

# ConCall-20070306

## From HL7 T3F

T3F - Transitional Technical Task Force

Tuesday Mar 6, 2007 12:00 PM (US Eastern Time, GMT -5)

### Contents

- 1 Present
- 2 Approved Agenda
- 3 Next Meeting canceled
- 4 Review/Advance Recent T3F Actions with Regard to Technical Directorate
  - 4.1 Composition and Functioning of the TD
    - 4.1.1 CTO Qualifications
    - 4.1.2 Support Services representative
    - 4.1.3 Additional "roles" required in TD
  - 4.2 Definition and Composition of TD "Sub-groups"
    - 4.2.1 Definition of Foundation & Technologies Sub-group
    - 4.2.2 Duplicate Listing
    - 4.2.3 Challenge of Creating Sub-groups
    - 4.2.4 Harmonization as a Core TD Challenge
    - 4.2.5 Project Management and TD
    - 4.2.6 "Top-down" Projects and Standards Liaisons
- 5 Next Steps
  - 5.1 Decisions/Issues List
- 6 Agenda item list (our sand box for future meetings)
- 7 Click for T3F Action Item List

## Present

Beeler, Blobel, Buitendijk, Case, Hammond, Jaffe, Lorenzi, Parker, Walker

## Approved Agenda

1. (05 min) Roll Call & Accept agenda
2. (50 min) Technical Directorate Review/Advance Recent T3F actions
  - (25 min) Technical Directorate Responsibilities & Procedures
  - (25 min) TD Sub-groups Names and Composition
3. (05 min) Next Steps

## Next Meeting canceled

Owing to the start of the HL7 Harmonization Meeting at the same time as the regular T3F Meeting, and the fact that several T3F members will be involved in Harmonization, the T3F Meeting for March 13, 2007 is canceled.

# Review/Advance Recent T3F Actions with Regard to Technical Directorate

The T3F began to review decisions taken during the last two meetings (February 20 and February 27 with regard to the organization and groupings of the Technical Directorate. We benefited greatly from the participation in this meeting of Drs. Jaffe and Hammond who had not participated in the previous discussions.

## Composition and Functioning of the TD

For this discussion, we used two documents -- The discussion in the minutes of February 20, and a revised TD Composition Chart (<http://www.hl7.org/documentcenter/public/wg/t3f%5Cgeneral/OrganizationalChartsProposal20070306.ppt>) prepared by Virginia Lorenzi. There was general agreement with the decisions of two-weeks ago, but we agreed to a few modifications as follows:

### CTO Qualifications

We agreed that the technical competence of the candidate was also a critical parameter. (This had been omitted in the earlier discussion only because it was an "unstated assumption" by most.) We agreed, then that this portion of the TD makeup should read:

The following are principles that should be applied in making a CTO selection, in this order:

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
4. Have a strong understanding or working knowledge of the technology that HL7 defines and is dependent upon.

### Support Services representative

Given the decision last week to add "Direct Support" "sub-group" as part of the TD, this representative will be elected by the same pattern and protocol as the representatives from TD, SS and DE sub-groups. (*This assertion needs to be verified in future meeting, and is added to "issues" list.*)

### Additional "roles" required in TD

In discussion it was suggested and agreed that the TD needs a designated Secretary (probably from among the staff participants), and a designated "Vice-Chair (perhaps elected by the TD) who can run meetings and take actions in the absence of the Chair.

## Definition and Composition of TD "Sub-groups"

This portion of the discussion focused on the sub-group discussions from last weeks minutes was not contentious, but clearly the T3F has some unease with the way the committees are partitioned into sub-groups. No specific recommendations for change were offered, but the following points were discussed.

### Definition of Foundation & Technologies Sub-group

We agreed that the definition of the FT group needs to include those committees with an interest in the "infrastructure" issues and techniques needed to implement HL7 standards, including such things as Security. The following is proposed as a revised definition:

Committees and projects in this space focus on providing the fundamental tools and building blocks that other Committees can use to build the standards, and upon the technology infrastructure that implementers of HL7 standards must manage.

## Duplicate Listing

The Tooling Committee is listed under both the FT group and the Direct Support Group. It should only be in the latter.

