

Q3. Did your WG achieve quorum for the majority of its sessions based on your WG's decision making practices?

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Yes	82.4%	28
No	17.6%	6
	answered question	34
	skipped question	0

Q4. Did your WG set objectives for the WGM?

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Yes	97.1%	33
No	2.9%	1
	answered question	34
	skipped question	0

Q5. If you answer N to question 4, please explain how you planned your meeting

Answer Options	Response Count
	2
answered question	2
skipped question	32
<i>we have reduced our sessions due to expected lower attendance</i>	
<i>Circumstances as they were, we had an interim co-chair, objectives were set outside the WGM.</i>	

Q6. Did your WG set any of the following specific objectives for the WGM? (choose all that apply)

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Ballot resolution	47.1%	16
Engagement with local/regional projects	11.8%	4
New project initiation	38.2%	13
Existing Project work/progress	91.2%	31
Existing Project status updates and sharing	88.2%	30
Joint meetings - engagement with other WGs	67.6%	23
Networking	58.8%	20
Comments		7
	answered question	34
	skipped question	0

Q7. Were you able to substantively accomplish your objectives and meeting business?

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Yes	94.1%	32
No	5.9%	2

Comments	7
answered question	34
skipped question	0

Q8. What hindered your ability to achieve your WG objectives or planned work items? (choose all that apply)

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Insufficient quorum	22.7%	5
Missing key members	54.5%	12
Members not prepared for meeting	4.5%	1
Change in meeting objectives	0.0%	0
Venue facilities (rooms, meals, support, location)	22.7%	5
Technical support problems	50.0%	11
Comments		19
answered question		22
skipped question		12

Q9. What supported your ability to achieve your WG objectives or planned work items? (choose all that apply)

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Attendance number (sufficient quorum)	71.9%	23
Participation by key members	75.0%	24
Pre-meeting preparedness (agendas, pre-meeting materials)	62.5%	20
Clearly defined meeting objectives	65.6%	21
Venue facilities (rooms, meals, support, location)	56.3%	18
Technical Support	28.1%	9
Comments		10
answered question		32
skipped question		2

Q10. Would your WG recommend using this WGM venue and location again?

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Yes	51.5%	17
No	51.5%	17
Comments		24
answered question		33
skipped question		1

Q11. Did your WG have additional participation from local/regional members?

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Yes	12.5%	4
No	87.5%	28
Comments		6
	answered question	32
	skipped question	2

Q12. Please enter any other comments or considerations that you would like to be considered by the Working Group Meeting Coordination Committee.

Answer Options	Response Count
	19
answered question	19
skipped question	15

I'd like to praise the HL7 staff for always doing a great job in organizing the meeting and being extremely helpful when issues arise.

HL7 Staff support was superb. I would once again suggest that some form of a scheduling application be found - one that would allow co-chairs and others to schedule joint meetings with other work groups, and avoid schedule conflicts. I am testing an open-source web-based room scheduling app now.

beautiful venue, best networking reception ever. But the wireless network access and limited local participation was a problem.

A pre-meeting survey of possible participants and what they expect in order to usefully participate. Maybe even some feedback from regional government health agencies or local educational institutions would be beneficial. I think HL7 should carefully position out of continental US WGMs to actively further regional affiliate agendas as well as progress universal standards work. A different mix of education/universal standards work/affiliate agenda items might be necessary for international WGMs.

While our attendance was substantially down, we had sufficient key people to make progress.

We did achieve quite a lot this meeting!

RCRIM deals with standards for regulated electronic environments. Outside of US, Canada, and Europe the implementation of electronic systems for regulators is limited so regional participation outside of those areas is not expected for our work group.

Kyoto and Rio did not generate any new OO participants, while all usual core participants were present. So the most additional participation we get in North America (most) and Europe (some).

We fully expect a large number of walk-ins and new perspectives at the Sidney meeting....

M&M Was NOT listed on the WGM list for this survey. This report reflects BOTH M&M and Publishing.

It is good to have meetings at international sites. i think, even with the attendance, it was valuable and shows a commitment by HL7

Again - internet connectivity in the rooms as well as in the meeting rooms is important.

It might be good to really publicize how much members enjoyed the visit. It was my first international conference. I now look forward to Sydney where before I might have let it go (my org is unlikely to finance my trip; I had to self-fund this one.) I would attend in Rio once/year even if I had to self-fund.

Allowing people to attend remotely will be a benefit when it comes to international travel. The European meetings receive more attendees because there is a perception that Europe is more business like. This WG meeting we actually got quite a bit accomplished and having an overall smaller meeting we were able to meet with people we normally wouldn't have time to talk to. Also being outside of the country forced us to focus on the meeting instead of making teleconferences to our home country. Good meeting¹

Great meeting!!

Given the loss already expected, to nickel and dime on projectors for individuals that already pay a high price to 'volunteer' sends a very poor message. If the over-run is simply unbearable, then perhaps consider sending fewer staff members. I know each has a responsibility but when you see the sheer numbers in attendance when the Board and others are complaining about losing money, I think taking 'one for the team' might be appropriate.

I did not leave the hotel to take advantage of the attractive surroundings. My goal at the meeting was to work on the committee's business.

Cost-cutting measures were detrimental to the role of a WGM as a platform for collaboration. Notably: LCD projectors; no printed information. Coffee/tea/cookie break is getting below the materialistically acceptable.

N/A