



Technical Steering Committee

E-NEWSLETTER

In This Issue

May 14, 2010

- [Message from the TSC Chair: HL7—An Organization That Delivers](#)
- [U.S. TAG for ISO TC215 Meeting Recap](#)
- [Domain Experts Steering Division: Ballot Quality](#)
- [Keep Your Passwords Secure](#)
- [Updates from the TSC since the Last TSC Newsletter and Working Group Meeting](#)
- [Update from the Architectural review Board \(ArB\)](#)



Message from the TSC Chair: HL7—An Organization That Delivers

By Charlie McCay
Chair, TSC

Email: charlie@ramseysystems.co.uk

HL7 is a membership organization, but it is also an organization that delivers products and services to its customers.

HL7's main products are the standards and implementation guides that are balloted and made available to members. The services may be defined to include a specification endorsement process and specification development environment as well as training, professional networking, and professional certification. I say, "may be defined" because HL7 has not yet felt the need to name and define the services that it delivers.

Since it began, HL7 has thrived because it has delivered products and services that have

been valued by its members and users. Since the scale of HL7's work has grown, we have to improve the clarity of those value propositions so that our products and services are seen and used by those who can get the most value from them.

The product briefs are the beginning of a drive to ensure that the value of HL7 standards is realized—that potential users can find the HL7 standards that will help them and that HL7 work groups can and do react when standards are not being adopted on the scale anticipated.

It is essential that HL7 describe the services that it provides in order to be able to effectively promote and improve them. We have to find business models that enable those that receive value from our services to invest with HL7 to make them even more productive. Understanding what those services are will be an iterative process, so we need to start to iterate.

Those of us that regularly attend HL7 working group meetings (WGMs) know that we are doing useful work, but have not been very good at articulating the value that we create for those who pay the costs. Being able to describe the value that we get from attending WGMs will help HL7 to package and manage the delivery of that value. Together we can find even better ways to deliver that value, be it created by developing and balloting HL7 specifications, or the related training and other activities.

HL7 is a membership organization that provides a framework for volunteers to be extremely productive and makes the resulting specifications available to its members. HL7 is also a product and services business that must deliver value to its customers.

Let's ensure that as HL7 we get a strategy in place to deliver high quality products and services. Let's ensure that as customers of HL7 we are clear and articulate about the products and services that we want and are happy to pay to have.



U.S. TAG for ISO TC215 Meeting Recap

By Ted Klein

HL7 Representative to the U.S. TAG

Email: kci@tklein.com

The U.S. TAG (Technical Advisory Group) for ISO TC215 (International Standards Organization Technical Committee 215 – Health Informatics) met on April 15 to prepare for the TC215 meeting in Rio de Janeiro, Brazil, scheduled for the week prior to the upcoming HL7 working group meeting. HL7 is represented at the U.S. TAG, along with most of the other ANSI Standards Development Organizations, and many of the U.S. government agencies, such as the Food and Drug Administration (FDA) and the Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality (AHRQ).

This meeting focused on process changes and updates for the U.S. TAG, such as meeting formats and model, and potential merging of some of the TC215 work groups. The process for the U.S. TAG bringing forward U.S. documents, such as those coming out of the federal meaningful use initiatives, for ISO standardization was also reviewed. The second focus was on the issues surrounding the scope overlap and working relationship between TC215 and the newly formed ISO TC249 Traditional Chinese Medicine. Additional topics included GS1 as a new member, and further progress on patient safety and quality initiatives as well as devices.

The ballots that are due for the Rio meeting were voted on and all were approved. These included:

- Several on waveforms;
- Several on Continuity of Care;
- The BRIDG Domain Analysis Model;
- Traditional Chinese Medicine (TC215 WG3 project);
- Healthcard Data and Health Records.

These votes will be carried to Rio as the U.S. vote for these open ballots.

