2019-05-04 TSC WGM Agenda/Minutes

TSC Saturday meeting for Montreal WGM

HL7 TSC Meeting Minutes
Location: Salon 3
Date: 2019-05-04
Time: 9:00 am

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Affiliation</th>
<th>Q1</th>
<th>Q2</th>
<th>Q3</th>
<th>Q4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Calvin Beebe</td>
<td>HL7 Board Chair</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giorgio Cangioli</td>
<td>HL7 Affiliate Representative</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lorraine Constable</td>
<td>HL7 ARB Co-Chair</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jean Duteau</td>
<td>HL7 Affiliate Representative</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Floyd Eisenberg</td>
<td>HL7 Clinical SD Co-Chair</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chuck Jaffe</td>
<td>HL7 CEO (member ex officio w/o vote)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tony Julian</td>
<td>HL7 ARB Co-Chair</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Knapp</td>
<td>HL7 Infrastructure SD Co-Chair</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austin Kreisler</td>
<td>TSC Chair</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wayne Kubick</td>
<td>HL7 CTO (TSC member ex officio w/vote)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ken McCaslin</td>
<td>Adhoc Member</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Kay McDaniel</td>
<td>Administrative SD Co-Chair</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riki Merrick</td>
<td>Administrative SD Co-Chair</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melva Peters</td>
<td>HL7 Clinical SD Co-Chair</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Roberts</td>
<td>Adhoc Member - GOM Expert</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia Lorenzi</td>
<td>HL7 Organizational Support SD Co-Chair</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandra Stuart</td>
<td>HL7 Organizational Support SD Co-Chair</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anne Wizauer</td>
<td>(scribe, non-voting)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Quorum Requirements (Co-chair +5 with 2 SD Reps) Met: (yes/No)

Agenda Topics

Q1 - 9 am to 10:30 am
1. Roll Call and Introduction of visitors (including declaration of interests)
2. Additions to, and acceptance of, agenda
3. Temperature check
4. Check e-vote on FHIR Ballot Expectations
5. Co-chair accountability
   a. Signoff concept, certifying that they've reviewed precepts/code of ethics upon election and re-election
   b. List of signoff materials
6. Emeritus status request from Amnon Shvo
7. Elect TSC Representative to Nominations Committee

Q2 - 11 am to 12:30 pm
1. Requests to open up licenses on other standards, similar to the FHIR model
2. Streamlining Project Approvals
   a. Confluence forms
3. Accelerated projects check-in
   a. Should we assign liaisons to projects other than Da Vinci?

Q3 - 1:45 pm to 3 pm
1. WG Health/PBS Metrics Vitality Assessment
   a. Rewarding positive behavior
   b. Expectations for responding to STU comments - should this be a WG health or PBS metrics measure?

2. Handling ballot vs. non-ballot comments during the ballot period and how they're reflected in reconciliation

Q4 - 3:30 pm to 5pm

1. Tooling update
   a. JIRA balloting update
   b. Tracker
   c. Publishing

2. Reviewing/updating guidance documents

3. Messaging to the board, cochairs this week

Sunday evening Agenda Topics

1. ArB/BAM
2. Product Management Groups
   a. CDAMG
   b. FMG
   c. V2MG

Wednesday lunch

1. Issues that have arisen so far this week

Minutes/Conclusions Reached:

