

2011-01-08 TSC WGM Minutes

From HL7 TSC

TSC Saturday meeting for 2011Jan WGM, Sydney Australia

[back to TSC Minutes and Agendas](#)

TSC WGM Agenda/Minutes

HL7 TSC Meeting Minutes		Date: 2011-01-08
Location:		Time: 9 AM - 5 PM local time
Facilitator: Austin Kreisler		Note taker(s): Lynn Laakso
Attendee	Name	Affiliation
x	Calvin Beebe	HL7 SSD SD Co-Chair
x	Woody Beeler	HL7 FTSD Co-Chair
x	Bob Dolin	HL7 Board Chair (member <i>ex officio</i> w/vote)
	Ed Hammond	HL7 Board Vice-Chair (member <i>ex officio</i> w/o vote)
Q3, Q4	Chuck Jaffe	HL7 CEO (member <i>ex officio</i> w/o vote)
x	Tony Julian	HL7 FTSD Co-Chair
x	Austin Kreisler	HL7 TSC Chair, DESD Co-Chair
x	Lynn Laakso (scribe, non-voting)	HL7 HQ
x	Patrick Loyd	HL7 T3SD Co-Chair
x	Ken McCaslin	HL7 TSS SD Co-Chair
regrets	Charlie McCay	International Council Representative
x	Charlie Mead	HL7 ArB Chair
	Don Mon	HL7 Board Chair (member <i>ex officio</i> w/o vote)
x	Ron Parker	HL7 ArB Alternate
x	John Quinn	HL7 CTO (TSC member <i>ex officio</i> w/vote)
regrets	Gregg Seppala	HL7 SSD SD Co-Chair
regrets	Ed Tripp	HL7 DESD Co-Chair

regrets	Jay Zimmerman	HL7 International Council Representative
x	Jane Curry	Guest/observer
Quorum Requirements (Co-chair +5 with 2 SD Reps) Met: yes		

Agenda Topics

Q1 - TSC Planning and Open Issue Review

([http://gforge.hl7.org/gf/project/tsc/tracker/?](http://gforge.hl7.org/gf/project/tsc/tracker/?action=TrackerItemBrowse&tracker_id=313)

action=TrackerItemBrowse&tracker_id=313) : 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. Link to Interim decision review since last WGM
(http://gforge.hl7.org/gf/download/docmanfileversion/6087/7944/2011Jan_Decisions_sinceW
4. (45 mins) Review Open Issues List (http://gforge.hl7.org/gf/project/tsc/tracker/?action=TrackerItemBrowse&tracker_id=313)
 - Foster development of Product Strategy (#1364) – Product Quality spun off into its own project. Product & Services Strategy project scope is outstanding task item assigned to Ken.
 - HL7 Security Considerations – Cookbook (#1513) – [see also introducing new processes to HL7 at # 1681], what is the consensus mechanism by which this has been approved for use as an Education tutorial?
 - Healthcare Readiness Project Development (#1636) – Government projects held a call on November 23rd; updated scope statement sent to GPWG on 12/09.
 - Neutral Mapping Notation (#1600) – sent followup inquiry to ITS and received response that WG would likely approve a revised scope statement at the January WGM.
 - How to proceed with NCPDP's request for mapping to the RIM (#1647) – last update was that John Quinn was to create a proposal for John Klimek to do the NCPDP mapping.
 - Explore maintaining usage statistics for V3 (pending response by Marketing) # 1661 – extended request to Marketing to accept ownership of the issue but have had no response.
 - Introducing new processes to HL7 (# 1681) – description of “process adoption” process, e.g. alpha vs endorsed vs. encouraged vs mandated i.e. Security Risk Framework Cookbook
 - Project Approval Request
(<http://gforge.hl7.org/gf/download/trackeritem/1745/7924/HL7ProjectScopeStatementC>
- Publish CDA IGs from Tooling, for SDWG at TSC Tracker # 1745
(http://gforge.hl7.org/gf/project/tsc/tracker/?action=TrackerItemEdit&tracker_item_id=1745&start=0) .
 - Project Approval Request
(<http://gforge.hl7.org/gf/download/trackeritem/1746/7925/HL7PSSHSConsolidationSDW>
- HL7/IHE Health Story Implementation Guide Consolidation, for SDWG at TSC Tracker

1746 (http://gforge.hl7.org/gf/project/tsc/tracker/?action=TrackerItemEdit&tracker_item_id=1746) .

- Project Approval Request
(http://gforge.hl7.org/gf/download/trackeritem/1747/7926/2010-12-22_PA_PSS_Interdependent_Registries.doc) - Interdependent Registries, at TSC Tracker # 1747 (http://gforge.hl7.org/gf/project/tsc/tracker/?action=TrackerItemEdit&tracker_item_id=1747) , Project Insight ID# 725 (<http://www.hl7.org/special/Committees/projman/searchableProjectIndex.cfm?action=edit&ProjectNumber=725>)
- Project Approval Request
(http://gforge.hl7.org/gf/download/trackeritem/1748/7927/HL7PSS-Canonical_Pedigree-FamilyHistory_2010-12-22.doc) - Canonical Pedigree (Family History) Interoperability Implementation Guide, at TSC tracker # 1748 (http://gforge.hl7.org/gf/project/tsc/tracker/?action=TrackerItemEdit&tracker_item_id=1748&start=0)
- Approve Out of Cycle Meeting Request for Pharmacy, see TSC Tracker # 1749 (http://gforge.hl7.org/gf/project/tsc/tracker/?action=TrackerItemEdit&tracker_item_id=1749&start=0) , meeting request (<http://gforge.hl7.org/gf/download/trackeritem/1749/7930/Pharmacyoutofcyclemtg.doc>)

