

JIC Executive Meeting

Wednesday 28th September 2016

20:00-21:00 UTC

Record of Discussion

Location: Teleconference via GoToMeeting

1. Welcome, Apologies.

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

2. Minutes of last meeting (20160706 - teleconference)

Approved.

3. Agenda approval, requests for AOB

Agenda approved. No new business was raised.

4. Review of actions from previous meeting

Outstanding Actions:

- **20160501-02, JIC Standard Set Work – Patient Summary:** Chairs to prepare updated materials so that a focused call for clinicians can be issued. *(see item 6 below)*
- **20160501-03, Unique Device Identifier:** UDI document to be updated with a chapter and annex *(see item 7 below)*
- **20160501-04, Unique Device Identifier:** Final review by small group should include the HL7 representations. *(see item 7 below)*
- **20160501-05, Unique Device Identifier:** JIC Member Review (ALL) *(see item 7 below)*

Other outstanding actions listed as agenda items below...

5. JIC Standards Set Work – Patient Summary

[PSSS Update Document](#)

[PSSS Work Plan](#)

The PSSS group's Chair summarized points in the update document linked above and then asked the PSSS sub-group chairs to provide any additional information.

One sub-group Chair stated that there had been a call that morning with the GS1 resources who would be helping with the work. She said they are asking great questions and had taken the Use Case Standard

Template that GDI put forward and were starting to use it. She stated that she was aiming for first preliminary draft by mid October, to then be developed and presented at the Oslo meeting.

Another PSSS group Chair reported that he had a Standard Set Identification call that coming Monday. He had received something on semantic standards that morning. He had various people working on the data standards, other working on the security privacy in IHE standards, and further input was coming on transport standards. He also extended appreciation to another group for the data set work they have been doing (which is 80-90% completed), as it has been very useful to his group at their beginning stages. He looked forward to providing further information in Oslo.

Another PSSS group Chair said that his group had had three meetings so far, and another was coming at the end of October, before Oslo. They have a first draft of their deliverable already drafted and currently out for detailed review by the task group members (with a copy submitted to the PSSS Chair). A framework to present conformity assessment has been agreed, and they were just waiting for the outputs from the other groups. Tables would soon be ready to populate so he was very happy with progress (though he would prefer to have received input from HL7).

An executive from IHE referred to the second issue in the PSSS Chair's document (2: *"The Patient Summary work in HL7 (INTERPAS) has restarted and identified interdependencies with JIC work. Also, there is the work in Europe on Patient summary with which various members of the JIC are involved. So questions are being raised about how things all fit together, is there duplication, how do we all create clear messages. This is to be a major topic for discussion and decisions at JIC in November."*) He stated that IHE's board had recognized that there is a lot of important work being done on Patient Summary by a number of different groups. IHE is represented within each of these groups, but these staff were not then very well connected internally. IHE therefore now have a task team of people who are involved in all these initiatives (such as the work being done in Europe, by HL7, and by the JIC), in order for them to stay connected. He wondered if any of the other SDOs face similar issues? An executive replied that HL7 have a number of working groups that touch upon the topic of Patient Summary, and so HL7 should take this opportunity to work with other SDOs. Another executive replied that perhaps there is a pressing need as individual SDOs to arrange for a day when different groups coming together to try and have a global summit on the issue of patient summary? This would be very helpful to get a status on it all, and to try and iron out some of the differences in approach and decide how a consolidated view could be presented to our stakeholders. Perhaps the JIC could facilitate this, although China in April 2017 is probably not the appropriate time? The JIC Chair agreed with this proposal, saying that one of the agenda items for Oslo is the fact that it is becoming a daunting process for SDOs to keep track of all the difference initiates and to understand what is required of each SDO by these groups. There are a number of initiatives in the EU that he met with recently, and so there is a definite need to discuss things to determine whether we invite all the SDOs to one of our meetings to tackle all the demands on the sub-sets of our standards. An executive agreed, saying that holding a summit or a well-planned all-day meeting in 2017 would be very wise. He thought the JIC's work should have progressed well by mid-year, to be able to take leadership and concrete information to look at. Another executive agreed that this was certainly something to discuss in Oslo, and given the input that is being asked of the JIC we need to have an agreed answer for them. Another executive said he fully supported this, as the JIC has much to contribute from a development role. He said that both the HL7 and EU projects have identified the JIC as a partner, so we should leverage that. He said that the next HIMSS in the US, or perhaps the WoHIT meeting could be an appropriate venue, or perhaps the ISO meeting later in 2017? He thought that there was urgency to the timing, so he hoped the JIC could move on it quickly. An executive said that thought should be given to who will cover the sponsorship of the work, and who will

lead it going forward? An executive said she wondered if some would consider getting some discussion going after the official end-time of the Oslo meeting? Another executive replied that unfortunately he would not be able to stay on, and the idea was left unresolved by others on the call.

The final PSSS group Chair was not on the call to update on his sub-group.

6. Unique Device Identifier (UDI) update

Executive responsible was not on the call so this was deferred to the Oslo meeting.

