Resume and Conclusions from Day 1

Murat Sariyar and Roman Siddiqui, TMF e. V.

1. Structured yellow pages are deemed important
   - Informing different stakeholders (Transparency)
   - Relevant (not necessary big!) biobanks should be covered

2. Biospecimen Locators are desired, but not easy to realize
   - ELSI issues (anonymity)
   - How to motivate participation („my treasure")?
   - How open should such a registry be?

3. Regulations/Money are necessary
   - For motivating/enforcing registration
   - Soft criteria like transparency are frequently no incentives for action

TMF – Technology, Methods, and Infrastructure for Networked Medical Research e. V.
Workshop „National Biobank Registers" | Berlin | February 18 - 19 2015

Page 2

4. Tracking of user queries
- Increases transparency
- Enables some control over user activities

5. Problems of definitions
- What is a biobank?
- What are sample collections?
- Needs a context-dependent operational definition.

6. Do not
- Rely on utility metrics for assessing your performance
- Try to validate the quality of your data (up to the user)

TMF – Technology, Methods, and Infrastructure for Networked Medical Research e. V.
Workshop „National Biobank Registers" | Berlin | February 18 - 19 2015

Page 3

7. Is sample sharing a realistic task for registries?

8. How (structured) should quality be captured?

9. To what extent is the registry responsible for the content?

10. What kind of additional services should a registry offer?

11. Should we define/have recourse to use-cases?
    - Typical scenarios of inquiries
    - Informing the data Model (MIABIS)

12. BBMRI ⇔ National Nodes?