu
Related Page(s):	Model
Related Section(s):	3.2.3
Grouping:	SFCU
Change Category:	Correction

Description

Since there isn't a well defined use, and it may reveal more than the patient wishes to, should this read "should be omitted"?

Existing Wording:

such as administrative activities, SFCU is not well defined and can be omitted

(Comment 20 - imported by: Lloyd McKenzie)

Comments

Comment by [Jira Admin](#) [2022-10-15]

Imported from spreadsheet by lloyd - comment #20

[OTHER-2621] Consider whether SFCU terminology should be expanded to address use cases in, for example, psychiatry Created: 2022-10-15

Updated: 2022-10-20

Status:	Triaged	value options
Project:	Other Specification Feedback	

Type:	Change Request	Priority:	Highest
Reporter:	Ron G. Parker	Assignee:	Unassigned
Resolution:	Unresolved		

Issue Links:	Vote is voted on by BALLOT-44041 Affirmative - Ron G. Parker : 2022-Se... Balloted
Specification:	Cross-Paradigm Gender Harmony (OTHER)
Raised in Version:	1.0.0-ballot
Work Group:	Vocabulary
Related URL:	http://hl7.org/xprod/ig/uv/gender-harmony/2022Sep/model.html#sex-for-clinical-use-sfcu
Related Page(s):	Model
Related Section(s):	3.2.3
Grouping:	SFCU
Change Category:	Clarification

Description

For many clinical uses limiting sex to male or female (or specified) makes sense – drugs are dosed for, or appropriate for males and females differently; radiation shielding must be placed differently; baseline lab results may differ; surgery will depend on specific organs. However, in psychiatry and similar situations, might there be a need for more nuanced SFCU? I understand the need for a small selection of SFCU values to drive decision making, and that using values other than M/F in contexts where the only reasonable SFCUs are M/F will cause confusion; however, please consider whether the SFCU valueset should be expanded

(Comment 63 - imported by: Lloyd McKenzie)

Comments

Comment by [Jira Admin](#) [2022-10-15]

Imported from spreadsheet by lloyd - comment #63

[OTHER-2625] link missing Created: 2022-10-15 Updated: 2022-10-20

Status:	Triaged	miscellaneous
Project:	Other Specification Feedback	

Type:	Change Request	Priority:	Highest
Reporter:	Ron G. Parker	Assignee:	Unassigned
Resolution:	Unresolved		

Issue Links:	Vote is voted on by BALLOT-44045 Affirmative - Ron G. Parker : 2022-Se... Balloted
Specification:	Cross-Paradigm Gender Harmony (OTHER)
Raised in Version:	1.0.0-ballot
Work Group:	Vocabulary

Related URL:	http://hl7.org/xprod/ig/uv/gender-harmony/2022Sep/model.html#sex-for-clinical-use-sfcu
Related Page(s):	Model
Related Section(s):	3.2.3
Grouping:	SFCU
Change Category:	Correction

Description

2nd paragraph is missing a link - note says to insert link to Use Case landing page in IG.

(Comment 67 - imported by: Lloyd McKenzie)

Comments

Comment by [Jira Admin](#) [2022-10-15]

Imported from spreadsheet by lloyd - comment #67

[OTHER-2627] consistency issue with SFCU descriptions Created: 2022-10-15 Updated: 2022-10-20

Status:	Triaged
Project:	Other Specification Feedback miscellaneous

Type:	Change Request	Priority:	Highest
Reporter:	Ron G. Parker	Assignee:	Unassigned
Resolution:	Unresolved		

Issue Links:	Vote is voted on by BALLOT-44047 Affirmative - Ron G. Parker : 2022-Se... Balloted
Specification:	Cross-Paradigm Gender Harmony (OTHER)
Raised in Version:	1.0.0-ballot
Work Group:	Vocabulary
Related URL:	http://hl7.org/xprod/ig/uv/gender-harmony/2022Sep/design.html#design-considerations
Related Page(s):	Design Considerations
Related Section(s):	4
Grouping:	SFCU
Change Category:	Clarification

Description

For SFCU, the column where it says Specific allowed set of values only - For V2 it says 'No, as it is a Required binding', Should this be 'Yes, as it is a Required binding'. Doesn't a Required binding only allowed for a specific set of values.

(Comment 69 - imported by: Lloyd McKenzie)

Comments

Comment by [Jira Admin](#) [2022-10-15]

Imported from spreadsheet by lloyd - comment #69

[OTHER-2615] ServiceRequest and Procedure should be listed as first-class targets for SFCU Created: 2022-10-15 Updated: 2022-10-20

Status:	Triaged		
Project:	Other Specification Feedback	miscellaneous	
Type:	Change Request	Priority:	Highest
Reporter:	Ron G. Parker	Assignee:	Unassigned
Resolution:	Unresolved		

Issue Links:	Vote is voted on by BALLOT-44035 Affirmative - Ron G. Parker : 2022-Se... Balloted		
Specification:	Cross-Paradigm Gender Harmony (OTHER)		
Raised in Version:	1.0.0-ballot		
Work Group:	Vocabulary		
Related URL:	http://hl7.org/xprod/ig/uv/gender-harmony/2022Sep/fhrgenderharmony.html#explicit-decisions		
Related Page(s):	FHIR Gender Harmony		
Related Section(s):	11.3.1		
Grouping:	SFCU		
Change Category:	Clarification		

Description

Please include ServiceRequest in one of those lists, as it is important for providing context for the to-be-performed procedure. Also include Procedure.

