Status of CCB Topics as of October 26, 2006

| Ref # | Topic | Status | CCB Meeting |
|-------|--|---|---------------------------|
| 1 | The NAACCR data item "address at diagnosis – state" does not provide enough specificity to determine the nation of residence at diagnosis. There is a need to distinguish between US resident, exact state unknown; Canadian resident, exact territory unknown; and unknown residency Proposal: 1. Add two fields to the SEER*DMS database: Country at DX and Country (Current). 2. New codes (US and CA or CN) will be proposed to the standards committee. 3. DT's legacy data will have to be reviewed so the correct code can be set in their database. Proposed by: Detroit Registry | This issue was not resolved in January. It was revisited in the June 2006 CCB meeting and resolved by implementing proposed changes in the 2.0 release of SEER*DMS. The two fields were added to the SEER*DMS database. And a polisher was implemented to calculate country based on state code. These changes were included in the Version 2.0 release. (#37162) | January 2006 June 2006 |
| 2a | The CCB discussed the purpose and content of each type of record processed in SEER*DMS. The workflow paths for each type were reviewed in detail so that the basic workflow route of each record type would be the same for all registries. Proposed by: NCI and Detroit Registry. | Modifications based on the decisions in this meeting were implemented in SEER*DMS version 1.2.0. | January 2006 |
| 2b | Updating the processing of NAACCR Modified Records. | Workflow modifications for NAACCR Modified Records were implemented in version 1.2.4 of SEER*DMS. | June 2006 |
| 3a | Develop a standard method to set default values in CTCs created from records that are not full abstracts (casefinding records, death certificate records, short health records). Proposed by: NCI. | Detailed lists of default values were defined and presented to the CCB for review. Changes to the defaults were discussed and approved in the July 2006 CCB meeting. The values approved by the CCB were implemented in versions 1.2.2 (CFO Defaults) and 1.2.4 and 1.2.5 (DCO defaults) of SEER*DMS. | March 2006 |

Status of CCB Topics as of October 26, 2006

| Ref # | Topic | Status | CCB Meeting |
|-------|---|--|-------------|
| 3b | Proposed modifications to the default values set in CTCs created from records that are not full abstracts (casefinding records, death certificate records, short health records). | The values approved by the CCB were implemented in versions 1.2.2 (CFO Defaults) and 1.2.4 (DCO defaults) of SEER*DMS. | June 2006 |
| 3c | Confirmation of modifications made to the DCO defaults. | The changes approved by the CCB were implemented in version 1.2.5 of SEER*DMS. | July 2006 |
| 4a | The active follow-up (AFUP) module was not included in the first release of SEER*DMS. AFUP requirements were discussed by the CCB in the March 2006 meeting. Proposed by: This need was expressed in the original requirements analyses. | Requirements analysis for the AFUP module continued from March through June 2006. In July 2006, a proposed design of the module was presented to the CCB. A prototype is currently being developed for CCB review. | March 2006 |
| 4b | Review a proposal for the design of Active Follow-up module. | A prototype will be presented to the CCB in Nov or Dec 2006. This is scheduled for the version 3.0 release. | July 2006 |
| 5 | Proposal to add an automated Rapid Follow-up task to the workflow. The new task would occur just before Match-Consolidate in the main branch of the workflow. It is designed to reduce delays in the updating of follow-up variables from records that are waiting in the workflow. | The Rapid Follow-up was first implemented in the 1.2.4 release of SEER*DMS. | June 2006 |
| 6 | Review a proposal to modify SEER*DMS to include the direct support of SSA extract and import files. | Initial development is complete. It requires testing and is scheduled for version 3.0 release. | July 2006 |
| 7 | Discuss a DMS field component (for abstracting, casefinding, followback, etc.) | Requirements analysis for a DMS field component is ongoing. | July 2006 |