2013 After Action Review

Country Engagement

What did we expect to happen?

- Would like to experience other country projects and engage with them
- Develop a pattern of understanding of how engagements might evolve
- See interest from countries in Facility Registry
- Deployment in Rwanda expand to other countries, specifically the Client Registry
- Community participation to expand on the calls
- Expect to see Terminology Services able to touch other environments passed Rwanda
- Country driven requirements in the Registry space
- Countries where smaller projects are operating are not necessarily a country roll out

What has happened?

- There are a lot of positive buy-in
- A lot of country engagement from some projects, just some of the components and not the whole architecture
- Was expecting one or two country engagement, instead there are more country engagement than anticipated.
- Tanzania and Philippines have started to think about OHIE architecture as a whole even though they started as only being interested in one component.
- Managing expectations and have learned how best to begin the engagement process with countries.

What would we like to do different?

- Continue to develop a more formalized process, making sure that the leadership is kept up to date on country engagement.
- More education materials to engage stakeholders such as to show them the big picture.
- All elements of the HIE are exercised, participating more practically.
- Develop a process such that when a country engages one of us, we communicate that back to the leads, including who the stakeholders are. Working towards a way for projects to register themselves so that we are better informed.
- Would like to see country wiki page for a table to log country interactions.
- Implement more full OHIE architecture in countries that are ready

Architecture Process

What did we expect to happen?

- “Year of engineering” expected clarification and refinement of the architecture
- Clearer goals on roles and responsibilities from the different component communities
- More well defined structure of Client Registry and how it interacts with different components, adding improvements to scalability for the Client Registry.
- Facility Registry was hoping to see network of service driven application directed by the country, e.g., how much information would flow through the HIM vs API directly
- Functionality to support country requirements
- Expected to come to agreement on standards development organizations and how we value that in comparison to the country requirements
- Interactions between tools and the other communities and the greater architecture
- Crosscutting interactions between the components

What has happened?

- Established architecture community calls which have helped community more organized but would preferred face-to-face conversations
- Have started documenting interactions of each component that have advanced and refined individual requirements and functioning.
- Strengthen compliance of Client Registry with HIE architecture helps standardization.
- Service oriented applications begin developed in country and integrations with DHIS
- Facility Registry came up with standard API which can be a model for different components to help normalize interactions
- Did not get closer to integration with applications, provider information to OMRS or Rapid SMS.
- Terminology Services begun to document and come to greater consensus among the group. focused on internal architecture this year but would like to be more open with communication to other groups
- Thorough examination of requirements to make some concrete architecture decisions

What would we like to do different?

- What transactions overlap and figuring out how components can interrelate
- Need a more formal governance and decision making process as it becomes more complicated, this will help new people having their questions answered
- Additional demand and integration of the facility registry with other components in countries
- Shaun will be the chief architect and lead the architecture meeting
- Swappability, standards based and adoptable - predictably swappable
Community Development

What did we expect to happen?
- IHE component of what Facility Register is up to, tracking activities in implementations, capture interactions and how they would affect what the community does, interest from other countries in the Facility Register
- Conversations around implementation engagement and website content
- Evolving underlying architecture and technology so communities have better understanding
- Expect a better understanding of architecture for the communities, drawing in people outside the usual suspects
- Figuring out who are Health Worker Registry community is, what are their use cases/functional requirements, identify appropriate standards of Health Worker information
- Sustain the non-usual suspects into community development
- More interaction with some of the users
- Expected to use the wiki as a collaboration tool for community development

What has happened?
- Saw a decline in non OHIE participation
- Did not bring in as many new faces as we should have
- Have a lot of structure in place but do not have much uptake, this may come from more people using OHIE
- Moving towards increasing architecture review process, engagement with countries and organizations, strengthening of community constructs
- Wiki has become a key resource for HIM and SHR communities
- Collected a lot of Health Worker use cases
- Successfully leveraged community engagement and CSD specification

What would we like to do different?
- Better sharing of implementation, communication around community development
- Good design that needs to be expressed in code
- Explore ways to "share the wealth", ways for people to lead country implementations, more potential engagement with health community, more engagement with regional groups
- See lulls in community call traffic as normal, does not mean that people are not watching
- See more engagement with local technology partners - good advocates for OHIE in country

Engineering

What did we expect to happen?
- Standards implemented in component software pieces
- Overall architecture picture
- A more complete system by now
- At least one manifestation of a technology to realize the workflows we have
- Development of the workflows to drive more tangibly the implementations

What has happened?
- Community agreed to specifications and documented those
- At the transaction level and agreed to a specific scope for a release of OHIE
- Connect-a-thon compliance demonstrated but not necessarily deployed into countries
- Have been working hard to develop the components each is working on but not so much on coordination

What would we like to do different?
- Focused on realizing workflows instead of technical functions of components, i.e., prioritizing workflows
- Rely on what have agreed on to be ready implemented in countries where software is
- Be demand driven
- Context of sub-communities need to be in the context of the larger engineering
- Concrete artifact such as a table that outlines areas like what’s observed, places of focuses. This workflow solves the documented need and why it would address the issue.