AGENDA
Date 12/22/15

Attendees:
Chris Stoeckert
Frank Manion
Mathias Brochhausen
Heather Williams
Oliver He
Helena Ellis
Asiyah

Not today:
Jie Zheng
Marcy Harris
David Birtwell

Review of actions
- Biobank Consent google group
- Cmap and VUE.
  - Let's work with Cmap for now
  - See https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=P0DBSYbRc0
    - link provided by Chris. compares cmap to others
    - http://cmap.ihmc.us/cmaptools (basic cmap is sufficient for now.)
- MUSC use cases: pending

This meeting:
- There is a new v4 use cases link:
  https://docs.google.com/document/d/1ba5e7iA6FAncmvyP5g2i6DL_kNoWTaFL9y0ANnLMc U
- ISBR: should hear back after the first of the year (Helena)
- Human subjects issue:
  - Penn not planning to use real data (a made up data set)
  - MUSC: i2b2 approach, deidentified real data
  - Chris is consulting with Penn IRB and will report back to group
  - Two different approaches are a strength.
  - Will aim to work with deid data for human subj section
    - we can state that back up plan: if identified data is needed for consent revie IRB approval will be obtained at a later date.
  - Chris: ideally we need to be able to compare search results with and without benef of new ontologies. (may be impossible without.)
  - Duke working on one or other option or different (maybe Deduce or i2b2)
  - U Mich: will decide after new year.
  - Reason we are doing this is to protect human subjects.
- Chris: slide templates for presentations on OBI based ontologies
- Review of upper level ontologies and overlap: ICO & DACTS
  - Frank and Mathias discussed off line briefly

- ○ Mathias: DActs updated to BFO2 so ready to use
    - ■ fairly natural way where dacts can tie to ICO.
    - ■ overlap is minimal
    - ■ Frank, Oliver, Mathias and other ICO developers should meet to go over details
    - ■ ICO and DActs are on github.
    - ■ OBI is compatible with BFO2 so need to update ICO to new OBI.
    - ■ When is the next release of ICO? can we refer to it from grant?
        - ● next ICO release: need new OBI and align/integrate with dacts
        - ● Mathias should not rush for integrating the 2.
        - ● Aim to do BFO2 work for now for next ICO release
    - ■ Mathias will do a new push for dacts.
        - ● need to do it right with ICO + write up why in text (in aim2)
- ● Next meeting: 1/7

ACTIONS:
- ● Add MUSC Use case(s) to Marcy's v4 "Biorepository Use Cases Intro_v4 mrh.docx
- ● Frank, Oliver, Mathias and other ICO developers should meet to go over links/overlap between ICO and DActs
- ● Mathias & Frank (write in aim2): current state and current plans for funding (dacts + ico, integration)
- ● Asiyah and Oliver: check on versions on ICBO and github that they download properly an consistent
========================OLD NOTES========================

AGENDA
Date 12/10/15

Attendees:
Chris Stoeckert
Frank Manion
Jie Zheng
Mathias Brochhausen
Heather Williams
David Birtwell
Oliver He
Helena Ellis

Apologies:
Marcy Harris

Notes:
- ● Should we use a googlegroup email list:
    - ○ Action: Frank will create a list for the whole Biobank Consent group.
- ● Review actions:
    Subgroup meeting to solidify use cases and tables (Jihad, Frank, Mathias, Marcy) [DONE]

Perform review of upper ontologies of both ICO and DActs: Mathias & Asiyah, Oliver [PENDING]

Jihad: convert notes to google doc. [DONE]

ACTION: Group: test cmap tools on your own computers.[IN PROGRESS] Should also che
- o VUE (free from Tufts): frank wild provide link: http://vue.tufts.edu/

- ● Sub group reports:
  - ○ Use cases: more on drive:
    - ■ use cases tables reviewed
    - ■ established format for chris: use cases in bullets.
  - ○ Upper ontology reviews?
- ● Examine use cases: see
  https://docs.google.com/document/d/1GT25dt86qm5O5vIMU53IJyhlM2oKSOlP_Zftg5IXcuY
  dit
  - ○ ACTION: Jihad summarize MUSC use cases, tease out processes, (see link above.)
- ● Deeper dive into ICO:
  - ○ ACTION: First need to review upper level ontologies and report back on overlap wit
    other ontologies: High level strategy: Scope of each Ontology (ICO, DActs, Other?)
    - ■ any migration of classes needed? [DISCUSS NEXT MEETING]
  - ○ Use process approach (planned processes). examples of processes: enrollment, fill
    up consent form, screening etc., storing the informed consent data (a function of t
    form.)
  - ○ Translate to a concept map of the processes with inputs and outputs.
  - ○ Then need to test with research coordinators (Frank & Marcy have done work like t
    before.)
  - ○ Then compare concept map with existing planned processes in ICO
  - ○ What is needed to address the use cases (Frank working from common rule
    perspective.)
    - ■ From Chris's perspective: what specimens can be viewed as available to to
      others?, what information about those specimens (and their donors) can be
      made available? and what is allowed to be done with those specimens (e.g.,
      genome sequencing)
  - ○ What are the obligations that each role (PI, reg team, researchers who need
    specimens) have to meet
- ● Next meeting: will move to Tuesday for that week (instead of christmas eve)

======================OLD NOTES======================
AGENDA
Date 11/25/15
Review actions:
Settle on tool to use: cmap or other
Continue ICO review Mathias recommended:
- look at competency questions
- Use Ontology dev pattern based on nondomain specific terms: look at the basic pattern of
- DACTS to create rights and obligations.

