

1 **PWG MFD Working Group Teleconference Meeting Minutes**
2 **March 26, 2009**

3
4 **1. Attendees:**

5 Shah Bhatti, Samsung
6 Nancy Chen, Oki Data
7 Lee Farrell, Canon
8 Ira McDonald, High North, Inc.
9 Glen Petrie, Epson
10 Bill Wagner, TIC
11 Peter Zehler Xerox

12
13 **2. Identify Minute Taker** – Nancy Chen

14
15 **3. Approval of minutes from last teleconference**

16 <ftp://ftp.pwg.org/pub/pwg/mfd/minutes/pwgmfd-minutes-20090312.pdf>

17 No objection to the minutes.
18

19 **4. PWG process**

20 Attendees were informed that the meeting is held in accord with the PWG Intellectual
21 Property Policy. There was no objection.
22

23 **5. Agenda bashing**

24 No changes to the agenda were suggested.
25

26 **6. Status of Scan Service specification**

27 (The spec used is: [ftp://ftp.pwg.org/pub/pwg/mfd/wd/wd-mfdscanmodel10-](ftp://ftp.pwg.org/pub/pwg/mfd/wd/wd-mfdscanmodel10-20090313.pdf)
28 [20090313.pdf](ftp://ftp.pwg.org/pub/pwg/mfd/wd/wd-mfdscanmodel10-20090313.pdf))

- 29 • PWG-wide Scan Service vote has been sent out, so far two votes are received.
30 Pete Zehler will send out email notes to remind everybody to vote. The vote ends
31 April 3rd.
32

33 **7. Status of Resource Service Specification**

34 (The spec used is: [ftp://ftp.pwg.org/pub/pwg/mfd/wd/wd-mfdresourcemodel10-](ftp://ftp.pwg.org/pub/pwg/mfd/wd/wd-mfdresourcemodel10-20090318.pdf)
35 [20090318.pdf](ftp://ftp.pwg.org/pub/pwg/mfd/wd/wd-mfdresourcemodel10-20090318.pdf))

- 36 • Resource Service Prototype draft was updated and in the second round of
37 Working Group Last Call for Comments. So far no new comment received.
- 38 • Before the spec can advance to Stable draft and hence the announcement of the
39 PWG-wide last call, there must be a report from prototyping the Prototype draft.
- 40 • **AI: Pete Zehler to send out email notes describing the scope of the prototype**
41 **implementation from the Stable draft, briefly state what has/has not been**
42 **prototyped – a list of operations for example will be sufficient.**
- 43 • **AI: Nancy to send out a reminder to the group to send Working Group Last**
44 **Call comments by April 3rd to end the Last Call.**
45

46 **8. Discuss the Issues raised in the MFD Model and Overall Semantics Specification**

47 (The spec used is: <ftp://ftp.pwg.org/pub/pwg/mfd/wd/wd-mfdoverallmod10->
48 [20090325.pdf](ftp://ftp.pwg.org/pub/pwg/mfd/wd/wd-mfdoverallmod10-20090325.pdf))

- 49 • Bill Wagner described his changes which were also described in his mail note
50 sent out with the updated draft. He would really appreciate members'
51 comments.
 - 52 ○ Main changes in Chapter 2: added subunits in table format
 - 53 ○ Main changes in Chapter 3: reorganization of operation, state, and
54 transitions drawn from various places into one central place to provide
55 a better overview.
- 56 • Question on “System”, Section 2.3, line 292 – “Are there system operations?”
 - 57 ○ First of all, should there be a separate document to describe system
58 operations? If using a separate document, users will need to read two
59 documents in order to understand the overall model. The consensus is
60 to keep it in the overall model document.
 - 61 ○ There should be at least system level Startup and Shutdown
62 administrative operations; we may argue that other administrative
63 operations such as Pause/Resume are too difficult to implement at
64 system level. We may say that a system level operation is similar to
65 service level operation; each system operation is fanned out to
66 individual services, like IPP system level operation is fanned out to the
67 individual print services. For scheduling, there is a central job level
68 scheduler for MFD and service level scheduler.
 - 69 ○ Power management operation was discussed. The level of power
70 control can be operated at system level should be carefully determined.
71 We decided to defer this issue to unfold itself further in Power
72 Management project discussion.
- 73 • Question on “Device”: “why we have both Services and Devices, both
74 referring to the same set of subunits?”
 - 75 ○ To many users, a MFD consists of multiple single function devices
76 (e.g. printer, scanner, fax, copier), calling scanner a subunit sounds
77 odd. Though a device is the end point of management application, a
78 subunit is not. Device is a collection of subunits. As long as we
79 maintain a clear mapping from device to subunits and from service to
80 subunits, there should not be a problem. Bill plans to take out his
81 comments temporarily; he will try to clarify the relationship between
82 service, device, and subunits in the future.
- 83 • Need a schema diagram for the top level elements of MFD model with the
84 same look and feel in the service spec.
 - 85 ○ **AI: Peter Zehler will provide one to Bill.**
- 86 • Section 2.5 Need a Template relationship diagram
 - 87 ○ **AI: Peter Zehler will provide one to Bill.**
- 88 • Question on Section 2.6 : “Is CopyRegion the same as ScanRegion?”
 - 89 ○ These two are the same: the area of image acquisition from a media
90 sheet side. We could use ScanRegion for both Scan and Copy services.
 - 91 ○ PrintRegion is captured in Print service as marker addressability.

- 92
- 93
- 94
- 95
- 96
- 97
- 98
- 99
- 100
- 101
- 102
- 103
- 104
- 105
- 106
- 107
- 108
- 109
- 110
- 111
- 112
- 113
- 114
- 115
- 116
- Question on Section 2.7.1: “Are Print and Scan coordinate systems the same? If so the text describing them should be generalized.”
 - We agreed in the previous face-to-face meeting that these two are the same.
 - **AI: Peter Zehler to provide generalized text and figure for the document format coordinate system.**
 - Discussion of better generalized term for ScanRegion: ImageRegion? ContentRegion? MediaBox? ImageBox? The most appealing one seems to be ContentRegion that becomes an image in Scan and is printed in Print that becomes an impression. No real decision made.
 - Question on Section 2.8: “To what extent JobTicket JobTicket Lifecycle apply to FaxIn Service?”
 - In FaxIn, there are a set of rules you can apply, you need to know when to apply which rule to an inbound job. Using the current service semantics, there is only one default job ticket for each service. However, an implementation may extend it to support a collection of job tickets that can be applied to each incoming job for FaxIn.
 - Section 2.9 Subunits Table: the table presentation with links to detailed spec is great.
 - Question on Chapter 4 – there are only table presentation for Document Processing Capabilities,..., etc. Should there be schema pictures too?
 - There was no consensus reached. Bill would like the group’s feedback.
 - Bill would like to have the group provide comments on the draft especially Chapter 3 which has been greatly reorganized.

117 **9. Next Step**

- 118
- 119
- 120
- 121
- **Next teleconference: April 2, 2009, 3pm EDT.**
 - **Bill will send out his update of the Overall document next Tuesday.**
 - **There will be another teleconference on April 16.**
 - **Please submit your final vote for Scan Service.**