

# Minutes

## Virtual Meeting of IUPESM Administrative Council

January 1999

**Members Present:** Barry J. Allen, Keith Boddy, Oskar Chomicki, Shmuel Einav, Dov Jaron, Fumihiko Kajiya, Jean-Pierre Morucci, Colin Orton, Peter Rolfe, Niilo Saranummi, Michael A. Smith, Heikki Terio

**Staff:** Delia Russell, Executive Secretary IOMP & IUPESM; Marijke Lensing-Kooiman, Executive Secretary IFMBE

### 1. Report of President Boddy concerning progress with the application for full membership in ICSU.

**Motion:** "That the IUPESM authorize expenditure of \$500 to send representatives to the World Science Conference, jointly sponsored by ICSU and UNESCO, which will be held in Budapest from 26 June to 1 July 1999."

**YES: 11**

**NO: 0 ABSTAIN: 0**

**PASSED**

Oskar Chomicki: . Why not use the services of Dr N.Richter (native of Budapest) to represent IUPESM at the Budapest ICSU Conference. Thus we would be spared the costs of travel and accommodation.

Dov Jaron: We need to vigorously pursue membership in ICSU. I am particularly encouraged by the invitation to make a presentation in Budapest and vote yes for participation both in Budapest and in Cairo.

Barry Allen: What do we want from ICSU? It would be helpful to restate our objectives here.

Keith Boddy: Budapest Meeting - Niilo Saranummi as Immediate Past President.

Colin Orton:.... and for Budapest, Niilo would be a fine choice, although I think any of our "senior" (I don't mean "old!") Officers would be appropriate.

Jean-Pierre Morucci: Niilo is a right man for Budapest, particularly as speaker taking in account his activities and background, totally in phase with the philosophy of the Budapest meeting. He could be associated with Nandor Richter (from Budapest), IFMBE Past President, now chairman of the IFMBE International Liaisons Committee and strongly linked to WHO through Andrei Issakov.

Niilo Saranummi: Regarding Keith's suggestion of me joining him in the Budapest meeting I am afraid that that will not be possible due to clashes with my other obligations. Previously I proposed to invite Mr. Nandor Richter to take part into that meeting together with Keith.

Peter Rolfe: Yes , I strongly support continuing to chase membership of ICSU. The Budapest presentation is a useful opportunity to try to move opinion in our favour. Biomedical Engineers and Medical Physicists have generally not been good at marketing, either themselves as individuals or their contributions to healthcare, industry and society. How are we going to use the air time wisely and effectively.

The subject of imaging is a very important one and could be the best single shot. However, Dov points out that there are many other things going on and of particular importance in the next millennium is going to be "Molecular, cellular and Tissue Engineering". Whilst being truly interdisciplinary it is a good shop window for biomedical engineers and medical physicists. Additionally it also demonstrates our willingness and our need to work closely with other professional groups of life scientists and physical scientists.



information about the type of discussions and questions that will be specifically dealt with in Cairo. Once that is known, then the person best able to support Keith could be identified.

*SG Comments: If this motion is approved the topic will be brought back to the table for discussion following the ICSU meeting in Paris.*

## **2. Creation and approval of standing committees.**

**Motion:** “That the IUPESM standing committees be approved as listed:

Congress Coordinating Committee (Chairman, G. Fullerton, Sec. Gen., Barry Allen, Colin Orton, Peter Rolfe, Heikki Terio)

Nominating Committee (Chairman, N. Saranummi, Past-Pres, Shmuel Einav., Robert Nerem, Hans Svenson, Michael Smith)

Awards Committee (Chairman, F. Kajiya, Vice-Pres., John Cameron, Oskar Chomicki, Dov Jaron, Jean-Pierre Morucci)”

**YES: 11          NO: 0   ABSTAIN: 0                                  PASSED**

Niilo Saranummi: Appointments should be done by the IFMBE and IOMP respectively. Note that the updated rules indicate three each.

Dov Jaron: Since I will be chairing the IFMBE Merit Awards Committee, it may be helpful if I was on the IUPESM committee as well.