5. **(January) Review TSC Mission and Charter**

(<http://www.hl7.org/Special/committees/tsc/overview.cfm>)

6. **(January) Review TSC Decision Making Practices**, and the draft of the updated TSC DMP

(http://gforge.hl7.org/gf/download/docmanfileversion/6030/7864/TSC_DMP_v3.0_20101213.doc)

7. *(May) Elect TSC Representative to Nominations Committee (Per GOM Section 10.06.01)*

8. *(May) Review TSC Three-Year Plan*

9. *(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: Report Project Visibility
- Task: Report Product Visibility

10. Next WGM Planning - next two WGMs - 2011-05-14_TSC_WGM_Agenda, Orlando FL; 2011-09-10_TSC_WGM_Agenda, San Diego, CA

Q2 - TSC Project Review: 11 am to 12:30 pm

TSC Project List (<http://www.hl7.org/Special/committees/tsc/projects.cfm>) :

1. EA IP Project Insight # 469
(<http://www.hl7.org/special/Committees/projman/searchableProjectIndex.cfm?action=edit&ProjectNumber=469>)
2. Product Visibility PI# 478
(<http://www.hl7.org/special/Committees/projman/searchableProjectIndex.cfm?action=edit&ProjectNumber=478>)

3. TSC Work Group Visibility Plan PI#631
(<http://www.hl7.org/special/Committees/projman/searchableProjectIndex.cfm?action=edit&ProjectNumber=631>) (*three-year plan item*)
4. TSC Communications Plan PI# 645
(<http://www.hl7.org/special/Committees/projman/searchableProjectIndex.cfm?action=edit&ProjectNumber=645>) (*three-year plan item*)
 - Work Group Health metrics - review suggestions
(http://gforge.hl7.org/gf/project/tsc/tracker/?action=TrackerItemBrowse&tracker_id=616)
 - Add metrics to WGH for % of projects having next milestone date in the past
(Tracker # 1649 (http://gforge.hl7.org/gf/project/tsc/tracker/?action=TrackerItemEdit&tracker_item_id=1649))

Status as of 2010Oct: Evaluate Project Health before tying this to Work Group Health

- Add participation in publishing calls to Work Group Health (Tracker # 1659
(http://gforge.hl7.org/gf/project/tsc/tracker/?action=TrackerItemEdit&tracker_item_id=1659))
 - Measure ballot progress in terms of overall years and in number of cycles to successful ballot (Tracker # 1660 (http://gforge.hl7.org/gf/project/tsc/tracker/?action=TrackerItemEdit&tracker_item_id=1660))
 - Metric to identify whether the WG follows their own DMPs re: posting minutes
(Tracker # 1683 (http://gforge.hl7.org/gf/project/tsc/tracker/?action=TrackerItemEdit&tracker_item_id=1683))
 - measure coordination between WG co-chairs (Tracker # 1731
(http://gforge.hl7.org/gf/project/tsc/tracker/?action=TrackerItemEdit&tracker_item_id=1731))
 - WG has a DMP based on review of the updated template, for 2011May (Tracker # 1732 (http://gforge.hl7.org/gf/project/tsc/tracker/?action=TrackerItemEdit&tracker_item_id=1732)) - already passed by TSC; going into effect next cycle.
5. HL7 Product Quality Plan PI# 647
(<http://www.hl7.org/special/Committees/projman/searchableProjectIndex.cfm?action=edit&ProjectNumber=647>)
 6. TSC Continuous Improvement objectives PI# 648
(<http://www.hl7.org/special/Committees/projman/searchableProjectIndex.cfm?action=edit&ProjectNumber=648>) (*three-year plan item*)
 7. TSC Linkage between Work Group 3-year plans and Strategic Plan PI# 649
(<http://www.hl7.org/special/Committees/projman/searchableProjectIndex.cfm?action=edit&ProjectNumber=649>) (*three-year plan item*)
 8. TSC Communication Strategy Project PI# 696
(<http://www.hl7.org/special/Committees/projman/searchableProjectIndex.cfm?action=edit&ProjectNumber=696>)
 9. Innovations Project PI# 701
(<http://www.hl7.org/special/Committees/projman/searchableProjectIndex.cfm?action=edit&ProjectNumber=701>)

Pending Projects

1. Product Strategy Project (Project Insight # 413
(<http://www.hl7.org/special/Committees/projman/searchableProjectIndex.cfm?action=edit&ProjectNumber=413>))
2. T3F Strategic Initiative Review

Q3 -: Architecture and Tooling: 1:30 pm to 3 pm

1. HL7 Quality Plan (15 minutes)
 - Project status
2. ArB
3. Tooling

Q4 - Strategic Initiative and HL7 Strategic Issues Architecture and Tooling: 3:30 pm to 5pm

1. Strategic initiative discussion
 - Review SI ballot comments (not reconciliation)
2. HL7 Business Plan review (30 minutes)
 - Plan socialization with TSC
 - Fostering leadership in HL7

Sunday

- SAIF - ArB presentation of SAIF IG initial work during Sunday's meetings: Charlie Mead

