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Foreword

This is a supplement to the IHE Radiology Technical Framework V18.0. Each supplement undergoes a process of public comment and trial implementation before being incorporated into the volumes of the Technical Frameworks.

This supplement is published on August 9, 2019 for trial implementation and may be available for testing at subsequent IHE Connectathons. The supplement may be amended based on the results of testing. Following successful testing it will be incorporated into the Radiology Technical Framework. Comments are invited and may be submitted at http://www.ihe.net/Radiology_Public_Comments.

This supplement describes changes to the existing technical framework documents. “Boxed” instructions like the sample below indicate to the Volume Editor how to integrate the relevant section(s) into the relevant Technical Framework volume.

Amend Section X.X by the following:

Where the amendment adds text, make the added text bold underline. Where the amendment removes text, make the removed text bold strikethrough. When entire new sections are added, introduce with editor’s instructions to “add new text” or similar, which for readability are not bolded or underlined.

General information about IHE can be found at www.ihe.net. Information about the IHE Radiology domain can be found at http://www.ihe.net/IHE_Domains. Information about the organization of IHE Technical Frameworks and Supplements and the process used to create them can be found at http://www.ihe.net/IHE_Process and http://www.ihe.net/Profiles.

The current version of the IHE Radiology Technical Framework can be found at http://www.ihe.net/Technical_Frameworks.
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Introduction

In healthcare and imaging centers, where images need to be shared among different systems, it is a common practice to distribute copies of imaging instances. At the same time, it is also common to modify studies or instances as follows:

- Correcting/updating demographics
- Splitting/combining studies due to incorrect Modality Worklist item selection
- Removing “bad” instances from circulation
- Permanently deleting old imaging instances or entire studies as may be required by institutional record retention policies

The combination of needing to distribute copies of instances and needing to modify instances leads to copies which are inconsistent, which in turn creates the potential for confusion, error or loss of data.

This supplement extends the Imaging Object Change Management Profile to support media interchange (PDI), study import (IRWF) and cross-enterprise document sharing for imaging (XDS-I.b).

Profile Abstract

The Imaging Object Change Management Extension (IOCM Extension) specifies how the mechanism defined in IOCM can be extended to support media interchange (PDI), study import (IRWF) and cross-enterprise document sharing for imaging (XDS-I.b).

This supplement is not a standalone Integration Profile.

Open Issues and Questions

None
Closed Issues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Issue/ (Answer)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td><strong>Is the Confirmation of Instances Availability Option necessary? If yes, then should it be an option or should it be required?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Response: Notification is a pro-active mechanism. Use case to notify the Requester could be accomplished with some other mechanisms (e.g., Requester could query at the instance level to find out if the receiving Image Manager / Archive has handled the object deletion / replacement properly). The second use case is for the receiving Image Manager / Archive to notify other systems about changes in the study. In fact, this second use case is a generalization of the first one in which one of the destinations is the Requester. Decided to make this transaction Required. Make sure the text handles one or more destinations. <strong>After public comment, we decided to remove the requirements of IAN completely except for the existing IAN requirement between IM/IA and DSS/OF that already exist in SWF.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td><strong>How do you find the latest information (i.e., ‘the Gold copy’)?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Response: You can’t. Out of scope for this profile.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In practice, there is not necessarily any authoritative reference for any instance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td><strong>Does MAWF change as a result of IOCM?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Response: No. Leave MAWF as is. IOCM introduces no incompatibilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td><strong>Inconsistency about content of IAN compared to Administrative Query and Clinical Query. i.e., IAN listed all instances (available and unavailable) but Administrative Query returns all while Clinical Query returns only available.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Response: All available instances have status ‘available’. All obsolete instances have status ‘unavailable’. KOS with the four specific document titles defined in IOCM have status ‘unavailable’.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Issue/ (Answer)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td><strong>Should this profile discuss PIR across multiple enterprises?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MIMA requires the forwarding of HL7®1 messages to multiple destinations (e.g.,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>local IM/IA and enterprise IM/IA) which will trigger the external IM/IA to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>update the patient and procedure information, for example. In these cases,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>there is no requirement to create new instances and no requirement to push</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>instances out to another IM/IA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Response: Call out that existing PIR use cases remain and as the preferred</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>mechanisms. Add to Volume 1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>**How does an item get back on the Worklist after it has been incorrectly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>selected?**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>For the use case of Correction of Modality Worklist Selection, when the study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>is fixed to the correct MWL entry, new MPPS N-Create and N-Set will be sent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>for the corrected images. This allows the DSS/OF to update the scheduled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>procedure status of the correct MWL entry accordingly. However, since the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>incorrectly selected scheduled procedure has already been marked as ‘completed’,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>how does it get back on the worklist?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Is it necessary to have an automated mechanism to reset the status of this</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>scheduled procedure step in the DSS/OF? If yes, then how? The challenge is</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>that according to DICOM, it is invalid to set another N-Set for the MPPS SOP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Instance once its status is set to COMPLETED or DISCONTINUED. There does not</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>seem to be any available mechanism that can reset a SPS status in the DSS/OF.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Response: Use Keep the IAN notification to DSS/OF as a trigger for DSS/OF to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>re-open the wrong worklist item. (same as MAWF) (NOTE: This overlaps with open</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>issue #9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td><strong>Should the KOS be persisted?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Response: Sometimes. The KOS should not be persisted for data retention use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>case because the KOS contains patient and procedure information. The KOS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>should be persisted for other rejection reasons. The KOS should only be</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>accessible for the case of quality reasons, but not the case for patient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>safety or incorrect worklist selection.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

