

2012-01-15 TSC WGM Minutes

From HL7 TSC

TSC Sunday meeting for 2012Jan WGM

[back to TSC Minutes and Agendas](#)

TSC WGM Agenda/Minutes

HL7 TSC Meeting Minutes		Date: 2012-01-15
Location: Mesquite		Time: 17:15 pm CST (local time)
Facilitator: Austin Kreisler		Note taker(s): Lynn Laakso
Attendee	Name	Affiliation
x	Calvin Beebe	HL7 SSD SD Co-Chair
x	Woody Beeler	HL7 FTSD Co-Chair
	Bob Dolin	HL7 Board Past Chair (member <i>ex officio</i> w/o vote)
x	Freida Hall	HL7 T3SD Co-Chair
	Chuck Jaffe	HL7 CEO (member <i>ex officio</i> w/o vote)
x	Tony Julian	HL7 FTSD Co-Chair
x	Austin Kreisler (Chair)	HL7 TSC Chair
x	Lynn Laakso (scribe, non-voting)	HL7 HQ
x	Patrick Loyd	HL7 T3SD Co-Chair
regrets	Charlie Mead	HL7 ArB Chair
	Don Mon	HL7 Board Chair (member <i>ex officio</i> w/vote)
regrets	Ravi Natarajan	HL7 Affiliate Representative
x	Ron Parker	HL7 ArB Alternate
regrets	John Quinn	HL7 CTO (TSC member <i>ex officio</i> w/vote)
x	Helen Stevens	Ad-hoc member
x	Ed Tripp	HL7 DESD Co-Chair
x	Pat Van Dyke	HL7 SSD SD Co-Chair
x	Mead Walker	HL7 DESD Co-Chair
x	Lorraine Constable	observer
Quorum Requirements (Co-chair +5 with 2 SD Reps) Met: yes		

Agenda Topics - Sunday

- SAIF Architecture Program
- ArB Composition
- Substantivity - Tony
 - ARB had an outstanding ballot item (since 2007? Gulp) on the term "substantive". I believe this is of significant interest to the TSC and needs to be tested with them. Here is a normative definition of what constitutes "substantive" unanimously approved by ARB today:
 - A substantive change is one that changes the semantics of a given artifact; this applies to both normative and non-normative artifacts.
 - For artifacts that are normative, or are intended to be normative (ie: specifications) any change that affects conformity is substantive. By definition, normative means the artifact has conformity statement(s). If there is an extension to a normative artifact, it is substantive only if it adds or changes existing conformance statements.
 - For non-normative artifacts, any change that adds new content, or affects a derivative work is substantive. Editorial change or clarification of original content or semantics is not substantive.
 - Tony will pick up the thread of resolving our negatives from that ballot and re-balloting this.
 - We speculate HL7 has never before balloted an item with only 4 paragraphs.
- TSC Messages to CoChairs and General Session

Supporting Documents

Minutes/Conclusions Reached:

- SAIF Architecture Program
 - Ron reports SAIF CD passed ballot, no negatives on the DSTU. Mistakenly embedded spreadsheet will be removed. Ballot reconciliation completed. Glossary work is not yet complete, but they are working towards completion and publication.
 - Related question - what is the ArB's next big task? Discussion of OWL with Cecil in relating concepts semantically for managing glossaries. Need to align our current organizational glossary. Governance in particular may not come into V3 ballot but may have significant contribution to an organizational glossary. Woody notes the V3 glossary is not the only glossary and that ArB should discuss with Publishing who is responsible for glossaries. His concern is with staff resources. Helen adds EHR FM also has a glossary not incorporated into the V3 glossary. They also have a hierarchy and relationship between terms. Woody notes this sounds like an information mode. Mead asks if this is something the ArB should be doing? The ArB's prime directive should be the SAIF IG. Patrick notes that the ArB is not responsible for the IG. There is a support function as we work out the IG as deficiencies on guidance from the CD are identified. Ron adds that ArB would contribute governance of terms included in the glossary. Helen feels they should work on the architecture and relationship of concepts between terms but not definition of terms. Woody asks how we prioritize that against all the other things we have to do, in \$. Mead feels it's a matter of the attention of the body to see that the framework gets implemented. Building a glossary is not the next link in the chain. Ron wants to talk about business and technical architecture to support the glossary but not the population of the

