

JIC Executive Meeting

Wednesday 7th December 2016

20:00-21:00 UTC

Record of Discussion

Location: Teleconference via GoToMeeting

1. Welcome, Apologies.

The meeting Chair welcomed attendees and observers to the meeting. Apologies were noted.

2. Minutes of last meeting (20161118 – face-to-face)

Approved.

3. Agenda approval, requests for AOB

Agenda approved.

4. Review of actions from previous meeting

The meeting's Chair said they wished to discuss some of the actions from Oslo meeting (20161118) as they did not all have names against them. The items were as follows:

- **ISO 21090 review – timelines and who?**

The meeting's Chair stated that this was to be a review shared by ISO/TC215 and HL7. An executive from HL7 said he had not yet been involved with this. An executive from ISO/TC215 reported that no timelines had been set as yet, but ISO realize this needs to move forward. They said that they would discuss it further and report back at the February meeting. An executive asked if clarification could be provided about what the real issues around this were, in case the JIC's organizations should change their references in standard sets etc.? The ISO/TC215 executive replied that they would provide this and that it has been agreed that a statement would be put in the document to guide people. They said for now it could be continued to be referred to, at least as a placeholder. They added that they thought the real issue was that this particular standard was harmonized to the abstract data types revision 3 in HL7, which was never adopted within HL7 (not to assign blame, as this decision not to adopt was made for many abstract reasons). As a result, however, those who have adopted it have basically "profiled it back" (in their own environments) to something that they have used – i.e. where they have found the existing data types, particularly related to CDA, they have defined a 'profile' which is drawn from that, and extended the previous HL7 data types to enforce in various ways. Therefore, in difference jurisdictions (such as Australia, or parts of the US or Europe) you will find people who have had to extend the underlying data types to achieve something, and they may have done it in somewhat different ways (not great news for those interested in standardization!). He added that the other thing

about data types was that there is a process for extending them in the underlying ISO standard on data types, and ISO 21090 was built on that principle.

- **Drafting of FHIR message on behalf of JIC – who will complete this?**

From the minutes: “It was proposed that a sub group should craft a message on behalf of the JIC re FHIR, focusing on what it was supporting. Potentially this could be a statement on all SDO products and what they achieve.”

The meeting’s Chair asked what the final decision was on this in Oslo? An executive from HL7 said they thought that the gist was that FHIR is a platform standard that can be used to represent multiple types of business needs, in which case it is orthogonal to many of the standards coming through SDOs on the JIC. So the decision on whether or not to use FHIR depends on if you want to access FHIR’s capabilities for implementation (i.e. it is not really a *replacement* for anything else). An executive agreed, and said that they recalled the essence of the Oslo discussion being that there is an issue that people aren’t yet aware of FHIR and that eHealth implementers should be including it in their strategies (as it is here to stay). Another executive said they missed this part of the discussion in Oslo but still wanted to clarify the point that although FHIR is important (and comes from a JIC SDO), is there a special reason to elevate it more than that? Because if the JIC elevates FHIR to something greater than the rest of the SDO’s standards then this would be a problem. An executive replied that they thought the issue was more that if the JIC ignores a major emerging trend then it is also not serving its community either. They said being a “FHIR denier” was not a good thing to be! Another executive agreed, saying that IHE and HL7 have clarified any overlapping terminology references, specifically to profiles and ‘connectathons’ and they sees high value in that. However, they thought the JIC should use caution in making a statement that could seem to elevated FHIR above others, as for them it is no more important that anything that comes out of CDISC or 13606. The Chair of the meeting returned to the initial question, saying that perhaps an initial draft statement should be produced for review at the next meeting (with the view to perhaps producing some others?). They said that this question had been raised repeatedly and they would also like to get a definitive decision in order to be able to move forward. An executive said they recalled the discussion on Oslo being a lively one, but they thought it got to the decision that the JIC website should promote the best work of all its members, and the discussion started with FHIR because it has caught on in a big way but with some market-place confusion. The meeting’s Chair agreed with this approach and said a first draft of this (with links to further information) could be agreed and used as a model for posting other things. An executive said for them the root questions is – is the primary purpose of the JIC’s SDOs to talk to each other, or to talk to the outside world? They had always assumed it was the former, allowing collaboration and encouraging synergy between the various organizations. They thought that if some communication were to be drafted then it would only be to allow the JIC to define the role the member Executives see FHIR playing. So volunteering to be the ‘marketing arm’ for the various participants in the Council is an expansion of mission that goes beyond the current remit. An executive from HL7 asked who had come up with this initial request, as it had not come from HL7? An executive replied that they had first raised the issue back in Amsterdam, as FHIR is featuring dramatically in the industry as being “the ultimate solution” beyond the point-to-point exchange paradigm. They had therefore been questioning how the various SDOs work together in terms of the design of FHIR in its current form as it goes through the ballot process, to make sure their collective interests were represented in the design and implementation of FHIR? It has the potential to be a game changer, so the sooner the JIC is on board the better. The HL7 executive replied that perhaps then the best course of action at this point is more

