WORKING GROUP: COMPLIANCE UNIT STANDARD PROCEDURE (CUSP) SHARING SITE

Working Group Meeting
September 7, 2017
**Agenda:**

- Team Updates - ~20 individuals online, and 30 individuals at the session

- Discussion Topics
  - Organization of species list
  - Managing site access
  - Management of procedures endorsed by >1 institution

- Goals for October Meeting
Data Import & Export Team Update
• Spoke with several universities and vendors regarding their electronic solutions
• Consensus that JSON and CSV are the two formats to focus on – should work for a broad range of users.
• Vendors are interested in incorporating the API (application programming interface) into their core product offering.
• Info received thus far re: required fields have been added to the SharePoint site. Appears to be some overlap here with Data Organization/Form team – will coordinate efforts.

Data Storage & Maintenance Team Update
• See slide on business use cases

Data Organization Team Update
• See slide on organization of species

Proposal Update
• Final draft of proposal was submitted to the Executive Committee for review. Currently waiting to hear if EC has additional comments, questions, etc.
General consensus below business use cases looked ok; there were no edits/suggestions.

**Business Use Cases & User Stories**

**FDP Community Member (Read Only)**
- Create a new account so that I can access the database.
- Search the database so that I can find and read procedures of interest to me.
- Filter and sort my search results so that I can easily narrow results to entries of interest.
- Flag database entries that need to be updated.

**Designated Institutional Representative* (Read & Edit)**
- Enter a new procedure into the system
- Edit or delete an existing procedure. I can only modify procedures submitted by my institution.
- Select procedures of interest and export the related data from the system so that I can use this information at my home institution

**System Administrator* (All)**
- Review new account requests. When new accounts are created, a confirmation email is sent to the new user.
- Update the permissions on accounts of existing users.
- Delete accounts of existing users.

* This user will perform all the same functions as the user(s) to the left, plus those listed below.
Discussion Topic: Organization of Species List

**Question:** How do we want to organize the list of species? Single list or hierarchical structure? Other ideas?

**Preferred Option**

- **All Species**
  - Capuchin
  - Cynomolgus
  - Gerbil
  - Hamster
  - Mouse
  - Pigtail Macaque
  - Rat
  - Rhesus Macaque

- **Non-Human Primate**
  - Capuchin
  - Cynomolgus
  - Pigtail Macaque
  - Rhesus Macaque

- **Rodent**
  - Gerbil
  - Hamster
  - Mouse
  - Rat
Discussion Topic: Organization of Species List

Question: How do we want to organize the list of species? Single list or hierarchical structure? Other ideas?

• General consensus that a hierarchical approach is preferred
• Need to be thoughtful in how we define the larger categories to avoid having a particular species being assigned to more than one category.
• Also, need to think carefully about the species we include in the database – is there a need, for example, to include all the subspecies of macaque for the purpose of this project? Or will the broader “macaque” fit our needs?
Discussion Topic: Managing Site Access

**Question:** How do we want to manage creation of new accounts?

*Use a HYBRID approach!*

- **OPTION A:** A centralized system administrator (or small group of administrators) is responsible for creating accounts and assigning access for all FDP members.

- **OPTION B:** Institutional representative is responsible for creating accounts and assigning access for members of their institution.
Discussion Topic: Managing Site Access

Question: How do we want to manage creation of new accounts?

- Hybrid approach proposed – centralized group will manage access for designated institutional representatives; designated institutional representatives will manage access for the institution.

- General consensus that institutions would like the option to have more than one designated institutional representative.

- Discussion regarding use of single sign on/federated sign on system
  - Would allow individuals to sign on with their institutional account.
  - Can help manages some account access issues (e.g., when an individual leaves an institution).

- Discussion regarding the need for individual accounts – can an institution have a single account that all users access? Strong opinions on both sides – maybe keep as an option for those institutions that want to use this approach?
Discussion Topic: Procedures Endorsed >1 Institution

- General support for using a “parent-child” model for data organization
- Decided previously that data will have a 3-year lifespan within the system – if not updated within 3 years, procedure will be automatically deleted.

**Question**: What if a parent procedure (with multiple approvals and/or children) expires? Should the additional institutions have a voice in it being retired from the system?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Procedure</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Original Approval Body</th>
<th>Additional Approvals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P345</td>
<td>Tail Clipping</td>
<td>5/10/17</td>
<td>University of Texas</td>
<td>UCLA, Caltech</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Modifications</th>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Additional Approvals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P345-M1</td>
<td>Cedars-Sinai</td>
<td>5/3/18</td>
<td>UW, Emory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P345-M2</td>
<td>University of Chicago</td>
<td>7/1/20</td>
<td>Institution Not Identified</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Discussion Topic: Procedures Endorsed >1 Institution (cont.)

Question: What if a parent procedure (with multiple approvals and/or children) expires? Should the additional institutions have a voice in it being retired from the system?

• Lots of discussion on this topic and related topics.
• What criteria is used to determine if a procedures is a new parent or a modification?
• Is it possible (or desirable) to have all mods in a single entry so that users only need to open a single document/entry to see all? Is there an upper limit to the number of modifications that a user would want to review in a single mod document?
• Clarification re: expiration date – should not be based on IACUC approval date, but on how frequently the procedure is accessed.
  • Look at the number of times a procedure has been clicked on or downloaded? Create a report for this?
Discussion Topic: Procedures Endorsed >1 Institution (cont)

• Instead of deleting the procedure from the system after a period of time, move the procedure to an archived or inactive folder?
  • Pros: Would allow users to still search these procedures if desired (could be a search criterion); could be particularly helpful with less common procedures.
  • Cons: More data to manage within the system – could get overwhelming to the point of no longer being useful.
  • Alternately, the working group (or a subgroup) could review procedures on some frequency and decide if they should be deleted, archived or remain active?
Other Topics Raised During Discussion

• **Data quality management** – how can we ensure that designated institutional reps are reviewing procedures to ensure they are not uploading a duplicate/they have a mod rather than a new parent? Need mechanism for quality control in case institutional rep does not do this? Working group may need to QC for a period of time, particularly early in the project to maintain organization.

• **Mechanism to ensure folks that download a procedure either come back to the database to say “yes I used this as is” or to upload their mod?** Easy for folks to “take” from the system without contributing back.
Goals for October Meeting

- **Aubrey/UW**: Follow up with EC regarding proposal and next steps
- **Data Organization Team**: Take a first pass at organizing in a hierarchical manner.
- **Data Import & Export Team**: Talk with David re: approach for site development
- **Data Storage Team**: Holding pattern for now.
Discussion Topic for Next Meeting: What type of reporting capabilities do we want from the system? Different reporting capabilities based on user role?