

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

4 **Attendees:**  
5

Nancy Chen	Oki Data
Mike Fenelon	Microsoft
Brett Green	HP
Ira McDonald	High North Inc.
Glen Petrie	Epson
Bill Wagner	TIC
David Whitehead	Lexmark
Peter Zehler	Xerox

- 6
- 7 • Pete started the meeting with the agenda today:
- 8     1. Approve last meeting minutes
- 9     2. Close PWG Last Call for the Scan Service requirement document
- 10    3. Review comments for the Model document from the last face-to-face meeting
- 11    4. Continue to review the Model document
- 12 • The meeting minutes for the last face-to-face meeting was accepted without change. Several
- 13 members said it is a good minutes.
- 14 • Close PWG Last Call for Scan Service requirement document
- 15     - There was no further comments from attendees. Epson, Xerox, Lexmark, and Oki Data
- 16     representatives at the meeting voted for approval. PWG procedure requires at least 30% or 8-
- 17     9 members have read the document with no further comments in order to move the document
- 18     for a formal PWG vote. The Last Call period was automatically extended because of
- 19     insufficient voting members. Also only members who have attended recent meetings can
- 20     vote.
- 21     - **Action Item:** Pete to obtain the required voting members.
- 22 • Review of comments/open issues from the last face-to-face meeting
- 23    1. Before proceeding with reviewing other comments, for reducing the complexity of Scan Service
- 24    object diagram, Pete proposed to split the current model document into a Scan Service model
- 25    document and a Template Service document. This will make the Scan Service model smaller and
- 26    also allow other service to reuse and benefit from the Template Service. Attendees unanimously
- 27    agreed to the proposal.
- 28    - Ira re-iterated the need to have a separate top-level imaging system diagram.
- 29    - **Action Item:** Pete will be responsible for Scan Service model document, Nancy for the
- 30    Template Service document. They will work together to split the current Scan Service object
- 31    diagram into three as Ira suggested.
- 32    2. Microsoft's intent on the contribution of WS-Scan
- 33    - Mike clarified that Microsoft's intent is to contribute all the keywords, elements, the
- 34    specification of WS-Scan to allow reuse in future PWG services and allow the continuity
- 35    between the PWG Scan Service model and WS-Scan model. But Microsoft does not intent to
- 36    contribute the schema and implementation to the public domain. Therefore to implement
- 37    WS-Scan on a platform other than Windows still requires a separate Microsoft license, but to
- 38    reuse the definitions in WS-Scan for on-going PWG services is allowed.

- 1 - Ira also mentioned that in today's steering committee, Jerry Thrasher (PWG Chair) asked  
2 whether Microsoft could make a copy of the WS-Scan spec that does not have the nastygram  
3 on the first page.

- 4     ▪ **Action Item: Mike will continue to discuss with Jerry and MS lawyer to rework  
5 the verbiage.**

6 3. Open Issues from last face-to-face meeting

7 a. Redraw all schema diagrams that do not have complete name of every element

- 8     ▪ We discussed either we need to find a proper XML tool that can generate diagram  
9 with elements' complete name, or manually redraw them, or withdraw the  
10 diagrams. Because there was a strong consensus in the last face-to-face to replace  
11 those incomplete names in the diagrams.

- 12     ▪ Later Mike Fenelon discovered a way to generate complete element names in the  
13 schema diagrams in XMLSpy.

- 14     ▪ **Action Item: Pete Zehler will regenerate these diagrams using XMLSpy.**

15 b. Is "SinglePageFile" attribute needed in Scan Document Processing Capabilities and Scan  
16 Document Processing element ?

- 17     ▪ Pete confirmed that the model later evolved to use DocumentOutputMode to  
18 allow SDSF, SDMF, MFSF, MDMF capabilities, not just single or multiple page  
19 files.

- 20     ▪ Also all "pages" should be changed to "images" across the model document.

- 21     ▪ **Action Item: Pete Zehler will remove "SinglePageFile" and make global change  
22 from "page" to "image" across the entire document.**

23 c. How is "JobPasswordEncryption" used, and should it be renamed as

24 "JobPasswordProtection" instead since its keywords consists of both encryption and  
25 hashing algorithms?

- 26     ▪ This attribute is inherited from IPP and is intended to protect the disclosure of Job  
27 Password for example being displayed in a browser. In IPP it is a mistake to  
28 specify only hashing algorithms as encryption methods. The element name should  
29 not be changed in order to maintain consistency with IPP.