Tuesday lunch

1. WGM agenda setting
 - 2011-05-14_TSC_WGM_Agenda, Orlando FL;
(May) Review TSC Three-Year Plan
(May) Review TSC Communications Plan
 - 2011-09-10_TSC_WGM_Agenda, San Diego, CA
(September) Review TSC SWOT

Supporting Documents

- <http://gforge.hl7.org/gf/download/trackeritem/1745/7924/HL7ProjectScopeStatementCDAIGs>
- <http://gforge.hl7.org/gf/download/trackeritem/1746/7925/HL7PSSHSConsolidationSDWGappr>
- http://gforge.hl7.org/gf/download/trackeritem/1747/7926/2010-12-22_PA_PSS_Interdependent_Registries.doc
- http://gforge.hl7.org/gf/download/trackeritem/1748/7927/HL7PSSt-Canonical_Pedigree-FamilyHistory_2010-12-22.doc
- <http://gforge.hl7.org/gf/download/trackeritem/1749/7930/Pharmacyoutofcyclemtg.doc>
- <http://www.hl7.org/Special/committees/tsc/overview.cfm>
- http://gforge.hl7.org/gf/download/docmanfileversion/6030/7864/TSC_DMP_v3.0_20101213.d

Minutes/Conclusions Reached:

Convened at 9:10am

Q1 - TSC Planning and Open Issue Review

([http://gforge.hl7.org/gf/project/tsc/tracker/?](http://gforge.hl7.org/gf/project/tsc/tracker/?action=TrackerItemBrowse&tracker_id=313)

action=TrackerItemBrowse&tracker_id=313) : 9 am to 10:30 am

1. Roll Call and Introduction of visitors (including declaration of interests) – Jane Curry is our guest today.
2. Additions to, and acceptance of, agenda: Agenda reviewed and changes made. Agenda accepted
3. Link to Interim decision review since last WGM (not yet available)
4. (45 mins) Review Open Issues List (http://gforge.hl7.org/gf/project/tsc/tracker/?action=TrackerItemBrowse&tracker_id=313)
 - Foster development of Product Strategy (#1364) – Product Quality spun off into its own project. Product & Services Strategy project scope is outstanding task item assigned to Ken.
 - No progress
 - HL7 Security Considerations – Cookbook (#1513) – [see also introducing new processes to HL7 at # 1681], what is the consensus mechanism by which this has been approved for use as an Education tutorial?
 - No update
 - Healthcare Readiness Project Development (#1636) – Government projects held a call on November 23rd; updated scope statement sent to GPWG on 12/09.
 - Bob suggests the Business Plan taskforce would be interested in participating – if this project is not budget-neutral its funding model would be of some importance. The PCAST report response is of urgent need but must be completed this week. The project scope has not gone through the Steering Division so the TSC does not formally have it available to review. Austin's name should probably replace Charlie's, and Charlie Mead would like to be included. ACTION ITEM: Austin to follow up on the progress of this project.

- Neutral Mapping Notation (#1600) – sent followup inquiry to ITS and received response that WG would likely approve a revised scope statement at the January WGM.
 - This will be addressed by ITS this week. An updated scope will return to the TSC under normal processes so this can be closed.
- How to proceed with NCPDP's request for mapping to the RIM (#1647) – last update was that John Quinn was to create a proposal for John Klimek to do the NCPDP mapping.
 - John had sent something to them. No response for 5 or 6 weeks. Don Mon has been conversing with NCPDP on SCO. Future of SCO to be discussed. This will come to a head in the next month whether an SCO having meaningful participation in the US TAG holds interest for NCPDP. Klimek is the executive VP for NCPDP for last 2 years.
- Explore maintaining usage statistics for V3 (pending response by Marketing) # 1661 – extended request to Marketing to accept ownership of the issue but have had no response.
 - Bob suggests we talk to Mark on getting information from the CHIME survey to provide these measures. This would be only U.S., though. Austin feels if we can't get Marketing to take this up or find a group to run a project it will wither. Keith Boone has a CDA Google map; ACTION ITEM – Calvin will check with Keith. Charlie asks what means V3 if that includes CDA as well as messaging as well as RIM modeling. Calvin suggests separate Google maps. V3 messaging is felt to be under-marketed.
- Introducing new processes to HL7 (# 1681) – description of "process adoption" process, e.g. alpha vs endorsed vs. encouraged vs mandated i.e. Security Risk Framework Cookbook.
 - Charlie McCay started this on his way out. This is tied to the incubation stuff, innovations work, and will impact the SAIF implementation guide. Austin asks if we need to track this separately. Calvin felt this has to do with the enhancement of our project process to deal with other areas with guidance on how to do it. Ken notes that the project processes should be addressed by Project Services. Jane notes that the processes need to be aligned in the GOM with the defined states. Lynn states that with the Risk Assessment Cookbook this originated as a way to track the possibility of another process for developing work. ACTION ITEM: Ken will take this issue to Project Services. Jane also suggests this needs to be addressed in ArB. Ron agrees. Calvin raises the issue that the 'big' thinking requires resourcing and funding and may lose traction. He asks for a narrow, terse description of the process. Austin sees it as a project sponsored by Project Services and ArB. The project proposal will give some oversight over the scope. Project Services has only an acting co-chair for the meeting, and ArB has other major contributions on their agenda so this will be developed after the WGM.
- Project Approval Request
 (<http://gforge.hl7.org/gf/download/trackeritem/1745/7924/HL7ProjectScopeStatementC>
 - Publish CDA IGs from Tooling, for SDWG at TSC Tracker # 1745
 (http://gforge.hl7.org/gf/project/tsc/tracker/?action=TrackerItemEdit&tracker_item_id=1745&start=0) .

