2022-05-06 TSC WGM Agenda/Minutes

TSC WGM Meeting 9am ET - 5pm ET

Zoom meeting: https://us02web.zoom.us/j/3890248668
For those without access to microphone/speakers:
+1 929 436 2866 US (New York)
+1 669 900 6833 US (San Jose)
+1 204 272 7920 Canada
+49 30 5679 5800 Germany
Meeting ID: 389 024 8668

Leadership
Austin Kreisler, TSC Chair
Gora Datta
Giorgio Cangioli, International Affiliate
Josh Mandel, FMG

Working Group Representatives
Dan Vreeman, CSDO
Riki Merrick
Christof Gessner, International Affiliate
Rob McClure, TSMG

National/Regional Representatives
Jean Duteau, Vice Chair
Melva Peters
Chris Shaen, US Realm Representative
Linda Michaelsen, CMG

Product Management Group Representatives
Josh Mandel, FMG

Ex Officio
Andrew Truscott (HL7 Chair), w/ vote
Rick Geimer
David Pyke, GOC Liaison
Anne Wizauer, staff

Implementer Representatives
Chuck Jaffe (CEO) w/ vote
Bryn Rhodes
Coles Lawton

Ad Hoc members

Staff/Guests

Ex Officio
Lorraine Constable

Quorum Requirement: Chair + 8 individuals comprised of at least 3 Working Group representatives and 1 National/Regional representative

Agenda

1. Re-envisioning focus group with Root
2. Housekeeping
   a. Introduction of visitors (including declaration of interests)
   b. Agenda review and approval
   c. Temperature check
      i. What are we doing right, what could we do better, personal update if desired
3. Follow-up on e-vote items (as necessary) - 30 min
   a. Project Approval Request by the Cross-Group Projects WG for PSS-1939 - FHIR IG & C-CDA Supplemental Guide for Medical Record Reviews at Project Insight 1755
   b. Project Approval Request by the Devices WG for PSS-1936 - FHIR IG for Intra-Procedural Anesthesia Records at Project Insight 1754
   c. Project Approval Request by the Patient Care WG for PSS-1946 - CHOICE Guideline for the use of a Fetal Resource at Project Insight 1746
   d. STU Publication Request by the FHIR Management Group for FHIR R4B at Project Insight 891
4. Discussion topics:
   a. SBAR: Errata publication of Technical Corrections
   b. Handling STUs that aren’t advancing to normative
   c. Work Group Health and PBS Metrics Review WG Updates
      i. PBS Metrics PSS Review Step and Approval Criteria
   d. Co-chair training: Should be made mandatory initially and then at regular intervals
   e. Will we meet on the Monday following the WGM? (2022-05-16)
   f. Policy for WG Zoom recordings
5. Parking Lot

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).

1. Re-envisioning focus group with Root
   a. Root worked with the group from 9:00 am - 11:00 am Eastern
2. Housekeeping
   a. Introduction of visitors (including declaration of interests)
      i. Lorraine Constable here as a guest/observer
b. Agenda review and approval
   c. Temperature check
      i. What are we doing right, what could we do better, personal update if desired
         1. Melva: need to finish work we start, clarify role of WG reps, lots of work ongoing with the new association
            management system
         2. Jean: New TSC structure is effective; need to make sure we don’t add complexity
         3. Amit: Thankful for guidance from other TSC members as he learns about the processes
         4. Chris: Need to continue looking at WGs that may have become ineffective
         5. Christof: Is grateful for accurate minute taking. Could put aside a few minutes per month to raise TSC-like issues
            from the affiliates.
         6. Dan: Transition to new governance structure has been smooth - thankful for everyone’s work. Need to give more
            air space to ideas and less to opinions. Directs people to an interesting blog post: https://waitbutwhy.com/2015/12
            /the-tail-end.html
         7. Giorgio: Must think critically about what we’re doing and adapt to challenges; need to better engage the affiliates
            and give them support. Need to resolve the problem of engagement and filling leadership roles.
         8. Goran: Is enjoying coming back to TSC after several years off. Would like a better way for notifications other than
            emails. Having longer TSC sessions is helpful. Mobile Health WG is celebrating 10 years and invites people to
            join Thursday Q4.
         9. Josh: TSC does well with asynchronous decision making practices like e-vote - other committees could do that as
            well. Need to make sure we’re spending our time on the most meaningful issues that matter most in the long run.
         10. Linda: Wants clarification that she’s doing the right thing when reviewing. HL7 Essentials page is really helpful.
         11. Lorraine: We’re always working improving on being inclusive of ideas rather than opinions, as Dan said. TSC
             handling restructuring well - want to make sure the community is handling it as well.
         12. Rick: Also enjoy the streamlined voting process - things seem to be working very well.
         13. Riki: Also like Dan’s idea about having space for ideas, although we do have only a short time available on calls.
             Was at an IHE meeting in Belgium, and it came up that we need a base starting point that every country should
             start from, and where should we have that discussion?
         14. Rob: Our transition to using asynchronous technology is great. We need to spend less time on administrivia and
             spend more time on leadership. Hoping to be substantially done with Gender Harmony by the end of the year.
         15. Sandy: Agrees with what has been stated so far; likes the direction that we’ve gone with the new structure.

