# Meeting Minutes
# PWG MFD Working Group Teleconference
# November 8, 2007

**Attendees:**

| | |
|---|---|
| Nancy Chen | Oki Data |
| Mike Fenelon | Microsoft |
| Lee Ferrell | Canon |
| Ira McDonald | Blue Roof Music Inc. |
| Glen Petrie | Epson |
| David Whitehead | Lexmark |
| Peter Zehler | Xerox |

- Due to the disk storage problem with the PWG email server, many people did not receive the minutes distribution. The meeting proceeded without accepting the meeting minutes from Oct. 11, 2007.
- Confirmation of the removal of "Retrieve Scan Document" Service Interface in the last telecon:
  - In the last teleconference we decided to remove all interfaces to the local scan document repository including Retrieve and Delete scan document. What if a remote scan user still need to retrieve the scan document from his desktop after the scan job is completed ?
  - We confirmed again that the Scan Service will always push scan document out to some separate, independent document repository (local or remote). When there is a need to support a remote user at a computer to retrieve a completed scan document, the scan destination must be one of the followings so that the Scan Service can automatically push the scan document out to the repository:
    1. a shared document repository between the remote Scan Client and the Scan Service,
    2. a separate, independent document repository co-located with the Scan Service.
    3. a storage location on the Scan Client.
  - For securely storing scan documents, a user must provide authentication information at the MFD local UI in order for the Scan Service to operate in the user's security context so that the document can be created in the Document repository under the user's ownership, with the access rights of the end user. It is conceivable that the local document repository can also provide interface to local UI so that walk-up user can retrieve scan document from local repository via local pipe between the Scan service and local repository using the user's security context. The Scan Service SHALL be able to store the document with the rights of the end user who has been authenticated by the Scan Service thus gained the credentials of the Scan Service to store the scan document in the repository.
- We continued the review of remaining comments in the same working draft that was used in the last teleconference: ftp://ftp.pwg.org/pub/pwg/mfd/wd/wd-mfdscan10-20071018.pdf
- Comment on Line #609 – Why service discovery is specific to LDAP or DNS
  - Service discovery should be supported via directory service (e.g. LDAP) and discovery protocols (e.g. WS-discovery, SLP, CIMs). The title of the use case should simply be "Scan Service Discovery" – this is only for discovery of scan service type, whether service capabilities should be discovered is a separate matter. The standard SLP printer template and LDAP print schema actually defined 30 most important capabilities out of 150 printer properties.

- Comment on Line#613 - Should Scan LDAP schema be defined?
  - Our assumption is the schema is based on Scan Service Schema. We still need to pick a smaller set of properties of Scan Service that SHALL be populated/ advertised in LDAP shema, or by dynamic discovery protocols. There should be a normative chapter or appendix for this information for Scan Service like it was done in IPP. We need to register the name of the LDAP schema with IANA, not every attribute in the schema. The LDAP print schema was actually published as a RFC. If we don't publish LDAP Scan Service schema as an RFC we can publish as a PWG standard and register the standard with a registry that the LDAP working group in IETF maintains. SLP or mDNS registration will need to be registered too. So is CIMs schema.
- Comment on Line #614 - DNS service type naming convention
  - Yes, we need one such as PWG-scan-service.
  - We need to register a PWG scan service SRV type with IANA.
- Use Case 8 Diagram Discussion:
  - The diagram should include discovery protocol.
  - Protocol binding will establish a standard mechanism for locating a scan service. A web service binding will perform WS-discovery & WS-transfer, both are used for discovery.
  - Capability is not in WS-discovery or WS-transfer, must be obtained directly from Scan Service.
  - There should be two high level service discovery processing flow diagrams: one using directory, one via discovery protocol.
  - Design requirements should parallel the two processing flow diagrams. We need the behavioral level requirements for discovery protocol, e.g. SSDP, SLP, … behaviors are almost the same (i.e. At Start-up Service advertises itself, client makes discovery request, service responses to discovery request. Many discovery protocols use an agent.)
- Scan ticket life cycle Diagram – we need to remove the footnote: "Any reference to a Scan Job Ticket is either an instance of a Scan Job Ticket or a reference to a Scan Job Template". Scan Service model now uses template only by value for instantiating a Scan Job Ticket.
- In the last meeting minutes, we said Scan Document is always being pushed by Scan Service to "external location", which should be changed to "separate, independent repository (local or remote).
- Section 9 comments – If we have a HoldUntil attribute, should we not also have a PendingScanJobsQueue?
  - Yes, we should have Pending scan job queue. In the current Scan Service model, there are only two queues: the Active Job queue holds all jobs created and not started (i.e. pending), or in processing; the Job History holds all job completed. The Active Job queue is also pending job queue. The Scan Service must consider low-end devices that cannot have more than two queues due to resource constraints. CIMs model also has only one job queue and job history.
  - For obtaining the list of pending jobs or jobs in any specific state, client filtering can be used. In IPP, GetJob operation can have a filter as a parameter, making server do the filtering. We can let filter be just a list of states. Right now "ListJob" operation in Scan Service is only a simple request. This will be further discussed in the next face-to-face meeting. The working draft will be updated with Scan Service/operation definitions.
  - Line #719 - A scan Service is hosted locally on a MFD or remotely on another computer.

- Line#730 – The sentence “These Description elements are settable by Administrator or read-only that can be controlled by a policy.” Should be removed. Descriptive elements are normally settable.
- Many people were confused with the word “attribute” and “element” used in the section. The recommendation is to use the definition from IPP – “attribute” is a simple element, an element that consists of a collection of elements is a “group element”. We need the definitions of these two in “Terminology” section. – element group: a collection of elements – use element/attribute interchangeably.

- Recommended changes to the last meeting minutes:
  - External repository -> separate, or independent repository (local or remote).
  - Change teleconference date Nov 22 to Nov 29.
- Plan before face-to-face meeting
  - Next teleconference: work from the same working draft and continue discussion from the rest of section 9.
  - We will start to work on the definitions of more scan elements.
  - Pete will post updated schema and WSDL before face-to-face meeting.
- **Plan for Teleconferences:**
  - **Next Teleconference: November 15, 2007, Thursday, 3pm EDT.**
  - **TBD - November 29, 2007, Thursday, 3pm EDT (depending on the progress made on Nov. 15)**