- Going to use the MIF-based tooling, work with Publishing. Not a standards development project. Jane says this project is a prerequisite to having the MDHT become incorporated into our process.
- VOTE: Unanimously approved.
- Bob asks how we track project progress to ensure it's not shelved. Lynn responds the PMO does some tracking and we're working on project health dashboards similar to Work Group health.
- Project Approval Request
([http://gforge.hl7.org/gf/download/trackeritem/1746/7925/HL7PSSHSConsolidationSDW - HL7/IHE Health Story Implementation Guide Consolidation, for SDWG at TSC Tracker # 1746](http://gforge.hl7.org/gf/download/trackeritem/1746/7925/HL7PSSHSConsolidationSDW-HL7/IHE%20Health%20Story%20Implementation%20Guide%20Consolidation%20for%20SDWG%20at%20TSC%20Tracker%20%201746) (http://gforge.hl7.org/gf/project/tsc/tracker/?action=TrackerItemEdit&tracker_item_id=1746) .
- This has been requested as a Public document. This is being examined as an ONC project to test the S&I (stds and interop) framework. Ron asks what the dialog has been with IHE about how we will play together. CHI is in need of alignment between their HL7 V3 infrastructure investment and the IHE profile. John notes the IHE profiles may need to be subjected to a balloting process. Bob adds that C32 collaboration is in need of that packaging, balloting, and reconciliation process. John recommends we discuss with Chuck in Q4. Bob notes that we should specifically address that we approve the project excluding the issue of the IP. Calvin moves to amend the motion/woody seconds.
- VOTE: Unanimously approved.
- Project Approval Request
(http://gforge.hl7.org/gf/download/trackeritem/1747/7926/2010-12-22_PA_PSS_Interdependent_Registries.doc) - Interdependent Registries, at TSC Tracker # 1747 (http://gforge.hl7.org/gf/project/tsc/tracker/?action=TrackerItemEdit&tracker_item_id=1747) , Project Insight ID# 725 (<http://www.hl7.org/special/Committees/projman/searchableProjectIndex.cfm?action=edit&ProjectNumber=725>)
- Ron notes there is huge interest in this; CHI is prepared to provide substantial requirements input – there was a large meeting on this in Cambridge. Project will include consideration of IHE profiles. It will probably be long-running with a DAM ballot for comment, then DSTU then Normative intent. Target dates are aggressive but it has great energy in PA right now, notes Patrick. This has the coordination efforts of a program management effort. PA will use the same project for all ballot types; Patrick notes that with the Project Health matrices there may be more consistency in future but for now there's more than one way to run projects through DSTU and normative.
- VOTE: Unanimously approved.
- Project Approval Request
(http://gforge.hl7.org/gf/download/trackeritem/1748/7927/HL7PSSCanonical_Pedigree-FamilyHistory_2010-12-22.doc) - Canonical Pedigree (Family History) Interoperability Implementation Guide, at TSC tracker # 1748 (http://gforge.hl7.org/gf/project/tsc/tracker/?action=TrackerItemEdit&tracker_item_id=1748&start=0)

- This also is requested as public document. Calvin moves to approve with the understanding and exception that the public document issue will be addressed by the EC, second by Ken. Charlie asks if this will analyze and harmonize across the different slices in genomics or to create another slice. References messages and interoperability are part of the scope. It is U.S. Realm specific.
- VOTE: Unanimously approved.
- Approve Out of Cycle Meeting Request for Pharmacy, see TSC Tracker # 1749 (http://gforge.hl7.org/gf/project/tsc/tracker/?action=TrackerItemEdit&tracker_item_id=1749&start=0) , meeting request (<http://gforge.hl7.org/gf/download/trackeritem/1749/7930/Pharmacyoutofcyclcmtg.doc>)
 - Calvin notes that these out of cycle meetings allow standards development without paying a WGM registration fee. It's generally felt that it reduces productivity. Pharmacy is meeting here at the WGM as well although the TSC has also approved an OOC meeting for a WG that is not meeting here in Sydney as well.
 - VOTE: Unanimously approved.

5. **(January) Review TSC Mission and Charter**

(<http://www.hl7.org/Special/committees/tsc/overview.cfm>)

- Efforts of the Working Group – clarified to reflect the WorkING group not the Work Groups. Remove other references where it is spelled out.
- Woody suggests we don't reiterate the duties listed by the GOM but point to the GOM instead. Calvin suggests we add a sentence in support of the Strategic Initiative effort. Ron cautions about citing the GOM but providing no insight. TSC will provide input and operationalize the Strategic Initiatives as indicated in GOM section 10.11 in the Mission. The Mandate should be removed, Calvin suggests. It would be a maintenance issue.
- Calvin moves to add to the Mission the paragraph, seconded by Woody.

TSC will provide input and operationalize the Strategic Initiatives as indicated in GOM section 10.11. The TSC also reviews and provides oversight to projects during the approval process. This allows the TSC to identify gaps and overlaps between projects of the Working Group and the Strategic Initiatives.

