2010-05-19 EA IP TSC WGM Agenda

From HL7Wiki

back to EA_IP_Meeting_Agenda_and_Minutes
back to WGM_information

Day	Date	'	Time	Icon	Event	Chair	Scribe	Room
.								
Wednesday	19 May 2010	AM	Q1					
			Q2					
			Q3					

		PM	Q4		HL7 Enterprise Architecture Alpha Projects Meeting
					
					1. TSC / ArB opening remarks - Ron Parker
					2. SAIF Peer Review feedback (to date)
					3. *SAIF and Sound;* work in progress from Project Services
					   • presentation
					4. Alpha Project Updates (30 minutes)
					   • PASS (Privacy, Access, and Security Services) Don Jorgenson, project lead; Abdul-Malik Shakir, ArB Liaison
					   • CTS2 (Common Terminology Services Release 2) - Russ Hamm, project lead; Cecil Lynch, ArB liaison
					   • Infoway Blueprint 2015 - Ron Parker, project lead and ArB liaison
					   • The Practical Guide to SOA in Healthcare Volume II: Immunization Management Case Study, by Government Projects WG - Steve Hufnagel and Nancy Orvis, project leads;
					      ▪ Link to draft: http://hssp.wikispaces.com/PracticalGuide
					   • ITS- Project: The ITS ~~is~~ Might Be Broken - Dale Nelson, project lead and ArB liaison
					   • EHR WG - Electronic Health Record System Functional Model Release 2 (EHR-S FM R2), Pat Van Dyke, project lead; John Koisch, ArB liaison
					   • OO – Composite Order. Austin Kreisler, project lead; Patrick Loyd, ArB liaison
					   • Structured Documents – Keith Boone
					   • caEHR - Charlie Mead
					5. Next Steps – 10 minutes
						Ron Parker, ArB Co-Chair	Lynn Laakso	El Pardo I

.								

Contents

- 4 Meeting Outcomes

Meeting Minutes

HL7 Enterprise Architecture Alpha Projects Meeting Location: Alvorada I		Date: 2010-05-19 Time: Q4 Weds, 15:30-17:00 BZT	
Facilitator	Ron Parker	**Note taker(s)**	Lynn Laakso
Attendee	**Name**	**Affiliation**	
See http://gforge.hl7.org/gf/download/docmanfileversion/5702/7305/2010MayWGM_Attendees_EAIP_Alpha_scan.pdf for scanned sign-in sheet			
x	Beeler, George (Woody)	Beeler Consulting	
x	Benson, Tim	tim.benson@abries.co.uk	
x	Bird, Linda	MOHH.COM.SG	
x	Bond, Andy	NEHTA	
x	Boone, Keith	GE	
x	Curry, Jane	ArB	
x	Dickinson, Gary	EHR Standards.com	
x	Dixon Hughes, Richard	DH4 Pty Ltd/HL7 International	
x	Duteau, Jean	GPI/MnM (NCI)	
x	Haddorff, Rick	Mayo, Project Services	
x	Hufnagel, Steve	DOD: MHS	
x	Julian, Tony	Mayo	
x	Laakso, Lynn	HL7 HQ	
x	McCauley, Vincent	HL7 Australia	
x	McCay, Charles	TSC Chair, Ramsey Systems	
x	McKenzie, Lloyd	HL7 Canada/ MnM	
x	Mead, Charlie	ArB	
x	Mulrooney, Galen	VA	
x	Natarajan, Ravi	NHS	
x	Parker, Ron	Canada Health Infoway	
x	Singureanu, Ioana	VA	
x	Van Dyke, Pat	EHR	
x	Wrightson, Ann	HL7 UK	
Quorum Requirements Met: n/a			

Agenda

1. TSC / ArB opening remarks - Ron Parker and Charlie Mead
2. SAIF Peer Review feedback (to date)
3. *SAIF and Sound;* work in progress from Project Services
     - presentation
4. Alpha Project Updates (30 minutes)

Supporting Documents

- Slides of NCI CBIIT efforts at http://www.hl7.org/Library/Committees/tsc/2010-05-19_TSC_SAIF_Alpha_Update_NCI_Slides.pdf
- Full slide presentation: http://gforge.hl7.org/gf/download/docmanfileversion/5705/7308/NIH-May12-2010.pptx

- SAIF and Sound presentation - http://gforge.hl7.org/gf/download/docmanfileversion/5643/7233/SAIFandSound-FastTracktoStandardsDevelopment.pptx
- Mapping of work artifacts and requirements to SAIF with Austin Kreisler -
    - http://gforge.hl7.org/gf/download/docmanfileversion/5703/7306/CDAHL7SAEAF_ImplementationGuide2.ppt
    - http://gforge.hl7.org/gf/download/docmanfileversion/5704/7307/CDAR3-SAEAF-Matrix-projectPlan.xls

Minutes

TSC/Arb opening remarks, Ron and Charlie Mead

SAIF Peer Review feedback (to date)

Seven themes to responses to peer review request 3 or 4 are very substantive, including Lloyd McKenzie, Steve Hufnagel, Ann Wrightson (who are present) Some themes:

- What constitutes things at different layers, esp. PIM and PISM
- Editorial issues with diagramming
- Traceability
- Seems connecting the dots and reading between the lines was necessary.