Q1 - 9 am to 10:30 am

1. Roll Call and Introduction of visitors (including declaration of interests)
   a. No guests this quarter

2. Additions to, and acceptance of, agenda
   a. Added messaging to board, cochairs for the week

3. Temperature check
   a. Group reviewed what’s going well, what we need to improve upon, and what is going on in their lives. Suggestions to improve communication throughout the organization. Bringing in new communities has been successful in some ways and challenging in others. Much of the organization wants us to move more quickly than we're able to. Need to figure out how to support the rapid changes in the organization. Multiple organizations are trying to do the same stuff we are with no understanding of how to do engage with us. We seem to be doing less churning on things over and over. Need to find ways to be proactive rather than reactive so we're not dealing with things urgently. Need to do better with our documentation on policies and procedures so people can find them. Need to continue to simplify our processes. Should look at increased participation and cooperation with other SDOs. Need to clarify the role of HTA. We spend too much time on minor details without focusing enough on the big issues. Not looking enough at and addressing risks to the organization. How do we accommodate new communities and accelerators? How do we support implementers and work with other standards organizations? Need to spend more time actually steering rather than on the technical details. Steering divisions aren't doing much steering. US Realm Steering Committee wants to do detail work. Need to start thinking about how we shift from tactical to strategic. Need to review board strategy at each WGM and once between WGMs. TSC members can bring things to the agenda. Need to work better with other SDOs in the US.

4. Check e-vote on FHIR Ballot Expectations
   a. Reviewed comments.
   b. Tony’s comments: Document says it’s expectations and guidelines. HL7 has established policies regarding modal verbs - must, should, shall. Should use those correctly in policy. If there are no comments, why can’t the content go to STU? Rules should be consistent.
   c. Jean: Why is this specific for FHIR and not for everybody? Lorraine: Part of SGB review was that we were going to take this and generalize it.
   d. Need to send back to SGB so they can review with these comments. If it’s going to be policy we need it to contain instructions not aspiration. For any given policy we go forth with the attitude that the policy locations are transparent and easy to find.

   ACTION: Anne Wizauer to add to SGB agenda tomorrow.

5. Co-chair accountability
   a. Signoff concept, certifying that they’ve reviewed precepts/code of ethics upon election and re-election
   b. List of signoff materials
      i. The new cochair handbook is on Confluence but still needs work. When it’s complete we can point people to it.
      ii. Signoff concept would be great but perhaps they should have to answer questions to prove that you read it. What happens if they answer incorrectly? Concern that this makes things more complex.
      iii. PIC will now work on the handbook to update. Precepts, for example aren’t in the handbook yet. We are relying on experienced cochair to train the incoming cochairs. Problem is when misinformation propagates. As of 2020, cochairs will be elected in July, announced in September, and start their terms Jan 1. That will give us some time for education. Discussion over how this decision was made and what the review period was. PIC was unaware. Went out with recommended GOM changes for peer review but it was missed by many.
      iv. Perhaps the questions come after the nomination rather than the election. There is a risk that this could become a catchment for everything we could imagine a cochair would need. Should identify the filter we’re using for what goes in. Otherwise it will become too big. Need to segregate essential things. Should also clearly articulate the commitment that is being made and the time it takes. Need to update the language to include shall, should, may, shall not.
1. MOTION: Set up a task force to create a new version of the cochair handbook, including the process of reviewing and demonstrating signoff and creating a plan for ongoing maintenance: Wayne/MK

2. VOTE: All in favor

6. Emeritus status request from Amnon Shvo
   a. Amnon is a long term cochair of Clinical Genomics and would like to be an emeritus cochair. It was presented as an idea to apply to anyone who would like to be an emeritus cochair, and we do have a proposed GOM update going up for peer review including this issue. The proposed change is a new section that says that emeritus cochairs will have all the privileges and rights of a regular cochair. Why don't they just run? TSC is directed to make comments on the email that will come from the GOC. Suggestion that they shouldn't have voting rights unless they run. There is no criteria with this proposal as it's currently written.
   i. MOTION that it's the consensus of the TSC that co-chair authority should not be added to the current definition of emeritus status in the GOM: Lorraine/Paul
      ii. VOTE: Jean opposed. Remaining in favor.
   iii. MOTION that the TSC recommends that work group cochair emeritus positions not be allowed: Jean/Melva
   iv. VOTE: Giorgio abstains. Remaining in favor.

b. Lorraine asks for status on the GOM update that the GOC was working on. Melva has been pushing hard to get volunteers to help review. The original task was to fix the table of contents, not review and edit the whole document. Melva welcomes any volunteers. Lorraine states they could bring problems back to ARB. Wayne notes that we can do everything ourselves and need to find people to delegate to. Austin suggests that on Monday night the steering divisions drum up some volunteers for our key issues. Tony notes that the GOC has not been open to edits.

