

Minutes

MEETING NAME 09-WG33: WG-33 Data Archive and Management

MEETING PLACE/DIAL IN

DATE & TIME Wednesday, March 31, 2021 | 11:00 am – 12:30 pm US ET

PRESIDING OFFICERS Matthew Bishop, UnityPoint Health
 Keith Eklund, Healthcare Tech Solutions

VOTING MEMBERS PRESENT

Ambra Health	Ostrow, Daniel
Argentix Informatix	Silver, Elliot
Grafimedia	Georgiadis, Pantelis
Healthcare Tech Solutions	Eklund, Keith
Laitek, Inc.	Brown, Barry
Laitek, Inc.	Costea-Barluti, Razvan
Laitek, Inc.	Solomon, Harry
Mayo Clinic Rochester	Persons, Kenneth
Society for Imaging Informatics In Medicine	Bishop, Matthew
Society for Imaging Informatics In Medicine	Carey, Cheryl

OTHERS

Laitek, Inc.	Behlen, Fred
London Health Science Center	Aizawa, Luiz
Mega Informatica Ltd	Fauquex, Jacques

VOTING MEMBERS ABSENT

AAPM	Bevins, Nicholas
ACR	Maldonado, Josh
Canon Medical Research USA	O'Donnell, Kevin
Canon/Vital Images	Dawson, Tim

Canon/Vital Images	Whitby, Jonathan
Change Healthcare	Ho, Kinson
DesAcc EMEA	King, Graham
European Society of Radiology	Mildenberger, Peter
GE Healthcare	Nichols, Steven
GE Healthcare	Numan, Jouke
Mach7 Technologies	Ulanov, Alexey
PixelMed Publishing	Clunie, David
Society for Imaging Informatics In Medicine	Henson, Kyle
Varian Medical Systems, Inc.	Schwere, Thomas

DICOM Anna Zawacki, SIIM
SECRETARIAT

1 CALL TO ORDER AND REVIEW OF ANTI-TRUST RULES AND DICOM PATENT POLICY (Co-Chairs, Secretariat)

The meeting was called to order. Guidelines for Conducting NEMA Meetings were read and attendance was recorded.

2 REVIEW AND APPROVE AGENDA (Co-Chairs)

The agenda was reviewed.

3 REVIEW MINUTES (Co-Chairs)

The minutes of the previous meeting were reviewed.

4 TOPIC ITEMS TO BE DISCUSSED (All)

ftp://d9-workgrps@medical.nema.org/MEDICAL/Private/Dicom/WORKGRPS/WG33/2021/2021-03-31/Sup223_24_InventoryIODandServices.docx

- Review final Sup223 draft # 24
- Go through the changes from the WG-6 review
- Review open issues

Sup223 was reviewed by WG-06 and they had several changes:

- Changes to how original attribute sequence is specified – that has been moved to a change proposal which will be out for ballot right now.
- Completion status flag –
- renames of some attributes
- study date/time and study update date/time range separated in the scope of inventory – changed

There was a discussion whether you can have an inventory instance with no records – basically, yes,

They resolved inventory and study level issue.

They wanted a match on series description – added. Wanted match issuer of patient ID as well as patient ID, more institutions supporting what IHE calls MIMA – multiple image manager archive – multiple institutions sharing a repository – so that's in.

Final things on the conformance assertions for the inventory creation – they wanted – if you are doing inventory creation through a Dicom service there is no reason you shouldn't be able to retrieve the inventory objects created with a Dicom service.

Changes:

In the scope of inventory - created study date/time range and study update date/time range. You can match on either or on both.

Added in series description as in matching, matched against each series in the study, allowing wild cards.

Searching for patient ID, we split this into patient ID sequence that gives issuer a list of IDs against that issuer. Looked at text for that.

Many changes in the storage management service class.

In the statuses removed terminal condition of no match, no complete with 0 studies found.

In the conformance requirements – all requirements have been bulletized, but no actual content changes, just formatting.

Added in some minor changes: question re: instance availability in CFIND – what relationship between unavailable here and removed from operational use?

