TSC will hold a Conference Call at 11AM Eastern time, each Monday except during scheduled face-to-face Working Group Meetings unless otherwise noted.

Zoom meeting: https://zoom.us/j/946185906
For those without access to microphone/speakers:
+1 646 558 8656 US (New York)
+1 647 558 0588 Canada
+39 020 666 7245 Italy
Meeting ID: 946 185 906

Alternate FCC Meeting Coordinates (in the event of Zoom failure):
Join the online meeting: https://join.freeconferencecall.com/anne498
Dial-in number (US): (712) 451-0423
Access code: 935633#
International dial-in numbers: https://fccdl.in/i/anne498
Online meeting ID: ann498

HL7 TSC Meeting Minutes
Date: 2021-04-19
Time: 11:00 AM U.S. Eastern

Facilitator: Austin Kreisler
Note taker(s): Anne Wizauer

Quorum = chair + 5 including 2 SD represented

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chain/CTO</th>
<th>A/B</th>
<th>International Affiliate Rep</th>
<th>Ad-Hoc</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x Giorgio Cangioli</td>
<td>x Bryn Rhodes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x Wayne Kubick</td>
<td></td>
<td>x Christof Gessner</td>
<td>x Jean Deteau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x Josh Mandel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x Amit Popat</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Clinical

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Infrastructure</th>
<th>Administrative</th>
<th>Organizational Support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>x Melva Peters</td>
<td>x Paul Knapp</td>
<td>x Mary Kay McDaniel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x David Pyke</td>
<td>x Rob McClure</td>
<td>x Riki Merrick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x Sandra Stuart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x Virginia Lorenzi</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ex officio

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Invited Guests</th>
<th>Invited Guests</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>x Lloyd McKenzie</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xxxxx</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TSC Ad Hoc Implementer Role Qualifications

Walter Suarez (HL7 Chair) w/vote:
- x Lloyd McKenzie
- x Anne Wizauer

Chuck Jaffe (CEO) vote:
- x Abdullah Shakur
- x Lynn Laakso

Bob Dieterle

Agenda

1. Housekeeping
   a. Introduction of visitors (including declaration of interests)
   b. Agenda review and approval
   c. Approve Minutes of 2021-04-12 TSC Agenda/Minutes

2. Review action items

3. Approval items referred for discussion from previous weeks with followup:
   a. Project Approval Request by the Patient Administration WG of the Administrative SD for National Healthcare Directory at Project Insight 1690
      i. Both comment and STU to normative are checked off
      ii. Response from Bob Dieterle:
         1. This PSS describes three different IGs.
            a. Update and localize the Validated Healthcare Directory information exchange IG (published to the US Realm) from PDex Plan Net) and expand support for FHIR/trust metadata in the endpoint resource.
            b. Provide standard federated directory query and response IG for FHIR endpoint information (this is what will be implemented by most of the systems that need to retrieve information on FHIR endpoints.
            c. IG to define attestation and validation of information submitted to the national directory
   2. The intent is to ballot 1) and 2) as STU1 in the September 2021 cycle and ballot 3) in the September 2021 as for comment (this is based on work from the ONC-FHA work that was never committed to an IG) to solicit feedback, and then update and submit as an STU1 in the January 2022 cycle.

4. Approval items from last week’s e-vote referred for discussion:
   a. Missed Reconciliation Deadline Appeal by the Public Health WG of the Clinical SD for Vital Records Death Reporting (VRDR) FHIR Implementation Guide at Project Insight 1475
   b. TSC Ad Hoc Implementer Role Qualifications

5. Approval items from last week’s e-vote approved 9-0-0:
   a. Missed Final Content Deadline Appeal by the Security WG of the Infrastructure SD for HL7 FHIR® Implementation Guide: Data Segmentation for Privacy (DS4P), Release 1 at Project Insight 1549
   b. Project Approval Request by the Security WG of the Infrastructure SD for FHIR at Scale (FAST): Scalable Registration, Authentication, and Authorization for FHIR Ecosystem Participants at Project Insight 1689