glossary. Woody's concern is the stagnation of the SAIF Artifact definition and some members of the ArB could contribute to that. Helen thinks we might ask ArB for the priorities they propose to work on and articulate their scope so that the TSC can set a priority. Ron notes the ArB still has a glossary task to provide glossary entries for every concept in our concept map; they simply noticed in the process of their task that multiple definitions existed for terms and some were questionable. Patrick adds that capturing the context of a term in the glossary is something we still need to do. Calvin asks if the ArB has considered whether such a glossary effort is in line with the Strategic Initiatives and ask them to consider that and come back to the TSC with their consideration.

- Austin has asked MnM to consider this week what can be done to reinvigorate the SAIF Artifact Definition and the SAIF AP. He has suggested OOC meetings and Woody suggests paid contract development.
- Ron will take these ideas back to the ArB and especially alignment with the Strategic Initiatives and come back to the TSC.
- Ron reports Steve Hufnagel presented to them on the EHR S FCIM cosponsorship from a support perspective. They will add a standing agenda item for SAIF AP update by Patrick so that he can bring tasks to the ArB from the SAIF AP. These tasks are anticipated to be the "what's next" for the ArB as well. Moving from definition of SAIF, they transition to a support role of the framework. He advocates the intersection of the MnM, OO, etc groups to move that Artifact Definition work forward and agrees that ArB should be involved.
- They'll come back with a list of things ArB might be working on with reference to the Strategic Initiatives.
- Observed that project scope statements need guidance in terms of established artifacts and responsibility based on cosponsorships. Ron doesn't know what that looks like yet. Austin notes the SAIF AP created RACI charts to note the relationships between projects and Work Groups to make those explicit. They anticipate becoming persistent stewards of certain processes or artifacts.
- ArB Composition - John requests we defer to later concall; John Koisch is moving on to other things and will no longer participate on the ArB. Grahame's ability to dedicate time to the ArB is threatened. They propose two new members: Lorraine Constable and Bo Dagnall; Total of 12 members. Lorraine brings help with the artifact definition process. Bo needs to discuss with his employer for support of this participation. He had very important and insightful comments on the DSTU. They need someone from Structured Documents as well. Bo would be that person. His experience in HL7 was discussed. Recommendation comes from Andy and Zoran. Helen suggests his candidacy be considered over the next cycle and TSC might consider this appointment at the May WGM. Patrick agrees we should not finalize composition at this point but the ArB should review composition through the lens of the Strategic Initiatives. Mead adds that commitment to HL7 can be both prospective and retrospective.
 - Austin suggests we defer discussion to Tuesday so that we can talk to John. Ron recounts the challenge of what the SAIF CD brings to us; Bo recognized that in his day to day real-life experience and got engaged - Ron feels the ArB needs to capture and promote that perspective.
- Substantivity - Tony
 - ARB had an outstanding ballot item (since 2007? Gulp) on the term "substantive". I believe this is of significant interest to the TSC and needs to be tested with them. Here is a normative definition of what constitutes "substantive" unanimously approved by ARB today:
 - A substantive change is one that changes the semantics of a given artifact; this applies to both normative and non-normative artifacts.