- VOTE: Unanimously approved
- Ken moves to remove the mandate from the M&C four bullets with a reference to the appropriate section in the GOM. Woody seconds.
 - VOTE: Unanimously approved.
- Ken moves we replace the TSC composition section with reference to the GOM by section title. Patrick seconds. VOTE: Unanimously approved.

6. Lynn asks if we need a new ORC liaison – Helen agreed to continue in that position.

Break at 10:43 am, reconvene at 11am.

1. **(January) Review TSC Decision Making Practices**, and the draft of the updated TSC

DMP

(http://gforge.hl7.org/gf/download/docmanfileversion/6030/7864/TSC_DMP_v3.0_20101213.doc)

- Calvin moves to approve with changes, Ken seconds
- VOTE: unanimously approved.
- 2. Next WGM Planning - next two WGMs - 2011-05-14_TSC_WGM_Agenda, Orlando FL; 2011-09-10_TSC_WGM_Agenda, San Diego, CA
 -
 - Austin and Lynn will get these started.

Q2 - TSC Project Review: 11 am to 12:30 pm

TSC Project List (<http://www.hl7.org/Special/committees/tsc/projects.cfm>) :

1. EA IP Project Insight # 469
(<http://www.hl7.org/special/Committees/projman/searchableProjectIndex.cfm?action=edit&ProjectNumber=469>)
 - ArB will present tomorrow night on real-world expectations of implementing SAIF. Existing EA IP project is not yet closed as only 2 alpha projects have responded to the survey/questionnaire. Postpone until tomorrow.
2. Product Visibility PI# 478
(<http://www.hl7.org/special/Committees/projman/searchableProjectIndex.cfm?action=edit&ProjectNumber=478>)
 - John presents the current state of the Martopia development
 - This is part of the annual report. Ken asks if the next 43 product briefs submitted to HQ for review could be sent to the TSC for review as well. Charlie asked about what is considered a product. It was generally felt that it was what was balloted but SAIF is also considered. Bob asked how this will be organized. There was a tree structure on the TSC wiki, but it can be organized any way we see fit. How are new ones identified? Lynn grabs them off the NIBs when new materials are ready to be balloted.
3. TSC Work Group Visibility Plan PI#631
(<http://www.hl7.org/special/Committees/projman/searchableProjectIndex.cfm?action=edit&ProjectNumber=631>) (*three-year plan item*). Calvin moves to fold in the next project # 645 into #631. Ken seconds. VOTE: Unanimously approved.
4. TSC Communications Plan PI# 645
(<http://www.hl7.org/special/Committees/projman/searchableProjectIndex.cfm?action=edit&ProjectNumber=645>) (*three-year plan item*)
 - Work Group Health metrics - review suggestions
(http://gforge.hl7.org/gf/project/tsc/tracker/?action=TrackerItemBrowse&tracker_id=616)
 - Add metrics to WGH for % of projects having next milestone date in the past (Tracker # 1649 (http://gforge.hl7.org/gf/project/tsc/tracker/?action=TrackerItemEdit&tracker_item_id=1649))

Status as of 2010Oct: Evaluate Project Health before tying this to Work Group Health

- Add participation in publishing calls to Work Group Health (Tracker # 1659 (http://gforge.hl7.org/gf/project/tsc/tracker/?action=TrackerItemEdit&tracker_item_id=1659))
 - Measure ballot progress in terms of overall years and in number of cycles to successful ballot (Tracker # 1660 (http://gforge.hl7.org/gf/project/tsc/tracker/?action=TrackerItemEdit&tracker_item_id=1660))
 - Metric to identify whether the WG follows their own DMPs re: posting minutes (Tracker # 1683 (http://gforge.hl7.org/gf/project/tsc/tracker/?action=TrackerItemEdit&tracker_item_id=1683))
 - measure coordination between WG co-chairs (Tracker # 1731 (http://gforge.hl7.org/gf/project/tsc/tracker/?action=TrackerItemEdit&tracker_item_id=1731))
 - WG has a DMP based on review of the updated template, for 2011May (Tracker # 1732 (http://gforge.hl7.org/gf/project/tsc/tracker/?action=TrackerItemEdit&tracker_item_id=1732)) - already passed by TSC; going into effect next cycle.
5. HL7 Product Quality Plan PI# 647
(<http://www.hl7.org/special/Committees/projman/searchableProjectIndex.cfm?action=edit&ProjectNumber=647>)
 - Address in Q3 under Architecture and Tooling
 6. TSC Continuous Improvement objectives PI# 648
(<http://www.hl7.org/special/Committees/projman/searchableProjectIndex.cfm?action=edit&ProjectNumber=648>) (*three-year plan item*) – WGM Development now a committee, Innovations now a project, two other elements still not started.
 7. TSC Linkage between Work Group 3-year plans and Strategic Plan PI# 649
(<http://www.hl7.org/special/Committees/projman/searchableProjectIndex.cfm?action=edit&ProjectNumber=649>) (*three-year plan item*) – objective to find committee support for academic members to attend WGMs lacking financial resources of corporate members? This was suggested to get academic members to take minutes, etc at reduced conference fees. Calvin moves to strike the academic effort, Ken seconds. Ken amends motion to close 649, Calvin accepts. This has now been formalized in the GOM.
 - VOTE: unanimously approved.
 8. TSC Communication Strategy Project PI# 696
(<http://www.hl7.org/special/Committees/projman/searchableProjectIndex.cfm?action=edit&ProjectNumber=696>) – Ravi is transitioning to Jay.
 9. Innovations Project PI# 701
(<http://www.hl7.org/special/Committees/projman/searchableProjectIndex.cfm?action=edit&ProjectNumber=701>) – Ed reported no progress since Cambridge – no Innovations session at this WGM.

