2011-01-09 TSC WGM Minutes

From HL7 TSC

Contents

- 1 TSC Sunday evening meeting for 2011Jan WGM
    - 1.1 TSC WGM Agenda/Minutes
    - 1.2 Agenda Topics
    - 1.3 Supporting Documents
    - 1.4 Minutes/Conclusions Reached:

TSC Sunday evening meeting for 2011Jan WGM

back to TSC Minutes and Agendas

TSC WGM Agenda/Minutes

HL7 TSC Meeting Minutes Location:		Date: 2010-01-09 Time: Q5 7 pm to 9 pm dinner is not included	
Facilitator	Austin Kreisler	**Note taker(s)**	Lynn Laakso
Attendee	**Name**	**Affiliation**	**Email Address**
x	Calvin Beebe	HL7 SSD SD Co-Chair	
x	Woody Beeler	HL7 FTSD Co-Chair	
	Bob Dolin	HL7 Board Chair (member *ex officio* w/vote)	
	Chuck Jaffe	HL7 CEO (member *ex officio* w/o vote)	
x	Tony Julian	HL7 FTSD Co-Chair	
x	Austin Kreisler	HL7 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
x	Charlie Mead	HL7 ArB Chair
	Don Mon	HL7 Board Chair-elect (member *ex officio* w/o vote)
x	Ron Parker	HL7 ArB Alternate
x	John Quinn	HL7 CTO (TSC member *ex officio* 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	Marc Koehn	EA IP PM, invited guest

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

Agenda Topics

1. Roll Call and Introduction of visitors (including declaration of interests)
2. Additions to, and acceptance of, agenda:
3. SAIF IG
4. Subsequent message and agenda setting (30 mins)

Supporting Documents

Minutes/Conclusions Reached:

1. Roll Call and Introduction of visitors (including declaration of interests) – Marc Koehn was introduced
2. Additions to, and acceptance of, agenda:
   - Message to cochairs from TSC Monday night and to membership at General Session Tues am.
   - Data types issue & SPL
   - agenda accepted
3. Datatypes issue:
   - Woody reports that Datatypes passed HL7 ballot and soon will in ISO. ICSR is going through ISO using datatypes R1.1 but ISO Datatypes is R2. Gunther Schadow has

concerns on the January ballot, with RX at DT R2, CPM at DT R2, but SPL will not be backwards compatible unless it can continue to use DT R1.

- MnM and ITS will have a joint session on resolving DT release rules Thursday Q1. It is anticipated they may respect their position to use SPL with DT R1 but the others need to come to DT R2. The meeting will be in 6.06.

4. SAIF

- Charlie gave a brief history of development and status of SAIF book. Two-architecture problem described and difference between canonical representation of SAIF and the implementation of SAIF at HL7 as well as other organizations.
- Governance is the key issue. A basic framework for governance was discussed.
- ArB feels that the TSC needs to adopt something like this to move forward with operationalizing SAIF. It will expose the issue of business architecture around process for our products of value will be forced to be rippled.
- Lloyd contributed a list of problems that need to be solved, and the list was mapped directly into the governance framework that would address those problems. This was a very positive reinforcement to the approach.
- Ron then shows the slide show.
- The SOA Governance was the model on which this is based, by Thomas Erl. Fundamental components are precepts, people, processes, and metrics. We need to know what we want to govern, however. Precepts are the codification of the decision making rules.
- Charlie notes we should have something to plug this governance framework into. He suggests the product development life cycle.
- Example precepts are from Erl's book and are specific to Services. Erl further recommends to initially focus on issues posing the greatest risks. Charlie adds that on the front of this is the four core processes including compliance, escalation and appeals, ongoing education and communication, and vitality process. Vitality is like a QI whether the governance is doing what it needs to do.
- Proposed methodology identifies what should be governed, the HL7 Precepts, for example HDF (process, artifacts, templates, guidelines), SAIF documents, and Publishing among other things that emerge. Recommendation is that we must test that each are governable in their current form, including their metrics. Establishing each precept involves defining objectives, policy, standards and guidelines for each precept.
- starting point might include "SAIF todos".
- Lloyd's list includes: (include list from Ron Parker)
  - what are the tools,
  - what format (common patterns, annotations, business needs),
    - common patterns – what parts of the UML model are required, or needed.
  - Authoring domains and groups, conceptual and analysis – when is it ok to stop at a dam and not do design.
  - Analysis – storyboards, use cases, what is required.
- These are seen as the core of things that need to be done to move the SAIF.
- Woody notes that other things like the RIM that have been around for a long time were not addressed. He also notes that HDF should be taken out and Core Principles inserted in its place.