Existing Wording:

The Sex for Clinical Use extension is available on all FHIR resource types; however, it is intended for use on clinical resource types (e.g., DiagnosticReport, Observation), and enclosing contextual resources (e.g., Encounter, EpisodeOfCare, Patient).

(Comment 57 - imported by: Lloyd McKenzie)

Comments

Comment by [Jira Admin](#) [2022-10-15]


Imported from spreadsheet by lloyd - comment #57

End of SFCU issues from Canada reported by RP

[FHIR-39001] Need to include an element that captures the source for this information Created: 2022-10-12 Updated: 2022-12-07 Resolved: 2022-12-07

Status:	Duplicate		
Project:	FHIR Specification Feedback		
Type:	Change Request	Priority:	Medium
Reporter:	Rob McClure	Assignee:	Unassigned
Resolution:	Persuasive with Modification		

Issue Links:	Duplicate duplicates FHIR-39246 Gender identity as self-reported vs. ... Triaged is duplicated by FHIR-39246 Gender identity as self-reported vs. ... Triaged Vote is voted on by BALLOT-41691 Negative - Rob McClure : 2022-Sep-FHI... Balloted		
Specification:	FHIR Core (FHIR)		
Raised in Version:	R5		
Work Group:	Patient Administration		

Outstanding Negatives:	STU
Related URL:	http://hl7.org/fhir/StructureDefinition/individual-genderIdentity
Related Artifact(s):	Patient
Grouping:	GH-Core, GHP, GI
Duplicate Issue:	 FHIR-39246 Gender identity as self-reported vs. reported by proxy

Description

While we expect gender identity to be provided by the individual there could be situations where the information captured came from a different source. One situation is in a death certificate where this information may come from a source that is not a legal document of the decedents decision. Note that the provenance resource can not be linked to a specific element so that will not work. This issue needs to be addressed for all resources that use this extension even though the death certificate example may not apply for all resources,.

Comments

Comment by Cooper Thompson [2022-10-17]
There is an extension you can use in Provenance.target to document Provenance for a specific element: https://build.fhir.org/extension-targetelement.html
Comment by Cooper Thompson [2022-10-19]
Rob McClure - does my suggestion to use the targetElement on Provenance address your concern here?
Comment by Rob McClure [2022-10-19]
I think this does. What we need to do its create some examples for Gender Identity - Mother as source, perhaps even another document if that is better than using RSG?
Comment by Rob McClure [2022-10-19]
But... When I look at Provenance I'm struggling a bit on how to use this to note that GI value came from a parent and then some other documented source. Seems it must be in the Agent section . What do you think?
Comment by Rob McClure [2022-10-19]
For a mother as source: Agent.type = Informant Agent.who = RelatedPerson.relationship = MTH
Comment by Rob McClure [2022-11-21]
See comments

[OTHER-2558] [Context for Sex for Clinical Use](#) Created: 2022-10-15 Updated: 2022-10-28

Status:	Triaged		
Project:	Other Specification Feedback		
Type:	Change Request	Priority:	Highest
Reporter:	Reuben Daniels	Assignee:	Unassigned
Resolution:	Unresolved		

Specification:	Cross-Paradigm Gender Harmony (OTHER)
Raised in Version:	1.0.0-ballot
Work Group:	Vocabulary
Related URL:	http://hl7.org/xprod/ig/uv/gender-harmony/2022Sep/model.html
Related Page(s):	Model
Related Section(s):	3
Grouping:	SFCU

Description

More information should be provided in relation to the context of use for the Sex for Clinical Use element including attaching it to a patient vs procedure, condition, etc.

[OTHER-2461] [Gender Harmony in Clinical Trials](#) Created: 2022-10-11 Updated: 2022-10-20

Status:	Triaged
Project:	Other Specification Feedback

Type:	Question	Priority:	Medium
Reporter:	Mitra Rocca	Assignee:	Unassigned
Resolution:	Unresolved		

Issue Links:	Vote		
	is voted on by	BALLOT-41632	Affirmative - Mitra Rocca : 2022-Sep-... Balloted
	is voted on by	BALLOT-42522	Affirmative - Jose Galvez : 2022-Sep-... Balloted
	is voted on by	BALLOT-42528	Affirmative - Norman Gregory : 2022-S... Balloted
	is voted on by	BALLOT-42534	Affirmative - Edward Bearden : 2022-S... Balloted
	is voted on by	BALLOT-42540	Affirmative - Amy Malla : 2022-Sep-HL... Balloted
	is voted on by	BALLOT-42546	Affirmative - Marti Velezis : 2022-Se... Balloted
	is voted on by	BALLOT-42552	Affirmative - Konstantinos Makrodimit... Balloted
	is voted on by	BALLOT-42558	Affirmative - Elaine Johanson : 2022-... Balloted
	is voted on by	BALLOT-42594	Affirmative - John Hassenplug : 2022-... Balloted
	is voted on by	BALLOT-42600	Affirmative - William Hess : 2022-Sep... Balloted
	is voted on by	BALLOT-42606	Affirmative - Ronald Claros : 2022-Se... Balloted
	is voted on by	BALLOT-42646	Affirmative - Virginia Hussong : 2022... Balloted
Specification:	Cross-Paradigm Gender Harmony (OTHER)		
Raised in Version:	1.0.0-ballot		
Work Group:	Vocabulary		
Related Page(s):	Background		
Grouping:	SFCU		

Description

How would sex for clinical use be used in the context of a clinical trial in which it may be important to know biological sex at birth as well as hormonal status.

