



SUBMISSION FEEDBACK

Please provide comments on all or any of the following, particularly in relation to each Option outlined in the Consultation Regulation Impact Statement:

- The appropriateness and feasibility of the proposals.
- Whether the proposed changes will address current concerns with the regulations in the diagnostic imaging sector.
- Potential costs associated with each option.
- Potential benefits associated with each option.
- Potential workforce impacts.
- Impacts on patient access to appropriate imaging.
- Rural and remote access for patients.
- Time required to implement the potential changes.
- Impact on both smaller diagnostic imaging practices and larger practices.
- Any other comments, questions and concerns that relate to the proposed options.

In addition, you may wish to respond to questions listed against specific Options.

Submissions should include substantiating evidence, where possible.

Option 1 – No regulatory changes or deregulation (refer to page 23 of the RIS)

Features:

- The current supervision requirements remain unchanged.
- The person under the professional supervision of the radiologist would require the appropriate qualifications, credentials, or training to provide the service.
- The current substitution rules in the *Health Insurance Act 1973* remain.
- Rural and remote exemptions.

| |
|----------------|
| Comment |
|----------------|

Option 2 – Minor changes including clarification of current requirements (refer to page 24-26 of the RIS)

Features

- Amendments to the current supervision requirements to clarify the circumstances under which a radiologist and/or specialist or consultant physician must provide supervision and how the supervision must be provided.
 - Professional supervision would require: the medical practitioner be available to observe and guide the conduct and diagnostic quality and safety of the examination and if necessary in

accordance with accepted medical practice, attend the patient personally, within a reasonable period of time.

- The personal attendance requirement of musculoskeletal ultrasound would be amended to align with all other ultrasound items.
- The person under the professional supervision of the radiologist would require the appropriate qualifications, credentials, or training to provide the service.
- The current substitution rules in the *Health Insurance Act 1973* remain.
- Rural and remote exemptions.
- Specified qualification requirements for ultrasound providers.
- Definition of diagnostic ultrasound.

Comment

██████████ agrees with this option. ██████████ believes clarification for the supervision is a benefit to patients and will ensure well supervised examinations without the requirements being too arduous.

Musculoskeletal Ultrasound (refer to page 25-26 of the RIS)

Questions:

- Are the principles as outlined satisfactory to clarify the requirements?
- What reasons, if any, are there for the personal attendance requirements for musculoskeletal ultrasound to remain?
- Would a minimum set of guidelines for ‘accepted medical practice’ per modality be appropriate?
- What savings are anticipated to be realised from removing the personal attendance requirements for musculoskeletal ultrasound services?
- What additional costs are anticipated to be incurred by requiring a medical practitioner (eg radiologist) to be in close proximity to attend on a patient personally within a reasonable period of time in circumstances where this is not currently the situation?
- What other costs (if any) might be associated with the proposed changes?
- What are the potential consequences of the proposed changes?

Comment

- ██████████ agrees with this option, although the definition of supervision needs to be clarified as in option two. You should not be able to perform MSK ultrasound in practices where a radiologist is not available to attend on the patient in a required time.
- There are no reasons for the personal attendance requirements to remain. As long as the radiologist is able to personally attend the patient when required in a required time.
- A minimal set of guidelines for accepted medical practice would be appropriate.
- There would not be additional costs by requiring the radiologist to be in close proximity for MSK ultrasound.
- This change would increase access to services and reduce waiting times for MSK ultrasound.
- MSK ultrasound should only be available in comprehensive practices.

Option 3 – Practice based approach (refer to page 27-34 of the RIS)

