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### HL7 TSC Meeting Minutes

**Location:** call 770-657-9270 using code 985371#
GoToMeeting ID: 273-848-837 (https://www.gotomeeting.com/join/273848837)

**Date:** 2013-05-27  
**Time:** 11:00 AM U.S. Eastern

**Facilitator:** Austin Kreisler  
**Note taker(s):** Joshua Carmody

Quorum = chair + 5 including 2 SD represented

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chair/CTO</th>
<th>ArB</th>
<th>International Affiliate Rep</th>
<th>Ad-Hoc</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>x Austin Kreisler</td>
<td>Ron Parker</td>
<td>Ravi Natarajan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x John Quinn</td>
<td>Lorraine Constable</td>
<td>Jean Duteau</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Domain Experts**

- **Foundation and Technology**
  - x Melva Peters
  - . Woody Beeler
  - . Calvin Beebe

- **Structure and Semantic Design**
  - x Mead Walker
  - . Tony Julian
  - . Pat van Dyke

- **Technical and Support Services**
  - x Andy Stechishin

**Ex officio Invited Guests Observers Observers HL7 Staff**

- x Don Mon (HL7 Chair) w/vote
- . obs1
- . regrets Lynn Laakso

- x Bob Dolin (Vice Chair) vote
- . obs2
- x Joshua Carmody

- . Chuck Jaffe (CEO) vote
- .

**Agenda**

**Housekeeping**

1. Introduction of visitors (including declaration of interests)
2. Agenda review and approval - Austin Kreisler
3. Approve Minutes of 2013-05-20 TSC Call Agenda

**Governance**
1. Approval items:
2. Discussion topics:

Management

1. Review action items (http://gforge.hl7.org/gf/project/tsc/tracker/?action=TrackerItemBrowse&tracker_id=494) –
   - Ballot quality - ACTION ITEM: set up a conference call to review plans for:
     - "Rochester group" will mine ballots/reconciliations across multiple types of ballots (group of 2.x IG, CDA IG, V3 standard, DAM, EHR FP, the EHR-S FM and a Service (e.g. RLUS)) to just see if there are statistics that can be identified.
     - Mead, Austin and Jean will review the same six with subjective Likert scale (5 point score) on what their quality is. Austin signs up for the subjective group, as does Mead and Jean.
     - ANSI/GOM Task Force to develop detailed TSC recommendation of a GOM change to remove closed ballot pools, and all pools remain open- this does not apply to recirculation ballots. Pick this up on May 28th.
     - Pat will draft a PSS (http://gforge.hl7.org/gf/download/trackeritem/2633/10490/HL7PSSv20131_CommentsSiteforNorm_Inform.doc) and have Calvin review it to work with Electronic Services to extend the dstcomments site functionality to normative and informative standards as well as the DSTUs but excluding comment-only. see TSC Tracker 2633 (http://gforge.hl7.org/gf/project/tsc/tracker/?action=TrackerItemEdit&tracker_item_id=2633&start=0).
     - Andy will address with Don the NIB form change to include a spot to identify CMETs. Don on vacation for two weeks; revisit later.
     - TRAC needs to revisit scope and deliverables PI# 901 Risk Assessment and Governance for HL7 Architecture Program project for ongoing work. Meeting this week 10 am EDT
     - Melva volunteers to refine the list of draft metrics for mid-tier governance and management group health for clearer wording, or specialized versions for steering divisions as compared to non-overseer group; International Council has chosen not to participate at this time. Need to refine metrics for governance groups, "overseer" synonym consideration, versus groups that don't govern anything.
     - everyone: suggest constructive ways to address improving awareness of architectural rules, precepts and structures via email. Need to address context of this action item.
     - Need to get the intent from CGIT of what is intended by the conformance facilitator role. See conformance facilitator wiki page (http://wiki.hl7.org/index.php?title=Conformance_Facilitator) Filling roles defined on PSS is increasingly challenging. Assign to FTSD co-chairs

