


# 2010-10-04 TSC WGM Innovations Workshop

## From HL7 TSC

[back to TSC Minutes and Agendas](#)

[back to WGM Information \(http://wiki.hl7.org/index.php?title=WGM\\_information\)](http://wiki.hl7.org/index.php?title=WGM_information)

Due to the success of this workshop at the January and May Working Group Meetings, another has been scheduled for the October Plenary and Working Group Meeting in Cambridge, MA. This TSC-hosted workshop will explore how new ideas can more effectively be introduced to HL7 and incubated prior to a formal standards development project starting. This may include help identifying the relevant work groups, help engaging with stakeholders and finding project funding.

Day	Date	'	Time	Icon	Event	Chair	Scribe	Room
.								
Monday	4 October 2010	PM	Q3, 4		HL7 Research and Innovations Workshop <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Q3: Brainstorming session               <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Objective: set structure for the committee.                   <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Objective becomes that by next WGM might have a proper committee meeting with a clear agenda and invite people to come and give presentations from the idea list, evaluate and enhance the process moving forward.</li> </ul> </li> <li>2. Review and discussion of ideas from May and January WGMs</li> </ol> </li> <li>■ Q4: Conclusions and next steps</li> </ul>			Haym Solomon

## Contents

- 1 Minutes
  - 1.1 Meeting Information
  - 1.2 Agenda
  - 1.3 Minutes
  - 1.4 Meeting Outcomes

## Minutes

### Meeting Information

<b>HL7 Research and Innovations Workshop Meeting Minutes</b>		<b>Date: 2010-10-04</b>	
<b>Location: Q3, Q4, Charles Sumner</b>		<b>Time: Q3 and Q4, 1:45 pm - 5 pm</b>	
<b>Facilitator</b>	Ed Tripp	<b>Note taker(s)</b>	Lynn Laakso
Q3	Gerald Beuchelt	Mitre	
Jane Curry	HIS Inc		
Q3	Steve Fine	Cerner	
x	Freida Hall	VA	
Q3	Gaby Jewell	Cerner	
x	Lynn Laakso (scribe)	HL7 HQ	
Q3	Charlie McCay	HL7 TSC Chair	
Q4	Sean McIlvenna	Alschuler Associates	
Q3	Brad Pedrow	GS1 US	
x	Ed Tripp	Facilitator, ESTripp and Associates	
<b>Quorum Requirements Met:</b> n/a			

## Agenda

### Agenda Topics

- Q3: Brainstorming session
  1. Review  
 (<http://gforge.hl7.org/gf/download/docmanfileversion/5884/7606/InnovationReview2010>)  
 and discussion of ideas from May and January WGMs

## 2. Objective: set structure for the committee.

- Objective becomes that by next WGM might have a proper committee meeting with a clear agenda and invite people to come and give presentations from the idea list, evaluate and enhance the process moving forward.

## ■ Q4: Conclusions and next steps

## Supporting Documents

- <http://gforge.hl7.org/gf/download/docmanfileversion/5884/7606/InnovationReview2010Oct.p>
- <http://gforge.hl7.org/gf/download/docmanfileversion/5886/7608/InnovationTemplate.greenCl>

## Minutes

### ■ Q3: Brainstorming session

#### 1. Review and discussion of ideas from May and January WGMs

List of innovations project on slide show. Highlighted ones provided updates prior to session (3).

B2I Tooling, Brandon represented by Jane Curry Model to Model Conformance Checker Needs funding to progress, they didn't think anyone at HL7 was interested. Jane says Model 2 Model conf is being discussed in Tooling and MnM for conformance checking without direct requirement traceability. Perception of lack of interest from HL7 means the Innovations group is not doing their job in providing visibility. There were videos initially but no one knows where the links are. Action Item: post links to the initial videos on the wiki; Freida to email Ken.