7. eStandards Development Lifecycle Discussion

Notes: RST circulated a revised endorsement statement to JIC executives on 3rd May 2016, asking for each SDO to follow its internal process to endorse the deliverable in the context of the JIC and accept (or reject) the revised wording in attached document. Alternatively, if organizations were also willing to provide an individual letter of endorsement for this deliverable, this was also welcomed.

Update from 20160706 - RST to send a follow-up to those SDOs who have yet to respond.

The responsible executive was not on the call, but another executive said that the eStandards work was aiming to produce a roadmap for the collaborative development of standards by SDOs. They are thinking that perhaps the Patient Summary could be something for them to explore, in order to try and see how the SDOs can work together in a more agile way in future. She hoped to have a first draft of the roadmap by June 2017, with progress updates along the way.

Action 1	JIC Chair to follow up to discern which SDOs (if any) had yet to supply statements.
-----------------	---

8. Agenda item suggestions for the November face-to-face

It was agreed that the following items would be included on the agenda for Oslo:

- JIC Patient Summary Standard Set
- UDI Update (CCH)
- A FHIR discussion (including what HL7 want from the JIC and SDOs).
- Discussion on International Patient Summary (IPS) project, commissioned by the European Commission (including an update on the work plan for the CEN project, and an update on the HL7 INTERPAS project by Rob Hausam)
- Election for new JIC Chair (DSW's tenure ends on 1st Feb 2017), plus potential new secretariat.
- Better process for signifying approval (*as mentioned on this call*)

9. New business

9.1. International Patient Summary (pre discussion before Oslo)

[IPS briefing doc](#)

An executive ran through the information in the briefing document linked above. Another executive said there had been discussion on this at DICOM, and he said it was worth clarifying points about Emergency Care, as some of it could be ambiguous. He said that with Emergency Care you talk about a patient who has a home doctor, but who is then treated by an emergency doctor. There are at least two Use Case scenarios

there - one way would be for the emergency doctor to prepare a summary of care that the home doctor can review, in order to understand and import the details of the emergency care to home. The other example would be like a summary of the patient's home care (like in a 'medic alert' bracelet) where a summary of that could be made available to the emergency doctor. Both have the flavor of a "pre-prepared" summary, (i.e. When the emergency doctor discharged the patient they would prepare a summary for the patient to bring with them). The other way would be accessing on-demand, so it might be useful to make these dimensions clearer in the documentations. The presenter said this was an excellent example of how people do think differently when it comes to patient summary. She said that the information coming back (the report) had not been covered but she thought this should be explored at the second stage, so something like a vision paper was needed. An executive agreed, saying there is a logical sequence to building up the data set content related to all scenarios, so this was a very valuable starting point.

Action 2	The JIC Chair asked everyone to review CCH's briefing document (linked above) thoroughly before the meeting in Oslo, and to identify key points to feed into the discussion.
-----------------	--

9.2. Pilot Implementations at the Olympic Games

An executive stated that he had two more points to raise. On the topic of 'Pilot Implementations' (covered under the Trillium Bridge II piece) he wanted to report back that a few years ago IHE had intended to offer a demonstration of interoperability in Patient Summary at the Olympic games but it was unfortunately put on hold. He said he would soon be meeting with the CIO of the Rio Olympic games to help him to determine whether his demonstration ideas would be viable at a further games and, if so, if she would help getting something in place?

9.3. JIC Endorsements

The executive second point was related to governance of the HL7 and E-Standards projects. He said that asking the JIC to endorse items is a very cumbersome process, so he wondered if there could be a more streamlined procedure developed for engaging and endorsing in projects more directly? An executive said this could be discussed in Oslo, but part of his legal training in mediation states that to get an agreement you need the right people at the table, so to speak on behalf of other organizations that haven't been consulted would be troublesome (as some would see delegations as fairly limited). There is an implied view that the Chair could speak on behalf of the JIC without having specific authorization, but this wouldn't go as far as committing resources. The presenter said that delegates for the JIC represent their organizations, so maybe the empowerment model where they could come forward and give their concurrence via a vote, rather than having to produce documents, would be an option?

The JIC's Chair agreed to add this to the agenda for Oslo, to try and come up with a workable solution where each organization clearly designates someone to speak on their behalf. The JIC would make it very clear that an endorsement on something from the Council would be based on the vote of those individuals. He stated that the JIC executives would, however, need to look at the legality of it. An executive agreed, saying that the JIC's Charter should empower the representatives to vote on behalf of their organization, so he would review the Charter before Oslo to bring that detail to the discussion.

Action 3	The JIC Charter to be reviewed before the Oslo meeting, in preparation for the discussion on forming a better process for signifying approval.
-----------------	--

No further new business was raised.

10. Adjournment

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

11. Next meeting

Confirmed as a Face-to-face meeting in Oslo:

Verkstedsvæien 1 , 0277 Skøyen Oslo, Norway (*exact room TBC*)

Date: Friday 18th November 2016

Time: 9:00 to approx. 14:00 local time (*including a working lunch*)

Note: Timing can be extended if necessary.