

# JIC Executive Meeting

## Friday 18<sup>th</sup> November 2016

Face-to-Face Meeting  
Oslo, Norway  
Time: 9:00 to 14:00 local time

### Record of Discussion

#### 1. Welcome, Apologies.

A representative from Norway welcomed everyone to the offices of the Norwegian Directorate for e-Health. The JIC's Chair welcomed attendees and observers to the meeting. Apologies are noted above.

#### 2. Minutes of last meeting (20160928 - teleconference)

Approved.

#### 3. Agenda approval, requests for AOB

Agenda approved. An executive requested that two items be added to the agenda:

- Revisiting Data Types (the 1<sup>st</sup> effort of JIC, but now has an unknown future and so do we need to make a statement about its future as an adhoc group?)
- A Statement on FHIR (as the JIC needs to come up with a statement that settles the market place)

This was agreed to.

#### 4. Review of actions from previous meeting

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

Outstanding Actions:

- **20160501-07, 20160706-02, e-Standards Development Lifecycle Discussion:** ACTION: *Comment and or approval to be sought from each SDO.*

**Updated 20160928-01:** ACTION: *The JIC's Chair to follow up to discern which SDOs (if any) had yet to supply statements.*

**Updated 20161118:** *DSW suggested that the JIC discuss how the Council could deal with such items more effectively in future.*

***Other outstanding actions listed as agenda items below...***

#### 5. JIC Standards Set Work – Patient Summary

The Chair of the PSSS sub group gave a summary of what the group wanted for the session, as per the briefing:

[Briefing document](#)

They stressed that much of the material presented is new and not yet reviewed and harmonized in the group.

The JIC Chair said that the JIC has some fundamental decisions on the way it goes forward with the Starter Set, other initiatives and the new Standards Set. The Standard Set work in particular is really influencing and shaping the way forward. He also agreed to include discussion around the 'Transnational Health Record' under item 6. A combined slide set was provided by the PSSS Task Group chairs:

[PSSS Presentation slides](#)

[Data Set document](#)

[Use Case Business Requirements](#)

#### 5.1. Draft Use Case (early experience of assessment against criteria) (Task Groups 1)

An executive spoke to the slides linked above. They reinforced that they were not developing but giving advice to jurisdictions on packages of existing standards. An executive said the JIC needs to ensure coordination and what it means in practice with other standards work. Another executive said that the JIC may need to revisit the definition of a standards set, still in the prototype stage. An executive said the key is that the JIC decided to do the work and not just talk about it, hence the prototype. The Chair said the focus was on giving people something they can use, so the JIC needs to put stake in the ground at what a "core" might look like, amongst a wider set. This needs to be thought about at a higher level. An executive agreed, and said that this is not just about one standard so it would be good to know what bundle works best for a use case. An executive asked how long did the Use Case work take? The executive replied that it was eight 1hr sessions with clinicians, and around 40-60 hrs to fill out the Use Case document. The GS1 team found the Use Case template easy to use.

#### 5.2. Standards analysis and mapping (Task Group 2)

The chair of this Task Group acknowledged the input of the Task Group members, a group of experts who worked together for about 40-60hrs – this work had input from them all, thus covering different perspectives. They said that thought needed to be given to what standards need to be in the "pool" and what standards can be drawn from this. The INTERPAS white paper and EU guidance were references right from the beginning. About 70 standards were in the initial "pool," then reviewed with criteria to move towards a master/core. The 'Approach to identifying and listing' slide (no.17) went into detail on this, along with 'Criteria for Inclusion' slide 18). An executive said the vendor space is another important issue and this approach supports this. Another executive said that it is important re what vendors are doing, and the JIC also needs to think about evolution, as we cannot forget the past and the legacy/what's already out there. The JIC's Chair said that the biggest thing this gives end users is a framework on which to make decisions, from user perspective- including questions they may miss if they do not go through a logical process. A lot will depend on capability at deployment end, but framework is key in allowing them to answer yes/no to each component of the framework. An executive talked about their experience in Canada and raised the issue of data quality and its importance with this work. Another executive agreed, and said it was an issue of information governance. The Chair of the Task Group said there needed to be assistance from the HL7

community with regards to information exchange, and asked does IHE need to be better represented in this as well? An executive asked had any thought been given to the ontology of the artifacts? Not at this point.

The Task Group Chair then referenced the draft document:

#### [Draft Standard Set Document](#)

Notes for document linked above:

- *It is clearly "incomplete", but section headers are included that we may use for other task group sections,*
- *The introductory sections were largely taken from the Scope and Foundation report, updated with directions and decisions made by JIC following that report,*
- *This draft is not totally clean edited,*
- *Task Group 2 members have completed 5 of the 6 interoperability standards levels in an initial assessment.. The transport related standards list has not been assessed, and*
- *As indicated in the overall work-plan, the Coordination Group is the next review level for the standards set components and documents.*

They said that the coordination group had not yet commented on this document. An executive said that there are some key learnings, e.g. Use Case, experience which can be shared for others to use. They asked if there were any 'take home' messages? The Task Group Chair replied that there is the broader concept of 2-step level approach - pool and then narrowing down for specific use. This takes time and experts, which has happened with the 3 task groups, and putting it together is up to JIC. An executive said there is great power in SDO collaboration, even if all do not agree. Another executive said it was tough to get it going. The JIC Chair agreed, and acknowledged that it is not perfect but we need to get iterations. He asked about when we might start to publish to get external views that move it forward?