6. Approval items for this week:
   a. Project Approval Request by the BR&R WG of the Clinical SD for PSS-1686 - Integrated Trial Matching for Cancer Patients and Providers at Project Insight 1687
b. Project Approval Request by the CBCC WG of the Clinical SD for [PSS-1712] PACIO FHIR Profile - Re-assessment Timepoint [APPROVED] at Project Insight 1691

c. Project Approval Request by the CDA Management Group for [PSS-1684] CDA IG Web Publishing [APPROVED] at Project Insight 1684


e. Project Approval Request by the BR&R WG of the Clinical SD for FHIM Implementation Guide: Migrate from Structured Product Labeling V3 to a FHIR-based submission at Project Insight TBD


g. Project Approval Request by the BR&R WG of the Clinical SD to Reaffirm HL7 Version 3 Standard: Pharmacovigilance - Individual Case Safety Report, Part 2: Human Pharmaceutical Reporting Requirements for ICSR, R2 at Project Insight 1665

h. Project Approval Request by the BR&R WG of the Clinical SD to Withdraw HL7 Version 3 Standard - Regulated Studies: Drug Stability Reporting (eStability), Release 2 at Project Insight 1662

i. Project Approval Request by the M&M WG of the Infrastructure SD for Reaffirmation of HL7 Version 3 Standard: Reference Information Model, Release 7 at Project Insight 1671

j. Weekly TSC meeting day/time - stay on Monday, move to different day/time, no preference

7. Discussion topics:
   a. Coordinating Ballot Submissions - further discussion/motions
   b. Responsibility for PBS Metrics/WG Health review task when SDs dissolve
   c. Review Parking Lot

8. Parking Lot

a. Clarifying the classification of STUs specs that are no longer in a trial use period but actually in production use (FHIR R3, C-CDA)

b. Proposal to remove SAIF statement from Mission and Charter template
   i. Potential replacement: WGs should work with product management groups to follow the methodologies as established by methodology groups and bring governance issues to the TSC.

   c. Tooling discussion with V2 Management Group re: active standards

d. Subcommittees/task forces we need to form
   i. Nominating subcommittee
   ii. WG Health/PBS Metrics Revisions task force
      1. Consider WG Health metric for periodic review/categorization of standards

e. Governance
   i. TSC governance vis-a-vis product family governance
   ii. Precept on canonical URLs
   iii. Requirement for FHIR specifications to use JIRA for reconciliation
   iv. Areas of FHIR Governance that require input from the TSC (2020-12-21 TSC Agenda/Minutes)
   v. Determine how we’re going to implement steps to handle errata/technical corrections (2020-02-24 TSC Agenda/Minutes)

f. WG Issues
   i. Virtual meeting touchpoints with WGs in absence of SD meetings
   ii. Cross-Group Projects Scope Increase: Revisit after experience with project concept process (2020-02-24 TSC Agenda/Minutes)
   iii. Future of CIC, CINI, LHS, EHR WGs

g. Coordinate artifact naming guidance update

h. Management group terms/reappointments - should there be term limits?
   i. Review specification lifecycle project and approval requirements.

j. How to manage all specifications that are dependent upon C-CDA moving forward (from 2020-06-15 TSC Agenda/Minutes) - refer to CDAMG

k. Coordination efforts with external terminology organizations - should this be referred to HTA?
   l. UTG issues - training and usability

Minutes

1. Housekeeping
   a. Introduction of visitors (including declaration of interests)
      i. Lloyd, AMS, and Bob here for various agenda items
   b. Agenda review and approval
      i. No additions/updates
   c. Approve Minutes of 2021-04-12 TSC Agenda/Minutes
      i. Accepted via general consent

2. Approval items referred for discussion from previous weeks with followup:
   a. Project Approval Request by the Patient Administration WG of the Administrative SD for National Healthcare Directory at Project Insight 1690
      i. Both comment and STU to normative are checked off
      ii. Response from Bob Dieterle:
         1. This PSS describes three different IGs.

