

Initial T3F Meeting - December 21, 2006

From HL7 T3F

Contents

- 1 Attendees:
- 2 Agenda:
- 3 Purpose:
- 4 Roles/Who does What
- 5 Logistics
- 6 Support
 - 6.1 Liora's Document on T3F Organization:
 - 6.1.1 Initial T3F agenda:
 - 6.1.2 Projects & priorities:

Attendees:

Bob Dolin, Woody Beeler, Craig Parker, Jim Case, Bernd Blobel, Hans Buitendijk, Charlie McCay

Agenda:

- Purpose
- Who does what?
- Roles
- Logistics
- Tasks/Priorities

Purpose:

Everybody stated their perspective on the purpose of T3F.

Jim

– Organization has grown exponentially size and scope and perception of what organization is trying to do. How to communicate across the organizational.

Organizational review of the working members.

What are the requirements these groups must fulfill for the committees.

Bernd

– Agrees with organizational aspects indicated. Used to be able to sit around 1 table while now the TSC is around 140.

Harmonizing issues from other organizations.

- Difficulty using work products. Nothing to bind them together. Need tool to compile overall.
- Harmonization of workproducts and tools with other organizations. ISO CEN vs. HL7 in service architecture. Service architecture needs to be in sync with RIM.

Craig

– Agreed with Bernd and Jim. Restated in a different way. HL7 has a Products and Services task force. T3F is closely related to that team (what), while our task is How: organize committees to make good products and services to support.

Bob

– Need to have a sense of HL7 priorities. Would be great if driven by Products & Services, but there always will be cart and horse issues. T3F needs to communicate back to the Board that prioritization process is needed. Jim: Also need clear mechanism to communicate priorities to membership so it is understood why.

Need to have process to re-use domain models. We have RMIMs, DMIMs, constraints on Clinical Statements. Help direct and prioritize tooling infrastructure and foster model re-use. Jim: Clarification that we need to advise the committee on tooling

Charlie

– Clarify the processes by which we produce the goods we deliver. Frameworks and domain expertise. Promotion as well. What we are effecting. Would be effective way to deliver on.

Woody

– Accept the notion that the current horizontal structure is a challenge. However we have an adoptive structure. Need to be very careful as we move to more hierarchical structure, particularly to ensure we maintain key knowledge. Should focus on adequate coordination.

Hans

– Initially thought of two areas of focus: organization/process and architecture. Based on others agreed that there is a need to address tooling needs as well as a third area. Not to create tooling, rather to provide input. Prioritization of needs is outside the scope of T3F, but important to re-enforce that without prioritization on what HL7 is trying to do that T3F cannot be as successful.

Roles/Who does What

We reviewed how to address leadership and facilitation.

- Hans indicated that, while the invite stated he was leading the team, this was not his assumption. He would liaise with the Board, provide background on ORC/SITF/etc., would not be a voting member.
- Jim indicated that representing constituents (Domain TCs for him) and facilitating at the same time would be very difficult and not desirable for him.
- There was consideration to have one co-chair from the three TC/SIG representatives and one from the international representatives.
- Charlie indicated that we should consider the three areas (organization, architecture, process & tooling) as an opportunity to get representation.
- After further discussion the motion was made to nominate Bob Dolin as the chair. The motion was carried.

We clarified that the duration of the T3F is not fixed. The focus is on transition to put a Technical Directorate in place. A combination of progress on TCO (timing based in part on financial viability) and T3F recommended transition steps will drive duration.

Bob indicated that he sees the duration 3-6 months, not too long.

Woody indicated a concern in general that a TCO position is challenging in the HL7 environment given that everybody in HL7 are technical leaders. It requires a special person to work well with everybody.

We agreed to distribute our efforts into three areas and identify two people for each area to take the lead.

- Organization -
- Architecture – Bernd Blobel
- Process & Tooling -

Woody and Charlie would be willing to work in either area. Bern expressed an interest for Architecture that would also help focus

on harmonization/synchronization with other standards organization.

We will pick up this discussion next round.

Logistics

We need to get a wiki site to facilitate discussions. Craig will set up a wiki site with security.

We need to get a list service. Bob or Woody (?) is going to get this in place through HQ.

On Sunday, Jan 7, there is a briefing meeting in preparation for the Monday Q1 update session. Objective is to provide a progress update. We agreed to meet on January 4, 14:00 – 16:00 EST to continue our discussion from today. Bob will set up the conference call specifics.

Hans will send with the minutes the notes from Liora on T3F priorities/thoughts. He also will include the Organization Visio and other documents that may be of interest/use to get background.

Support

Liora's Document on T3F Organization:

Staff should poll members to determine 2 1-hour meeting times between now and the SD WGM

- include 3 elected from TSC; Bd liaison (Liora? Hans? other?); affiliate rep (as soon as determined) and Board appointee
- suggest: noon ET 2nd/4th Monday

For Board agenda: review and comment on initial T3F agenda, per below

Initial T3F agenda:

1. leadership: chair or co-chairs: one elected, one appointed? topic for Board to discuss
2. self-definition: mission statement
3. projects & priorities: see list below; T3F should discuss, set priorities, timelines; suggest the T3F proposes a priority and reviews with BoD and TSC in January if at all possible to a) create awareness, b) get buy-in.
4. work structure: within and between WGM; suggest bi-weekly telecons outside WGM; within WGM, suggest M-T-Th-F 8:00-9am;

Projects & priorities:

Technical: (from the original Board charter)

- Define parameters of an HL7 technical architecture including:
 - Relationship among HL7 technical work products including specifications, implementation guides and tools.
 - Relationship of those products to external products/standards
- Define the relationship of these products to the HL7 Products & Services strategy.
- Establish an approach to meeting new product requirements identified by the Products & Services Task Force.

(added later, as illustrations of the above)

- Harmonization of work products: what are the processes and how are they managed?
- When to create a new specification and when to constrain an existing specification?

- When to use messaging and when to use a service oriented architecture?
- When to use a message and when to use a document?

(issues raised during the discussion of the election)

Technical coordination and structures:

- How will the T3F (and future Technical Directorate) work with the TSC, the Affiliates, MNM and the ARB?
- How will the structure and function of the TSC and ARB change to meet the objectives of the ORC and SITF?
- Continued need to distinguish TCs from SIGs: is this still functional?
- Need for formal project teams managed by TCs (2- or 3-tier organization, but not TC/SIG)?
- Need for RIM TC?
- Need for Clinical Statement &/or TermInfo TC?
- Need for other consolidation/refinement of committee structures?