Q2 - 11 am to 12:30 pm

1. Elect TSC Representative to Nominations Committee
   a. The committee is generally the SD cochairs that are not up for re-election. This year it will be Paul, Jean, Melva, Riki, and Virginia. The TSC chair position is also open for new nominations.
   ACTION: Anne Wizauer send out Doodle poll to schedule call of nominations committee in May

2. Requests to open up licenses on other standards, similar to the FHIR model
   a. This is a request from CDAMG and V2MG to the executive committee. This originated from a non-member student at a university who wanted to do a mapping project between CDA and FHIR, but they read the license agreement for CDA and they were not allowed to create derivative products based on the license restrictions. Main question is why we're licensing our products differently? FHIR has its own licensing policy. CDA and V2 are asking for one similar to FHIR, an open source creative commons license. Still assert logo and copyright authority. This just closes how we use the product. Concern that it will further decrease membership, although it hasn't seemed to be a factor before. Would mean a change in publishing process and can't be implemented until new web specs are ready.
   b. Calvin notes that using our standards requires a click through and registering with the website. Could remove the mechanisms to get the standard without giving up control. Could just remove the click through, but that doesn't cover the right to create derivative works issue. Need to understand the potential impacts. There are layers of issues. We could choose to make this all open source but could have serious consequences. We have gained some big members but we haven't recovered what we originally had. Discussion that this isn't the same level of change as our original IP change.
   c. Board is discussing new business models - this should be part of that conversation.
   d. Calvin asks what options might be less vs. more risky. The visibility of a standard on the web is limited because of the way we've protected it with click through. Would making this more web accessible and having a license agreement as part of the package be a step that would appease the community? Tony: I don't see any difference between that and ISO. You can find a standard and read a snippet, protected it with click through. Would making this more web accessible and having a license agreement as part of the package be a step that would appease the community? Tony: I don't see any difference between that and ISO. You can find a standard and read a snippet, but then you have to pay money to get it.
   e. Discussion over the 90 day delay for non members. Do our members find that to be an important benefit?
   f. Virginia: Encouraging students to look at HL7 is important. We could change the license agreement to allow for academic use. Their issue was they would not be able to publish, which is the case with anyone with controlled materials.
   g. Is there a recommendation out of the TSC for the board discussion?
   i. MOTION to inform the board that TSC is concerned with impact on membership and recommends it be examined by BoD business model group: Wayne/Lorraine
   ii. VOTE: All in favor