Mike Smith: With regards to the Awards Committee could I suggest that there are not two sub-committees but just a single award committee consisting of two representatives of the IFMBE and IOMP. I believe it is important that if IUPESM is to develop, we should try and move away from the principle of splitting every committee into two to consider engineering and medical physics separately.

*SG Comments: There is little information in the published IUPESM By Laws concerning the committee appointment procedure. I therefore suggest that we proceed with the appointments so the committees can begin their work. If the IOMP or IFMBE Executive Committee wish to make alternative suggestions please do so. If the committees require more working members, supplementary appointments can be done at our next meeting.*

## **3. Proposed rules for operation of the Awards Committee from J. Morucci.**

**Motion:** “That the *Operating Procedures for the IUPRSM Awards Committee* as proposed by J. Morucci and amended by Colin Orton are approved by the IUPESM Administrative Council.”

**YES: 11          NO: 0   ABSTAIN: 0                                  PASSED**

Nilo Saranumi: OK, but for two comments: (1) strike out the 2000 USD in parenthesis in the first chapter as this is adequately covered in the last sentence and (2) in the criteria add ‘All criteria need not be fulfilled simultaneously.’ AS that has been the case in the past.

Oskar Chomicki: This could be discussed at length at a later date when Fumihiko has presented his suggestions.

Dov Jaron: Section 8 "financial" is too ambiguous. Does anybody know what has been the practice in the past?

*SG Comments: If this motion is approved the Secretary Generals office will instruct the Chairman of the Awards Committee to review the Procedures and make any suggestions for improvement or clarification that they feel necessary. In addition I will ask the Committee to make a concrete proposal for the amount*

*of the financial commitment. This request will be considered along with other elements of our budget for 2000 later this year.*

#### **4. Consideration of the Electronic Publication Option for Chicago'2000.**

**Motion:** "That the IUPESM approve the request of the Chicago'2000 Organizing Committee to provide CD rather than printed copies of the proceedings for IOMP, IFMBE and IUPESM as specified in the meeting contract."

**YES: 8**

**NO: 2 ABSTAIN: 1**

**PASSED**

Niilo Saranummi: 50 copies of CD's is perfectly OK, no paper is required.

Oskar Chomicki: Approved

Dov Jaron: Agree to both items.

Barry Allen: I am in full support for moving to electronic proceedings.

Peter Rolfe: I essentially agree with the response of Niilo.

Keith Boddy: Support proposal by Niilo.

Colin Orton: Electronic Publication of the Chicago 2000 abstracts: I agree with Gary's proposals, including the IEEE addendum to the Letter of Agreement.

Jean-Pierre Morucci: I agree with Gary's proposals.

Mike Smith: This particular proposal is a little difficult. I believe that the majority of delegates would wish some form of printed information that is available to them at the Congress so that they can browse the brief abstracts of each presentation to determine which particular session, or paper in a session, they should attend. I also believe very strongly that in order to undertake efficient searches of literature it is important that abstracts of presentations should be available on CD. As a consequence, though I strongly support the CD option for the subsequent availability of published work at the conference, I believe there is still a need for printed information about papers to be made available for the delegates to decide the presentations they should attend. This is particularly important in a large congress with a multiplicity of parallel sessions. I myself am now used to attending conference whereby both printed abstracts and CD are made available, the former being used at the conference and the latter being used subsequently.

Colin Orton: I think that Mike Smith is correct when he states: "I believe there is still a need for printed information about papers to be made available for the delegates to decide the presentations they should attend." However, the vast majority of papers will not be of interest, yet the traditional World Congress book of Abstracts has included everything. This makes the book far too unwieldy to carry around at the Congress. It was even in two volumes in Nice, each one too bulky to carry. I warrant that many (most!) attendees left them in their hotel rooms during and after the Congress.

A potential solution might be to make the Abstracts "book" and meeting schedule available on-line several weeks prior to the Congress. Attendees could decide beforehand which papers and sessions to attend, and print out those parts of the book that they need for the Congress. This would save money, trees, and many backs! It would not increase the effort required by the organizers since all this is needed for the CD-ROM anyway. Furthermore, it is totally compatible with the theme of WC-2000. All registrants would be instructed to refer to [wc2000.org](http://wc2000.org) for the program and Abstracts and to download or print those parts of the program they need for the Congress.