2. Approval items: for e-vote next week
   - Project scope Statement (http://gforge.hl7.org/gf/download/trackeritem/2634/10493/HL7PSSv20131DataSegmentationforPrivacy_WGAApproved.doc) for HL7 Data Segmentation for Privacy (DS4P) Implementation Guide, Project Insight #1006 (http://www.hl7.org/special/Committees/projman/searchableProjectIndex.cfm?action=edit&ProjectNumber=1006) and TSC Tracker #2634 (http://gforge.hl7.org/gf/project/tsc/tracker/?action=TrackerItemEdit&tracker_item_id=2634&start=0), for Security WG of FTSD and cosponsored by CBCC WG of DESD.
   - Project scope Statement (http://gforge.hl7.org/gf/download/trackeritem/2635/10496/HL7PSSV2OverHTTPv2013.1.doc) for HL7 Over HTTP, at Project Insight #1007 (http://www.hl7.org/special/Committees/projman/searchableProjectIndex.cfm?action=edit&ProjectNumber=1007) and TSC Tracker #2635 (http://gforge.hl7.org/gf/project/tsc/tracker/?action=TrackerItemEdit&...
3. Approval items: from e-vote this week: 6/0/0 with 2 Affiliate, SSD, DESD, T3SD, FTSD voting
   - Project Scope statement (http://gforge.hl7.org/gf/download/trackeritem/2629/10469
     /HL7ProjectScopeStatementv2012_TraumaCDA_7.doc) for Trauma Registry Data Submission CDA
     for CIC of DESD and cosponsored by SDWG of SSD SD at Project Insight #1001
     (http://www.hl7.org/special/Committees/projman/searchableProjectIndex.cfm?action=edit&ProjectNumber=1001)
     and TSC Tracker # 2629
     (http://gforge.hl7.org/gf/project/tsc/tracker/?action=TrackerItemEdit&tracker_item_id=2629&start=0)
   - Project Scope statement (http://gforge.hl7.org/gf/download/trackeritem/2630/10486
     /HL7_PSS_DHCS_CDA_20130506FINAL.doc) for HL7 CDA® Implementation Guide for National
     Medical Care Surveys for PHER WG of DESD and cosponsored by SDWG of SSD SD at Project Insight
     #1002 (http://www.hl7.org/special/Committees/projman/searchableProjectIndex.cfm?action=edit&ProjectNumber=1002)
     and TSC Tracker # 2630
     (http://gforge.hl7.org/gf/project/tsc/tracker/?action=TrackerItemEdit&tracker_item_id=2630&start=0)
   - Project Scope statement (http://gforge.hl7.org/gf/download/trackeritem/2632/10488
     /HL7PSS_Reaffirmation_EHR_ChIP20130506.doc) for Reaffirmation of HL7 EHR Child Health
     Functional Profile, Release 1 for EHR WG of SSD SD and Child Health WG of DESD at Project Insight
     #985 (http://www.hl7.org/special/Committees/projman/searchableProjectIndex.cfm?action=edit&ProjectNumber=985)
     and TSC Tracker # 2632
     (http://gforge.hl7.org/gf/project/tsc/tracker/?action=TrackerItemEdit&tracker_item_id=2632&start=0)

4. Discussion topics:
   - 3 year plan review,
   - update on IHE Balloting
   - BAM status.

5. Reports: (attach written reports below from Steering Divisions et al.)
   - No TRAC call, resumes 5/29
   - No ANSI/GOM Task Force call, resumes 5/28


Minutes

Minutes/Conclusions Reached:

- Quorum not achieved, the following is informal discussion only
- Last week’s minutes not considered or approved because lack of quorum

Topics:

3-year plan

- Reviewed 3-year plan in Project Insight
- Austin: There are 2 items on the plan, those two items not sufficient.
- Austin: FHIR visibility and maintenance are the only things on the plan
- Austin: FHIR is in play now, so not really an appropriate “3 year plan” item
- Austin: FHIR should be converted to regular project
- Austin: What else should be on our 3-year plan? Are we still stuck in “response mode”?
- Austin: Setting up infrastructure for new HL7 business model will take a while. Is our “planning horizon” now further than 3 years away?
- Woody: We’re doing a good job of advancing. Not sure where else to turn for new things to wrestle with.
- Austin: The plan is in effect whatever we have in Project Insight that are marked as “3-year plan item”.
- Austin: There is no formal 3-year plan document at present.
- Austin: Are there things on the 3-year planning horizon that we haven’t thought about and should be planning for?
  (mostly silence, people are thinking)
- Austin: The two 3-year plan items we currently have are actually in flight. Not really “planning items” anymore.
- We’ve been doing “WG Visibility maintenance” for years now. Probably shouldn’t be a plan item. More like a regular project.
- Austin: Please think of plan items over the next week or two so we can start fleshing that out.

