

**IHE-RO Technical Committee  
Conference Call Notes  
Wednesday, January 14, 2009  
12:00-2:00pm (ET)**

**Technical Committee Chairs:  
Bruce Curran, MS, ME  
Stuart Swerdloff, PhD**

**Attendees**

Stuart Swerdloff  
Bruce Curran  
Colin Field  
Walter Bosch  
Sunita Ranjitkar  
Harold Beunk  
Koua Yang  
Uli Busch  
Scott Johnson  
Sanjay  
Julio Almansa  
Colin Winfield

**I. Reports and Updates**

1. Review of 2009 Advanced Objects Supplements
  - a. Two actors (producer and consumer) and transaction set (storage and retrieval) per beam type → TF volume 1 to include text explaining this approach
  - b. Use separate beam types for radiation types (Photon by default, not explicitly part of name). Electron and Ion beams will add “electron” or “ion” to actor and transaction names.
  - c. DICOM Requirements on Adv. Objects spreadsheet are for Dosimetric Planner only. Specifying both Geometric *and* Dosimetric Planner actors for all beam types was considered to be too large a work load. Most beam technique parameters (except those for arcs) are not specified by Geometric Planner.
  - d. Discussion regarding meaning of “O+\*” requirement for DICOM attributes: O+\* indicates attribute is optional for producer, but must be accepted (but not displayed) by consumer, if produced.
  - e. Review of attribute requirements. → Questions for review by Bruce:
    - i. Motorized Wedge (p22) – Wedge Position: do we want to define whether the open or wedged segment comes first? Convention is

to start with wedge-in segment. Constrain producers to start with wedge-in segment.

- ii. Conformal Arc – do we want to define an upper bound on Number of Control Points?
  - iii. Arcs with Wedges: For arc techniques (both simple and conformal), is there current clinical rationale to support delivery with hard wedge or motorized wedge (as an optional transaction)? Is the frequency of use for wedged arc and wedged conformal arc sufficient to warrant inclusion of this technique in the TF?
  - iv. Is inclusion of Wedges with IMRT (step-and-shoot or sliding window) a mainstream clinical use case that should be supported in the TF?
  - v. Should we specify an upper bound on number of control points? The bound is technique dependent. What bound is clinically realistic?
  - vi. Step-and-shoot and sliding-window:
    1. Do we allow concatenated beams? Probably not relevant to transactions between TPS and TMS.
    2. Beam limiting device angle must be constant (p. 62) – should we consider relaxing this constraint?
2. Next T-con to approve updates TF document → Stuart and Bruce to arrange with Sunita
  3. Next IHE-RO TC meeting Mar 23-25, 2009 in Washington, DC. → Sunita to follow up with Bruce regarding meeting and hotel arrangements

## II. Future Meetings

- a. IHE-RO 2009 Test Schedule: (Bruce will confirm ASTRO travel support.)
  - Domain Pre-Testing – June 3-9, 2009, Erlangen, Germany (Siemens)
  - Connectathon – Sept. 14-22, 2009, Fairfax, VA (ASTRO HQ)  
(9/14 test prep, 9/15 setup, 9/16-19,21 testing, 9/22 wrap-up)
- b. IHE-RO 2009 TC Face-to-Face Meetings:
  - March 23-25, 2009 (2.5 days) Washington, DC 2010 Content Development
  - Nov. 5-7, 2009 post-ASTRO, Chicago area
  - Jan 25-29, 2010, location TBD
- c. IHE-RO Potential Future T-cons:
  - Wednesday, February 25, 2009 at 12:00 - 2:00 p.m. ET
  - Wednesday, April 22, 2009 at 12:00 - 2:00 p.m. ET
  - Wednesday, May 20, 2009 at 12:00 - 2:00 p.m. ET
  - Wednesday, July 15, 2009 at 12:00 - 2:00 p.m. ET
  - Wednesday, August 12, 2009 at 12:00 - 2:00 p.m. ET
  - Wednesday, October 14, 2009 at 12:00 - 2:00 p.m. ET
  - Wednesday, December 2, 2009 at 12:00 - 2:00 p.m. ET

d. Related Meetings:

- DICOM WG-7 Oct 21-25, 2008, Charleston, SC
- DICOM WG-7 Mar 17-20, 2009, Washington, DC
- AAPM, Jul 26-29, 2009, Anaheim, CA
- ESTRO Aug 30 – Sep 3, 2009, Maastricht, NL
- ASTRO Nov.1-5, 2009, Chicago, IL

Adjourned 2:00pm ET