3. Streamlining Project Approvals
   a. Confluence forms
      i. There is an online PSS workflow pilot that is slow to get up and running. There is a non-dynamic form in use, but the dynamic form is in pilot.
      ii. There is an idea to make another form to register intent to initiate a project to give time to engage interested parties and identify potential problems early. Would happen before you do the PSS and then be triaged.
      iii. Reviewed Tony's proposal of registering project intent. Avoids project shopping. Would be a subcommittee of the TSC comprised of people with domain experience to know where things should go. This process was described in the BAM.
      iv. Reviewed Austin's proposal. Form a project review board with representation from each SD, product MGs, International rep and a US Realm rep. Doesn't approve projects, but makes sure appropriate people/groups are involved. In conjunction with doing this, we can take advantage of listener pages and registries. Want to make this a lightweight process. This should make simplification downstream possible. Project could be proposed by a WG or proponents outside of a WG. Group doesn't approve projects but can make a recommendation to the TSC that something shouldn't move forward.
      v. It's an opportunity to catch other things, like if something is truly a new product family, or if there is a lot of external content already developed. Discussion over what problem this actually solves. Catches issues earlier instead of when it reaches TSC. Josh reports it would be easy to add a beginning section to the PSS with a pre-triage section in the workflow. Lorraine thinks it should be separate from the current form but then it carries forward into the current form.
      vi. After the PSS is written and introduced into the workflow, instead of going through all the current approval steps, there would be a review period in which all groups (US Realm, product management groups, SDs, TSC) review the proposed project. During this time groups can request to be a cosponsor, request changes, identify issues, and make other recommendations. Lorraine suggests this should come after the sponsoring WG approval. PSS should be collected and annotated with the WG monitoring and responding. TSC makes final approval. Jean notes that this is a fundamental change to the cochair role.
      vii. Discussion over having groups certify that they looked at it even if they don't have to officially vote. Discussion over groups that don't fill out the Notice of Intent to Project - still don't catch those. Could make failure to register projects a WG health measure. Review participation could also be a WG health measure. Discussion over whether just cochairs are responding to the review period or if the groups themselves are reviewing, and if the groups are reviewing does there have to be an e-vote? We need to
Q3 - 1:45 pm to 3 pm

1. Accelerated projects check-in
   a. Reviewed MK’s Da Vinci slides.
      i. The updated PDoX PSS will be coming to TSC hopefully this week. There are 15 PSSs with 17 IGs. WGs should review the updates. All calls are under Da Vinci rather than the primary sponsoring WG. Discussion over all of the comments anticipated to come in on the early-opening ballots and the workload.
      ii. Concern that the sponsoring committee and cosponsors have not yet reviewed the material. Reviewed dates for out of cycle ballot. WGs will have to review in the next couple of weeks.
      iii. Da Vinci has done a good job with external communication. The paid reviewer program announced in March received a very light response.
   b. Other accelerator projects are coming forward.
      i. CARIN: They are updating blue button for R4 to make unified which is required in CMS rules. Have been developing it independently so far but need to bring it into HL7. There is a draft SOU covering this that hasn’t been signed yet. Expecting a PSS to come forward soon. Wayne notes they want to skip the ballot process and publish without balloting. People are publishing FHIR IGs that aren’t HL7, for example. CARIN is going to create this thing outside of our current process but then they’re going to want us to maintain it. We may need to develop a fast path process to get to something that is published but doesn’t have the intention of becoming an ANSI normative product. Jean: You shouldn’t be able to come in with something that gets a stamp of approval without procedure. Da Vinci is working the process, why can’t the others? Lorraine: We only have in WG minutes that CMMI wants to have a similar alternate process for their archetypes. Wayne: If an organization is willing to come in and become members we need to figure out a way to accommodate them.
      ii. Gravity: This is a collaboration among clinical expert groups developing standards around social determinants of health. They would like to come in but also have no interest in the balloting process. MK: The biggest user of all of the social determinants is Medicaid. They already are passing this information built out. If you want Medicare to use it is has to be put into a reg.
      iii. Is it appropriate to come in to get our stamp without our process? Wayne: It would have to be treated as a completely different product line. We can’t blur the lines and make it a different product offering. Our community will end up providing support and it could be a business risk. Wayne notes that the CARIN draft agreements include provisions for them bringing in people to do work, follow our process, and a maintenance plan, etc. Need to communicate agreements to WGs.
      iv. TSC will need to understand what controls are in place.
   c. Should we assign liaisons to projects other than Da Vinci?
      i. We will want projects coming in to have a liaison to the TSC. We also need a TSC-appointed liaison.

