



**Joint Initiative on SDO Global Health Informatics Standardization
Joint Working Group (WG9)**

Meeting Minutes

Meeting 1
Brisbane, Australia
August 26 2007

CEN Co-Chair	HL7 Co-Chair	ISO Co-Chair	Secretariat
Kees Molenaar	Charles Jaffe	Don Newsham	Elizabeth Hanley
gc.molenaar@minvws.nl	cjaffe@hl7.org	DonNewsham@SierraSyst ems.com	Elizabeth.hanley@standards .org.au

Attendance

Country	Name
Australia	David Rowlands
Australia	Richard Dixon Hughes
Australia	Elizabeth Hanley
Australia	Heather Grain
Australia	Chris Mount
Australia	Anthony Maeder
Australia	Graeme Miller
Australia	Grahame Grieve
Brazil	Beatriz Leao
Brazil	Lincoln Moura
Canada	Grant Gillis
Canada	Marion Lyver
Canada	Don Newsham
Canada	Kathryn Hannah
Canada	Ross Fraser
Finland	Hillevi Vuori
Finland	Tecmapekka Virtanen
Germany	Bernd Blobel
France	Alice Rideau
Japan	Michio Kimura
Japan	Ken Toyoda
Japan	Kouichi Kita
Korea	Yun S Kwak
The Netherlands	William Goossen
The Netherlands	Shirin Golyardi
The Netherlands	Luuc Posthumus
Norway	Knut Lindelien
Russia	Ivan Emelin
Singapore	Lim Bee Kwan
Singapore	Quek Hui Nar
Sweden	Karin Kajbjer

Sweden	Gunnar Klein
Sweden	Ragnar Nordberg
Turkey	Nihat Akpinar
Turkey	Nihat Yurt
United Kingdom	Dipak Kalra
United Kingdom	Jeremy Thorp
United Kingdom	Melvin Reynolds
United Kingdom	Martin Severs
United Kingdom	Nick Brown
United Kingdom	Stephen Kay
United Kingdom	Ian Shepherd
USA	Gary Dickinson
USA	Charles Jaffe
USA	LuAnn Whittenburg
USA	Ed Hammond
USA	John Ritter
USA	Audrey Dickerson
USA	Todd Cooper
USA	Jason Rock
USA	Randy Levin
USA	Amnon Shabo
USA	Jim McLees
USA	Lori Reed Fourquet
USA	Chris Chute

1 Welcome and Introductions

Don Newsham, chair of the first meeting of the Joint Initiative Working Group (JWG), opened the meeting and noted that many of those present were involved in multiple Standards Development Organisations (SDO), for instance, HL7, CEN, IHTSDO, and ISO.

Ed Hammond, Chair of the Joint Initiative Council, stated that CEN, HL7 and ISO were the SDOs participating in the Joint Initiative presently, and that the Joint Initiative is a significant achievement in the world of healthcare standards. The intention is to share work programs in the JWG and to produce one Standard in a reasonable length of time.

He further stated that the processes for this will be developed in the JWG, and that the JWG is an open group.

Don Newsham noted that the majority of time is to be spent on work program harmonization and joint initiatives. He noted that there were a number of convenors and ISO Heads of Delegation at the JWG meeting whose role would be to inform the JWG of initiatives from their respective groups, and how to accommodate the joint initiative work that has to be done.

- a) Agenda review
The agenda was confirmed.

2 Joint Initiative Charter Update

- a) HL7 / ISO / CEN
It was noted that the Charter has been approved by all three participating SDOs, that is, CEN/TC215, ISO/TC215 and the HL7 Board have approved the Charter.

Gary Dickinson stated that there were a number of comments from the US. Ed Hammond reported that the preceding meeting dealt with the collation of comments, and that some comments were editorial, some misunderstandings were clarified, and that one change to the goal will be considered at the ISO Executive Council meeting to follow the JWG meeting. An updated Charter would be made available at the ISO/TC215 meeting, incorporating any agreed changes.

Kathryn Hannah stated that the Charter needed to be disseminated widely as she considered that there was considerable disinformation apparent at a recent meeting of the IMMIA general assembly. She noted the perceived lack of transparency, and that poor communication is a major issue.