Gary Fullerton: The idea put forward here by Colin is exactly what the Organizing Committee plans. The entire program will be available on-line several weeks before the meeting with search and print options active. The attendee can plan his/her attendance and print out the abstracts, times and locations of what most interests them. The AAPM has volunteered to print the entire program with Titles and Authors only for quick location of the presentation space in an easily carried paper document. They are doing this at no

charge to the Congress with the intent of maintaining their traditional income stream for advertising in the Program Issue of Medical Physics. This is a well-defined process and results in a cost saving to the Congress. In addition there will be computers available for consultation in the Exhibits Hall.

**Motion:** “That the IUPESM approve the request the request of the representatives of IEEE/EMBS to sign an addendum Letter of Agreement as proposed to allow IEEE to publish short papers for the meeting. This action will authorize the Presidents of IOMP, IFMBE and IUPESM to sign the new agreement. This action is approved only if the additional expense is minimal and the result makes the proceedings for the meeting available to a larger library audience.”

**YES: 10            NO: 0    ABSTAIN: 1**

**PASSED**

Niilo Saranummi: The other suggestion is much more difficult. First of all there is only one contract between the int'l organisations and the Chicago 2000 organisers. Therefore one should not refer to letters of intent that have been superseded by the actual contract. Secondly, the paragraph on the Conference Digest is the result of ‘twisting the hand’ of the organizers of past world congresses to produce one. The most difficult one was San Antonio where only tiny abstracts were accepted. IFMBE and I believe IOMP as well have always encouraged the organizers to use longer papers. Furthermore, the sentences on the ‘first right of refusal’ for the official journals also originate from this. Now that CD’s exist and are cheap there is no reason to continue with the short / tiny abstracts. Papers can very well be of the length of ‘the EMBS tradition’ of 4 page short papers.

Therefore I propose that (1) There will be no abstracts only short papers of 4 pages. (2) That the official journals of IOMP and IFMBE waive their right to publish the Conference Digest in the case of Chicago 2000. (3) IUPESM considers together with IFMBE and IOMP how to manage conference papers in the contract for Sydney and there after. Is it OK to give the copyright to the organizers in the future?

Colin Orton: GOOD IDEAS. I think we should consider adopting Niilo’s proposals.

Oskar Chomicki: Approved.

Dov Jaron: Agree to both items.

Barry Allen: The IEEE, or any other partner, can publish what it likes at its own expense and in its own time. Certainly the weight of the Nice abstracts and their relative uselessness gives a poor cost effectiveness. (My plan for 2003 is to give hard copy abstracts to participants based on their key words, how practical this will be, remains to be seen).

Peter Rolfe: The matter of 4 page “papers” is not straightforward. It has been something of a tradition of the IEEE EMBS to do this and there are some other societies as well. An argument for is that the reader can get more from the 4 pages than from the alternative half or one page. The authors may also feel that they can say more. An argument against is that these are still not real “papers” because the level of peer review is questionable and therefore authors are sometimes less happy to produce 4 pages. Such “papers” are not often cited, but they may be listed in CV’s to give the impression that they are genuine peer-reviewed papers; I am unhappy about this aspect.

Keith Boddy: Support proposal by Niilo.

Colin Orton: Electronic Publication of the Chicago 2000 abstracts: I agree with Gary’s proposals, including the IEEE addendum to the Letter of Agreement.

Jean-Pierre Morucci: I agree with Gary’s proposals.

Mike Smith: I am cautious about allowing IEEE to publish short papers for the meeting. I am concerned about the growing number of publications world-wide and I would be reticent to encourage this trend. Ideally, I would hope that the good science that is presented at the World Congress would be submitted for publication in one of the good peer review journals in the field of Medical Physics or Engineering. The availability of short 4 page publications, which are unlikely to be refereed to the same standard as most scientific journals, would probably deter scientists from publishing the work fully if they had had their



Barry Allen: There is a pressing need for these august organizations to do something useful for the membership, and these objectives are spot on in this regard.