[OTHER-2460] [Sex and Gender in medical product labels](#) Created: 2022-10-11 Updated: 2022-10-20

Status:	Triaged
Project:	Other Specification Feedback

Type:	Question	Priority:	Medium
Reporter:	Mitra Rocca	Assignee:	Unassigned
Resolution:	Unresolved		

Issue Links:	Vote			
	is voted on by	BALLOT-41631	Affirmative - Mitra Rocca : 2022-Sep-...	Balloted
	is voted on by	BALLOT-42523	Affirmative - Jose Galvez : 2022-Sep-...	Balloted
	is voted on by	BALLOT-42529	Affirmative - Norman Gregory : 2022-S...	Balloted
	is voted on by	BALLOT-42535	Affirmative - Edward Bearden : 2022-S...	Balloted
	is voted on by	BALLOT-42541	Affirmative - Amy Malla : 2022-Sep-HL...	Balloted
	is voted on by	BALLOT-42547	Affirmative - Marti Velezis : 2022-Se...	Balloted
	is voted on by	BALLOT-42553	Affirmative - Konstantinos Makrodimit...	Balloted
	is voted on by	BALLOT-42559	Affirmative - Elaine Johanson : 2022-...	Balloted
	is voted on by	BALLOT-42595	Affirmative - John Hassenplug : 2022-...	Balloted
	is voted on by	BALLOT-42601	Affirmative - William Hess : 2022-Sep...	Balloted
	is voted on by	BALLOT-42607	Affirmative - Ronald Claros : 2022-Se...	Balloted
	is voted on by	BALLOT-42647	Affirmative - Virginia Hussong : 2022...	Balloted
Specification:	Cross-Paradigm Gender Harmony (OTHER)			
Raised in Version:	1.0.0-ballot			
Work Group:	Vocabulary			
Related Page(s):	Background			
Grouping:	SFCU			

Description

How would sex for clinical use be used in a clinical setting in which a product label cites a sex difference in safety or efficacy?

[OTHER-2457] Type and Values for Recorded Sex and Gender Created: 2022-10-11 Updated: 2022-11-17

Status:	Triaged
Project:	Other Specification Feedback

Type:	Change Request	Priority:	Highest
Reporter:	Marti Velezis	Assignee:	Unassigned
Resolution:	Unresolved		

Issue Links:	Vote			
	is voted on by	BALLOT-41627	Negative - Mitra Rocca : 2022-Sep-HL7...	Balloted
	is voted on by	BALLOT-42526	Negative - Jose Galvez : 2022-Sep-HL7...	Balloted
	is voted on by	BALLOT-42532	Negative - Norman Gregory : 2022-Sep-...	Balloted
	is voted on by	BALLOT-42538	Negative - Edward Bearden : 2022-Sep-...	Balloted
	is voted on by	BALLOT-42544	Negative - Amy Malla : 2022-Sep-HL7 I...	Balloted
	is voted on by	BALLOT-42550	Negative - Marti Velezis : 2022-Sep-H...	Balloted
	is voted on by	BALLOT-42556	Negative - Konstantinos Makrodimitris...	Balloted
	is voted on by	BALLOT-42562	Negative - Elaine Johanson : 2022-Sep...	Balloted
	is voted on by	BALLOT-42598	Negative - John Hassenplug : 2022-Sep...	Balloted
	is voted on by	BALLOT-42604	Negative - William Hess : 2022-Sep-HL...	Balloted
	is voted on by	BALLOT-42610	Negative - Ronald Claros : 2022-Sep-H...	Balloted
	is voted on by	BALLOT-42650	Negative - Virginia Hussong : 2022-Se...	Balloted
Specification:	Cross-Paradigm Gender Harmony (OTHER)			
Raised in Version:	1.0.0-ballot			

Work Group:	Vocabulary
Outstanding Negatives:	STU
Related Page(s):	Recorded Sex or Gender Sex for Clinical Use
Grouping:	GHP, RSG, SFCU
Request in-person:	Marti Velezis

Description

When referencing the type with LOINC codes - which do not always include the same answer values as in the FHIR value set. This is confusing.

Also, not having a clear distinction in type for "sex" and "sex assigned at birth" can lead to confusion and/or misuse of these types.

Leaving so much variation in how to represent the sex and gender concepts - is negating the need for the guide. Consider more constraints if these concepts are to be used for interoperability - as there are many clinical uses of this data with regulated medical products that need to be considered.