Action 1.1: Secretariat for Joint Initiative Council to convene a meeting to review comments from the US.

Action 1.2: Secretariat for Joint Initiative Council to distribute the revised Charter to each participating SDO (secretaries) and to post it on the ISO/TC215 website and the Sharepoint.

- b) Future additional SDOs
Future SDOs were identified as follows: IEEE; DICOM; IHTSDO; and LOINC.
IHTSDO was identified as being of high priority interest for joint initiative work

A key element in determining additional SDO participants is that there needs to be work on commonality or overlapping work items with that SDO, which could be improved upon in terms of co-operation and collaboration. The aim is to be open and inclusive, and to resolve issues using an agreed decision process leading to an integrated work program for international standardization needs.

Ed Hammond stated that it was decided to start work with formal SDOs but if there is a need for a joint initiative with non-SDO organizations, then those other organisations would be approached.

Gary Dickinson asked if the Joint Council would use a casting vote system to resolve counteracting issues. Ed Hammond stated that the success of the Joint Initiative depends on respect and co-operation of the three groups involved, and an intent to resolve issues as they emerge; recognising the need to work together; and to develop a compromise position that will move standards development forward.

3 Working Group Structure

a) Scope (from Charter)

The JWG provides “the discussion, liaison, advisory and communication forum for achieving the goals of the Joint Initiative Council on SDO Global Health Informatics Standardization. This JWG is a planning, process determination and co-ordinating group that makes recommendations to the Joint Initiative Council on resolving gaps, overlaps or issues of counterproductive standardization. “

Issues identified by those present were as follows:

- Collection of comprehensive information on work programs;
- Developing common processes for harmonisation activities;
- Identification of gaps and evidence of decisions to resolve gaps;
- The need to consider the complete standards lifecycle, including the review process;
- Responsiveness to stakeholder needs.

It was agreed that the following functions should be included in the JWG’s scope:

- Investigation and analysis;
- Liaison / stakeholder engagement;
- Education.

b) Structure

Gunnar Klein enquired if the Joint Initiative would be selective in terms of membership of the JWG. Don Newsham stated that the JWG would not hold closed meetings, and in regard to the Joint Initiative Council’s responsibility to identify JWG members, this would mean extending an invitation to people with specific and relevant expertise. Ed Hammond stated that the JWG would not be a replacement of CEN, HL7 and ISO, and that it would be a dynamic expert group, responsible for co-ordination and facilitation. Stephen Kay noted that the JWG should refer issues back to the SDOs.

It was reported that the co-chairs of the JWG represent ISO/TC215, CEN/TC 251 and HL7, with Charles Jaffe as the HL7 co-chair, and Kees Molenaar (Melvin Reynolds as substitute for Kees Molenaar at this meeting) as the CEN co-chair.

c) Process for ISO Co-Chair / Convenor

The JWG is hosted by ISO/TC 215. Dr Kwak stated that the convenorship of the JWG is an exceptional situation, and that an exception should be made in this case to appoint the ISO co-chair / Convenor at the Executive Council meeting after the JWG meeting, rather than following the usual ISO TC215 procedures.

d) Secretariat

The secretariat for this Joint Working Group is hosted by ISO/TC215 for all SDOs and has been accepted by Standards Australia. The secretariat, Elizabeth Hanley, will co-ordinate with secretariats of the 3 SDO, will provide all JWG secretariat services, and will be the single point of communication for the Joint Working Group.

4 ISO / CEN / HL7 Work Program Harmonization

Don Newsham tabled a preliminary summary of the ISO, CEN and HL7 work programs sourced prior to the JWG meeting. Three categories of projects were identified:

- Current joint initiative work items, for example, data types.
- Joint items being undertaken by one or more SDOs eg Audit trails.
- Apparently similar projects on multiple work programs (more analysis on these would clarify if they are similar).

Issues raised by those present were as follows:

- Should published work be included?
- Should preliminary work items be included to allow identification of proposed work?
- The challenge to request the developers of active work items to consider harmonization with other similar projects;
- The need for further information about active work items, that is, description and project completion status;
- Some projects may not have the potential to become joint work items for example, health cards, mandated health care identification requirements;
- Public access to the summary of the collected SDO work programs;
- A number of sets of use case initiatives are currently underway;
- Prioritisation of standards work is needed to make interoperability work;
- A roadmap in high priority areas is needed to explain how the standards fit together.