- For artifacts that are normative, or are intended to be normative (ie: specifications) any change that affects conformity is substantive. By definition, normative means the artifact has conformity statement(s). If there is an extension to a normative artifact, it is substantive only if it adds or changes existing conformance statements.
- For non-normative artifacts, any change that adds new content, or affects a derivative work is substantive. Editorial change or clarification of original content or semantics is not substantive.
- Tony will pick up the thread of resolving our negatives from that ballot and re-balloting this.
- We speculate HL7 has never before balloted an item with only 4 paragraphs.
- Helen asks if this is product-agnostic or product-specific.
- Mead asks about conformity statements in regards to normative standards.
- Ron responds that the quarter spent discussing included an inference in the definition that going forward, to be normative you have to assert how you will provide conformity to this statement. Derivative product downstream that would be affected by a change is substantive change. For a normative artifact, changes adding conformance statements or changes affecting conformity is a substantive change. Mead suggests we need examples for each silo. Helen would like to see more clear and articulate language that articulates the principles of conformance without weasel words and ensure appropriate examples. Freida notes that the ANSI essential requirements have some guidance, and the GOM talks about protocol specifications and that language needs to be clarified against this language. We want to get to something we can self-adjudicate. Ron agrees, and recounts that all the issues raised were part of the discussion today with ArB. Calvin comments that it seems that every syntactic change is not substantive. Ron notes that that is not the case, only semantic change but merits clarification. With the use of "semantics of a given artifact" then the question on changes that affect conformity. Ron notes he would prefer some other phrase than semantics, not content but semantics of the constructs and will require more work. Woody's concern is in changing semantics in the definition of ActClass, for example, and what it would do to the RIM. Ed asks if he can add content to a normative standard, if it doesn't affect conformity is it insubstantive? Ron responds that adding text that helps users understand the standard is not substantive; the phrase on editorial change needs to be repeated for normative standard. Helen asks about establishing the arbitration mechanism for how it is implemented. Lynn adds that TSC is arbiter with ArB providing the definition of substantive; Helen would like to see the process spelled out and include arbitration by the Steering Division. Calvin notes there may be different concerns for substantivity in different levels, e.g. business processes. Patrick notes that ArB is missing expertise on the document paradigm (hint-hint Calvin). The issue of substantive change on downstream effects on standards that are not in use yet was discussed. Ron notes that concepts that drive behavior in the organization are important to recognize.
- Need to have a joint meeting with ArB and TSC or we'll go through this all again. Calvin notes that different consumers will have different perspectives, Architects versus developers versus implementers. Austin suggests Ron advertise the upcoming discussion on an ArB call to the TSC list to have opportunity to participate.
- Final note on ArB composition, Austin reminds the TSC that John appoints and the TSC approves.
- TSC Messages to CoChairs and General Session
 - We'll be handing out gold stars to cochairs of the healthiest work groups to hand them out to their members in meetings the rest of the week. Mead adds that the forward

direction of the SAIF IG.

- Ken joins at 6:36 PM
- Ron wants to communicate that the ArB is transitioning into a supporting role. Calvin notes that the Artifact Definition need for re-invigoration is also a point. SDWG's constraint based system using modeling tools is important to bring into that work. Austin has statistics on activities by numbers. Mead notes that the product of uniting functional model with information models, CIMI activity as background is important to note. Products available on the web is an accomplishment we must celebrate. Suggest a demonstration at a general session. Recognize the efforts of the work groups that took time to review their product briefs. Survey will run until Feb 12th.
- Austin will also describe the changes to WGH with wiki presence going away in favor of participation in harmonization and the change to raising the bar on minutes with no minutes as automatic red. He may even mention that someday they may not be able to schedule meeting rooms if they do not publish minutes.

Austin thanks Ken for his efforts on the TSC.

Adjourned 6:44 PM CST

Actions <i>(Include Owner, Action Item, and due date)</i>
--

- | |
|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">■ . |
|---|

Next Meeting/Preliminary Agenda Items
--

- | |
|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">■ . |
|---|

Retrieved from "http://hl7tsc.org/wiki/index.php?title=2012-01-15_TSC_WGM_Minutes"

- This page was last modified on February 6, 2012, at 18:18.