2010-01-16 TSC WGM Minutes

From HL7 TSC

Contents

- 1 TSC Saturday meeting for 2010 Jan WGM
  - 1.1 Saturday January 16th, 2010, 9 am - 5 PM Phoenix, AZ USA
    - 1.1.1 Q1: 9-10:30 AM
    - 1.1.2 Q2: 11 AM-12:30 PM
    - 1.1.3 Q3: 1:30-3 PM
    - 1.1.4 Q4: 3:30-5PM

TSC Saturday meeting for 2010 Jan WGM

back to TSC Minutes and Agendas

Saturday January 16th, 2010, 9 am - 5 PM Phoenix, AZ USA

Q1: 9-10:30 AM

- Roll Call:

Meeting Attendance - :

At	Name	Affiliation	Email Address
x	Calvin Beebe	HL7 SSD SD	cbeebe@mayo.edu
x	Woody Beeler	HL7 FTSD	woody@beelers.com
Q1, Q4	Jane Curry	HL7 Tooling, observer	
Q3, Q4	Bob Dolin	HL7 Chair	BobDolin@gmail.com
Q3, Q4	Marc Koehn	invited Guest, HL7 EA IP PM	marc.koehn@gpinformatics.com
x	Austin Kreisler	HL7 DESD	austin.j.kreisler@saic.com
x	Lynn Laakso (scribe, non-voting)	HL7 HQ	lynn@hl7.org
x	Patrick Loyd	HL7	Patrick.loyd@gpinformatics.com
x	Ken McCaslin	HL7 TSS SD	Kenneth.H.McCaslin@QuestDiagnostics.com

x	Charlie McCay (chair)	HL7 TSC Chair	charlie@ramseysystems.co.uk
x	Charlie Mead	HL7 ArB	Ch.mead@booz.com
x	Galen Mulrooney	invited guest, HL7 SOA	galen.mulrooney@va.gov
x	Ravi Natarajan	HL7 Affiliate	Ravi.Natarajan@nhs.net
	Ron Parker	HL7 ArB Alternate	rparker@infoway-inforoute.ca
x	John Quinn	HL7 CTO	jquinn@hl7.org
x	Gregg Seppala	HL7 SSD SD Alternate	gregg.seppala@va.gov
x	Helen Stevens	HL7 TSS SD Alternate	helen.stevens@shaw.ca
x	Ed Tripp	HL7 DESD Alternate	Edward.tripp@estripp.com
x	D. Mead Walker	HL7 FTSD Alternate	dmead@comcast.net
x	Ann Wrightson	HL7 UK observing	

- Additions to agenda:
- Roadmap discussion
    - TSC Roadmap Projects
    - Review current Roadmap objectives for the TSC
        - 442: Balloted reference architecture; ArB delivered Architecture Framework, not the architecture. It was not balloted. Precursive step has been undertaken. Another step, is identify the governance, then we can move forward with the actual architecture. Needs description updated.
        - What is the process for communicating to the Roadmap group that the party assigned wishes to modify the objective? No formal process exists. See documentcomments site for feedback on the Roadmap assignment. Need rationale for the Roadmap tasks and reason for changes
        - 408 – should be closed
        - 377; ISO JIC coordination, revisions closed – this is done.
        - 409 Done
        - 414: first steps to identify gaps is to know what we have; our Product definition is towards that first step. John says this is towards an effort we wanted to work on with SCO, but lost champion in Ed as chair of SCO. No active project at this point. Helen notes that this has been done at a national level for UK and Canada; not necessarily effective for universal realm. Mead suggests collating the documents together. Helen agrees but not as a TSC activity, but International Council. Ann notes that TSC might want to know those areas where other standards exist to know where we should not develop efforts. Woody notes the scope is too broad. Need to offer that feedback to Roadmap committee.
        - 415 follows on as next step to 414.
        - 413 HL7 Product Strategy: assigned to Quinn and McCay; adopted to TSC. Product visibility, v2/v3 marketing, product strategy – will review later in the agenda.
    - Roadmap site
    - What is the TSC action plan under each strategic initiative for the next year? 3-5 SMART objectives for each heading...

