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Candidate Architecture & Usability Ideas

1. Use case based re-structuring
   • Consider the 12 use cases presented earlier as BRIDG foundational use cases. Evaluate and identify classes/attributes/associations that do not support any of the 12 use cases and mark them for deletion.
   • Mapping spreadsheets from older harmonized projects and BRIDG tags could be leveraged for making some of these decisions
     • Notes: Maybe a good way to identify the first set. May identify new use cases besides the 12 whose semantics maybe useful to keep. Consider doing structuring first and then packaging

2. “Lack of usage” based re-structuring
   • Classes/attributes/associations in BRIDG that do not appear to be used by anyone. E.g., Statistical, parts of Regulatory domain, Molecular biology, Experiment, etc.
     • Notes: FDA Data Standards Program mentions Statistical semantics. Research it further and poll the WG members if this is being used

3. FHIR-based modifications for attributes
   • Re-visit BRIDG Naming conventions – remove data types in names, shorten names
     • Notes: Changing attribute or class names may create confusion with existing users. Could use some EA functionality to display a better name
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4. Other packaging constructs
   • Based on smaller and implementable business use cases (e.g., registration of a trial, submission of AE report, etc.)
   • Based on logical groupings (E.g., Organization, Product, etc.)
   • Parexel Suggestion
     • Notes: Some literature exists that could provide ideas on how to leverage a DIM for implementation.

5. Re-visit the Pillar structures
   • Remove Schedule Pillar??
   • Consider moving some key attributes out of Defined Pillar and remove the Defined Pillar??

6. Re-visit the Activity inheritance structure
   • Explore flattening the activity inheritance. Have some additional thoughts on how we could approach this

7. Re-visit StudyProtocol and StudyProtocolVersion classes & attributes
To Do

• Are there other ideas to consider?
• Prioritize the list

• New items:
1. Add terminology binding
   • Could we consider adding CDISC terminology binding for business terminology
   • Business vs structural terminology
     • Could support the collapsing the Activity model by providing structural terminology.
     • Was discussed 2 years during Architecture sub-group calls
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