Pending Projects

1. Product Strategy Project (Project Insight # 413
(<http://www.hl7.org/special/Committees/projman/searchableProjectIndex.cfm?action=edit&ProjectNumber=413>)) – nothing to report.
2. T3F Strategic Initiative Review – Woody was unable to get a scope statement ready by year-end 2010. He will endeavor to get one soon.

Architecture and Tooling (From Q3 agenda):

1. HL7 Quality Plan (15 minutes)

- Project status – kicked off a couple months ago but had not advanced as we'd hoped. Left off at investigating who HL7 customers are for quality and what are their priorities. We could spend 6 months on that without coming up with a quality plan deliverable. Do we want to survey what our customers find most important in product quality... Survey the membership annually on the quality attributes or survey the customers on what the quality attributes should be. Woody notes not only the elements of quality in a standard but how do you track these? Ease of use – does that mean how many weeks it takes to implement an interface? Ron asks if an implementation of a certain portion conflicts with an existing implementation. Calvin adds how many documents do you have to open on your desktop to get your work done? Charlie notes that this is a governance discussion. NCI noted they didn't have the bandwidth to govern everything but they are looking along the product development life cycle and do a risk profile then governing artifacts at those risk points. Jane asked what risk points were discovered? Charlie says we'll go through this in the ArB tomorrow. In the early ArB this cycle, the quality issue was raised that we only evaluate at project initiation and at ballot. Other points along that life cycle need to be evaluated. Calvin notes there is quality as seen through standards development participation, and secondly the quality of the artifacts that are consumed. Ron asserts that the perception of quality in a product is more important from the consumer, rather than from those that are involved in the development of the product. Is the process by which standards are produced as important as the quality of the product of the standards that are published? Jane comments that we currently have quality by inspection – must evaluate the content of the ballot packages but that is generally considered to be inefficient. Bob says you ask the stakeholders about what the elements of quality they find of importance. Woody's initial presentation includes this perspective and is incorporated by reference in the initial draft of the product quality plan project scope. Bob's concern is how you measure the quality perception on an ongoing basis as compared to an initial survey to identify the quality components that should be measured. We've had no volunteers to assess the ability of evaluating ISO 9000 compliance processes. It's an expensive process and there's no resource to evaluate it. It's more important outside of the US as criteria for evaluation of software systems and services. Calvin cites a recent quality effort at Mayo for finding root causes of errors. Those kinds of perspectives might be helping our evaluation. Woody has concerns that Jane's perception of the absence of quality in the product but the tooling and publishing mechanisms that have been developed have a quality assurance effect. Calvin offers to provide a human-readable perspective on these deeper quality issues. Ron cites the RIM harmonization process as a governance framework that produces a very high quality product. Some of the tooling and publishing efforts create quality through good architectural representation. Calvin notes the risk of the existing developers that really are building this are aging and need to bring in new developers but still assure the quality of the product that is developed. Bob thinks we need to define our measurement strategy before we do root-cause analysis. Calvin says we need to develop samples that analysts can use not at the granular level at which the standards developers operate. We need to decide which of these ways we should approach the issue and what we're trying to improve – the

experience of the standard developer or the downstream experience of the standard user/implementer.

Recessed at 12:30 pm for lunch

Q3 -: 1:30 pm to 3 pm

Re-convened at 12:35pm.

Ken asked if the TSC should collectively send a letter to Charlie thanking him for his service.
ACTION ITEM: Ken and Lynn will work on that.

1. ArB – postponed until Sunday night
2. Tooling – “The Lloyd Conversation”.
 - NCI working on intro to RIM, services for CICIS. Looking to build the next generation of NCI infrastructure. To be RIM-aware, the issues of tooling is coming up. Lloyd has been working for NCI for the past year to map BRIDG to the RIM. Now he’s working on a standard model for all clinical sciences, with RIM stuff as well as MIF, with its inherent UML issues bringing up the problems with tooling. Tooling needs to be better architected and more supportable. Estimates around \$1.5 M and worked in parallel could be done in 6-9 months. If HL7 were to submit a response to an NCI RFP as an HL7 collective effort what would be required? This might not be in the purview of the TSC. The NCI second generation has a lot of interest in a metadata repository much like HL7 has discussed an artifact repository. Someone needs to go to the NCI wiki on what is included in semantic infrastructure 2.0 and then also to see what is involved in gap analysis. Charlie estimates there are about 60 days to prepare. HL7 has a precedent in the NLM project where HL7 prepared a response to an RFP – Bob cautions that we don’t want to appear to be competing on that level with our members. Charlie says no one understands the problem NCI faces as well as HL7 does. HL7 could send a comprehensive set of responses to the SI 2.0, but to truly leverage this NCI effort we need an alignment statement between HL7 and NCI for how we build what we both need. Woody says, the right people are going to be here this week, so let’s talk to them. Bob would like to see the NCI RFP include in their questions on ‘how will you work with HL7 to see that their efforts are aligned’?
 - Jane notes that one of the biggest challenges is the vocabulary binding needed in adherence of the newest core principles and properties.
 - ACTION ITEM: Jane will set up a meeting with the members of the Tooling committee and Charlie and Grahame Grieve.
3. Incubator discussion: with Charlie McCay they had a call in late Sept/early Oct with context that McCay was trying to articulate a way in HL7 to address certain key projects more rapidly. McCay’s Implementation group was working on building things based on not-fully-developed materials, with the knowledge that permutations would likely occur once their feedback was returned to HL7. How to enable the development of projects creating document semantics for NCI under tight ARRA funding guidelines that cannot wait for the full development of CDA R3. How to create a formal process to acknowledge the existence of and lend legitimacy to these execution threads. The ideas are not to build a standard (as with DSTU) but to build something that implements a standard. CDA R3 is the candidate for

this type of incubator; NCI is using datatypes from 21090 and will build what they need if HL7 doesn't have something defined.