## Challenge of Creating Sub-groups

After last weeks call, Lorenzi posted a "discussion" note against the minutes. It observed a number of cases in which a particular committee might, arguably, exist in all three groups, and then went on to observe:

A bit of gray is a good thing. - I think one of the main benefits of dividing by three is that it divided management and communication into more manageable chunks. A long time ago, I was part of a reorg where this was done arbitrarily - Team A, Team B, Team C. It worked great. While that might be radical to consider now, the theme of it might be healthy. **Let people know that the main purpose is not to categorize, but instead to reduce the amount of people in meetings brainstorming and making decisions so that work can get done.** [Emphasis added]

Several people agreed, and also agreed that no division of **existing** groups can be done without some disagreement among the participants and without some circumstances where a particular assignment can be argued (*ad nauseum*).

A couple of members stated they would like to propose alternative alignments, and it was agreed that this can happen. It was also noted that the DE group is more than twice the size of the other two, and may be difficult to "manage" for that reason. Suggestions for pruning or re-assignments are welcome.

## Harmonization as a Core TD Challenge

In discussion it was agreed that however the sub-groups are defined, and whatever additional relationships may exist between committees, the

**TD will not be successful in meeting HL7's objectives unless it can assure the harmonization of content and design across HL7 standards.**

As a consequence, this notion of **required harmonization and shared stewardship** must clearly be part of the mission statement of the TD, of the TD sub-groups, and of each TC and SIG within the sub-groups. Overall, it is the TD that must define and manage the processes that bring about such harmonization and then must delegate similar responsibilities to the sub-groups and committees beneath it.

## Project Management and TD

The discussion repeated an earlier agreement by the T3F that the TD must have a central role in project management. It is assumed that the project life cycle strategy being developed will be a fundamental process for all HL7 work. The TD will in the future have the responsibilities:

- to approve projects (after they are vetted in the sub-groups)
- to initiate projects to carry out its mission (such as harmonization)
- to oversee the functions of the project management office, and
- to maintain the project lifecycle definition

Certainly, several of these responsibilities will need to be delegated in whole or in part to other groups.

## "Top-down" Projects and Standards Liaisons

This led to a discussion of the role of the TD in launching new projects that may originate outside of HL7 or from other Board-related activities. This has been a "cause for concern" among the volunteers. We agreed that there will be such project requirements in the future, as there have been in the past. The TD certainly must take an active role in assessing such projects, estimating their impact on the Working Group, and advising the Board on how to proceed.

Once the Board or the TD has agreed that such a project is required, then the TD must undertake to present ("sell" if you prefer) these projects to the Working Group.

A related discussion of the role of the TD in dealing with the liaison and collaboration arrangements between HL7 and other standards developing organizations (SDOs) was raised. Here again, the TD must have a role in assessing and making recommendations about such liaisons, **and their proposed collaborative projects**, before the liaisons and/or projects are "finalized."

## Next Steps

No definitive action was taken in this regard, other than to continue refining the TD definition. However, we began accumulating an "decisions/issues" list of items that must come up for T3F vote in the near future.

## Decisions/Issues List

- Is the CTO the TD Chair or an "administrative Officer" who supports the TD?
- How should the TD Vice-chair be selected?
- Should the TD representative for the Direct Support sub-group be chosen in the same fashion as the representatives of FT, SS & DE, including the election of an alternate?
- What should be the "generic" term used to refer to the sub-groups?

## 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-20070306>"

---

- This page was last modified 20:51, 6 March 2007.

# ConCall-20070320

## From HL7 T3F

T3F - Transitional Technical Task Force

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

## Contents

## Attendance

**Present** Beeler, Buitendijk, Case, McCay, Parker, Lorenzi, Hammond

## Minutes

Approved minutes of meeting of 06 March 2007

## Agreed Agenda

1. Roll Call & Accept agenda
2. Review of TD Composition (Lorenzi diagram)
3. Discussion of sub-group makeup (Case comment)
4. Decision points listed in home work

## TD Composition

Virginia Lorenzi had provided an updated chart of the TD composition (the members, their constituency and voting privileges). This diagram formed the basis of discussion, with notes being captured on the diagram. The following points summarize the points of final agreement by the T3F:

- The TD will be made up of elected representatives, the TCO, appointed members and support staff.
- Four members will be elected to represent the committees in each of the four sub-groups. For each such position, the nominations will be made by the committees, with the expectation that most nominees will be co-chairs of one of the represented committees. The elections will select a primary representative on the TD, **and** an alternate who will attend and vote when the primary is unavailable. The four sub-groups are:
  - Foundations and Technology
  - Structures and Semantic Design
  - Domain Expertise
  - Support Services

This group is made up of committees that are presently Board-appointed but the T3F agreed that in future these should be TD-appointed. They include Publishing, Education, Electronic Services and, perhaps, Marketing. The T3F agreed that a new group "Project Services" should be created to continue the work of the Project Life-Cycle team, and to provide an interface between the "PMO" and the Working Group projects. Discussion suggested there might need to be a "Product Management" committee established in this sub-group, as well.

In discussion we agreed that McCay would contact the current "Product" transition team to solicit their ideas for continuing that work, and that Case would contact the Project Life-Cycle group in regards to a prospective "Project Services" committee.

- Two members will be elected to represent the HL7 affiliates (including the US affiliate). The nomination and election of these representatives will be managed by an Affiliate Council representing all affiliates.
- The CTO/TCO will be selected by a recruitment process managed by the Board in collaboration with the TD.
- One member appointed by the Board to serve as Board Liaison to the TD
- Two members appointed by the TD. One of these will be a representative of the ARB, which group will continue as a TD-appointed committee. (The representative may be either the ARB Chair, or a member, in the circumstance that the Chair is already a TD member.) The second TD-appointment will be established as a limited-term appointment to allow the TD to co-opt the participation of particular individuals or expertise that the TD requires.
- Staff support participation would include a Reporter/Scribe for the TD, and staff liaison from such areas as PMO, Publishing, Electronic Services.
- In general, all but the support staff will be voting members.
- The chair will vote only to break ties.
- All positions should have fixed, but renewable terms of two-years, and the start-up process should proved for staggering these terms either by having half the appointments be for half-terms, or half of them being for initial three-year terms.
- In general, the representatives from the four sub-groups should be selected first; then the affiliate representatives should be selected, and finally the appointed positions should be named. This allows the appointment process to help balance the TD representation.

## TD Sub-groups

The group continued discussion on the make up of the sub-groups with particular attention to the relative roles of **"committees, SIGs, and projects."**

The T3F has some sense that SIGs are created to accomplish a project, while other projects, such as Clinical Statement and TermInfo, thrive on their own. Further, the current "rules" for meeting room assignments make SIG status an essential element for success -- "if you can't meet, you can't work."

The T3F agreed that a first step towards addressing this would be to provide meeting-room assignment priority to selected cross-committee projects. The priorities for meeting-room assignments should be assigned by the TD to Committees, SIGs and projects, and that a process of actively tracking the effective use of assigned meeting space should be in place.

## TD Meeting Style

As a final item, the T3F discussed the "style" of TD meetings. We agreed that the meetings should be open. Participation of non-members in the discussion at the meeting should be controlled by the chair and/or the adopted agenda. This is similar to the current pattern followed by the Board.

## Role of CTO/TCO

The chair asked the T3F members to send him a note about which strategy they favor for the CTO position. Specifically, should the CTO be recruited to serve as the TD Chair, or should the CTO be recruited to be an active (voting member) of the TD whose responsibility is to support the TD while the Chair is elected to fixed terms by the 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-20070320>"

- This page was last modified 15:17, 27 March 2007.

# ConCall-20070327

## From HL7 T3F

T3F - Transitional Technical Task Force

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

## Contents

## Present

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

## Agenda

1. Roll Call & Accept agenda & Approve Minutes
2. Follow up on action items
3. Role of TCO and TD Chair
4. Review Diagram of TD relationships (Parker)
5. Discussion of e-mail topic "SIG is not a Project"
6. Discussion of Core concepts for TD (McCay)
7. Planning for Cologne deliverable

## Minutes

Approved minutes of 3/20/2007

## Follow up on action items

Jim Case reported on initial discussions with Project Life-Cycle Team. Appears to be consensus that the definition, execution and maintenance of the Project Life-Cycle will become a TD responsibility once the strategic team completes its task. There is no expectation that the current project team would continue functioning. The notion of a "Project Services Committee" appointed by the TD appears a reasonable solution.