1 HL7 is the registered trademark of Health Level Seven International.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Issue/ (Answer)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **8** | **Which destinations should the Image Manager send IAN to?**  
Response: There is no publish-subscribe mechanism. IAN destinations are configurable as defined in RAD-49, but how to configure the destinations is not defined in IHE. Also specific consumer behavior is out of scope, although there is some informative text defined in this profile in Volume 1 suggesting how to use IAN to correct evidence documents.  
No more requirements related to IAN besides the existing transaction between Image Manager / Archive and DSS/OF. So this question is not an issue anymore. |
| **9** | **Should a new instance contain a reference to the instance that it replaces?**  
We could put the replacement relationship in the Referenced Image Sequence of the new instances. However, this Sequence is only available in the General Image module. That means only image objects can have this relationship defined. Therefore, non-image objects such as GSPS will not have this relationship defined. It is important to note that it is still possible to replace a new GSPS object, for example, by deleting the existing one via a DICOM Key Object Selection Document (KOS) and then creating a new one. The only difference is that the new one will not have an explicit reference to the existing instance that it replaced.  
Committee Response: Yes. The reference would improve traceability which can be especially important in the data modification cases this profile addresses.  
The current text includes this mechanism for images. A CP will be submitted to DICOM requesting a general attribute (e.g., Referenced Instance Sequence (0008, 114A) with a Purpose code that can be applied to all instances). See Section 4.74.4.1.2.  
Committee Updates: The CP is rejected by DICOM. Committee agreed and there are no longer any references to the original SOP instances in the replacement instances. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Issue/ (Answer)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td><strong>What “hiding behavior” is appropriate for instances that are rejected for quality reason?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Hiding Behavior” means that for instances that have been flagged with KOS for rejection, the Image Manager omits them from query results and refuses retrieval. Such hiding behavior is required for instances that are rejected due to patient safety reason. This specification proposes that for instances that are rejected for quality reasons, (inherited from MAWF) (but not for other reasons), there are two modes of behavior for both query and retrieve. The Image Manager / Archive must be able to support: (1) returning the KOS and the rejected instances, and (2) hiding the KOS and the rejected instances. However, there is no explicit mechanism defined in MAWF for how this should be done. Two possibilities were discussed: (1) Consumer AE Title driven server behavior, or (2) Server provides different AEs, one that returns all (correct and obsolete), one that returns only the latest view That means Image Manager / Archive has to support two AEs for Query and two AEs for Retrieve; one for administrative query/retrieve (i.e., return all), one for clinical query/retrieve (i.e., return latest, or hide rejected instances). Committee Response: - Current text in MAWF only requires the IM to configure which mode to present, but does not specify a particular mechanism. - IOCM specifies the query/retrieve behavior is configurable based on the Called AE Title in the DICOM query/retrieve request - Restriction of which mode to use is best handled by the IM, rather than always letting the consumer choose. Therefore, the profile specifies that the IM shall provide a configurable mechanism to control which systems have access to which behavior. No specific mechanism is defined though. See Section 4.66.4.1.3.1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Issue/ (Answer)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td><strong>What should be the behavior if the Image Manager supports MIMA? E.g., Can the rejected images due to quality reason allow to be sent?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Committee Response:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- For images rejected due to quality reasons, these images should continue to be sent to the Receiving IM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- For images rejected due to other reasons, these images should not be sent to the Receiving IM provided that they have not been sent prior to receiving the KOS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td><strong>Report related actors defined in SINR are currently excluded from this profile. Is this acceptable?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Committee Response:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Decision has been made to defer this to a future Supplement or Change Proposal, as we may want to address some of the larger issues, such as whether it still makes sense to have separate Image Manager and Report Manager Actors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td><strong>Is the recipient responsible for updating other instances that reference a deleted instance?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Committee Response:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sometimes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>For example, when an image is replaced a GSPS instance that references this image becomes useless because it references an image instance that is now gone/hidden, unless a new GSPS is created with a corrected reference.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>It is challenging for a recipient to understand all the different SOP classes and all the possible reference attributes, but is possible to specify a minimum subset (e.g., images, PS and SRs). The recipient may also need to judge if the reference is still valid to know if it <em>should</em> be updated, but the default assumption is that a referencing object is valid unless it too has been rejected in the Change Request (i.e., in the absence of a specific reason to believe it is invalid).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>However, there is currently no means of associating the rejected instances with their replacement instances, if any, so the recipient may find it difficult to produce new referencing instances with corrected references.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Issue/ (Answer)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td><strong>Shall the use case Evidence Document Correction (X.3.5) be a named option?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Committee Response:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Evidence Document Correction Use Case was removed because it is no longer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>mandatory for a Change Requester to support IAN (and take certain actions based</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>on these notifications).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td><strong>Would be it cleaner to use UPS rather than IAN to drive the DSS/OF behavior?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In case of modality worklist selection correction, after the images are corrected, the Image Manager should update the DSS/OF so that DSS/OF can reset the procedure step back to Scheduled.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Committee Response:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The DICOM Unified Worklist and Procedure Step Service has not yet been</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>incorporated into the IHE Profiles whereas IAN has. For now, IAN is the best</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>mechanism.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td><strong>Would this profile be better as an option in SWF and PIR instead of a separate profile?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The current profile uses grouping with the SWF and PIR for the required workflow related transactions. It may be difficult for the reader to understand the dependencies and what transactions are required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>If this profile is an option in SWF and PIR, then it becomes more explicit which transactions are in scope.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Committee Response:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Decision has been made to keep IOCM as a separate profile in order to increase its visibility as separate, but complementary, functionality to SWF and PIR.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td><strong>How to differentiate between new original instances and replacement instances in the audit record?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Committee Response:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>There does not appear to be a clear need to be able to distinguish between original and replacement instances for the purposes of audit logging.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Issue/ (Answer)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 18 | **For Table 4.74.4.1.2.1-1, should the Performed Procedure Step Start Date/Time of the replacement instances correspond to the time replacement instances are created, or should they be copied from the original instances?**  
Committee Response:  
The replacement instances are still a result of the original Performed Procedure Step so they shall have the Start Date/Time of the original Performed Procedure Step. |
| 19 | **On the Rejection Note Stored transaction, for the Patient Safety Reason and Worklist Correction, the expected action stated that the Rejection Note itself should not be provided in query/retrieve or store. However, for the media export case, The Portable Media Creator is required to include the Rejection Note but not the rejected instances. Is it inconsistent behavior? For example, what if an Image Manager/Archive is also a Portable Media Creator?**  
Committee Response:  
The required behavior can still be supported because the Image Manager / Archive can still keep the rejected note to itself so that it can be made available on the exported media.  
However, for the Data Retention Expired case, the expected action explicitly stated that the rejection note should be deleted, not just forbidden to be returned. Therefore, the rejection note cannot be made available in the media.  
Furthermore, for all three use cases, the idea of making the rejection note available is to allow an Image Display which has obtained the prior copy of the study the ability to hide rejected instances if it receives the same study at a later time.  
So should IOCM be different from MAWF regarding the handling of the rejection note so that the KOS should still be available? This may make ‘dumb’ Image Displays unhappy if they receive a KOS with references to non-existing instances. |
3 Scheduled Workflow (SWF)

