2019-03-13 SGB Agenda/Minutes

Attendees Present

Chair: Lorraine Constable
Scribe: Anne Wizauer

	Name
x	Calvin Beebe
x	Lorraine Constable
	Russ Hamm
	Tony Julian
	Paul Knapp
	Ewout Kramer
x	Austin Kreisler
x	Wayne Kubick
x	Thom Kuhn
x	Rik Smithies
	Sandy Stuart

1. Agenda review
2. Approve Minutes of 2019-03-06 SGB Agenda/Minutes
3. Action Items
4. Discussion Topics
   a. FHIR Ballot Expectations from FMG - draft feedback for FMG
   b. Request for SGB to co-sponsor Characteristics of Realm Transferable Standards Specifications
   c. Further discussion on draft precepts on tooling?
   d. architecture/tooling risks that came out of TRAC
   e. Large architectures coming in: risks/precepts
   f. Continue with draft policies to develop around Currency of Value Set Content
   g. Precepts We Need to Develop
   h. Specialty Product Family rationale from PLA - for 2019-03-20 call
5. Parking Lot
   a. Mapping coordination
   b. Add link to Confluence page from ARB page
   c. Review of product management life cycle spec to see if it talks about project and ballot scope
   d. Review Mission and Charter
   e. Drafting Shared Product Management Responsibilities
   f. Technical Alignments Between Product Families
   g. How groups are to interact with publishing, EST, Vocabulary, etc.
   h. Precept on bringing in large projects
   i. Vocabulary - review HTA material for precepts
   j. Precept for adding new tools (include that WGs with a specific mandate must be involved, such as EST, Publishing, Vocabulary, etc.) - was this covered by the tooling precept we created in New Orleans?
   k. BAM guidance on process for product adoption
   l. Create PRECEPTS that require that it be articulated in the standards how the value sets specified within the standards respond to changes in regulation, licensing, time, etc.- **to do in April/before Cologne**
   m. FHIR Product Director Position Description: we should 1) review further and draft feedback, then 2) map back the description to the role of FGB
   n. Ownership of content
   o. What precepts do we need to address PSS/profile approval processes of balloting and publishing potentially thousands of CIMI model?

OPEN ACTION ITEMS:

	Description	Due date	Assignee	Task appears on
☐	Paul Knapp to send documentation to the cochairs of HTA and Vocabulary noting that we've drafted precepts on external terminologies and highlight questions on their currency document.		Paul Knapp	2019-11-06 SGB Agenda/Minutes
☐	Paul Knapp and/or Lorraine Constable to communicate the motion on the policy on the use of retired or legacy HL7 code systems to Vocab and HTA on an upcoming Vocab call (from 2019-09-20 SGB WGM Agenda/Minutes)		Paul Knapp	2019-09-20 SGB WGM Agenda/Minutes
☐	Paul Knapp to create a draft of generalized FHIR Ballot Expectations (from 2019-09-20 SGB WGM Agenda/Minutes)		Paul Knapp	2019-09-20 SGB WGM Agenda/Minutes
☐	Austin Kreisler will look at the TRAC risks in the December timeframe (from 2019-09-20 SGB WGM Agenda/Minutes)		Austin Kreisler	2019-09-20 SGB WGM Agenda/Minutes
☐	Lorraine Constable to draft plan on educating /communicating with cochairs on precepts (from 2019-09-20 SGB WGM Agenda/Minutes)		Lorraine Constable	2019-09-20 SGB WGM Agenda/Minutes
☐	ACTION: Paul Knapp to ask for the most current version of Currency of Value Set Content		Paul Knapp	2019-08-07 SGB Agenda/Minutes