- Roadmap task force: need to tell Dave et al and Chuck Jaffe that the communication of the participation of the TSC on the Roadmap committee was not clear. Did not include TSC Chair, ArB representative or Affiliate TSC representative but Affiliate includes chairs. Notify web site team that all members are listed as co-chairs, instead of Jaffe.
    - BOD page now shows public and private groups, and membership. Charlie still seeks to have that information made more public. Need also to allow for SD alternate representation as the Representatives cannot always make the calls. Perhaps need to look at TSC SD as cochairs instead of rep and alternate, just sharing a vote.
- Brainstorm SMART deliverables for the objectives
    - Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic, Timed
    - each write down one objective under each (6 minute exercise)
        1. Discussion: WB: carry on. What more can we do? Laundry list of req's for supporting EHR, PHR, IHE, etc per MW. JC notes should include interoperability or information exchange. Promote SAEAF and link all HL7 product sto that framework. GS: revise HDF to be health develop framework and ballot as JIC project and get all SDOs to follow. CB systematic mean; AK start balloting DCMs in the next year. ET: have a presence, publicize and review global meetings and solicit appropriate representation at each meeting. KM/HS: expand computer based technology non wgm training and info exchange. RN coordinating with similar standard to avoid dup and reduce confusion. GM: lead connectathons to demonstrate implementability and usefulness; increase use of blogs and social media with end-users. CMcCay; establish effective JIC coordination. WB notes that with the HDF suggestion you can't get anything done within a year but need to identify the first steps.
        2. Discussion #2. Find a proper editor for processable content WB. MW: implementation guide template, documenting process for creating implementation guide. JC Implement tooling to capture requirements from end user interop initiatives. Do customer segmentation description. GS: more thoroughly implement pt 2 of HDF requirements process, getting domain expertise. CB: template repository and CDA implementation guide tooling and support. AK, start implementing SAEAF in at least one DESD project next year. CMead: formalize/define/operationalize arch governance. ET: describe process to reduce DESD project approval time in half by May 2010. KM/JS: collaborate with other SDOs to streamline dev process by leveraging technologies. RN: integrated workflow process. GM: institute modeling and tooling so IGs for V2, V3 and SOA produced from same template. '"Woody asks why V2. GM says NCPDP says they're working on XML and another format at the same. JC notes a v2-v3 mapping exercise does not add value. V2 to V3 migration still a challenge in many areas. Ann notes we may need to reduce clarity to stimulate '"; CMCCay wants online meeting agendas and schedules e.g. social media tools.
        3. Discussion #3. WB: Develop means of creating an example for each specification, static models. MW specific example for producing a v3

template. JC: ... GS: develop v2 to v3 maps for domains supported by V2. CB: cross tutorial review teams to improve tutorial content. AK: require IGs as part of all DESD standards projects. CMead: everyone needs to adopt SAEAF, not just the architecture but the framework. Future project approvals must state their saeaf alignment, SAEAF education has to be part of each member's participation. ET: review implementation experiences as part of each f2f, identify obstacles and approaches how to overcome obstacles. Noted that ICTC might be part of that. KM/HS: v2/v3 migration strategies. AW: making simple standards for simple purposes without large knowledge . RJ: reference implementation. GM: connectathon to demonstrate; provide performance testing criteria and services. Or encourace vendors to do it; NIST for US Realm. Develop business case for that. How to certify whether one is doing V3 "right". SAEAF conformance assertions might guide this. Look at whether conformance services are available and encourage that development? CMcCay: national initiative implementation collaborative promotion and shared experience. JQ: three-step process – practicalize the HDF for example toolbase methodology one example V3 message and CDA template. Develop class and teach on methodology over x number of sessions with requirement that attendee has modest knowledge of HL7. create workbook on messages and CDA implementations. Galen notes that universities are lacking this in their curricula, CME credits are a start. Continuing education for Computer Science; Helen notes some Health Information Sciences programs are teaching HL7 too. John notes we need to provide materials. Need to provide a textbook. Helen adds: other methods of publishing our standards, eg Kindle, and DITA like IHTSDO.

