**Agenda January 13th**

* What happens to our FC form in the input tool if someone edits detail on the web tools? Should we have internal procedure for data only to be edited in the input tool (and resent to server) so that if we require a data sheet (FC form) it will reflect the most accurate information? Or should we perhaps have a ‘view FC’ function on the web tools so that any ‘edits’ will be reflected on this report instead of creating am FC form from the input tool and risking have missing data.
* Can we agree on a procedure for the following scenario so that we stay consistent (even if we won’t document it in our QM)? If a tube breaks, staff are to consult supervisor who will make a decision on a case by case basis:

-If too many tubes have broken, eliminate that sample for the input tool for that date and add comment and send to server.

-If only one tube has broken, assume it was positive and report it as positive on input tool with an appropriate comment and send to server

-Only report positive tubes and add comment, send to server and have supervisor on web tool either change the MPN value or delete the sample

-Other scenario?

* Time frame for launching the use of the input tool and web tools (either 1: keep paper and use input tool for all labs and contractors and use 2015 for validation if feasible or 2: use both system and paper FC forms and do validation with 2016 data).

-With option 2, discuss if we can do the validation using only the ASGAD data from a lab that has a functioning ASGAD and the others can use the web tools in the fall of 2016 to generate their reports.

-Charles suggested using both systems for a period of time (May) and do the validation with that data and use new system for the rest of 2016 season. Contractors to use new system season 2017.

-Discuss what is needed in order to have a valid validation for CALA purposes.