

2010-05-15 TSC WGM Agenda

From HL7 TSC

TSC Saturday meeting for 2010May WGM





[back to TSC Minutes and Agendas](#)







Contents

- 1 TSC Saturday meeting for 2010May WGM
 - 1.1 Agenda
 - 1.2 Minutes
 - 1.2.1 Minutes/Conclusions Reached:
 - 1.2.1.1 Q1 - Roadmap and HL7 Strategic Issues: 9 am to 10:30 am
 - 1.2.1.2 Q2 - TSC Planning and Open Issue Review: 11 am to 12:30 pm
 - 1.2.1.3 Q3 - 1:30 pm to 3 pm
 - 1.2.1.4 Q4 - Architecture and Tooling: 3:30 pm to 5pm

[back to WGM Information](#)

Agenda

Day	Date		Time	Icon	Event	Chair	Scribe	Room
Saturday	15 May 2010		AM Q1		Roadmap and HL7 Strategic Issues: 9 am to 10:30 am 1. Roll Call and Introduction of visitors (including declaration of interests) 2. Additions to, and acceptance of, agenda: 3. Roadmap discussion 4. HL7 Quality Plan	Charlie McCay	Lynn Laakso	Bandeirantes
			Q2		TSC Planning and Open Issue Review: 11 am to 12:30 pm 1. (45 mins) Review Open Issues List <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ TSC Tracker # 1511, For 2010MayWGM: DSTU Approval Process review and discussion <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Motion: to approve request to publish DSTU for Neonatal Care Report (NCR) Implementation Guide for CDA Release 2 at TSC Tracker #1551 ■ TSC Tracker # 1364 Foster development of Product Strategy <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Status: On agenda Q3 ■ TSC Tracker # 1319 IPR, patents, and copyright issues <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Status: for discussion ■ TSC Tracker # 984 JIC Project: Harmonised health informatics document registry and glossary <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Status: has not yet come as project scope for approval within HL7 	Charlie McCay	Lynn Laakso	Bandeirantes
			PM Q3		TSC Project Review: 1:30 pm to 3 pm 1. TSC Continuous Improvement objectives <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ WGM Development Project ■ Innovations Project ■ Product Strategy Project (Project Insight # 413) ■ T3F Strategic Initiative Review ■ Review ISO/CEN/HL7 tracking; should the TSC be hosting the Sunday Q4 'activities with other SDOs'? 	Charlie McCay	Lynn Laakso	Bandeirantes
			Q4		Architecture and Tooling: 3:30 pm to 5pm 1. Governance of full project life cycle 2. ArB	Charlie McCay	Lynn Laakso	Bandeirantes

					3. Tooling			
.								
Sunday	16 May 2010	AM	Q1					
			Q2					
		PM	Q3					
		Q4		HL7 Activities with Other SDOs	Charlie McCay	Lynn Laakso	Versailles I and II	
		Q5		TSC Sunday Dinner/Meeting SAIF	Charlie McCay	Lynn Laakso	Liberdade	
.								
Monday	17 May 2010	AM	Q1					
			Q2					
		PM	Q3					
		Q4						
		Q5		TSC Monday Co-Chairs Dinner/Meeting	Charlie McCay	Lynn Laakso	Windsor	
.								
Tuesday	18 May 2010	AM	Q1					
			Q2					
		Lunch		TSC Tuesday Luncheon Meeting	Charlie McCay	Lynn Laakso	Versailles I	
				WGM Planning - agenda setting next two WGMs - agenda links <ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ (September) Review TSC SWOT and Three-Year Plan▪ (January) Review TSC Mission and Charter				
		PM	Q3					
			Q4					
.								
Wednesday	19 May 2010	AM	Q1					
			Q2					
		PM	Q3					
		Q4		Enterprise Architecture Alpha Projects Meeting			El Pardo I	
		.						
Thursday	20 May 2010	AM	Q1		HL7 Research and Innovations Workshop <ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Q1: Overview and Video Presentations▪ Q2: Discussion and next steps			Versailles I
		Q2						
		PM	Q3					
			Q4					
		.						

Minutes

HL7 TSC Meeting Minutes		Date: 2010-05-15	
Location: Bandeirantes		Time: 9:00am - 5:00pm BRT (GMT-3)	
Facilitator	Charlie McCay	Note taker(s)	Lynn Laakso
Attendee	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	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
regrets; travel delay	Charlie Mead	HL7 ArB	meadch@mail.nih.gov
x	Ravi Natarajan	HL7 Affiliate	Ravi.Natarajan@nhs.net
x	Ron Parker	HL7 ArB Alternate	rparker@infoway-inforoute.ca
x	John Quinn	HL7 CTO	jquinn@hl7.org

travel delay	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	Rene Spronk	guest, HL7 NL chair, RIMBAA Chair	Rene.Spronk@ringholm.com
x	Jane Curry	guest, ArB and Tooling	janecurry@healthinfostrategies.com
x	Ann Wrightson	guest, HL7 UK Technical Chair	Ann.Wrightson@wales.nhs.uk
x	Gerald Beuchelt	guest, Mitre, Templates interest	gbeuchelt@mitre.org