- quarter's time expired: email to Lynn, she'll compile and send it out (see attachment), determine if we're discussing at a conf call etc. When we review next start at #4 or work back from #6?

Q2: 11 AM-12:30 PM

- (30 mins) Open Issues List
    - Determine/recommend the tools across the organization, TSC Tracker # 323
        Status: Pending creation of project in Electronic Services; unable to identify project facilitator at this time.
        Make a funding request or staff request? Still an issue worthy of effort. Lots of people interested in helping, but no one interested in leading. Helen suggests we put it on a list of priorities for staff/financial help. TSC create list of top 5 and ask for resources. What tools get used within the organization? If some other organization puts forward the effort; needs a sponsor.
    - Review the Role of the Steering Divisions TSC Tracker #749
        Status: Ed and Austin to provide an update at the 2010JanWGM
        Ed reviewed the first part; current role of steering divisions. DESD has been doing more proactive activity with Work Group health than other SDs.
        Austin reviewed the second part; future additional roles of SDs. Ravi asks

why there is no emphasis on quality on V2 standards. Woody wasn't sure if anyone was even working on V2 Datatypes, is that MnM? Tony Julian scheduling InM to discuss a new datatype reports Gregg. Austin notes SSD and DESD can play a larger role, FTSD and T3SD already play a major role. This is part of architectural governance, says Charlie Mead. Helen notes there are areas beyond V3 that could use better quality efforts. V2 has been discussed, EHR is of particular note, needing to come under the umbrella for overall HL7 instead of working in isolation. Calvin notes the common models should be the location of constraint rather than derived from the tooling after the fact. Patrick notes that Clinical Statement has had some, although limited, success. Ann notes that her involvement for CDA R3 and vMR are not basing their work on Clinical Statement. Mead suggests we need a list of where the bubbles overlap. Lists should be maintained within the steering divisions. Austin notes SSD develops things to be used in DESD; DESD should not be developing those models from scratch. If they need 'new' things they should work with SSD SD to create the building blocks. Steering divisions need to be able to 'pop their bubble' and require them to work with the other groups. CMead notes architectural composites vs architectural primitives; comes back to governance. National initiatives in Canada and Australia both say we need to build at an enterprise level. CMcCay notes this would be a good note for the Monday night meeting. CMead notes that we need to have the business architecture down. Woody notes this is intertwined with volunteering and membership. Goes back to strategic initiative #6.

These efforts need resources; sponsored voluntolds or other individuals.
. CMcCay Would like to see product roadmap or document roadmap how do projects within an SD relate to each other and the overall direction of travel. Lynn reviewed the origin of the issue from GForge. Helen moves that a requirement for every work group to participate actively (as defined by each SD), and if they do not it automatically puts the WG into red status; the SD has the authority to take action up to and including initiation of dissolution of the WG. Ed seconds – discussion. Woody is sympathetic but the meeting schedule adds to a volunteer schedule and approving projects is not exciting. EVote may be defined as adequate participation. Patrick notes we don't want to beat up co-chairs even more. Woody notes that you can come to expect participation of certain co chairs but there are others you never hear from. Helen notes that co chairs need to have the expectation to participate. Mead supports, however the TSC should initiate dissolution rather than the SD. Austin notes that he signed up as a member of each WG in his steering division and as such has opportunity to initiate dissolution in any WG. Galen notes that many calls he's participated in are just 'does anyone have anything' and 'nope' and the call ends. They get more reports back after the fact rather than discussion in advance of a TSC vote. Patrick notes that yes at least with two cochairs, that one should be able to participate. CMcCay notes meeting minutes are also important; does this indicate it is more important than that? Austin notes he and Ed have a process in place that they find more effective than a club. Helen tables the motion.

Austin asks if this satisfies the task assignment. Woody would like to see it circulated to the Steering Divisions. Austin just sent it today; do we approve

today or review at a future teleconference? Steering Divisions to review on Monday night; approve as draft document for review at future TSC conference call.