Minutes

1. Agenda review
2. Approve Minutes of 2019-03-06 SGB Agenda/Minutes
   a. MOTION to approve: Austin/Calvin
   b. VOTE: All in favor
3. Action Items
4. Discussion Topics
   a. FHIR Ballot Expectations from FMG - draft feedback for FMG
      i. Reviewed last week's minutes. Need to clarify that if a management group makes a decision, it can be appealed to the TSC. Lorraine agrees with the draft precept, but has a concern that, while there are lots of people and energy involved in connectathons, we have a challenge connecting the business community to the implementation community, and one of the best ways to do that is with a ballot. Should discourage using balloting inappropriately, but discourage it overall. Wayne notes that doing a draft for comment in the FHIR world is different than doing it in the rest of the world. Lorraine: We need to define the guidelines.
      ii. Deciding what does and does not go to ballot based on workload - is that guidance general or FHIR-specific? Austin: The point was that any management group decision can be appealed to the TSC. Lorraine: Whose decision is it over what goes to ballot? It has been TSC's role up to now. Austin: First and foremost it's the WG. Then it goes to the TSC. We haven't really said anything about management groups' role. Management groups review NIBs but we haven't said they approve it. Calvin: What if it doesn't meet the quality check? We have given them the authority to reject on that basis. If the content is there, complete and have met the deadlines, the management group could make a recommendation to the TSC if there is too much stuff proposed for ballot. Austin: Do we want every one of these to come to the TSC, or just the appeals?
      iii. Wayne; Perhaps there is a need to assign a priority value to projects, for example if there is funding or a required fix. Need to start making these decisions at the point of the NIB or earlier. Calvin: Does content which is universal vs. US realm have a different priority? Has to be a balance - IPS is very important too. Lorraine: For individual decisions on content and IG proposals, the management groups and the WGs have the role to say whether it's ready or whether it goes. Appeal goes to the TSC. The questions is handling the bolus of ballots across different ballots themselves. Wayne: One criteria is a balance across universal /US, one could be a first come/first served, and the third is an assigned priority based on external factors or dependencies - for example, upcoming regulations. Another issue is how many missed deadlines and appeals they've had - could be a ballot health metric. There should be some kind of penalty for those who make the same mistakes over and over.
         1. DRAFT PRECEPT on prioritizing projects for balloting:
            a. Add to next week

      iv. FMG feedback:
         1. Need positive criteria for when comment ballots are appropriate
         2. WGs can appeal the management group's decision to the TSC

☐	ACTION: Paul Knapp will work on a grid with types of change/degree of review	Paul Knapp	2019-05-22 SGB Agenda /Minutes
☐	**ACTION: Need to create precepts on stable identifiers for value sets, concept maps, and code systems**		2019-01-18 SGB WGM
☐	ACTION: Review proposed updates to the GOM, then determine how/where to represent SGB		2019-01-18 SGB WGM
☐	Add Calvin's document on continuous maintenance and the decision to the SGB site.		2018-11-14 SGB Agenda /Minutes

3. There are times that it is appropriate to engage the business community in addition to the implementer committee
4. Management groups assess and make a recommendation to TSC if they want to prioritize the ballots based on quality criteria

b. Request for SGB to co-sponsor Characteristics of Realm Transferable Standards Specifications
   i. Reviewed PSS brought forward by ARB/Ron Parker. Calvin: Is this guidance applicable to a realm specification or a universal specification? Lorraine: It's guidance for something you believe to be universal. Spec could be realm specific in terms of participation, but you can lay it out to be applicable universally. Austin: What would SGB's role be as cosponsor? Maybe we're an interested party. The thought was that the long term management of how the document is used in standards development might live here. May be generating precepts around this that product families need to follow when developing IGs, for example.
   ii. Calvin: The challenge will be the additional work it puts on a realm specification. In addition, does the tooling support it? Some of these things may be tooling requirements.
      1. MOTION that SGB be an interested party in this project: Austin/Paul
      2. VOTE: All in favor
   iii. Austin: How big a chunk is vocabulary? Is this dominated by terminology choices? Lorraine: It's important, but not the only thing that's important.

c. Further discussion on draft precepts on tooling?
   i. Lorraine notes that EST did some work on criteria here: http://wiki.hl7.org/index.php?title=Tooling_Project_Selection_and_Prioritization
   ii. Add review for next week

d. Carry forward:
   i. architecture/tooling risks that came out of TRAC
   ii. Large architectures coming in: risks/precepts
   iii. Continue with draft policies to develop around Currency of Value Set Content
   iv. Precepts We Need to Develop
   v. Specialty Product Family rationale from PLA - for 2019-03-20 call