Our analytic process first occurred as separate individual efforts to make sense of the dataset and to generate varying hypotheses based on evidence. Each group member used their own analytic techniques within the tool to aggregate, clean data, make connections, and gain insights. After these separate threads of analysis were complete, all of the group members met to discuss their findings in the datasets. The group members shared their findings while displaying the tool on a large display (lcd tv). One of the group members navigated the tool – while the others prompted him to take desired actions. The collaborative analysis began with overlapping hypotheses taking precedence. We found the hypotheses that were the same to be the most interesting. We mostly used the graph view to layout the network of entities and how we thought they were interrelated. We also used the search function to find documents that a group member knew existed and add it to the graph. The timeline brushing was also used to compare time periods of interest. After discussing and analyzing the overlapping hypotheses, conversation then diverged to related hypotheses of our main narrative. We then discussed hypotheses that appeared to be red herrings such as the e. coli case. After more discussion aided by the tool we decided on our final analysis. We also used the tool to save a log of our interactions so that we would know which actions we took if we needed to recreate or remember our collaborative provenance.