2. WG Health/PBS Metrics Vitality Assessment
   a. Melva reports on the activities of the task force. Went through all of the WG health metrics and the PBS metrics.
      i. M&C: Recommended change to 5 year review from 2
      ii. SWOT: Change to 5 year review from 3
      iii. Balloting: Current metric is this cycle plus two previous; would change to current plus previous 5
      iv. Minutes: Should add “approved minutes must be posted on Confluence.”
      v. Listserve activity: Discussion over the fact that we have more communication channels now (Zulip, Confluence)
      vi. Confluence space: All groups have a page but some aren’t using it and some haven’t cleaned up their pages. Another issue is what is the source of truth for the M&C, SWOT, DMP.
      vii. Harmonization: Recommendation to remove and add a new measure when the new process is rolled out.
      viii. Concalls: No change
      ix. Participation in SD telecons or SD votes: No change but votes should be done in Confluence with WGs in alphabetical order. Should standardize the way results are reported.
      x. SD/TSC elections: Currently if you don’t participate, it counts against you for two cycles. Recommendation was that it just counts for the election cycle.
      xi. No change to the rest.
      xii. Wayne suggested adding tooling liaison and 1 year check in with EST. EST did a call for liaisons last week and got a fair response. Discussion over how to monitor. EST will have to work out a process.
      xiii. Discussion over rewarding positive behaviors. Gold star isn’t a carrot for people who don’t care, but it’s a useful carrot for many.
   b. PBS metrics
      i. 3 year plan items: recommend to remove and only count open items
      ii. Items behind >120 days: recommended new weighting. Austin suggests it doesn’t need to be earlier than 5 years, although that could affect the reaffirmations.
      iii. Discussion over how groups actually use PI. Some groups use it frequently and some hardly at all. Dave reports that people aren’t diligent about updating it. Confluence/JIRA may make PI obsolete.
      iv. Reviewed ballot management health items, a new category of things moved out of PBS metrics.
         1. Reaffirmations: if we get rid of the 3 year plan, instead we would need to be diligent for creating project placeholders to determine when reaffirmation, new release, or withdrawal process needs to be started. A year’s notice may not be enough if there’s new work.
         2. Could put a sunset date on all projects that, if you haven’t taken action on it, it goes away. WGs should have to reassert that the project is still active. It would be periodic review. Would get rid of the 120 day measure.

ACTION: Anne Wizauero update Project Health cell to reflect PBS metrics color

3. Discussion over what SDs do when someone is yellow or red in PBS metrics and they want to do a new project. SDs don’t currently hold up projects. If groups are red, their projects should be held up. PBS metrics would have to be recalculated after they address things and Dave can certify it.
   a. MOTION that if WGs are red, they can’t initiate net new work (excludes reaffirmations and withdrawals) until PBS metrics are cleaned up: Lorraine/Piki
b. VOTE: All in favor
c. SD cochairs to alert red WGs at SD meetings on Monday night

4. Outstanding questions are about the communication channels and tooling. Discussion over if there should be a metric about cochairs not attending meetings. Should we add one about projects being done without notification? There was another idea to have a metric around deadline appeals. Perhaps we have quality audits on balloting, such as reconciliation packages. Discussion over what to do with idle ballots. Should close projects that are idle. There are active ballot items without reconciliation packages that don’t count as unpublished.

ACTION: Anne Wizauer to send out the three pieces of the WG Health vitality spreadsheet for e-vote, one per week.

c. Expectations for responding to STU comments - should this be a WG health or PBS metrics measure?

4. Q4 - 3:30 pm to 5pm

1. Handling ballot vs. non-ballot comments during the ballot period and how they’re reflected in reconciliation

a. Non-ballot comments should not be elevated to the status of a ballot comment. Original guidance around weighting comments was to make it clear that ballot comments have priority. Reviewed Lloyd’s comments regarding how JIRA balloting will change the way comments come in. The new balloting process will know who has signed up for a ballot pool. Jean notes he’s found an amazing amount of stuff that explains numerous issues as part of his work to re-do the ballot desktop. We need to circulate why we’re doing these things, because they are ANSI requirements. Jean feels FHIR doesn’t care at all about the ANSI parts of our organization, and the way that Lloyd is building the balloting piece is that things are basically always being balloted. It removes the motivation to ballot and be an ANSI accredited organization. Lorraine: Need to figure out what our requirements are in the new system, and TSC hasn’t been properly informed on what is going into the JIRA balloting process. We don’t really understand the impacts of what’s being proposed. Need a walkthrough of the intentions of the design. Discussion over timelines and delays on the project. Need to find a lightweight way that anyone someone is doing something, there is a review and check/balance so it’s not all on one person’s shoulders.