for the various SDOs to align their own internal position with FHIR, rather than it be an external action? An executive said they had been associated with the JIC since 2005 (as had some others on the Council) and they disagreed with the precept that the JIC exists only for the executives to talk to each other, however anything that is said externally should be something that all SDOs agree to. For them, all the JIC's SDOs will be affected by FHIR's rapid uptake in the implementation community, so it is a great opportunity for the JIC to be seen to be doing something useful. The JIC has spoken out about other important topics in the past so there is precedence there. They agreed with the two-stage process as the course of action. Some on the call agreed with this, but another executive said they thought that having the JIC issue a statement to the effect that FHIR is "the ultimate solution" (as was originally suggested) is way too premature. Any communication needs to be open and encouraging but definitely not go beyond that. The Chair of the meeting returned to the initial question of asking who would draft this first statement? No one volunteered so they therefore inferred that it was not a high priority for anyone at this time. It would be added to the agenda for the January call.

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

5. JIC Standards Set Work – Patient Summary – Next Steps

The Chair of the PSSS sub committee said there had been a teleconference between the four chairs that week and they had agreed to do a thorough review, get feedback to her and then meet in London face-to-face on the 11th & 12th of January (some dialing in). As was discussed in Oslo, the documents that were presented there by the task groups were still 'works in progress,' so updated documents would be provided after this meeting. The Chair would also encourage others on the JIC to send them comments by the 5th of January.

6. Update on IPS (HL7) and CEN meeting and principles for working

(Action from Oslo: "ISO and HL7 to do initial assessment and bring back to the JIC – timelines to be agreed on next JIC call.")

The executive responsible was not on this call to present, so the item was deferred to the next meeting, though another executive asked if there were any direct implications for the JIC's SDOs? Were there any suggestions or comments that the JIC needs to think about between now and when it is reviewed later? The Chair of the meeting replied that they thought the main message that came out of the meeting related to the HL7 and CEN work and its principles. It did not go as far as talking about expectations from the JIC, but elaboration could be given on the next call. An executive from HL7 agreed with this.

7. Olympic InterOp Demo

An executive reported that the JIC had endorsed this initiative several years ago – the idea being to utilize the Olympic venue as a very high visibility demonstration of interoperability, related to the movement of health information between athletes and the various points of service that the Olympic world. Initially the initiative it moved along quite quickly but then it halted due to issues related to the Rio Olympics. They stated that it had now actively started up again and they would report back as they make progress. An executive asked whether this is related to the request to endorse and approach to the Japanese Olympic committee (raised at the ISO meeting in Lillehammer)? The presenting executive said they could clarify, but

they thought that had come out of WG2, from a discussion raised by BKI, where Japan have said they would like to positively support this but needed a resolution of endorsement from ISO TC215. This was the resolution put forward in Lillehammer (but it eventually will be an IOC item, not an ISO or JIC item). They said they did not need it to be a standing item on the JIC's agenda but would reach out to individuals as necessary.