Retrieved from "http://hl7t3f.org/wiki/index.php?title=Initial_T3F_Meeting_-_December_21%2C_2006"

- This page was last modified 07:32, 7 January 2007.

ConferenceCall-200704

From HL7 T3F

Contents

- 1 Present
- 2 Agenda
- 3 Discussion
 - 3.1 Deliverables and Scope
 - 3.2 Focus
- 4 Actions adopted
 - 4.1 Steps
 - 4.2 Reconcile Other Documents
- 5 Next Meeting

Present

Dolin, Beeler, McCay, Parker, Case, Buitendyck, Blobel

Agenda

1. What do we believe the T3F deliverables to be?
2. Discuss the material Hans sent us and develop action plans for creating the T3F deliverables.
3. Additional logistics

Discussion

Deliverables and Scope

Recommend Structure & Architecture with White Papers and Dissolve

Execute part of the TD responsibilities as an interim

Deal with SI documents and Issues therein

Answer: All of the above

Focus

What should focus be? -- Identifying Architectural objectives and fulfilling them (i.e. reuse models **not** "DO THIS")

Identify issues between committees and recommend a process to resolve, but not to resolve by dictate.

Actions adopted

Steps

1. Starting with the Current "HDF", and the SI Documents identify the **SIX** (not more) features/objectives of the HL7 "Architecture" (e.g. "reuse common models")
2. Work through the SI documents to identify issues and strategies that prevent achieving these objectives, and/or facilitate achieving them
3. Outline a standards development process that can realize deliverables that meet these objectives. (Definition of what is a "Projects" belongs here too.)
4. Identify principles under which Committees are formed and differentiated, how they relate to the T3F/TD structure, including resolution process for inter-committee conflicts.
5. Create a white paper for review by Board and TSC about this

Reconcile Other Documents

1. Need to work through the lists in the technical directorate document, identify which steps we'll do in our initial phase, and which will remain for future effort, and what is the default behavior absent a TD to act.
2. Similar resolution of items in the Initial T3F Meeting documents, including issues raised in the T3F Election correspondence

Next Meeting

- Attend Sunday evening session (5:30 - 7) (prep for Monday) (GWB will assemble summary slides from this discussion)
- Attend and present at SI Session Q1 Monday (Set up Sunday)
- Hold brief QA session at TSC Meeting Monday Night (Craig set up)
- Tuesday and Thursday, Breakfast Session, Pick room later - 8 - 9 AM

Retrieved from "<http://hl7t3f.org/wiki/index.php?title=ConferenceCall-200704>"

- This page was last modified 21:06, 4 January 2007.

FaceToFace-20070109

From HL7 T3F

January 9, 2007, San Diego, 8-9 AM

Contents

- 1 Present
- 2 Today's Agenda
- 3 Meeting Schedule
 - 3.1 Weekly
 - 3.2 Koln WGM
- 4 Responsibilities
 - 4.1 Initial Action item list
- 5 Open T3F Position
- 6 Next agenda

Present

Buitenjdycck, Blobel, Beeler, Parker, McCay, Case

Today's Agenda

1. Meeting schedule
2. Responsibilities
3. Open position
4. Agenda topic list
 - Core challenges. Each with
 - Success Criteria and Time box
 - Communications strategy
5. Next agenda

Meeting Schedule

Weekly

One hour 12 Noon Eastern Tuesday

Koln WGM

Agenda time within the Affiliate meeting, the Board Meeting and in a general session
Report and/or business items at TSC
Sunday evening planning/coordination session of T3F (5-7PM)
Open session immediately follow the TSC Meeting on Monday evening

Face-to-face T3F Meetings

Responsibilities

Review these decisions at 60 days (early March)

Agreed we need only a Chair, at this point, plus targeted responsibilities for an action item list. Elected Beeler as Chair.

Initial Action item list

- Refine the steps from minutes of 20070104 into action items
- Classify and propose actions on items in document trove
- Assemble agenda topic list

Open T3F Position

Provided recommendations on possible candidates to be conveyed to Board for consideration as they fill this position.

Next agenda

- Finalize Koln WGM space/time needs
- Logistics - Meeting support and technology & e-mail lists
- Focus on the Agenda Topic List

Retrieved from "<http://hl7t3f.org/wiki/index.php?title=FaceToFace-20070109>"

- This page was last modified 17:26, 9 January 2007.

FaceToFace-20070111

From HL7 T3F

Contents

- 1 Present
- 2 Adopted Agenda
- 3 Project Life Cycle Team Discussion - Hall, McCaslin
 - 3.1 Questions to ToT
- 4 Outreach and Participation
- 5 Finalize Koln WGM space/time needs
- 6 Logistics - Meeting support and technology & e-mail lists
- 7 Meeting in conjunction with Harmonization (March 13-16 in Las Vegas)
- 8 Remaining topics deferred for lack of time, included
- 9 Agenda topic list (being built, suggest items)
- 10 Action item list

Present

Parker, Beeler, Blobel, Buitendijk, Case, McCay, McCaslin, Hall

Adopted Agenda

Process Discussion with Frieda and Ken
 Involving key groups and individuals.
 Finalize Koln WGM space/time needs
 Logistics - Meeting support and technology & e-mail lists
 Meeting in conjunction with Harmonization (March 13-16 in Las Vegas)
 Focus on the Agenda Topic List

Project Life Cycle Team Discussion - Hall, McCaslin

Group's remit ends shortly after Transition ends.

Key features - have a process but must be iterative (not waterfall)

Sought peer review. No interest until announcements last week. Is now, and Peer Review closes Feb 15

Suggesting "project Facilitator" in each Committee

Results of a project will be used, and for standards ultimate focus is a normative standard.

T3F will need to assign steps in new structure to assure Life Cycle is alive and workable in new structure, including roles of TD, Technical Committees and relationship of TD to successor to the Project Life Cycle effort.