Finally, the work group convener or U.S. representative to the work group gave a review of activities underway in each of the TC215 workgroups. This included updates on the OID project and the Glossary project, both of which HL7 is actively involved in.



Domain Experts Steering Division: Ballot Quality

By Austin Kreisler and Ed Tripp

Domain Experts Steering Division Co-Chairs

Emails: austin.j.kreisler@saic.com and edward.tripp@estripp.com



There has been considerable discussion over the past couple of years about the quality of material included in HL7 ballots. This article is going to focus on two aspects of ballot quality. The first is a discussion of a recent feature of all balloted Version 3 content called the Quality Analysis Report. The second aspect of ballot quality discussed in this article is ballot reconciliation.

Quality Analysis Report

A new feature of the Version 3 ballot site is the inclusion of a Quality Analysis Report in each universal domain. This report has its origins in the Ballot QA Review report added to the Version 3 ballots back in 2008 and was found in the Introduction section of the ballot. The report contains information on problems with the artifacts published material. The Ballot QA Review was a useful tool; however, it was difficult to trace issues in the review to specific ballot content. The new Quality Analysis Report breaks the QA Review report down by publishing domain and is included in the domain content. The report identifies all sorts of technical problems with content including:

- Vocabulary reference errors
- Dynamic Model Bindings (Wrappers)
- CMET References
- Static Model Design-to-Definition References

All of these issues with content are automatically identified as part of the Version 3 publication process. The most significant problems identified in this report are highlighted in yellow and are marked as “fatal” errors, indicating the artifact in question has one or more of the following issues:

- The schema generated for the element in question or any higher order elements that include it will fail to validate.
- The Model Interchange Format (MIF) file created to represent the element will fail to validate.
- The model element in question will be invalid according the HL7 design methodology.

The report is not perfect; it can contain “false” positives—items that are not broken but are flagged as such in the report. The report can be used two ways. First, work groups publishing content should be closely reviewing the report to identify areas in their designs that need to be corrected. For ballot reviewers, the report can be a rich source for comments on the balloted material. In fact, the Quality Analysis Report was added to each domain specifically so balloters would be able to see and use it.

Ballot Reconciliation

Another aspect of ballot quality has to do with ballot reconciliation. Once a proposed standard has been balloted, regardless of ballot level (comment, informative, DSTU or normative), the work groups sponsoring the ballot have an obligation to consider or reconcile the comments submitted. This reconciliation process often leads to changes that need to be made to the content that has been balloted. Changes to the informative and DSTU ballots can be incorporated without re-balloting the proposed standard. Normative content, which has been subjected to substantive changes during reconciliation, will require a subsequent round of balloting. This is where ballot quality issues can arise unless work groups are very thorough. Work groups are responsible for applying all the changes agreed to during reconciliation. In ballots where reconciliation results in numerous changes or in situations where multiple individuals are responsible for applying those changes, ballot quality errors can be inadvertently introduced. Work groups should have processes in place to verify that all reconciliation has been appropriately applied to the content. Sadly, we have work groups whose processes are lacking; they are stuck in round after round of normative balloting because they fail to apply reconciliation to their ballot content. Alarming, there are standards that are slipping through because balloters are not going back and verifying that agreed upon dispositions to issues have been

applied to content. These represent standards that have slipped through the ballot process with problems that have been identified and solutions devised, but are not implemented in the standard. This is one of the most serious quality issues. We realize that balloters would like to trust that work groups would do the right thing and conscientiously apply reconciliation, but the process is very much a human process, and as such, is fraught with human error. Today the HL7 ballot process is our primary mechanism for enforcing quality, making the balloters our frontline quality assurance people.