Quorum Requirements (Co-chair +5 with 2 SD Reps) Met: yes

Agenda Topics

Q1 - Roadmap and HL7 Strategic Issues: 9 am to 10:30 am

1. Roll Call and Introduction of visitors (including declaration of interests)
2. Additions to, and acceptance of, agenda:
3. Roadmap discussion
4. HL7 Quality Plan

Q2 - TSC Planning and Open Issue Review: 11 am to 12:30 pm

1. (45 mins) Review Open Issues List
 - TSC Tracker # 1511, For 2010MayWGM: DSTU Approval Process review and discussion
 - TSC Tracker # 1420 TSC Mission/Charter review - GOM change suggestion SD reps to co-chairs
 - Status: GOM change proposal?
 - TSC Tracker # 1364 Foster development of Product Strategy
 - Status: On agenda Q3
 - TSC Tracker # 1319 IPR, patents, and copyright issues
 - Status: for discussion
 - TSC Tracker # 984 JIC Project: Harmonised health informatics document registry and glossary
 - Status: has not yet come as project scope for approval within HL7
 - TSC Tracker # 749 Review the role of the steering divisions
 - Status: DESD Article on Role of Steering Divisions published in January Newsletter. Feedback?
2. Scalability and impact of U.S. ONC work
3. (May) Review TSC Three-Year Plan
4. (May) Review Technology Plan 2009 and update milestones
5. Next WGM Planning - next two WGMs - agenda links
6. (May) Review TSC Communications Plan - how are we doing against it?
 - Maintenance project: obtain / publish WG updates to M&C, SWOTs and DMPs
 - Task: report Work Group Health, and Work Group Visibility
 - Task: Investigate work groups not having posted meeting minutes at WGM to revisit metrics on whether the WG has 'met'
 - Task: Investigate work groups meeting minutes at WGM to establish metrics on number of active in-person participants when the WG has 'met'
 - Task: Report Project Visibility
 - Task: Report Product Visibility

Q3 - TSC Project Review: 1:30 pm to 3 pm

1. TSC Continuous Improvement objectives
 - WGM Development Project
 - Innovations Project
 - Product Strategy Project (Project Insight # 413)
 - T3F Strategic Initiative Review
 - Review ISO/CEN/HL7 tracking; should the TSC be hosting the Sunday Q4 'activities with other SDOs'?

Q4 - Architecture and Tooling: 3:30 pm to 5pm

1. Governance of full project life cycle
2. ArB
3. Tooling

Sunday - SAIF?

Tuesday lunch

1. WGM Planning - agenda setting next two WGMs - agenda links
 - (January) Review TSC Mission and Charter
 - (September) Review TSC SWOT and Three-Year Plan

Supporting Documents

- http://hl7t3f.org/wiki/index.php?title=HL7_Quality_Plan
- http://hl7t3f.org/wiki/index.php?title=Quality_Analysis_in_Ballot

- http://gforge.hl7.org/gf/download/trackeritem/1551/7195/DSTU_Publication_Request_CDAR2L3_IG_NEONATALRPT_R1_D1_MAY2010.doc
- http://hl7t3f.org/wiki/index.php?title=Technology_Plan_2009
- TSC Three Year Plan

Minutes/Conclusions Reached:

Q1 - Roadmap and HL7 Strategic Issues: 9 am to 10:30 am

1. Roll Call and Introduction of visitors (including declaration of interests)
 - see attendance
2. Additions to, and acceptance of, agenda:
 - In future will have others' names on agenda items, members must take ownership of items or they won't have priority on the agenda.
 - Need reports back on items requested, written offline. Just a couple of lines, not a verbal update; post to the wiki directly, email the list or Lynn.
 - Gerald asks if we are Tweeting using tags? Rene reports they have been using WGM2010
 - Jane asks when are the reports due? By Friday 9 am Eastern time for the leadership planning call.
 - Helen suggests the agenda include questions or comments from the membership on the reports.
 - Charlie suggests to add if video or audio recording and documenting of proceedings; disclosure that recording is occurring is needed. Rene suggests it be added to the DMPs. Helen reports that the DMP is being revised now and can be addressed. Will it be with advance permission or notice? Defer conversation to PIC.
 - Charlie asks to add discussion of future agenda discussion for the remainder of the week and messages for the cochairs meeting, etc.
3. Roadmap discussion
 - Last WGM the TSC created SMART objectives. Roadmap committee reviewed them and created Subgroups tasked to work on individual initiatives. There is no comprehensive reporting back from the subgroups at this time. Who will take the lead to report back on these roadmap discussions? They will meet Wednesday morning. Need someone to bring out the actions needed to be taken by the TSC based on those recommendations. John volunteers to work with Lynn and Karen on these.
 - Jane suggests we also determine when we expect to hear back. Later this week or after the Board retreat? John will report back on the next conference call after the Roadmap committee meets this week. Ravi asks what are the deliverables and process. Need to have those initiatives identified by the Roadmap committee provide communication of expected delivery.
 - Ken thinks we need a page of definitions of what the Roadmap is about to clearly outline the goal of the Roadmap. Helen agrees and thinks the Roadmap committee needs a communications plan to the membership. Ravi notes we have worked on product and project visibility but the Roadmap does not have this visibility. Ken had started a drawing to describe them but ended up identifying tactical elements among the strategies. Need also to have marketing council wrap around that and put something out there. Noted to John, our liaison to the Roadmap committee.
4. HL7 Quality Plan
 - John reports we've discussed it a few times, Woody came up with something for January. Our progress report so far is one slide with not much to report.
 - Austin wrote an article for technical newsletter
 - Woody added wiki page for Quality Analysis in Ballot to find things that cause failures in validation, and included the ballot quality reports automatically as part of TOC for each ballot. This is the publishing effort, there are other efforts in tooling, and John will incorporate into his report.
 - Austin notes from his article several elements from Woody's report as well as concerns on reconciliation. He notes there are quality processes involved with SAIF that were not written into his article. Charlie thinks we need a project scope document for producing the quality plan, and Austin volunteers to lead the project. Need the scope statement and the responsibility is shared by TSC and CTO. ACTION ITEM: Austin will draft one and run it past John. When? Should we discuss again Tuesday lunch?
 - Is the product and services strategy part of the quality plan? It should be separate.
 - Woody suggests change to the GOM to cast negative votes other than through the ballot pool (by foundation or methodology groups). Helen asks are we authorizing individuals or the cochairs of groups, or as a committee vote? Woody suggests key representatives of a set of foundation groups they would collectively vote as a consensus as a single vote? Is 'balloting' the quality plan or will there be other quality checks upstream, asks Austin. Helen notes if a group doesn't know they have a quality problem, or do not pay attention to the quality factors. The tooling and automated QA in publishing's work to bring those out will provide upstream quality checks. John reports technical issues when the ballot workbench is backed up the day before the ballot close falsely showing ballot problems.
 - Mandarins in this case are the facilitators in every domain are supposed to participate in a formally defined publishing process and the negative votes might be cast against those whose facilitators do not participate. Ann fears innovative efforts might get stomped on before they reach DSTU. Woody notes that problems are more about a DSTU that has been out for 18 months and has never successfully had a schema validated against it. Helen notes these situations should have a plan with dated milestones to fix it rather than just a negative vote on the ballot. TSC should have the power to 'take our name off' a product.
 - Ed notes problems where the issuer of a ballot that notes during reconciliation that something would be fixed but it was not fixed. Should they note where the fix is included in the ballot before it goes to publishing? Woody notes 6 days between final content deadline and ballot opening. It's too difficult to do it a day before ballot open.
 - Charlie notes we are brainstorming content of the quality plan; we will not resolve it today. Ravi notes it is product, process, tooling, people all need to be collated in quality planning.
 - Ed's issue is what drove Austin to write the article in the first place. The balloters are on their fourth iteration and have not put in the changes that were identified and agreed to during the reconciliation of the first round of balloting. At some point it is wasting the time of the reviewer. Need to, in the scope of that project, how that process will happen.
 - Is this a quality plan for the products the organization produces or for the processes we use to publish those products, or the services we offer to the member and other stakeholders? Charlie states this needs to be made clear in the project scope statement. Austin notes he will write a narrow scope to address specifications. Other initiatives should be referred to in this scope statement and addressed separately. John will report this to the board. Charlie notes that Bob Dolin has been working on a quality plan for IHTSDO which has not yet been obtained. Need also the draft project activities and expectation-setting for work items and communicated, a light-weight project plan involved with this quality plan.
 - Ann asks not to forget the affiliates and the international contribution to process and deliverables. Charlie notes that the project will need a liaison to the Affiliates Council, likely Ravi. Ravi would be happy to collect feedback from the Council to see what they'd like to see the Quality plan provide. When new projects go out for review they are sent to both the cochairs and the Affiliate chairs to engage if they find it of interest, notes Helen. Ravi would like to see the architecture to show with a swim lane diagram how the different points of quality are checked. The HDF describes that but it is not well followed and enforced. It falls down both in closing the loop to bring feedback to the committees and also on enforcement, notes Jane. The project life cycle is supposed to be enforced by the work group co-chairs notes Ken. Need another avenue for implementers to say that this doesn't work, besides just balloting. Charlie notes we've had discussions on project health to note compliance; perhaps the quality plan can address that. Gerald asks if the projects have issue trackers like the TSC? Issue trackers are not effective as a control mechanism notes Woody. Gerald notes that it works to raise visibility of issues. Austin adds the visibility would be effective. Charlie notes the NIB also an important check and has been effective. Helen adds that it's two committees consistently not following the issue then we