It was agreed that:

- the summary list of work items from ISO, CEN and HL7 work programs was a useful tool (with basic description and status information included);
- the summary of participating SDO work plans should be maintained, including current and preliminary work items;
- a priority view by domain or use case would add value.

Richard Dixon Hughes, Jeremy Thorp and Ross Fraser expressed their interest in working on identification of priorities.

5 Current Harmonization work Updates

a) 13606 Electronic Health Record Communication

Dipak Kalra noted the following harmonisation issues regarding 13606:

- Mapping between 13606 and HL7 (classes and attributes; the HL7 patient administration SIG is looking at mapping with 13606);
- Part 5 may need to go to the SOA HL7 SIG;
- Archetypes / templates / HL7 V 3 clinical statements;
- Further task work on 13606 and HL7 harmonization will take place at the upcoming HL7 Meeting in Atlanta and continue at the Dublin JWG meeting.

b) Data types

Graham Grieve noted the following issues:

- Work done in HL7 has been brought into ISO/TC215. HL7 WG 2 and ISO/TC215 WG2 have agreed to do a joint publication ;
- Continuous procedural issues related to balloting in both HL7 and ISO;
- The large volume of comments have lead to a complete rewrite;
- The CEN 13606 team have been asked to review the data types;
- There is a need for 13606 to be based on the harmonised data types.

Graham Grieve noted that the process is moving as quickly as possible.

c) Clinical Information update

William Goossen noted the following issues:

- The need to explore templates and archetypes;
- The need for quality criteria;
- Ongoing harmonisation work (DCM group are working on a top ten of sample materials, and aiming to combine them).

Martin Severs questioned whether the clinical governance has been set up to manage clinical statements. Other than the work of IHTSDO and the current work in ISO TC215 WG 1 / WG 3 / WG 8, there is no specific work on clinical information. William Goossen will further update the JWG at the next meetings on ways and means to address clinical information standards.

d) ICH

Ian Shepherd reported that seven new work items originating from ICH have been introduced into ISO WG 6, and that discussions have been held with HL7, CEN and ISO representatives during last the last eighteen months, Presentations to other TC 125 Working Groups were scheduled for the upcoming ISO meeting to identify linkages and whether other experts could join the project teams. These projects are intended to be done jointly with CEN, ISO and HL7.

It was noted that there are several overlaps on the HL7 work program with the ICH work, and that HL7 experts will attend the ISO/TC215 WG 6 meeting later this week.

Dr Kwak noted that there are two WG 6 work items related to ISO TC 212, that TC 212 needs to approve this work, and that they should be included in the development work from the beginning.

6 Working Group Processes Discussion

Jeremy Thorp referred to the NHS decision tree process as a possible informed decision making process for the JWG. He noted that the decision tree starts with requirements and asks are the standards available, or is the work underway, or should the work be done internationally, or nationally? The decision tree process would enable the JWG to identify gaps, and where work needs to be done.

Action 1.3: Table decision tree for discussion at the next JWG meeting.

This agenda item was held over for further discussion at the next JWG meeting.

7 Next JWG meetings

It was noted that the JWG co-chairs would work with the Joint Initiative Council to determine future meeting dates and locations.

The next JWG meeting in October 2007 is confirmed. Future JWG meetings are:

- a) CEN, Dublin (2 October, 2007)
- b) HL7, San Antonio (to be confirmed)
- c) HIMSS, Orlando (23 February, 2008)
- d) ISO / CEN, Goteborg during May / June 2008 (date to be confirmed)
- e) HL7 Meeting, Vancouver in September 2008 (date to be confirmed)

8 Actions

Action 1.1: Secretariat for Joint Initiative Council to convene a meeting to review comments from the US.

Action 1.2: Secretariat for Joint Initiative Council to distribute the revised Charter to each participating SDO (secretaries) and to post it on the ISO/TC215 website and the Sharepoint.

Action 1.3: Table decision tree for discussion at the next JWG meeting.