Features

- Amendments to the current supervision requirements to clarify the circumstances under which a radiologist and/or specialist or consultant physician must provide supervision and how the supervision must be provided.
 - Professional supervision would require: the medical practitioner be available to observe and guide the conduct and diagnostic quality and safety of the examination and if necessary in accordance with accepted medical practice, attend the patient personally, within a reasonable period of time.
- The personal attendance requirement of musculoskeletal ultrasound would be amended to align with all other ultrasound items.
- The person under the professional supervision of the radiologist would require the appropriate qualifications, credentials, or training to provide the service.
- Computed Tomography services would only be able to be provided in a comprehensive practice, with the exception of CT of the coronary arteries (items 57360 and 57361).
- Supervision would be tailored to the type of diagnostic imaging practice.
- A comprehensive practice would require a radiologist to be available during agreed operating hours.
- Where a radiologist is on site during ordinary operating hours, the radiologist would be allowed to determine the supervision requirements for the practice and have the flexibility to implement and supervise efficient and effective processes.
- Where a radiologist is on site during ordinary operating hours, the radiologist would be allowed to substitute a requested service for a more appropriate service, without the need for consultation with the requester, if the substituted service has a lower MBS fee than the requested service.
- The current substitution rules in the *Health Insurance Act 1973* remain.
- Where a radiologist is NOT on site during ordinary operating hours, a radiologist must be on site for the performance of the following services:
 - Mammography;
 - The administration of contrast; and
 - Image guided intervention procedures/surgical interventions.
- The reporting and supervising radiologist would not have to be the same person, but practices would be required to maintain records which indicate the name of all the radiologists involved in the service.
- Rural and remote exemptions.
- Specified qualification requirements for ultrasound providers.
- Definition of diagnostic ultrasound.

| |
|----------------|
| Comment |
|----------------|

A Comprehensive practice (refer to page 28-29 of the RIS)

Questions:

- Are there any other types of practices which have not been identified?
- Are there comprehensive practices that do not currently have a radiologist onsite?
- What are the costs of employing a radiologist onsite during ordinary operating hours?

- What are the costs of non-comprehensive practices expanding to become comprehensive practices?
- Are there enough radiologist for this to occur? What are the barriers?
- Is there any role for standalone CT and, if so, how would current safety and quality concerns be addressed? What will be the impact of this change on providers and patients?
- What other costs (if any) might be associated with the proposed changes?
- What are the potential consequences of the proposed changes?

Comment

- [REDACTED] agrees with this option and think that there is no place for stand-alone CT practices, except possibly for CT Coronary Arteries. Stand-alone CT practice, except in the case of CT Coronary Arteries practices do not allow for substitution of examination if required, eg x-ray or US. This would lead to unnecessary CT scans being performed.

Non-radiologist specialist practice (refer to page 30-31 of the RIS)

Question

- Are there any other services currently performed by non-radiology specialists?

Comment

ADDITIONAL ISSUES FOR CONSULTATION

1. Rural and remote exemptions (refer to page 31-32 of the RIS)

The intention of having rural exemptions is to ensure patients have access to services without compromising on quality. However, current arrangements for rural exemptions vary for each of the modalities, creating confusion due to an inconsistent approach. The current approach is also difficult to administer.

Questions

- Does the current rule meet its goal of increasing access for patients without comprising on quality?
- Should exemptions be geographically/distance based rather than looking at population base and local availability of specialist services?
- Are there any other mechanisms that provide incentives for local services provision in rural Australia?
- What is the role of tele-radiology? Should it be the only service, or an adjunct the local service provision?
- Should the exemption not be available for certain types of services?

Comment

2. Implementing any changes and the relative role of regulation and the Diagnostic Imaging Accreditation Scheme (DIAS) (refer to page 33-34 of the RIS)

The relative role of regulation and accreditation in enhancing the quality framework for MBS funded diagnostic imaging services will be determined following feedback received from stakeholders under this consultation process.

Questions

- Would changes to supervision be better placed in the DIAS or remain in the regulations?
- How would a practice based supervision approach be incorporated into regulation?
- Is it necessary to have a modality based approach in the regulations (as a minimum) and a practice based approach in accreditation?

Comment

3. Any additional proposals, suggestions or comments?

Comment

MRI services should be further deregulated. The current eligibility system does not reduce the number of services, but only reduces the competition for radiology practices. The Eligible MRI systems are able to just work longer hours rather than working normal business hours, so this proves there is no advantage in so tightly regulating MRI eligibility. If the systems themselves were deregulated, but the request requirements remained, this would increase accessibility to services, reduce waiting times and improve competition amongst imaging providers without increasing the expenses to Medicare.