should not as the TSC spend 80% of our time discussing a problem exhibited by such a small group. Put them on probation, hand-hold them through the process, call them out. Charlie adds if you don't get the NIB in, you can't ballot; if you don't get your preview material in, you can't get on the ballot. If you don't include material you said you would on the reconciliation, they should be removed from the ballot. Helen says even if it is found to happen even after the ballot opens just pull them out of the ballot. Woody asks how do we reconcile when the committee says that they did it and the negative voter maintains it is not addressed. Helen suggests that if the voter addresses it with the committee, the Steering Division, and the TSC with full information and education is found to be in bad faith, then you can pull it out of the ballot. Woody notes that it will be difficult to address within 30 days during when the ballot is open.

- Charlie notes that this repeating problem is clearly something the TSC needs to address. Woody notes we should indeed be tough when we are confident that the issue has been carefully reviewed. Austin notes if we can identify work groups that are abusing the reconciliation process, we are able to insert into their processes the requirement for a rigorous peer review before returning to ballot.
- Mead notes the TSC should invite the chairs of those committees to talk to the TSC and discuss this particular concern. One committee is Pharmacy and the other was Patient Care with whom we are now working more closely. Both are in DESD. It is not exclusive to them. Also there was stale content which was removed from the ballot site, which helped. Should we invite them to participate with the quality plan. Woody says we should have their publishing facilitators attend the publishing calls. Ravi notes we used the TSC's power in getting the DCM project more clearly identified. Can we have them identify the specifics of the changes in a ballot? Then such a spreadsheet identifying the changes can be reviewed to see that the negative vote reconciliation is included. Need also a liaison with CFH and CHI to see how their quality processes can be reflected. Can have also participation in publishing calls added to Work Group Health. Could add requirement to include publishing facilitator – Helen notes we all review with project scope statements.

Recess 10:35am

Q2 - TSC Planning and Open Issue Review: 11 am to 12:30 pm

Follow-through; identified a need for template for project communication plan to go along with the project scope statement. Suggested during the break that hData project will work with project services to draw up a template with Gerald and Lynn. ACTION ITEM: Lynn and Gerald to work with Project Services to draft a template.

1. (45 mins) Review Open Issues List

- TSC Tracker # 1511, For 2010MayWGM: DSTU Approval Process review and discussion
 - **Motion:** to approve request to publish DSTU for Neonatal Care Report (NCR) Implementation Guide for CDA Release 2 at TSC Tracker #1551
 - snuck in a request for publication for Neonatal Care report
 - 8 negatives on this request with publication – reconciliation of negative votes; person changed their negative but the followers of that voter did not go back in and change their votes to follow those.
 - Helen asks what is expected of the TSC to do their due diligence. Should the explanation of the reconciliation of the negatives be included on the form? How will we know if someone is being railroaded. Woody notes that the GOM guidance is that they should consider the negatives and not just disregard them simply because they can, because they are permitted to in the GOM. Helen asks if they are not required to offer consideration then why does the TSC have to review it.
 - Ron notes for a future discussion point whether all clinical sub domains under the purview of Structured Documents? This is neonatal care report. He thinks SD defines how one uses structured documents but not how all the clinical domains shall be represented. FUTURE TOPIC: at project approval, who should be the primary sponsor. Assign to Ron.
 - Austin suggests we add a section to this to have the cochair explain/summarize the characterization of the negatives and consideration given. Helen asks who checks to make sure that what is being published is of poor quality (check for crap). These are not reviewed by the Steering Divisions. When projects for DSTU are up for review it is copied to the cochairs. Charlie summarizes the TSC is reviewing to ensure that the remaining negative votes are not saying "this is crap", and that if one is coming up on the agenda should be notified to the cochairs and should have a representation at that TSC meeting. Suggestion is that the reconciliation spreadsheet and the request to publish be circulated to the cochairs a week before coming to the TSC agenda. How do we communicate to the membership? Need a recommendation.
 - Jane Curry suggests the realm be added to the request to publish. Need to include the project scope statement for that information. So the notification package should include the request to publish, the scope statement, and the reconciliation package. A set of hyperlinks is fine. Ann suggests the link be directly to the document not to a repository. This suggestion should be taken in general for all communication. Woody notes the realm should also be added to the request to publish as a key identifier.
 - Resolved (by general consensus) Three additions to form: hyperlinks to reconciliation package and project scope statement, realm, and form for comments on the reconciliation.
 - **VOTE:** Request to publish unanimously approved.
- TSC Tracker # 1364 Foster development of Product Strategy
 - Status: On agenda Q3
- TSC Tracker # 1319 IPR, patents, and copyright issues
 - Status: need a place for the Working group where issues can be enumerated and status of issues can be reviewed and participants can volunteer to help with issues. John suggests the TSC ask the Board for a clearly documented policy on IP. Woody notes that there is information in-flight from agreements from four years ago never documented in minutes, that risks decisions nominally adopted in principle that need to be formalized, namely tooling publishing IP. Helen adds that it also needs to have the legalese interpreted for organizational members.
 - Charlie notes we need an IP communication channel at WGMs. Parallel, the TSC needs to engage with the Board on changes to IP policy. That process in development of IP policy needs to be in the TSC discussion. Woody has an IP presentation that could be advanced to the TSC articulating his understanding of the policy. John notes that despite 23 years with this organization he's still uncomfortable making statements on the HL7 IP policy. Charlie asks do we wish to review prior to Board meeting? Mead suggests we publish to TSC and discuss at upcoming conference call. FUTURE AGENDA ITEM: We'll try to fit it in on Sunday evening. Woody will send a link.
 - Ravi asks who is responsible for this within HL7 – it is the Board. The TSC can recommend, endorse, raise issues. Ravi suggests we have a tracker for IPR to collect issues and points for discussion. What do we do about push back. Affiliates need to engage on the affiliate related content and IP. Ann suggests that IP at the affiliate agenda on Sunday – Helen says Thursday?
- TSC Tracker # 984 JIC Project: Harmonised health informatics document registry and glossary
 - Status: has not yet come as project scope for approval within HL7
 - Question on whether the glossary included in the ballot should be included; needs to be broader than just Vocabulary WG including Publishing. Woody reports that last week ISO WG dropped it as a document and remains just a registry database. Publishing WG wants to manage processes and glossaries in general, like the Green sheets and incorporate into V3 glossary and then have people submit definitions to ISO/JIC process. As an unfunded mandate it has not made progress. Andy Stechishin was targeted to do the work. Need to ask Heather Grain to draft a scope statement. Terms can have multiple definitions including a global and several domain-specific. Woody thought a scope statement cleared the steering division, and ACTION ITEM: Woody will work with Lynn to find it. It is on the FTSD

