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

* 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.

-Change sample type name from normal to ‘routine’.

-Have the sorting capability in the input tool archive changed from only year to ‘from dd/mm/yy to dd/mm/yy

-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. 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?

* 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).
* 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 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).
* Can the default ‘start box’ in the input tool be the sampling crew initials instead of the tides?
* Can there be an auto tab once a box is filed for the time, positive tubes like it does for the controls. I don’t think he will be able to do more than that seeing as salinity we could be inputting a one number value or a two number value and the system would not know if when you put a ‘1’ it ment ‘1’ or it ment you were not done and you were going to input ‘10’ for instance.
* Can we have a ‘drag down’ option like in excel to auto-fill the ‘processed by’ initials?
* 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.
* 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.
* 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.
* Can we have time ‘auto fill’ the 0 in the time if it’s 0920 for example? Again here it’s coming back to me that we brought this up to him on a couple of occasion and he didn’t want this in case someone didn’t use the 24 hrs clock by mistake and puts in 130 instead of 1330. He said it had to be the user who ‘purposely inputs 4 numbers’.
* NS QC flag is not working if they input the same lots number for the media lots (not being flagged in red).
* 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).
* 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?
* The last precision criteria imputed is not being reflected in the next data sheet. Goes back to original one.
* Julie to test if changing the default duplicate mid-season in the config file will create any bugs going forward.
* 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.
* What value was selected for <2 (1 or 1.9)?
* 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.
* 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).
* Last issue to be discussed on Tuesday 12th of March at 2pm with Charles and group. Time frame for launching the use of the input tool and web tools (either keep paper and use input tool for all labs and contractors and use 2015 for validation if feasible or use both system and paper FC forms and do validation with 2016 data). If we go with option 2 and 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 that would be a win win for everyone I think (spoke with Pat and he was on board too).

Anything missing?