T3F will designate Jim Case as point person to Project Life Cycle

Suggest that the final proposal for the process be Life Cycle team documents, and the final proposal on responsibilities for the steps and maintenance of life cycle be in T3F documents

Questions to ToT

Is Strategic Initiative Document being Maintained? (Needs to be updated by each team as it progresses.) How does ToT remain aware of what each team is doing?

Outreach and Participation

HL7 Board appointed Virginia Lorenzi to fill the open slot. Logistics and timing prevented Virginia from attending this meeting, but the T3F looks forward to her participation

Groups for T3F Direct Liaison - with designated contact:

- Project Life Cycle - Case
- Transition Oversight - Buitendijk
- TSC - McCay
- ARB - Parker

T3F will provide a standing invitation to the Chair(s) (or their designee) to attend T3F Meetings (Beeler to do)

Finalize Koln WGM space/time needs

Sunday night joint session

T3F Face-toface meetings 7AM -8AM Tuesday and Thursday

Open Mike session - We will ask Linda how we might get a flexible locale either at breaks or one evening

Craig Parker agreed to follow up with HQ on these.

Logistics - Meeting support and technology & e-mail lists

GotoMeeting plus HL7 Conference Call service (Beeler)

Three HL7-supported mail lists (Parker):

- Mail List "to" T3F members
- T3F Public list
- T3F Internal list

Meeting in conjunction with Harmonization (March 13-16 in Las Vegas)

No. Full group not available

Remaining topics deferred for lack of time, included

Focus on the Agenda Topic List

Agenda topic list (being built, suggest items)

Core challenges. Each with
Success Criteria and Time box
Communications strategy

Action item list

Refine the steps from minutes of 20070104 into action items
Classify and propose actions on items in document trove
Assemble agenda topic list

Retrieved from "<http://hl7t3f.org/wiki/index.php?title=FaceToFace-20070111>"

- This page was last modified 18:00, 11 January 2007.

ConCall-20070116

From HL7 T3F

Conference Call, January 16, 2007

Contents

- 1 Attendees
- 2 Roll Call & Accept agenda
- 3 Core challenges for T3F
 - 3.1 Defining a Technical directorate
 - 3.2 Coordinate our vision with the Board
 - 3.3 Maintain clear open communication to membership (ongoing)
- 4 T3F Action item list
- 5 Six Core Architectural Features
- 6 Communications strategy
- 7 Agenda item list (our sand box for future meetings)
- 8 Click for T3F Action Item List

Attendees

Beeler, Blobel, Lorenzi, McCay, Parker, Quinn. Unavailable: Case, Buitendijk,

Roll Call & Accept agenda

Next weeks call shift to **Wednesday, January 24 at noon Eastern**, then go to regular schedule

Core challenges for T3F

Defining a Technical directorate

Goal date: May WGM - have a proposal that can be discussed and refined at WGM

- Establish whether TD/T3F will: oversee development, or approve/monitor/intervene projects
- Assume: Reasonable staffing/commitment levels for TD at
 - 2-hrs per week is realistic (1 call, 1 work) (**Note:** SI plan says 3-4 hrs/wk)
 - 5-7 hours during a WGM

Coordinate our vision with the Board

Goal date(s): First report in 30 days, then continue

- Verify that Governance & Structure is not in conflict with us
- Continue our collaboration with Project Life Cycle

- Add Action item to be sure Life Cycle is implementable in organization

Maintain clear open communication to membership (ongoing)

NOTE: Do NOT edit these minutes except for corrections. The same list appears as Core Challenges For T3F where it can be revised, amended and appended.

T3F Action item list

Formally - Accepted Items 2 thru 6 on the list, thereby completing item 1

Charlie McCay accepted action to to assemble list of documents for consideration under item 3.1 of action item list.

Six Core Architectural Features

We discussed Six Core Architecture Features. The discussion rambled but there seemed to be consensus on three key points:

1. As listed, the features are "ok" for a techie elevator talk
2. The features need to be extended to include an over-arching schema and references or bindings to existing technical architectures (e.g. Zachmann) *See e-mail from Blobel*
3. This list **must open**
with its relationship to HL7's product strategy and mission -- paraphrased as "to do whats needed for interoperability"
(*E-mail from Lorenzi will be used to update the six-features page*)

Communications strategy

Dropped for lack of time, but was added to Core challenges

Agenda item list (our sand box for future meetings)

Click for T3F Action Item List

Retrieved from "<http://hl7t3f.org/wiki/index.php?title=ConCall-20070116>"

- This page was last modified 18:38, 16 January 2007.

ConCall-20070124

From HL7 T3F

T3F - Transitional Technical Task Force

Conference Call is scheduled for 1.0 hour

Wed Jan 24, 2007 12:00 PM (US Eastern Time, GMT -5)

Please consult <http://www.timeanddate.com/worldclock> for your local times

Telephone conference Information - HL7 Conference Service

Phone Number: 973-582-2813

Participant Passcode: 124466

Online Meeting service - GoToMeeting

for this meeting only : <https://www.gotomeeting.com/join/949147364>

not <https://www.gotomeeting.com/join/873285595>

GoToMeeting ID: 873-285-595

Contents

- 1 Present
- 2 Prior Homework
- 3 Accepted Agenda
- 4 Architecture
- 5 Core Challenges
- 6 Agenda item list (our sand box for future meetings)
- 7 Click for T3F Action Item List

Present

Beeler, Blobel, Buitendijk, Case, Hammond, Lorenzi, McCaslin, McCay, Parker, Walker

Prior Homework

Review/update working items as:

- Core Challenges For T3F
- Six Core Architecture Features

Accepted Agenda

1. (05 min) Roll Call & Accepted agenda

2. (20 min) Refine Core Challenges For T3F
Need Success Criteria
3. (20 min) Complete top-level representation of **Six Core Architecture Features**
4. (10 min) Review, update T3F Action item list
 1. Review list of documents (McCay)

Architecture

We moved architecture discussion to the beginning to accomodate Bert's time. He had concerns that the architure features and basic principles needed work and pointed everyone to the papers he has posted on this subject. He noted that quality, usability, scalability, and portability should be included. It was agreed that readability could be removed. He might draft suggestions on how to improve. Others on the call expressed an interest that we focus more time in the immediate future on operational and organizational aspects of T3F rather than architecture, that is, defining how the T3F will effectively ensure compliance with a technical architecture.