How to proceed, do we make a wiki page for B2i to fill out or point to some web site of theirs? Need to capture responses and input to the projects we put out there. There needs to be follow through – innovations doesn't come for free. So part of process is to review the ideas, determine if we pursue or shut them down. Jane says it's too hard to do it just at these meetings – they are too far apart. Need a way to get a feel from those in the larger HL7 community if they want it pursued or not (yes/no vote) and point them to the work in progress.

hData: simplified health data exchange (Gerald Beuchelt) Involved with ITS. Project scope statement approved, coming up for ballot. It's been brought into the realm of mainstream HL7 work, not under Innovations any longer. Gerald credits the Innovations activity for promotion and awareness to move it forward. We can declare success and move on. Charlie feels there's still some novelty to the specifications themselves that should be tracked. There may be impacts to MnM's work and ArB etc. Charlie feels though there are discussions happening elsewhere we should still track. If we get through to an Incubator "branding" we may want this to still be part of that effort. Ed suggests Gerald get an article in the newsletter on his experience with the process.

Model-Driven Health Tools (MDHT) (Dave Carlson and John Timm) Involves SDWG, Publishing, Tooling, etc (see slide show). Pilot for Genetic Testing Reports, and CDA tools being developed in project for Progress Note. Jane reports there's a demo Q2 Tuesday. Remains to discuss what to make it self-supporting, currently an OHT tool. This tool is non-volunteer contributed, non-vendor donated and HL7 hasn't done a lot with this type of tool. HL7 would have to support how to use

the open source code within the standards development use. If we've got a project (implementation guide) that's been through HL7 as an implementation guide using tools that HL7 doesn't endorse using outputs that HL7 doesn't endorse, is that a problem, asks Charlie. Jane says it produced a PDF. Other than registering the templates in the OID registry, otherwise as a PDF it doesn't fit in with our other artifacts. It's not in MIF. Dave's tool went as far as bringing the input to MIF format albeit the older version. No component reuse like SMD provides. Publishing is evaluating it for use with other projects.

Skip's name is on Configuration Management, Information Governance (of assets in device software), Intellectual Property, and Packaging and Distribution (P2). Jane reports they are all part of the Shared Artifact Repository. Just approved in OHT as part of Shared Artifact Repository, and noted as prerequisites. Charlie asks if you're packaging something you must have some sort of a product, but we're still working on our Product Lists. Intellectual property speaks to different kinds of resources not just our standards/specifications.

Freida suggests towards statusing progress on these issues to have a wiki page, with a template for what you're looking for to give updates. The MARC-HI site would be a good place to point to. We need a wiki page. Each item can have a page, with a template, and use categories, etc. Charlie suggests a wiki category for each work group and a separate wiki category for Innovations, and use a category combination in one's search.

Freida notes the Pligg item. Electronic Services could not move it forward. HL7 resources were not available to work on it, but if Ken wanted to host it and Linda provide training on using it they could do so. Pligg was also meant to be piloted with business plan development at the HL7 Board level but the enthusiasm just wasn't there. If we move forward with it, it will need to be in a finite or sustainable space. You'd need to pilot it with a migration or conversion strategy in place. If it's successful, what do we do with it?

Ed draws a process chart, with identification of idea to solve "X" problem, flowing to decision box on value, if value determined move to Incubate, then assess again, and move to adopt. Charlie asks if there's a third option for Value assessment for shelving an idea for later consideration. (park it or put it on the bench). Jane says you have to employ criteria on what is valuable, and may be different on process criteria versus tooling criteria. Jane notes the criteria with the publishing stuff that it would have to not interfere with what we're already doing.

Charlie addresses Incubator Branding page. He has not sent out his statement to the group. Do we want to establish a wiki and web presence as a Group or continue it as a TSC project? Perhaps under T3SD as part of the infrastructure of the organization. If we have a wiki page and a listserv we can measure interest. If the organization decides it's not a good idea to continue with this group we can archive the wiki page and be done. Needs to be explicit that we don't have funding for ideas. Should communicate that you need to bring not only your own proposal but willingness to put effort into others' proposals.

