

Meeting Minutes

PWG MFD Teleconference August 2, 2007

On-Site Attendees:

Peter Zehler	Xerox	Peter.Zehler@xerox.com
Nancy Chen	Oki Data	nchen@okidata.com
Dave Whitehead	Lexmark	david@lexmark.com
Lee Farrell	Canon	Lee.ferrell@cda.canon.com
McDonald, Ira	High North	imcdonald@sharplabs.com
Glen Petrie	Epson	glen.petrie@eitc.epson.com

The teleconference focused on resolving submitted issues and comments – NOT documented in the updated working draft and raised via mail:

1. Toshiba's Andrey Savov has provided his use case flow step description along with a Rational Rose UML activity diagram. Nancy Chen has redrawn the diagram in Visio and updated the draft spec for the use case.
 - o This update will be reviewed in the next teleconference next week.
2. Amdrey Savov has asked whether PWG has a Visio to Rose diagram converter. I believe he wants to be able to generate code from UML diagrams, but Visio is only a UML drawing tool. Does anybody in the group know any such tool? Should we change to use another UML tool such as Rose? What do our members currently use? What the group think?
 - o The group discussed this. On the pro side was that this would provide a standard machine readable representation of the model and allow for direct machine generated code. On the con side was that the tools are expensive and would incur a learning curve for the uninitiated, there may be an unequal benefit across the PWG (it is unknown how many participants use case tools). The consensus was that we should take this to the MFD mailing list. Is anyone volunteering to create and maintain the UML diagrams? If someone will we can certainly incorporate them into the specification and store them on the PWG site along with the specification and WSDL/schema.
3. Ira McDonald has alerted that Scan Service should conform to the DSP0223 spec of DMTF for WBEM related projects. Currently the operations specified in the Scan Service draft spec is conformant to the DSP0223 spec, but the Use Case sequence diagram probably need update to reflect the coherence with the generic operation model of WBEM.
 - o This is not an official goal of the MFD work although it makes sense to keep it in mind. As always we are open to changes that make alignment across the industry easier.. Ira will be posting a white paper on this subject to the MFD list.
4. Ira found the filename of the Scan Service draft spec is missing a digit (7 for July) in our 'wd' naming convention. This will be corrected next time (afraid that people can't retrieve the file through the link published.)
 - o This will be fixed for the next specification release

NOT documented in the updated working draft and raised at the teleconference:

5. The use of the terms template and ticket need additional work in the terminology section.
 - Clarify that the term template is used as a convenience in the specification to refer to a ticket that is not bound to a job.
6. Line 261 (step 4 of use case 1) says that a Client sends a Validate Template. There is no such operation. There is a Validate Ticket but that operation is performed within the context of a job at a specific MFD/Scan Service.
 - There is no need to validate tickets to store them so step 4 is optional. Further discussion followed on the merits of the Validate Template operation in addition to the Validate Ticket. Validate Template could be limited to a simple syntactic check to insure it is well formed. It may be possible to add an additional parameter that would specify the target Scan Service to validate the template against. (It is possible to implement a template repository so it is not collocated with the Scan Service. Further discussion with a wider audience is required
ISSUE: Should there be a Validate Template operation?
7. Add the ability to override Job Ticket elements without the need to edit the Job Ticket.
 - Add an optional "Override" parameter to CreateJob and description to specification
8. Line 631: change "MUST not" to "MUST NOT".
 - OK.
9. Line 640: Change "From rfc2911" to "From rfc2790"
 - OK.
10. Line 737: Change "NEED NOT" to "MAY"
 - OK

Documented in the current working draft:

11. Line 376 and 584: How should single document data file or multiple document data files output from the single document object be indicated in scan job ticket? We need an element in scan job ticket to indicate 'single' or 'multiple' document output mode for the scan job. (NC).
 - Add a new semantic element called OutputDocumentMode with values of 'Single' and 'Multiple'.
12. Line 604 : Should we migrate the model away from xxx-default towards a default ticket (aka DPA InitialValueJob)? The two main advantages I see is that descriptive as well as processing elements can be included. It also removed the need for element name mangling that we inherited from IPP.(PZ)
 - Agreed we will change to a default ticket bound to each Scan Service.
13. Line 608: Is there an alternative representation for xxx-supported that can capture the allowed values for Job Ticket elements? It would be nice to remove the need for element name mangling just to represent the capabilities of the Scan Service.(PZ).
 - CIM requires allowed values to be represented as Capabilities. We will move to Capabilities for the representation of allowed values/ranges per CIM best practice.
14. Line 612: Should we separate active jobs from job history? The IPP model already has separate ordering rules for these two groups of jobs. It would improve the modeling while still providing a clean mapping. (PZ)

- Yes we should and this will also provide a cleaner mapping to Job Logs in CIM
15. Line 633 : I was under the impression that State was intended to be processed by automata and have well known and unchanging values and transitions. How does 'Other' fit in with this goal? (PZ)
- Qualify 'Other' so that is not used and is included for completeness in the unification of rfc2911 and rfc2790.
16. Line 646: Incorporate all states into unified state transition diagram. (PZ))
- Ira will provide an integrated diagram in some form (AI:IM). An update to the diagram in the specification will be made based on that.

Teleconference to be held 8/9, details will be sent to the MFD mail list