

## Architecture Review Board Meeting Minutes September 16, 2008

Attendees:

Name	P or A	Role	Affiliation	email
Barr, Phil		Guest	Thomson Reuters	phil.barr@thomsonreuters.com
Curry, Jane	P	ArB	Health Information Strategies	janecurry@healthinfostrategies.com
Grahame Grieve	P	ArB	Kestral Computing Pty Ltd	grahame@jivamedical.com
Julian, Tony	P	ArB	Mayo Clinic	ajulian@mayo.edu
Koisch, John	P	ArB	NCI	koisch_john@bah.com
Kriesler, Austin		Guest	SAIC	duz1@cdc.gov
Larsen, Ed		Guest	HITSP	erlarsen@ix.netcom.com
Lynch, Cecil	P	ArB	ontoreason LLC	clynch@ontoreason.com
Markum, Les	P	Guest	Technical Lead, EHR , BC	<a href="mailto:les@sun.com">les@sun.com</a>
McCay, Charlie		Guest	Ramsey Systems Ltd	<a href="mailto:charlie@ramseysystems.co.uk">charlie@ramseysystems.co.uk</a>
Mead, Charlie	P	ArB	Booz Allen Hamilton	charlie.mead@booz.com
Orvis, Nancy		ArB	DOD	nancy.orvis@tma.osd.mil
Parker, Ron		ArB	CA Infoway	rparker@eastlink.ca
Quinn, John		ArB	Health Level Seven, Inc.	jquinn@HL7.org
Shakir, Abdul-Malik	P	ArB	Shakir Consulting	ShakirConsulting@cs.com
Wrightson, Ann		Guest	NHS(IHC)	ann.wrightson@wales.nhs.uk
Yongjian, Bao		ArB	GE Healthcare	<a href="mailto:yongjian.bao@med.ge.com">yongjian.bao@med.ge.com</a>
Spears, Cory	P	Guest	McKesson	cspears@practicepartner.com
Rogers, Rich	P	Guest	IBM	rrogers@us.ibm.com
DeJong, Alex	P	Guest	Siemens	alex.dejong@siemens.com

### Action Items

#	Description	Who	History/Update	Status	Area

## **I. Call to Order**

The meeting was called to order by John Koisch at 3:30pm PDT with Tony Julian as scribe.

Charlie noted that Rene Spronk has resigned from the ArB.

## **II. Steering Division Presentation Reaction**

### **III. Technical Support services**

a) Publishing, Education, tooling, Pic

- Shared the content of the three meetings
  - 1<sup>st</sup> – services discussion
  - 2<sup>nd</sup> – application of RM-ODP. This helped us recognize that the computation view was not as well represented as others.
  - 3<sup>rd</sup> meeting – developed a services-aware specification
- How are we going to roll this out? We are resource constrained!
- There were some who thought that the Out-of-cycle meetings were not open. Notifications were public, wiki was open, meeting had non-ArB attendees.
- It was suggested that it be held near the interim harmonization meeting.
- There is an understanding that there is a joint meeting Wednesday q3-q4 in January. There was concern that this meeting has not been announced appropriately
- On the dynamic model: Make sure that it covers all of our product types, not just services. One individual wanted the model to go into patterns, which is not our intent, but the committee has been notified. Grahame said it would be a good example.

b) Foundation and Technology

- There was discussion that the document is important. The primary discussion was over procedures of the division.

- Gossip: ArB is reorganizing the Foundation Steering Division, instead of re-distributing the work. At lunch the TSC discussed the problems of conflating architectural governance with organizational governance.
- TSC needs to give us a coherent set of storyboards that our business architecture would realize. They may have a broader view. ArB will build architectural model, NOT organizational model. There should be a close match.
- Grahame: InM chairs are partitioned across the organization. MnM is wrongly distributed, Vocab wants to be split into two. Most of the committees are not aligned. Collectively we could improve things, but the chairs are the backbone of the organization – we should preserve their positions. It is time to address this.
- Half of MnM should be tooling, the other half rim,vocab, infrastructure.

#### IV. General Feedback:

- John K: HSSP/SOA feedback – they are generally OK with this. Communication plans need to be formalized to take this to the next level. Once we request peer review, we should do it by focus group since not every work group is a focus group. Overall the feeling is positive. We have a lively future as the infrastructure of the SOA group.
- It comes down to one issue: As a co-chair of SOA, John can influence the agenda, and work details, but this session is devoted to HSSP, as was the last. Opinions were sought on how to harmonize SOA. The practical guide is seen as an HSSP project. They discussed the idea that the Practical Guide needs to be analyzed in light of SAEAF. It should be a high priority to release the first draft of the SAEAF document on Wednesday. Charlie added a section on Process and Deliverables, which is largely incomplete.
- There clearly will need to be for each of the interoperability paradigms a group that will manage the machinery of the paradigm. The SOA WG will be able to make a choice: If their focus continues to be HSSP, they will be de-facto marginalized. No-one wants to trash the HSSP effort, but HL7 needs to set its own scope and mandate re SOA.
- There is no SOA WG – it is HSSP(OMG) now. They have self-determined their mandate and agenda. They should have an obligation to HL7.
- It appears that they are targeting core/infrastructure. Currently HL7 is doing the requirements, and HSSP is doing the specifications.