Conclusion

Poor quality ballots waste both the work group's time and ballot reviewer's time. Issues with ballot quality can translate into the release of poor quality standards. The Quality Analysis Report represents a tool that can be used both by work groups and by our front line quality assurance analysts (balloters) to improve the quality of HL7 standards. Ballot reconciliation should be part of the process of improving the quality of HL7 standards, but it can represent a major source of poor quality ballots and poor quality standards. Until HL7 as an organization figures out how to implement real quality control processes with teeth, the balloter remains on the front lines of quality control. In the end, the balloters decide if a ballot is ready to become a standard.



Keep Your Password Secure

***By Joshua Carmody**
HL7 Web Development Coordinator*

Email: joshua@HL7.org

A new password policy was instituted on the HL7.org website on April 5. By choosing passwords that meet a higher standard of security, members are helping us to safeguard their account and keep both their personal data and HL7's information safe.

Have you changed your password yet? In the weeks since the new password requirements took effect, a large number of members have visited our site and were prompted to change their password. Our quick and painless password change form made

it easy for them to make their member accounts more secure in just a few seconds.

However, if you haven't logged in to HL7.org in the last 30 days, perhaps you have yet to change the password on your account. If this is the case, why not take a minute to do so now? By simply visiting <http://www.HL7.org>, and logging in with your existing username and password, you will be presented with the password change form. Simply type in your current password, and enter a new compliant password in the two form fields provided. Your new password must be at least six characters long, and contain at least one letter and one number. After that, simply submit the form, and you're done!

In a world of computers, we are increasingly faced with challenges to keeping our data secure. Use of shared computers, open WiFi, malicious programs, and computer hackers are just a few of the dangers to our data's security that we need to be aware of. By taking a few seconds to improve the security of your HL7.org password, you can help HL7 stand up to these threats.

If you have any questions about changing your HL7.org password, or need assistance in doing so, please contact webmaster@HL7.org.



Updates from the TSC since the Last TSC Newsletter and the January Working Group Meeting

*By Lynn Laakso
HL7 TSC Project Manager*

Email: lynn@HL7.org

TSC Three-Year Plan

The TSC has adopted a three-year plan which includes a Continuous Improvement Plan, Communications Plan, and continuing maintenance of Work Group Visibility, as well as addressing how the TSC can continue to support linkage between Work Group plans and the Strategic Plan. More information is available on each of these efforts from the TSC web page under "Projects", at <http://www.hl7.org/Special/committees/tsc/projects.cfm>.

Work Group Visibility

As of the 2010May WGM, 25 of 42 Work Groups will have current Mission and Charter

(M&C) statements, which are defined as those whose date since last review less than two years (not counting Board committees or International Council, etc.). This will be the rolling milestone going forward to encourage our Work Groups to keep their Mission and Charter statements up-to-date.

Listserv activity is being tracked by number of subscribers and by number of messages sent to each Work Group's primary list.

Product Visibility

The product list holds 96 products, and will be updated each ballot cycle. Of the products available on the wiki, all but twelve have been reviewed by a steward work group.

General Visibility:

The Update from the TSC that is sent out most weeks has been including of late a statistic of the week, to encourage interest in the current events as well as demonstrate all the different ways in which our members, customers, and other interested parties interact with HL7.

Approvals

Approved Publications:

The TSC approved the following DSTU for publication

Interested parties are invited to download these DSTU and provide comments and feedback on the standards and their implementation at <http://www.hl7.org/dstucomments/>.

- **HL7 Version 3 Standard: Immunization, DSTU Release 2** by Public Health and Emergency Response (PHER) Work Group (WG) of the Domain Experts Steering Division (DESD); Project Insight ID=309, for 6 months. This release adds patient-specific immunization profile query capabilities to the current suite of Immunization-related HL7 V3 messaging. This release is an addendum to the Immunization DSTU Release 1, which expires in April 2010. This release is approved as DSTU for 6 months anticipating start of normative process this fall.
- **eMeasure: Representation of the Health Quality Measures Format (HQMF)** by the Structured Documents WG of the Structure and Semantic Design Steering Division (SSD SD), Project Insight #508, for 24 months.