agenda.

- Ravi asks what is the process with the JIC projects when HL7 participates with JIC but a project comes through JIC into HL7. HL7 still has to create a project scope for projects that are participating with JIC.

2. Scalability and impact of U.S. ONC work

- Need to understand the impact of our ability to deliver specifications in a timely manner to meet the needs of PEOs to earn the revenue we anticipate. If HL7 is to be paid to do something, we don't know what we're going to be asked for and what they're going to pay.
- Ravi asks if ONC will have a representative to work with the other national programmes.
- Calvin notes the providers that are watching what ONC are doing, the other three hundred people that will be in Cambridge will be primarily focused on these issues. There is a concern of the large number of newbies showing up in October unfamiliar with the HL7 process and concerned with US Realm content and flooding existing agendas.
- Austin is worried about HL7 re-organizing itself around this funding source, that will later go away. We should have it expected to behave like a project; Jane noted the EHR-S FM which took several iterations. Helen notes its strain on the rest of the organization was very serious. Austin notes it is more than a project, but a program with a program manager for the various projects underneath.
- Ron notes to be intentionally naïve, given what Infoway had to do, they did within HL7 Canada and then brought this to HL7 International. Therein lies the problem that the U.S. does not have its realm having separate structure. We could blow the concept of HL7 International completely asunder.
- One context, how will this happen, how to deliver
- Second context: find out how the Board will sell this product or scale back the budget.
- Mead notes we should get the U.S. Affiliate afloat, and work on the Quality Plan – the things that we as the TSC can have impact upon.
- Ken notes he represents an interested vendor, as well as ACLA, and if we needed a point person to take charge of this, though John is better connected in D.C.
- Calvin says the challenge is the educational process and the process as defined by the GOM.
- FUTURE AGENDA ITEM: add to Sunday night. Evaluate quality plan and U.S. Affiliate efforts, and documenting what we think the work items will be.

3. (May) Review TSC Three-Year Plan: will be impacted by ONC discussion; move to Q3.

Recessed 12:32PM

Q3 - 1:30 pm to 3 pm

1. Jan2011 WGM discussion, impact on workload with U.S. Realm activity and attendance.

- ACTION ITEM: Lynn will find out if more Asian attendees came to Phoenix
- PIC – proposing cochair WGM assessment after each WGM. Trying to measure perceived productivity of a certain WGM. Ed notes it's the current economic environment. Do we allow teleconference for a fee so that the Work Groups can obtain participation? Woody notes the electronic meeting between face-to-face meetings are only possible with the f2f interaction in between. ACTION ITEM: Lynn to find location of results of Internationalization Task Force findings. Need to evaluate the productivity of the work groups that are doing electronic meetings here in Rio in spite of policy. Productivity at Jan WGM further complicated by the recency of the October WGM with a short time frame.