- Grahame: IT would be pointless to reduce the HSSP sessions. The committee will be divided into two, and the SOA people will merge with MnM, while the HSSP will go their direction.
- John K: Timing is a problem. Between now and January someone, probably the TSC should weigh in on the direction. HSSP and SOA have failed to provide services infrastructure to provide components: behavioral model, taxonomy, etc. People coming to HL7 looking for SOA are getting HSSP, which is not quite that.
- John had expectations for us to provide advice and lay out the structure.
- Ron P: Until recently there was not a perception that HSSP was welcome to push back into the organization a SOA rendering. While it is not our job, but that of the TSC, it is our job to describe what it looks like.
- John K: How do we as an HL7 community get things out?
- Charlie: In a perfect world what would you want the SOA WG to do?
- John K: It is a bandwidth problem. The oxygen is taken up with HSSP/OMG conceptual and business concepts.
- Charlie: Are the majority not HSSP?
- Ron P: We need to put material things on the table. John is expecting other things in terms of advice.
- Unified Field theory is NO pushback. Just do it.
- Ron P. Questions are :What are the implications of what I am doing, and how do I prepare for it?
- Cecil: lay out the process.
- John K: I have a plan for laying it out using the specification stack as a link table. He discussed contextualizing IHE with Kieth Boone. A lot of people want to see what to do. People are excited about seeing a grid of things to do.
- Jane: A checklist of things to do. Questions about Admit/Discharge/Transfer.
- AMS: How is the work going to get done? This is not unlike where MnM was 15 years ago.

- Charlie M: Even if the ArB has the bandwidth, there is considerable bandwidth required operationally. So much of what is happening here is happening at the NCI to the point that Johns boundaries are beginning to blur.
- Ron P: In INFOWAY, we are about to face the problem that now that we have finished all of this getting the infrastructure going, we need to have a model that the industry needs to see as sustainable. Therefore the work here is compelling to get INFOWAY successful. The level of expectation is higher than what was expected.
- John K: TSC said "You are not ready": John we were ready to re-tool our message, but have been re-inforced.
- This seems to be concentrating around Federal Health Architecture.
- It is ALL John's fault that we are so successful – he is putting so much time into it.
- John: There is an expectation that I coordinate with the SOA workgroup. The fact that we were not chasing the SOA people has caused some angst. One of the SOA co-chairs was there for two of the three meetings, as was MnM and Vocabulary and InM.
- AMS: The old MnM was backroom with no minutes or agenda. We are open.
- Grahame: I will not be back. It would be lovely if we could look at the dynamic model because it is missing entrypoints, has classes with no attributes.
- John: Previous speaker stated at one time "We don't need a model, we just need prose – it is more important than any model."
- Charlie left to give a presentation to Immunizations.

## **V. Dynamic Model**

- Channel is in there so you can express the way that a participant deals within the interaction given different interoperability paradigms. It is an information pathway at the technology binding that realizes the semantics.

- Grahame: The three interoperability paradigms represent a failure of HL7 policy.
- John: Channel gives the binding. That may be a policy failure, but it is a design decision.
- Grahame: We need a way to provide granularity. A document specification is a behaviour model with no granularity.
- Instance of the dynamic model is a choreography. This provides a cover for a number of work units, each of which may have one-many interactions, or be unrelated, which may have one-many exchanges. There is a notion of states, and how they propagate from service out.
- States are missing in the model. Choreography has states in long-running transactions. The execution of the choreography has states. Documents have states also, but the individual parts don't in many cases e.g. if the vital sign service is down.
- A participation is a real-world thing that takes on a role.
- An interaction has participants. It realizes a relationship. Do we exclude publish/subscribe?
- Commissioning party and Responsible parties are the two who participate in the interaction.
- Any number of systems can participate as a subscriber in a sub/pub.
- This does not describe the relationship of interactions. How are they related? Is it recursive?
- Pigs ears were added to workunit and interaction.
- Participation: What is the reason for the participation roles within the interaction? They may use different channels.
- Grahame: Channel (granularity) is at the wrong level.
- John: Behaviours through roles are realized through multiple channels.
- Grahame: What is below participation is a structure that allows me to state linkages.

- John: No, statements on how real-world systems take on responsibilities.
- This model was derived from the review of the meta-model.
- Grahame: Uneasy about channel. John: Specially the loose coupling to payload.
- Payload relationship to interaction is not necessarily one-to-one.
- Les: Should we tie exchange to participation instead of interaction?
- One pigs-ear was replaced with WorkUnitRelationship.
- Pigs-ear on interaction was replaced with InteractionRelationship
- John will send out the model, and source the information in Gforge.
- Charlie had a discussion with Woody about the energy-state.
- The rim has nothing to do with messaging, and has divided itself. Putting contract on the left side of the rim is problem – it should be on the right side.
- There was discussion about the pending state and its relationship to the role relationship.

**VI. Adjournment:**

The meeting was adjourned at 5:30pm PDT.