Ballot vs. Non-Ballot Comments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>APPROVED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date of Approval</td>
<td>Draft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Balloting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description</td>
<td>During ballot reconciliation, for STU and Informative ballots, as is the case for Normative ballots, all ballot comments must be considered and have a disposition status applied; comments received through non-ballot processes will be considered at the discretion of the committee.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Draft Amendment:**

- If a WG decides to make a change to the active, non-ballot build version of a specification while a ballot is underway and the non-ballot change conflicts with the reconciliation of a ballot comment, the WG must reconsider the decision that led to the change and document the resolution of the conflict.

Link to Minutes: 2020-11-25 SGB Agenda/Minutes

Recent TSC discussion on Coordinating Ballot Submissions: 2021-04-19 TSC Agenda/Minutes

From the GOM:

**STUs: (14.02.04)**

- At the close of the review ballot the responsible Work Group (WG) shall capture all comments using the HL7 Ballot Reconciliation Report unless the WG has petitioned for and been granted a waiver of such use by the Technical Steering Committee (TSC). The responsible WG shall consider all comments with the intent of improving the quality and clarity of the proposed standard. While not on a par with a normative reconciliation package, the results of the Work Group’s consideration of the comments submitted as recorded on the Ballot Reconciliation Report shall be posted to the Ballot Desktop.
- A negative without comment shall be considered as “no response” and shall not be factored into the numerical requirements for approval. No effort shall be made to solicit comments from the submitter of a negative without comment.
- The process of consideration of the comments is not as complete or rigorous as normative reconciliation. Nevertheless, the responsible Work Group is expected to annotate each negative comment on the reconciliation report with a disposition of “Persuasive”, “Not Persuasive”, “Considered for Future Use”, or “Not Related” with a recorded vote and an explanation for the Work Group’s decision in accordance with the Work Group’s Decision-making Practices (DMP) to maintain transparency on decisions made. A negative ballot withdrawn at the request of the submitter shall be recorded as an affirmative.
- The issue of substantive change shall not be applicable to a STU. In the instance of an approved STU with substantive change resulting from review, it is left to the discretion of the responsible Work Group to either submit to another review ballot or move forward with a request to the TSC to release the revised content as a standard for trial use.

**Informative: (14.01.04)**

- At the close of the ballot the responsible Work Group (WG) shall capture all comments using the HL7 Ballot Reconciliation Report unless the WG has petitioned for and been granted a waiver of such use by the Technical Steering Committee (TSC). The responsible WG shall consider all comments with the intent of improving the quality and clarity of the informative document. While not on a par with a normative reconciliation package, the results of the Work Group’s consideration of the comments submitted as recorded on the Ballot Reconciliation Report shall be posted to the Ballot Desktop.
- A negative without comment shall be considered as “no response” and shall not be factored into the numerical requirements for approval. No effort shall be made to solicit comments from the submitter of a negative without comment.
- The process of consideration of the comments is not synonymous with nor shall it assume the rigor of normative reconciliation. There is no requirement to resolve negative comments and seek withdrawal of the negative. Nevertheless, the responsible Work Group is encouraged to annotate each negative comment on the reconciliation report with a disposition of “Persuasive”, “Not Persuasive”, “Considered for Future Use”, or “Not Related” with a recorded vote and an explanation for the Work Group’s decision in accordance with the Work Group’s Decision-Making Practices (DMP) to maintain transparency on decisions made. A negative ballot withdrawn at the request of the submitter shall be recorded as an affirmative.
- The issue of substantive change shall not be applicable to an informative document. In the instance of an approved informative document with substantive change resulting from review, it is left to the
discretion of the responsible Work Group to either submit to another ballot or move forward with the revised informative document.

- If the informative document fails to be approved, it again falls to the discretion of the responsible Work Group, after appropriate revision if necessary, to either submit to another review ballot, withdraw the document from consideration, or repackage the content and submit it to the TSC for consideration of submission to a normative ballot.

Comment: (14.04.04)

- At the close of the comment-only review period the responsible Work Group (WG) shall capture all comments using the HL7 Ballot Reconciliation Report unless the WG has petitioned for and been granted a waiver of such use by the Technical Steering Committee (TSC). The responsible WG shall consider all comments received during the review period with the intent of improving the quality and clarity of the submitted content before seeking the approval of the TSC for submission to a subsequent ballot.
- The Work Group shall post the results of their consideration of the comments submitted as recorded on the Ballot Reconciliation Report to the HL7 Ballot Desktop. There is no requirement to respond to any comment or advise any submitter of the disposition of their comments. Given that this is a comment-only review; the issue of substantive change is moot.