QIBA Transition FDG-PET Subcommittee Update  
October 8, 2010  
2 pm CDT

Call Summary

In attendance:  RSNA Staff:  
Paul Kinahan, PhD, (Moderator)  Timothy Turkington, PhD  Joe Koudelik  
Richard Frank, MD, PhD  Jeffrey Yap, PhD  Julie Lisiecki  
Andrew Buckler, MS

Purpose of today’s call:
• Close-out of the existing FDG-PET sub-groups and restructure around our quantitative imaging goals  
• Three areas to pursue:  
  o Profile Writing  
  o Road Show / corporate visits  
  o Information packet for the FDA (led by Dr Frank and Mr Buckler)  
• Need to merge and prioritize list of vendor “asks” from all five current sub-groups  
• Prioritization based on continued discussions and vendor feedback  
• Dr Kinahan requested a paragraph from each subcommittee chair summarizing findings/results of their group’s work.  Links to any studies/ results would be appreciated. This paragraph will be part of a 5-paragraph summary presented to the whole group and posted on the QIBA WIKI.  
• Consider contingency relationships to avoid adverse affects on the long-term outcomes of some of the related projects

Potential 3 new work groups:  
• Profile Writing work group  
• Road Show work group  
• Information packet for the FDA work group (led by Dr Frank and Mr Buckler)

NIBIB Contract:
• 1.2 million over 2 years for sub-grant within technical committees (no salary support salaries, except post-docs, and engineers)  
• Necessary to keep track of resources/expenditures for government reporting  
• Consider projects that have an impact and get vendors directly involved e.g., Road Show, Profile writing projects  
• Plan to work on an information package for FDA biomarker approval  
• Part of the planning for new projects will need to take into account the feedback that received from the Road Show / vendor comments, which will help determine more specific actions

Road Show:  Wording to consider for talking with vendors:  
• “Here’s what you need”  
• “Here’s how it should be done”  
• “We need these capabilities”  
• Follow up with why it should be done this way – tie this to the Profile-writing process  
• Stress the level of acceptability and emphasize competitive advantage  
• Focus on “tweaking” existing systems, not building new product  
• Clinicians and scientists can support these Profile Claims; thus emphasizing buying power (i.e., a business case)  
• Bulls-eye approach needed: “Ideal”, “Target,” and “Acceptable” acceptable”; either the product is or is not compliant  
• Plan for success and deal with the unexpected. Stress the idea of writing committees; work towards consensus
After conversations with vendors:

- Whether vendors assign people to certain committees or not will be a reality check for the Road Show team
- Vendors themselves will emphasize where they want their focus to be; what serves the common good
- Vendor engagement may vary; some may only want to meet minimum requirements (Bulls-eye approach); let vendors decide at what level they wish to participate
- Vendors are interested in their potential gain vs. the effort required
- Need for modality committees to be formed including academic + pharma representation
- Name committee for groups developing from Road Show interaction – keep names simple and specific to encourage vendor members to join for the long term

Next steps:

- Paragraph from each subcommittee chair summarizing findings/results of their group’s work to close-out groups
- Dr Kinahan to follow up via email with other subcommittee chairs regarding direction of the groups
- Poster work for RSNA 2010: Separate tasks and assign people appropriately:
  - Technical content
  - Presentation/ graphical content production
  - One overall FDG-PET Subctte informational map proposed for RSNA 2010 instead of input from five sub-groups; additional discussion needed on next call
- Next FDG-PET Subctte call will be scheduled for November via poll; informational email to sent out in interim