

## NPUAP S3I

June 1, 2002 Meeting - Las Vegas

### Minutes:

- Self-introductions: Approximately 25% new participants (n=50)
- Review of Agenda
- Importance of Roll call/attendance: emphasized importance for ISO regs
- Minutes from group meeting-none from New Orleans
- Overview of S3I
- Document Numbering
- Lit review issues
- Information sharing
- Funding update
- Fall meeting date/place

### Overview of S3I

#### Development principles

- Consensus
- Voluntary
- Industry-wide

#### Organizational Structure

#### General Layout of Standard

### Document Numbering

#### Alpha-numeric coding

Leading characters- G, TIG, TD, LS

Participant list would be G1: the only document entered

### Literature Review Issues: Jan Cuddigan

Endnote review: separate coding of documents

Endnote database created by Cuddigan

Valid & reliable peer-review process needed

#### Recommendations

- Document archiving and distribution- source of the information
- Relevance: search criteria (e.g. English, type of study, human- categorize vs. exclusion- if exclude need to be consistent with criteria). Suggestion that each work group make decision regarding the inclusion/exclusion criteria-consensus required today. Most would agree to include Medline, white papers from NPUAP, WOCN, etc, government pubs, gets sticky when you include manufacturers/industry pubs, clinical opinion pieces, presentations, non-peer reviewed pubs. Best tactic would be to start

broad/inclusive and winnow down during the process-think of a coding system to facilitate extraction/deletion of material as we proceed.

- Point made to include non-English and rely on EPUAP to translate- or other translation- random searches to make sure we include key papers. Focus on areas where evidence appears to be lacking? Quality of translation is critical.
- Suggested using WOCN, AHCPR and others as guide for inclusion criteria
- Question regarding non-peer reviewed literature specifically marketing material from all industry sources- how to include or important to include information from those manufacturers who are not at the table- putting out a call vs. actual requests- is there a public forum-DMERC journal (HME news and others place an Ad). Need to use Medtrade as vehicle for dissemination and make sure that all industry is aware of initiative and web-site access
- Quality of sources
- Distribution-copyright issues

Information Sharing: Dave McCausland

How do we set up rules: only to be used in standards process- not necessarily works  
How do we ensure that proprietary info is handled appropriately

Recommendations:

- All info to be used only for standards
- Group outside of standards could serve a funnel for this information and sign a waiver to protect the information
- Simplistic form or template for information sharing

Comments:

Disclosure of test data vs. test methods

Test data will not be disclosed- strong sentiment expressed

If test method is ready for publication, not problem with sharing- if method is still in development, not willing to share.

If beneficial to everyone yet still in development, but not a test for a specific product, then see no problem with sharing. More people sharing method and improving it- we can all learn from it.

Difficult to obtain the test methods from mfgers during seat cushion standards

Development - had to start from scratch—don't care about the data- want the methods

Hesitancy to lose competitive advantage by losing test method e.g. testing shear gives your product an edge. This is a key issue. Non-proprietary information--how to gather information about what test methods actually are considered non-proprietary? Conduct

an initial survey of manufacturers to determine which methods are available for disclosure at this time. What about sharing proprietary information that doesn't work?

Manufacturers have proprietary methods that they feel validate their products- new best practice guideline/standard may not test their product well-would be best served by sharing as they could be hurt if the new standard doesn't test their product well.

Clinical guidelines are beyond the scope of this process.

Test methods- individual decision on part of each mnfger

Summary:

Survey

Do we need a filtering organization to collect the data and turn it into a generic method- no identification of the test by mfgr – volunteers from each working group perform this test? How to determine the members of the group? Non-industry group to “clean” the data by removing identification of the product for all publicly shared information?

Abbey suggested having each manufacturer send bulleted list to Lisa at NPUAP of test methods willing to share. Survey would be a list of characteristics that the TIG group has identified as wanting to test and asking manufacturers what methods they would be willing to share that test those characteristics. E.G. what do you have to offer (share freely) to test shear, pressure, etc.?

Explain options for how data could be “cleaned” before public disclosure- would make mfgrs more comfortable.

Funding Update

Working Group Tasks

Afternoon summary:

Next meeting to be held in Atlanta at Medtrade , Monday October 28<sup>th</sup> (precedes conference)

MJ needs to follow-up and send list of manufacturers to Dikran. Letters to be drafted and sent from NPUAP to manufacturers regarding test methods and lifespan/fatigue testing of products.

Data projector used was : NEC Model LT 155- very light weight and accepted all computer types

Send note of thanks to Kathy Baldwin & her group for their work on lifespan.