Approved Projects:

- **Develop and publish Principles & Rules to specify the syntax for vocabulary binding in implementation guides “Vocabulary Syntax Binding”** for Implementation and Conformance Work Group [WG] of Foundation and Technology Steering Division [FTSD] at Project Insight ID= 630. The scope of this work is to provide a set of rules as to how to express the association between value sets (implementable terminology) and Version 3 coded elements and data type properties, defining syntax and style for representation in implementation guides to define vocabulary conformance. The goal is to have this balloted as normative and ultimately stored in the “refinement and localization” section of the ballot.
- **Common Product Model (CPM) DSTU R2**, for Orders and Observations (O&O) WG of SSD SD at Project Insight ID= 625. This project is cosponsored by Health Care Devices, Pharmacy, RCRIM, and Patient Safety Work Groups. It will address support for medical devices’ regulatory data requirements, extending the Common Product Model structures required to specify medical devices and their function. It also intends to relate the Common Product Model to the Substances Project deliverable as appropriate, e.g., turn Substance in CPM into a reference to a CMET.
- **Person Registry Enhancement** by Patient Administration WG of SSD SD at Project Insight ID=576. This is a follow on to an earlier project with an extensive use case from the Youth Healthcare program of the Netherlands (Registry Enhancements for Social Services) that was completed in January 2010. This new project takes the results of that Project (490) and applies them as a DSTU Update ballot to the Person Registry topic in the Patient Administration DSTU.
- **Substances Model** for Orders and Observations [O&O] WG of SSD SD at Project Insight ID= 626. This project is cosponsored by Pharmacy Work Group. The purpose of this project is to provide more specific definition to substances in support of the CPM model. This project will develop data elements, structures and relationships between the data elements required to uniquely define and identify substances and specified substances within medicinal products or used for medicinal purposes, dietary supplements, food and feed additives and cosmetics. The project will further provide references to other standards and external terminological resources as applicable to this standard.

- **V3 XML Implementation Technology Specification for RIM Serializations; Release 1** for the Implementable Technology Specifications [ITS] WG of FTSD at Project Insight ID=627. This project is cosponsored by RIMBAA Work Group. This project will produce a normative specification that describes a serialization of RIM graphs implemented as XML instances. The names and types found in the XML instances and the matching schemas are taken directly from the RIM.
- **Medical Product Information - SPLr5** for RCRIM of DESD at Project Insight ID= 325. The FDA has implemented Structured Product Labeling for Pharmaceutical products and intends to extend the use of SPL to other medical products (biologics, devices and animal products). This project will revise SPL to allow the use of the elements that will be contained within the Common Product Model (including device data elements) to enable the use of SPL for the device industry.
- **Micro ITS and REST based Transport, Packaging and Representation (hData) Project** for Implementable Technology Standards (ITS) WG of FTSD at Project Insight ID= 641. This is an exploratory project to determine the ability to create and the supports required for smaller more business oriented HL7 V3 Payloads and alternate REST based mechanisms, which may be used to package, represent and exchange those artifacts. Ultimately this project or its spinoffs may deliver a specification for a Micro ITS delivering smaller more business oriented HL7 V3 Payloads, and a RESTful specification for transport and a Packaging and Representation specification for xml data objects that works with it.
- **Project Visibility project** for Project Services Work Group [WG] of Technical and Support Services Steering Division [T3SD] (TSC Issue # 1447 – Status=Closed; Project Insight ID= 633). This project is intended to continue to create and evaluate improved visibility of HL7 Projects, and intends to address the ability to see from the web site when a project is expected to ballot, and get to the project team's documents, minutes, meeting schedules and the like for a project.
- **First Time Attendee Process Improvement Project** by the Process Improvement Committee (PIC) of T3SD (TSC Issue # 1476 – Status = Closed; Project Insight ID=643). The project intends to be more deliberate in engaging First Time Attendees, not only with tutorials, but also by encouraging leadership interaction.
- **Security and Privacy Ontology Project** for Security WG of FTSD at Project Insight

ID= 646. This project will develop a domain ontology encompassing the healthcare IT security and privacy domains providing a single, formal vocabulary embodying the concepts in each domain as well as concepts shared between the two. The concepts identified and defined in this ontology will be primarily drawn from those concepts contained in the Security and Composite Privacy DAMs. The concepts in this ontology will be extended in order to bridge to standard ontologies in associated domains such as enterprise architecture, clinical care and biomedicine.