       a. Update and localize the Validated Healthcare Directory information exchange IG (published) to the US Realm (using knowledge from Pdex Plan Net) and expand support for FHIR/Trust metadata in the endpoint resource.
       b. Provide standard federated directory query and response IG for FHIR endpoint information (this is what will be implemented by most of the systems that need to retrieve information on FHIR endpoints)
       c. IG to define attestation and validation of information submitted to the national directory
2. The intent is to ballot 1) and 2) as STU1 in the September 2021 cycle and ballot 3) in the September 2021 as for comment (this is based on work from the ONC-FHA work that was never committed to an IG) to solicit feedback, and then update and submit as an STU1 in the January 2022 cycle.
   a. Bob here to discuss. There are three IGs; two will go to STU in September and one for comment before an STU in January.
   b. Updated to reflect comment as opposed to informative in timeline
      i. MOTION to approve: Melva/Paul
      ii. VOTE: All in favor

3. Approval items from last week’s e-vote referred for discussion:
   a. Missed Reconciliation Deadline Appeal by the Public Health WG of the Clinical SD for Vital Records Death Reporting (VRDR) FHIR Implementation Guide at Project Insight 1475
      i. AMS here to discuss. Missed reconciliation deadline as well as final content deadline after that. Reconciliation deadline appeal came in late, and balloters weren’t contacted to withdraw negatives. AMS stated that he used the link to send the message to voters but it didn’t function correctly. Was able to get the notification out after the deadline.
      ii. This was supposed to go out in the ballot on Friday but in addition to missed deadlines, Melva reports that there is still a QA issue to resolve.
   b. TSC Ad Hoc Implementer Role Qualifications
      i. Wayne voted against since the original Board request was to add 2 TSC members from the FHIR community.
      ii. Jean: It's a little late in the process from a GOM standpoint. The GOM just says two implementer roles and that it's up to the product management group to determine their requirements for the position. I understand Wayne's point but we changed the GOM to make it not FHIR specific. If we only want FHIR implementers it'll be hard given what the GOM says.
      iii. Wayne: If we did something in the GOM that's wrong, we're obligated to fix it, or we could go back to the board and say this is what we recommend. Or we could add a third implementer. The board asked for two to be FHIR implementers.
      iv. Dave: I agree that it's late for this objection to be brought forward. We have discussed expanding it. We should explain our reasoning to the board if they have a sincere objection.
      v. Austin: Qualifications for the implementer role on the TSC need to go out in the nomination announcement, which is why we're reviewing.
      vi. Jean: It's possible we could say that, given what the board would like us to do, we could change it to FHIR. Austin: Could say FHIR or other implementation experience.
      vii. Jean: Should we go back to the board to ask their preference? Wayne: No matter what we do, I will inform the board. If we're committed to do this, are we invested in building the same kind of community in other product families?
   c. Virginia: We need to consider the strategic use of the spots on the TSC.
   d. Amit: Is the TSC's role to execute on Board directives or take the board's advisement and have its own decision making practices? If our role is to execute Board directives then we should reconsider. Austin: There are times when the TSC does not align well with the board: Wayne and I try to keep the TSC and the Board in alignment. Amit: Then I think we should just communicate it to the board. Austin: The TSC can express its preferences for specifics. We could decide that we're going to seek specific skills. Sandy expresses that we should not to that for this election since the FHIR implementer spot isn't up for election.
      i. MOTION to approve the description, removing the words ad hoc: David/Jean
      ii. VOTE: Wayne is opposed. Josh is opposed. Bryn is opposed. Remaining in favor (8-3-0)

4. Discussion topics:
   a. Coordinating Ballot Submissions - further discussion/motions
      i. Paul states that his issue is that this states that committees can resolve and close issues during the ballot as opposed to after the ballot closes. Committees can look at things and propose dispositions, but they should be precluded from voting on and closing items while the ballot is open. Lloyd states this is how it's been done for years. If someone raises an issue, and you address the issue, and the balloter is comfortable with it then they don't need to vote on it. Paul: The ballot has a defined timeline and it should be held open for the agreed upon timeline. Lloyd: The ballot will not change - it's frozen for the duration. Riki: More than one person might comment on the same thing and you risk not taking all opinions into account. Paul: People may not submit their comments until the end of the 30 days, and then they may be commenting on something that is already closed.
      ii. Rob: What Lloyd is saying is mostly true - when we go through and take care of things and determine resolutions, it is very different from collecting all the comments into one pile and working through them. So if someone reads the ballot and makes a comment, will it be considered if the item is resolved?
      iii. Amit arrives
      iv. Paul: Part of the issue is when the ballot is open and the issue has been decided. When you announce a deliberation period, you should wait to make changes until the deliberation period is over. Items can be reviewed and dispositions proposed but decisions should be held off on until everyone has had the opportunity to contribute
      v. Jean: There's a timing issue with this. If you raised an issue and waited a certain amount of time before voting, that could be a problem.
      vi. Virginia arrives
      vii. Jean: You shouldn't vote and close the issues until the ballot is closed.
      viii. Lloyd: My general interest is allowing work to progress efficiently. If a WG discusses and has a proposed resolution on an item, additional people voting on it isn't going to change the resolution. We do want to ensure that people who
are putting their votes in via spreadsheet are being included. Leaving an item unresolved is slowing the work down. If WGs resolve things as they come in it's not preventing anything from happening. If voters don't agree with a resolution they can open a new issue.

