**Agenda**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Meeting Information | | | | | | | | |
| **Meeting Location:** | Phone | | | **Meeting Time:** | | 11:00 am – 12:00 pm ET | | |
| **Dial In:** | 877-262-2695 | | | **Access Code:** | | 100856# | | |
| Attendees | | | | | | | | | |
| **Name** | | | **Attended** | | **Name** | | | **Attended** | |
| Doug MacFadden | | Harvard |  | | Nich Wattanasin | | Partners |  | |
| Nick Anderson | | UC Davis |  | | Bhaswati Ghosh | | Partners |  | |
| Shawn Murphy | | Harvard / Partners |  | | Philip Trevvett | | Harvard |  | |
| Marc Ciriello | | Harvard |  | | Elaina Sendro | | The Chartis Group |  | |
| Vivian Gainer | | Partners |  | | Other: | |  |  | |

| Agenda/Minutes | | |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Agenda Item | **Points of Discussion** | Meeting Notes/Follow-up |
| **ACT Performance Testing** | * + - Check in on next steps as follow up from 4/24 call | Smoke test queries are not representative of what end users are doing, so  Capturing information on ALL query performance (from end users and testing purposes, no differentiation between them)  -Looking at indicators in real world conditions  -Dave Wallend (SHRINE): don’t capture a lot of information in this sense on the current version, but looking to do so in this next release (coming out this summer)  -Suggestion: Wait until we have the next SHRINE release in production and mine for this type of information for a performance indicator that we can share with sites |
| **MRN Survey** | * + - Review initial responses from ACT MRN survey distributed a few weeks back | Vivian reviewed the initial summary from the ACT MRN survey.  -Good response rate  -A variety of responses to the current processes or what they need  Open this up for discussion at the June meeting (ACT breakout)  How are we going to find investigators? How are we going to share queries?  Question: Doug was trying to determine how many sites would find the plugins useful or not  Question: Marc: will sites look to us for the process or do we expect them to document their own process?  -Combination – we want to understand if  Set any assumptions at the June meeting? Process related, technical related, where there are gaps in the process  **We will share with the Exec. Committee on 5/14**  Nick: do some sort of publication on this information; this is addressing the primary struggle that |
| **ACT Training** | * Discuss dissemination’s plan of developing a training mechanism for ACT   + Review technical capabilities to allow potential end users trial access to the tool (with governance approval) | Doug: Could do something with dummy data, but this likely won’t achieve the goal / folks won’t be satisfied with seeing  Webclient hooked up to the production network; ontology to this webclient alone that is much smaller than the real ontology to control (no HIV, abortion, etc.)  -Could show the full ontology, while making just some of it unqueriable; allow just a few areas (demographics, etc.) to be queriable  Next steps: Run this through the governance work group and  I2b2: use synPUF data from medicare as dummy data |
| Next Meeting/Future Agenda Items | | |
| **Next Meeting/Future Agenda Items:** | Elaina OOO 5/22, next meeting 6/10 | |