Peter Rolfe: Fine.

Keith Boddy: Agree.

M. C.C. Lensing-Koolman: It is a very good idea to move the IUPESM Website to the USA under the wings of the SG!! Please note that there is a one-month notice on the subscription of the current webpage domain. Let me know when you want the site to be moved to the USA and I will take the necessary steps to make it possible.

Another important item is the IFMBE (part of the) of the IUPESM.ORG site. This part has to be moved too to its own domain. During the IFMBE AC on Cyprus Niilo, as editor of IFMBE News, suggested to move the IFMBE Webpage to his institution in Tampere. As far as I recall a decision upon this item was not taken at that meeting. Please, could the three of you (Gary, Niilo, Heikki) discuss this issue and let me know what you all have decided?

Colin Orton: I agree that the IUPESM Home Page administration should move to Washington, DC (actually, College Park, Maryland, but close enough). The proposed contract with the AAPM looks fine.

Jean-Pierre Morucci: Yes.

*SG Comments: If this motion is approved I will begin the process of working with Heikki and Niilo to find an appropriate home for the IFMBE home page. The new IUPESM page will provide a link to the new IFMBE location so users of the old address will not lose direct access service. The move will probably take 6 to 8 weeks but we will not take down the old site until the new one is up and ready to move. We also will need the assistance of the previous provider in downloading existing materials.*

**7. Authorization of sending an IUPESM letter of invitation for Al Gore, Vice-President of USA, as plenary speaker for Chicago'2000 in support of local organizers.**

**Motion:** "That the IUPESM authorize sending an invitation to Al Gore, Vice-President of the USA, to speak to our members as a plenary speaker for the Chicago'2000 opening ceremony on the topic of "Global Knowledge Networks".

**YES: 11**

**NO: 0**

**ABSTAIN: 0**

**PASSED**

Niilo Saranummi: OK.

Oskar Chomicki: Approved.

Dov Jaron: Yes.

Barry Allen: The IUPESM can support such an invitation if we think the speaker is appropriate. As an ex-Tennessean, I would support IUPESM writing to Al Gore, but not, for example, Bill Clinton for obvious reasons. However, we would only do so on the invitation of the Conveners, as is the case. Al would not be my first choice, but its not up to us to take an initiative in this.

Peter Rolfe: Might he be "President Al Gore" soon? Fine.

Keith Boddy: Approve.

Colin Orton: I agree, the IUPESM should send a letter of invitation to Vice-President Gore.

Mike Smith: I support the proposal for inviting Vice-President Gore.

*SG Comments: If this motion is approved Keith Boddy and I will draft a letter to go along with a letter from the Chicago'2000 Co-Presidents.*



inviting such societies to be members of IUPESM, particularly as we will need to consider the future if applications to ICSU are successful.

It is quite practical to have very productive links between societies without either being a formal member of the other. An example with which I am familiar is the linkage between the British Institute of Radiology and the RSNA which co-operate and participate in each others congresses without having reciprocal membership of the other society. In addition, if other societies are considered for membership for IUPESM, I believe they should be clearly and unequivocally international in their membership and nature. Though the RSNA allows and encourages membership from around the world, its annual meeting is always held in North America and, I believe, its officers are from North America. On this basis, I would be cautious about classifying them as a truly international organisation in a way that IUPESM clearly is.

Gary Fullerton: Mike has made some very good points about the issue of IUPESM expansion. I would, however, like to encourage you to consider this issue in a more expansive fashion than we have done in our discussions to date for the following reasons:

