

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_kNoWTaFL9y0AnLMqU
- Frank, Oliver, Mathias and other ICO developers should meet to go over links/overlap between ICO and DACTS **Keep until after the grant deadline**
- Mathias & Frank (write in aim2): current state and current plans for funding (dacts + ico, integration) [DONE]
- Asiyah and Oliver: check on versions on ICBO and github that they download properly and consistently **Postpone until Oliver or Asiyah can join the call**
- Frank to talk to UMich biobank to get byin 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 be needed/used. Will figure out federated queries as part of our discovery process.

Topics for Today

- ICO Dacts overlap:
 - MB: not needed before the grant deadline.
 - Should highlight same frameworks used between dacts and ICO in aim 2
 - What are some of the challenges in aim 2 regarding dacts and ICO
 - Overlap is minimal
- Going forward we are working on the U01 in the google doc:
https://docs.google.com/document/d/1DGOi5vd0wbcT2oQZRTmISPUCI9_Hwj1k4YB68WsvO/edit?ts=568e7eba#heading=h.gjmyh1tycaf
- Deidentified data sets, where will they be generated and how shared.
 - if we are all generating a deid 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 23]
 - 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)

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

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_kNoWTaFL9y0ANnLMoU
- 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 review IRB approval will be obtained at a later date.
 - Chris: ideally we need to be able to compare search results with and without benefit 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 and 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 check <http://vuc.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/1GT25dt86qm5O5vIMU53IjyhIM2oKSOIP_Zftg5IXcuY/edit
 - 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 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 o

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=0B6sjrSOFI0cVVFmWmxBYmlybDQ&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#
 - 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

