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Background

• Regulation – Human Tissue Act 2004, Research Ethics Committee Approval
• University HTA licence, overseen by Human Tissue Governance Team
• MSD – 16 departments, many research centres, groups and units
• Wide range of individual solutions at department or group level –
  • Off-the-shelf Sample Management Systems
  • ‘Home-built’ solutions
  • MS Excel spreadsheets
• Creates many issues –
  • Lack of overview of licenced activity – reporting complex and time-consuming
  • Risks of HTA non-compliance through inaccurate record-keeping
  • Lack of scalability – problems in maintaining accuracy of large and fluid datasets
  • Patchy levels of support - often reliant on key individuals with specific local knowledge and understanding
  • Old systems now out of support, or no longer compatible with modern IT infrastructure
Advantages of adopting a centralised system

- Consistent approach to maintaining information necessary to demonstrate compliance with HTA statutory obligations
- Ensures system is managed in line with information governance best-practice – including patching, updates and maintenance, security, back-up
- Comprehensive role-based security allowing granular control of access to view and act on data appropriate to the user’s operational activities.
- High level overview of all regulated activity under HTA Licence 12217
- Minimises duplication of effort and resource in supporting multiple disparate systems
- Allows sharing of expertise and resource in addressing common questions and issues.
- Worldwide user base with active user community
Implementing OpenSpecimen

• HTG and MSDIT seek a biospecimen management system, funded centrally at division level, to reduce risk

• OpenSpecimen selected following consultation and tender and order placed in mid to late 2019

• Funding also obtained for IT specialist to lead OS implementation, commencing in-post in May 2020 for two years

• OpenSpecimen instance implemented as ‘production’ webserver and database servers, and a separate ‘test’ server, running on MSDIT virtual machines

• OpenSpecimen implementation overseen by an OpenSpecimen Implementation Steering Group, with user involvement from an OpenSpecimen Implementation Working group
Implementation timeline

• Initial Scoping of relevant collections – 15 groups/collections
• Establish OpenSpecimen Platform Infrastructure – MSDIT VMs
• OS Implementation Working Group MS Teams group established
• Installation of OpenSpecimen ‘Test’ and ‘Production’ systems
• OS system level configuration – Institutes & standing data
• Appraise OpenSpecimen consent management options
• Attempted recruitment Onboarding Manager – Dec 20 & Feb 21
• OS user authentication integrated with local eDirectory
• OpenSpecimen system backup operational
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PP (REDCap) ID</th>
<th>GI Study Number</th>
<th>Date of Approach</th>
<th>Research Status</th>
<th>IID Number</th>
<th>Sapphire Number</th>
<th>NHS Number</th>
<th>Site and MRI</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Date of Birth</th>
<th>Age at Registration</th>
<th>Patient Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8882</td>
<td></td>
<td>21-Mar-2011</td>
<td>Not Specified</td>
<td>1820482</td>
<td></td>
<td>ST-10-00001</td>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>70 yrs</td>
<td></td>
<td>Patient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>173</td>
<td>1154</td>
<td>27-Apr-2017</td>
<td>Consented</td>
<td>Not Specified</td>
<td>Not Specified</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>66 yrs</td>
<td></td>
<td>Patient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>172</td>
<td>1153</td>
<td>26-Apr-2017</td>
<td>Consented</td>
<td>Not Specified</td>
<td>Not Specified</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>66 yrs</td>
<td></td>
<td>Patient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>170</td>
<td>1151</td>
<td>25-Apr-2017</td>
<td>Consented</td>
<td>Not Specified</td>
<td>Not Specified</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>74 yrs</td>
<td></td>
<td>Patient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>171</td>
<td>1152</td>
<td>25-Apr-2017</td>
<td>Consented</td>
<td>Not Specified</td>
<td>Not Specified</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>53 yrs</td>
<td></td>
<td>Patient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>187</td>
<td>1149</td>
<td>18-Apr-2017</td>
<td>Consented</td>
<td>Not Specified</td>
<td>Not Specified</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>61 yrs</td>
<td></td>
<td>Patient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>189</td>
<td>1150</td>
<td>18-Apr-2017</td>
<td>Consented</td>
<td>Not Specified</td>
<td>Not Specified</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>65 yrs</td>
<td></td>
<td>Patient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>188</td>
<td>1148</td>
<td>31-Mar-2017</td>
<td>Consented</td>
<td>Not Specified</td>
<td>Not Specified</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>51 yrs</td>
<td></td>
<td>Patient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>185</td>
<td>1147</td>
<td>30-Mar-2017</td>
<td>Consented</td>
<td>Not Specified</td>
<td>Not Specified</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>39 yrs</td>
<td></td>
<td>Patient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>164</td>
<td>1146</td>
<td>28-Mar-2017</td>
<td>Consented</td>
<td>Not Specified</td>
<td>Not Specified</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>77 yrs</td>
<td></td>
<td>Patient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>20-Mar-2015</td>
<td>Consented</td>
<td>Not Specified</td>
<td>Not Specified</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>3 yrs</td>
<td></td>
<td>Patient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>227</td>
<td>1202</td>
<td>04-Mar-2015</td>
<td>Consented</td>
<td>Not Specified</td>
<td>Not Specified</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>11 yrs</td>
<td></td>
<td>Patient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>220</td>
<td>1201</td>
<td>21-May-2015</td>
<td>Consented</td>
<td>Not Specified</td>
<td>Not Specified</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>9 yrs</td>
<td></td>
<td>Patient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>224</td>
<td>1209</td>
<td>21-May-2015</td>
<td>Consented</td>
<td>Not Specified</td>
<td>Not Specified</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>4 yrs</td>
<td></td>
<td>Patient</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
NDORMS Experience

Observations

• What we like:
  – Learning curve is not as steep as expected
  – Good documentation and video tutorials
  – Strict validation of data before import
  – Flexible report and sample searching
  – Tissue coordinators are very happy with what they have seen so far

• What we find challenging:
  – Import of data needs thought and experience
  – Container implementation is confusing and sub-optimal
  – Understanding how Krishagni fit in
“… everything is going smoothly, the system is easy to learn and therefore easy to use.”

“The help you have provided has been really useful and easy to follow instructions.

“Adding the external collection sites was straight forward … I’ve also managed to change the collection protocols to include additional samples.”

“So far, I really like this system. The layout, content and ease of use makes it really user friendly. Compared to our previous system, RFTrackIT, I would recommend OpenSpecimen every time!”
Closing thoughts…

• Plan out how storage is arranged – diagrams can help!
• Plan out how specimens and data are collected – is this largely standardised, or are there very specific requirements for individual collections?
• Identify, where applicable, timepoints or events in the study at which specimens and / or data is collected
• Map collection data requirements onto the OpenSpecimen default dataset – identify OS out-of-the-box (non-mandatory) data items that are not required, and any data items that will need to be added to OS
• Consider use wherever possible of OS User Interface features such as drop-down lists, radio buttons and conditional field display to facilitate good quality data entry.