1. The IOMP Executive Committee has been instructed by the IOMP Council to consider the issue of continued participation in IUPESM and must give a recommendation for a decision at the meeting in Chicago.
2. The IOMP Council in Nice was critical of continued partnership if the Union can not become more meaningful to IOMP members.
3. This decision is critical to the continuation of IUPESM and we have a well defined time-line for job performance.
4. I for one am not convinced that full membership in ICSU is going to resolve this question if we do not generate a real partnership on the basis of shared issues between IOMP and IFMBE.
5. The potential strength of IUPESM is the ability to bring global scientific and engineering issues of medicine into the international science arena such as ICSU where it is presently under represented.
6. Mike is right about the structure of the RSNA but he is wrong if he concludes that the RSNA meeting is not the most important meeting of the users of medical physics and biomedical engineering products in the world. (How do we resolve the issue of old paradigms when needing to address the needs of the future?)
7. I can see that RSNA membership in IUPESM may not be the right method of cooperation and RSNA may not be the right clinical organization with which to begin our global interaction but we need to begin somewhere..
8. In the end we need to develop stronger IUPESM ties with clinical/medical organizations if we are to truly represent the global interests of our members.
9. I am open to ideas.

Mike Smith: With regard to my comments and your point 6 below. I do not believe I am wrong as you suggested because I offered no view as to the importance of RSNA to physicists and engineering. In fact I attend RSNA regularly and hold it in the highest esteem and recognize its importance for many physicists and engineers.

I simply believe that IUPESM should include membership of other organizations providing (i) they are relevant and of high standing and (ii) they are international in nature. This applies to both IOMP and IFMBE but not the RSNA. If RSNA became a member of IUPESM would we consider applications for membership from other national scientific organizations?

I do believe we need to have affiliated links with a range of organizations (e.g. RSNA) and that we need to identify how this can be achieved (eg affiliated membership).

Gary Fullerton: We are in complete agreement. Please do a little more thinking on the option of a IUPESM medical society affiliation that might be appropriate for a society like the RSNA and share it with us. I think you are on the right track.

**10. IUPESM Letterhead is available from the Secretary General's Office for the use of Officers and Committee Chairmen. Please indicate your needs.**

As a result of discussions 30 sheets and envelopes of IUPESM letterhead were sent to all members of the council.

*SG Comments: I encourage all members of the Council to use our letterhead as frequently as possible and appropriate. We need to establish more of an identity. Several of you have asked about electronic letterhead. I am checking into that option.*

Respectfully submitted,

Gary D. Fullerton, Ph.D.

Secretary General IUPESM

## *Operating Procedures for the IUPESM Awards Committee*

- TITLE : 1. The awards shall be called the IUPESM Awards of Merit and consist of a plaque and expenses to travel to the World Congress to present an address.
- REASON : 2. The Awards recognise a Medical Physicist and a Biomedical Engineer who have established distinguished careers respectively in Medical Physics and Biomedical Engineering.
- CRITERIA : 3. The primary criteria for nominating Awardees are:
- 3.1 The nominees should have exerted a significant impact on the science and scientific practice of Medical Physics and Biomedical Engineering,
  - 3.2 The nominees have significantly influenced the development of the professions of Medical Physics and/or Biomedical Engineering,
  - 3.3 The nominees' activities in national and/or international organisations for Medical Physics or Biomedical Engineering have been meritorious.
- NOMINATIONS : 4. 4.1 Nominations may be made by IUPESM, IFMBE or IOMP. A Curriculum Vitae is to be submitted together with the proposal with special attention to the criteria in article 3,
- 4.2 Nominations must be submitted to the Chairman of the Awards Committee, at least 12 months prior to the next World Congress.
- COMMITTEES : 5. The Award Committee shall consist of 2 subcommittees chaired by the Vice President of the IUPESM
- 5.1 Each subcommittee shall consist of 3 representatives each selected by the member organisations, IFMBE and IOMP,
  - 5.2 Each member shall have one vote, but the Chairman votes only to break a tie.
- SELECTION : 6. Each Award Subcommittee selects one Awardee for submission to the IUPESM Council six months prior to the next World Congress.

- PRESENTATION : 7 The IUPESM Awards of Merit will be awarded on the occasion of the next World Congress. The Awardees will be notified by the Secretary General at least 4 months prior to the Congress.
- FINANCIAL : 8 The IFMBE, IOMP and the IUPESM and the organisers of the World Congress will provide reasonable financial support for participation by Awardees in the Congress.

gdf: 2 February 1999