

**QIBA Process Committee**  
Tuesday, July 6, 2021, at 2 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  
Gudrun Zahlmann, PhD

**RSNA Staff:**

Joe Koudelik  
Susan Stanfa

**Review of [Technical Conformation \(TC\) Process QIBA Wiki Page](#)**

- At this stage, imaging site feedback is collected to determine Profile usability and practicality of the technical requirements in implementation
  - Sites are not asked to adopt the Profile in their routine work, but to determine whether it would be practical to use in routine work
- Clarification was sought on whether sites should be required to perform scans on human subjects or phantoms
  - Sites would be required to execute each requirement and most QIBA Profiles do not require patient scans
  - Flexibility based on each Profile will be needed, e.g., in some cases, patient scans would be strongly encouraged if there was benefit to the patient (benefit to the patient always outweighs benefit to the Profile)
  - Sites must report whether they scan a patient or phantom, and the BC would decide whether the full procedure has been adequately tested
- Valuable information is still provided when a site does not complete a requirement as the BC would learn why it could not or would not perform it
- It is helpful to the BC to know when a requirement is not standard procedure and why a site would choose not to perform it; BCs must make a case for the value of each checklist requirement
- A BC may be faced with checklist feedback where none of the recruited sites were comfortable executing the Profile (on patients, phantoms, etc.); this may indicate that the Profile should not advance to TC
- Planning and recruitment
  - A list of sites/people participating in the field test to be developed by the field test leader
  - Guidance on recruitment may not be needed, as pilot sites are usually acquired through collegial relationships
- Collecting and processing feedback
  - It would be helpful for sites to know which changes to checklist requirements were made between Profile versions, for example:
    - A site had implemented a Consensus Profile version and one requirement was not performed, then a TC draft is published where that requirement has been relaxed
    - The site would now be able to complete all requirements under the latest Profile version
    - Suggestion to provide description of edits via “change tracker” document focusing on the last two Profile versions
  - BC assessment of test coverage
    - Materials and instructions are distributed to pilot sites
    - Test coverage is documented, and if incomplete, i.e., all requirements were not tested: (1) omission of the requirement to be considered, or (2) rationale for technical confirmation in the absence of testing to be documented
    - If there are no substantive practical issues, a Profile could advance to TC, but the test sites would not be able to claim conformance; conformance requirements are more rigorous in stage 4

- A site must provide a thorough record of checklist requirements they performed, ones they did not, and rationale for not doing so; the BC would decide and document whether procedures were adequately tested based on the information provided

#### **Action items**

- Mr. O'Donnell to update the TC Process QIBA Wiki page based on Process Committee feedback
- Mr. O'Donnell and Dr. Boss are not available to moderate on July 20, so the group will reconvene on Aug 3

**Next Process Cmte Call:** Tuesday, August 3, 2021, at 2 p.m. (CT) **[1<sup>st</sup> & 3<sup>rd</sup> Tuesdays of each month]**