Core Challenges

We discussed the role of "arb" during the transition. It was recommended that arb continue to do what it does today but should report to the T3F.

Charlie edited the Core Challenges section on the wiki based on refinement discussions.

We discussion TD organization and the organizational charts presented. Ed suggested we take over the top boc of TD and evolve everything under it. Ed will try to find the original author of the Strategic Initiatives Org Chart diagram. It was noted that the charts we've stored on the wiki are both somewhat misleading. The one from ORC looks "messy" but really represents the full picture of the three areas - Foundations&Technology, Structure&Semantics, and Domain Expertise where most volunteer work will occur. The one from the Strategic Task Force report looks much cleaner but hides the details on these three areas. It also shows paid positions in more detail than volunteer positions which may be misleading. The difference between Product and Project Managers was not clear. Ed thinks we need a discussion on "What is the technical directorate?" Virginia agreed to try to do mock up diagram(s). We agreed that we should read the Strategic Task Force report section on the Technical Directorate and add discussion on it before next meeting.

Agenda item list (our sand box for future meetings)

Next week - carry forward Documents discussion (did not have time this week). We should time box architecture to 10 minutes and place at end of agenda.

Click for T3F Action Item List

Retrieved from "<http://hl7t3f.org/wiki/index.php?title=ConCall-20070124>"

- This page was last modified 06:37, 28 January 2007.

ConCall-20070130

From HL7 T3F

T3F - Transitional Technical Task Force

Tuesday Jan 30, 2007 12:00 PM (US Eastern Time, GMT -5)

Contents

- 1 Present
- 2 Prior Homework
- 3 Accepted Agenda
- 4 Core Challenges, particularly TD role & Organization
 - 4.1 Charts from Virginia Lorenzi
 - 4.2 Sketched chart from Craig Parker
 - 4.3 Comments from Charlie McCay on TD definition
- 5 Next Steps
- 6 Agenda item list (our sand box for future meetings)
- 7 Click for T3F Action Item List

Present

Beeler, Blobel, Buitendijk, Lorenzi, McCay, Parker

Prior Homework

Review/update working items as:

- Review description of Technical Directorate from Strategic Task Force Documentation (<http://www.hl7.org/rwj/documentcenter/Strategic%20Initiatives%20Recommendations%207-26-06.doc>)
- An alternative description which may be more relevant and up to date is posted under the Governance page at: [http://www.hl7.org/documentcenter/public/wg/sito/SIIP%20Transition%20View%20of%20Org%20Model%20\(3\).doc](http://www.hl7.org/documentcenter/public/wg/sito/SIIP%20Transition%20View%20of%20Org%20Model%20(3).doc)
- CM_comments_on_TD_definition_from_Strategic_Recommendations

Accepted Agenda

1. (05 min) Roll Call & Accept agenda
2. (25 min) Core Challenges
TD Organization, What is TD
3. (10 min) Architecture
4. (10 min) Document List

Core Challenges, particularly TD role & Organization

Whole meeting was devoted to discussion of this topic using two additional documents submitted by Lorenzi and Parker.

Charts from Virginia Lorenzi

(<http://www.hl7.org/documentcenter/public/wg/t3f/general/Organizational%20Charts%20for%20Discussion.ppt>)

Virginia Lorenzi had assembled a **Power point of Charts**

(<http://www.hl7.org/documentcenter/public/wg/t3f/general/Organizational%20Charts%20for%20Discussion.ppt>) that she prepared to reflect the TD relationships as they were expressed in either other charts or textual descriptions from the SI effort. These included:

- **Simplified version of chart produced by ORC**

- Discussed why ARB, Cross-domain and PMO were separate from TD. Presume this is because it was felt that these were Board interests that were separable from TD.

- **TD as presented by graphically by the consultants**

- Notes: PMO is part of TD; No overt resolution group (including ARB); Production (Ed, Tooling, Pubs added) and "Product Management" above the three areas.

(Some discussion of what "Product" Management is (person, group, subset of TC chairs, etc.))

In narrative, as noted, the Chairs of the three TC boxes are part of TD.

- **Composition of TD, as presented in the consultants text**

- Suggests a good bit of "power" to CTO. However, the essence of the TD is to get and keep the organization moving forward in a coordinated fashion.

Discussion of the CTO as a paid vs a volunteer position.

- Pros - Full attention to the problem;

- Cons - subsumes an influential position that volunteer leaders might aspire to and desire.

- **Revised SI diagram based on feedback from Board and others** - Notes: One worrisome feature is the "final authority" designation of the CTO. Note also, it includes the notion of a TSC.

Sketched chart from Craig Parker

(<http://www.hl7.org/documentcenter/public/wg/t3f/general/org.png>)

Noting that the charts provided tended to mix and match between organizational responsibilities (hierarchy) and organizational relationships (horizontal), Craig Parker assembled a sketched chart that reflects both sets of relations on a single slide.

This was discussed briefly. We concluded that a single format such as this is desirable as an end-product.

Comments from Charlie McCay on TD definition

Charlie McCay had prepared annotations on the TD definitions. The group agreed this is a good direction and would like to expand and refine this list in our next conference call.

Next Steps

Agreed for next meeting to:

1. Use the source documents, Virginia's charts, and Charlie's notes to refine a list of TD:

- Responsibilities
- Relationships
- Constituencies

2. Using the above, and the charts provided by Craig and Virginia to craft a refined chart for TD that the T3F can endorse.

Agenda item list (our sand box for future meetings)

Click for T3F Action Item List

Retrieved from "<http://hl7t3f.org/wiki/index.php?title=ConCall-20070130>"

- This page was last modified 21:17, 2 February 2007.