Conclusions:

- BF is in for some significant rework.
- Absence of governance framework and information framework is problematic for implementation.

Should we continue to expect assistance from the alphas on providing input or will you want to wait for the revisions?

Steve notes artifacts developed in TOGAF, Zachman, etc then trying to map them into the framework. Seemed to work to just reference these other artifacts from within the ECCF grid. Suggests a hybrid exercise to fill in the viewpoints with references.

Ron further notes that there are things in the BF that may belong in an implementation guide. Narrative will strive to be HL7-neutral as possible. Using distributed computing design paradigm, need to assert those implications and then add the context to transport paradigm. Met with SOA this morning to talk about the problem.

CMead slides from CBIIT have SOA strategic goals. SAIF not talking about an implementation, but a design paradigm. Design paradigm is about benefits, principles and goals. These include: Interoperability vs integration, increased federation, business and technology alignment, and vendor neutrality. You can get integration with Z-segments but not true interoperability. Strategic benefits include increased ROI, increased organizational agility, and reduced IT footprint. Eight design principles bring Challenges including design complexity, need for design standards (informational and behavioral), top down delivery requirements, governance requirements, contract-first (anti-agile) design/delivery.

Charlie then showed a slide that indicated everything the NCI had already been doing, and it was the bottom right three boxes. Need to do the rest of the grid.

Keith Boone asks why we continue to use the acronyms like PIM and PISM, when we get lost; why not use plain English like logical model or conceptual model. CIM pronounced as "sim" is hard to recognize.

CMead notes the NCI IG will be posted in two weeks. It is asked not to use "ECCF" but "Conformance Framework". The architect community feels they've been ignored or not listened to, but the developers don't understand the material, and need plain language.

Woody asys the HDF terms aren't used for the same reason. Ron notes that the use of jargon when you have shared semantics is acceptable, but otherwise it is a problem. You can avoid further confusion of talking about levels (e.g. CIM, PIM) once the context of the viewpoint is set.

Jean notes John Koisch has a document in which he describes the relationships between terms. It is not about HL7 but about specifications written in an Enterprise Architecture.

Consensus that an HL7-specific implementation guide for those concepts is needed.

Steve noted they defined the objective of a particular viewpoint in the view, including who its users are, and what its typical products might be. The implementation guide could have twelve chapters for each viewpoint, to allow users as

analysts to focus on the conceptual level and so on.

Ron notes we need 3 types of IGs 1. Specification design for HL7 the organization Components of that guide need contribution by HL7 WGs 2. Reference IG adapted by other organizations for their purposes 3. Reference IG for vendors of solutions of systems in that pattern

Steve adds:
Panic due to the multiple viewpoints when they are only working on one cell of the grid. He and Gary Dickinson noted some work on EHR FM was going to be a state diagram in the PIM and no other part of the grid even mattered.
Ron notes there has been a presumption that a project must engage with all 12 elements of the grid, which is not true.
Charlie Mead adds if you have a particular role you care about certain sections of the grid.

Steve shares a concept of the audience-specific view.

SAIF and Sound; work in progress from Project Services

Rick Haddorff discussed the SAIF and Sound. Join them Q3 PSC WG meeting tomorrow for further interaction.
Ann notes the stack being brought in from OMG had certain technology expectations with certain models regarding Services.
Cmead notes when they first started work on the ECCF they are not using OMG terms but conceptual, logical, implementable. CIM, PIM, and PISM well enough established they thought they could use them. We can take them back out if they are not well understood.
Lloyd says the project process shouldn't be referencing the framework at all. Artifacts coming from the architecture should fit into the framework, some artifacts are derived and some are defined. The project process referring the framework is premature.
Woody notes Slide 5 is divergent and not really coherent with the rest of the slide deck.
Ioana adds this is an attempt to represent communication with the different roles where we struggle with this in the past.
Keith asks on slide 7 layering both down and across, but Ioana notes that you can use this process in balloting using the PLPCD to vet your business requirements. Balloting DAM they get stakeholders engaged. Keith thinks that stating that a DAM is only balloted as informative is misleading, but Woody notes that the TSC has offered this guidance at this time.
Ann asks if this implies you must reballot; it is frequently an iterative process. Iterative or refinement?
Ballot artifact is growing with each iteration.
Ann asks how we introduce configuration management on these changes. Ron notes we will need changes to our own architecture to support these changes.

