2023-09-10 FMG WGM Agenda/Minutes

FMG Meeting Minutes
Location: TBD
Date: 2023-09-10
Time: 12:00 PM
Chair: Lloyd
Note taker(s): Anne W.

Quorum = chair + 4

Co chairs: David Hay
x Lloyd McKenzie

ex-officio: Dan Vreeman, CSDO

Members
- Hans Bultendijk
- Brian Postlethwaite
- Paul Knapp
- Anne W., scribe
- Josh Mandel
- John Moehrke
- Brian Pech
- Sarah Gaunt
- Grahame Grieve
- Brian Pech
- x Claire Parsons
- x Isaac Vetter

Agenda

• Housekeeping
  ◦ Roll Call
  ◦ Agenda Check
• Review Items
  ◦ Vital Records Common Profiles Library FHIR IG Publication Request
  ◦ Birth and Fetal Death Reporting FHIR IG Publication Request
• Discussion Topics
  ◦ Messaging to WGs this week
    ▪ R6 ballot in December
    ▪ Extensions IG

Minutes

HL7 Antitrust Policy: Professional Associations, such as HL7, which bring together competing entities are subject to strict scrutiny under applicable antitrust laws. HL7 recognizes that the antitrust laws were enacted to promote fairness in competition and, as such, supports laws against monopoly and restraints of trade and their enforcement. Each individual participating in HL7 meetings and conferences, regardless of venue, is responsible for knowing the contents of and adhering to the HL7 Antitrust Policy as stated in §05.01 of the Governance and Operations Manual (GOM).

• Housekeeping
  ◦ Roll Call
  ◦ Guests noted above
  ◦ Agenda Check
  ◦ No additions
• Review Items
  ◦ Vital Records Common Profiles Library FHIR IG Publication Request
    - Update Release under title to say STU 1.1 rather than CI build
      ▪ MOTION to approve both requests: Grahame/Hans
        ▪ VOTE: All in favor
  ◦ Birth and Fetal Death Reporting FHIR IG Publication Request
      ▪ MOTION to approve: Hans/John
        ▪ VOTE: All in favor
• Discussion Topics
  ◦ Messaging to WGs this week
    ▪ R6 ballot in December
      ▪ Grahame: Feedback from market is growing in strength that it’s going to be hard to shift off 4. If we do go to 6, it will be really, really hard for us to do breaking changes post R6. For normative, if they’re not right people aren’t going to use them. We could just keep rolling on.
      ▪ Should convey to the committees that there’s a real chance that it won’t matter if they call resources normative in R6, and there won’t be breaking changes afterward. Lloyd: Does that include things like EBM? Grahame: We could carve out things like EBM and some of the medication stuff and make changes later. It’s not that it’s a separate ecosystem but it’s not yet integrated. No clear guidance or obvious outcomes to convey to the committees, just the real prospect that the market is getting much more resistant to change, and we face calling R6 final even if we don’t call it normative. We need feedback from the committees on how they feel about that. We should perhaps take a little more time for R6 to get it right.
Paul: So the question for committees is when do you think you'd be ready for a more final version? Grahame: It's not only when, but how would that change your plans, do you have a way to cope with that. It's not just when but how.

Lloyd: So at this meeting we go to WGs and indicate that the vast bulk of FHIR, anything patient facing, patient linked, or necessary to use patient linked resources will be de facto normative in R6 or is likely to be. Even for other resources that default position is they’re de facto normative, and we’re looking for feedback on anything they think shouldn’t be and why.

Paul: There will be two questions - if we then go normative, how do we introduce new stuff in resources and how do we create new resources?

Hans: There will be more versions, it’s just whatever is there you cannot break. If you want something better you have to start something new.

Hans: There will be new regulatory requirements and new methods to do things. Paul: You can pre-adopt new elements or elements that take you to a different style of implementations. Hans: We’ve come up with new segments that can do that. You want to progress and can’t deprecate what you have.

Lloyd: So it will still be possible to define new resources and elements, but it will affect changes to things post R6.

What would a longer timeframe look like? WGs tend to have a broad interpretation of "we have more time" that doesn’t necessarily serve us well. So the message is we’re still planning to go out to the community in the next 2-3 months to get feedback on the timeframe. Grahame: We’ll do it before the end of the year and process it in January.

Paul: So does that mean we’re not planning a December ballot? Grahame: No we’re not.

Lloyd: The notion behind the incremental ballot is FHIR is a sufficient size that a big bang ballot doesn’t work for the community.

Paul: If we entertain a December ballot, could it be for comment?

Reviewed timelines for December ballot. Content freeze would be December 5th. Ballot open would be December 22nd.

Discussion over how useful this would actually be to WGs.

Two categories: This thing is a little flaky and we want to make some changes before we lock it down; the other is we think this is pretty solid and we want you to review it to be sure.

John: We should know more about what isn’t planned to be in the first wave. We should go beyond what is the very next wave.

Paul: We should ask about all of their resources and the plans for all of them.

Lloyd: So our intention is to have a pre-review ballot with two categories of resources that are appropriate (stable content/early review and content with open questions about changes that need to be made). Will be 2-3 waves of pre-review prior to normative ballot, and we want to know which resources from category 1 or 2 that you want to put forth for December.

Josh asks about timing for next waves? Would be the subsequent ballot cycles.

Category 2 could ballot in more than one wave. Recommendation will be to get it out as soon as the content is sufficient for production review.

Bryn suggests staggering normative and for comment waves and ask WGs to define what their calendars are for each. Why would I ballot my mature stuff? Lloyd: It's for the reviewers so they can beat the heck out of it, and when it comes around for normative they can do a quick scan of the list of changes and review quickly. The challenge with alternating comment and normative is when you've done a normative ballot and there are substantive changes, you have to do another normative ballot.

Paul: We want to minimize the number of corrective iteration cycles.

Extensions IG

- Still intend to ballot the core extensions IG in January
- Paul asks to add a request that WGs review what's in that guide and make sure everything is in there that should be
- Should review stats 2 for duplicates

Other topics for WGs?

- Are you planning to come forward with new IGs?
- Grahame concerned about the sheer amount of IG work going on and what's in our short term and long term interests to exert some control over the reconciliation and consistency between them? It's a board level question to some degree. It would be great to ensure all the use cases are reconciled. Interested in hearing from the committees how concerned they are about that as a data gathering thing. The sheer volume of IGs is creating an issue of perception around how HL7 is managing them.
- Grahame: To deal with it we could be much harder in review of new IG proposals so there's more consistency; we could say we'll have more committees to review and sign off; or we could say we'll beef up the community process where HL7 reviews and stamps those IGs.
- John: Governance of starting an IG is to look around to see if there's another one covering that space and demanding rationale for why they're not using it if there is. Why isn't the greater community driving this?
- Lloyd:
  - So for WGs, we want to ask if they have thoughts about alignment across IGs and how can we foster that?
  - Want to also prompt them about are their Jira issues up to date and applied.

Monday session will be primarily about extensions

Adjourned at 1:39 pm