2. (May) Review TSC Three-Year Plan

- WGM development project – Helen, due to alignment with her appointment to the WGM planning task force will work with Lynn on getting a PSS ready.
 - If we had a U.S. program meeting out of cycle like certain work groups do should not include the same time as the regular WGM. If a series of IGs needed for U.S. National Initiative, and a project/program formed to deliver those initiatives, we cannot prohibit them from discussing it outside of Sydney.
- Innovations project: Ed Tripp, working with Ken Lunn
- Product strategy:
 - Ken feels we need better marketing support. Jane notes that you build the product line and then turn the information over to marketing.
 - We have captured the available information for each spec, ready for a web page for each product. Some projects develop specs for stakeholders that have engaged in the project. However the rest of the life cycle of the specification we do not engage, for implementation, marketing, measuring market penetration and uptake. We need a strategy for doing that.
 - Mead suggests we next identify which products have been commercially successful. Rene notes that such collections by other groups have been failures.
 - The product list is mainly the published and balloted specifications. There are other ways HL7 provides value in education, training, tools etc. that may not be regarded as a product. Education committee does not provide that sort of marketing for affiliates. The impact of the financial implications of the products and services of the organization is yet another thread of the product strategy.
 - Financial benefit of educational sessions incorporating activities of the affiliates is something we should consider, notes Mead.
 - Impacts on the SAIF work need to also be considered.
 - Ken, Mead, Calvin and Ron volunteer to work on this. ArB is going to need to be involved. Ken will call the first meeting.
 - Need also to work with Stan's group on this.
- T3F Strategic Initiative Review: Woody to lead, try to have the review by October. Scope statement in 30 days.
- TSC Communication Plan:
 - Helen notes the communication plan needs to address communications with non co-chair members. Charlie says they have a separate list of attendees that attend Work Group Meetings. How do we identify this information to the membership in general. Austin would like to be able to send to the members of all the lists for all the work groups in the steering division. ACTION ITEM: Lynn will look into this.
 - Volunteer for lead: Ravi and Lynn

3. (May) Review Technology Plan 2009 and update milestones

■

4. Next WGM Planning - next two WGMs - agenda links

5. (May) Review TSC Communications Plan - how are we doing against it?

- Clarifying the technical responsibilities of the CTO versus the TSC. Expresses expectation of accomplishments for CTO, etc. and Ron comments that the ArB would benefit from a similar exercise with the dates. It was initially intended as an exercise to assist with the CTO evaluation. Needs to be updated. As a residual, we want a document to express the expectations of what the CTO is doing. FUTURE AGENDA ITEM: Look at a revision at an upcoming conference call of the CTO side, not necessarily the TSC side. If something needs to be added to the TSC side, it should be on the TSC three-year plan. Dependencies with TSC items should be identified. We should look at TSC self-evaluation as well, perhaps to evaluate against three-year plan. Jane suggests tracking to include level of effort/resources. Perhaps look at the T3F evaluation and make it recurring, including a 360 degree perspective from CTO, BOD, and members.
- Update this by end of this WGM and discuss at subsequent conference call ACTION ITEM: John, Charlie and Lynn to develop. Copy to ArB for those items having charge to ArB.

6. TSC Continuous Improvement objectives

- WGM Development Project – Helen has been assigned.

- Innovations Project – Charlie has received communications from Ken but needs to pass on to Ed. Workshop scheduled Q1/2 on Thursday. Agenda reviewed; no specific presentations scheduled.
 - Can also be a distraction to other activities, how soon do we assess an innovation to determine if it's the 'right' way?
 - Ed notes that necessity is the mother of invention, there must be a need for the product of the innovation and not just a way around existing process. Ravi asks what happen after its life cycle to become business as usual. Linda Fischetti had offered showing their toolkit in VA for managing innovation.
- Product Strategy Project (Project Insight # 413) Ken will lead, Mead, Calvin and Ron all will participate.
- T3F Strategic Initiative Review: Woody will lead, need to contact some of the other original T3F participants outside the TSC to evaluate.
- Review ISO/CEN/HL7 tracking; should the TSC be hosting the Sunday Q4 'activities with other SDOs'?
 - Is this really a TSC activity? JIC will no longer be meeting at HL7 WGMs. Are there new things that came into the JIC last week that need update to the group? John says yes, but without having the benefit of minutes to identify what was formally recorded it is difficult to make an update. There exists a misperception in ISO TC 215 that when JIC projects were presented they needed to take any objections instead to go to head of organization. JWG participants did not actually have jurisdiction. The SDOs session is to expose activities that HL7 engages with other organizations.
 - Ron says this is the checkpoint to identify if we are on track with the expectations of HL7 participation with SDOs.
 - This kind of reporting has fallen to the TSC because no one else has picked it up. The ORC is also involved. Some specific WGs hold relationship with individual SDOs. What would benefit HL7 most to promote to ISO e.g. Woody mentions the RIM. May need other fora to have these conversations. This also may fall into product strategy to find those elements that HL7 wants to be "the" standard. Missing some key participants from the SDOs also.
 - Helen notes Robert Stegwee will not be there tomorrow to give the JIC update; who will provide? John will give a plug for the Q4.
 - Austin suggests we request to the Board if they want this session conducted and if they want the TSC to do it or the ORC?
 - Without OMG and NCPDP it's all JIC participants. Do we need to reiterate JIC statuses again.
 - TSC discussing our strategy is one thing but the greater purpose is for HL7 attendees. TSC will continue to host this session.