Modify TF Vol. 1, Section 3 Scheduled Workflow (SWF) as defined in the Multiple Image Manager Archive (MIMA) Supplement. The modified text new for IOCM is in red.

Table 3.2-1: Scheduled Workflow - Actors and Options

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actor</th>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Transactions</th>
<th>TF Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Image Manager/ Image Archive</td>
<td>Availability of PPS-Referenced Instances</td>
<td>Instance Availability Notification</td>
<td>RAD TF-3: 4.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPS Exception Management</td>
<td></td>
<td>Modality Procedure Step Completed</td>
<td>RAD TF-2: 4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performed Work Status Update - Receive</td>
<td></td>
<td>Performed Work Status Update [RAD-42] (as the Receiver)</td>
<td>RAD TF-2: 4.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple Identity Resolution (see Section 3.2.1)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Procedure Scheduled [RAD-4]</td>
<td>RAD TF-2: 4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Modality Procedure Step In Progress</td>
<td>RAD TF-2: 4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Modality Procedure Step Completed</td>
<td>RAD TF-2: 4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Creator Procedure Step in Progress</td>
<td>RAD TF-2: 4.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Creator Procedure Step Completed</td>
<td>RAD TF-2: 4.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Image Manager Instances Stored [RAD-70]</td>
<td>RAD TF-3: 4.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Image Manager Storage Commitment [RAD-71]</td>
<td>RAD TF-3: 4.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Image Manager Instances Query [RAD-72]</td>
<td>RAD TF-3: 4.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Image Manager Instances Retrieval [RAD-73]</td>
<td>RAD TF-3: 4.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Modality Images Stored [RAD-8]</td>
<td>RAD TF-2: 4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Retrieve Images [RAD-16]</td>
<td>RAD TF-2: 4.16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 28 Imaging Object Change Management (IOCM)

**28.1 Actors / Transactions**

Figures 28.1-1, **28.1-2** and **28.1-3** show the actors directly involved in the Imaging Object Change Management Integration Profile and the relevant transactions between them. Other

---

2 DICOM is the registered trademark of the National Electrical Manufacturers Association for its standards publications relating to digital communications of medical information.
actors that may be indirectly involved due to their participation in Scheduled Workflow, Consistent Presentation of Images, etc., are not necessarily shown.

Figure 28.1-1: Imaging Object Change Management Actor Diagram related to SWF and IRWF
If the Image Manager/Image Archive supporting IOCM is also grouped with an XDS-I.b Imaging Document Source, then the Imaging Document Source shall support the IOCM functionality defined for the following transactions in Figure 28.1-3.
Table 28.1-1 lists the transactions for each actor directly involved in the Imaging Object Change Management Profile. In order to claim support of this Integration Profile, an implementation must perform the required transactions (labeled “R”). Transactions labeled “O” are optional. A complete list of options defined by this Integration Profile and that implementations may choose to support is listed in Section 28.2.