- **Care Plan Topic; continuation of work** for Patient Care WG of DESD, Project Insight ID =529 (was formerly 105, and modified scope now being tracked at #529). The Care Plan Topic is one of the rollouts of the Care Provision Domain Message Information Model (D-MIM). The Care Plan is a specification of the Care Statement with a focus on defined Acts in a guideline, and their transformation towards an individualized plan of care in which the selected Acts are added.
 - Care Plan has been balloted some years ago as DSTU. However, it was felt at that time that more work needed to be done in defining care plan, the components of the care plan, identifying use cases and use. The plan for 2010 is to complete the contents of Care Plan.
- **Privacy Policy Reference Catalogue** for the Community Based Collaborative Care (CBCC) WG of DESD, at Project Insight ID 656. A catalogue of reference privacy policies is required to support the CDA R2 Consent Directive Implementation Guide specification as well as the earlier Composite Privacy Consent Directive R2 specification. Those specifications require a reference to a privacy policy; however, a normative vocabulary for those policies does not exist. This project intends to develop representative privacy policy sets applicable in various healthcare information exchange scenarios in a structured natural language.
- **Draft a policy for endorsement by the HL7 Technical Steering Committee on submitting HL7 proposed content change requests for SNOMED-CT to IHTSDO** for Vocabulary WG of the FTSD at Project Insight ID #634. This project will be a jointly developed policy between HL7 and the IHTSDO to develop a policy and process whereby HL7 members can develop, vet, package and submit internationally scoped SNOMED-CT content change requests to IHTSDO. Currently, change requests for SNOMED-CT content changes are coordinated and submitted to the IHTSDO via each member nation's National Release Center (NRC). There is currently no process for HL7 International members to submit SNOMED change

requests to IHTSDO. A fundamental first step in improving upon the use of SNOMED within HL7 International is to develop a clear policy on how HL7 will manage and submit SNOMED change requests to IHTSDO. This project will be a step towards the international coordination of change requests to SNOMED. NOTE: This policy is not intended to circumvent or replace the role of NRCs in coordinating realm specific content changes to SNOMED.

- **Health Interoperability Service Ontology** project for the Service Oriented Architecture (SOA) WG of FTSD, at Project Insight ID 628. The project's intent is to develop a Health Interoperability Service Ontology encompassing the description and classification of healthcare-oriented SOA services into a single, formal vocabulary. The concepts identified in this ontology will be derived from several sources, including but not limited to the SAIF, the SOA WG Roadmap, and service capabilities identified in the HL7 EHR Functional Model. The concepts in this ontology will be extended to bridge standard ontologies in associated domains such as enterprise architecture, clinical care, and biomedicine.
- **HL7 Personal Health Record System Functional Model – Promote from DSTU to Normative and Promote to ISO TC215 under ISO/HL7 Pilot Agreement** for EHR WG of the SSD SD, at Project Insight ID #660. The project intends to address the functional needs of Personal Health Record system developers and users. PHR information is expected to be sent, received, or exchanged from multiple systems, including: EHR systems, insurer systems, payer systems, health information exchanges, public health systems, Internet-based health education sites, clinical trials systems, and/or collaborative care systems.