[OTHER-2456] Sex for Clinical Use value set consider adding "intersex" value Created: 2022-10-11 Updated: 2022-10-20

Status:	Triaged
Project:	Other Specification Feedback

Type:	Change Request	Priority:	Highest
Reporter:	Marti Velezis	Assignee:	Unassigned
Resolution:	Unresolved		

Issue Links:	Vote		
	is voted on by	BALLOT-41626	Negative - Mitra Rocca : 2022-Sep-HL7... Balloted
	is voted on by	BALLOT-42527	Negative - Jose Galvez : 2022-Sep-HL7... Balloted
	is voted on by	BALLOT-42533	Negative - Norman Gregory : 2022-Sep-... Balloted
	is voted on by	BALLOT-42539	Negative - Edward Bearden : 2022-Sep-... Balloted
	is voted on by	BALLOT-42545	Negative - Amy Malla : 2022-Sep-HL7 I... Balloted
	is voted on by	BALLOT-42551	Negative - Marti Velezis : 2022-Sep-H... Balloted
	is voted on by	BALLOT-42557	Negative - Konstantinos Makrodimitis... Balloted
	is voted on by	BALLOT-42563	Negative - Elaine Johanson : 2022-Sep... Balloted
	is voted on by	BALLOT-42599	Negative - John Hassenplug : 2022-Sep... Balloted
	is voted on by	BALLOT-42605	Negative - William Hess : 2022-Sep-HL... Balloted
	is voted on by	BALLOT-42611	Negative - Ronald Claros : 2022-Sep-H... Balloted
	is voted on by	BALLOT-42651	Negative - Virginia Hussong : 2022-Se... Balloted
Specification:	Cross-Paradigm Gender Harmony (OTHER)		
Raised in Version:	1.0.0-ballot		
Work Group:	Vocabulary		
Outstanding Negatives:	STU		
Related Page(s):	FHIR Gender Harmony		
Grouping:	SFCU		
Request in-person:	Marti Velezis		

Description

Consider adding a value to capture "intersex" so that it is available in the required value set for Sex for Clinical Use (<http://terminology.hl7.org/ValueSet/sex-for-clinical-use>)

[OTHER-2490] [Repeating GSC is a problem](#) Created: 2022-10-13 Updated: 2022-10-31

Status:	Triaged
Project:	Other Specification Feedback

Type:	Change Request	Priority:	Highest
Reporter:	Kathy Walsh	Assignee:	Unassigned
Resolution:	Unresolved		

Issue Links:	Vote		
	is voted on by	BALLOT-41784	Negative - Kathy Walsh : 2022-Sep-HL7... Balloted
	is voted on by	BALLOT-42377	Negative - Donna Carter : 2022-Sep-HL... Balloted
Specification:	Cross-Paradigm Gender Harmony (OTHER)		
Raised in Version:	1.0.0-ballot		
Work Group:	Vocabulary		
Outstanding Negatives:	STU		
Related URL:	http://hl7.org/xprod/ig/uv/gender-harmony/2022Sep/terminology.html#sex-for-clinial-use-sfcu		
Related Page(s):	Terminology		
Related Section(s):	13.4 Sex For Clinial Use (SFCU)		
Grouping:	GH-V2, GHP, SFCU		

Description

Laboratory results are used in 70% of medical decisions according to the CDC: "Each year, 70% of medical decisions depend on 14 billion laboratory tests [Ready? Set? Test! Patient Testing is Important. Get the Right Results. | CDC][https://urldefense.com/v3/_https://www.cdc.gov/csels/dls/lcn/ready-set-test-campaign.html_!!BS-MXwli!F1Db27pbVK91rEm2qRH8iJnTQYfj3kP2QptqHjnnMmg3vxnj7zIDZynzoWb874CiORJ4zunWMIGDE_s2qgn3cioLKFNIrg\\$](https://urldefense.com/v3/_https://www.cdc.gov/csels/dls/lcn/ready-set-test-campaign.html_!!BS-MXwli!F1Db27pbVK91rEm2qRH8iJnTQYfj3kP2QptqHjnnMmg3vxnj7zIDZynzoWb874CiORJ4zunWMIGDE_s2qgn3cioLKFNIrg$)"

Laboratory results are integral to providing quality patient care. The premise of the Sex for Clinical Use (SfCU) concept is an industry path forward, however there must be alternative solutions in the interim.

US Realm laboratories are subject to the Clinical Laboratory Improvement Amendments of 1988 (CLIA). "Sex" (singular) is required by CLIA to be included in a laboratory test request, per §493.1241(c)(3), even if there are multiple tests ordered §493.1241(c)(4).

(3) The sex and age or date of birth of the patient.

(4) The test(s) to be performed.

Laboratories have used HL7 V2 for decades which supports a single value: PID-8 'Sex' until V2.4 in 2000 HL7 relabeled to "Administrative Sex".

It would be a substantive change requiring significant development by laboratories to support SfCU at the order level. This change is not backwardly compatible with prior versions of HL7 as it directly and materially affects the use of the HL7 Version 2 standard for laboratories. [ANSI 2022 Essential Requirements](#), Annex A: Definitions, Substantive Change: A substantive change in a proposed American National Standard is one that directly and materially affects the use of the standard. Examples of substantive changes are below: - "shall" to "should" or "should" to "shall"; - addition, deletion or revision of requirements, regardless of the number of changes; - addition of mandatory compliance with referenced standards

[OTHER-2414] [SFCU Capitalization Consistency](#) Created: 2022-10-06 Updated: 2022-10-20

Status:	Triaged
Project:	Other Specification Feedback

Type:	Technical Correction	Priority:	Highest
Reporter:	Kathy Walsh	Assignee:	Unassigned

Resolution:	Unresolved
Issue Links:	Vote is voted on by BALLOT-41581 Affirmative - Ulrike Merrick : 2022-S... Balloted
Specification:	Cross-Paradigm Gender Harmony (OTHER)
Raised in Version:	1.0.0-ballot
Work Group:	Vocabulary
Related URL:	http://hl7.org/xprod/ig/uv/gender-harmony/2022Sep/model.html
Related Page(s):	Model
Related Section(s):	3.2.3
Grouping:	SFCU

Description

Please be consistent in capitalizing SFCU instead of SfCU, Sfcu, or any other variation.