- DCMs - Consistency of Clinical content TSC Tracker # 890
  Status: FAQ review, see email response, or listserv discussing with Patient Care Tues Q1.
- JIC Project: Harmonised health informatics document registry and glossary, at TSC Tracker # 984
  Status: opened 3/11/2009, Project Insight #495; No PSS has come through project approval by SD or TSC; Woody may have had a project tscope from Sept.
- TSC Work Group Visibility Project 2009 TSC Tracker # 997
  Status: Work Group organizing documents continue to trickle in; Lynn suggests we close this project and open a TSC annual maintenance project for updates to Mission/Charter, SWOT, DMP. OK
- TSC Project Visibility Project 2009 TSC Tracker # 998
  Status: Not an approved project; Recommend closure as Project Insight Searchable Database enhancements and 'Projects' section on Work Groups' web pages complete 2009 objectives. Do we want a 2010 Project Visibility effort? Helen would like to see each project have a wiki and linked from their website for the work group. Lynn and Helen to work on PSS for 2010 and close the 2009. Each project should be accessible from the Work Group project list.
- How projects and work groups manage their relations with other organizations, Project Insight # 1091
  Status: ORC has not met. Are there TSC member opinions on what/how the ORC should operate so Helen has something to take back to the ORC when they meet? Helen last night got the agenda for the Board meeting; ORC has a motion to approve a relationship Helen had not seen with Mohawk College (Ontario CA) providing a reference implementation. CMead reminds that the significant component of the SAEAF around governance including relationships with other organizations, relating to exchange of specifications especially. How two enterprise architecture specifications collaborate, etc. Need to include consideration of SAEAF. CMcCay notes the ArB and ORC need to review that topic. John notes that he's heard the discussion on the CTeam; they need to talk to Chuck Jaffe and Dennis Giokas. ORC has lunch meeting on Monday. She will raise TSC concern over any relationships having technical content. She also asks the Steering Divisions to note relationships that are not formalized or where the collaboration is outside the bounds of the MOU. Anatomic Pathology meets within IHE but IHE is only supposed to create implementation guides not building standards. Project scope statements should have checklist of arrangements/MOUs, recommends Calvin. Helen says we'll first recognize the relationships we have. Ken notes the issue to address is the communication within the organization; how did this get on the Board agenda without an ORC member being involved. CMcCay says Helen needs to clarify when an MOU is needed; and identify what triggers the development, e.g. with IP question on shared development.
- IPR, patents, and copyright issues (TSC Tracker # 1319)

- Discussion items for 2010JanWGM:
1. Where do people go to raise questions about IPR/copyright?
2. Informational item: What are we doing about managing HL7 IP access rights and decoupling from membership rights.
   - Discussions at the board level re; licensing of IP with US Federal Govt. Plans on the table for National licenses also for Canada and the UK. Still in the discussion stage. Woody thinks the TSC needs to have voices at that table; need an established group long term to deal with and answer questions about this stuff. Need to know what the rules are. Ravi agrees there should be a separate team. It took 4 weeks to start testing Static Model Designer due to these kinds of questions. Woody would like to be involved as well as to know there is a group to turn to. John reiterates that we need to talk to Chuck. John to call Chuck to visit the TSC meeting.
- Board Request: Innovations Committee, Project Insight # 1320
  Status: Innovations Workshop scheduled for Monday Q3/Q4. Video format presentation. TSC needs to be aware of how we relate to innovation. Begs the question what is business-as-usual as compared to innovation. Recommend TSC members attend. Helen notes we need to determine if it's truly innovative or if it's disruptive and wishing to go around established patterns. CMead notes that those feeling they're on the bleeding edge also need to regard semantic interoperability; comes back to governance process. Project scope statements also need to be used.
- International Council Request: quality considerations if Work Groups not meeting at WGMTSC Tracker # 1321
  Status: Last discussion Oct 7 2009. Benchmark U.S. WGM for effectiveness postmortem. What metrics should be measured? Quality plan on agenda for this afternoon; this is about meeting quality not about product quality. CMcCay notes that the chair of HL7 wants an organizational quality plan of which a product quality plan is a start. Helen notes the board has put together a group to look at international meetings. This may not be a TSC thing. Should be HQ and International Council. Quality of decisions made in Kyoto without adequate representation was called into question per Ann. Helen notes there are work groups that have determined they will not meet at all at international meetings and will operate on a two-meeting per year schedule. A room full of first-time attendees plus a co-chair does not make for effective work; not just at international meetings but any meeting. Calvin notes the WGs publish their meeting minutes with attendance, what are we asking for – some analysis? What is the criteria for an effective meeting, anywhere. WGHealth already reports on if a WG meets at a WGM; so do we determine what an effective quorum is and whether it was met? Ken notes that quorum guidelines are not based on previous experience. Woody notes if everyone is a newbie you might challenge preponderance of influence. Can we ask cochairs after the meeting if they thought in the meeting they had adequate representation and discussion to effectively conduct their business, Helen asks. Mead says we need an example of what bad things happened before we go crazy on this. International council has asked for one international meeting per year; want to know what an effective meeting is.