b. Looking at Lloyd’s comment, are we saying that between the point where the ballot opens and closes, non-balloters can raise things to a ballot level issue? Also the equivalent of block votes will occur. Tony: I asked Lloyd if the rules were still as specified on a wiki page, and he said yes. That wiki page said balloters have to submit a spreadsheet. The new ballot system will not include any spreadsheets. You put in a vote record that points to a comment record. You can only make a vote record during the ballot period. Austin: My understanding was this was the first step in moving everything we ballot to JIRA. Need to examine the difference between this and the SGB policy.

i. Guest arrives: HL7 Norway representative

ii. Reviewed draft precept from SGB and Jean’s comment. The draft precept says that all ballot comments for STU, Informative, and Normative will be considered and have a disposition applied. Comments received through non-ballot processes will be considered at the discretion of the committee. In Lloyd’s JIRA balloting system, all comments come in are initially non-ballot. Jean’s comment states that STUs and Informative don’t currently have a requirement to resolve negatives or seek withdrawals.

i. The precept was developed because WGs were instructed that non-ballot comments on normative material took precedence over ballot comments for STU during reconciliation. There are a lot of pieces that we’re going to have to tease out of the balloting process. The reason FHIR handled the comments that way was a time issue.

ii. Wayne: The bigger issue is back to the web publishing, and we’re further diminishing the value of membership. We can’t keep giving people reasons not to be members. Discussion over discovered items, which is they the precept allows for committee discretion. But if you want to guarantee that your item is considered, you become a member and respond to the ballot.

iii. Calvin: It could say comments received through non-ballot processes will not be considered as a part of the ballot. Discussion over considering net new features. Do we think there should be a ballot participation advantage over an open comment period? If you put ballot comments above and you cease considering non-ballot comments then it becomes an actual member benefit. Should this precept help preserve the value of membership? Everyone agrees.

ACTION: Anne to add the draft precept on ballot vs. non-ballot comments to SGB agenda

2. Tooling update

a. JIRA balloting update

i. JIRA tracking is the current issue that we need to resolve before JIRA balloting. Testing will start after the WGM with a pilot in June/July. Discussion over whether there will be a period of time where people are doing both JIRA and the current Gforge process. Lorraine reports that Lloyd expects a hard cutover. Want to go live in between the September and January ballots.

ii. Need to also plan training and communication regarding what we expect of cochairs when we roll over. Spreadsheets will point to JIRA trackers instead of gforge.

iii. Who owns the transition strategy? Need someone to coordinate.

3. Reviewing/updating guidance documents

a. Need to set up a subcommittee to start looking at those. That’s part of the scope of the cochair handbook project we identified earlier. Wiki documents that don’t apply anymore should have “THIS NO LONGER APPLIES” on the top of the page. The current scope of the subcommittee is the things listed on the TSC Guidance page. Should check for overlap in the procedures section. Subcommittee should triage the documents for what should be updated or thrown out.

4. Messaging to the board, cochairs this week

a. no net new project for WGs with projects in the red

b. new WG health metrics being developed

c. looking for volunteers for TSC guidance document updates

d. deadline for Jan ballot will be a month before the Sep WGM

i. Initial PSS deadline will go back to Dave’s deadline

1. MOTION that WGs have sponsoring WG-approved PSS to Dave by 5/24, and remind people that sending to the PMO doesn’t initiate any of the other approval steps: Paul/Melva

2. VOTE: All in favor

5. Adjourned at 5:05 PM