[OTHER-2511] [CDA Sex for Clinical Use - Unclear Sentence](#) Created: 2022-10-14 Updated: 2022-11-12

Status:	Triaged		
Project:	Other Specification Feedback		
Type:	Change Request	Priority:	Highest
Reporter:	Gay Dolin	Assignee:	Unassigned
Resolution:	Unresolved		

Issue Links:	Vote is voted on by BALLOT-41810 Negative - Gay Dolin : 2022-Sep-HL7 I... Balloted
Specification:	Cross-Paradigm Gender Harmony (OTHER)
Raised in Version:	1.0.0-ballot
Work Group:	Vocabulary
Outstanding Negatives:	STU
Related URL:	http://hl7.org/xprod/ig/uv/gender-harmony/2022Sep/cdagenderharmony.html#cda-gender-harmony
Related Page(s):	CDA Gender Harmony
Grouping:	GH-CDA, GHP, SFCU

Description

- I don't know what this sentence means, "

Note that the order concept in CDA is referenced by the somewhat concise Order class, which, being in the header, does not support SFCU."

Are you referring to AdministrativeGenderCode in the Header?

Comments

Comment by [Jay Lyle](#) [2022-11-12]

How about

Note that the order concept in CDA is ~~referenced~~ **represented** by the ~~somewhat concise~~ Order class. ~~which, being~~ **Since the Order class** is in the header, **it cannot be referenced by the** ~~does not support~~ SFCU entry.

[OTHER-2510] CDA Recorded Sex or Gender - Sex for Clinical Use SPRT actRelationshipType is "Has Support" <small>Created: 2022-10-14 Updated: 2022-12-07</small>			
Status:	Triaged		
Project:	Other Specification Feedback		
Type:	Technical Correction	Priority:	Highest
Reporter:	Gay Dolin	Assignee:	Unassigned
Resolution:	Unresolved		
Issue Links:	Vote is voted on by BALLOT-41809 Affirmative - Gay Dolin : 2022-Sep-HL... Balloted		
Specification:	Cross-Paradigm Gender Harmony (OTHER)		
Raised in Version:	1.0.0-ballot		
Work Group:	Vocabulary		
Related URL:	http://hl7.org/xprod/ig/uv/gender-harmony/2022Sep/cdagenderharmony.html#cda-gender-harmony		
Related Page(s):	CDA Gender Harmony		
Grouping:	GH-CDA, GHP, SFCU		

Description

SPRT actRelationshipType is "Has Support" not "Support"

Comments

Comment by Jay Lyle [2022-11-12]
Agree
Comment by Sean Muir [2022-12-07]
In such a case the relevant specification SHOULD be associated with the SFCU as "support" ("SPRT"). to In such a case the relevant specification SHOULD be associated with the SFCU as "has support" ("SPRT").

[OTHER-2494] Better example for A person with BRCA2 mutations <small>Created: 2022-10-13 Updated: 2022-10-20</small>			
Status:	Triaged		
Project:	Other Specification Feedback		
Type:	Change Request	Priority:	Highest
Reporter:	Gay Dolin	Assignee:	Unassigned
Resolution:	Unresolved		
Issue Links:	Vote is voted on by BALLOT-41791 Negative - Gay Dolin : 2022-Sep-HL7 I... Balloted		
Specification:	Cross-Paradigm Gender Harmony (OTHER)		
Raised in Version:	1.0.0-ballot		
Work Group:	Vocabulary		
Outstanding Negatives:	STU		
Related URL:	http://hl7.org/xprod/ig/uv/gender-harmony/2022Sep/model.html#sex-for-clinical-use-sfcu		
Related Page(s):	Model		
Grouping:	SFCU		

Description

- Better example for A person with BRCA2 mutations can be identified so that a screening mammography order is properly performed.
- BRCA + in men screening: <https://www.breastcancer.org/research-news/brca-mutations-up-cancer-risk-in-men> and <https://www.auajournals.org/doi/full/10.1016/j.juro.2017.02.385>
- BRCA Screening in women: https://www.cdc.gov/genomics/disease/breast_ovarian_cancer/medical_options.htm (and mentioned men too)

[V2-25418] [Revise text for OML laboratory orders](#) Created: 2022-10-14 Updated: 2022-11-08

Status:	Triaged
Project:	V2 Specification Feedback

Type:	Change Request	Priority:	Highest
Reporter:	Freida Hall	Assignee:	Unassigned
Resolution:	Unresolved		