3. Follow-up on e-vote items (as necessary) - 30 min
   a. Project Approval Request by the Cross-Group Projects WG for PSS-1939 - FHIR IG & C-CDA Supplemental Guide for Medical
      Record Reviews PSS-1939 - FHIR IG & C-CDA Supplemental Guide for Medical Record Reviews, at Project Insight 1755
         i. Amit wonders if it makes more sense to have a DAM first ahead of the published IGs? They listed ballotting everything
            together. Is it Cross-Group Projects the right sponsor? Would want a domain expertise group to do the DAM.
         ii. Jean: The PSS needs clarification on exactly what it is they’re trying to do.
         iii. Melva states Patient Care might be a better sponsor. Jean: This spans a lot of WGs and will need coordination from across
             the spectrum.
         iv. Only one implementer listed.
         v. Amit: Shouldn’t the DAM be put together by domain experts? Austin: There are no specific rules on who can put together
            DAMs and how they approach it.
            1. Item is tabled until an additional implementer is identified
      i. No implementers noted.
         1. MOTION to table until the WG identifies a minimum of two implementers: Melva/Jeann
         2. VOTE: Josh abstains. Remaining in favor (14-0-1)
   c. Project Approval Request by the Patient Care WG for PSS-1946 - CHOICE Guideline for the use of a Fetal Resource PSS-1946 - CHOICE Guideline for the use of a Fetal Resource, at Project Insight 1746
      i. Amit has concerns over using the word "CHOICE" in the title. Discussion over whether or not there are copyright
         implications. Also only have one implementer listed.
      ii. Reviewed project page. CHOICE stands for Child Health & Obstetrics International Collaboration and Exploration.
      iii. Amit is concerned that it has political implications.
      iv. Dan will reach out to them to discuss IP, implementers, external drivers
      v. Item is tabled until Dan has a chance to speak with them.
   d. MOTION to table STU PSSs in this e-vote that do not list two or more implementers: Goran/Jeann
   e. VOTE: Josh abstains. Remaining in favor (13-0-1)
      i. May need to update JIRA workflow to have two mandatory fields for implementers rather than text box
   f. STU Publication Request by the FHIR Management Group for FHIR R4B at Project Insight 891
      i. Discussion over naming. Answered by clarifying that version is different than the release.
      ii. Melva brings up an issue that was raised about ballot reconciliation not being complete.
      iii. Item tabled until we discover is reconciliation is complete

4. Discussion topics:
   a. SBAR: Errata publication of Technical Corrections
      i. Dan introduces the topic; group reviews the document.
      ii. There seems to be a need for some clarifications. Reviewed questions Dan has received recently.
      iii. First recommendation is that an errata would be allowed to have resolved tickets of three types: Technical correction;
          change request: correction; or change request: clarification.
         1. Josh: Having this kind of clarity would be helpful. Josh asks about making small compatible improvements, maybe
            3 updates per year, but that seems implausible given the current publication process.
         2. Dan: This is mean to be a rubric for that decision making process. This isn’t the right approach for new features or
            requirements. This is for smaller scale corrections and clarifications. However, an STU update can be completed
            without an additional ballot using a separate process for things like enhancements.
         3. Rob mentions that clarifications are a gray area. It always boils down to what we think should go through a ballot
            and what shouldn’t. We need to evaluate what the true benefits of the ballot process are and back off on
            expectations that things that are in the gray area always have to go through ballot.
4. Dan: Much of what you said revolves around the STU Update process. This is the more lightweight version of that. Rob: I'd like to see it proven there's a simpler process for technical corrections/errata that benefits us in a meaningful way that is responsive and nimble.
5. Gora asks about timing - are these published immediately? Dan: Yes, these are a shorter process, with the timing up to the WG.
6. Jean: In Cross-Group Projects and Pharmacy, we've taken advantage of this process and encouraged others to do so. The problem is the line is a fuzzy line. Clarifications are the trickiest. People need to understand what an errata is for and how easy it is to do.