CMcCay notes they did send out a questionnaire and its results will be reviewed this week. Ann notes a decision register by each WG might be useful where she recounted a decision was made but not taken forward because the proper people were not in the room. Galen notes that the questionnaire neglected to ask if they got walk-ins or new attendees. SOA had new folks in Cologne, not many in Kyoto. Charlie and Ravi can bring back any further action to the TSC from the International Council; close this item.

- HL7 Activities with other SDOs, TSC Tracker # 1337
  Status: Q4 session Sunday, Agenda CMcCay notes that the JIC is reviewing itself as we speak. Don't know if there will be JIC meetings at future HL7 meetings. Ed is no longer the chair. More like a JWG meeting as we did in Atlanta.
- Document the process of ArB nomination and confirmation, TSC Tracker # 1340
  Status: Draft presented for review. Passed unanimously.
- Foster development of product strategy - see Q3

- (15 mins) Discuss deliverables coming out of Working Group Meeting; dispense with this item.
- (15 mins) Review TSC Documents
  - TSC Mission and Charter – Helen distributed a document. Need 10 mins to review. Carry into Q3.
  - TSC Communications Plan – put off to a telecon
  - TSC Decision Making Practices and proposed revision
  - Review Technology Plan 2009 and update milestones; put off to telecon
  - TSC SWOT and three year plan, three-year plan detail ; defer until after roadmap discussion.
- (15 mins) Review ISO/CEN/HL7 tracking. Defer to q4 meeting Sunday.

Q3: 1:30-3 PM

- Update on action item: John talked to Chuck; origination of liaison with Mohawk comes from Implementation Advisory Panel (as compared to Standards advisory Panel). Carol Diamond, David Kivi (ASTM). Implementation concerns of V3 regarding XML. Google, Microsoft, and W3C pushing for it. Halamka wanted to know what it would look like if we used RESTful XML. At Atlanta meeting group from Meijer Corp. was there and at HITSP meeting; wanting to do CCD documents using REST and partner is Mohawk.
- TSC Mission and Charter would like to know what 'product project' term means. Helen moves to change the composition (and will put together a GOM change proposal) to simplify the election process to elect one cochair for each SD each year with alternating terms and eliminate representative and alternate, but two cochairs representing one vote. HL7 Chair is ex officio with vote. Woody seconds Helen's motion with friendly amendments. Details of implementation to be developed. **Motion Unanimously approved**. Helen moves someone write a revision to suggest a change to GOM for appeal process on Normative content to come through the TSC instead of Karen (Associate Executive Director). Normative rules governed by ANSI not HL7. Austin seconds. Calvin abstains; **motion passes**. Helen further moves the TSC representative in the board asks the Board if any appeals come to their attention in the interim until the GOM revision includes the TSC in these discussions. Ken seconds. **Unanimously approved**.