ConCall-20070206

From HL7 T3F

T3F - Transitional Technical Task Force

Tuesday Feb 06, 2007 12:00 PM (US Eastern Time, GMT -5)

Contents

- 1 Present
- 2 Prior Homework
 - 2.1 Background
 - 2.2 Working Documents
- 3 Accepted Agenda
- 4 Technical Directorate Discussions
 - 4.1 Aggregate and summarize TD responsibilities
 - 4.2 Consider TD make-up and roles
- 5 Next Steps
- 6 Agenda item list (our sand box for future meetings)
- 7 Click for T3F Action Item List

Present

Beeler, Blobel, Buitendijk, Case, Lorenzi, McCaslin, McCay

Prior Homework

Review/update working items as:

Background

- Review description of Technical Directorate from Strategic Task Force Documentation (<http://www.hl7.org/rwj/documentcenter/Strategic%20Initiatives%20Recommendations%207-26-06.doc>)
- An alternative description which may be more relevant and up to date is posted under the Governance page at: [http://www.hl7.org/documentcenter/public/wg/sito/SIIP%20Transition%20View%20of%20Org%20Model%20\(3\).doc](http://www.hl7.org/documentcenter/public/wg/sito/SIIP%20Transition%20View%20of%20Org%20Model%20(3).doc)

Working Documents

- Review of TD functions from Charlie McCay
- Summary of various "**organization charts**" assembled by Virginia Lorenzi (*in PowerPoint*) (<http://www.hl7.org/documentcenter/public/wg/t3f/general/Organizational%20Charts%20for%20Discussion.ppt>)
- Beginning sketch of Organizational relations by Craig Parker (*in png*) (<http://www.hl7.org/documentcenter/public/wg/t3f/general/org.png>)

Accepted Agenda

1. (05 min) Roll Call & Accept agenda
2. (40 min) Technical Directorate Discussions
 - (20 min) Aggregate and summarize TD responsibilities
 - (20 min) Consider TD make-up and roles, including relationships to Board, CTO, TSC, and high-level groupings of TCs and SIGs
3. (10 min) Document list

Technical Directorate Discussions

Aggregate and summarize TD responsibilities

Several participants had amended function list that we seek to refine. Among the discussion points for this list is:

- What is the TD role in identifying, managing and/or defining products going forward?
 - **Action:** Ask the Products and Services SI group their view on this.
 - **Agreed:**
 - The TD must have a role in accepting the Products it believes it can execute based on resources, architecture, coherency, etc.
 - Long-term, who will define Products?
- What is role of TD in re other tasks such as Education, PR, Marketing
- What is the relationship of the TD to Supporting tasks -- PMO, Publication, Electronic services, Tools, etc.?
- **Note:** Representation (voting or not) from the two above is essential to TD functioning

Consider TD make-up and roles

For this discussion we worked with a revised version (slide 1)

(<http://www.hl7.org/documentcenter/public/wg/t3f/general/WorkingDraft-TD-Charts.ppt>) of the preliminary chart created by Craig parker, and two if the charts (slides 2 & 3)

(<http://www.hl7.org/documentcenter/public/wg/t3f/general/WorkingDraft-TD-Charts.ppt>) prepared by Virginia Lorenzi. The discussion focused on slide1 with the following notes and actions:

1. **Query:**
 - Do the COO and CTO report to Board or to the CEO (as indicated here)? Some of the SI material suggests that these report to the Board in parallel.
2. **Discussion:**
 - Why is TSC in the middle of the path from TCs to TD?? This would appear to further separate the TCs and SIGs from the actions in the TD and Board. This discussion led to the following points.
3. **Agreed:**
 - There should be an expectation that the Co-Chairs TCs and SIGs in each of the FT, SS and DE sub-groups will meet routinely to resolve issues between their groups. This implies ConCalls, and WGM face-to-face meetings. (In effect, there is one committee of co-chairs for each sub-group.)
4. **Agreed:** There will need to be two representatives of each sub-group available to participate in TD meetings.
 1. One of these would be the "primary" representative, and the other is an "alternate" who can attend and participate when the "primary" is unavailable. The "alternate" should Chair the Sub-group co-chairs meetings.
 2. Recommend an election process for the sub-group representatives to the TD that is similar to that used to select the T3F. Specifically, candidates must be a Co-Chairs of one of the committees in the sub-group. Votes for the primary and alternate delegate will be cast by each Committee or SIG in the sub-group.
5. **Agreed:**
 - With the above meetings in place, then the TSC (all co-chairs of all TCs and SIGs) becomes a plenary or retreat style

meeting, and the "TSC" is no longer needed as an "in-line" box.

6. Discussion:

Should the six TD representatives of FT SS DE also convene periodically? We agreed that this will depend upon the strategies adopted for resolving issues and conflicts between and among TCs/SIGs. Certainly these six individuals must play a key role in these processes.

Next Steps

At the next meeting we agreed to continue advancing two documents in parallel:

1. The draft TD structure charts (<http://www.hl7.org/documentcenter/public/wg/t3f/general/WorkingDraft-TD-Charts.ppt>)
 - Revise to reflect agreements in last this meeting
 - Begin to revise slide 2 based on these discussions
 - Visit rationale for selection of sub-groups (slide 3)
2. The list of TD responsibilities and relationships.
 - Reduce the number of "bullets" in each section to a few (2-4)
 - Clearly segregate and define the three sub-groupings of responsibilities
 - Begin to assign specific responsibilities to "boxes" on the charts

Agenda item list (our sand box for future meetings)

Click for T3F Action Item List

Retrieved from "<http://hl7t3f.org/wiki/index.php?title=ConCall-20070206>"

- This page was last modified 19:36, 6 February 2007.

ConCall-20070213

From HL7 T3F

T3F - Transitional Technical Task Force

Tuesday Feb 13, 2007 12:00 PM (US Eastern Time, GMT -5)

Contents

- 1 Present
- 2 Prior Homework
- 3 Accepted Agenda
- 4 Status Reports
- 5 Technical Directorate Discussion
 - 5.1 Slide 1-TD Hierarchy diagram
 - 5.2 TD responsibilities
- 6 Next Steps
- 7 Agenda item list (our sand box for future meetings)
- 8 Click for T3F Action Item List

Present

Beeler, Blobel, Buitendijk, Case, Lorenzi, Parker, Quinn, Walker

Future absences

February 20, Blobel, Case

February 27, Beeler, Quinn

Prior Homework

Prepare to continue advancing two documents in parallel:

1. The draft TD structure charts (<http://www.hl7.org/documentcenter/public/wg/t3f/general/WorkingDraft-TD-Charts.ppt>) which includes Craig's chart and two of Virginia's charts.
2. The list of TD responsibilities and relationships.