iv. Product Management Groups
1. Jean doesn't believe we really need the product management groups to be involved in errata. It's supposed to be quick. Austin: They probably need to at least be notified since they'll have to create an incremental version containing the errata.
2. Lorraine: There's no point in bringing them into the approval loop, but some product families need to be notified because of their particular publication process.
3. Jean: There could be a standing agreement with a product family that they don't need a letter every time for very specific types of updates or situations.
4. Linda: In FHIR, I'm used to seeing the change log. Is that different from the CSDO letter? Dan: The letter has different components, including boilerplate language, explanations, a list of changes, and a formal notification re: the next version. It's quite similar to the kind of change list you might see in the history page with wrapper context.

v. Dan will document the kinds of changes, the way in which we can communicate the list of changes, clarify notification to product management groups.

b. Handling STUs that aren't advancing to normative
i. Problem is how to manage STUs that are no longer in trial use period but are actually in production use. They will never become normative and likely will need maintenance.
ii. Austin mentions C-CDA, which is the poster child for this.
iii. Options:
   1. Do nothing
   2. Allow for long-term/permanent STU extension
   3. Introduce a new state
      a. Could be "Standard in Use (SU)" as opposed to STU
   4. Introduce a new kind of standard (ballot type)
      a. Could be a status of "HL7 Normative" (not ANSI)
      b. Austin: Would this make any difference to those using the standard?
      c. Christof notes the fast track status route in ISO. Giorgio: In that case it's a document from outside of ISO.
      d. Gora: Maybe we should specify the country to further narrow it down.
      e. Dave: I like the concept of Standard in Use, although I'm not sure we need to do it by country. Need to say this is a long term stable thing.
      f. Dan: What core issue are we trying to solve? Seems that the STU label isn't causing much of a problem. Option 3 seems to solve most of the problems.
      g. Rob: So it would be like a normative thing, i.e. any changes would be a guarantee of backwards compatibility. Standard in Use would have some expectations that people could implement with guarantees that no one would make a breaking change.
      h. Christof: If an external organization supports or endorses moving an STU to Normative, is that sufficient for ANSI or not? We could have a new kind of ballot - couldn't make substantive changes through this ballot. Austin: This is kind of like we do with reaffirmations - it's supposed to be an up or down vote. The question is "do you approve this STU becoming normative." People could comment, but those would be considered for a future release.
   i. Austin: The discussion started with what to do with C-CDA and how to advance it in step with USCDI. FHIR R4 is in a similar boat. ELTSS is another example.
   j. The Standard in Use concept would allow us to restrict types of changes that could be made without a new version.
   k. Option 5 would be a different type of on-ramp to normative
      i. Giorgio/David/Christof will update the document to clarify what's allowed, expiration dates /renewals, and flesh out option 5 before the concepts go to e-vote
      ii. Also may affect what happens to currently expired STUs

c. Work Group Health and PBS Metrics Review WG Updates
i. Project Insight items with next milestone behind >120 days
   1. Discussion over whether or not this is a meaningful metric. Melva notes that the only dates we have on the current PSS is ballot target dates. Once Project Insight goes away, everything will be in JIRA. We removed all the deliverable dates that used to be in the word and confluence forms. Do we need other dates in JIRA? Austin asks if these dates are meaningful to the WG. Riki and Lorraine state it's somewhat helpful to review those at the WGMs to determine where things are at. Rob: Having a list of things you're supposedly working on is helpful. Need an ability to have dates forballoting, publication, project end so people can see where they're at. Would need a dashboard in JIRA.
   2. Decision to keep it until we have a better way of tracking it in JIRA
ii. Projects 2+ years old: drop as a metric
iii. 5 year anniversary - missing deadlines: proposal to move to WG Health metric
iv. Recirculation - would be information only
v. Unpublished ballots: Make a WG health metric
vi. Expired STUs - elevate to WG health metric
vii. Active ballots without reconciliation: should update to be notification but not a ding