## Role of TCO and TD Chair

The T3F continued discussions of the Role of the Technology Coordination Officer (TCO or CTO) in the TD. In aggregate, the T3F believes the TCO should be a partner with the TD, but that the Chair should come from among the volunteer community. Beeler agreed to draft a formal motion for adopting such a position during next week's conference call. The motion will include a secondary motion addressing whether the TCO should be eligible for election as the TD Chair.

There is general consensus in the T3F that the TD Chair should be elected by the TD, rather than in an "at large" election. The belief is that TD is best placed to recognize the qualities and capabilities needed for this role. The group agreed that with this approach there is no need to select a formal Vice-Chair. Such responsibilities could be delegated by the TD chair, as needed.



There will be a need to avoid the Chair selection process from getting "hung up" on the terms of the candidates.

## Review Diagram of TD relationships (Parker)

Craig Parker provided an update of the diagram that reflects the relationships between the TD, the CEO, CTO and other HL7 Employees, the Board, and the Technical committees. The group asked for minor modifications, which were made, resulting in this final document. (<http://www.hl7.org/documentcenter/public/wg/t3f%5Cgeneral/WorkingDraft-TD-Charts-5-cp.ppt>)

## Discussion of e-mail topic "SIG does not equal project"

There was a brief discussion of this e-mail thread. Prospectively, the issues of "SIG vs TCs" or "Projects vs Committees and SIGs" must be a serious TD undertaking. The TD will only succeed if it addresses this with sensitivity and wisdom so as to not disenfranchise the volunteers who seek to contribute. Although this *will* be on the TD agenda the T3F will not discuss these questions further until the steps to organize an instantiate the TD are underway.

## Discussion of Core concepts for TD (McCay)

McCay had presented a series of questions under the heading "Success criteria for TD". These are the sorts of questions posed by HL7 adopters and developers, and for which it is often difficult to get a consistent answer today. This list was augmented in subsequent e-mail threads.

The core notion, however, is that the TD can only be successful if each of these questions is easily answered at all times and across all committees. It is not the TD's responsibility to be "answer central" for these, but to assure that the processes and management capabilities are present such that the answers are always readily available.

## Planning for Cologne deliverable

The final topic focused on steps to finish material and prepare for the Cologne meetings. McCay notes that the T3F has identified three areas to work on - Organization, Architecture, and Process.

We have made good progress on Organization, with a firm recommendation as to the composition of the TD, and how the roles should be filled.

For architecture and process we recognize that there is good existing work available, and that these should be addressed once the organizational issues are resolved.

The T3F agreed that the objective for Cologne is to complete the Organization work and present it along with a tactical plan for establishing the TD to the Board.

The following steps/action items were agreed:

1. (Beeler) Finalize the TD organization documentation
2. (McCay) Agree upon a set of questions that the TD is tasked to assure can be answered, starting with Success criteria for TD
3. (Lorenzi) Agree on a set of responsibilities for the TD, and the set of responsibilities that it will ask other committees to take on. This could be done using the Strategic Recommendations as a very straw straw man from CM comments on TD definition from Strategic Recommendations
4. (ALL) Assure 2 & 3 are consistent. (Suspect that we will need to agree some questions, look at the responsibilities, then look at the questions again.)
5. (Case)- Create a set of decision making Practices for the TD, starting with the PIC document.
6. (Parker) - We also need to provide a time-line for the first elections to the TD so that it is in place for the Sept WGM, assuming that our proposals are accepted in May.

## **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-20070327>"

---

- This page was last modified 15:00, 3 April 2007.

# ConCall-20070403

## From HL7 T3F

T3F - Transitional Technical Task Force

Tuesday Apr 3, 2007 12:00 PM (US Eastern Time, GMT -5)

### Contents

## Present

Beeler, Blobel, Buitendijk, Case, Hamil, Lorenzi, McCaslin, McCay, Parker, Quinn, Walker

## Roll Call, Accept agenda, Minute approval

Revised agenda and accepted minutes from March 27.