Recess 3:14 pm

Q4 - Architecture and Tooling: 3:30 pm to 5pm

Resume 3:48pm

1. Governance of full project life cycle

- Project Services were trying to help people understand what projects were going on and where they were at.
- How do we maintain ongoing project status after project approval? The HDF has the guidance.
- We have mandated the Project Scope Statement (PSS). However the WGs will not going back into Project Insight to update status. There was no buy-in to go in and update milestones or target dates.
- Ken notes at the time we gave the action to Project Services we found it important to communicate where people were going and why they were on that track, and that ongoing feedback was needed. How do we categorize it in a way that is helpful to bring visibility to those seeking to engage with HL7 but not too onerous a task.
- Ravi notes the life cycle has more reflection on the quality plan, the ArB. Does the HDF need to be revisited to identify those elements that are purely theoretical and those that have been found practical. Do we need a traceability mechanism to see where the DSTU came from?
- Mead comments the PSSs that have been created, have they shown value? How can we show this? Austin notes HL7 is resource-poor. The more requirements we put on projects the likelihood they will produce anything decreases.
- Helen notes the information on a PSS is valuable, and we are not using it to its full benefit. We don't need monthly or even quarterly status updates but at each major change to the project. Some old projects need to have status updated.
- Ken notes that there may be changes to the project life cycle to sync with SAIF. Projects being up to date should be part of work group health. Linda Jenkins at HQ is directing a lot of people asking questions to HL7 to the project information from Project Insight. She notes the lack of current information is a problem.
- Austin notes that the publishing checkpoint for informative and DSTU could also include an update to Project Insight with expressing the intent to move the standard forward or if they regard it as done.
- Helen does not find it unreasonable for work groups to look at their 8 or 9 projects one time a year and update their status. Mead notes that this update is based on the rational belief that there is a benefit to it. Need to better describe the benefit.
- Charlie noted the search items from the statistic of the week had over 500 hits.
- Helen notes that we need better push on project initiation as someone was about to start the same project as she had, and he only saw it once it was about to ballot. Charlie comments that the TSC Communications Plan will benefit from Ravi's attention to this matter.
- Austin suggests we craft a new WG Health metric on adherence to project management, project updates. Look at obsoleting metrics we already have and get into continuous improvement. Ken supports this as his steering division is looking into different or additional metrics already. Project services may be the right people to evaluate those statistics, says Charlie. Ken notes the Andrea e-News might be the better place to put out those project announcements.
- Woody states the ballot announcement is going to always get more visibility. Also, new projects are added to Project Insight when Dave gets the proposal; perhaps they should not be added until they're approved. Lynn notes they may get out there as three-year planning items.
- Helen feels the projects should be updated or need to be closed when they are completed. Ron suggests we pick up the phone and call each one. Project Services did a Project Insight Review and Cleanup and only got 87% response rate; some work groups simply did not respond. Helen notes their steering division will be going through every single project. Ed suggests any projects more than two cycles past their due date have their WG red-flagged. Woody notes HDF is in trouble, so is Templates, and are due to have red-flags. Charlie notes they should be red-flagged, noted for what the problem is, and then the Steering Division can address it.
- Woody notes he's trying to update a project end date right now but cannot enter a date; this may be a problem that we can fix notes Helen.
- Charlie notes PSC, Electronic Services need to find the ways we can enable better visibility.
- Ravi notes we have many communication channels, and finds it confusing. Can we streamline this to set expectations from TSC, from Steering Division, from Work Group, from Projects. Then we can identify measures in the channels to feed into the health reporting at each subsequent level.
- Ken notes there is not one single form of communication that works for everyone. There's not a magic bullet to solve the issues.

2. ArB

- Ron reports they have gotten peer review out. They have not received many reviews back but those that they have received have been extensive. Need to let people know the kinds of things they heard, what they think they are going to do about it.
- When will Governance Framework be published? Jane notes there is draft information and she can let you know where that is, but it's not ready yet.
- Implementation Guides on SAIF from NCI; three flavors include HL7's use of SAIF to create product, for consumers of SAIF artifacts to incorporate into their products, and reference implementation guide for use in application space.

