<div align="center">

Meeting Minutes
PWG MFD Model Working Group Teleconference

</div>

Meeting was called in order at 11am EDT, June 7, 2007, by Peter Zehler.

Attendees:

Hiromasa Akamatsu	Kyocera Mita
Nancy Chen	Oki Data
Lee Farrell	Canon
Ira McDonald	High North
Harry Lewis	IBM
Takashi Nakamura	Kyocera Mita
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.

Meeting Agenda was Agreed as Follows –
- Review Job Ticket Life Cycle Diagram
- Use Cases Discussions

Discussion on Scan Job Ticket Life Cycle on Job Creation Diagram –
- The diagram is on page 21 of the revised Scan Service Model and Requirement working draft "wd-mfdscanreq10-20070605_rev.pdf".
- Peter led the attendees through discussion of the diagram:
  - A user has a scan intent uses a scan client to input scan parameters which are encoded by the scan service as scan ticket. The same scenario could also be carried out by a local user directly through scan service's local UI. A local user could also input scan parameters which are converted into a scan template and store in a local or remote repository by scan service. The Scan ticket is bound to Scan Job by Scan Service. A Scan Job Document could be stored in an internal or external Repository. A scan client could reference a scan job template instead of passing Scan Ticket himself. The Scan Service has some Scan Defaults that could be incorporated into Scan Ticket of a Scan Job.
  - Recommendations to the diagram:
    - The Local User Interface should be labeled as "Walk-Up User Interface, the Local End User as Walk-Up End User, and the end user at a Scan Client as Remote End User.
    - Association lines should be added between Scan Job Template and Scan Client, and between Scan Job Template and the Walk-Up End User.
    - Put the Scan Job Template Repository between Local and Remote End User.
    - Add a Scan Default Template next to Scan Template in Template Repository.
    - Add a footnote to state that any reference to a Scan Ticket is either an instance of Scan Ticket or a reference to a Scan Template.

- The label "Scanner" at the center of the blue box should be "MFD", because Scan Service is in a MFD along with other services, scanner is just a component of the scan device, and this is a MFD spec.
- Change Scan Ticket to Scan Job Ticket to be consistent with chapter 2.
- There should be relational "arrow" lines (is-a, has-a, contain-a, reference-a..) between objects as in UML diagram.
- Action Item: Nancy Chen to modify the diagram in formal UML notations.

o What are contained in the Scan Defaults ?
- Could have the Default Scan ticket, Scan template, or the actual attributes of the Scan Service. It includes service configuration defaults and default ticket/template. JDF and IPP models all include these attributes.
- Should we use IPP semantics "default-xxx attributes/supported-xxx attributes or Microsoft WSD/DPA-like initial-value-job (using default ticket)?
  We decided to use WSD/DPA-like initial-value-job because:
  - The IPP default-xxx applies only to processing instructions, whereas default ticket includes both processing instruction and job description.
  - We also need to ensure the semantics does not preclude mapping to WSD-Scan today or other models.
  - If some other model uses default-xxx, you can map it to Scan Default Template which is a external resource.

- **Use Case Discussions**
  o Use case 1 & 2 were not discussed because it needs to be updated with details consistent with today's decision on "scan ticket life cycle" first.
  o Discussion of Walter Filbrich's recommendations:

  (1) Make this use case only define scanning and storing the document at the local UI.

  We agreed to the proposal. Document Repository is used to denote any storage either local or remote.

  (2) Make the next (use case 4) the same as this (use case 3) be initiated at a remote PC.

  We agreed to the proposal.

  (3) Make use case 5 define a scanning and storing operation using either use case 3 or use case 4 but specifically storing and retrieving the document from a local "mailbox" (a user's private file).

  We agreed to the proposal. Also the definition of "Document Repository" and "mailbox" will be added to terminology. Mailbox is a special type of document repository resident in scanner that serves as a private document storage area for a user. Definition of other types of repository is deferred until after complex scan jobs are modeled.

  o Use case 3 –
  - Line 226 – change "Repository" to "Document Repository".
  - Issue from last teleconference: "Should template be always used to create a Job?": The answer is "yes" from "scan ticket life cycle" discussion.
  - Discussion on the issue: "Where should metadata be placed?" –

The word "metadata" has too many meanings. The definition of document format is out of scope for this document. We decided to include extension for vendors to add metadata in scan document, but do not consider to define "metadata" in scan service. Consideration later in the future to add infrastructure to support metadata standards for on-ramp scanning is also a good idea. For now we need to define the basics first.

- Discussion on the issues:
    - "How should scan job destination be specified?" The decision is:
        The destination should be part of the scan job ticket, and in URI format, same as PSI and WebDAV spec.
    - "How should scan job completion be made available to users?"
        - For complex scan jobs, notification mechanism is needed however the security requirements made it hard to specify. PSI or IETF did not have solution for this. The decision is to define status for scan job and users will be able to query the status of a scan job, and retrieve the job data when the scan job successfully completes. In addition, the scan service will support optional vendor-specific notification mechanism.
        - The only meaning of a scan job return is a scan job is accepted which does not imply that scan job data is available.
    - The decision on "Should notification be supported or not?" is left to vendor implementation option in protocol mapping.

- **Next Teleconference:**
    EDT June 14, 2007, Thursday, 11am-12pm.