Accepted Agenda

1. (05 min) Roll Call & Accept agenda
2. (02 min) Status reports
3. (50 min) Technical Directorate Discussions
 - (25 min) Charts of TD hierarchy and relationships
 - (25 min) List of TD responsibilities
4. (05 min) Next Steps

Status Reports

Beeler reported that he discovered, belatedly, e-mails requesting T3F status reports to the Board which had not been forwarded. He will send this in.

Technical Directorate Discussion

Slide 1-TD Hierarchy diagram

(<http://www.hl7.org/documentcenter/public/wg/t3f/general/WorkingDraft-TD-Cha>)

There was a free ranging discussion of Organizational hierarchy begun at last weeks meeting.

We noted the strong preference of this group to seek an alternate title for the CTO --perhaps Technical Coordinating Officer. The concerns arise because of the role of CTOs in other standards bodies and because of the statement in one SI document that "CTO leads the Technical Directorate. While the CTO may seek consensus among the members of the TD, as the responsible party he or she holds the final decision making authority." An implied veto-power such as this sits very badly with the volunteer membership. We were advised to make this position known to the Transition Task Force as soon as possible.

Omissions: It was noted that the Security TC is not in the list of committees in third slide and should be.

Discussed the relationship of the various Board-appointed committees to the hierarchy. Must list all the Board-appointed committees. A number of these should report to the TD, including Electronic Services, Publishing, Architecture Review Board, Tooling, Implementation, Marketing, and Education. (Not exhaustive) While others like Legal Affairs, Finance, Bylaws, etc. will likely remain Board-appointed.

Discussed the relationship of these "appointed committees" to the TD and observed:

- Most of these are performing or overseeing "support" functions rather than "standards development" or policy functions
- These should each have a direct line relationship to the TD and a dotted line relationship to either the CTO/TCO, CEO or COO
- There should be at least one designated "staff" participant in each of these
- We need to add TD-appointed committee responsibilities to the TD list
- These groups need some form of representation in the TD
- These groups should expect to provide routine reports to the TD

TD responsibilities

After the prior meeting Beeler had re-shuffled the original list into three categories. Prior to this Meeting Berndt Blobel provided a set of recommendations by e-mail. These were discussed and we agreed to changes as follows:

- In the **"Resolve Issues"** (3rd) Group
 - Items 2 & 4 are the dominant responsibilities
 - Item 1 heavily overlaps item 4. Item 1 can be dropped if wording changes are made to item 4 to assure that it is covered.
 - Item 3 is an obvious requirement given the oversight responsibilities and can be dropped as an explicit line item
- In the **"Development Process"** 2nd) Group
 - Items 1 to 3 are the key items and in the correct order.
 - Item 4 is the same as item 3 above, and can be dropped for the same reason
- In the **"Oversee Development"** 1st) Group
 - Item 1 is critical and remains where it is
 - Items 2-4 should be delegated to the sub-groups with TD oversight, and enumerated as part of the sub-group's base charter

- Items 5, 7 and 8 are project-related. These, too, need to be delegated to the individual committees via the sub-groups, with support from the PMO
- Item 3 becomes a TD oversight of the sub-groups with respect to products and projects

The discussion of projects and HL7's experience with the PMO suggests that the TD and the Sub-groups must function, in part, as a "Project Mgmt Committee" assuring that the TCs are following a defined strategy. In that case, the PMO is a support position providing reporting, tools, etc. Absent such a relationship a PMO staff position **cannot** succeed.

MISSING: The list is still missing is a responsibility for "Product Definition" and strategy.

Next Steps

Agreed for next week to discuss:

- Makeup of TD (slide 2)
- Makeup of Sub-groups (slide 3)
- Utility of a distinction between TCs and SIGs
- Refinement of the responsibilities list & hierarchy chart

Agenda item list (our sand box for future meetings)

Click for T3F Action Item List

Retrieved from "<http://hl7t3f.org/wiki/index.php?title=ConCall-20070213>"

- This page was last modified 19:34, 13 February 2007.

ConCall-20070220

From HL7 T3F

T3F - Transitional Technical Task Force

Tuesday Feb 20, 2007 12:00 PM (US Eastern Time, GMT -5)

Contents

- 1 Present
- 2 Prior Homework
- 3 Agenda
- 4 Progress Report
- 5 Technical Directorate Composition
 - 5.1 How should the TD make decisions?
 - 5.1.1 Can members vote?
 - 5.1.2 Do some members NOT have voting privileges?
 - 5.1.3 Alternatively, is the TD more of an advisory committee for the CTO or a volunteer chair in which the CTO or chair makes all final decisions but goes to the TD for advice?
 - 5.2 Assuming the proposal that the chair of the TD is a volunteer and there is a paid TCO who works hand in hand to support and coordinate TC activities.
 - 5.2.1 Who chairs the TD (one of the existing TD members, someone else)?
 - 5.2.2 How is that decided (appointed, elected, by whom)?
 - 5.2.3 Does the CTO/TCO have a vote?
 - 5.2.4 What are the qualifications for the CTO?
 - 5.2.5 Does a volunteer chair have a vote?
 - 5.3 The diagram says “up to 3 CTO-recommended members (in conjunction with CEO and COO)” I believe the rationale is to suggest candidates to fill perceived gaps.
 - 5.3.1 Should there be 3 appointed positions like this?
 - 5.3.2 Who should recommend them?
 - 5.4 Should a representative from ARB have a seat and a vote on the TD?
 - 5.5 Do people agree with the 3 affiliate positions (one US)?
 - 5.6 Do people agree one rep each from FT, DE, and SS? (I think this one we’ve discussed the most).
- 6 Next Steps
- 7 Agenda item list (our sand box for future meetings)
- 8 Click for T3F Action Item List

Present

Beeler, Buitendijk, McCay, Lorenzi, Parker, Quinn, Walker

Prior Homework

Prepare to continue advancing two documents in parallel:

1. The draft TD structure charts (<http://www.hl7.org/documentcenter/public/wg/t3f/general/WorkingDraft-TD-Charts-2.ppt>) .
2. The list of TD responsibilities and relationships.

Agenda

1. (05 min) Roll Call & Accept agenda
2. (02 min) Progress Report to Transition Oversight Team
3. (50 min) Technical Directorate Discussions
(20 min) Technical Directorate composition
4. (05 min) Next Steps

Progress Report

Beeler reported that a monthly progress report to the Transition Oversight Team and Board is due February 28. We missed the last report because Beeler missed the e-mail requesting it. Beeler will draft the report, circulate it to the committee for comment and seek an "ok" at next week's T3F call.

