

Meeting Minutes
PWG MFD Model Working Group Teleconference

Meeting was called in order at 11am EDT, May 17, 2007, by Peter Zehler.

Attendees:

Hiromasa Akamatsu	Kyocera Mita
Nancy Chen	Oki Data
Lee Farrell	Canon
Walter Filbrich	Samsung
Grant Gilmore	366 Software
Ira McDonald	High North
Harry Lewis	IBM
Dave Whitehead	Lexmark
Craig Whittle	Sharp
Peter Zehler	Xerox

Last Face-to-Face Meeting Minutes Review –

- Pete briefed through the meeting minutes for the last face-to-face meeting.
- Action Item Status:
 - CUPS’s interest in mapping of MFD model:
 - Pete reported Mike Sweet expressed interest to see how MFD semantic model progresses, but suspected it can not be cleanly mapped to CUPS as an extension to IPP.
 - Mike suggested it might be a better fit on client side as the routing of imaging data from scan service to one or multiple clients is more interesting.
 - Pete and the group discussed the requirement of “eventing” for this scenario for notifying image-data-ready event to multiple clients.
 - Pete will continue to contact Mike on CUPS interest.
 - The revision of the Charter of MFD Model WG has completed by Ira.
- Minutes was accepted without change.

Review of the Charter Document for MFD Model WG –

- The revised charter document was accepted without change.

Review Comments/Discussions on the Scan Service Semantic Model Working Draft

-
- File name of the working draft should follow PWG name tag policy and be change to:
wd-mfdscanreq10-yyyymmdd
 - The word “standard” should not be used for working draft itself.
 - The reference on “candidate standard” should be taken out at the bottom of page 1.
 - The name of the draft should be “Scan Service Model and Requirements”.
 - Conformance Terminology should follow a PWG standard such as WIMS.

- Scan Service Terminology:
 - “Scan Job Ticket” is better than “Scan Ticket” because it’s for scan job.
 - “Scan Job Template” is preferred over “Scan Ticket Template” as it’s before the ticket being bound to a job.
 - We need “Scan Service”, “Scan Device”, others to come.
- Use Cases Discussion:
 - There was a concern that Scan-to-work flow scenario was mentioned, however it’s not clear that workflow protocol itself or definitions are “out-of-scope” in this semantic model WG charter. It was suggested a “Out-Of-Scope” subsection taken from the Charter document should precede the use case scenarios for clarification.
 - An important new use case scenario “Scan Service Discovery” was added: “Bill wants to discover the Scan Services available in his enterprise network, so that he can choose one in the future when he wants to submit a Scan Job. Bill wants to discover Scan Services both statically (via enterprise directories) and dynamically (via discovery protocols). Bill can statically discover Scan Services via an LDAP query to his enterprise directory that searches for instances of an LDAP Scanner schema (which represents a Scan Service or a Scan Device), similar to the industry standard LDAP Printer schema (RFC 3712). Bill can dynamically discover Scan Services by a DNS query to his enterprise DNS server that searches for instances of a DNS SRV (RFC 2782) record for Scan Service (to be registered w/ IANA).”
 - Whether the spec should include Use Case UML Diagram was discussed. Some interests were expressed. This will require key scan service objects and operations be defined first.
 - **Action Item: Pete Zehler and Nancy Chen will work together to provide these diagrams ready by next Wednesday for next meeting.**
 - It was suggested that Section 3 should be “Requirements” that includes:
 - Rationale for scan service model requirement
 - Use cases descriptions
 - Design requirements for scan services derived from the use cases such as abstract scan service interfaces, discovery semantics, etc.
- Comments Received for the Remaining Structure of the Working Draft:
 - Section 4 should be the “Object Model” of the scan service where top level objects and operations are defined. The description and diagram of life cycle of scan job can be served as a subsection here.
 - There should be a section on “Internationalization Considerations” that describe how localization is done, much like what’s included in WIMS and PSI spec.
 - We will need a very extensive section on “Security Consideration”, but “security” should not be mentioned in other parts of the document.
 - There is no need for a separate section on “Scan Service Schema”. Schema will be referenced to its schema file.

- There is no need for a section on “Scan Web Service Binding” in this abstract scan service model – abstract model only, might not have every attribute like in IPP spec.
- There should be an Appendix X and a change log to keep track of changes.

Action Items:

- Peter Zehler and Nancy Chen to provide use case diagram by next Wednesday May 23.
- Ira McDonald to provide use case scenario for Scan Service Discovery
- Craig Whittle to provide use case scenario for Scan Service Capabilities Discovery (of an already discovered service)

Next Teleconference:

- **EDT May 24, Thursday, 11am-12pm.**