Issue Links:	Vote		
	is voted on by	BALLOT-42001	Negative - Freida Hall : 2022-Sep-V29... Balloted
	is voted on by	BALLOT-42318	Negative - John Tataseo : 2022-Sep-V2... Balloted
	is voted on by	BALLOT-42320	Negative - Carolyn Houswerth : 2022-S... Balloted
	is voted on by	BALLOT-42322	Negative - Ravi Singh : 2022-Sep-V291... Balloted
	is voted on by	BALLOT-42324	Negative - Rebecca Parsons : 2022-Sep... Balloted
	is voted on by	BALLOT-42326	Negative - Sean Carvin : 2022-Sep-V29... Balloted
	is voted on by	BALLOT-42328	Negative - Rob Lindsey : 2022-Sep-V29... Balloted
	is voted on by	BALLOT-42331	Negative - Alexandra Tokarchuk : 2022... Balloted
	is voted on by	BALLOT-42333	Negative - Michael Zufall : 2022-Sep-... Balloted
	is voted on by	BALLOT-42338	Negative - Teresa Brannum : 2022-Sep-... Balloted
	is voted on by	BALLOT-42349	Negative - Falguni Patel : 2022-Sep-V... Balloted
	is voted on by	BALLOT-42351	Negative - Paul Mitas : 2022-Sep-V291... Balloted
	is voted on by	BALLOT-42353	Negative - Scott Chapin : 2022-Sep-V2... Balloted
	is voted on by	BALLOT-42355	Negative - Ricardo Garcia : 2022-Sep-... Balloted
Specification:	V2.x Message Specification (V2)		
Raised in Version:	V2.9.1		
Work Group:	Infrastructure & Messaging		
Outstanding Negatives:	Normative		
Related URL:	http://www.hl7.org/documentcenter/public/ballots/2022SEP/downloads/V291_R1_N1_2022SEP.zip		
Related Artifact(s):	Laboratory order message (OML)		
Related Page(s):	Orders (Chapter 4)		
Related Section(s):	4.4.6, 4.4.8, 4.4.10, 4.4.12		
Grouping:	GH-V2, GHP, SFCU		
Request in-person:	Freida Hall		

Description

This comment is related to [V2-25413](#) but is specific to the functionality to support the GSC Sex for Clinical Use segment in Laboratory orders (OML) or results.

Laboratory results are used in 70% of medical decisions according to the CDC: "Each year, 70% of medical decisions depend on 14 billion laboratory tests [Ready? Set? Test! Patient Testing is Important. Get the Right Results. | CDC|[\[https://jira.hl7.org/sr/jira.issueviews:searchrequest-fullcontent/temp/SearchRequest.html?jqlQuery=project+%3D+FHIR+AND+%28Related+URL"+...\]\(https://jira.hl7.org/sr/jira.issueviews:searchrequest-fullcontent/temp/SearchRequest.html?jqlQuery=project+%3D+FHIR+AND+%28Related+URL\) 38/44](https://urldefense.com/v3/_https://www.cdc.gov/csels/dls/lcn/ready-</p>
</div>
<div data-bbox=)

set-test-campaign.html_!!BS-MXwliiF1Db27pbVK91rEm2qRH8iJnTQYfj3kP2QptqqHjnnMmg3vxnj7zIDZynzoWb874CiORJ4zunWMIGDE_s2qgn3cioLKFNIrg\$]"

Laboratory results are integral to providing quality patient care. The premise of the Sex for Clinical Use (SfCU) concept is an industry path forward, however **there must be alternative solutions in the interim.**

US Realm laboratories are subject to the Clinical Laboratory Improvement Amendments of 1988 (CLIA). "Sex" (singular) is required by CLIA to be included in a laboratory test request, per §493.1241(c)(3), even if there are multiple tests ordered §493.1241(c)(4).

(3) The sex and age or date of birth of the patient.

(4) The test(s) to be performed.

Laboratories have used HL7 V2 for decades which supports a single value: PID-8 'Sex' until V2.4 in 2000 HL7 relabeled to "Administrative Sex".

It would be a substantive change requiring significant development by laboratories to support SfCU at the order (or result) level. This change is not backwardly compatible with prior versions of HL7 as it directly and materially affects the use of the HL7 Version 2 standard for laboratories. [ANSI 2022 Essential Requirements](#), Annex A: Definitions, Substantive Change: A substantive change in a proposed American National Standard is one that directly and materially affects the use of the standard. Examples of substantive changes are below: - "shall" to "should" or "should" to "shall"; - addition, deletion or revision of requirements, regardless of the number of changes; - addition of mandatory compliance with referenced standards

***Please add language to the OML Laboratory Orders messages; *suggested text:** "Local jurisdictions, regulatory requirements, or Business Associate agreements may necessitate an alternative solution to communicate the patient's genetic "sex for clinical use" for the purpose of laboratory tests and results."

[OTHER-2530] SfCU for laboratories (US Realm) Created: 2022-10-14 Updated: 2022-10-20

Status:	Triaged
Project:	Other Specification Feedback

Type:	Change Request	Priority:	Highest
Reporter:	Freida Hall	Assignee:	Unassigned
Resolution:	Unresolved		

