Suggested items for f2f discussion.

Issues relate both to the SM3 specification and the actual semantic model, either individually or combined. \

1.   The schema approach for the operations currently has service type specific operations. That is, each Service type has a separate set of operations, labeled with that service type, although most operations are functionally common to all service types. The MFD Model specification (SM2) labels the operations with a <service> insert, indicating that the specific service type is to be inserted. The specific destination service is identified as an element in each operation, so is the service type needed in the service name? Should we continue to follow the present approach or :

a.   Allow the schema to represent the operations as Service specific sets, but remove the Service type from the name?

b.   Represent all the operations as Imaging Client Operations (and Local Imaging System Proxy Operations) in the schema and in the specification, eliminating service type in operation names.

c.   Some other generalized grouping of operations (e.g., hardcopy input, hardcopy output ?) in the schema, eliminating service type in operation names.

d.   Something else.

2.   The current schema uses the same element names for distinctly different elements. On one level, the terms State, StateMessages, StateReasons for example are used with respect to the System and each Service (although the element data types are consistent). On a different level, the same element names referring to certain capabilities is used both as a Boolean and as a different data type (e.g, Brightness, Sharpness, Contrast, Subject, To). The former use is probably benign, but might the latter cause some confusion?

Thanks,

Bill Wagner

_____