30 d. Should "AccessMode" be removed?

- 31     ▪ This element comes from WIMS. The intent is to ensure only a user belonging to  
32 Admin or Owner group can delete a Service object that could cause catastrophic  
33 effect. In IPP spec, the requirement is "only Administrator can change the service  
34 object." Pete made a point that we do not have a way to specify how to lock up a  
35 specific object in a service. Protocol mapping is preferable for enforcing Access  
36 Mode of an object. This seems to imply the service interface would need a  
37 parameter for security policy that specifies which element can be accessed by who.  
38 In IPP, this is done by each IPP operation that specify which operations can only  
39 be used by Administrator, which are for operator, some are restricted to job owner.  
40 IPP never modeled security elements. Ira recommended we can remove  
41 AccessMode, but should not remove ownerURI of a Service. AccessMode is the  
42 group name designated by the owner of the service who has the proper access  
43 rights to the service object. This is from an IETF's requirement in IPP to provide  
44 some basic security policy in order to protect a service from being "deleted" or  
45 accidentally "shutdown" for example.

- 46     ▪ **Conclusion: We will keep the AccessMode and clarify the intent and semantic of  
47 this element.**

- 1                   ▪ **Action Item: Ira will provide Pete the description of AccessMode that will clarify**
- 2                   **its intent and semantic.**
- 3           e. Is there new InputChannel need to be supported other than SOAP?
- 4                   ▪ The new InputChannel needs to be supported is SOAP, and there is a pending
- 5                   IANA registration of SOAP in printer MIB.
- 6                   ▪ This issue is closed.

- 7 • Continue on reviewing the model document beginning section 6.4.5

- 8   1. Section 6.4.5.6 NaturalLanguage

- 9   - How this is used: HTTP client request the desired Natural Language to be used, the service
- 10   then supplies the requested language and sets its current natural language to the requested
- 11   one. In IPP is the same, if the requested natural language is not supported, the default is used.
- 12   - How do we intend to handle localization: A service must support the configured local natural
- 13   language. This is the default when the client requested language is not supported.
- 14   - Conclusion: This implies we are missing a “RequestedNaturalLanguage” element in all
- 15   related service request operations.
- 16   - **Action Item: Pete will add this element in all related service request operations.**

- 17   2. Section 6.5

- 18   - Line 1042-1043: “Initial implementation will be limited to single document jobs”. Pete
- 19   explained that we will only limit our initial protocol binding prototype implementation to
- 20   single document jobs to keep things simple for timely prototyping. This is not the limit for
- 21   the model. **The group decided to remove this sentence from the model.**
- 22   - Section 6.5.3.1.1 “NumberUp”: Page” need to globally be replaced with “image”.
- 23   - Section 6.5.3.1.6 “Destination: Does this require a corresponding capabilities element?
- 24           ▪ This element specifies the URI scheme the service supports for the destination of a
- 25           document, e.g. HTTP, SharePoint, .... There is no associated capability element.
- 26   - Section 6.5.3.1.8 Exposure: The current semantic is consistent with WS-Scan. But the
- 27   schema element in WS-Scan is a choice of “AutoExposure” or the group of three elements:
- 28   Brightness, Contrast, Sharpness. The Schema in PWG’s is a choice of all four, which is
- 29   confusing.
- 30           ▪ **Action Item: Pete will change the schema to be the same as WS-Scan.**

- 31   3. Should ActiveJobs and JobHistory be grouped under JobTable (used in WS-Scan)?

- 32   - Consensus is YES to be consistent with IPP and WS-Scan.
- 33   - **Action Item: Pete changes it accordingly to align with WS-Scan. He further stated that since**
- 34   **MS has contributed WS-Scan to PWG Scan, he will align the model closely with WS-Scan.**
- 35   **He will send out email notice on the differences between PWG Scan and the alignment**
- 36   **needed with WS-Scan.**

- 37
- 38   2. Next Steps

- 39   • **Next teleconference is next Thursday on May 8, 2008, EDT 3pm.**
- 40   • **We will try to finish reviewing the current model document in the next teleconference.**
- 41   • **Pete and Nancy will provide the Scan service model and Template service model**
- 42   **documents with all update from previous face-to-face and this teleconference comments in**
- 43   **two weeks.**
- 44