**Members:** Yvonne Coulter, Mary McCoy, Melissa Craft, Earle Barnes, Debbie Smith, Tymn Neece, Jayme Osborn, Laura Jones, Corbin Ellsaesser, Debbie Czarnecki, Melinda Doherty

**SCC Members:** Kathy Branca, Creed Baughman, David Romano, Jesus Blasquez, Fred Church, Ellen Carney

**Not Able to Attend**: Randy Rhodes, Tomek & Don Keller

**Recording Secretary:** Jayme Osborn

1. The meeting began at 12:05 p.m. EST. Jayme Osborn announced that the call was being recorded.
2. Updates
	* SoftLab Update -- MU2 and HL7 2.5.1: Fred Church
		+ It has been winding down a bit in October.
		+ 76 clients are live.

* + Core Measures of Upgrade Go Lives: Fred Church
		- Projected Down time vs. Actual Downtime
			1. Report with data on the downtimes – see last page of these minutes.
				1. Only a few are red.
			2. About 12 are in progress now.
			3. Based on budgeting, they think that 20-30 more upgrades will be starting Q1 2015. They will be the more typical upgrade projects.
		- Quality of the Conversion – SCC has weeded through the issues. They have a post mortem after every go-live. Not finding anything that is not client-specific.
		- First client is going live with 4.0.7.2 in about a month.
		- Will work on presenting some of the metrics at the conference next year.
		- Some clients have reported on the list serve that they are having performance issues. We are seeing this on the list serve. SCC is working on this. The message size increased dramatically – 10 fold. Some systems choked on that. Slowness’s are tracked. We want SCC and clients to be partners in the preparation for the go-live. SCC will take that back to their teams. Clients also need to make sure the PC’s meet the requirements that are provided.
		- For clients with longer downtimes – there are two things:
			1. Total downtime – depends on the size of the conversions that are being done.
			2. Hitting the target – they are doing well with that.
			3. SCC has extracted some steps from the downtime – they have done as much as they can do to minimizing the downtime.
	+ ICD-10 Update: Ellen Carney
		- Hasn’t changed much since our last report.
		- 20 are out for post live. 10 of those will be doing the ICD-10 upgrade as part of the 4.0.7 upgrade.
		- There are some clients that did not need any help from SCC.
		- They are where Ellen expects them to be.
		- If a client has the codes on their system, just not activated: how is the best way to get them activated? SCC will be working with the clients. Clients also need to put a task in.
		- Will have to schedule these activations – we all can’t do the activation at the same time. SCC will be proactive to prevent a bottleneck.
		- A problem was identified – the full diagnosis description does not appear on the screen. The user can scroll through it. A task was logged by Maine and it is still unresolved. All clients will need that fix. SCC: it is in process for getting corrected and it will go to all clients.
1. Database Conversion: Tomek was not able to attend the meeting. This topic will be moved to the next meeting.
2. SNUG Webinar Series for 2014: Don Keller was not able to attend the meeting. This topic will be moved to the next meeting.
3. Proposal for adding SNUG fees to Maintenance Agreement: Jesus Blasquez
	* This is about the SNUG Board recommendations for discounting maintenance costs if the client attends the SNUG conference.
	* Jesus has talked to Gilbert, but he hasn’t’ been in the office a lot. Gilbert is aware. Jesus has talked to him a couple of times. Need further discussion. Tymn has forwarded information his facility has on to Jesus. This is a partnership. For there to be a discounted maintenance cost, the clients have to put the time for education that makes a difference in the amount of support that SCC has to provide.
	* Also, we need to coordinate better with SCC about the topics that are being presented at SNUG. They can be based on the tasks that SCC sees being logged.
4. SCR Change Letter: Ellen Carney
	* Jesus sent it to Missy and she forwarded it to the Board.
	* Letter has to do with the requirements for SCRs.
	* Effective immediately; therefore, it is already in place. Ellen apologized for they were delayed in getting us notified.
	* (1) The SCR process hasn’t changed that drastically.
		1. Now the $975 evaluation fee has to be paid before the evaluation is started.
	* (2) Instrument development:
		1. This is for a new instrument not previously developed by SCC. The vendor often pays for it.
		2. SCC found they were doing a lot of work and then the client decided not to use that analyzer.
		3. They follow the same path as the SCR’s now, requiring the $975.
		4. For a new They have had instances where developed and
			1. $975 is required up front IF it is an interface that SCC has not previously programmed.
		5. The AE will escalate it if it is needed quickly.
		6. SCC has a published list of interfaces they have done. It is on the SCC website, but there is a problem accessing it right now and they need to make sure it is up to date. It will be referenced in the letter.
		7. There will be an automatic set of questions that come up to be answered at the start of an instrument interface. This will speed up the process.
		8. When a client puts in a RFQ for an instrument interface, they will need to make sure it is clear that it is for new development.
		9. The letter will be sent out to clients next week.
5. Cumulative Hot Fix (HF) Concerns: Missy Craft
	* After the Customer Service call last week the process was reviewed. There are concerns that a two hour downtime every month is not realistic for most clients.
	* Many clients may not take them every month – they may want to change the frequency of receiving them.
	* Are we defeating the purpose of the more frequent hot fixes if clients are going to refuse them monthly?
	* What are SCC’s goals by taking this approach? Can we achieve those goals if clients are going to refuse those monthly HF’s?
	* SCC agrees that it is a concern.
	* Jesus: this is a conversation we need to have with Tomek or Alexi. HF’s take a couple of hours of downtime.
	* SCC has talked about dividing the HF’s into: (1) the ones that take a long time vs. those that don’t require a lot of downtime, (2) those with or without database impact, or (3) break them down into product-specific HF’s.
	* Then the clients could take the others 1-2 x/year.
	* SCC is aware and is willing to re-evaluate the process.
6. The meeting was adjourned at 12:48 p.m. EST.
7. The next meeting will be November 20, 2014 at 12:00 p.m. EST.

Respectively submitted,

Jayme Osborn

SNUG Secretary