## Resolution with regard to CTO/TCO

The following motion was presented, discussed and approved unanimously. It formalizes discussions on the role of the HL7 "Chief Technology Officer" and that role's relationship to the prospective Technical Directorate.

## Motion as adopted

### WHEREAS:

- The task of over-seeing and coordinating the technical activities of Health Level Seven requires the full-time attention of a knowledgeable professional, "Technical Officer";
- The effective coordination of the various committees and SIGs requires a restructuring of these into three or four sub-groups reporting to an elected Technical Directorate;
- The Technical Directorate must assure the continued involvement and support of HL7's **Core Resource** - volunteer-driven Working Group; and
- The success of the Technical Directorate and the success of the "Technical Officer" are inextricably intertwined, and, further, are essential to HL7's success;

### THEREFORE, the Transitional Technical Task Force RESOLVES to recommend:

- The "Technical Officer" should be recruited to work with and support the Technical Directorate in its responsibilities to oversee HL7's technical activities;
- The "Technical Officer" should report to the CEO and the HL7 Board, and should be a voting member of the Technical Directorate.
- The Chair of the Technical Directorate should be elected by the voting members of the Technical Directorate, and selected from within the members of the Technical Directorate.
- The Technical Directorate and its Chair should delegate responsibilities and operational decision-making (to be defined later) to the "Technical Officer."
- The Technical Directorate should have a role in recruiting and evaluating the "Technical Officer."

# Status of "ISO Data Types" DSTU released in current ballot

The T3F was asked to consider the request from InM that the DSTU entitled "ISO Data Types, Release 1" be changed to "Draft" status. The T3F and Charlie McCay discussed the background of the document.

- It is prepared as the "data types" portion of the "New" UML/XML ITS being prepared by the ITS SIG.
- It was presented to and adopted at the International Collaboration Meeting in San Diego as the first formal effort to harmonize the data types requirements of HL7, CEN (European Standards) and ISO.
- InM agreed (either at or shortly after the San Diego meeting) that the ITS SIG should prepare this document for ballot as a DSTU in this cycle.
- The document format uses the "ISO" standard template, which surprised some. Note, however, that its content is entirely within HL7, and the ISO/HL7 RIM is also published in this format,
- The document title was changed for ISO.
- The "wrapper" document in the ballot provides both a hyperlink to the PDF containing the DSTU, and a link to the discussion of this material on the Wiki.

In its discussion, InM was concerned about three issues - format, due process, the reference to the Wiki-pages. In discussion, the T3F agreed that neither the format nor the Wiki reference were sufficient reasons to alter the status of the document.

With regard to the "process" issues, the T3F adopted the following motion:

The T3F recommends to InM that it allow this document to continue under ballot as a DSTU. The reasons include the following:

- Given the discussions on this topic at the last two WGMs the general content should not be a surprise to any one.
- Its "announcement" at the joint HL7-ISO-CEN Meeting in San Diego, coupled with its subsequent submission to both ISO and CEN for voting would make a change in status at this time embarrassing for HL7.
  - (It has been circulated for "global" voting by the member bodies (countries) of both CEN and ISO, and their responses will be returned to the ITS SIG for resolution under the terms of the HL7/ISO Pilot Project Agreement.)

Clearly, InM has "the final say" in whether to continue the request to change the static, but the T3F asks that Headquarters not change the status until after InM has had a chance to reconsider.

As an aside, the T3F does recommend collecting the Wiki informative material in a separate PDF file for reference by voters.

## Cologne Logistics

The Transition Steering Committee is planning a series of five-minute presentations by each of the Transition Task Groups during the "general sessions" on Monday and Tuesday in Cologne. The T3F Chair will be expected to present one of these.

Craig Parker agreed to contact HQ to determine what other meeting space has been provided for the T3F.

Retrieved from "<http://hl7t3f.org/wiki/index.php?title=ConCall-20070403>"

---

- This page was last modified 17:41, 3 April 2007.

