# 2020-02-07 FMG WGM Agenda/Minutes

| HL7 TSC FMG Meeting Minutes<br><br>Location:<br>Exhibition 3.7 | Date: 2020-02-07<br>Time: 4:00 PM |
|---|---|
| **Chair**: | **Note taker(s)**: Anne W. |

| Quorum = chair + 4 | | **yes/no** | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Co chairs | David Hay | | Lloyd McKenzie |
| ex-officio | Wayne Kubick, CTO | | |

| | Members | | Members | | Members | Observers/Guests |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Hans Buitendijk | | Brian Postlethwaite | | Paul Knapp | Anne W., scribe |
| | Josh Mandel | | John Moehrke | | Brian Pech | |
| | Grahame Grieve | | | | | |

## Please record your attendance here: [2020-02-07 FMG WGM Attendance](#)

## Agenda

- Roll Call
- Agenda Check
- Review items
  - [FHIR-Based Quality Reporting White Paper](#) PSS
- Discussion Topics
  - Addition of value set profiles (Rob)
  - V2+
  - Wrap-up of the Week
- AOB (Any Other Business)

## Minutes

- Roll Call
- Agenda Check
- Review items
  - [FHIR-Based Quality Reporting White Paper](#) PSS
- Discussion Topics
  - Wrap-up of the Week
    - Hans: Working on updates to BodySite. Substance in 2018May there was a vote that it needs to move to BRR but it didn't happen - it's still with OO. Need to revisit the position as the vote was never finalized.
      - ☑ Anne Wizauerto add ownership of Substance to upcoming FMG call
    - Hans, cont'd: Looking at a subset of Device to go Normative. Want to define candidates by May. ServiceRequest: want to move it to FMM3. Task is at FMM2 but feel like it would be a stretch to get it to 3. Specimen: Currently FMM2, with no strong pressure to advance it. There will be a resource proposal around DeviceDispense, associating a device with a patient.
    - Brian Post: For PA, no change to intent from last time. PatientMerge was presented to Patient Care and they were happy with it. Will put into R5 for wider review. Encounter has potential design issues that are significant - will do a major restructure on the resource that may involve splitting it in two. Will do drafting leading up to San Antonio with a Connectathon on it there to compare approaches. Lloyd notes they'll have to work out what references to it they'll need to change. Brian: We're also proposing to produce an informative IG with guidance on all the various different types of Encounters and walk through them. May become a permanent IG but unsure at this point. Brian asks if people are interested in it, they welcome people to submit example use cases to be worked through.
    - Grahame: Nothing particular from the committees.
    - Lloyd: Pharmacy are comfortable not trying to do a Normative in May. They are otherwise feeling on track. BRR are going to want to bring AdverseEvent into play soon, so they're not thrilled with R5 taking too much longer than Jan of next year. Not expecting to take any resources Normative in the next round. FM isn't really thinking Normative at this point. Unclear on Vocab's Normative aspirations for R5. SOA is interested in increasing awareness of their work so we can bring it to the attention of other WGs when they bring forward proposals like CareCoordination, etc. Lloyd asks for a write up of the scope and content of their relevant resources.
    - John: Few of his WGs were here. Security has agreed to create a Permissions resource.
    - Lloyd: Did anybody hear urgent considerations around R5? None noted.
  - Mark Kramer: Had a birds of a feather meeting for content creators. Came up with ideas to mature the IG publishing process. The four proposals have to do with versioning, issue reporting, release documentation, and pre-release testing. Would help to have formal releases on Github stating what is new in that release - updates, bug fixes, etc. Two ideas in pre-release testing were setting up a separate test server to see if the IGs will build, and go/no go release testing. This would require resources so hopefully we can bring more people into the picture so it doesn't all land on Grahame and Lloyd.
    - Grahame: There are two ways to report issues - one is in JIRA, and one is in Github against the tools. If it's a change in a document, it should go to JIRA. If it's an issue with tooling, it should go to GitHub. Mark agrees and the group discussed. The users of the CI build tool don't know if it's a template or a publisher so they weren't sure what to do. They would be

happy with guidance. Wayne: Why can't everything be done in JIRA? Grahame: I'm not watching every task in JIRA, but I'm watching everything in GitHub. What's going in JIRA is going to the committee already for triage. Lloyd notes they could come up with a process to pull the things out of JIRA to alert Grahame to - can work on an efficient triage method.

- Addition of value set profiles (Rob)
  - Reviewed http://build.fhir.org/ig/HL7/cqf-recommendations/documentation-terminology.html
  - Rob states that they found they were needing to represent the membership of a value set in one of three ways. All are covered by our existing extensions. One way is a Compose. Another way is RulesText, and another is Expression. We want a profile on ValueSet that describes which to use. Lloyd: If you're going to propose adding profiles to core, you have to do a formal proposal. Rob: We need some guidance with what we need to do and with what approach. Lloyd: There is a profile proposal template that is not well exercised because profiles live in IGs, not core. The template should be on Confluence under FHIR under Designers (link: Profile Proposals). Once complete, contact Anne to have it added to an agenda. Grahame advises to be thorough in the scope section regarding who would use it and why, and why it must live in the core spec as opposed to an IG.
- V2+
  - Michael Faugh presents. The purpose is to express V2+ documentation using FHIR, published on a website, and to manage /edit V2+ content using a web application; also express V2+ messages using FHIR syntax. They want to encapsulate the entire V2+ standard in FHIR documents.
  - Would use FHIR IG publisher with Compositions as the primary input. Other IGs could follow on once the workflow is established.
  - Would express V2 in FHIR - not just mapped.
  - Hans: Do we agree with this approach? If so we need to define some structure definitions in FHIR so we have a consistent approach.
  - Lloyd: Is there a need for any new resources or datatypes? Hans: Not for step one, but yes for step 2. Hans: We need to have a way to define the content of the standard; then to go to the next step, an ITS for V2+ using FHIR, you have to create resources. Discussion over what the FHIR ITS is.
  - Grahame: There is technical confusion here. Grahame will sit down with the project to go over it. Advises the team to do things the same way as all the other IGs - get a GitHub repository and get it working that way first. Advises them to look at using Simplifier to see if it would work for them. Should plan well in advance the versioning policy on how it will be published on the V2 website.
- AOB (Any Other Business)
  - None
- Adjourned at 5:23 pm