Other Approvals

- **Out of cycle meeting approval for RIMBAA:** September 15 and 16, 2010 in Rome, Italy. The purpose of this out-of-cycle meeting is to offer a platform for the exchange of experiences by HL7 Version 3 implementers who are located in Europe. The out-of-cycle meeting is held in addition to the regular meetings of the RIMBAA WG during the Working Group Meetings.
- **Out of cycle meeting approval for Electronic Health Records (EHR):** June 9 - 11, 2010 at AHIMA's offices in Chicago, IL. The intent is to continue work on the EHR-S FM Release 2 in preparation for ballot and meeting our agreement for completion with our international partners. The out-of-cycle meeting is held in addition to the regular meetings of the EHR WG during the Working Group Meetings.

Other Notices:

A number of HL7 standards have been successfully approved and/or reaffirmed as American National Standards by ANSI.

- **HL7 Version 2: XML Encoding Syntax, Release 1 - ANSI/HL7 V2 XML-2003 (R2010).**

This specification, informally known as HL7 V2.xml, defines the Extensible Markup Language (XML) encoding rules for traditional HL7 Version 2 message content. It primarily addresses the expression of HL7 Version 2 messages in XML as an alternative to the traditional “vertical bar” encoding, and describes the underlying rules and principles. It has been reaffirmed for another five years.

- **HL7 Version 3 Standard: Reference Information Model, Release 2 - ANSI/HL7 V3 RIM, R2-2010.**

Congratulations to MnM and Vocabulary WGs, who jointly sponsored the recently-approved RIM, R2 document. The Reference Information Model (RIM) is the combined consensus view of information from the perspective of the HL7 working group and the global HL7 affiliates. The RIM is the ultimate source from which all HL7 Version 3 protocol specification standards draw their information-related content. Changes since Ballot 2009May include approved changes from ballot reconciliation activities as well as harmonization including changes to ActRelationshipType, and ActMood. Most changes are not substantive, but rather correct errors or clarify descriptions. Substantive changes include: a) Deprecation of selected ActClass codes that were found to be improper or ambiguous content; and b) Revision of definitions of ActMood codes, although the intent of these changes is to NOT alter the meaning of the codes in any way.

- **HL7 Version 3 Standard: Healthcare, Community Services and Provider Directory, Release 1 - ANSI/HL7 V3 SPDIR, R1-2010.**

This Services Functional Model (SFM), the most recent standard to receive ANSI approval, seeks to define the functional requirements of a Healthcare, Community Services, and Provider Directory Service (Referred to as Human Services Directory or HSD). As part of the Healthcare Services Specification Project (HSSP) it enables the specification of a directory service that supports a number of activities including Credentialing, Scheduling, Authentication, Referral and Wait List Management.

- **HL7 Version 3 Standard: Role-based Access Control Healthcare Permission Catalog, Release 2. ANSI/HL7 V3 RBAC, R2-2010.**

This ANSI-approved standard represents the five documents that together comprise the HL7 Security Work Group's Role Based Access Control project work products. This document presents normative language to the HL7 permission vocabulary in constructing permissions {operation, object} pairs. HL7 standards has been successfully reaffirmed as an American National Standard by ANSI.

- **ANSI/HL7 V3 GELLO, R2-2010 - HL7 Version 3 Standard: GELLO; A Common Expression Language, Release 2). (revision of ANSI/HL7 V3 GELLO, R1-2005)**

GELLO is a standard query and expression language for decision support. GELLO is a class-based, object-oriented (OO) language that is built on existing standards. Congratulations to the Clinical Decision Support Work Group on this achievement!

For any additions, updates or suggestions on any of these TSC promoted initiatives please contact Lynn Laakso (lynn@hl7.org).

How to find TSC information

The TSC wiki site houses its minutes, process documents, templates, links to the ArB wiki and the TSC Issue Tracker, a list of current projects, and more. You can access the TSC wiki at: <http://www.hl7.org/permalink/?TSCWiki>. See the links below for instructions on how to view the list of projects and access the TSC Issue Tracker.