- How do we document the expectations of behavior between HL7 and NCI if working under this incubator status. What will be the governance? Do you need a Work Group to bring forward some sort of proposal? How will they know if it's "off track" and won't go forward. Incubator projects must be aware that what ends up in the actual HL7 spec is not obligated to look just like what they implemented for the incubator. Does it have to drive through a WG? Does it need a formal proposal aka a PSS or describe what other level of bureaucracy will be used? Calvin notes that any incubator needs to have TSC approval. Who will draft the first proposal?
- ACTION ITEM: Bob will write the first draft and Calvin will look over his shoulder, and Charlie will review. Calvin suggests using the PSS for the model. Bob says he's looking at the incubator proposal process not the specific CDA R3 incubator project. Ron suggests we include the Board as well as TSC review as it will set expectations outside of HL7. Charlie thinks that missing from the PSS are the barriers to entry, motivations, risks, candidate trajectory; more the elements of an implementation rather than go-no go.

Recess 3 pm.

Q4 - Strategic Initiative and HL7 Strategic Issues Architecture and Tooling: 3:30 pm to 5pm

Reconvene 3:28 PM

1. HL7 Business Plan review (30 minutes)
 - Plan socialization with TSC
2. Business model
 - Aligning IP consideration with TSC Buckets
 - Where would the money be spent (e.g. supporting the TSC chair, etc...)
 - Slideshow on business model framework
 - Management of IP will take a course correction, application of IP policies to be uniform and enforced. Membership dues structure, OMOV recommendations and so on considered.
 - Jane asks if the other artifacts include derived artifacts that are input into others' processes. Some will, some won't – the distinction will need to be made clearly. Bob comments that the IP categories and the Product brief organization will need to be aligned.
 - Formal registration of our IP which is more than just the copyright protection, which will provide us with the leverage of greater legal penalties for infringement.
 - This is only the framework, but the implementation still remains to be seen. Wrappers on documents and other mechanisms are still TBD and the TSC involvement and input on these considerations are welcomed.
 - At Board meeting they will roll out a draft implementation of the business side of this framework, after whose approval it will be announced to the membership.

- Woody asks if Exhibitors at HL7 meetings is being given serious consideration, Chuck is not personally in favor of turning it into a trade show. Bob cautions there is also a caveat that we exercise caution in adding new services in the next two years. This is a captured idea, not a definitive plan.
- OHT model with repository where one can bring down updates to subscriptions is among the considerations but more closely arranged as a library model as a 'managed' repository.
- Austin asks about going open source. Chuck notes that ONC has had this same question posed repeatedly and they will not respond so we must pursue some other method. On a small scale Austin was speaking to giving away the standards and then selling the services. That is still a possibility. These are all in the process recommendations from Andy Updegrave. All such flexibility is still available in the path ahead. Bob cautions that IP-based revenue is the current direction, however.

3. Strategic initiative discussion

- Review SI ballot comments (not reconciliation)
 - It was the largest ballot pool. 135 people responded; there was very good feedback. Much feedback on wanting the criteria to be even more measurable. There were comments on restructuring the strategic initiatives as well. From here, the SI committee will re-convene, go through the comments, publish a revised document by May 1 and review by Board and TSC. Another revision based on those comments to be reviewed at Board retreat. After September will ballot another set of comments.
 - Chuck notes that there are 'lumpers' and 'splitters'; some want more detail, some want less. Austin notes that as the TSC is to operationalize these SI, the more detail there is, the more tasks there are the less bandwidth we have available for each. Bob notes that not all are funded projects. As the 2012 budget is influenced by the 2012 Strategic Initiatives we likewise see how our priorities in the current plan pan out. Austin notes that the TSC will also be playing catch-up to try to complete projects that were part of an earlier SI.

4. Fostering leadership in HL7

- John thinks we need some ideas for programs in the organization that would encourage co-chairs to serve on Steering Divisions and participate in the TSC. If we're short on candidates we may not be able to fill the TSC in another cycle or so. Bob asks when the money starts rolling in, where can that money be spent to assist volunteers in doing their HL7 'jobs'. Charlie started with very little specificity on the TSC Chair role, and eventually defined it to encompass so much that he could no longer afford to do it. Can we provide additional staff resources to make their jobs more effective? Ron thinks something went away over time in the organization – with its history as a volunteer organization. Historically, corporations would volunteer staff to contribute time, and individuals became engaged to the extent they spent even more time than funded by the corporation to accomplish their interests. Instead we're seeing consultants, especially self-funded, which can't fund that level of participation. With the level of specialization that was reached by individuals, those with that intellectual capacity, their specialization has allowed them to become consultants. Ron asks what can we do to attract back the sponsors with the wherewithal to provide members to fill these key