# ConCall-20070410

## From HL7 T3F

T3F - Transitional Technical Task Force

Tuesday Apr 10, 2007 12:00 PM (US Eastern Time, GMT -5)

### Contents

## Present

Beeler, Buitendijk, Hamill, Lorenzi, McCay

## Minutes & Agenda

Approved the Agenda and the Minutes from April 03, 2007

## Status of tasks for Cologne Deliverable (see 3/27 Minutes)

We discussed briefly the deliverables set out two weeks ago for the "Cologne Deliverable," as:

1.
  - Beeler - TD organization documentation
  - McCay - Advancing "Success Criteria" statement
  - Lorenzi - Responsibilities for TD
  - Case - Decision making Practices
  - Parker - Time-line (tactical plan for establishing TD)

We reviewed (and modified) the preliminary outline for the "T3F Cologne Deliverable". We agreed to maintain this on the Wiki, using the assigned responsibilities as included in the outline. We adopted a goal of having edited material for people (ourselves) to review and have it available by midnight Sunday. This will allow us to review it on the call of 4/17, with a view to finalizing it 4/24 for Cologne.

## Architecture Project

We discussed the task of defining an "Architecture" for HL7. We agreed that definition and maintenance of an Architecture should be discussed in the "*Success Criteria*", "*Responsibilities*" and "*Relationships*" sections of the deliverable document. We also agreed that the Architecture effort that has been started should continue to progress in Cologne.

In discussion, it was noted that Architecture defines the common elements among our efforts, their relationships to each other and the relationships to other specification architectures. Answers to questions of "*When I do use what technology?*" or "*How do I do SOA within HL7?*" should be based on the Architecture, but not embodied in it.

We propose that the Architecture should be a Project that is defined and managed by the T3F, where the project participants include both T3F members and others. The goal should be to have a defined Architecture draft at about the same time that the TD is established (September WGM). At that point, the project becomes a TD project, that will proceed to seek formal adoption of the Architecture as an "HL7 Informative Document." To that end, a project proposal should be drafted for review in Cologne.

(Bernd Blobel)

## **Adjourned at 1:30 pm**

Retrieved from "<http://hl7t3f.org/wiki/index.php?title=ConCall-20070410>"

---

- This page was last modified 15:56, 10 April 2007.

# ConCall-20070417

## From HL7 T3F

T3F - Transitional Technical Task Force

Tuesday Apr 17, 2007 12:00 PM (US Eastern Time, GMT -5)

### Contents

- 1 Present
- 2 Approve Minutes & Accept Agenda
- 3 Products and Services Joint Meeting
- 4 "Peer Review of T3F Cologne Deliverable"
- 5 Adjournment
- 6 Agenda item list (our sand box for future meetings)
- 7 Click for T3F Action Item List

## Present

Beeler, Case, Hammill, Jaffe, Lorenzi, Parker, Quinn=Homework=

## Approve Minutes & Accept Agenda

We approved the minutes of April 10, 2007

Invitation from Products and Services for a joint meeting was added to the preliminary agenda along with tentative planning for Cologne

## Products and Services Joint Meeting

An inquiry from T3f had led to an invitation from Products and Services to hold a joint meeting in Cologne. The recommended time, however, coincided with the Transition Task Force Meeting on Sunday evening. T3F is desirous of holding discussions with Products and Services and delegated a couple of members to follow up with them.

## "Peer Review of T3F Cologne Deliverable"

The realities of real-world schedules left us with precious little to review. There was an initial Introduction and Mission Statement that were discussed and amended as we talked.

For the other sections we discussed in more detail what we felt should be in the document and then challenged ourselves to produce these in time to review a more or less complete document next week.

## Adjournment

The meeting adjourned after about 40 minutes.

## **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-20070417>"

---

- This page was last modified 16:01, 23 April 2007.



# ConCall-20070424

## From HL7 T3F

T3F - Transitional Technical Task Force

Tuesday Apr 24, 2007 12:00 PM (US Eastern Time, GMT -5)

### Contents

- 1 Present
- 2 Minutes and Agenda
- 3 Cologne schedules
- 4 Review of T3F Cologne Deliverable
  - 4.1 Introduction
  - 4.2 Success Criteria
  - 4.3 Steering Division Roles
  - 4.4 Technical & Support Services SD
  - 4.5 TD Elections and Terms
  - 4.6 Tactical Plan
  - 4.7 Project Plan for Architecture
- 5 Agenda item list (our sand box for future meetings)
- 6 Click for T3F Action Item List

## Present

Beeler, Case, Hamill, McCay, Lorenzi, Parker

## Minutes and Agenda

Minutes were not available for review. We added Cologne Schedules to the agenda

## Cologne schedules

We agreed to three meetings in Cologne --

- two face-to-face breakfast meetings (7 to 8 AM on Monday and Thursday mornings), and
- an "Open Mic" Session immediately following the TSC Meeting on Monday evening. We hope to be able to meet in the same room.