- TSC Tracker: link to http://gforge.hl7.org/gf/project/tsc/tracker/?action=TrackerItemBrowse&tracker_id=313
- Project Insight Searchable Database: link to <http://www.hl7.org/permalink/?searchableProjectIndex>
- Project List on GForge: link to http://gforge.hl7.org/gf/project/tsc/frs/?action=FrsReleaseBrowse&frs_package_id=98
- Project Insight: link to <http://www.hl7.org/permalink/?ProjectInsight>, (requires PMO-assigned log in credentials)



Update from the Architectural review Board (ArB)

*By Charles Mead, MD, MSc
Co-Chair, Architectural review Board*

Email: meadch@mail.nih.gov

What's in a name?

In the summer of 2008, the ArB was confronted with assigning a name to its CTO-directed efforts to define an enterprise architecture strategy for HL7. This effort quickly focused on the definition of a **framework** around which HL7 and any of its interested enterprise stakeholders/customers could use to specify those aspects of their respective enterprise architectures that had an impact on enabling instances of Working Interoperability between intra- or inter-enterprise trading partners. After some discussion, the ArB chose to christen its emerging framework – or, more correctly, the collection of four sub-frameworks that collectively defined the resulting framework – as the “HL7 Service-Aware Enterprise Architecture Framework.” The key concepts that the ArB wanted to advertise was that the framework was “service-**aware**” but not restricted to application with a services-**oriented** architecture *per se*, and that it was a **framework** rather than a full-blown enterprise architecture. The moniker “SAEAF” (pronounced as “safe”) therefore emerged as the *nom de plume* of the effort.

Over the roughly 15 months between the September 2008 Working Group Meeting in Vancouver and the Phoenix Working Group Meeting in January 2010, SAEAF gained both maturity and traction inside and outside of HL7. In particular, several large-scale, pan-enterprise interoperability efforts – including, but not limited to, the Federal Health Architecture initiative in the U.S. and the Canada Infoway project – undertook serious evaluations of both the utility and feasibility of adopting SAEAF. In the course of those discussions, it was repeatedly pointed out to those presenting SAEAF to these enterprises that the enterprises themselves were already committed to existing enterprise architecture frameworks such as TOGAF 9 or Zachman and that – although of some theoretical interest – these efforts did not need another enterprise architecture framework. The discussions then focused on the fact that SAEAF was *not* – nor was it ever intended to be – a full enterprise architecture framework. Rather, the ArB had always thought of SAEAF as an *adjunct* to an existing enterprise architecture framework – an adjunct that enabled

frameworks such as TOGAF 9 or Zachman to increase their focus on Working Interoperability.

The ArB decided that the name needed to change in order to resolve this confusion. After much discussion of various naming approaches, and with TSC approval, the ArB officially renamed the SAEAF at the January 2010 Working Group Meeting. The new name, **Service-Aware Interoperability Framework (SAIF)**, is a more accurate description of “what it actually is.” The final name – which has the distinct advantage of being able to still be pronounced as “safe” – is courtesy of Andy Bond. Thanks Andy!

SAIF Update – Following is a brief update on the progress of each of the four SAIF sub-frameworks.

