2022-09-20 US Realm WGM Agenda/Minutes

US Realm Steering Committee Call Agenda/Minutes  Date: 2022-09-20
Location: Kent  Time: 1:45 PM Eastern
https://us02web.zoom.us/j/3890248668

Co-Chairs  Note taker(s)  Anne
Steve/Brett  Anne

Quorum: Chair +7

Please log your attendance here: 2022-09-20 US Realm WGM Attendance

Attendees:

Members:  Members:
Steve Posnak (Chair)  Sandy Stuart
Brett Marquard (Cochair)  Danielle Friend (Implementer)
Ed Hammond (Chair Emeritus)  Open (Implementer)
Dan Vreeman (HL7 CSDO)  Christol Green (Payer)
Austin Kreisler (TSC Chair)  Laura Conn (Public Health)
Hans Buitendijk  Chris Shawn (Security/Privacy)
Bryn Rhodes  Rob McClure (Vocabulary)
Ioana Singureanu  Ron Parker, International Council Representative

Guests:  Guests:

Agenda

Administrivia

- Agenda review

Discussion topics:

- HL7 US Realm: 2022 Priorities and Outlook - Presented in Jan 2022
- US Public Health Profiles Presentation
  - What is US Realm SC role in supporting your future ballots?
  - What tools would help you be successful?
  - What processes must every 'curated domain' have to be successful?
- Degrees of reuse
  - Full profile alignment - Must Support, cardinality, value sets
  - Partial (no formal link)
    - same set of elements
    - same value sets
  - Different Must Support Choices
  - Limited
    - same value sets.

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).

Administrivia

- Agenda review
  - Reviewed

Discussion topics:

- HL7 US Realm: 2022 Priorities and Outlook - Presented in Jan 2022
US Public Health Profiles Presentation

Brett asks how many comments they got on the library? Sarah reports it was 54. The profiles themselves had all been balloted already.

Sarah: Going through the ballot process, if you’re doing a library, should ensure that you have good descriptions at least. There should be stuff in there that describes what these things are and what they’re used for. What do we want in these reusable collections?

Rob: I like the idea of shared libraries and reusing things that are useful, but the idea of a bunch of profiles stuck on a page isn’t useful. Something related to things implementers implement. Connectathons and ballots review the domain content. We will be doing a cross review when there are issues in the QA file we review and when there are errors, we see if it’s related to tooling or if it’s something related to things implementers implement. Connectathons and ballots review the domain content. We will be doing a cross comparison across IGs; particularly the narrative sections will be targeted for more consistency.

Grahame: US Realm could create a library of US extensions to determine if what is being created is unique. Gay: So we should have a process around US Realm extensions. Grahame: Could also be appropriate to do a universal one but governance becomes more complicated. Ioana: We should look at tooling and investigate why this happens.

Grahame is working on a tool and will announce it on Zulip when it’s ready.

US Public Health Profiles Presentation

John Loonsk and Sarah Gaunt present what they’ve been working on - US Public Health Profiles Library (USPHPL)

intended to be a complement to US Core. Work emanated from two large projects - Electronic Case Reporting and MedMorph. Profiles are intended to reduce implementation burden.

Was balloted in the Sep 2022 ballot cycle. Public Health WG is prepared to assume the role of helping to manage the library development, use, and exception process.

Have discussed implementing an IG development and publication process work with new public health IGs moving forward.

First step is to publish USPHPL 1.0; next steps are to implement committee processes; develop technical processes with Grahame; develop support for ongoing maintenance; and explore relationships with US Core.

Austin: Is this envisioned to be US Realm specific, or universal? John: Only US Realm right now. Austin: Public Health WG doesn’t have authority to impose what you’re talking about, so it might have to be under the umbrella of US Realm Steering Committee. Brett: Cross Group Projects was given a new type of authority, so we do have a process to grant that authority. Austin: I just want to make sure the appropriate authority is in place so they’re not stepping out of bounds. Sarah: Anything that’s Public Health WG sponsored would be what this is imposed upon so it’s not outside the WG’s authority. Rob: It makes sense that an HL7 WG would have projects that do realm specific stuff.