- Update on IHE balloting

  Last Friday a task force to tackle IHE balloting met, but Austin couldn’t join them. John Quinn, Keith and Karen were on the call.
  It was pretty simple. Chuck Jaffe’s feeling (expressed through Karen) is “let’s just make it happen”, tackle issues of IP and processes when we reach point of DSTU and Normative balloting. But for now it’s just commenting and can be simple.
  Keith felt confident about how he would respond to inquiries from commenters. By next year IHE will be better organized, and we can have more detailed policy discussions.
  A replacement for an individual who resigned from the IHE liaison position is still being sought.
  Initial step is to draft a comment-only ballot. Ask people to submit comments.
  The way this was phrased on the call suggests this will be moved forward as a “board project”. Austin notes that in order for this to be approved this needs to be on the board agenda next week. The approval process for board projects is different from ballot approval process.
  John: I don’t remember that being discussed on the call last Friday.
  Woody: What they want to do doesn’t seem to require board involvement.
  John: Maybe Keith put the “board project” phrase it without thinking. Neither Karen nor Chuck would likely have suggested it be a board project.
  Keith has a challenge that he is supposed to be in Chicago for IHE the same week as he’s supposed to be at the board retreat.
  Lynn sent notes about the call and Project Scope Statement to the FGB list. But if this is a board project, the board should be the primary sponsor. Lynn said in her e-mail that this would be a “board project”, but we wonder if she means “FHIR Governance Board” and not “HL7 Board of Directors”. And this should be an FGB project, not FHIR project.
  It will be a draft, doesn’t really have to be a project, but we will formalize it as one because it is useful to do so.
  Now we need to flesh out what is the next step of making this into a DSTU ballot with IHE.
  John: We have several months to figure that out. Don’t want to procrastinate, but it doesn’t need to be an immediate hurdle to move forward.
  Austin: We’re not going to get into IP considerations at this point.
  John: I’m also talking to Karen about how to deal with IP for implementation guides for Consolidated CDA. They’re already jointly copyrighted, but we need to think about maintenance and future changes.
There’s a project in Structure Documents to address it, but there are still questions about IP. John advised that we move it forward, but let’s get Doug and Chuck talking about the future of IP between the two organizations.

- Austin: I believe we’ve resolved the questions about IHE. Continue task force. Focus on immediate future, and not what will happen after draft for comment. Austin will follow up with Lynn tomorrow (Tuesday, May 28).
- FGB will be informed that the e-mail was misaddressed to FHIR.

Update on business architecture model

- Austin: ARB believes they have identified a missing piece of current business architecture: distinguishing between product families and product lines. They think they need a 3rd “axis” to distinguish. They think they’ve had a paradigm shift, but Austin is not sure what this new paradigm is. They perhaps want to organize HL7 into “products”, “services”, and “paradigms”.
- Woody: Messaging is not all of V3. If you think of V3 as just “model and RIM-based messaging”, then there’s no confusion. There’s a distinction between V3 for messaging, V3 for documents, V3 for services. But many people don’t understand these 3 different views.
- Austin: The question is how does that factor in, but they haven’t figured that out yet.
- Austin: There is now an effort to create a CDA Implementation Guide Family. They need to figure out governance, methodology, etc, for product family. They are trying to formalize the process we went through informally with FHIR. Probably this will be the process for standing up new products in the future. First phase figure out how to separate concerns, second phase deliver on it. After the CDA IG product family is finalized, there may be new product families stood up after it fairly quickly using the same pattern.

Other calls resume this week. TRAC and ANSI/GOM Review calls resume. Back into normal swing of things.

On next week’s call we’re going to come back to EHR project that we were unable to reach a conclusion for in Atlanta.

Call completed after 30 minutes.

Next Steps

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actions (Include Owner, Action Item, and due date)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Next Meeting/Preliminary Agenda Items

- 2013-06-03 TSC Call Agenda.
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