Issue Links:	Vote		
	is voted on by	BALLOT-42118	Negative - Freida Hall : 2022-Sep-HL7... Balloted
	is voted on by	BALLOT-42378	Negative - John Tataseo : 2022-Sep-HL... Balloted
	is voted on by	BALLOT-42379	Negative - Carolyn Houswerth : 2022-S... Balloted
	is voted on by	BALLOT-42380	Negative - Ravi Singh : 2022-Sep-HL7 ... Balloted
	is voted on by	BALLOT-42381	Negative - Rebecca Parsons : 2022-Sep... Balloted
	is voted on by	BALLOT-42382	Negative - Sean Carvin : 2022-Sep-HL7... Balloted
	is voted on by	BALLOT-42383	Negative - Rob Lindsey : 2022-Sep-HL7... Balloted
	is voted on by	BALLOT-42384	Negative - Alexandra Tokarchuk : 2022... Balloted
	is voted on by	BALLOT-42385	Negative - Michael Zufall : 2022-Sep-... Balloted
	is voted on by	BALLOT-42593	Negative - Teresa Brannum : 2022-Sep-... Balloted
	is voted on by	BALLOT-42652	Negative - Falguni Patel : 2022-Sep-H... Balloted
	is voted on by	BALLOT-42653	Negative - Paul Mitas : 2022-Sep-HL7 ... Balloted
	is voted on by	BALLOT-42654	Negative - Scott Chapin : 2022-Sep-HL... Balloted
	is voted on by	BALLOT-42655	Negative - Ricardo Garcia : 2022-Sep-... Balloted
Specification:	Cross-Paradigm Gender Harmony (OTHER)		
Raised in Version:	1.0.0-ballot		
Work Group:	Vocabulary		
Outstanding Negatives:	STU		
Related URL:	http://hl7.org/xprod/ig/uv/gender-harmony/2022Sep/hl7v2genderharmony.html#introduction-to-v2		
Related Page(s):	Introduction to V2		

Grouping:	SFCU
Request in-person:	Freida Hall

Description

In the US, laboratory results are used in 70% of medical decisions according to the CDC: "Each year, 70% of medical decisions depend on 14 billion laboratory tests [Ready? Set? Test! Patient Testing is Important. Get the Right Results. |

CDC|https://urldefense.com/v3/_https://www.cdc.gov/csels/dls/lcn/ready-set-test-campaign.html_!!BS-MXwliiF1Db27pbVK91rEm2qRH8iJnTQYfj3kP2QptqqHjnnMmg3vxnj7zIDZynzoWb874CiORJ4zunWMIGDE_s2qgn3cioLKFNIrg\$]"

Laboratory results are integral to providing quality patient care. The premise of the Sex for Clinical Use (SfCU) concept is an industry path forward, however **there must be alternative solutions in the interim.**

US Realm laboratories are subject to the Clinical Laboratory Improvement Amendments of 1988 (CLIA). "Sex" (singular) is required by CLIA to be included in a laboratory test request, per §493.1241(c)(3), even if there are multiple tests ordered §493.1241(c)(4).

(3) The sex and age or date of birth of the patient.

(4) The test(s) to be performed.

Laboratories have used HL7 V2 for decades which supports a single value: PID-8 'Sex' until V2.4 in 2000 HL7 relabeled to "Administrative Sex".

It would be a substantive change requiring significant development by laboratories to support SfCU at the order (or result) level. This change is not backwardly compatible with prior versions of HL7 as it directly and materially affects the use of the HL7 Version 2 standard for laboratories. [ANSI 2022 Essential Requirements](#), Annex A: Definitions, Substantive Change: A substantive change in a proposed American National Standard is one that directly and materially affects the use of the standard. Examples of substantive changes are below: - "shall" to "should" or "should" to "shall"; - addition, deletion or revision of requirements, regardless of the number of changes; - addition of mandatory compliance with referenced standards

{Please add language to the V2 Introduction (and other appropriate sections); **suggested text:** "Local jurisdictions, regulatory requirements, or Business Associate agreements may necessitate an alternative solution to communicate the patient's genetic "sex for clinical use" for the purpose of laboratory tests and results."

Comments

Comment by [Cooper Thompson](#) [2022-10-17]

Adding guidance seems reasonable. However, if labs are using PID-8 to drive medical decisions, those medical decisions are likely often wrong today (for certain subsets of patients, at least).

[OTHER-2547] SFCU v2, "specific allowed values only" Created: 2022-10-14 Updated: 2022-10-31

Status:	Triaged
Project:	Other Specification Feedback

Type:	Technical Correction	Priority:	Highest
Reporter:	Carmela A. Couderc	Assignee:	Unassigned
Resolution:	Unresolved		

Issue Links:	Vote is voted on by BALLOT-42171 Affirmative - Carmela A. Couderc : 20... Balloted
Specification:	Cross-Paradigm Gender Harmony (OTHER)
Raised in Version:	1.0.0-ballot
Work Group:	Vocabulary
Related URL:	http://hl7.org/xprod/ig/uv/gender-harmony/2022Sep/design.html#design-considerations
Related Page(s):	Design Considerations
Grouping:	GH-V2, GHP, SFCU

Description

SFCU table, V2 entry: "specific allowed set of values only" - the answer is "No, as it is Required binding" - wouldn't that mean there is a specific set of values only?

The answer should be yes.

[OTHER-2536] [SFCU to use for decision support](#) Created: 2022-10-14 Updated: 2022-10-20

Status:	Triaged
Project:	Other Specification Feedback

Type:	Technical Correction	Priority:	Highest
Reporter:	Carmela A. Couderc	Assignee:	Unassigned
Resolution:	Unresolved		

Issue Links:	Vote is voted on by BALLOT-42153 Affirmative - Carmela A. Couderc : 20... Balloted
Specification:	Cross-Paradigm Gender Harmony (OTHER)
Raised in Version:	1.0.0-ballot
Work Group:	Vocabulary
Related URL:	http://hl7.org/xprod/ig/uv/gender-harmony/2022Sep/background.html#sex-and-gender-reporting-in-payment-for-care
Related Page(s):	Sex and Gender Reporting in Payment for Care
Grouping:	SFCU

Description

There is useful information in this section, however which SFCU should be used for a patient for decision support? - e.g. finding patients to be considered for mammograms. Which SFCU would the algorithm use?

