

## AGENDA

Date 12/10/15

### Attendees:

Chris Stoeckert

Frank

Jie Zheng

Mathias Brochhausen

Heather Williams

David Birtwell

Oliver

### Apologies:

Helena Ellis

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 check [idepink.ue.tufts.edu/](http://idepink.ue.tufts.edu/)
  - VUE (free from Tufts): frank will provide link.
- 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/1GT25dt86qm5O5vIMU53IjyhIM2oKSOlP\\_Zftg5IXcuYdit](https://docs.google.com/document/d/1GT25dt86qm5O5vIMU53IjyhIM2oKSOlP_Zftg5IXcuYdit)
  - 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 with 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 the 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 this 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=0B6sjrSOFIOcVVFmWmxBYmlybDO&usp=sharing\\_eid&32d4e9&usp=sharing\\_eid#](https://drive.google.com/folderview?id=0B6sjrSOFIOcVVFmWmxBYmlybDO&usp=sharing_eid&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 14

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:

- o Discussed at AMIA
- o Should occur after the use case examination
- o Documents from DActs could go as classes in ICO,
- o Where do they stand with BFO and OBI? Still need a good review to see if various processes are in the right place.
- o DActs: uses BFO 2. Classes from OBI, IAO.
- o Need to make sure both DActs and ICO are using same versions of upper level ontologies.
- o 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=sharing\\_eid&ts=5632d4e9&usp=sharing\\_eid#](https://drive.google.com/folderview?id=0B6sjrSOFIOcVVFmWmxBYmlybDQ&usp=sharing_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 retrieval)

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