Craig Parker undertook to follow up on meeting space (and has done so as these minutes are written). The TSC space is confirmed. Breakfast spaces remain open.

## Review of T3F Cologne Deliverable

Unlike last week, we had meaningful, complete content for most of the sections. As a result, we were able to scan/review most of the material on this call. Individual contributors took their own notes. The notes here are, therefore, incomplete. (The notes

are here in document section order, not in the order we discussed them.)

## Introduction

This section needs to be expanded with the notion that the T3F sees this document as a "living" entity that will evolve and be modified as the TD undertakes and becomes accustomed to its tasks. It is, in effect, a "contract" between the TD and the Board. Any "Charter" created for the TD should be drawn from this document and not allowed to re-define it.

We will also add a section here that presents up-front the "time-line" we are seeking the Board to approve. This time-line will require general Board approval of the proposal at their June 4, 2007 Conference Call.

## Success Criteria

Charlie noted that the criteria as listed were near-term (tactical). He agreed to expand the section a bit to acknowledge this and to summarize possible long-term criteria, but also observing that, in the end, the definition of success criteria must be a core TD task.

## Steering Division Roles

Rephrase some of the listings to acknowledge that the SDs can, and should close some of the issues without referring them to the TD.

## Technical & Support Services SD

[Note new name

(see email)] Need to include a reference to both the Marketing Committee and the Product and Services Group, with notation that relation of these to TD is to be finalized in Cologne or soon thereafter.

## TD Elections and Terms

We agreed that there was not a need to "stage" the Board appointment of the Board Liaison after the representative elections. We also agreed that the elections will be simpler if we do **not designate in advance** which elections are for one-year terms, and which are for two-year terms. Rather, after the election, we will draw "lots" to see which of the two Affiliate Representatives will serve only a one-year initial term, and which two of the four SD Representatives will do the same.

As I document this discussion, I realize there are **two key questions we have not considered**:

1. Should the terms be on a calendar year, and therefore coterminous with the Board? Or should they start in September? (If the former, I recommend that the initial terms be 15 and 27 months to start in September and then switch to a calendar-year cycle.)
2. We said that half of the SD Representatives have a one-year term. I presume that we would set the "Alternate" terms the same for those SDs. This means only one election every two-years for each SD. Do you agree?

I will propose an e-mail "referendum" on these two questions with a confirmation vote at the next meeting unless the referendum is near-unanimous.

## Tactical Plan

See current Wiki posting of this section. It reflects what we agreed to. In summary:

- in early June start a six-week cycle (3 weeks for nominations/3 weeks for voting) for the SD representatives and alternates
- follow that with a similar six-week cycle to elect affiliate representatives.
- ask the Board to name the Board Liaison before the September meeting in Atlanta.

This plan will allow the initial TD and SD meetings to be held in Atlanta. To that end, the T3F will need to work with HQ to schedule Atlanta meetings for:

1. TD Meeting Sunday evening or Monday afternoon (when will Plenary end?)
2. TD Plenary/TSC Retreat meeting, with dinner
3. Meetings of each SD that same evening following the retreat (in place of TSC business meeting)  
(The TD cannot meet this afternoon because of the conflict it would represent for the SD representatives.)
4. One subsequent TD Meeting - perhaps Friday morning

## **Project Plan for Architecture**

Because the Chair failed to communicate this task adequately to Berndt Blobel, there is no Project Proposal to include in the document. Instead Beeler will use the document forwarded by Berndt to craft a brief section acknowledging the need for such a project and suggesting that a project proposal to that effect will be developed either during or shortly after the Cologne meeting.

## **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-20070424>"

---

- This page was last modified 23:12, 24 April 2007.