Table 28.1-1: Imaging Object Change Management Integration Profile - Actors and Transactions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actors</th>
<th>Transactions</th>
<th>Optionality</th>
<th>TF Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Change Requester</td>
<td>Rejection Note Stored [RAD-66]</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>RAD TF-3: 4.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Replacement Instances Stored [RAD-74]</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>RAD TF-3: 4.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Image Manager / Archive</td>
<td>Rejection Note Stored [RAD-66]</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>RAD TF-3: 4.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Replacement Instances Stored [RAD-74]</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>RAD TF-3: 4.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Instance Availability Notification</strong> [RAD-49]</td>
<td>R</td>
<td><strong>RAD TF-3: 4.49</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Retrieve Images [RAD-16]</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>RAD TF-2: 4.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DSS/Order Filler</td>
<td>Query Key Image Notes [RAD-30]</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>RAD TF-2: 4.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Retrieve Key Image Notes [RAD-31]</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>RAD TF-2: 4.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Instance Availability Notification</strong> [RAD-49]</td>
<td>R</td>
<td><strong>RAD TF-3: 4.49</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
28.2 Imaging Object Change Management Integration Profile Options

Options that may be selected for this Integration Profile are listed in the Table 28.2-1 along with the actors to which they apply. Dependencies between options when applicable are specified in notes.

Table 28.2-1: Imaging Object Change Management - Actors and Options

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actor</th>
<th>Options</th>
<th>TF Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Change Requester</td>
<td>No option defined</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Image Manager / Archive</td>
<td>No option defined</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 28.3 Imaging Object Change Management Integration Profile Actor Groupings and Profile Interactions

Imaging Object Change Management builds upon the underlying actor transactions defined in other Profiles. For this reason, certain IOCM Profile actors shall be grouped with actors from other Profiles as defined in Table 28.3-1.

#### Table 28.3-1: Imaging Object Change Management Integration Profile - Actors and Transactions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Integration Profile</th>
<th>Actor</th>
<th>Grouped With</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Imaging Object Change Management</td>
<td>Change Requester (See Note 1)</td>
<td>Scheduled Workflow</td>
<td>Support communication of procedure steps and storage commitment when Change Requester is grouped with Acquisition Modality, Image Manager/Image Archive or Evidence Creator.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Acquisition Modality</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Scheduled Workflow</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Evidence Creator</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Scheduled Workflow</td>
<td>Defines how Image Manager/Image Archive can obtain scheduled worklist in order to correct the modality worklist selection of the acquired instances.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Integration Profile

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actor</th>
<th>Grouped With</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Image Manager/ Image Archive</td>
<td>Scheduled Workflow</td>
<td>Support Image Manager to Image Manager change management if Multiple Patient Identity Resolution Option is supported.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department System Scheduler/ Order Filler</td>
<td>Scheduled Workflow</td>
<td>SWF defines how the Department System Scheduler/Order Filler provides scheduling information and receives updates from performed procedure steps and instance availability notification.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Image Display</td>
<td>Scheduled Workflow</td>
<td>SWF defines message semantics for query-retrieval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change Requester (see note 1)</td>
<td>Patient Information Reconciliation</td>
<td>PIR defines the patient information reconciliation mechanisms that shall be supported by these actors. IOCM shall not be used as an alternative mechanism for handling patient information reconciliation use cases.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Image Manager/ Image Archive</td>
<td>Patient Information Reconciliation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department System Scheduler/ Order Filler</td>
<td>Patient Information Reconciliation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Image Manager/ Image Archive</td>
<td>Import Reconciliation Workflow</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department System Scheduler/ Order Filler</td>
<td>Import Reconciliation Workflow</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Importer</td>
<td>Import Reconciliation Workflow</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portable Media Creator</td>
<td>Portable Data for Imaging</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Rev. 1.7 – 2019-08-09 Copyright © 2017: IHE International, Inc.
### Integration Profile

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actor</th>
<th>Grouped With</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Portable Media Importer</td>
<td>Portable Data for Imaging</td>
<td>Portable Media Importer shall be supported by these actors to distribute imaging related information on interchange media. IOCM specializes their behavior for handling change management use cases.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Image Display</td>
<td>Portable Data for Imaging</td>
<td>Image Display</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report Reader</td>
<td>Portable Data for Imaging</td>
<td>Report Reader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Print Composer</td>
<td>Portable Data for Imaging</td>
<td>Print Composer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Display (ITI TF)</td>
<td>Portable Data for Imaging</td>
<td>Display (ITI TF)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note 1: At least one of the optional retrieve transactions is required to be supported. Refer to Section 18.4 for additional requirements on the Imaging Document Consumer.

### 28.4 Imaging Object Change Management Process Flow

Add new Section 28.4.5:
28.4.5 Image Correction of Exported Study

This section shows how the synchronization mechanisms described in the previous use cases can be adapted to systems across the enterprise. Use Case: Image Correction for Patient Safety Reason (Section 28.4.3) is used as an example for illustration.

The Acquisition Modality sends left breast cranial caudal view (LCC) images that are incorrectly labeled as right breast (RCC) view images to the Image Manager/Archive. The Image Manager/Archive is also acting as an XDS-I Imaging Document Source and publishes the manifest that references these incorrect images to the XDS Repository [RAD-68]. The XDS Document Repository then registers the manifest to the XDS Document Registry [ITI-42].

