

1 **Meeting Minutes**
2 **PWG MFD Working Group Teleconference**
3 **January 17, 2008**

4 **Attendees:**
5

Nancy Chen	Oki Data
Lee Farrell	Canon
Glen Petrie	Epson
Bill Wagner	TIC
David Whitehead	Lexmark
Peter Zehler	Xerox

6
7 We continued discussion on remaining issues raised on the MFD email list in the updated file:
8 ftp://ftp.pwg.org/pub/pwg/mfd/wd/MFDIssues_017008.pdf.

- 9
- 10 ○ Are we going to separate the model and semantics specification out into its own document?
 - 11 ○ Would like to be able to edit and close the requirements document independently from the
 - 12 model and semantic. IPP spec also separated requirements from model and semantics, and
 - 13 protocol mapping and encoding; they are three separated documents. Later we will have a
 - 14 separate document for Scan Service Protocol Mapping and Encoding.
 - 15 ○ **Decision: Separate Scan Service Requirements and Scan Service Model and Semantics into**
 - 16 **two separate documents.**
 - 17 ○ Figure 2 – Below are discussions and decisions made :
 - 18 ○ **No extra top steps will be added to illustrate the Local Scan Client locating Scan Services**
 - 19 **and Repositories to the use case 2 diagram.** These steps are client side activities for the
 - 20 preconditions of this use case, not germane to Scan Service semantics.
 - 21 ○ **Step (5) will not be removed** because the use case will allow modification of the Scan Job
 - 22 Template.
 - 23 ○ **Step (7) “template” will be changed to “modified Scan Job Template”,** not “Configured Scan
 - 24 Job Template” based on the decision from the previous teleconference.
 - 25 ○ **Will not add Step (10a): assign Scan Job a Scan Job Identifier** – instantiating a Scan Job only
 - 26 need create required objects, assigning attributes (e.g. Scan Job Id) inside the objects is lower
 - 27 level of detail to be performed later at programming level. This is top level processing flow
 - 28 steps.
 - 29 ○ **Steps (13a) & (13b): “digital document” will be changed to Scan Document Data.** Digital
 - 30 document here is the scanned data, not document object. **Specific storage location will not be**
 - 31 **changed to “Document Repository”. We want to be generic.**
 - 32 ○ **Step (17): “document location” will be changed to Scan Destination, not a file name.** Scan
 - 33 destination is a URL, might not be a file name.
 - 34 ○ **Step (18) will be changed to “Retrieve Scan Document Data by Scan Destination specified**
 - 35 **by the end user”.** It’s not the Scan Document object in Scan Service being retrieved, it’s Scan
 - 36 Document Data. The same reason as Step (17), not retrieving from a file, but a Scan
 - 37 Destination (URL).
 - 38 ○ **Line 374 - 381 will be updated to exclude protocol mapping and encoding information and reflect**
 - 39 **simple design requirements.**
 - 40 ○ Line 402 – 434

- 1 ○ The section describes what a user can control the relationship between a Scan Job and
2 Document object(s), as well as between a document and file(s). **All relationships described**
3 **may be supported by Scan Service, and should be moved to Scan Model and Semantics.**
- 4 ○ **Design Req 2.7 will only require (a), the rest (b), (c), (d) are all optional.** The only
5 requirement from the use case scenario is to support (a) Single Document Job that contains
6 one single file. (b), (c) and (d) are all optional (MAY).
- 7 ○ Line 442
 - 8 ○ **Design Requirement 2.9 is simplified to “At the completion of the scan job, the Scan Service**
9 **SHALL update the completion status of the job and notifies the Scan Client.**
 - 10 ▪ Detailed requirements 1~3 are deleted.
- 11
- 12 ○ Line 1283
 - 13 ○ **Won’t consider “auto” or “manual” duplex here.** You can describe multi-sided scanning
14 without a duplexer. “Sides” element describes intent, not process. Specifying “duplex” does
15 not mean an ADF is involved.
 - 16 ○ **ScanDocument.ScanDocumentStatus(.ImagingDocumentStatus).CurrentPageOrder remains 1toN.**
17 We don’t know what other output order is useful in Scan, might make sense in printing.
 - 18 ○ The comment on
19 ScanDocument.ScanDocumentStatus(.ImagingDocumentStatus).DocumentFormatDetailsDetected,
20 ScanDocument.ScanDocumentStatus(.ImagingDocumentStatus).DocumentFormatDetected,
21 ScanDocument.ScanDocumentStatus(.ImagingDocumentStatus).DocumentFormatVersionDetected
22 is ignored because these elements have been deleted from the model.
 - 23 ○ ScanDocument.ScanDocumentStatus(.ImagingDocumentStatus).ServiceURI
24 ScanDocument.ScanDocumentStatus(.ImagingDocumentStatus).SystemUpTime
25 ScanDocument.ScanDocumentStatus(.ImagingDocumentStatus).ScanServiceCounters
26 Have been removed from document level, except for the ScanServiceCounters.
 - 27 ○ ScanDocument.ScanDocumentTicket.ScanDocumentDescription.DocumentCharSet make sense for
28 scanning characters on the originals,
29 ScanDocument.ScanDocumentTicket.ScanDocumentDescription.DocumentNaturalLanguage make
30 sense for system generated character strings.
 - 31 ○ ScanDocument.ScanDocumentStatus.ScanDocumentDescription.PageOrderReceived is the input
32 document page order received. “CurrentPageOrder” is for output document.
 - 33 ○ ScanDocument.ScanDocumentTicket.ScanDocumentProcessing.(ImageDocumentProcessing).Numb
34 erUp,
35 ScanDocument.ScanDocumentTicket.ScanDocumentProcessing.(ImageDocumentProcessing).Prese
36 ntationDirectionNumberUp do make sense for scanning. Xerox has a scan service does this. This
37 scans several pages into one page to reduce number of pages. Some lower end scanner may treat this
38 as post processing. “ScanRegion” element defines how much on an input page is to be scanned.
- 39
- 40 ▪ Next Steps:
 - 41 ○ Nancy and Pete will continuously update the draft. The draft will not be posted until all
42 comments upto today have been addressed.
 - 43 ○ We will continue to discuss all issues raised so far in the next teleconference.
- 44

45 **Next Teleconference: January 24, 2008, Thursday, 3pm EST.**