Keith notes we haven't mapped out when we have a fast-track.
Woody notes there are work groups invested that need to review this in more detail, especially Publishing. Ron adds we need to craft some objectives about how to land this and position it for the next WGM.

Lloyd notes that we indicate sequence of CIM artifacts leading to PIM artifacts but we don't know if it will work out that way.
Woody says MnM and Publishing have a say in the process, and the TSC probably needs to decide where the process sits. MnM and Vocabulary were waiting for this to come out of the ArB and PSC jumped in.

Ioana notes DIM, SIM and LIM from the HDF need to be translated for people, so we could get rid of them and use the SAIF terminology to have synergistic communication. We've never really adopted these terms in real life, let's retire them before they gain unnecessary traction. Keith agrees.

Charlie McCay asks who will steward the proposed next steps. Keith asks if you need an opportunity to present this to leaders in the different Work Groups (Steering Divisions), but really present it and discuss, not an overview. ArB, Publishing, MnM for example. Charlie will work with Rick and Freida on further development.

To what extent is this pre-empting the EA work that is supposed to be happening, asks Ann. Ron notes that will also be part of the architecture development.

Alpha project updates:

PASS – no representative present

CTS2 – no representative present

Infoway Blueprint 2015 – finished business arch and moving into the technology side and information model. They ave a series of use cases which they can make available, casting in EHR-S FM as func profiles. Using language and conformance assertions from EHR-S FM. They were going to test the overlap between SAIF and TOGAF but Steve has also done this. They will report on their own analysis of the fit between paradigms.

PracGuidSOAVII- Steve states they have documented the experience doing Immunization Management capability, with peer review of draft hope to finalize in October. Air Force will be actual implementation, with prelim design review (PDR) in June with prototype in September.

ITS: Ann notes as outgoing interim ITS cochair, as an alpha project is has not happened, but the underlying work is lively and fruitful, with a number of hopeful prototype style projects working on how it might work in future. Charlie McCay working with Keith on MicroITS and other efforts. Keith says they're looking at balloting definition of MicroITS. ITS statements about platform generated a lot of discussion notes Ron.

EHR WG – two models under development. Gary Dickinson working with Paul Boyse on interoperability model. Steve notes that the products may only fit in one or two viewpoints.

OO – no representative present

Structured Docs – Keith notes no major update between now and the last WGM. Conceptual leaps include mapping of work artifacts and requirements to SAIF with Austin Kreisler [1], and [2]; spent last 4 months working through submissions and suggestions. There may be some insight there into process and governance. Can ask Austin for the info, SD listserv or website.

CMead noted he had already talked about NCI earlier.

Ron notes the ArB was supposed to provide support and guidance but due to day job needs has not happened as they thought. How shall they support this, going forward? Keith asks if peer review is still open. Ron says yes but will take three more ArB calls before they can start making changes to BF. Steve asks if you will share the proposed changes? Ron says they will disposition the comments and share their intent to act, even if they cannot get the changes into the documents right away. They hope to include a timeline for expectation to see the changes incorporated.
Ravi notes the folders and documentation terminology are still inconsistent. They have made progress on the wiki clarification and GForge work still in process. Charlie McCay notes that for the peer review process we need a page on the wiki to state the progress of peer review and direction.
Ann requests a commitment to rigorous simplicity.
Ron notes some of the documentation still reads like someone is thinking out loud, and is needing a strong editorial pass. There is a great deal of work to do before attempting an implementation guide. Keith recommends review by professional editor in non-health care IT.
Ann requests they avoid concise obfuscation.

Alpha project engagement process needs clarification going forward. Need an open list people can subscribe to with comments and questions. Jane suggested the ArB listserv. Need the communication strategy devised and published.

Ron is concerned about the engagement with the stated alphas, ensuring they receive support if needed and looks forward to hearing the rest of the alphas weigh in.

Adjourned 16:55 PM BZT

Meeting Outcomes

Actions *(Include Owner, Action Item, and due date)*
- Charlie McCay will work with Rick and Freida on further development of the proposed next steps for SAIF and Sound.   - Lynn will post the Conceptual leaps include mapping of work artifacts and requirements to SAIF from Austin Kreisler; (see   - http://gforge.hl7.org/gf/download/docmanfileversion/5703/7306/CDAHL7SAEAF_ImplementationGuide2.ppt   - and http://gforge.hl7.org/gf/download/docmanfileversion/5704/7307/CDAR3-SAEAF-Matrix-projectPlan.xls
Next Meeting/Preliminary Agenda Items

- .

- This page was last modified 13:27, 28 May 2010.