Branding proposal for projects wanting to make an example of it. Something new that impacts and challenges elements of status quo, currently must deal with areas of resistance first to get through approval process at SD and TSC. Something like DCMs or the old Birds of a Feather meetings (BOF) to produce white papers or specifications, and meeting virtually, need something like the BOF type branding for things like the Security Cookbook. Doesn't fit in with the current project

process. Hasn't been through a ballot but self claimed HL7 Security and Risk Assessment process. Gerald notes we could move in two stages that once a project is accepted into the incubation process, then once it passes muster as a real project it becomes part of the mainstream. Charlie notes we have normative, DSTU, documents etc. that people recognize, and like Eclipse does you can get 'badged' as an incubator. With support you can migrate to a mainstream project. Gerald warns against too much process applied to innovations.

Output of the successful incubator process becomes a project scope statement to join the mainstream and realize the activity. The front loading doesn't have to mean filling in a form, but can be hallway conversations. Or perhaps just four fields on a form to be very simple but can't have not even a list or risk perception that no one in HL7 is interested as happened with B2I. Freida suggests someone you can call if you want to start a project, so you don't have to worry about where the form is etc.

- Objective: set structure for the committee.
  - Objective becomes that by next WGM might have a proper committee meeting with a clear agenda and invite people to come and give presentations from the idea list, evaluate and enhance the process moving forward.
- Q4: Conclusions and next steps

GreenCDA update by Sean McIlvenna Take a set of templates like CCD and flatten it to simplify. Taking considerations the implementers don't need to be concerned with (mood codes, type codes) and have a transform only on the dynamic data. Going to see how well it's received with the CCD example and go from there, they don't know what else will be next. GreenCDA is not itself a standard but a methodology to assist in implementation of CDA based system. Created a schema for each template. It's basically an implementation guide.

Lynn asked if this still met criteria such as we discussed earlier with hData or was it mature enough to have moved beyond an Innovations Project. It was felt that it stood on its own, the ballot results indicate it is moving into the mainstream.

See page 13 of the ballot document at

[http://www.hl7.org/documentcenter/ballots/2010SEP/downloads/CDAR2\\_IG\\_GREENMOD4CCD\\_R1\\_](http://www.hl7.org/documentcenter/ballots/2010SEP/downloads/CDAR2_IG_GREENMOD4CCD_R1_)  
Sean will send the slide to Lynn to post with the minutes.

Ed would like now to flesh out the conceptual outline on the process for Innovations going forward.

Push back on the concept of a form, so perhaps approach it as an "Idea Registration". Would need: Concept Name, Contact and Problem/Issue Addressed. Freida suggested we might want to solicit who they thought were the interested parties, but that might come later. From idea registration, we schedule a presentation. We would put the list into the agenda for the upcoming WGM. Would also want to establish a wiki presence for that idea. Development of the wiki page ought to be the contact for the idea, once the page is created and the requestor is notified of the page link. Has to be on the HL7 wiki, and anyone that registers can edit.

From the "Idea to Solve 'x'" box we get a presentation, getting into assessing value, how will that be done? There is a risk to subjecting an immature idea to a consensus process to vote yes or no. Do we have an Innovations Work Group to make the assessment and tag the ones that are of interest? Does the Work Group need to develop the assessment criteria? Any concept registered gets the opportunity to present. Do we then solicit a Work Group to 'sponsor' the idea and take it forward? If no Work Group will accept sponsorship it will be tabled. That is, the Value decision point goes either to Incubate, trash, or Save for Later (tabled, benched, or parked)

During the process, we brand it as an Incubator project rather than an HL7 Project.

The Assess decision point needs definition. The Working Group sponsor as well as the contact will be expected to post to the Wiki. They can present the results back to the next Innovations meeting.

1. What will be assessed
2. How measured
3. Expected duration of incubation
4. Results:

Need an announcement prior to the WGM about what the presentations will be. Maybe even an article in the newsletter about what is on the idea register.

## Meeting Outcomes

<b>Actions</b> <i>(Include Owner, Action Item, and due date)</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>■</li></ul>
<b>Next Meeting/Preliminary Agenda Items</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>■</li><li>■</li></ul>

Retrieved from "[http://hl7tsc.org/wiki/index.php?title=2010-10-04\\_TSC\\_WGM\\_Innovations\\_Workshop](http://hl7tsc.org/wiki/index.php?title=2010-10-04_TSC_WGM_Innovations_Workshop)"

- 
- This page was last modified on October 5, 2010, at 00:11.