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1 Attendees, Introductions

Andy Brush, Tegam
Brad Golackson, Kihomac
Colin Walker, Qualer Dan
Armitage, Qualer Dan
Hall, Hall Associates
David Zajac, Cal Lab Solutions
Dennis Jackson, NSWC Corona
Doug Kramer, ETS-Lindgren
Ekta Mehta, Qualer
Erik Disler, General Motors
Gerhard Mihm, IT & Electronics Tech. Center
Greg Tolentino, Tegam
Jack Sommpi, Sommpi Consulting
James Smith, Boeing
Jason Watson, Consumers Energy
Marcus McNeely, McNeely Consulting
Mark Kuster, Pantex Metrology
Marlino Bitengar, Qualer
Mike Schwartz, Cal Lab Solutions
Pete Loftus, Rolls-Royce
Randal Dean, Eastman Chemical Co.
Tom Harris, Eastman Chemical Co.
Victoria Knox, Boeing

2 Minutes Review

Corrections to meeting minutes: NA (no prior 141 MII Committee, no activity carried forward from 141 Automation Committee)
3 Discussion

James “Smitty” Smith inaugurated the new committee meeting in style with a toast, and after introductions the committee heard status updates and held discussion as follows, reorganized afterward into the emergent topics.

3.1 MII Road Map

The committee reviewed its current charter, the MII vision, background, progress and road map. Attendees offered road map and charter changes and additions such as

- a specific task to write an MII standard (Marcus McNeely),
- specific deliverables and end products (Smitty),
- documented ways for companies to support and use the MII (Colin Walker),
- wording to articulate the SoA’s relation to the whole MII picture (Pete Loftus).

Dennis Jackson suggested that tackling instrument specifications first might generate more interest and yield benefits such as disciplined data entry. Gerhard Mihm agreed that a high demand for standardized specifications exists and Erik Disler wondered if such standards already exist. Others wanted at least a standard information header for instruments, which Smitty indicated that NCSLI RP-5 may already have. David Zajac explained the rationale for tackling SoAs first (a more focused and smaller task). Mark Kuster suggested that enough interested volunteers and participation would allow a parallel specification effort. Brief discussion of alternative data formats (JSON, XML, etc.) also occurred.

3.2 MII Written Standard

The committee generally agreed on documenting the MII as a standard, perhaps staking a foothold (Smitty, Andy Brush) first with an NCSLI LM (laboratory management) document or RP (recommended practice), then moving step-by-step to a national or international standard. Colin Walker pointed out that an open-source standard protected from takeover would encourage more adoption. Marcus McNeely suggested separate standards for each MII document format in order to break up the large task and facilitate presentation to stakeholders. While other organizations may have their own internal data formats or standards, each entity would map and convert to and from the MII standard format for data interchange (Colin Walker).

3.3 Intellectual Property

The committee also discussed protecting MII-related intellectual property (IP) and whether NCSLI or a new consortium of some type should own the IP. David Zajac mentioned the Linux open-source development model and outlined MIMOSA and how MIMOSA set up its consortium. Though recognizing the primarily NCSLI-born concept, Colin Walker, Andy Brush, Mike Schwartz, David Zajac, Smitty, Marcus McNeely, Mark Kuster, and others voiced support for a completely open MII standard. Some suggested writing and signing an IP and conflict-of-interest agreement. The committee did not resolve the ownership question.

3.4 Demos

Colin Walker demonstrated Qualer’s eye-catching accredited lab geosearch based on collecting over 250,000 CMCs issued by American ABs and a partial conversion to the current MII SoA data schema proposed by Cal Lab Solutions.
3.5 Engagement

The committee also discussed the problems of industry adoption and engagement, including the importance of convincing other organizations to join (Dennis Jackson), especially the larger ones (Andy Brush), and whether the market will drive adoption and overwhelm those who do not issue their own documents in an MII machine-readable format (Mike Schwartz). Mike Schwartz also pointed out that the two companies involved so far have already thought of new MII applications and we may therefore expect further unforeseen innovative ideas with wider participation.

Smitty suggested everyone present take the discussion and concepts back to their organization and assign tasks as appropriate. Since we want AB adoption and participation, and we might recruit them through Tim Osborne, Dana Leaman, and others. They might delegate an AB representative to participate.

Attendees registered on sign-up sheets and indicated which if any Working Groups they would like to join. Including those who signed up in the subsequent MII Panel Session, 24 people volunteered for the General WII Working Group, 5 for the newly proposed Taxonomy Working Group, and 15 for the newly proposed SoA Editor Working Group.

3.6 Automation

Mark Kuster asked whether the previous 141 Automation Committee had any prior initiatives the MII&AC should continue. No one knew of any at this time.

4 Action Items

- WG: Revise the committee charter as discussed.
- WG: Kick off the Taxonomy Working Group.
- WG: Kick off the SoA Editor Working Group.
- WG: Recruit stakeholder participation.
- WG: Address the IP issue.