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| Chuck Jaffe | cjaffe@HL7.org |  | X |
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The items below we presented by individuals without attempting to get agreement or concensus.

1. Answer for each stakeholder/participant – What do I want and can get from HL7? What is the ROI for a person to participate? Understand exactly what service is to be provided for each participant in HL7.
2. Need issues around the transport of data to be solved.
   1. Includes a library of tools, API, content templates
3. Need to address data provenance, tagged metadata
4. Need to understand issues relating to Governance and Quality. These may not be a job for HL7.
5. HL7 should “control” its domains of interest, but should not try to do everything.
6. Content should be shared and interest of HL7
7. What is future of RIM?
8. Won’t be a single universe – means we will always have duplicative standards, terminologies, templates, etc.
9. Understand differences between constraint and extension. Which should be used when?
10. How do we govern change?
11. Make a business case for change.
12. HL7 should be a service organization.
13. Where should CIMI ultimately live? HL7, openEHR, CDISC, CEN, ISO, WHO, …?
14. We need a different way of thinking about the business model
15. We need to create standards faster.
16. We need to identify points of leverage and use them.
17. In 5 yeL7 will be irrelevant unless they join CIMI.
18. Focus on process in HL7 – how should we operate functionally?
19. What is the stakeholder mix in HL7?
20. What is the business case for participants? We need to define the business case for participants.
21. HL7 needs to support both a single country as well as all countries in the international community.
22. How we capture and store data needs to be explored
23. We need business case for clinical research
24. We need custom development approach in health care
25. Is health more complex than banking?
26. We need common plumbing for a myriad of purposes – generic approach rather than so many specific things.
27. Supply chain has done better than us.
28. What is the Rosetta Stone of unscrambling all the standards.
29. There is much in common in standards independent of the domain or nation. We need to build toward taking advantage of this.

**Issues and Changes**

1. We need to converge clinical care and clinical research in our standards creation
2. Getting data is slow and expensive
3. Policy transcends technology.
4. CDA is lousy for data analysis.
5. We need to manage complexity
6. Complexity is a result of our attempts to be flexible.
7. Conformance and compliance is important. How do we insure it?
8. Dominance of US influence in vendor products, ignoring local country needs.
9. Role of national bodies in simplification process
10. Education
11. Implementation guides – what roles and what problems can they solve?
12. Need template registry and more.
13. We need to stay focused
14. Incorporate implementation into HL7
15. HL7 needs lobby on policies that must be solved (regulators)
16. Much simpler standards to the broader community
17. Understand the supply and demand for standards. Use service model.
18. Let science lead informatics
19. Does HL7 engage the right people to understand and react to the more fundamental issues.
20. We need to define links and relationships – people, organizations, and things.
21. Analytics
22. Key issues
    1. Semantics
    2. Data model
    3. Terminology
    4. Transport (as secondary issues to above)
23. We need simple manuals.
24. We need to focus on process and workflows
25. We need component based software
26. We need to define tooling requirements at beginning of work, not at end after the work is done.
27. We need better vision at the top on organizational issues.
28. We need to define where we set the boundaries of HL7. Then we need to look carefully at the edges of the boundaries to understand service and interface requirements.