- **Information Framework (IF):** Early in the development of SAIF, the ArB made a decision to postpone work on the IF until the other SAIF Frameworks had reached a reasonable stage of stability and maturity. This decision was based on the ArB’s belief that the IF would come together fairly quickly due to HL7’s considerable experience with the modeling and use of structured, static semantics like the legacy constructs such as the RIM, CDA, RMIMs, Clinical Statement Pattern, etc. Each of these artifacts represents an instance of using an underlying “information grammar” to define the static semantic structures that are a critical part of an overall interoperability tapestry. The IF serves as the “grammar” for both specifying these various structures, as well as providing a consistent framework for specifying the Enterprise Conformance and Compliance Framework (ECCF-)-based Information Viewpoint artifacts. Through the HL7 IF Implementation Guide, the IF will therefore enable the consistent, cross-organizational development of a number of diverse artifacts such as service specification Semantic Profiles and domain-specific languages. Given HL7’s historic experience with information modeling, the development of the IF is expected to be a relatively straight-forward exercise of “reverse engineering what we already know and do.” Regardless of the degree of difficulty involved in the development of the Information Framework, the IF is scoped to document the information modeling grammar from which the various artifacts are constructed and utilized, and describe how that grammar relates to the other SAIF framework grammars as documented in the Behavior Framework (BF), ECCF, and Governance Framework (GF). *An initial draft of the IF was distributed for comment prior to the May Working Group meeting.*

- **Behavior Framework (BF):** Given that one of the primary responsibilities of the BF was to incorporate the requirements of the legacy HL7 Dynamic Model, the BF has received considerable attention by both members of the ArB as well as others with a vested interest in that subject. As a result, the BF has had several significant revisions over the past 18 months. It has now stabilized in the form of four models and a number of core constructs – e.g. Role, Contract, Interaction, Accountability, Collaboration, etc. – and is ready for both wider review and initial application. The BF has been discussed in some detail in the Orders and Observations Work Group and has met with initial approval and interest in continuing further exploration in the context of a SAIF “alpha project.” In addition, it appears that the Clinical Document Architecture (CDA) Release 3 effort may benefit from incorporating certain aspects of the formal description of interactions as specified in the BF. Finally, the NCI’s caEHR project plans to incorporate a considerable amount of behavioral semantics in its evolving services-oriented architecture. Within HL7, a domain-analysis model of the BF is being developed for informative ballot during 2010. In addition, *a “version 0.9” of the BF is now in the HL7 DITA repository and was recently released for formal Peer Review.*
- **Enterprise Conformance and Compliance Framework (ECCF):** Of the four SAIF sub-frameworks, the ECCF has received the most interest outside of HL7 because of its formal notion of specifications which contain embedded, finely-granulated, testable “conformance statements” (aka requirements). In particular, a number of national efforts involving multiple vendor suppliers of software components see the ECCF as a way to identify and certify relevant software capabilities using a single standard grammar for describing the various components’ capability claims. Within HL7, the ArB has worked to harmonize the ISO-conformant language of SAIF (a derivative of SAIF’s use of the ISO standard RM-ODP) with those of the HL7 Implementation / Conformance Work Group (IC WG). The ArB anticipates that the IC WG will play a significant role in HL7’s implementation of the ECCF. *A “version 0.9” of the ECCF is now in the HL7 DITA repository was recently released for formal Peer Review.*
- **Governance Framework (GF):** The core constructs of the GF include Jurisdiction and Provenance. Both constructs have application in two contexts: i)

At an organizational level to define and describe the roles, processes, authorities, accountabilities, and artifacts that collectively describe both intra- and inter-enterprise governance, such as how parts of organizations work together in an interoperability context, e.g. reuse of standards, localizations, etc.; and ii) At an architectural level to describe how those aspects of enterprise architecture which affect Working Interoperability are governed including, the discovery and management of architecture primitives versus architecture composites. *A draft version of the GF is planned for distribution in the near future.*

Alpha Projects/SAIF implementation Guide – The ongoing adoption of SAIF by both HL7 and other organizations such as the National Cancer Institute, Canada Health Infoway, and the Australian National e-Health initiative, involving the defining and deploying of enterprise-specific SAIF implementation guides is under the joint supervision of the TSC and the ArB and will be the subject of another Technical Newsletter article.

This email is being sent to the entire membership of HL7. PLEASE DO NOT REPLY TO THIS EMAIL as this account is not checked for incoming messages. If you no longer wish to receive emails from HL7, please send an email with UNSUBSCRIBE in the subject line to, HQ@HL7.org, and we will remove you from our list.