8. Meeting schedule for 2017 for approval

A proposed meeting schedule for the JIC Executive Meetings was approved as below (*and calendar invitations have now been shared by FMC*).

DATES	TIME	COMMENTS / NOTES
11 Jan 2017	20:00-21:00 UTC	Teleconference
08 Feb 2017	20:00-21:00 UTC	Teleconference
08 March 2017	20:00-21:00 UTC	Teleconference
05 April 2017	20:00-21:00 UTC	Teleconference
<i>April/May?</i>	<i>TBC</i>	<i>Face-to-face, location TBC</i>
07 June 2017	20:00-21:00 UTC	Teleconference
12 July 2017	20:00-21:00 UTC	Teleconference (<i>CHANGED FROM 5TH TO AVOID THE 4TH JULY US HOLIDAY</i>)
August 2017	No meeting	
06 Sept 2017	20:00-21:00 UTC	Teleconference
04 Oct 2017	20:00-21:00 UTC	Teleconference
<i>06-10 Nov 2017</i>	<i>TBC</i>	<i>Face-to-face in London, UK (around the ISO/CEN TC215 joint meeting in Liverpool)</i>
06 Dec 2016	20:00-21:00 UTC	Teleconference

The November meeting was proposed as being in London in the IHTSDO office in Paddington (due to its proximity to the Heathrow Express, and it was suggested that having it before the ISO meeting could be good (although having it on a Sunday would perhaps not be ideal). Alternatively it could be held in Liverpool at the venue there.

Action 1 The JIC's secretary to contact the British Standards Institution [BSI] to gauge if an appropriate room could be arranged there as an alternative to London.

In a briefing document the meeting's Chair had suggested that possible dates and locations for the April/May face-to-face were as follows:

1. JIC meet around the ISO/TC215 Health Informatics Plenary in Hangzhou, China (17th-21st April 2017) – *but with no attendance from IHTSDO (Chair and attendee), although a Chair-Elect should be in place by then, as they will be appointed by February.*
2. JIC meet in London at end of IHTSDO meeting (23-27 April) which allows time to travel to London and opportunity to attend IHTSDO meeting – *this would mean a gap since it would need to be at end of IHTSDO meetings*
3. JIC meet either before or after the HL7 Working Group meeting in Madrid (6th-12th May 2017) – *need to review who does not go to HL7?*

4. JIC meet in London (IHTSO office) enroute to/from HL7 meeting - *which might enable those who do not attend HL7 to have single flight to/from London. This could be either before or after the HL7 meeting*
5. JIC meet at standalone time in May in London or other convenient location
6. Other options?

The briefing stated that *“the April 2017 meetings of ISO (China) and IHTSDO (UK) are back to back. The beginning of the ISO meeting coincides with Easter and there is no feasible gap for IHTSDO to get to China for a JIC meeting at the end of ISO week and then to London for the IHTSDO meeting. A key agenda item will be draft proposals for all aspects of the JIC Patient Summary Standards Set.”*

An executive said the problem with all of the other options is funding. Some of the JIC are able to piggyback their ISO funding to allow them to attend JIC meetings that are co-located, but they expected that all non-ISO options are going to be challenged in this way (though they appreciated the difficulty of meeting in China). Another executive agreed, and said that perhaps a more substantial teleconference should be scheduled in May instead of a face-to-face, as there was no easy answer to its scheduling? The meeting’s Chair replied that they worried that if there was not target for presenting a full PSSS in draft status then it could really impact on the focus of that work, although a lot would depend on how their face-to-face in January went. On attendance in China –executives from IHTSDO and HL7 said they could not be there, but most others on the call were intending to be there so perhaps it was still actually an option.

Action 2	IHTSDO to issue a Doodle poll related to possible dates around the ISO meeting in China.
-----------------	--

A definitive answer on either the April/May or November meeting was not reached, so this question would be picked up on the next call.

9. Any Other Business

No further business was raised.

10. Adjournment

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

11. Next meeting

Confirmed as a teleconference on Wednesday 11th January 2017 (20:00-21:00 UTC)