2008-09-11

Meeting Information

Date:	September 11, 2008
Time:	11 AM EDT/5 PM CEST

Attending: Rachel Ellaway and JB Mc Gee, Co-chairs; Frank Hess, Valerie Smothers

Agenda Items

1. Review minutes of last meeting

JB reviewed the action items. Rachel did email xhtml attributes for flash support last night. She added that we need to demonstrate how you do this and provide some further examples. The specification can have a minimal set of data, supporting documentation should have more explicit instructions. Rachel added that a first draft or starting point for an implementation guide will come out of eViP.

JB commented that many would rather wait for the spec to be done than participate in these discussions. They are waiting for the decree. Are we close to v 1? Rachel commented that as long as no important issues arise, yes. We've had a several arise from eVip. We are unlikely to get anything else of significance. The only other comments have been from Daden regarding second life.

2. Review AMEE and eViP progress

JB asked of the specification come up at the eViP meeting at AMEE? Recent changes have been made to accommodate eViP requirements. Rachel commented that no one raised additional changes. There is a variable level of engagement with implementation. Jörn received a prize for innovation and implementation. Casus was the only group with many issues, but we've changed many things and provided examples to accommodate their needs. Ivimeds implementation is hard to judge. Thierry has gone on 12 months paternity leave. Valerie commented that she needs to implement Rachel's changes flash recommendations, then she will have added all of the changes agreed upon.

Rachel summarized that the project is one third done. All of the deliverables have been met. Chara and Terry keep everyone focused. The group has gone through many issues, including a profile of healthcare lom. They have a common consent document model. Gabrielle Campbell of the AAMC is involved in that. So far eViP has a procedural standard around clearing consent and copyright. They are trying to translate it to different languages and see what is lost. The plan is to let eVip finish this work and share the document back. Then there would be work within North America. The AAMC would do something to enable piloting in a non-European context.

JB asked how the eViP document is approved within different eViP countries. Rachel explained that it is approved just at the institutional level. Going national is beyond the resources or influence of partners. But they can get it recommended as a common model afterwards. The partners need to have implemented a standard before Christmas. They are expecting partial interoperability; data will move, and be stored locally. The translation to runtime is the next step forward. The closest is Campus. Sören and Terry got funding for a small study on moving content to Labyrinth. It wasn't a standard format. But they found many critical differences in educational approaches.

3. Review changes to specifications

Valerie reviewed that she had done the following to address issues that had been raised:

- Added information on handling nested NodeSections
- Changed counter processing information to reflect the addition of the CounterRuleEnabled element (for selective processing) and Link CounterActionRules.
- Removed references to Media within VirtualPatientData.
- Added language about XtensibleInfo and namespaces.

4. Discuss second life meeting

The demo will take place September 26.

5. Open discussion

Rachel and JB agreed we should ask the working group for final comments before the technical edit and submission to the standards committee for the standards committee's comment, public review, and balloting.

Rachel asked what the function of the group is after the ANSI process is complete. Valerie explained that within 5 years of approval as a standard, a standard must be reaffirmed or updated. We will need a plan in place for addressing updates. In addition, other working groups have focused on promoting adoption. This group may be able to facilitate that as well. We should aim for version 1.0 of an implementation guide by the time the standard is released.

Decisions

The co-chairs agreed to send a message to the group asking for final comments on functionality.

Action Items

Valerie will work on a technical edit of the specs.

Valerie will send message to the group asking for final comments on functionality.