Technical Directorate Composition

The meeting was devoted to a discussion of the make-up (composition) of the TD, using the chart from the Strategic Initiative report as a starting point. (Slide #3 of the draft TD structure charts (<http://www.hl7.org/documentcenter/public/wg/t3f/general/WorkingDraft-TD-Charts-2.ppt>)) Virginia Lorenzi had provided a framework for the discussion by posing a list of questions based upon that chart plus prior T3F discussions. Here questions form the "outline topics" of these minutes, with points made during the committee discussion as regular text.

How should the TD make decisions?

Can members vote?

The T3F is clearly agreed that the TD is a consensus body and that decisions are taken by vote of that group.

Do some members NOT have voting privileges?

There will probably be some non-voting positions for participation by HL7 staff.

Alternatively, is the TD more of an advisory committee for the CTO or a volunteer chair in which the CTO or chair makes all final decisions but goes to the TD for advice?

Again,. the T3F believes the majority of decisions should be by vote of the TD. There may remain certain tactical decisions that the Chair and or CTO is authorized to make. (Current example is what is referred to as the "John Quinn Rule". This is a by-law stipulation that the TSC Chair may approve the advancement of standards to membership vote either by-passing committee vote, or with remaining negatives.)

Assuming the proposal that the chair of the TD is a volunteer and there is a paid TCO who works hand in hand to support and coordinate TC activities.

NOTE:

Previous discussions in the T3f had raised the idea that perhaps the TD chair should be drawn from the volunteers and that the CTO position should act as an "administrator" to the TD, responsible for much of the communication, planning and coordination that the TD needs to function. (This might be similar to the relationship between the CEO and the Board.) In that discussion it was also suggested that a title of "Technical Coordination Officer", or TCO, might be appropriate. As of this date, the T3f has **not adopted this idea.**

It is, however, still under discussion. The following sub-questions were posed to get better understanding of how such a relationship would work **if** it were adopted.

Who chairs the TD (one of the existing TD members, someone else)?

Initial response was that the Chair would be elected from within the TD, but we did not explore the idea of a nominating committee and an election from with one vote for each TCs and SIG.

How is that decided (appointed, elected, by whom)?

(See above)

Does the CTO/TCO have a vote?

General feeling was yes, otherwise the individual has little influence with which to carry out his/her mission.

What are the qualifications for the CTO?

The following were cited as principles for selection:

1. A proven consensus builder
2. Someone who **knows** and **is known to** the HL7 Working Group
3. Likely to have been a Co-Chair or “facilitator”, but not necessarily required

Does a volunteer chair have a vote?

As with all Chair positiosn, they have a "tie breaking" vote only.

Related point The T3F agreed that the TD members should have defined terms, but not “term limits”.

The diagram says “up to 3 CTO-recommended members (in conjunction with CEO and COO)” I believe the rationale is to suggest candidates to fill perceived gaps.

Should there be 3 appointed positions like this?

Note:

this item was addressed last during the meeting. Thus, the rationale for this recommendation lies, in part, with the responses to the remaining composition questions.

T3F agreed:

- There should be one Board-appointed position, who also serves as a Board liaison
- That the TD have the option of "co-opting" a member who would serve with a vriable (but defined) term. This would allow the TD to achieve better balance, to fill a gap in knowledge, or accomplish other goals.
- T3F should consider adding a position to represent the “other” volunteer-driven Board-appointed Committees (Electronic Services, Publishing, Legal Affairs, etc.)

Who should recommend them?

The TD should have a recommendation/nominating process for these.

Should a representative from ARB have a seat and a vote on the TD?

The group discussed whether they thought there will continue to be an ARB. It was agreed that a number of the TD tasks will require appointment of responsible groups and that it is likely some of the ARB functions will remain to be undertaken by an established group. The T3F believes that the ARB should be appointed by and report to the TD.

In that case, then the ARB Chair should be a voting member of the TD if the Chair is not already a TD member. Note that T3F still needs to parse the tasks of the current ARB and assign them to itself, to a future ARB or to its sub-groups.

Do people agree with the 3 affiliate positions (one US)?

After a good deal of discussion, the T3F agreed that it would prefer to see two "affiliate positions" with no slot designated for a particular affiliate. The objective is to gain broader technical and requirements input for architecture and product positioning.

These members should be elected by an "affiliate council" that represents all affiliates, including the US, however the actions of these representatives within the TD should not be "directed" or "vetted" by either the Affiliate Council or the Affiliates of which they are members.

Note:

This discussion also led to the observation that there needs to be a "staging" of TD membership selection, at least initially. That is, we should delay election of affiliate slots until after the three "TC/SIG" positions are filled, and should delay the "appointed" positions (with the exception of the Board appointment) until after the affiliate representatives are known.

Do people agree one rep each from FT, DE, and SS? (I think this one we've discussed the most).

In general, the T3F is comfortable with this, assuming, as we agreed earlier, that each sub-group will have **both** a delegate and an alternate. We also noted that recommendations from Sub-groups will have weight simply because they originate from within the Working Group.

Next Steps

Next week (February 27) Beeler and Quinn will be absent at HIMSS. Craig Parker agreed to chair the meeting.

Action items:

1. Craig agreed to refine the "committee chart" he had started as Slide #1 of the draft TD structure charts (<http://www.hl7.org/documentcenter/public/wg/t3f/general/WorkingDraft-TD-Charts-2.ppt>)
2. Requested Virginia to take a stab at creating a revised version of the TD Composition chart based on the minutes and discussions from today's call.

During next week's meeting the T3F will focus on the composition of the sub-groups, their "designation" (what are they called generically), their names, a brief summary of what each sub-groups represent, and whether the current aggregation of TCs and SIGs are appropriate to those groups. It was noted several times that there is no hard and fast "rule" that there must be exactly three sub-groups. There could be more.

Agenda item list (our sand box for future meetings)

Click for T3F Action Item List

Retrieved from "<http://hl7t3f.org/wiki/index.php?title=ConCall-20070220>"

- This page was last modified 16:01, 21 February 2007.