Consider adding a description of this use case to this section.

[OTHER-2546] [SFCU designated value set - link broken](#) Created: 2022-10-14 Updated: 2022-10-20

Status:	Triaged
Project:	Other Specification Feedback

Type:	Technical Correction	Priority:	Highest
Reporter:	Carmela A. Couderc	Assignee:	Unassigned
Resolution:	Unresolved		

Issue Links:	Vote is voted on by BALLOT-42170 Affirmative - Carmela A. Couderc : 20... Balloted
Specification:	Cross-Paradigm Gender Harmony (OTHER)
Raised in Version:	1.0.0-ballot
Work Group:	Vocabulary
Related URL:	http://hl7.org/xprod/ig/uv/gender-harmony/2022Sep/design.html#design-considerations
Related Page(s):	Design Considerations
Grouping:	SFCU

Description

SFCU designated value set link is broken

[OTHER-2545] [SFCU CDA value for "unknown"](#) Created: 2022-10-14 Updated: 2022-10-20

Status:	Triaged
Project:	Other Specification Feedback

Type:	Technical Correction	Priority:	Highest
Reporter:	Carmela A. Couderc	Assignee:	Unassigned
Resolution:	Unresolved		

Issue Links:	Vote is voted on by BALLOT-42169 Affirmative - Carmela A. Couderc : 20... Balloted		
Specification:	Cross-Paradigm Gender Harmony (OTHER)		
Raised in Version:	1.0.0-ballot		
Work Group:	Vocabulary		
Related URL:	http://hl7.org/xprod/ig/uv/gender-harmony/2022Sep/design.html#design-considerations		
Related Page(s):	Design Considerations		
Grouping:	SFCU		

Description

In the SFCU table, supporting the notion of unknown, the CDA column has a value of "included in value set" this doesn't seem right.

[OTHER-2552] [SFCU value references are inconsistent](#) Created: 2022-10-14 Updated: 2022-10-20

Status:	Triaged
Project:	Other Specification Feedback

Type:	Technical Correction	Priority:	Highest
Reporter:	Carmela A. Couderc	Assignee:	Unassigned
Resolution:	Unresolved		

Issue Links:	Vote is voted on by BALLOT-42176 Affirmative - Carmela A. Couderc : 20... Balloted		
Specification:	Cross-Paradigm Gender Harmony (OTHER)		
Raised in Version:	1.0.0-ballot		
Work Group:	Vocabulary		
Related URL:	http://hl7.org/xprod/ig/uv/gender-harmony/2022Sep/terminology.html#sex-for-clinial-use-sfcu		
Related Page(s):	Sex For Clinial Use (SFCU)		
Related Section(s):	13.4		
Grouping:	SFCU		

Description

I'm not sure I selected the right page, but this is in section 13.4

Current text:

In addition to M or F SFCU also provides an important additional value of Specified which is

The concept codes in the code system are female, male and specified (lower case).

Suggest changing to

In addition to **male** or **female**, SFCU also provides an important additional value of **specified** which is

[FHIR-38980] [sexForClinicalUse should be Patient resource specific](#) Created: 2022-10-12 Updated: 2022-12-07 Resolved: 2022-11-15

Status:	Triaged
Project:	FHIR Specification Feedback

Type:	Change Request	Priority:	Highest
Reporter:	Bas van den Heuvel	Assignee:	Unassigned
Resolution:	Not Persuasive		

Issue Links:	Vote			
	is voted on by	BALLOT-41688	Negative - Bas van den Heuvel : 2022-...	Balloted
	is voted on by	BALLOT-42719	Negative - Javier Espina : 2022-Sep-F...	Balloted
	is voted on by	BALLOT-42821	Negative - Chris Melo : 2022-Sep-FHIR...	Balloted
	is voted on by	BALLOT-42907	Negative - Bert Roos : 2022-Sep-FHIR ...	Balloted
	is voted on by	BALLOT-43224	Negative - Lissou Zhang : 2022-Sep-FH...	Balloted
	is voted on by	BALLOT-43341	Negative - Vadim Peretokin : 2022-Sep...	Balloted
	is voted on by	BALLOT-43781	Negative - David Simons : 2022-Sep-FH...	Balloted
	is voted on by	BALLOT-43923	Negative - Martin Rosner : 2022-Sep-F...	Balloted
Specification:	FHIR Core (FHIR)			
Raised in Version:	R5			
Work Group:	Vocabulary			
Outstanding Negatives:	STU			
Related URL:	https://build.fhir.org/extension-patient-sexforclinicaluse.html#			
Related Page(s):	Extension Registry			
Grouping:	GH-Core, GHP, Ready-for-main, SFCU			
Resolution Description:	As described in the SFCU section of the model, SFCU is context specific. The extension is enabled for non-Patient resources so that implementers can annotate clinical resources like Observation, DiagnosticReport, ServiceRequest, etc. with the sex for clinical use that should be used in that specific context.			

Description

This extension should be limited to Patient not for all resources and elements

Comments

Comment by [Lloyd McKenzie](#) [2022-10-17]

This is a gender question, which falls under the gender project

Generated at Fri Dec 09 18:50:57 UTC 2022 by Francis Lau using Jira 8.20.9#820009-sha1:3f676e980ac1d5cf6a703f13d6584c8f19f830d3.