Grahame: It’s more confusing to me how this would work as a universal realm thing. I can do the tooling but I don’t want to do it unless this committee approves the idea. Rob: So this is about looking to deal with the same thing that the MCode question was - we’re developing these things and we want to run it through a process where we can test conformance, in this case against US Core. Sarah: We want the same process that happens with US Core to happen with any US Public Health sponsored IGs to make sure they’re using the profiles in the Public Health Profiles Library. Rob: It sounds like there’s a proposal for a cross group project around US Core. Grahame offered to look at it and make a comparison.

Ioana: We want to have nationally constrained profiles or templates in a library that already exists. Would be nice to have dual validation - this would be a blueprint for how we bring together a specific domain and US Realm concerns and constraints.

Steve: What types of resources do we need to evolve into a more organized and coherent structure? This is one aspect. Over time we need to develop a plan for how we’re going to govern these libraries. What can we help build technically and administratively to keep people organized?

Mark: Public Health is well defined in terms of content boundaries. Other groups like Patient Care or Orders and Observations - the WG doesn’t really map to a domain that is similar to Public Health. We need to understand what the other appropriate domains are.

Brett: I don’t know when there is enough momentum around a topic area so we catch all the domain management we need to have.

Isaac: Purpose of use and accelerators could define domains.

Ioana: Grahame could help determine a mature library of profiles that is then part of the publication pipeline. Maybe it’s not a variance, it’s just a convenience to help people reuse extensions, but then other times it’s a variance.

Sarah: A big advantage to checking is publicity so people know it’s out there.

Steve: We have an operating hypothesis that there is an US Realm way to do things. As we reach new maturity points, we need to figure out how we instill that kind of consistency, making it available in advance. Would help address inconsistencies upstream.

Grahame: If you don’t force conformance, the majority of people won’t do it.

Brett: People need accountability in the system. Steve: That’s what the variance process does for us - it gives us feedback that we’ve needed through structure and governance.

Discussion on the FHIR profile registry. Grahame will be reworking it so people can find what they need. The implementation hasn’t met the needs of the community. You can make it work, but it’s too difficult. The publication schedule of UTG also makes things difficult.

Ioana: The idea of registry is useful, but a curated registry with a ranking scheme based on ballots and reviews something has gone through would be really useful. It would also be useful to know about implementation. The more information we can have in the registry the better.

Chris: It would be beneficial to have it so when you’re going through the publishing tool, it finds similar profiles and surfaces them. It could also list all the things the author ignored and suggest that they consider using them.

Emilee: The one thing we’d appreciate is consistency in how IGs are put together written. WGs all seem to do things in a different way. This goes for FHIR IGs and CDA IGs. Brings up the example of the C-CDA eICRF (although there are others). Also, when an IG conforms to a version and it gets updated, does that mean the template you conformed to last year can be updated?

Brett: The C-CDA release cycle is not great. When you base yourself on something in FHIR, the requirements are all there. With C-CDA, implementers are confused about what template they’re supposed to use.

Brett asks about FMGs approach in terms of quality for FHIR IGs? Discussion over role of US Realm in terms of quality. Are there rules around what’s expected? Grahame: FMG isn’t domain experts so we don’t argue about domain content. FMG makes sure processes were followed. When there are issues in the QA file we review and when there are errors, we see if it’s related to tooling or if it’s something related to things implementers implement. Connectathons and ballots review the domain content. We will be doing a cross comparison across IGs; particularly the narrative sections will be targeted for more consistency.

Rob: I like the idea of shared libraries and reusing things that are useful, but the idea of a bunch of profiles stuck on a page isn’t useful. There should be stuff in there that describes what these things are and what they’re used for. What do we want in these reusable collections?

Sarah: Going through the ballot process, if you’re doing a library, should ensure that you have good descriptions at least.

Brett asks how many comments they got on the library? Sarah reports it was 54. The profiles themselves had all been balloted already.
• Grahame: Is this something the group as a whole believes is a meaningful use of my time? Will the Public Health committee back it, and US Realm back the process?
  • MOTION that the US Realm supports the process of review against Public Health WG Profiles library for US Realm Public Health WG IGs: Rob/Ioana
  • Austin asks for a description of the process. Rob states that the intent is, for US Public Health IGs, there’s a requirement to do the comparison against US Core the the Public Health library.
  • VOTE: All in favor
• Degrees of reuse
  • Full profile alignment - Must Support, cardinality, value sets
  • Partial (no formal link)
    • same set of elements
    • same value sets
    • Different Must Support Choices
  • Limited
    • same value sets.
    • Carry forward
• Adjourned at 3:05 pm Eastern