## SWOT Analysis for Anatomic Pathology Working Group

1. What are the strengths of your workgroup?

* Strong US and international representation and integration
	+ Working on integrated activities (e.g. IHE, DICOM. IHTSDO)
* Strong intra-group activity (e.g., Orders and Observations, Clinical Genomics, Vocabulary, Imaging Integration, …)
* Active participation by:
	+ Pathology Professional Organizations
	+ Cancer Registry Professionals
	+ Vendors
	+ Government agencies
	+ Academic Institutions
	+ Consultants
* Strong domain knowledge
* Work on actual implementations in place
* Working knowledge of HL7 V2.x and CDA
* Supporting emerging FHIR standard

2. What are the weaknesses of your workgroup?

* Limited human resources
* Time constraints
* A very short list of formal projects but large in impact/scope like Unique ID
* Travel and attendance at WGMs is challenging for global and government members…there is a clear need for teleconferencing at WGMs to keep the group moving

3. What opportunities do you see that can be addressed by your workgroup?

* An increased interest in interoperability by US and international governments
* Clear need for reporting style guides to define the necessary components of an anatomic pathology report (content and visual formatting)
* Structured reporting framework to ensure accurate transport of anatomic pathology reports across disparate systems
* Standardization of biomarker reporting and bio-repository data
* Management of specimen identification (Unique ID)

4. What obstacles or threats to progress have you identified?

* Fragmented approaches to implementation of anatomic pathology reports
	+ v2x vs v3 vs CDA differences
* Lack of harmonization of standardized data elements (including name and definition) as it applies to specific domains and standardized value sets for key fields
* Lack of standards for managing and transferring templates and value sets
* Cost of participation in working group meetings and HL7 membership
* Perception by US state and local Public Health entities that there is limited value of participation in HL7 AP
* Time to produce standards does not fit the timeframes of legislative and regulatory stakeholders