ConCall-20070227

From HL7 T3F

T3F - Transitional Technical Task Force

Tuesday Feb 27, 2007 12:00 PM (US Eastern Time, GMT -5)

Contents

- 1 Present
- 2 Accepted Agenda
- 3 Other Business
- 4 TD Sub-groups Names and Composition
 - 4.1 Background
 - 4.2 Organizing Principle
 - 4.3 Sub-group Definition and Composition
 - 4.3.1 Foundation & Technologies
 - 4.3.2 Direct Support
 - 4.3.3 Structure & Semantic Design
 - 4.3.4 Domain Experts
 - 4.3.5 Other
- 5 Agenda item list (our sand box for future meetings)
- 6 Click for T3F Action Item List

Present

Beeler, Case, McCaslin, McCay, Lorenzi, Parker

Accepted Agenda

1. (05 min) Roll Call & Accept agenda
2. (50 min) Technical Directorate Discussions
 - (40 min) TD Sub-groups Names and Composition
 - (10 min) Review changes to TD Charts and list of responsibilities
3. (05 min) Next Steps

Other Business

- T3F Monthly Progress report is due tomorrow. Beeler will submit this and copy to the T3F.
- Approved minutes of last week's meeting

TD Sub-groups Names and Composition

Background

As a starting point for this discussion, the T3F used a previously developed Strategic Initiative document titled "Creation of the Transitional Technical Task Force (T3F)"

(<http://www.hl7.org/documentcenter/public/wg/t3f%5Cgeneral/HL7%20Organizational%20Framework%20-%20V0005.doc>) .

This document from November 2005 included a summary of the committees to be organized and coordinated by the the TD.

The objective of this T3F meeting is to refine and resolve our understanding of what the structure represents, where we think alternate committee assignments might be made and where we feel this structure may cause "problems" in the future.

The findings and outcome of this meeting **have not been formally adopted**. We agreed to document the outcome of the discussions and then to re-visit this in the next meeting or so. (This strategy is also being followed with regards to the composition and function of the TD itself.)

Organizing Principle

During the discussions today, the T3F made the following observations:

- HL7 members join committees because of their personal (or corporate) interest in the **subject matter content** of the committee, regardless of whether their interest stems from academic, development or implementation activities.
- The original break-out of committees (provided in the SI document (<http://www.hl7.org/documentcenter/public/wg/t3f%5Cgeneral/HL7%20Organizational%20Framework%20-%20V0005.doc>)) aggregates the committees by commonality of **what they produce** and the relationship of that work product to the other Working Group committees. There was a consensus expressed that this is a sound approach.
- One of the key activities of the TD will be to identify and reduce those places where committees are "stepping on each others toes" or "reinventing the wheel" Coordination within the proposed sub-groups will facilitate this activity.
- The existing relationship between TCs and SIGs may need to be "re-thought", because this strategy will clearly place a number of SIGS in a sub-group that is different from that to which their current "parent TC" is assigned.
- It will be important to not disrupt existing collaboration while establishing this organization, and it is clear that many topics will be managed, in "matrix fashion" between committees in two or three sub-groups.
- A number of committees clearly produce products that fit in two or even three of the sub-groups. This will undoubtedly cause the TD to consider whether to recommend that these groups be split.

Sub-group Definition and Composition

The remainder of these minutes reflect changes to that portion of the original document

(<http://www.hl7.org/documentcenter/public/wg/t3f%5Cgeneral/HL7%20Organizational%20Framework%20-%20V0005.doc>) that divided the existing TCs and SIGs into three groups for the purposes of nominating and electing the representatives to the T3F and listed the "Other committees" to be considered.

Foundation & Technologies

Committees and projects in this space focus on providing the fundamental tools and building blocks that other Committees can use to build the standards.

- Conformance and Implementation
- Infrastructure & Messaging
- Implementable Technology Specifications (ITS)
- Java
- Modeling & Methodology
- Security
- Service Oriented Architecture (SOA)
- Templates
- Tooling Committee

- Vocabulary
- **Related multi-committee projects:**
 - Dynamic Model
 - Harmonization
 - HL7 Terminology

Direct Support

These committees are currently Board-appointed. They are, for the most part functioning on volunteer effort, although each has strong support from a designated staff liaison. The primary feature of these committees is that their projects provide direct support to the other committees of the Working Group that enables the remaining committees to function efficiently.

- Publishing
- Tooling
- Education
- Electronic Services

Structure & Semantic Design

Committees and project in this space focus on creation of basic patterns and common messages that could exist on their own, but are mostly used by others.

- CCOW
 - CCOW is both a foundation (component architecture) and a pattern - the resulting functions*
- Clinical Decision Support
- Electronic Health Record (EHR)
- Financial Management
- Genomics
- Orders & Observations
- Patient Administration
- Personnel Management
- Scheduling & Logistics
- Structured Documents
 - This committee is a mix of all three sub-groups. CDA-R2 is both a technology and a pattern, and the "implementation" guide work is Domain Expert effort*
- **Related multi-committee projects:**
 - Clinical Statements
 - Common Message Element Types (CMETs)

Domain Experts

Committees and projects in this space focus on creation of messages, services, documents using many of the common structures in place, yet expanding it in key areas as well.

- Anatomic Pathology
- Anesthesiology
- Attachments
- Cardiology
- Clinical Guidelines
- Community Based Health Services
- Emergency Care
- Government Projects

*In similar fashion to OCCR (below). this group fosters participation and development, but does it actually **do** development?*

- Health Care Devices
- Imaging Integration
- Laboratory
- Patient Care
- Patient Safety
- Pediatrics Data Standards
- Public Health Emergency Response (PHER)
- Pharmacy
- Regulated Clinical Research Information Management (RCRIM)

Is not this group doing patterns?

Other

Additionally there are these Board-appointed committees:

- Architecture Review Board (ARB)
As noted in last week's discussion, this becomes a direct responsibility of TD
- Outreach Committee for Clinical Research (OCCR)
*Although it fosters participation and development, this group does not actually **do** development*
- Process Improvement
This becomes a direct responsibility of TD

Agenda item list (our sand box for future meetings)

Click for T3F Action Item List

Retrieved from "<http://hl7t3f.org/wiki/index.php?title=ConCall-20070227>"

- This page was last modified 01:26, 28 February 2007.