- Charlie notes that there are things we have already done, we need to document it in this framework.
- Ownership of the responsibility of certain precepts will be easier once the dialog on what are the artifacts that need to be evaluated has been brought out.
- Austin wants the standards developed under the governance issues to have a 'brand' to which existing standards can work towards in new releases. Woody asks at which point do we insist on products being 'in' the brand. Austin feels that we need to address that at a later date.
- The example precepts were at a step of granularity above what Woody envisioned. Ron feels we need to establish the metrics around the things we already do, and then you set the precepts based on the granularity of the metrics.
- The RIM changes and Vocabulary constructs that are done during Harmonization which can be encapsulated in a metric.
- Charlie recommends we pick a high-value target and the list can grow. In six months we may have a large catalog of precepts that are defined.
- Calvin asks if this will be a project? It is agreed a project proposal will be needed. Calvin further asks what the staffing and resourcing effort will be? ArB might be responsible for defining the precepts but someone needs to pick it up to take a crack at it. A candidate project to use the architecture would be Patrick's OO Composite Order. Ron asserts that the OO Composite Order project must tell us what the important things that we need to focus on defining must be.
- Woody feels we need to be able to reference things at a higher level of abstraction or we'll never get any more standards written. Static models might be a precept, but static model boundaries are not at that level. That level of granularity is too much work for HL7 to adopt. Charlie responds that we make it as coarsely granulated as we wish and then try to set the governance – they found with NCI that if they are too coarsely granulated they cannot govern them.
- Marc asks do we have a set of rules already that we're breaking. We may need to find something that we're already breaking and retranslate it using this grammar and force ourselves to focus not just on the precepts but on the people and processes and metrics.
- Subjectivity of the topics become the issue of discussion. Where it is not pure science it is difficult to get consensus.
- Marc notes you make a choice among some set of constraints but you identify the choice you've made. Calvin notes you need a systematic approach to making those choices. What we haven't figured out is the hard stuff that will be disruptive to fix. Cross-model harmonization might be a process that has to be run through a group or find some other way to make it work. Some things are just taking what we already do and put it into this format.
- Charlie notes that SAIF was to make explicit as much as you possibly can, and the governance is just an explicit approach to decision making. Marc adds it's not just an explicit documentation of process but the consequences of not making a choice.
- Calvin notes there are decisions that need a vetting process (and venting process). The project plan needs to have this description and have a description of the forum for issues. Charlie notes the ArB needed the TSC at this point to step in as they cannot take that role on. Ron feels that MnM will factor largely on the insight for this. Woody

notes that it will depend on the level of granularity. Austin sees dimensions in MnM, Vocabulary, and the nonexistent governing work group over behavior. Patrick adds we never had a behavioral model substantive enough to push back issues to a governing body like ArB. Ron feels we can still describe the problem.

- How will the TSC operationalize this effort now? Calvin will be involved. Austin asks, will these concepts on governance now be reflected in the SAIF book? Charlie says yes, it will be written though it's been at a stop for three years. They now know what to write. Woody notes Tuesday Q3 6.06 joint with ArB to begin dealing with this stuff. There is also Weds Q4 on EA update. The program view and the dashboard previously described are still not advanced, and we may need to re-describe the re-set of the EA IP. Patrick had initially described some pieces they thought that would be needed to formulate the program. Austin agrees that that will be the EA program meeting with example project of Composite Order.
- We should write up the program on a project scope statement. Lynn notes that a program project scope was drafted. She will forward.
- Tuesday Q3 will be the discussion on precepts under a governance framework with MnM.
- Weds Q4 is the Composite Order as instantiation of program management. Patrick can chair.

5. Subsequent message and agenda setting (30 mins)
   - Governance framework direction accepted, "architecture management" perhaps. Schedule of follow on sessions should be announced.
   - Charlie asks that in May meeting ArB was to look at other groups that could take on aspects of SAIF implementation. Impl/Conf was targeted to take on the ECCF. Charlie's met with them several times. They have still not made a decision. If IC does not accept responsibility, then should the TSC be evaluating what they actually are doing? They are meeting with them Q2 Tuesday. Frank said earlier that they really don't want to take it on. It seems they are focused exclusively on V2. But if they are sensitive to any potential encroachments on their turf, they need to find resources, or create a separate V2 and V3 IC groups. Austin says the TSC is interested in their answer back. Charlie can report back on Tuesday lunch. He'll be added to the agenda. John cannot be there as he's teaching at lunch.
   - What is the ballot plan for the SAIF book as the canonical representation of the architecture framework? NEHTA and NCI and so on would like to have it normative. Charlie thinks they would provide resources. Need also to ballot the SAIF IG. Need to write a project scope statement as it's the gateway to balloting. Lynn can draft something up.
   - Ken notes that with an international body interested in it perhaps we want to advance it to ISO… Formalization of SAIF book will come up against RM-ODP. Now the RM-ODP people are interested in SAIF from an interoperability perspective. RM-ODP is also an ISO standard. We probably should harmonize at least the ontology with RM-ODP, especially if we ever take this to ISO. There are advantages in tooling with formal UML profiles that work with RM-ODP. It should be added to the project scope statement, but that means that Charlie will have to update the ECCF for the RM-ODP ontology.

- Message to the membership is that SAIF book, canonical representation, will be balloted, at least initially informative. The second document, the SAIF IG, will also be evaluated for ballot level. There needs to be a project scope statement for each.
6. Ravi was named the new Affiliate Representative to the TSC at today's International Council.

Adjourned 8:58 PM

Actions *(Include Owner, Action Item, and due date)*
■ .
Next Meeting/Preliminary Agenda Items
■ .

Retrieved from "http://hl7tsc.org/wiki/index.php?title=2011-01-09_TSC_WGM_Minutes"

- This page was last modified on January 31, 2011, at 19:30.