<div align="center">

HL7 FHIR Foundation Board Call
Friday, August 12, 2016
4:00 – 5:00 pm ET
Dial in: 770-657-9270 Pass code: 2627371#
To mute:*6; to un-mute: *6

</div>

Participants: Stan Huff, MD; Pat Van Dyke; Russ Leftwich, MD; Ed Hammond, PhD; Chuck Jaffe, MD, PhD; Wayne Kubick; Grahame Grieve; Micky Tripathi; Viet Nguyen, Dave Shaver; Karen Van Hentenryck (scribe)

Regrets: Paul Biondich, Ewout Kramer

<div align="center">

Agenda

</div>

1. **Roll call/welcome to new Board members/agenda review** (2 minutes) – Huff called the meeting to order at 4:04 pm ET. He welcomed new board members.

2. **Approval of the minutes from 07/01/2016 call** (2 minutes) – **MOTION** by Hammond, seconded by Kubick: To approve the minutes. The motion carried unanimously.

3. **Review/approval of proposed vision statement (10 minutes)** – Grieve briefly introduced the draft vision, to which the group applied some minor editing. **MOTION** by Jaffe; seconded by Nguyen: To approve the vision statement posted below. The motion carried unanimously.

   HL7 FHIR Foundation Vision: The FHIR Foundation promotes global adoption and implementation of the FHIR platform standard. The foundation provides information, educational materials, tools, websites, and project support that help the FHIR community collaborate, align, and expand. The foundation seeks to improve the interoperability of health data with a goal of improving the quality, efficiency and effectiveness of healthcare. |

4. **Review/approval of proposed Board constituency** (rules around foundation members voting on directors) (15 minutes) – Huff noted we have some discretion on how Board members are approved. At one end of the spectrum is a totally open election process where anyone can run (current HL7 method). On the other end of the spectrum is a process whereby the current Board appoints new Board members. Another option is to specify the number (or percentage) of positions that will be appointed by the Board vs. elected by the members. We could have a predominance of those appointed or voted, whichever seems appropriate. The underlying goal is to have a strategic Board and having a Board fully elected by members does not guarantee a Board with the knowledge and experience in the right areas to strategically move the organization in the right direction.

   Cooper asked about the model for membership. This is currently on the agenda but what we've agreed to thus far is individual membership (no organizational membership) that would cost a few hundred dollars. Organizations that are interested would support multiple people from their organizations joining as members. The ability to elect some members of the Board is one of the membership benefits. Cooper favors having most Board be appointed. We might have representation from

<div align="center">

</div>

particular stakeholder representatives on the Board. Kubick noted we identified those Stakeholder categories in an earlier Board meeting. He suggests a minimum of 3 Board members being elected by the membership.

Tripathi likes the idea of some Board members being appointed and others elected but suggests ¾ be appointed and ¼ elected. Regarding representation from different stakeholder groups, he suggests stakeholder groups we used as guidelines as having strict rules in this area may lead to suboptimal choices in terms of Board members. Leftwich endorses Tripathi's views.

Nguyen suggests nominees for elected positions be required to demonstrate some minimum level of support from other members and the Board to be included on the slate. Hammond suggests forming a group of 2-3 Board members to screen the candidates, and Shaver suggests we identify the qualification (leadership, membership, etc.) to be nominated for election to the Board. Per the bylaws, there are a maximum of 16 Board members. Board terms are 3 years.

MOTION by Hammond; seconded by Cooper: To reserve 4 of the Board positions as member-elected seats and seek a volunteer to develop a proposed process for membership election of Board members. Shaver amended the motion to expand the deliverable to include qualifications as well as a process. The motion carried unanimously. **ACTION ITEM**: Hammond/Van Hentenryck will develop a draft process for membership election of Board positions for review on a future call.

5. **Review proposed membership process** (15 minutes) – Grieve has not done much on this yet due to ballot obligations. Huff noted we need two things:
   - A proposal that identifies:
     - types of memberships we will offer (e.g., individual and/or organizational) and their related costs
     - how members will participate in the activities of the foundation (e.g., do we establish work groups, will they vote on certain policies, etc.)
   - A proposal for sustaining the organization – make a formal statement that we will not only have membership and membership dues, but go after grants, seek benefactors, etc.

   Grieve indicated that, for the moment, we will proceed with the individual membership route but not organizational membership (though that may change in the future). The cost would no exceed more than a few hundred dollars, but we haven't settled on an exact figure.

   Grieve noted other member benefits including access to an email list and to a collaborative space such as a Google docs group that would be administered by the Board. One of the Board's first responsibilities is to grow the organization and gradually formalize. Those on the call agreed with this strategy.

   ACTION ITEM: Grieve/Kubick will draft a formal proposal for review and vote on a future call.

6. **Policies for hosting implementation guides and other third party artifacts on the**

FHIR.org website – Grieve provided some background on this issue for new Board members. DAF, for example, is not an HL7 IG but is posted with the specification. HSPC IG is looking for a home. Grieve would like that home to be FHIR.org. Participants reviewed the four draft guidelines on this issue as published on the Google Docs document.

Huff observed that candidate artifacts don't have to be balloted through HL7 but they have to adhere to a defined process that is published on FHIR.org. In other words, the process for approving the IG must be published. Are we implying that the process has to be open? In the absence of an executive arm, the Board would be tasked with approval of IGs. Huff, Grieve and Nguyen agreed to recuse themselves from any vote related to HSPC given their involvement with that organization. To mitigate this situation (which will occur often), we should have a small committee that will determine who can/can't vote on posting third party artifacts. **ACTION ITEM**: Huff and Grieve will draft a proposal for how we approve posting of these artifacts on the website and bring it back to the Board for review/vote. In the interim HSPC will be granted permission to post their IGs, recognizing that once we have a formal policy, they must be conformant, or their IGs will be taken down.

7. **Housekeeping** (1 minute) - Huff
   - Next call in about two weeks. Karen will arrange
   - Agenda items for next call
     - Approval of minutes
     - Proposal for electing Board members (Hammond/Van Hentenryck)
     - Membership proposal (Grieve)
     - Proposal for posting third party artifacts (Huff/Grieve)
   - CMS RFI – Jaffe asked for input for this. Viet has read it and will send some information. Karen will send the link to the group.

Call adjourned at 5:05 pm ET