Later, as described in Section 28.4.3, the Acquisition Modality corrects the study and sends a Rejection Note and Replacement Instances to the Image Manager / Archive ([RAD-66], [RAD-74]). The Image Manager / Archive hides the incorrect images. Furthermore, the Image Manager/Archive acting as an XDS-I Imaging Document Source replaces the original submitted manifest that references the incorrect images by submitting a new replacement manifest that references the replacement instances. The replacement manifest also includes a reference to the KOS with a Selection Document Title of “Rejected for Patient Safety Reasons”.

Figure 28.4.5-1: Image Correction of Exported Study

Note: The interaction between Acquisition Modality and Image Manager/Archive is a simplified version of Figure 28.4.3-1 for illustration purpose only.
Since the manifest no longer references the rejected instances, XDS Imaging Document Consumer that retrieves the replacement manifest will not be aware of the rejected instances. For an XDS Imaging Document Consumer that has already retrieved the original incorrect instances, the rejection note in the replacement manifest allows the consumer to hide the incorrect instances accordingly.

**Variant:** Instead of publishing a study using XDS-I.b, a Portable Media Creator exports the corrected study to an interchange media. The media includes the KOS with a Selection Document Title of “Rejected for Patient Safety Reasons” and the replacement instances.
Volume 2 – Transactions

4.31 Retrieve Key Image Notes

Modify Section 4.31.4.2.3.2 as follows:

4.31.4.2.3.2 Presentation of rejected or incorrect images in Imaging Object Change Management

An Image Display or Imaging Document Consumer participating in the Imaging Object Change Management Integration Profile may receive Key Image Notes.

When an Image Display or Imaging Document Consumer receives a Key Image Note with Key Object Selection (KOS) Document Title valued (113001, DCM, "Rejected for Quality Reasons"). The Image Display or Imaging Document Consumer shall support the three behaviors listed below. The behavior shall be configurable as one of the following:

- Suppress from presentation the rejected instances referenced in this KOS and this KOS itself
- Present the rejected instances referenced in this KOS and this KOS itself
- Ignore this KOS and present the rejected instances.

When an Image Display or Imaging Document Consumer receives a Key Image Note with the Key Object Selection (KOS) Document Title valued (113037, DCM, "Rejected for Patient Safety Reasons"), (113038, DCM, “Incorrect Modality Worklist Entry”), or (113039, DCM, “Data Retention Policy Expired”), it shall suppress the KOS and its referenced rejected instances from presentation.
Volume 3 – Transactions (continued)

4.47 Distribute Imaging Information on Media

... In Volume 3, add Section 4.47.4.1.2.4 at the end of Message Semantics

4.47.4.1.2.4 Access to Rejected Instances

The contents of this section are required for Portable Media Creator Actors in the Imaging Object Change Management Profile.

The Portable Media Creator shall include the received KOS instance on the media and exclude from the media all instances referenced by the KOS instance, if the KOS instance has one of the following Document Titles:

- (113001, DCM, “Rejected for Quality Reasons”)
- (113037, DCM, “Rejected for Patient Safety Reasons”)
- (113038, DCM, “Incorrect Modality Worklist Entry”)
- (113039, DCM, “Data Retention Policy Expired”)

In Volume 3, update the following section with reference to IOCM

4.47.4.1.3.2 Image Display

The Image Display reads the DICOM image data from the media and provides the user with the ability to view all studies (that it supports) contained on the media. GSPS objects and Key Image Notes are read from the media and applied if the Consistent Presentation of Images and the Key Image Notes IHE Integration Profiles are supported. The Image Display may optionally be grouped with other actors that view other evidence objects.

An Image Display in the Imaging Object Change Management Profile shall support presentation of rejected or corrected instances as defined in Section 4.47.4.1.5.

In Volume 3, update the following section with reference to IOCM

4.47.4.1.3.3 Report Reader

The Report Reader reads the DICOM SR Reports from the media and may process them (based on the SR object classes it supports). At a minimum, it provides the user with the ability to view all reports per the DICOM SR SCP requirements.
A Report Reader in the Imaging Object Change Management Profile shall support presentation of rejected or corrected instances as defined in Section 4.47.4.1.5.

In Volume 3, add new Section 4.47.4.1.3.4.1 for IOCM

4.47.4.1.3.4 Portable Media Importer

…

4.47.4.1.3.4.1 Access to Rejected Instances

The contents of this section are required for Portable Media Importer Actors in the Imaging Object Change Management Profile.

The Portable Media Importer shall import the KOS instance from the media and exclude from import the instances referenced by the KOS instance, if the KOS instance has one of the following Document Titles:

- (113001, DCM, “Rejected for Quality Reasons”)
- (113037, DCM, “Rejected for Patient Safety Reasons”)
- (113038, DCM, “Incorrect Modality Worklist Entry”)
- (113039, DCM, “Data Retention Policy Expired”)

Note: The Portable Media Importer may encounter media created by two different types of Portable Media Creator, one that is IOCM compliant and therefore will exclude from the media all rejected instances (see Section 4.47.4.1.2.4), and one that is non-IOCM compliant and therefore will include on the media rejected instances as regular instances. Therefore, it is important for the Portable Media Importer that supports IOCM to process any rejection notes on the media and exclude from import all the rejected instances accordingly.

In Volume 3, update the following section with reference to IOCM

4.47.4.1.3.5 Print Composer

The Print Composer reads the DICOM image data from the media and provides a means to print it.

A Print Composer in the Imaging Object Change Management Profile shall support presentation of rejected or corrected instances as defined in Section 4.47.4.1.5.

