

AGENDA

Date 2/4/16

Attendees:

Chris Stoeckert
Heather Williams
Jihad Obeid
Mathias Brochhausen
Helena Ellis
Jie Zheng

Not today:

Frank Manion

Notes:

- Congrats on U01 submission
 - Review in May/Score
 - Council in August
 - Specified start date: 9/1/16
- review terms in ICO [POSTPONE TILL NEXT VISIT]
- So for NEXT MEETING:
 - especially those relevant to biobanking that require def:
<https://github.com/ICO-ontology/ICO/issues>
 - review current ICO
 - review gaps (e.g. what we said in the grant)
 - + what we have in d-acts (need inclusion from d-acts) in close collaboration with U Mich.
 - Can use biobank consent from (OBIB) as an example to test the core terms in the ICO
 - What are the core terms defined in ICO and how related to d-acts
 - Will want to capture terms and changes will want to track in github.
 - Can review ontology in ontobee (vs. protege.):
 - jie updated ICO on webProtege:
 - <http://webprotege.stanford.edu/#Edit:projectId=2dc11696-19bf-4412-b59d-17d205dd25fe>
- Biobank Consent Ontol calls: continue on same schedule?
 - Do we have a name as an affinity group or working group?: working group
 - Current focus: have to keep focus on ICO for biobanking.
 - Do we invite others? (e.g. from ECAG?)
 - as long the focus remains on Biobanking consent.

AGENDA

Date 1/21/16

Attendees:

Chris Stoeckert
David Birtwell

Frank Manion
Mathias Brochhausen
Helena Ellis
Asiyah
Jie Zheng

Not today:

Marcy
Oliver He
Heather Williams

Notes:

- Any further edits and which doc to use?
 - Chris is keeping a parallel copy in word
 - Lockdown Wed 1/27
 - Need to work on competency questions in Aim 3
- Focus on Broad consent: do we need to change that?
 - Frank: if we limit to broad consent, then does not cover enough complexity and may not review well.
 - Chris and Jihad agree.
 - Frank (1st) then Mathias & Jihad will try to re-write.
- Duke will set up a similar graph db as Penn
 - so federated queries
 - UAMS and Mich will be in later stages
 - Need to address that in grant
- Timeline:
 - years 1-2: ontology dev
 - by year 2 we should be ready to start testing
 - but ontology dev will continue
 - see under timeline and metrics
- Review of use cases [Frank & Marcy]
 - discussion by email
 - Action: all review the document
 - Do these use cases reflect the competency questions
 - Frank will try to match the competency questions to the use cases (in a table?)
- VICO Screening Questions are now also in ICO
 - Asiyah: the screening questionnaire is part of informed consent.
 - so a lot of that was added to ICO
 - The question is do you screen before you enroll or enroll then screen?
 - Screening content should be removed from ICO but keep in VICO:
 - Chris: make ICO a domain ontology, not an application ontology.
 - for Biobanking keep ICO (as domain ontology) the same and use OBIB for the application
 - Mathias: The current representation does not take into account the way that question textual entities depend on questions (which are a specific kind of

speech acts). Barry Smith is currently working on representation for speech acts, which will enlighten the discussion of those topics.

- **Next meeting agenda:** review terms in ICO especially those relevant to biobanking that require definitions
 - follow in issue tracker: <https://github.com/ICO-ontology/ICO/issues>
 - Do we need to fork ICO on github: production vs. dev?
 - David: make **branches not forks** for **public release** vs. dev
- **Next meeting also discuss** the future schedule of future Biobank Consent Ontol calls.

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

AGENDA

Date 1/7/16

Attendees:

Chris Stoeckert
David Birtwell
Frank Manion
Mathias Brochhausen
Helena Ellis
Heather Williams
Oliver He

Not today:

Asiyah

Review of actions

- Marcy's v4 "Biorepository Use Cases Intro_v4 mrh.docx" - Jihad: add MUSC use cases:
 - https://docs.google.com/document/d/1ba5e7iA6FAncmvyP5g2i6DL_kNoWTaFL9y0ANnLMq-U
- Frank, Oliver, Mathias and other ICO developers should meet to go over links/overlap between ICO and D-Acts [Keep until after the grant deadline]
- Mathias & Frank (write in aim2): current state and current plans for funding (d-acts + ico, and integration) [DONE]
- Asiyah and Oliver: check on versions on ICBO and github that they download properly and are consistent [Postpone until Oliver or Asiyah can join the call]
- Frank to talk to UMich biobank to get by-in on being part of phase 1

Decisions

- Going forward we will work on the U01 in the google doc. See link below.
- Reasoning not necessary for all groups
- Tracking terms to biobank - will go over next OBIB call
- A common SPARQL store will not needed/used. Will figure out federated queries as part of our discovery process.

Topics for Today

- ICO D-acts overlap:
 - MB: not needed before the grant deadline.
 - Should highlight same frameworks used between d-acts and ICO in aim 2
 - What are some of the challenges in aim 2 regarding d-acts and ICO
 - Overlap is minimal
- Going forward we are working on the U01 in the google doc:
https://docs.google.com/document/d/1DGOi5vd0wbcT2oQZ-RTm-ISPUCI9_HwJ1k4YB68WsvQ/edit?ts=568e7eba#heading=h.gjmyh1tycaf
- De-identified data sets, where will they be generated and how shared.
 - if we all generating a de-id data set then can we share data centrally?
 - David: used the ontology in triple store only.
 - No plans to share data
 - Chris: can generate simulated data. And can send that.
 - importing relational data into a triple store (rdf) is time consuming but can be done.
 - relational testing and rdf testing can go in parallel.
 - queries across institutions options:
 - a common data store in rdf: not needed, but instead:
 - Federated SPARQL endpoints going across multiple institutions: in scope for this project
 - SHRINE on i2b2 an advantage of implementation of i2b2 but out of scope for this project
- How to handle competency testing (in i2b2 if reasoning is involved)
 - MUSC: testing in i2b2 not involving reasoning. Testing competencies through execution of queries in use cases. [this can happen by the end of year 2-3]
 - This has implications on defining classes and terms (in ICO). things need to be described in multiple ways to be used with and without inferencing.
 - Chris: we can proceed, the basic hierarchy will go a long way.
 -
- Scope of work at Duke especially in the consent arena.
- helena has a question about tracking the mapping of duke terms to the biobank ontology (helena will write Chris with this question)