- Link to ; Interim decision review since last WGM for review; please look at it.
- ORC/Mohawk issue: ORC operations, how Don brought an ORC motion to the Board without the ORC having a meeting, Helen will address offline. What are the issues that the TSC have with the relationship with Mohawk so Helen can bring them forward and the Board members present can discuss. Woody asked what the ITS in use of a RIM-derived specification converted to another 'space' in XML. If it is non-ITS, then it might be non-RIM-derived and that is a problem. McCay notes InM defined what an ITS was a few years ago and handed it off to the ITS group. It doesn't appear to be a membership-sharing agreement as some appear. If this MOU will have an impact on product strategy we want to know about it. Procedural issue is one element, may need to take off the Board agenda, or needs to be an opportunity between now and Tuesday to review the document and engage with its stakeholders (TSC) to provide feedback. Helen needs to take this up with the ORC. John notes that the topic of greater expediency is more about whether Mitre and Mohawk are 'hijacking' the adoption of HL7 inside of HITSP and thus we need to engage with them. Bob notes that HL7 is trying to introduce Mohawk to Mitre through the Innovations committee.
- (30 mins) Product strategy, TSC Tracker #1364
  - Update from V2/V3/CDA Product Strategy group; Stan Huff said he had no slides to show. Woody noted that in his interview with Virginia Riehl that CDA was noted not as the first V3 standard but as a completely separate standard. Mead was on a call last week reviewing an early stage of the document. Austin noted that this report has people very agitated. Bob notes the report is more a surfacing of issues than a strategic document.
  - Three threads: need a product strategy for HL7 to try to reduce duplication of effort, don't know when projects are expected, seeking clarity of the work. List of the products that we've got as a stepping stone towards, how do we maintain that list, add things to it, (bringing in stuff from three-year plans) and work with marketing committee and advisory board on strategic function within HL7. Charlie sees it needing a separate group to review those components. TSCs function can include review of products we've defined already.
  - Link to Product List FAQ wiki page
  - Marketing effort compared to product definition; immediate visibility to products for stakeholders. Should be V2 and V3. Within V2 there is only messaging. V3 stems from the RIM; has messaging, documents and services. Woody says three foundations RIM, Datatypes, and Vocabulary from which all else derives. Mead suggests TSC review offline and discusses improvements at another time. CMcCay suggests a task force to work with Lynn. Calvin notes CDA is a V3 standard, needs to be cleaned up. Ed notes the last two diagrams should be removed from the wiki until one is more appropriate. Bob notes we should add the marketing council/committee to the discussion to make the picture suitable for the outside audience. Woody feels the marketing committee needs more involvement with the technical side. CMcCay notes Monday Q2 the Marketing committee will discuss the product list on the web site. TSC should get involved. TSC needs to be involved with the product of "working group meetings". Please see if you can also be involved with the May WGM. Ravi suggests definition of products is TSC responsibility, exposure by Marketing. Woody volunteered to help, along with Calvin, John, and potentially Mead. Helen asks if we want to ask the marketing committee to join us in May? CMcCay notes our agendas are quite full; is this topic

at the top of the list? Woody notes that this started four years ago (strategic initiative) and hasn't really taken off. Marketing council/committee roles etc have been in flux and so reaching a complete and coherent marketing function. When to review product list next to TSC? 2 weeks after WGM review on concall

- (30 mins) Quality plan – woody slide show.
    - not organizational quality plan, but V3 Project quality plan
    - last quality gate may not be ballot but the end user. Consequences of not adhering to quality measures should allow for foundation groups to cast votes without registering for ballot pool.
    - Bob notes that consensus around the 'what' on slide 3 helps build the metrics for use on a quality dashboard. Charlie notes that timeliness might be more of a project element than a product but others agree. Bob says find criteria for the 'whats' is the driving objectives. Ravi notes the customer's 'whats' then we can translate that. Ann says we must recognize the different kinds of customers. CMead says architectural projects are clobbered more by the absence of quality requirements; notes need to have concept of mapping 'fit' metrics to quality requirements. Next steps need to be quantifiable measurements. CMcCay notes that in reporting need surveys and feedback, gathering implementation experience, something systematic. Consistency within and between products is an internal review process.
    - Reporting of the metrics; who is responsible for that? Publishing already generates a great deal of reporting. There is greater participation.
    - Ann asks where is the technical change management for reuse of component pieces? Consistency within and between products would be a core part of it.
    - Reporter role, Helen asks, in regard to ballot pools that are closed – if anyone sees something that is wrong can they submit a negative vote? No it's only for selected Work Group representatives; TSC members, SD chairs? No, a group or two that has to take a vote on it and that one vote is cast, or create a quality officer or quality group. Barring a new group formation, Publishing should have an option, along with MnM and Vocabulary perhaps within FTSD. Helen notes they should not be allowed for non-V3 products.
    - Jane arrives for Q4 and notes the original organization review committee had that in their purview to resolve such consistency.
    - Woody to send to the TSC list? Sent it last night.
    - What should the TSC do with this? Do not present Monday night; Bob will address quality plan on Tuesday at BOD meeting.