In Volume 3, update the following section with reference to IOCM

4.47.4.1.3.6 Display

The Display (defined in the IT Infrastructure Technical Framework) reads the web-viewable information from the media and displays it. Note that the web-viewable content will only be present if the Portable Media Creator involved supports the Web Content Option.
A Display in the Imaging Object Change Management Profile shall support presentation of rejected or corrected instances as defined in Section 4.47.4.1.5.

In Volume 3, add the following new section

4.47.4.1.5 Presentation of rejected or corrected instances in Imaging Object Change Management

An Image Display, Report Reader, Print Composer or Display in the Imaging Object Change Management Integration Profile shall present or suppress rejected or corrected instances as follows:

If the actor receives a Key Image Notes with the Key Object Selection (KOS) Document Title valued (113001, DCM, "Rejected for Quality Reasons"), it shall support the three behaviors listed below. The behavior chosen shall be configurable as one of the following:

- Suppress the KOS and its referenced rejected instances from presentation or printing.
- Present or print the rejected instances referenced in this KOS and this KOS itself
- Ignore this KOS and present or print the rejected instances

If the actor receives a Key Image Note with the Key Object Selection (KOS) Document Title valued (113037, DCM, "Rejected for Patient Safety Reasons"), (113038, DCM, “Incorrect Modality Worklist Entry”), or (113039, DCM, “Data Retention Policy Expired”), it shall:

- Suppress the KOS and its referenced rejected instances from presentation or printing.

Note that the Image Display, Report Reader, Print Composer and Display may encounter media created by two different types of Portable Media Creator, one that is IOCM compliant and therefore will exclude from the media all rejected instances (see Section 4.47.4.1.3.4.1), or one that is non-IOCM compliant and therefore will import from the media rejected instances as regular instances. Therefore, it is important for the Image Display, Report Reader, Print Composer and Display that supports IOCM to process any rejection notes and exclude all the rejected instances accordingly.

4.49 Instance Availability Notification

...
4.49.4.1.2.2 Critical attributes in Imaging Object Change Management

The content of this section is required for Image Manager / Archives in the Imaging Object Change Management Integration Profile.

The Image Manager / Archive receives the Key Image Note with the Key Object Selection Document Title valued (113001, DCM, "Rejected for Quality Reasons"), (113037, DCM, "Rejected for Patient Safety Reasons"), (113038, DCM, “Incorrect Modality Worklist Entry) or (113039, DCM, “Data Retention Policy Expired”). According to the behavior configured (see Section 4.66.4.1.3), it shall send one of the following availability status values for all the rejected instances according to the received KOS:

- "UNAVAILABLE" when it is configured to hide rejected instances.
- "ONLINE", "NEARLINE" or "OFFLINE" when regular use of rejected instances is configured, depending on the actual availability of the individual instances.

It shall also send one of the following availability status values for all remaining instances in the same notification:

- "ONLINE", "NEARLINE" or "OFFLINE".

If the trigger event is receiving a Key Image Note with the Key Object Selection Document Title valued (113038, DCM, “Incorrect Modality Worklist Entry”), then the Image Manager / Archive shall populate the Referenced SOP Instance UID in the Referenced Performed Procedure Step Sequence with the corresponding MPPS Instance UID of the referenced rejected instances. For all other trigger events, the Image Manager / Archive shall populate the Referenced SOP Instance UID in the Referenced Performed Procedure Step Sequence with the corresponding MPPS Instance UID of the received instances.

4.49.4.1.3 Expected Actions

...  

4.49.4.1.3.1 Procedure Step Status Management in Imaging Object Change Management

The content of this section is required for DSS/OF in the Imaging Object Change Management Integration Profile.

If a completed procedure step has no more associated available instances, then the DSS/OF shall reset the status for this procedure step to Scheduled.

In Volume 3, add the following new Section 4.49.4.1.3.1

Modify 4.61.
4.61 Imported Objects Stored

In Volume 3, add new Section 4.61.4.1.2.3 under Message Semantics

4.61.4.1.2 Message Semantics

4.61.4.1.2.3 Access to Rejected Instances

The contents of this section are required for Importer Actors in the Imaging Object Change Management Profile.

The Importer shall include the received KOS instance and exclude all received instances referenced by the KOS instance, if the KOS instance has one of the following Document Titles:

- (113001, DCM, “Rejected for Quality Reasons”)
- (113037, DCM, “Rejected for Patient Safety Reasons”)
- (113038, DCM, “Incorrect Modality Worklist Entry”)
- (113039, DCM, “Data Retention Policy Expired”)

4.66 Rejection Note Stored

In Volume 3, add the following new Section 4.66.4.1.2.2 Note that the MAWF Trial Implementation Supplement adds Section 4.66.4.1.2.1

4.66.4.1 Rejection Note Stored (for Quality Reasons)

4.66.4.1.2 Message Semantics

4.66.4.1.2.2 Multiple Identity Resolution Option in Scheduled Workflow

The contents of this section are required for Change Requester Actors grouped with Image Manager / Archive Actors claiming the Imaging Object Change Management Profile that also support the Multiple Identity Resolution Option in the Scheduled Workflow Profile.
The Image Manager / Archive shall meet the requirements defined in Appendix J: Multiple Identity Resolution Option. Specific to this transaction, it shall support:

- Cross-Referencing of Patient Identifiers (RAD TF-3: J.2.1)
- Configurable Mapping to Default Assigning Authorities (RAD TF-3: J.2.2)
- Message Semantics when Sending SOP Instances (RAD TF-3: J.2.4.1)

In Volume 3, add the following new Section 4.66.1.3.2.

