

Meeting Minutes

PWG MFD Semantic Model Teleconference September 13, 2007

Attendees:

Peter Zehler	Xerox
Nancy Chen	Oki Data
Lee Farrell	Canon
Mike Fenelon	Microsoft
Harry Lewis	InfoPrint
Ira McDonald	Blue Roof Music/High North, Inc.
Glen Petrie	Epson
Kei Sando	Oki Data
Craig Whittle	Sharp
David Whitehead	Lexmark

- Meeting Minutes of the last teleconference on August 23 was approved without change.
- We continued discussion of Use Cases beginning with Walk-up Scan and Discover Storage on page 16 of the updated draft : <ftp://ftp.pwg.org/pub/pwg/mfd/wd/wd-mfdscan10-20070913.pdf>.
 - We discussed the ‘Scan Policy Template’ again and the consensus was that it should be ‘Scan Repository Policy’ that addresses security related attributes such as access rights and document storage location. The scan repository security should be addressed in ‘Security Consideration’ section instead. Nancy to globally remove the word ‘security’ or ‘policy’ from the Use Cases.
 - Pete announced that security issues regarding access to data in and out of Scan Service will be the primary focus of the discussions at the next face-to-face meeting.
 - Discovery of repository locations is a method by which the Scan Service provides the list of repository locations for the user to select the preferred repository for his/her scan document. For the purpose of describing the use case, the user only knows to select a repository from a list provided by the Scan Service. User does not have to deal with how the list of repositories are discovered either statically or dynamically, or administratively configured. We decided to remove “discovery repository” from the use case and replace with “select a repository from a list” instead. The same changes will have to be made in the processing flow steps and the use case title.
- Discussion of the Use Case “Walk-up Scan, with Pre-selected Scan Template and Policy Template Overwrite”
 - The “Policy Template” is a default scan template or simply a user selected template. The word ‘Policy’ needs to be removed globally, including the use case diagrams.
 - ‘MFD UI’ should be considered as part of the Scan Client.
 - A user always selects a template that best matches his/her intent; the template may be administratively set to implement the user’s company policy; this can be enforced by

- 1 XML schema element that says 'MUST NOT OVERWRITE'. The processing step 4
2 should be changed accordingly.
- 3 • **Discussion of the “Walk-up Batch Scan” use case:**
 - 4 ○ The description of the use case should describe what the user does; the processing
5 flow information should be removed.
 - 6 • **Discussion of the “Workflow On-Ramp Scan” use case:**
 - 7 ○ This is a use case that the user simply selects the template for a specific workflow
8 application, same as “Walk-up scan with pre-selected template” scenario. We agreed
9 to **remove this use case.**
 - 10 • **Discussion of the use case “Finding Scan Job Storage Location”:**
 - 11 ○ The user will have to get from the job history in order to find where the documents
12 were stored for a previous scan job. The problem is a MFD might not have enough
13 capacity to keep the history. Regarding how much of history that must be kept should
14 be an implementation dependent issue of value versus cost. We will need a
15 conformance statement that requires a MFD to keep a minimum time period of
16 history (60 minutes in IPP).
 - 17 ○ We agreed to a better description and title for the use case:
 - 18 ▪ **Title: “Finding a Previously Scanned Document”**
 - 19 ▪ **Description: Harry interfacing with the Scan Client, scrolls to the list of his
20 scan job, selects the scan job and locates the destination(s) of his scan job.**
 - 21 ○ We will need steps in diagram for getting the list of all scanned jobs in history and
22 getting the scan job element for the user selected scan job.
 - 23 ○ The minimum conformance for the time period for keeping the job history will need
24 to be captured in Design Requirements if history is supported. **Nancy to make a note
25 in Design Requirement section.**
 - 26 ○ In processing flow, ‘Scan Client’ should be used for MFD UI or local scan client.
 - 27 ○ The processing flow was tweaked for the consistency of Scan Client vs. MFD UI and
28 a better description.
 - 29 • **Discussion of the Scan Service Schema:**
 - 30 ○ There are three choices for representing the Scan Service capabilities:
 - 31 ▪ Using xxx-support and xxx-default elements
 - 32 ▪ Use the same names, but the syntax is different for the ‘supported’ vs.
33 ‘default’ vs. value elements in the actual ticket.
 - 34 ▪ Use single definition for each semantic element. For example, ‘Media-Color’
35 in ‘supported’ syntax is a list of allowed well-known values implemented as a
36 list of NMTOKENs. The problem is ‘Media-Key’ in ‘supported’ syntax is a
37 string that can contain white space characters which NMTOKENs would not
38 work; however using a string surrounded with ‘quoting’ characters to
39 delineate the string would work.
 - 40 ▪ The use of a list of strings for attributes in Microsoft’s past experience was
41 problematic. The recommendation was to use separate element definition for
42 ‘supported’, vs. ‘default’, vs. ‘value’. We will discuss this further at face-to-
43 face.
 - 44 • **No teleconference before the next face-to-face meeting.**
 - 45