Attendees:
Chris Stoeckert
Helena Ellis
Frank
Marcy Harris
Jie Zheng
Mathias Brochhausen
Asiyah (Yu Lin)

Notes:
Drive link:
https://drive.google.com/folderview?id=0B6sjrSOFIOcVVFmWmxBYmlybDQ&usp=sharing_eid&t
32d4e9&usp=sharing_eid#
Helena: had a couple of questions about ethics inclusion and budget issues.

Frank: use cases will lead to competency questions
Marcy: generate a table: rows for specimens, columns for types of uses. (Research, therapeutic
sciences) Aiming for the 14th
Mathias:
      Step one sharing consent templates.
      Extract rights and obligations once signed as consents.
Group:
      Templates don't have biobank consents. Need biobank consents:
      There is the one from Michigan
      MUSC: need to put in folder.
      Duke: on its way.
      Need to look at users of specimens as well.
      DActs ICO links:
- Discussed at AMIA
- Should occur after the use case examination
- Documents from DActs could go as classes in ICO,
- Where do they stand with BFO and OBI? Still need a good review to see if various processes are in the right place.
- DActs: uses BFO 2. Classes from OBI, IAO.
- Need to make sure both DActs and ICO are using same versions of upper level ontologies.
- ICO also using BFO 2 (per Asiyah & Jie) but need to double check with relations.

      CMap is open source http://cmap.ihmc.us/cmaptools/
      Frank trying to map common rule legal theory.
Actions:
      Subgroup meeting to solidify use cases and tables (Jihad, Frank, Mathias, Marcy)
      Perform review of upper ontologies of both ICO and DActs: Mathias & Asiyah
      Jihad: convert notes to google doc.
      Group: test cmap tools on your own computers.

========================OLD NOTES========================

AGENDA
Date 11/12/15

1. Chris to lead discussion about grant
2. Update from the biobank group meetings
3. Frank to go over ICO slides
4. Actions from last meeting:
   a. Get on google drive:
      https://drive.google.com/folderview?id=0B6sjrSOFIOcVVFmWmxBYmlybDQ&usp=s aring_eid&ts=5632d4e9&usp=sharing_eid#
   b. contribute use cases to google drive.

Attendees:
Chris Stoeckert
Heather Williams
David Birtwell
Frank
Marcy
Jie
Mathias

Notes:
Chris to lead discussion about grant:
U01 moving ahead.
Good reviews
Chris would like 1:1 with each institution to discuss role and budget
Tentative call with PO tomorrow
- how preapp relates to U01 review: study section, is it independent from X02
- how much filtering went on in the X02 review?
Writing assignments:
Need to add:
1. barriers to adoption.
2. "Can you give examples to hidden value?" competency questions not enough. Perhaps a more comp questions.
3. Should we add other CTSA partners?
   a. Already 5 institutions?
   b. Others could be added as reviewers of ontol (e.g. Peter Elkin, Laura Palmer, UT Houston: Cui, Utah: Julio) need letter of support for review of ontology.
4. Expand 3 aims:
   a. Aim 1: Dev of Ontol for Biobanking OBIB: Chris
   b. Aim 2 ICO and DACTS: Frank and Mathias
   c. Aim 3 Apply to competency questions: Expanding the technology to do that.
      i. Example at Penn: can expand
      ii. Need to address implementation: technical demonstration (not a production system) demonstrate minimum technology for competency questions.
      iii. Using SPARQL end points to do queries. Can do at Duke and Michigan, MUSC

    iv. FHIR: based in XML/JSON FHIR RDF. David Boothe. Chris attended FHIR calls.
        Looking for use cases. Expanding FHIR to support biobanking.

Need to add people on grant who are NPRM expertise
    MUSC: Dr. Magruder. Jihad to bring back to the table.
    U Mich: tbd
    Jihad ask Helena if Duke ELSI group interested

Update from the biobank group meetings
Started meeting.
Alternates with this meeting
Next Thursday at this time.
Last call: covered initial steps with Duke, mapping to OBIB, need for additional terms.
Next: storage and distribution.
Helena: to map terminology in that area to OBIB

Frank went over ICO slides:
Chris
Use Cmap to model logical definitions between processes.
Focus on Biobanking consents.
Mathias
First step look at competency questions to test for over modeling (e.g. be able to do the retriev
Use Ontology dev pattern based on nondomain specific terms: look at the basic pattern of DAC
how to create rights and obligations.
Topdown approach: link up the domain specific term to that pattern.
Action: frank to get Mathias and Jihad to meet at AMIA

Next meeting dedicated to ICO review