Q4: 3:30-5PM

- HSSP Process Project Results - Galen Mulrooney
    - HSSP Process Refresh Project Wiki page
    - Link to document
    - HSSP reuses processes of both OMG and HL7 organizations. Authoritative documentation of these processes is found either in HL7 GOM or OMG policy/procedure. Moving towards facilitator role like MnM, like CTS2 is owned by Vocab. May want to add SOA facilitator to project scope statement. No formal facilitator training available but perhaps just a designated individual to provide communication. Follow up with Project Services/Freida and Rick Haddorff.

- TSC will not name a specification liaison, but may approve the named liaison that is specified in the project scope statement as part of the scope statement. TSC will not notify OMG when the ballot has passed. They approve publication but are not responsible for notification.
- Galen recited a process issue with DSTU passing at 60% and going on to the OMG; and secondly that the OMG was working with unpublished materials. Woody notes that OMG should be using RIM-derived structures, doing the analysis on the HL7 side.

- ArB: Charlie Mead: ECCF document available, has been reviewed multiple times and ready for larger audience. BF about three weeks behind. Karen Smith ahs moved intro and BF and ECCF into DITA. Using Concept maps for cognitive view of chapter. Want to consider using real topic maps as the ISO standard instead, linking knowledge structure to knowledge occurrence. In your inbox note an email from John regarding NCI willing to fund tools for producing materials for the SAEAF book. CMcCay notes that the document structure for finding the materials is unwieldy. NCI partially funding Jane to coordinate these materials. Jane says the good news is that SVN is good source control. Bad news is they are not as easy to browse as a wiki or file management system. Best use is to have an SVN client; Jane uses Tortoise. ArB has not yet met and approved the full document for posting on the HL7 web site ArB page. Once Phase 1 is 'released' they'll create a PDF version, and working with ES for publishing on website main page on Weds. PDF version will be available for Weds Q4 discussion. CMead notes the timeline called for intro ECCF and BF by this meeting; they'll have 2 of the 3 with BF a few weeks behind. Need to know the plan for publishing not the actual locations. Comment is that the structure for finding the document within GForge is not immediately apparent. Need to know which version to look at not compare the differences between them. Jane notes they've been doing iterations using HTML and are looking for approval to publish when they meet tomorrow. CMead notes NCI has developed education, like a 2 day class on ECCF. Is the TSC interested in leveraging these resources. Work with EA IP, Education? NCI is specific to services but not messaging/documents. Galen asks will we be getting peer review or ballot on the SAEAF? Calvin notes the SAEAF is the framework, not the architecture itself. Patrick notes that we currently ballot the HDF, and he thinks we should ballot the SAEAF too. CMead notes that HL7 will surely develop an implementation guide but HL7 needs also to maintain and develop the SAEAF. The HDF is HL7's implementation of SAEAF. Need to determine conclusion of which key alpha projects determines feedback cycle for SAEAF to update it by ArB.
- EA IP update - Marc Koehn
  - Towards balloting SAEAF, we discussed at the last WGM a process similar to the RIM.
  - Biggest challenge right now is confidence and momentum. 2008 developed materials; Jan 2009 started drafting what rollout would look like. May tried to get approval on the notion; September saw the first real progress. Some have made good progress, some are stuck, some are waiting for other events to get started. Not a lot of concrete output. Marc proposes objectives to coalesce what we know. Weds Q4 is not a rah rah; substitute brief update, note touchpoints and training, and then proceed like an EA IP advisory group effort we had in November to identify challenges and barriers. What do we need to accelerate production of materials and gain momentum. Perhaps we can establish then what the timeline will be to getting us there. Woody asks the fee structure for the tutorials. CoChairs

are complimentary within the first two years they're offered – need to provide an announcement on the tutorials for cochairs as well as that the session is alpha projects and not hosting the whole bunch of Work Groups.