xi. Rob: That's a significant burden on people going in to review comments. Now you're commenting on something that's no longer the same thing, because it's been resolved.

xii. Paul: Items may be open, raised and closed by people who aren't members.

1. MOTION that WGs suspend closing items under ballot during the ballot timeframe: Paul/Rikki

2. Discussion:
   a. Rob: I agree with the sentiment but am also swayed by some of Lloyd's comments on things like typos. Maybe we consider the types of comments with respect to any they might close before the ballot closes. Things like typos could be resolved but more controversial things would be held open.
   b. Lloyd: My leaning is if we were to do anything, we should say that the rules around requiring 60% to reopen an item would be waived if an item was resolved while the ballot was open.
   c. Wayne: I'm swayed by Lloyd's comment that we are seeking to make things efficient. It should be at the WG's discretion.
   d. Amit: The purpose of the ballot is to gain feedback and general outside consensus to improve the quality of the product in a static fashion. The difference here is we need to append a friendly amendment to the motion where any major negative comments would be handled Paul's way and small things would be handled Lloyd's way.
   e. David: I agree with Amit and Lloyd. If something is of importance enough that someone marks it as negative, closing it in advance is doing a disservice. If we leave it open that people can close tickets at any time, it's opened up for abuse. Things will get changed outside of accepted process. Anything above a typo and potentially affirmative votes would be acceptable, but anything marked negative needs to go through the regular, proper process.
   f. MK: If in fact you make rules by WG, it's not received positively across the organization. It needs to be very clear and the WGs need to share how they're going to handle things, perhaps in the DMP.
   g. Rob: I'm still in agreement that it would be nice to support rapid resolution on things that don't matter much. The JIRA issue and the vote are not tightly bound. We've all experienced negatives on typos, particularly on organizational votes. The only way we can clean this up is you vote for every issue. Then we could make a rule where if it's a typo, it can be closed out quickly. But if all of the issues in a collection are given just one vote, we can't do this right.
   h. Austin: We need to be able to remain agile. Some issues like typos should go through quickly. Other things should be held off on until the ballot closes. If this can't be enforced in tooling, the rule will be ignored. If we want to explore putting rules in place, we should explore how they can be automated and enforced in tooling so they're not inconsistently followed by WGs.
   i. Melva: The fact that we're using JIRA for balloting is what caused this to bubble up. Previously spreadsheets weren't handled until the end.
   j. Bryn: It's not even possible to know right now what's submitted via the ballot. Paul: If a committee has five different IGs, but only two in ballot, they can update the items that aren't in ballot.

3. AMENDED MOTION that WGs suspend closing items under ballot during the ballot timeframe excluding typos and questions

4. AMENDED MOTION that WGs suspend closing items under ballot during the ballot timeframe. If the issue that's being resolved has been voted by the submitter as a typo or question, the WG can close the item before the ballot closes: Paul/Rikki

5. VOTE: Clinical opposed. Wayne is opposed. Jean is opposed. Bryn is opposed. Motion passes (6-4-0)

6. Josh arrives

   a. The document must be amended and policy communicated to WGs.

   b. Carry forward:
      i. Responsibility for PBS Metrics/WG Health review task when SDs dissolve
      ii. Review Parking Lot

5. Adjourned at 12:30 pm Eastern