Joint Initiative Council

JIC Executive Meeting
Wednesday 13th January 2016
20:00-21:00 UTC
Record of Discussion

Location: Teleconference via GoToMeeting

1.   Welcome, Apologies.

The chair welcomed the Council members to the meeting. Apologies are noted above.

2.   Minutes of last meeting (20151105 – face-to-face in Bern)

Approved.

3.   Agenda approval, requests for AOB

Agenda approved. It was also agreed that an update on the Trillium Bridge II would be covered under AOB.

4.   Review of actions from previous meeting

Action list: https://confluence.ihtsdotools.org/display/JIC/JIC+Action++List

Outstanding Actions:
  - o   20150624-01: Updating the Charter *[RDH to complete the final document and circulate for final approval. IHTSDO will work to coordinate getting everyone's signatures].* Update on 20160113: **Signatures from HL7, ISO/TC2015 and DICOM are still to be received.** Executives from those SDOs are asked to follow up with this as soon as possible please.

Other outstanding actions were listed as agenda items below…

5.   JIC Standard Set Work – Patient Summary

5.1.   Overview of progress – briefing note for discussion and feedback

5.1.1.   Workplan
Link to Briefing Document.
Link to Work Plan spreadsheet

The chair of the sub-group said there would be a Standard Set sub-group call the next evening as they are happening on a fortnightly basis. Their aim is to have something in draft form to the JIC by the September JIC meeting, for full discussion at the face-to-face in October. As outlined in the briefing document linked above, there are four task groups involved and they are working actively.

The chair stated that they would like the JIC to review and feedback on the draft workplan linked above – at this time focusing on the first two stages of *Detailed Use Case Development* and *Standards Identification and Analysis Options* for identifying and analyzing standards in a standards set.

An executive said that they had recently met with Canada Health Infoway to discuss some of their relevant use-cases. Another executive is also helping with the initial 'fleshing out' of the use-cases in terms of definitions, and over the next month they will work on a high-level draft.

5.1.2. Options for identifying and analyzing standards in a standards set – draft for discussion/feedback

Options for Identifying and Analyzing the Standards in a Standard Set document

An executive on the sub-group highlighted some items within the second draft of the Options document linked above. They said there were two reasons behind wanting to work on standards categorization as a starting point – the first is to be able to present standards in a coherent manner for reporting using categorizations (rather than just a broad listing), and the second is to be able to parse up the work, to organize it in terms of structural, transport, terminology and semantic standards etc. This will build on the work that other on the JIC have already done. The executive said there had been a desire to set up a more formalized ontology, but for now they have decided to organize things in a more straightforward manner.

It was asked if there were any questions and comments. An executive said they really liked the questions that were posed in the report, but they would like the report to say that it is targeted to interoperability within a domain. In their own previous work with NEHTA, the area they had trouble with was conformance, and they noted that conformance had been worked around in the report. They stated that there are standards for conformance, for architectures and for functional models, in terms of a global framework. The executive gave an example of "who are the actors within the domain, and what are the business processes?" as there are standards and specifications developed in that area. Another executive agreed, saying in terms of domain context the thought was how to implement and use patient summary in a domain, underpinned by conceptual and contextual standards. It will be interesting how to identify that within discussions. Thought needs to be given to exactly how important domain context standards are to this work. The executive agreed, saying there had been similar discussion with the Trillium Bridge work. Another executive said the purpose of categorization is for the person who wants to find and use things, so it is important the criterion is related to how users will read and understand it in order to know where to find things. The European community has invested in an interoperability framework, which should perhaps be considered here, and also we need to be careful about how words are used in different categories – words like "content" and "function" are used in different ways throughout the report. The chair of the sub-group replied that this was a valuable comment, and on the sub-group's December call one of the things that was

picked up with the interface with the different strands of work, so what is identified here will also be relevant to the implementation guidance documentation, and also the conformance assessment. All these different perspectives will be very valuable. An executive stated that if there are better words to use they are open to making changes. On interoperability frameworks, another executive said they were previously referring to HL7 Safe, the NEHTA Interoperability Framework and the e-Health Interoperability Framework Standards and Architecture Principles, which were turned into the Australian Standard Handbook. It was requested that they share these frameworks with the members of the JIC sub-group as they would be a useful reference. The executive agreed to do this.

Action 1	Interoperability frameworks to be shared internally within the JIC Standard Set sub-group.

An executive said they thought it was all very valuable work, and suggested that GS1 would fit in with point 1 on the report (on data-related standards). The sub-group executive agreed to this, and asked to be reminded of this. The sub-group chair asked the JIC executives to provide any comments to the sub-group on this working document..

Action 2	JIC executives to please provide feedback on the Options report.

6.   Unique Device Identifier (UDI) Update

Item deferred until the February meeting in order to include feedback from HL7.

7.   ISO TC 215 update on 80003 series

Item deferred to the February meeting, as at the time the necessary representatives from ISO-TC215 were not in attendance.

8.   New Business

8.1.   Update on Trillium Bridge

The following presentation was given:

https://confluence.ihtsdotools.org/download/attachments/21366833/Trillium%20Bridge%20II-20160113_JIC_shorter2.pptx?api=v2

Link to the refined EIF: http://ec.europa.eu/health/ehealth/docs/ev_20151123_co03_en.pdf

The JIC executives were asked for their support and input, and asked if the JIC could perhaps take on the task of developing the governance process. As noted in the presentation linked above, interested SDOs are invited to:

- Participate in the consortium as associated partners to influence the process
- Appoint a member to the SDO advisory group, and to
- Offer support through the JIC.

An executive asked the presenter if they thought that a coordinated JIC input (via a JIC sub-group) would be helpful over time, or do they see another SDO advisory group performing that

Joint Initiative Council

function? This is important as there is a need to avoid duplication. The presenter replied that these were three different options that were all possible, and they would welcome opinions. They thought that governance was an issue for the JIC, and asked what would be the easiest option? **It was agreed that that this could be added to the February meeting as a discussion point.**

An executive said it would be useful to know exactly what requires governing, as it would be useful to have clarity on this. The presenter replied that one thing would be the Standard Set, as it would need governance once it is defined. Another executive agreed that this would be a definite requirement of the Standard Set work, but asked what would need governance within Trillium II? The first executive said they thought that the presenter was referring to two separate things – the first is a clear request (which they supported) that if the JIC is producing a Starter Set then it will also set up governance over it, in order to make the applicable changes and modifications. If that were to happen within the progress of Trillium II, and if that project comes to the JIC to suggest changes, then the JIC could consider those changes within the broader context of the Starter Set and provide maintenance. Secondly, the other side is that as Trillium Bridge rolls out with pilot projects and there are real users of the Standards Set, then there is a requirement for some form of 'library' where people can deposit details of what they are doing which may be different to the standards. To they, this second point seems to be outside of the scope of the JIC.

Action 3	The JIC are asked to please review the Trillium II presentation prior to the discussion in February.

9. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned after the chair thanked the attendees for their time.

10. Next meeting

Confirmed as a teleconference on Wednesday 10th February at 21:00 UTC.