Anne Wizauer to add WG Health/PBS Metrics items that are ready to e-vote

d. Gora asks about projects funded by external entities, and the possibility of things being abandoned when funding runs out. We need to explore this and see if we can provide checks and balances.
   i. Melva notes that there's a section in the IG proposal asking about how the specification will be maintained long term. There are no guarantees, but at least it's being considered, and it's one of the things that will go into the new process of the standards lifecycle. WGs also need to be better at closing projects when this happens.
ii. Josh: When it comes to approving projects, it can be hard to know which of them will succeed. If we raise the bar to have more criteria about long term maintenance, sometimes the market forces it to not be long term. Then those things should be closed and people should move on.

e. PBS Metrics PSS Review Step and Approval Criteria

   i. The PBS metrics team is doing a step on the PSS consensus review and asking for plans for addressing PBS metrics infractions before approval is granted.
   
   ii. Did a pilot where we made a separate JIRA ticket to address the PBS metrics infractions. The process became confusing and complicated, especially when the WGs had multiple issues to identify. Was difficult to determine what issues they’d addressed or communicated in a plan. They might have 6 items but they only address 2. Tying a separate tracker to a tracker subtask was too complicated. We’d like to stop that path.
   
   iii. Additionally, HL7 is getting a new membership and meetings database and we are getting into the time when staff will be wrapped up in testing and implementation. We’d like to put the PBS metrics on hold until January; the back and forth communication on it takes up a lot of time.
   
   iv. Riki: Reviewing PBS metrics was originally part of the steering division signoff and could go over to the WG reps, perhaps.
   
   v. Melva: I thought that the process was that the WG reps were supposed to be doing that review. I thought the PBS metrics team would put in the info about where the WG is with PBS metrics, and the reps would take it from there. Notifications were supposed to be sent to the WG reps. Riki notes that it would help if the subject line was clearer. Melva will work with Josh after the WGM to alter the PBS metrics task email.
   
   vi. Austin notes that the project leads are also confused about this since they often aren’t the cochairs who have to deal with it.
   
   vii. Riki brings up that some of them have multiple projects and we’d have to track progress.
   
   viii. Discussion over having office hours times so WGs have a time to discuss with staff. Riki suggests they should be by invitation to a specific group to go over things. Gora suggests the WG rep should also be present.

f. Co-chair training: Should be made mandatory initially and then at regular intervals

   i. Carry forward to next 90 minute call

   ii. Anne will send the items not approved today back to e-vote as they're resolved.

h. Policy for WG Zoom recordings

   i. Riki and Linda share proposal for discussion
   
   ii. Session attendees must agree to the recording
   
   iii. Reason for recording and how it will be used should be clearly stated
   
   iv. An attendee who has a question or comment but does not want to be recorded can request the recording be stopped by sending a private message to the host, and then the recording will be stopped and re-started.
   
   v. Suggested text for the custom message: "Recording of this session was agreed upon by the group. If you want your questions, demo or comments NOT to be recorded, please send a private chat to the host/co-host and they will stop the recording and call on you. Recording will be restarted when your portion has finished."

   ✔ Linda Michaelsen to discuss how the Zoom recording policy could be implemented with Dave and whether it would work in Whoava

   i. TSC member plans for in person in September

      i. Karen sent out an email referencing a previous survey on meeting in person in September.
      
      ii. Discussion over why the question is being asked and what it means for the future, and who should be making the decision. Should consider having a minimum number of in person meetings per year.
      
      iii. Meeting in person is still preferable to most people, although others won’t be able to travel due to individual or country restrictions while we’re still in a pandemic.

         ✔ Anne Wizauer to add the questions from the email to an e-vote

5. Parking Lot

   a. Revisit issue of having two implementers for STUs listed on PSS at the TSC retreat