

2010-01-19 TSC WGM Minutes

From HL7 TSC

Tuesday January 19 2010 (Phoenix) TSC Luncheon

■ 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
	Bob Dolin	HL7 Chair	BobDolin@gmail.com
x	Andy Gregorowicz	observer, Mitre	andy@mitre.org
x	Kate Hamilton	observer, Alschuler Assoc.	kate@alschuler-associates.com
x	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	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	Ravi Natarajan	HL7 Affiliate	Ravi.Natarajan@nhs.net
	Ron Parker	HL7 ArB Alternate	rparker@infoway-inforoute.ca
	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
	D. Mead Walker	HL7 FTSD Alternate	dmead@comcast.net

Agenda:

1. defer International feedback to a conference call
2. (10 mins) Innovations Workshop recap
 - Q3 was mostly tooling-related; could have been discussed in Tooling WG
 - Less organized than anticipated

Some videos posted to broadcast a message; others concerned it is another hurdle to start a project.

Q4 had methods to hide complexity of V3 (GreenCDA, hData)

Having a forum to share ideas was well received.

- Lessons learned from Monday workshop
 - Need a clear brand for innovations activity to distinguish innovation work from mainstream development
 - e.g. Eclipse incubator projects
 - Mohawk MARC HI "Living Lab"
- Want a list of topics in advance for opportunity for representation by appropriate co-chairs
- Need a different time slot, as Monday PM is very conflicted with most WGs meeting
- Top few innovation suggestions
 - Not much discussion at the end, just the benefit of the exercise rather than the individual topics.
- Plans between now and end of May WGM
 - Ed to monitor activity as liaison
- Review the decision that this should be an activity that reports to the TSC
- Recommendations to the board
- Next Steps
 - Need governance of the process so you can kill something effectively versus those ideas that have a hope of succeeding in the mainstream.
 - Innovation branding for projects such as DCM: by noting it as an innovation, out of step with current processes, will take the sting out of the potential change.
 - Directed Innovation: identify TSC-proposed innovation challenges
- (10 minutes)EA IP Next Steps Discussion Paper,
 - How do the foundation committees gain knowledge of what the SAEAF impacts are on their foundational artifacts? Support of these committees in planning,
 - Need to add vocabulary, ITS (though they have a pilot already)
 - SOA? EHR? Might want to participate.
 - Work with the committees willing to participate and then 'go after' the ones being recalcitrant.
 - Need to get the foundation documents first, as determined by ArB, not TSC, or some other group. ArB has, in the ECCF, a candidate list of artifacts to be produced for a specification stack instance; this is not a sample list of existing foundational artifacts to be adapted to the SAEAF. Go to the committees responsible for those artifacts to establish a plan with the ArB and each other. Deal with conflicts as they arise between participation expectations of the individual work groups.
 - As you build your gap list, you can start documenting your future state business architecture.
 - Need to take the pieces of our existing architecture, core principles, rim, datatypes etc and identify the set of fragments and then determine how to take them forward and how they'll work together in the end state.
 - Perhaps the Foundation and Technology Steering Division should be establishing that list along with the ArB.
 - Forward-looking plan from ArB will be published.

- Governance process, harmonization: formal peer review was requested by the Steering Division attendees. Revisit Weds Q4
- Reference link Overview Snapshot May2009
- Reference link updated Elevator Pitch to be reviewed on an upcoming conference call
- Suggestions as to how we can do an effective evaluation of the TSC as prescribed by the T3F. Forward to a conference call
- Update from ORC; MOU with Mohawk being withdrawn, will work with ORC and Tooling to come up with a more appropriate engagement strategy.
- (10 minutes)Next steps for establishing a Product Strategy Group that reports to the Board, Marketing, and the TSC, and is charged with ensuring that HL7 has a Product Strategy.
 - Proposed as a Board named committee/task force to coordinate between groups. Woody sees overlap between Marketing, Roadmap, and Product strategy efforts? Helen asks about Education too. TSC can produce the products but not take them forward. Does this need to be discussed at Roadmap task force Weds AM? TSC representative needs to be Board-y, having Marketing knowledge?
 - propose it to the board as part of the CTO report
 - Product task force or stakeholder engagement? We are selling stuff, these are products.

Adjourned 1:50 PM

Topics not discussed:

- Product suggestions:
 - MoUs, Charter Agreements, and Liasons -- While these are not "traditional" products – they do cost involve giving away access to HL7 IP and/or meetings and/or brand, and so deliver value and have a cost
 - Podcasts (audio and/or Video) from WGMs — these could be delivered as a member benefit which would be hugely valuable to many current and potential members (helping to reduce very expensive member churn). Some extracts or complete items could be delivered free as a marketing exercise
 - If we're going to conflate classes and enumerated instances in the diagram, we should list all of the services that have currently been approved, i.e. EIS, RLUS, CRFQ, and (I believe) PASS.
 - NCI notes we see the partnership with HL7 going forward as one of HL7 taking the lead on development and maintenance of the core SAEAF content as manifest in the SAEAF Book, a resource for all organizations interested in adopting SAEAF. In turn, the NCI CBIIT plans to develop a set of tools for managing SAEAF-derived semantic content (we lump this content under the rubrique "model/artifact management") which we would be willing to share with the larger community.
 - As well as selling membership and WGM attendance, HL7 currently runs a franchising operation. HL7 leases Affiliate rights to the National Organisations in return for a cut of their membership revenue. This should be captured, documented, and managed as a Product. We should be looking at how we maintain this product specification, and how we sell it, how we price it, and how we ensure that it is delivered in a cost effective and high value way. Maybe we will

move to a different business model for global presence — but for now there are franchises and we need to include that in our documentation and planning processes

- one productive way to address management of the product list might be to categorize the information we need for any "product" by what stage in the development/balloting cycle that information will be required as well as by who should be submitting that information, and finally to what end use the information is to be put.
- (10 mins) DCM discussion recap with Patient Care Tuesday Q1
- (5 mins) Feedback to TSC from International Affiliate meeting –
 - Expressing International endorsement for projects through interest in the ballot pool, like one would 'Follow' a discussion on Twitter/Linked In, tied to membership?
- Move forward to another discussion? SMART objective review, for Roadmap Strategic Initiatives

Retrieved from "http://hl7tsc.org/wiki/index.php?title=2010-01-19_TSC_WGM_Minutes"

- This page was last modified on January 19, 2010, at 22:57.