- CTS2 not really started up
- PASS balloted this cycle but not created new SAEAF artifacts. Galen notes the ballot looked much different than previous SFMs and thought it more closer to a SAEAF artifact.
- Blueprint just getting underway;
- CDA R3 using SAEAF as reference but no formal engagement with their assigned ArB liaison.
- OO: Grahame created a paper, JK and Patrick reviewed it but had to re-level it for universal realm instead of Australian realm. Will be used in OO sessions at the WGM. Progress is in fits and spurts. Ann asks if they're using IHE international consensus methods; Patrick says no. CaEHR and functional profile projects might use the IHE model.
- ITS Jane notes that Dale said it was on the back burner to deal with ITS 1.1 and will use SAEAF for determining new requirements for ITS.
- Ed notes our progress moves a bit like innertube on the lazy river. Drifting along – do we need to set a date at which all new projects must use SAEAF-driven architecture?
- EHR-FM still in formative phase.
- Are we drifting? Woody says we don't have the documentation yet; BF still three weeks out. What do we do about them? Marc says we need to do more collection of information on what the projects have learned, but do we need to move faster? CMead notes that at NCI they had a lot of problem with not wanting to engage because they thought it was a moving target. It didn't happen at NCI until they said 'you must use this'. Can't move that forward without enough ArB facilitators.
- Mead says we're not implementing a framework, need to develop the architecture from the framework. Need to help the ArB take the generalities into a defined architecture.
- Ravi notes we want early intercepts to publish and wants better visibility to the framework.
- Marc says the end game is fully defined architecture, compatible and comprehensive, mutually congruent. Can't put clear action plan in place as we need governance structures, so the architecture will evolve because of that. Can we all accept the iterative nature this will create with the different working groups working on their projects independently and finding resolution in harmonization. Can we publish those artifacts for which we can say, these ones will be used, this is the PDF version, if you want to see the source in GForge this is where it is, it's not hidden.
- CMcCay says we tasked the ArB to create it, then the TSC to create an implementation rollout plan, then some key projects to use it. Need to reiterate that this is, indeed, going to happen. Need a communication plan for those other than alpha projects. Should be an EA IP deliverable; it was identified as a deliverable a while ago. Need to set the expectations.
- Galen notes that the alpha projects are developing the architecture from the framework. We must take care to use the SAEAF to define the framework versus the alpha projects as alpha implementations of the SAEAF, not SAEAF alpha.

- CMead says look at SAEAF going from framework to an architecture as three step process. First draft in Vancouver. By April f2f in Las vegas NCI picked up ECCF, another company picked up BF but quickly gave it back. JK, Wendell, hammered on BF April to September. Got top-down buy in, in step 2 from Board and TSC. Step 3 is governance. Projects build composite structures not architectural primitives. Need to go back into the projects to extract the primitives, and the governance is needed to do so. Woody asks if we use an example of patterns of interactions. The discovery and extraction of primitives must involve those groups that have tried to do governance in terminology, datatypes, information models, etc. Trying to instantiate the fundamental building blocks of what we use today. CMead got InM, and Vocab involved early on but then had to change to behavioral framework pieces. Who will do the extraction of the primitives, ArB, Foundation groups, etc?
        - What is the elevator pitch? What definition of governance will work for the membership? Take forward to Sunday.
    - Tooling: John Quinn – bumped to Sunday night.

Adjourned 17:10.

Retrieved from "http://hl7tsc.org/wiki/index.php?title=2010-01-16_TSC_WGM_Minutes"

- This page was last modified on January 26, 2010, at 21:22.