#### 5.3. Draft conformity assessment framework (Task Group 3)

##### [Conformity Assessment Framework Document](#)

##### [Presentation slides](#)

The Chair of this Task Group said Task Group 3 and 4 were more about how you make this usable. TG3 have been meeting since June, with experienced experts who have been working in the area for 5-10 years. RHA agreed to take offline the HL7 involvement, since this is a concern for this work. The key is to keep alignments with ISO and their conformity assessment side CASCO, and also the RSP work. In the absence of having products from TGs 1 and 2, the group has worked on conformance statements and criteria for assessing. An executive said that "Specified Requirements" as in the original JIC definition is the key connection to conformity assessment. Another executive asked – should we start with conformity statements that are tied to the standard, and the responsibility of the SDOs? The Task Group Chair replied that there are two things – process and specification. An executive challenged the statement that standards are about conformity statement and that should be part of whole lifecycle. Another executive agreed, but clarified that they were saying that as SDOs the JIC needs to write better conformity statements. An executive said a lot of work has been done around the world on this and asked if the group is extracting the learning? The Task Group Chair said yes, and many of the Task Group members have been involved in such work and will be augmented with others. An executive said we have a "new beast" here, a role of conformity assessment in standards set is new, so it may be a little work. The JIC Chair said one of the things missing in ONC's work is the steps between conformance and end-user implementation. How do you want to implement and ensure it conforms to what you want it to do? The work in the Task Groups 3 & 4 to provide conformance and implementation guidance is new ground and where the JIC needs to go. We can then drive to make changes. The Task Group Chair said we understand the challenge of needing to think in a different way and the enormity of the task.

#### 5.4. Implementation Guidance, survey results and outline plan (Task Group 4)

### Presentation slides

The Chair of this Task Group gave the presentation linked above. They said it was not a criticism of work to date but rather a different take, going back to being a learning process and being iterative. They want to emphasize that whole SS activity is about guidance, being a wrapper. The four group leaders have not coordinated prior to this meeting and papers, and they acknowledged that others have a task group and they only used WG1 because the whole package is not yet coherent, and on Chair's work may be another's responsibility. Their view was that we are not producing a Standard Set, but rather a framework and Standards are examples at this time and not yet in position to say they are a Standard Set. The focus should be 'if I have this problem then what do I need to consider?' The Task Group Chair reference the 'Deliverables' slide (3) and said they were not producing an implementation guide that links 36 specifications together as it cannot be done. The wording is not clear for the users/external audience. It is dangerous to suggest we can deliver too much – we cannot gather everything as we are working with volunteers. The JIC therefore needs to manage expectations. He suggested instead that there be a coherent view of how standards artefacts can solve a specific Use Case. What is the list of enablers? SS are beyond IPS - everyone agreed. Both HL7 and CEN projects are now more aligned with PSSS timewise since JIC work has slipped. They said they had not delivered on a summary of standards for the questionnaire due to personal circumstances, but there were responses from six countries to date. The work in the Task Group Chair's area is heavily dependent on the other Task Groups. Must tighten on language across all documents to ensure consistency. They did raise concern with the standards that another Chair wants to exclude. Trialing and feedback is important.

An executive said the JIC should accept that they have been confined by the Use Case, but so much work has been done. SK has no Task Group but needs to build this from the SDOs. The strength of other task groups is in the work of the individuals. One Chair said his group had worked hard to produce their scope and foundation work, within the working definition. Another Chair said that the TG group leads are airing what needs to be hammered out. . There are four pieces of work which need to be harmonized. Another Task Group Chair said this is the group to air and we must consider the outside world and how we represent things.

The JIC Chair stated that the work had started with great intensions - a PSSS (which will be delivered), plus a clear framework/repeatable solution. How do you then guide people through this or do something else with it, recognizing difference from anything done before? The Task Group Chair replied that using a Standard Set in a slightly different way. Four parts can produce guidance on where people can start. He is fine with things as it is what they have come up with, as opposed to this is all the variables or scenarios. The JIC Chair said – consider the PSSS as: here are steps that may guide you e.g. to a vendor on the other end responding to a RFP. None of us is expecting it to be definitive, but instead a way to come up with a starter set for a specific use case. The role should be to summarize everything done and get engagement with the vendor community. One Chair said he agreed, saying it was aligned and cohesive with what we are already doing. An executive said they were still learning about what needs to be done to make it real – they need to consider with audiences how to make this a reality – to help us as SDOs shape the work.

The JIC Chair said he was willing to host a face-to-face meeting for the Task Group chairs in London in January, focused on:

- Gaining clarity on the way forward
- Identification of process for engagement with 1-2 vendors to get their feedback and 'buy in.'
- Share with other projects to get feedback
- Summarize what needs to be done.

