

**Meeting Minutes**  
**PWG MFD Model Working Group Teleconference**

Meeting was called in order at 11am EDT, May 24, 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
Takashi Nakamura	Kyocera Mita
Glen Petrie	Epson
Norbert Shade	SigmaTel
Bill Wagner	TIC
Craig Whittle	Sharp
Peter Zehler	Xerox

**Last Teleconference Meeting Minutes Review –**

- The meeting minutes for the last teleconference was accepted without change.
- Action Item Status:
  - Ira went through the revised draft and reported all the action items were done.

**Review Comments/Discussions on the Working Draft –**

**Section 1~2:**

- “req” should be removed from the name of the working draft on page 1. A requirement document can only become an informational document not a standard. The MFD semantic model is to be a standard document.
- “PWG510X.X-2007” should be taken out of the standard Title. This number is to be assigned by the secretary of IEEE standard when we submit the standard document.
- The next draft status should be “interim”, instead of “initial”.
- Terminology: “RECOMMENDED” should be added in conformance terminology.
- “Scan Ticket Template” should be “Scan Job Template” which is an unbound ticket.
- There was a concern that in the definition of Scan Job, one of the storage location - “mailbox in the scanner” could be confused with the mailbox for scan-to-email which is out of scope for this document. The group decided to remove the reference to file/mailbox from the definition.

**Section 3:**

- There should be a brief descriptive name for each use case. This can make references to these use cases easier later.
- Use Case 1 Sequence diagram discussion:

- The “Set scan parameters” interaction is not possible for a scanner without UI. One possible change is to state that the scanner MAY not have a UI, or simply strike out the “without UI” statement.
- However, it’s important to have a use case for a scanner that does not have a UI for setting up scan parameters. Someone can set a job remotely with ticket/job identification, then enters the id into device for a scan job. Therefore multiple ticket identifications can be set up remotely in advance by users, and a user can then select one at the physical scanner. The selected job template is then associated with a job when the user walks up to scanner and pushes start button. **Action Item: this should be an additional use case that needs to be captured.**
- There should also be a separate use case that describes how a scan job template could be created for a scanner without UI.
- A scan job template could be transient or from a repository as a template library created by an administrator – for security reason. After a transient scan job template is created, the default job template may be copied into the transient scan job template. As such, **“Set scan parameters” should be changed to “modify transient scan job template”**. The note **“Transient Scan Job Template is created...”** should be changed to **“Default job template is copied into a transient scan job template”**- may use scan parameters. It was also decided that **the definitions of “Default Scan Job Template” should be added into “Scan Service Terminology” section. However “implementation choice” should be carefully noted in the definition.**
- Discussion on whether we should take the position that a Scan job has to be generated from a template.
  - Job can be created from scratch with parameters too. Should that parameter set be called a template in the operation?
  - All jobs need some kind of parameters that could be in a default state.
  - Without template as in print service (IPP model) is perfectly fine. IPP uses default properties, not template. Default can be changed to use different parameters, and saved as a different template. If there ever be only one default is needed, then template is not required. There is always the case that a template is created for user’s convenience.
  - If a template is needed, then a transient template will be needed. Otherwise scan parameters can be taken directly into a scan job.
  - IPP model has initial-value-job, but that is not the same as a template.
  - Do we want scan service different from print service as in IPP and always have a scan ticket?
  - Both UPnP and WSD have the concept of ticket. Certainly the notion of print ticket is becoming more and more common, JDF also uses the concept.
  - This is an architectural issue in MFD services in general that can impact future implementations from the abstract model.
  - **Action Item:**
    - **Capture this as an open issue: i.e. “Is template required for creating a job?” or “Can descriptions and processing attributes**

be bound to a job itself as ordinary attributes of job as the way used in IPP model?"

- It was felt that this open issue should unfold from the definitions of scan job parameters, scan job template, scan job ticket, and scan job. A diagram that describes the sequence of creating scan job parameters, scan job template, scan job ticket, and scan job could be very helpful.
  - **Action Item: Peter Zehler to create the diagram (for the life cycle of scan job parameters) for discussion in the next meeting.**
- “Add Physical Document” should be “Add Scan Document”. As scan document is always physically scanned from a hardcopy document. This will be used later for faxout service which requires the scan document directly from a reference or a hardcopy that is physically scanned.
- An implicit “Close Scan Job” activity should be added after “Add Scan Document” that would cause a scan job to be scheduled immediately.
- The following two issues remain to be discussed in the next meeting:
  - **How should a scan job be routed to destination**
  - **How to specify scan job destination**
- **Next Steps:**
  - Two use cases need to be added:
    - A user creates a scan job template.
    - A user walks up to scanner and scans using a pre-created scan job template.
  - Discuss three issues at the beginning of the next meeting:
    - How should a scan job made available to the user?
    - How should the route of scan job destination be specified and synchronized. In other words, how is the scan job data flow through a network scan service, and how to inform the recipient a scan job data is available.
    - Should notification be supported or not?
  - Peter Zehler to create a diagram for the life cycle of scan job parameters for discussion in the next meeting.
- **Next meeting within two weeks: June 7<sup>th</sup>, 11am-12pm EDT.**
- **Reminders from the Chair and Ira:**
  - We need to make sure companies have invested interests in scan semantics across multiple protocols and then efforts in contributing their views how PWG scan model should proceed.
  - **In July face-to-face meeting at Microsoft there will be a 2-hour topic on collaboration of MS and PWG in MFD services. Please bring your opinions.**
  - MFD scan service semantic model is interested in scan service in a network environment, not a scan service between a PC and a locally attached scanner.