Now look at the Open Items:

Open items have been reorganized, will have hyperlink to the presentation when we get the address of where that will be on the website.

1a is general key attribute matching needed for the scope of inventory?

Current draft includes broader inventory only? You can either get a full inventory and inventory scoped down to the 8 or so selectors that we have.

2 questions – 1. Is matching against additional keys germane to the migration use case? 2. Even if not germane – there are other *use-casey* stuff that slipped in i.e. research? Could add more broad scoping to support other use cases as a forward-thinking idea?

If we don't allow more general arbitrary keys to include, it would be up to the client to filter down the broader inventory.

1b introducing attribute matching mechanism.

Problem is the existing matching mechanisms don't handle certain things we want, like missing attribute values.

They raised a use case of matching SOP classes in study.

If 1a became more broad, 1c becomes moot.

2a should studies or series level folders or container files allow extraneous objects?

Question for those who create migration tools.

2b should specific non-DICOM file access protocols be prescribed normatively?

We specified the recommended protocols.

Security – de-identification profile- same open issue we have had.

Rules and production of an inventory -issue raised last time.

Final issue – do we need standardized confidentiality or privacy attributes?

Should those be something that it is possible to migrate? Do you rely on the EMR to be managing patient confidentiality? Should such attributes be handled external to the DICOM IOD?

In the inventory creation service – Paused status. Question though was: what is the requirement or use case for an external client who has requested an inventory to be produced, for that client to ask for a pause and resume?

We can imagine – you have started off an inventory, it will take a couple of weeks, along the way a radiologist says that you are interfering with their processes – should we be able from our client to say – ok, pause the inventory and then at later time resume it? or does that need to happen on the PACS itself?

It has to be able to happen on the PACS. PACS also needs a capability to reject/resume for the exact same reason. But also see a use case where client can do the exact same thing. Willing to put into the draft for public comment – a pause request from the client. Question then is – is it making it too complex? General principle on pause button is - you started it; can you stop it?

We have a command for the client to ask what the current status is. It may be a good idea for that command to also be able to specify a revised reporting interval.

I want this report every hour on where you are, but when you get closer to the end, you may want to start getting updates every 10 min.

Discussed a lot about being able to reuse inventories that are already created – basically getting your increment over the baseline.

Question – should a client be able to request a fresh inventory?

The minute you allow it, it will be the only thing used, except it will take a couple of weeks vs an hour if you use the other one.

Action: Leave it as an open item for public comment.

Added in a section – relationship to other DICOM proposals.

There is a revision of DICOM conformance statement coming along approximately the same time, so we'll see what we have to do for that.

Let's walk slowly through the doc and raise questions.

Scan through all of part 17

Pause command and changing reporting interval – 2 things we want to put in today.

- Requested edits to some diagrams.
- Inventory tree – clearer picture.
- Broken up each of the examples into separate sub sub sub sections, makes it easier to reference.
- Further discussion here about how the attributes change between the different objects in these trees.
- Questions on public comment period-
- Asked for a new section on empty inventory – raised and resolved – Harry to add it to closed issues.
- It will be released for public comment sometime next week – week of April 5. It will be open for 45 days.

Action: Release letter that goes out to the full DICOM mailing list. SIIM will publicize it to SIIM membership.

After public comment period closes, Shayne from DICOM Secretariat will compile them and send off to us, so we could respond.

WG-06 doesn't meet again until June. We have 5 hours allocated on the agenda in June to approve this for letter ballot.

5 OLD BUSINESS

6 NEW BUSINESS

7 DATE AND TIME OF NEXT MEETINGS (Secretariat)

- Continue T-con meetings bi-weekly with the exception of next meeting – in a month
- Next call is April 28, 2021 between 11:00 am and 12:30 pm ET

NEMALINK CODE

09-WG33

SUBMITTED BY

Hull, Carolyn

SUBMITTED ON

6/8/2021

LEGAL APPROVAL

6/11/2021

UPLOAD LOCATION

Enter upload location.