Then the JIC can look at it in May, building on outcomes for the workshop.

## 6. Discussion on coordination across International Patient Summary (IPS) projects

### 6.1. CEN approach

[Presentation slide set 1](#)

[Presentation slide set 2](#)

An executive from CEN reiterated the CEN work as per the slides linked above. An executive said there was violent agreement about a need for an IPS and asked – can the JIC play a role in trying to bring together the different projects? Another executive said the CEN work was synergistic with the JIC, and the JIC work was feeding in to it. Not agreed to progress to an RSP is correct decision at this time.

### 6.2. Trillium Bridge II

[Presentation slide set](#)

An executive gave the presentation linked above. Another executive said that the key point was about how we communicate IPS work and value not just to patients but also clinicians – and the value of keeping in good quality data. The presenting executive said that Depak has agreed to get a group of clinicians together to produce clinical guidelines. The JIC's Chair said that there is a need to engage clinicians to demand and talk to vendors who really struggle with timelines for change of product development driving clinical acceptance. We must have buy-in from big vendors and changing our visions of vendor platform to Google, Apple, IBM Watson etc. To have projects succeed and be adopted by governments we need real life examples of implementation. We need to streamline processes to get specifications through and keep pace. This should be a future discussion point for the JIC.

### 6.3. INTERPAS (now IPS HL7)

#### Project Scope Statement

An executive stated that they have now got approval of the project by HL7, including presence on the HL7 website and a mailing list. They would be meeting the next day to do some concrete planning (ideally they would provide some updated slides to JIC afterwards). They asked- is the goal to have a single standard? It could be a focal standard for data standard (content and semantics). A rapid timeline is needed – it needs to be confirmed and aligned with CEN. CEN do not want a diverted effort but do need agreement on timelines. They are interested in it being global. The HL7 EHR group is defining the functional requirements.

<b>Action 1</b>	A copy of the HL7 IPS project statement to be circulated to JIC members
-----------------	---

### 6.4. ISO – Transnational health record

[Presentation slide set](#)

This had just passed ballot in ISO and was Asian focused (see slide set linked above, from the ISO meeting afterwards). An executive said this is called 'Cumulative Patient' profile in some jurisdictions and is already being shared as patients move.

## 7. Discussion on forming a better process for JIC signifying approval

It was stated that it was great to hear what is happening, but really this is about how the JIC is positioned and its role.

<b>Action 2</b>	The JIC Chair to present options on February 2017 call and relevant risks, taking IPS as an example and 21090 discussions.
-----------------	--

## 8. Unique Device Identifier (UDI) update

An executive stated that HL7 is working on a Domain Analysis Model which will need to be referenced – it is moving slowly currently, though it is progressing. Pressure is behind implantables.

## 9. FHIR Discussion

It was proposed that a sub group should craft a message on behalf of the JIC re FHIR, focusing on what it was support. Potentially this could be a statement on all SDO products and what they achieve. An executive said they had nothing to add – the Use Case work can be further supported.

<b>Action 3</b>	The Chair to confirm on next JIC call who will do this.
-----------------	---

## 10. ISO 21090 – Harmonised data types discussion

An executive from ISO/TC215 stated that this was the first effort of the JIC and the Council owes it to the industry to look after it. It was proposed that a group be put together to review. This should be JIC sponsored and contributed to, but not our standard. The JIC should potentially just produce a relevant statement. The JIC Chair replied that relevant SDOs do review and propose recommendations for the JIC to consider.

<b>Action 4</b>	ISO and HL7 to do initial assessment and bring back to the JIC – timelines to be agreed on next JIC call
-----------------	--

## 11. Election for new JIC Chair

An executive stated that the JIC's Charter indicates that the Chair normally stands for 2 years, and DSW had been in the position since February 2015 so the Executives need to consider this. It is in the power of the Executives to consider the period of the Chair, and he said he had detected a unanimous opinion that all on the Council were happy with DSW in the role and wanted to suggest that he does an additional year in 2017 and appoints a 'Chair Elect' ready for 2018. DICOM were not represented in this decision but all others agreed with the motion so it was passed. DSW replied that he was honored and happy to accept in order to keep energy in the current work. All agreed that this was critical. For the Chair Elect, an executive suggested that the process for that could start now ready for February 2017. This was seconded and passed unanimously.

<b>Agreement 1</b>	DSW to serve a third year as JIC Chair in 2017, with a 'Chair Elect' to be nominated in February 2017 to take over in 2018.
--------------------	---

## 12. Any Other Business

12.1. JIC website

It was noted that the other work of the JIC needs to be added to the website.

<b>Action 5</b> Please send information through to JMI who will collate.
--

12.2. Next face-to-face meeting

The question of the location of the next face-to-face meeting (usually around April/May) was raised. The ISO meeting in China falls close to Easter, and Executives need to decide as if they wish to link the meeting there as visas will be required.

<b>Action 6</b> The Chair to investigate alternatives for scheduling the first f2f in 2017
--

**13. Adjournment**

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

**14. Next meeting**

Confirmed as a teleconference on Wednesday 7<sup>th</sup> December 2016 (20:00-21:00 UTC)