**CSSP working group January 7th 2016 minutes**

1. Reviewed all the points from December 10 2015 email and agreed on following point:

-Have Charles keep the impossible tube combination flag but to allow for users to send data to server if there are unusual tube combinations. User should still be prompted to double check this data in case of typos. Once on web tools at the approval stage, a supervisor should have the capability of selecting an MPN value from the non-modified MPN table for the un-usual tube combination before approving the data. : After speaking with Patti, the non-modified MPN table does not have any assign values for the un-usual tube combination. So in that case, we would just need to make sure that we are following the same procedure: biologist is consulted and decides on a case by case basis whether to delete that sample data for that run or assign a value based on next most feasible number while airing on the side of public safety. Charles will look into if he can add a function in the web tools for supervisors to assign an MPN value at the ‘approval stage’. If he can’t, supervisors would need to approve data, go in the ‘run tab’ and edit the sample data from there.

We think that samples with improbable tube combos should be disregarded because they indicate that an error has occurred with the technique. However, this should be discussed by the Senior Biologists. Note that improbable values can be calculated according to a procedure outlined in SM (21st edition) – page 9-54

-Change sample type name from normal to ‘routine’. No prob

-Have the sorting capability in the input tool archive changed from only year to ‘from dd/mm/yy to dd/mm/yy. No prob

-Agreed on using the input tool for samples other than routine samples by creating config files on a case by case basis (example: NS Rain 2015). To discuss: I forgot to mention this consideration. At the moment, the web tool allows us to manually add a whole run. Should this be allowed for QA/QC purposes or should we only be allowed to add runs via the input tool. Charles will not remove this option as we may want to input old data sheets that are not currently in ASGAD (example: rain runs, MOU’s) Also, what happens to our FC form in the input tool if someone edits detail on the web tools? Should we even be able to edit data on the web tools? It’s a nice feature for sure but 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 after data has been approved not knowing if it’s been modified? I’ve added this to the agenda for Wednesday but Charles will add an edit history to the web tool so that whatever we decide to do, we will have a way of tracking changes.

NL votes to have all editing to data, as well as initial entry, be done via the input tool. Can’t old data sheets also be added via config files in the input tool? Would adding them via Web tools be easier or something?

1. Seems to be a delay with the email notifications for NL and NB. NS not receiving emails at all and data missing on web tools (sent with duplicate error yet input tool said it was sent successfully). Will look into this. Lauren he thinks he may only have updated one of the two versions of the CSSP input tool install versions on the server.
2. Can rejected sheets still be available on web tools in an archive until they are replaced by a corrected version? This way, supervisor can track what data is still missing/needs to be updated without going into the input tool. He will look into having some kind of option for this.

and also some sheets will never be replaced and it would be nice to track those as well (example: runs that failed because the bath was at 50oC). Suggestion here would be to only track those via the input tool seeing as this is only a lab issue. I asked if we could have a clickable option somewhere on the input tool to flag a data sheet as ‘failed’ . Any data sheets that are flagged that way will not be ‘sendable’ to the server and the file name will change from ‘C’ to ‘F’. We can then use the sorting capability of the input tool to view all failed runs.

Agree. Track via input tool. Such problems will still remain in the archive.

1. Can the default ‘start box’ in the input tool be the sampling crew initials instead of the tides? No prob
2. Can we have a ‘drag down’ option like in excel to auto-fill the ‘processed by’ initials? He will look into this but said it may be complicated for him to do
3. Can we leave the ‘site type’ and ‘sample comments’ out of the ‘auto tab’ but still be able to select it in case we need to change the duplicate or add a comment? i.e.: not have to press tab to skip the comment and site type section seeing as we will rarely put any sample comments. He is pretty sure this won’t be possible but will look into it.
4. Can the ‘sample comments’ be transferred into the ‘run comments’ once we create an FC form? If not, look at other options so as to not lose that information on fc forms. He will look into this
5. Check with Charles if activating the delete button in input tool is possible. I’m pretty sure he’ll say no on this one but as an alternative, I’ve gone in the input tool and really if you make a mistake (let’s say you need to delete the whole salinity column) you can double click on the first one, change it and then press the ‘down arrow’ on your keyboard and change the next one very quickly…overriding the values would be faster than deleting and re-imputing. Ok I was surprised he said yes haha BUT he agrees that overriding data is quicker than any other option. Also, the space bar at the moment works the same as the delete button. So if you guys agree to leave it as is, I can update in the WI’s these two ways of deleting or overriding data.

The existing options work ok – no problem.

1. NS QC flag is not working if they input the same lots number for the media lots (not being flagged in red). See answer at number 2.
2. Can we add a flag to the supervisor at the approval stage in case the time of first sample and the incubation start time is greater than 8hrs? Also, can we have a flag to the supervisor if the ‘results read by’ is more than 24 hrs. after sampling date (signaling samples being process perhaps the next day due to extenuating circumstances). He suggested adding a line at the approval stage where it would give you the ‘hold time’ that will be calculated using the incubation start time, dates and first sample time.
3. How can we incorporate intertech duplicates and intertech reading in the input tool? Can we have an extra sample type (intertech dup) that we can manually select ‘F2 function’? How can we view this data on the FC form? How will the precision criteria (different from daily duplicate) be saved by default? See attached FC form. Changing the FC form at this point would be the worst case scenario for him so he suggested that we can select the daily duplicate cell in the input tool, press F2, to add the intertech dup or intertach read underneath with the capability of inputting the precision criteria. On the FC form, it will look exactly like we use to do it which is just the bare minimum, who did it, what were the results and is it acceptable.

Sounds fine to NL

1. The last precision criteria imputed is not being reflected in the next data sheet. Goes back to original one. He will add it in the config file but we will still have the option to override it in the input tool.
2. At the moment, the input tool is allowing you to send fictive sampling runs for dates that are in the future and this shouldn’t be allowed (same for samples read and recorded by). You shouldn’t be allowed to send to server data for which the results read and recorded by are in the future/has not happened yet. He will fix that
3. What value was selected for <2 (1 or 1.9)? The value for <2 is ‘1’ in the webtools calculation
4. Web tools: when creating a config file and you select your subsector, can it by default select all the sampling stations or have a ‘select all’ button. It would be quicker to un-select an inactive site instead of selecting all the active ones especially when there are lots of sampling stations to choose from. He will add a feature to help us with this.
5. When reviewing a data sheet that was sent to the server for approval on the webtools, the webtools doesn’t flag in red for the supervisor all the information that was flagged in red in the input tool. Also, double check what was set as the correct limits for total incubation time (should be between 22 and 26 hrs of incubation, everything else should be flagged in red). Can you guys let me know (other than the incubation range) exactly what red flags should be showing up but are not working. He will need to know exactly which one so he can fix them.