4.66.1.3 Expected Actions

... 4.66.1.3.2 Multiple Identity Resolution Option in Scheduled Workflow

The contents of this section are required for Image Manager / Archive Actors claiming the Imaging Object Change Management Profile that also support the Multiple Identity Resolution Option in the Scheduled Workflow Profile.

The Image Manager / Archive shall meet the requirements defined in Appendix J: Multiple Identity Resolution Option. Specific to this transaction, it shall support:

- Cross-Referencing of Patient Identifiers (RAD TF-3: J.2.1)
- Configurable Mapping to Default Assigning Authorities (RAD TF-3: J.2.2)
- Expected Actions when Receiving SOP Instances (RAD TF-3: J.2.4.1)

In Volume 3, add the following new Section 4.66.4.2.1

4.66.4.2 Rejection Note Stored for (Patient Safety Reasons)

... 4.66.4.2.2 Message Semantics

... 4.66.4.2.2.1 Multiple Identity Resolution Option in Scheduled Workflow

The contents of this section are required for Change Requester Actors grouped with Image Manager / Archive Actors claiming the Imaging Object Change Management Profile that also support the Multiple Identity Resolution Option in the Scheduled Workflow Profile.

The Image Manager / Archive shall meet the requirements defined in Appendix J: Multiple Identity Resolution Option. Specific to this transaction, it shall support:

- Cross-Referencing of Patient Identifiers (RAD TF-3: J.2.1)
• Configurable Mapping to Default Assigning Authorities (RAD TF-3: J.2.2)
• Message Semantics when Sending SOP Instances (RAD TF-3: J.2.4.1)

In Volume 3, add the following new Section 4.66.4.2.3.1.1

4.66.4.2.3 Expected Actions

...

4.66.4.2.3.1 Additional Requirements for Image Manager / Archive in IOCM

...

4.66.4.2.3.1.1 Multiple Identity Resolution Option in Scheduled Workflow

The contents of this section are required for Image Manager / Archive Actors claiming the Imaging Object Change Management Profile that also support the Multiple Identity Resolution Option in the Scheduled Workflow Profile.

The Image Manager / Archive shall:

• Not provide the incorrect instances referenced in this KOS in responses to an instance query/retrieve transaction ([RAD-72], [RAD-73]).

In addition, the Image Manager / Archive shall meet the requirements defined in Appendix J: Multiple Identity Resolution Option. Specific to this transaction, it shall support:

• Cross-Referencing of Patient Identifiers (RAD TF-3: J.2.1)
• Configurable Mapping to Default Assigning Authorities (RAD TF-3: J.2.2)
• Expected Actions when Receiving SOP Instances (RAD TF-3: J.2.4.1)

In Volume 3, add the following new sub-sections 4.66.4.3.2.1 and 4.66.4.3.3.1

4.66.4.3 Rejection Note Stored (for Incorrect Modality Worklist)

...

4.66.4.3.2 Message Semantics

...

4.66.4.3.2.1 Multiple Identity Resolution Option in Scheduled Workflow

The contents of this section are required for Change Requester Actors grouped with Image Manager / Archive Actors claiming the Imaging Object Change Management Profile that also support the Multiple Identity Resolution Option in the Scheduled Workflow Profile.
The Image Manager / Archive shall meet the requirements defined in Appendix J: Multiple Identity Resolution Option. Specific to this transaction, it shall support:

- Cross-Referencing of Patient Identifiers (RAD TF-3: J.2.1)
- Configurable Mapping to Default Assigning Authorities (RAD TF-3: J.2.2)
- Message Semantics when Sending SOP Instances (RAD TF-3: J.2.4.1)

... 4.66.4.3.3 Expected Actions

... 4.66.4.4.3.1 Multiple Identity Resolution Option in Scheduled Workflow Profile

The contents of this section are required for Image Manager / Archive Actors claiming the Imaging Object Change Management Profile that also support the Multiple Identity Resolution Option in the Scheduled Workflow Profile.

The Image Manager / Archive shall:

- Not provide the incorrect instances referenced in this KOS in responses to an instance query/retrieve transaction ([RAD-72], [RAD-73]).

In addition, the Image Manager / Archive shall meet the requirements defined in Appendix J: Multiple Identity Resolution Option. Specific to this transaction, it shall support:

- Cross-Referencing of Patient Identifiers (RAD TF-3: J.2.1)
- Configurable Mapping to Default Assigning Authorities (RAD TF-3: J.2.2)
- Expected Actions when Receiving SOP Instances (RAD TF-3: J.2.4.1)

...42

In Volume 3, add the following new sub-sections 4.66.4.4.2.1 and 4.66.4.3.1

4.66.4.4 Rejection Note Stored (for Data Retention Expiry)

...

4.66.4.4.2 Message Semantics

...

