

QIBA Process Committee Call

Tuesday, April 21, 2020 at 3 pm CT

Call Summary

Attendees:

Kevin O'Donnell, MASC (Chair)

Michael Boss, PhD (Vice Chair)

Alexander Guimaraes, MD, PhD

Nancy Obuchowski, PhD

Nicholas Petrick, PhD

Daniel Sullivan, MD

RSNA Staff:

Fiona Miller

Joe Koudelik

Susan Stanfa

Self-Attestation, Registration and Certification Review of the Conformance Process

- Additional discussion is needed re: the self-attestation process and how this applies to various stakeholders (e.g., sites, vendors, CROs)
- Mr. O'Donnell drafted a task comparison table containing pathways for self-attestation vs. certification

Discussion on QIBA Profile Simplification and Brevity

- QIBA documents are structured to accommodate audience that use them for a particular purpose
- The "[How to Write a Profile](#)" QIBA Wiki page was reviewed
- Suggestions on how to restrict the length of Profiles
 - Keep specifications concise; for every requirement written, it needs to be determined how to test it and another line is added to a given checklist
 - List a single actor for each requirement (multiple actors create a complex process)
 - Only requirements that contribute to achieving the Claim are to be included, e.g., if you would not fail someone for not conforming to the requirement, then omit the requirement
 - If the requirement has only a marginal impact on Claim, it can be included if it is simple to do (i.e., minimal effort required)
- It was noted that importance of a requirement could be subjective to Profile authors
 - If supporting data are not available, a consensus option is often needed; this may result in a difference of opinion among BC members
- Discussion re: publicizing basic Profile-writing guidance and re-emphasizing fundamentals
 - Novice QIBA Profile authors, especially in newer BCs, may not be familiar with QIBA processes or previous discussions re: common Profile-writing issues
 - Staff to remind cmte leaders about specific (wiki) resources, but would defer to the Process Cmte for interpretation or clarification of process
- Discussion re: factors that may hinder progress through Profile stages:
 - How different types of QIBA member stakeholders/personalities approach work (e.g., industry representatives, academicians, etc.)
 - When there is a lack of supporting data, considerable time may be required for discussion and consensus before a Profile can advance
 - Lack of opportunities for face-to-face work during sticking points in a group's Profile development process
- Discussion re: increasing productivity and efficiency on QIBA calls included the following suggestions:
 - Hold longer calls and allocate more effort to formal meeting agendas
 - Pre-determining purpose/type of call (e.g., focus on Profile-editing, discussion/consensus-building, decision-making, etc.)

- Two-hour BC calls were suggested to better accommodate writing sessions
 - Profile Editors to lead the calls and queue-up required documents pre-call
 - Due to QIBA being a volunteer organization, staff have had limited success with past efforts to solicit agendas or co-chair availability
- Coordinating Cmte calls to be used as forums for disseminating procedural requests
 - Standing CC agenda item allocating 5-10 mins to operational reminders to be established
 - Although staff request RSVPs, many BC co-chairs fail to attend quarterly CC calls
 - Process Cmte member rep to attend each of the 4 modality Q2 CC calls planned for May;
 - This call will include a discussion of brevity issues with Profiles
 - Guidelines from the "[How to Write a Profile](#)" QIBA Wiki page will be presented
 - The importance of dedicated editing time to further the Profiles will be highlighted
- Discussion re: Profile editors and the degree of change allowed to be made to a Profile before a 2nd round of public comment should be required (this threshold has not yet been defined or published)
 - Interpretation of "public comment" is unclear; is this a consultation process to gather expertise opinion, or just a comment process to inform stakeholders with minimal feedback expected?
 - Small changes might have a significant impact
 - At the very least, the affected community should be provided a chance to give input re: the change
 - Some benefits of the public comment process are:
 - Identifying blind spots overlooked by the BC
 - Avenue for promoting the Profile; awareness of the document is brought to those who otherwise may not have known
 - Curation/peer review
 - Since Profiles are living documents, they are subject to revision/refinement at any time (changes do not need to be confined to only the public comment period)
 - It was noted that since groups spend so much time working on the documents, they may no longer be able to see the big picture and may have biases; public comments help the Profile to become more user-friendly
- CC leadership to request "role rosters" from their respective BCs, e.g., lead clinical guidance rep, statistician rep, physicist rep, technologist rep, etc.
 - This will help to highlight gaps in necessary perspectives within each BC
 - Role rosters to be added to the Dashboard for all BCs; Mr. O'Donnell to draft entries for PC review
 - It was stressed that input from technologists is crucial to early Profile development, especially on the feasibility of requirements
 - It may be a challenge to convince institutions to allow staff technologists to participate in QIBA calls as a worthwhile activity; suggestions included:
 - Contacting AART for advice
 - Keep time constraints reasonable, e.g., ask technologists to join every 3rd call, or invite to specific BC calls that will focus on Tech issues and require input

Next Process Cmte Call: Tuesday, May 5, 2020 at 3 pm CT (1st & 3rd weeks of each month)