

1 **Meeting Minutes**

2
3 **PWG MFD Semantic Model Teleconference**
4 **September 6, 2007**

5
6 **Attendees:**

7

Peter Zehler	Xerox
Nancy Chen	Oki Data
Lee Farrell	Canon
Ira McDonald	Blue Roof Music/High North, Inc.
Glen Petrie	Epson
Bill Wagner	TIC
David Whitehead	Lexmark

- 8
- 9 • **Meeting Minutes of the last teleconference on August 23 was approved with the**
10 **correction of Lee Farrell’s name in the attendee list.**
 - 11
 - 12 • **We continued discussion beginning on page 12 of line 393 for the use case “Walk-up**
13 **Scan and Store Document”.** (Note: The working draft used in this meeting is still
14 <ftp://ftp.pwg.org/pub/pwg/mfd/wd/wd-mfdscan10-20070820.pdf> that was used in the
15 previous two meetings.)
 - 16 ○ Thanks for Glen Petrie’s update to the processing flow steps.
 - 17 ○ We further decided to make this use case a simple “push green button” scan with no
18 provision for user to enter “scan job ticket identification” that can be used to identify
19 the default template associated with an individual user. Because the core model
20 should not concern with whether the list of template provided for a user’s selection is
21 for a specific user or not. It is implementer’s decision to add that semantics in
22 providing the list.
 - 23 ○ **Glen will provide this update again. (At time of writing this minutes, Glen already**
24 **provided this update.)**
 - 25 • Question raised on the difference between StartScanJob and CreateScanJob operations and
26 whether StartScanJob pushes the green button (in the flow step 6 of use case “Scan from PC
27 and Store Document in Repository”) :
 - 28 ○ The Scan Service model does not have a StartScanJob operation, the CreateScanJob
29 operation should be used.
 - 30 ○ We had the issue with how to add document via the CreateScanJob. In IPP the ‘last
31 document’ flag is in the AddDocument or the SendDocument, but not in the
32 CreateDocument. We decided to use “closed” – a boolean element - in the
33 CreateScanJob API to indicate no more document to be added.
 - 34 ○ A recent direction from the PWG steering committee is that we should not use API or
35 operation names with capitalized words in the processing flow steps to describe a
36 processing function. **Nancy will go through all use cases to reflect this change.**
 - 37 • For the next two use cases (“Scan from PC and Store Document in Repository” and “Walk-
38 up scan with multiple sets of originals”), the group felt these two use cases should be

1 combined into one; this will reduce the number of redundant use cases that provide the
2 requirements for scanning one set or continuous sets of hardcopy originals from a local or
3 remote client.

- 4 ○ “GetScannerElement” probably should be changed to “GetScanServiceElement”
5 because the operation is for getting elements in the scan service, not a scanner. A scan
6 service can have several scanners that support the operations of the scan service. The
7 consensus is that “GetScanServiceElement” is more appropriate.
- 8 ○ For the question on “Should we provide a MANUAL COMPLETION MODE of scan
9 service?”:
 - 10 ▪ We decided to use automatic time-out on no further input condition to allow
11 continuous scan of multiple sets of originals
- 12 ○ On the question of “Should we provide a processing attribute for ScanJob to indicate
13 whether the output scan documents of each set of scan originals should be
14 STORED_IMMEDIATELY right after scanned, or STORE_AT_FINISHED after all
15 sets of originals have finished scanning?”
 - 16 ▪ Consensus is ‘No’, because a small scanner that cannot store all the scanned
17 data may not be able to complete a large scan job.
- 18 ● Discussion on the use case “Scan Document to and Retrieve from an Internal Mailbox”:
 - 19 ○ General consensus is that “Retrieve from... Mailbox” is out of scope, the scan service
20 semantics should only be responsible of notifying the availability of scan document
21 data, not defining the semantic of retrieving document stored in a mailbox from a
22 remote client after job completion.
 - 23 ○ We felt that this use case does not add more requirements to the model:
 - 24 ▪ Storing scan document to an internal mailbox is not different from storing to
25 any other repository. All storage destinations are specified as URL. Providing
26 a list of mailbox is the same as providing a list of destinations.
 - 27 ▪ Although accessing a ‘mailbox’ is generally protected by access controls,
28 unlike accessing other repositories, this type of processing requirements
29 should be handed off to other services, not in Scan Service.
 - 30 ○ Decision: Delete this use case. However we should add clarification in the definition
31 of mailbox that states that mailbox may support access controls (authentication and
32 authorization) or privacy for specific user. Add ‘scan-to-mailbox’ in Out-of-Scope
33 section and states that it should be handed off to other service.
- 34 ● We began the discussion of the use case “Walk-up Scan and Discover Storage”
 - 35 ○ The general feeling on the brief descriptions of the use case is that it’s heavy on
36 security concerns – not the main objective of the model.
 - 37 ○ What is a Scan Policy Template – a default template in which values are based on
38 organizational policy (most likely a security policy to constraint a user’s right),
39 representing the policy of an organization. Most felt that this should not be part of the
40 use case.
 - 41 ○ Due to time constraint, we will revisit the issues discussed in the next teleconference.
- 42
- 43 ● **Nancy to update the working draft as much as possible before the next teleconference.**
- 44
- 45 ● **Next week teleconference is on EDT September 13th, 3pm. We will continue today’s**
46 **discussions.**