4.66.4.4.2.1 Multiple Identity Resolution Option in Scheduled Workflow

The contents of this section are required for Change Requester Actors grouped with Image Manager / Archive Actors claiming the Imaging Object Change Management Profile that also support the Multiple Identity Resolution Option in the Scheduled Workflow Profile.
The Image Manager / Archive shall meet the requirements defined in Appendix J: Multiple Identity Resolution Option. Specific to this transaction, it shall support:

- Cross-Referencing of Patient Identifiers (RAD TF-3: J.2.1)
- Configurable Mapping to Default Assigning Authorities (RAD TF-3: J.2.2)
- Message Semantics when Sending SOP Instances (RAD TF-3: J.2.4.1)

4.66.4.3 Expected Actions

4.66.4.3.1 Multiple Identity Resolution Option in Scheduled Workflow Profile

The contents of this section are required for Image Manager / Archive Actors claiming the Imaging Object Change Management Profile that also support the Multiple Identity Resolution Option in the Scheduled Workflow Profile.

In addition, the Image Manager / Archive shall meet the requirements defined in Appendix J: Multiple Identity Resolution Option. Specific to this transaction, it shall support:

- Cross-Referencing of Patient Identifiers (RAD TF-3: J.2.1)
- Configurable Mapping to Default Assigning Authorities (RAD TF-3: J.2.2)
- Expected Actions when Receiving SOP Instances (RAD TF-3: J.2.4.1)

Modify 4.68 Provide and Register Imaging Document Set – MTOM/XOP to specify the behavior for an Imaging Document Source supporting MAWF or IOCM.

4.68 Provide and Register Imaging Document Set – MTOM/XOP

In Volume 3, add Section 4.68.4.1.2.5 under Message Semantics as follows.

4.68.4.1.2 Message Semantics

4.68.4.1.2.5 Access to Rejected Instances

The Imaging Document Source in Imaging Object Change Management Integration Profile shall create a manifest that:
Includes references to DICOM KOS SOP instances with the Document Title valued (113001, DCM, “Rejected for Quality Reasons”), (113037, DCM, “Rejected for Patient Safety Reasons”), (113038, DCM, “Incorrect Modality Worklist Entry”) or (113039, DCM, “Data Retention Policy Expired”) that mark rejected instances

Excludes the rejected instance(s) referenced by the KOS instances

If a previously submitted manifest includes references to rejected DICOM SOP Instances, then the Imaging Document Source shall submit an updated manifest to replace the existing manifest.

In Volume 3, modify 4.69 Retrieve Imaging Document Set to specify the behavior for an Imaging Document Source supporting MAWF or IOCM, by adding new sub-section 4.69.4.2.3.1.

4.69 Retrieve Imaging Document Set

4.69.4.2.3 Expected Actions

4.69.4.2.3.1 Access to Rejected Instances

The contents of this section are required for Imaging Document Source and Imaging Document Consumer Actors in the Imaging Object Change Management Profile.

For Key Object Selection instances with Document Titles (113001, DCM, “Rejected for Quality Reasons”), (113037, DCM, “Rejected for Patient Safety Reasons”), (113038, DCM, “Incorrect Modality Worklist Entry”), or (113038, DCM, “Data Retention Policy Expired”),

• The Imaging Document Source shall not return the rejected instances referenced by this specific KOS.

When an Imaging Document Consumer receives a Key Image Note with Key Object Selection (KOS) Document Title valued (113001, DCM, "Rejected for Quality Reasons"), the Imaging Document Consumer shall support the three behaviors listed below. The behavior shall be configurable as one of the following:

• Suppress from presentation the rejected instances referenced in this KOS and this KOS itself

• Present the rejected instances referenced in this KOS and this KOS itself

• Ignore this KOS and present the rejected instances.

When an Imaging Document Consumer receives a Key Image Note with the Key Object Selection (KOS) Document Title valued (113037, DCM, "Rejected for Patient Safety Reasons"), (113038, DCM, “Incorrect Modality Worklist Entry”), or (113039, DCM, “Data Retention Policy Expired”),...
Policy Expired"), it shall suppress the KOS and its referenced rejected instances from presentation.

Add the following new sub-sections in Volume 3, Section 4.74

4.74 Replacement Instances Stored

4.74.4.1.2 Message Semantics

4.74.4.1.2.3 Multiple Identity Resolution Option in Scheduled Workflow

The contents of this section are required for Change Requester Actors grouped with Image Manager / Archive Actors claiming the Imaging Object Change Management Profile that also support the Multiple Identity Resolution Option in the Scheduled Workflow Profile.

The Image Manager / Archive shall meet the requirements defined in Appendix J: Multiple Identity Resolution Option. Specific to this transaction, it shall support:

- Cross-Referencing of Patient Identifiers (RAD TF-3: J.2.1)
- Configurable Mapping to Default Assigning Authorities (RAD TF-3: J.2.2)
- Message Semantics when Sending SOP Instances (RAD TF-3: J.2.4.1)

4.74.4.1.3 Expected Actions

4.74.4.1.3.1 Multiple Identity Resolution Option in Scheduled Workflow

The contents of this section are required for Image Manager / Archive Actors claiming the Imaging Object Change Management Profile that also support the Multiple Identity Resolution Option in the Scheduled Workflow Profile.

The Image Manager / Archive shall meet the requirements defined in Appendix J: Multiple Identity Resolution Option. Specific to this transaction, it shall support:

- Cross-Referencing of Patient Identifiers (RAD TF-3: J.2.1)
- Configurable Mapping to Default Assigning Authorities (RAD TF-3: J.2.2)
- Expected Actions when Receiving SOP Instances (RAD TF-3: J.2.4.1)