roles? How can we attract back the individuals with the specialized knowledge that now have these independent roles? John notes that the number of the large companies becomes a fixed-size community. Ron notes that the cadre of people that we need must be cultivated. Austin notes the organizations must be courted to allow that level of participation. John and Austin both noted they were surprised that their companies were willing to support their efforts in HL7. Patrick noted that his individual contracts were too small to have any one engagement sponsor his involvement. John further comments that organizations like SAIC and Accenture can leverage John's and Austin's participation in their own industry positioning without regard to John's and Austin's specific contributions. Ron recounted Jane once observed that such organizational participation was an early evaluation point to show that one is able to 'play' in that market. Jane adds that the collaborative environment, or the skills learned in collaborative development, are a specifically marketable skill that is not available in a closed internal environment. These collaborative skills, Ron adds, are of special importance in the emerging markets of HIEs.

- Woody remarks that Charlie's involvement was surprising. Chuck notes that there were some elements that Charlie could have delegated at the Board level. Woody added that the Steering Divisions were created to provide a staging of participation between the TSC and the co-chairs at large. However, the lack of participation in some areas indicates that they may not feel that sense of lack of accessibility in participation. This will be a topic to discuss this week for 'why are the Steering Divisions' and what is their purpose. They don't see the deliberations that go on in the TSC. Most Steering Divisions are focused on Project Approvals and not on guidance and steering. Cross-committee coordination, elimination of redundancy are part of their reason for being – is that something that needs more emphasis. Chuck asks if we reduce the administrative requirements will it free them to actually do the steering? Calvin notes that for SSD SD if it weren't for Hans there would be few constructive comments; otherwise there would be just a rubber stamp, perfunctory role. Bob notes that one thing the SD is supposed to do is make sure that proposed work isn't in conflict with other work in their SD. Calvin adds that the coordination with SSD SD is also needed between them and the Domain committees. Woody notes that there is a problem with bandwidth. There was a motion in FTSD to have a scheduled Steering Division during daytime to address cross-committee meetings. Calvin says they get more feedback once there is publication out of the Steering Division, if it weren't for Hans. Austin notes that once we start flushing out the SAIF IG the role of the SDs will have to be re-evaluated, what we look at in that middle-tier between TSC and Work Groups. DESD has done some steering with Work Groups having problems on their Work Group Health but the ones he'd want to talk to this week are not here (begging the question...). Austin adds that the T3F review should also look at the current operation of TSC based on what we anticipated happening. Calvin asks is the resolution of issues of consistency what we really want to happen at this tier, as with Structured Documents is always taking information from the various domain groups and bringing it into their documents. Shouldn't the collaboration be between O&O and Structured Documents, but Austin notes that the domain specialists are off in a corner doing their own little thing. It's a risk of specialization, and the availability of generalists to represent the domain viewpoints. Calvin reiterates as we review consistency between artifacts we'll need to come back to the structuring of the steering divisions. Jane notes

that before the T3F the semantic groups were expected to create patterns that the domain groups were to absorb, where the domain groups became the clients to the structured documents etc.

- Do the SD cochairs just need to be elected representatives to the TSC and then just not convene at the SD level? Ken notes many projects are sent back for additional information. Austin asks if there are other things they should be doing if they are really supposed to be 'steering'. For 'program management' the cross-group coordination will be key, notes Ron. When the money starts rolling in, (nudge to Bob) we need to staff at a whole different level to provide that coordination and use this kind of structure to do multithreaded work and ensure we can deliver for our customer base. Whether they are properly constituted we need to see the SAIF implementation.
- Austin asks if we are confusing leadership with project management.
- Bob asks what is the Steering Division activity regarding bi-directional communication management? Ken notes two paths – Lynn does an Update from the TSC, plus T3SD also maintains an agenda item to review the TSC meeting. Bob further asks to what extent do the committees have on their agendas to receive information on what has happened in the TSC. Austin suspects the majority in DESD don't do that, Ken notes that PSC, ES do that. The SI strategies will have to come through the SD, notes Jane. It may require top-down influence rather than bottom-up project-based influence.
- Woody asks if the other Steering Divisions are meeting to discuss the role of their steering divisions this week? None is. The implementation of the SAIF will undoubtedly shed new light on the roles needed from the Steering Divisions.

Adjourned 4:55pm.

Next Steps

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

- Calvin will check with Keith on his Google Map for CDA Usage for V3 marketing/usage statistics.
- Ken will take this issue # 1681 to Project Services on description of "process adoption" process, e.g. alpha vs endorsed vs. encouraged vs mandated i.e. Security Risk Framework Cookbook.
- Lynn and Austin to draft next WGM agenda
- Austin to follow up on the status of Healthcare Readiness Project Development (#1636)
- Lynn will combine projects 645 and 631, and close project 649 for the TSC.
- Woody to create a project scope statement for T3F Strategic Initiative Review.
- Ken and Lynn to draft a letter to Charlie thanking him for his service.
- Jane will set up a meeting with the members of the Tooling committee and Charlie and Grahame Grieve on the NCI RFP response.
- Bob will write the first draft and Calvin will look over his shoulder, and Charlie will review for incubator proposal process (not a specific incubator project)

Next Meeting/Preliminary Agenda Items

- Next conference call is January 24.

Retrieved from "http://hl7tsc.org/wiki/index.php?title=2011-01-08_TSC_WGM_Minutes"

- This page was last modified on January 18, 2011, at 20:36.