- Steve Hufnagel emerged with EHR-S FM implementation with looking for more maturity but got back excellent feedback on placement of existing artifacts.
- Alpha projects have received little feedback.
- Mead comments that you can potentially review the documents on their own without the GF. Some are reading the documents looking for an architecture and not just an architecture framework. The project is very ambitious.
- Ron notes that much of the documentation is about 'why' to rationalize the exercise and need to re-frame around the how.
- John notes that Charlie Mead shared with him a presentation used by caBIG. Ken Buetow noted that he was using the SAIF as their framework and it ended up with Doug Fridsma.
- Ann's concern is that such a document cannot be described more concisely. Ron noted they are not yet generating artifacts that are re-consumable. It is still being looked at for evaluation as a solution to a problem. It's a huge effort and it's not being reduced further. They are rocketing up the Gartner hype curve.
- Austin's concern is that it is a very large piece of IP that is loose out there in the public and without control. Ron is also concerned about its branding and marketing. Fridsma's comment on SAIF spurred immediate response to generate pathways to the most recent draft for public review.
- Charlie's concern is letting people know what is happening next. Ron notes that will be part of their three quarters of discussion tomorrow. Charlie's concern is setting the agenda for Weds Q4.
- Will the framework be balloted? Other HL7 methodology not balloted. Concerns are how to create interoperability with SOA.
- Ron notes that the intent was from the alphas we would note what existing artifacts work in this framework. Secondly the model of how things are done and accountability pattern that has to be more fully defined and business process created. As a new incarnation of the HDF it needs to be more engageable; there will be tooling required to support this new stuff, to manage the artifacts. Woody notes that the tooling group might be better at identifying the tooling that would assist the methodology; they need to know the methodology. He notes a sense that the ArB have been holding the bits and pieces close to the vest and not sharing them. No one has been willing to show the dynamic model. Ron notes there is still a great deal of work going on. There has been an inability to get closure around some of the artifacts. It is taking them a long time and they are not mature in their thinking.
- Ravi notes if this is so strategic, why can't we dedicate some proper project management to alleviate stakeholder anxiety? Ron agrees and needs to have a resourcing discussion with John. Initially Charlie Mead was able to commit a lot of John Koisch's time but resource is now wildly variable.
- Marc Koehn was PM for the EA IP, the alpha project initiation but not part of SAIF development.
- Charlie notes that the TSC is going to get a kicking on this, as the TSC was charged with resolving this issue, getting an architecture in place as a key objective three years ago. The EA IP is not making the progress it needed to make.
- Helen observes that given the work coming this year from ONC we need to stabilize and firm up our approach to this by the October meeting. What can we get, as a resetting of objective, this year?
- Woody notes the bulk of the SAIF framework already understood and in play. We have reference model, vocabulary, static models that need to be slotted into the information framework. Missing is the dynamic framework.
- Ravi agrees that we need to mitigate the striving for perfection with seeing what we can accomplish. Ron agrees with Woody that the dynamic model is what should be the area of focus; this will be a significant amount of ongoing work.
- Calvin noted that the framework was a framework and then we build an architecture but we're not discussing it in those terms. Austin says the product quality plan is going to need the governance framework and he needs to see what you have, right now, not a few months down the road. There is not any time to wait for it to be perfected; it will have to be iterative.
- Helen asks if ArB can come back with a plan tomorrow night.

Also on agenda for tomorrow; tooling, agenda for Monday evening and Working Group communication

Adjourned 5:04 PM

Actions *(Include Owner, Action Item, and due date)*

- Refer suggestion of DMP to include reference to addressing recording of meetings with advance permission or notice, to PIC; owner – Helen.
- Identify actions needed to be taken by the TSC based on Roadmap subcommittee recommendations. John volunteers to work with Lynn and Karen on these. Need to have those initiatives identified by the Roadmap committee provide communication of expected delivery. John expects to have something by the next TSC Concall (June 7).
- Roadmap committee needs a communications plan to the membership – John to address with the Board.
- Quality Plan project scope statement - Austin will draft one and run it past John for TSC discussion again Tuesday lunch.
- Communicate Resolution (by general consensus) of DSTU approval process revisions: Three additions to form: hyperlinks to reconciliation package and project scope statement, realm, and form for comments on the reconciliation. Should be distributed to cochairs and international chairs prior to consideration by TSC.
- Jan2011 WGM discussion, impact on workload with U.S. Realm activity and attendance. ACTION ITEM: Lynn will find out if more Asian attendees came to Phoenix
- Lynn and Gerald to work with Project Services to draft a template for project communication plan to go along with the project scope statement.

Next Meeting/Preliminary Agenda Items

- Future discussion point whether all clinical sub domains under the purview of Structured Documents? This is neonatal care report. He thinks SD defines how one uses structured documents but not how all the clinical domains shall be represented. FUTURE TOPIC: at project approval, who should be the primary sponsor. Assign to Ron.
- Review updated Technology/Communications plan, at an upcoming conference call: of the CTO side, not necessarily the TSC side

Retrieved from "http://hl7t3f.org/wiki/index.php?title=2010-05-15_TSC_WGM_Agenda"

- This page was last modified on May 28, 2010, at 13:08.