Last Call Resolution Comments
Network Scan Service
Semantic Model and Service Interface
V1.0

The following comments were received during last call of the Network Scan Service Semantic Model and Service Interface V1.0 document that beginning September 11 2008 and ending at the PWG Plenary meeting in October 2006. The draft at ftp://ftp.pwg.org/pub/pwg/mfd/wd/lcrc-mfdscanmodel10-20080911.pdf reflects the resolution of the last call comments as indicated below.

1. General: The operations names do not agree with the schema. They need to include the service type in there name

Resolution: The operations and the associated parameters and messages were updated in the specification and in the WSDL and schema to align them all. .

2. Sections 10 was [TBD].

Resolution: inserted the following text

3. Conformance Requirements

This section describes conformance issues and requirements. This document introduces model entities such as objects, operations, elements, element syntaxes, and element values. These conformance sections describe the conformance requirements which apply to these model entities.

Client Conformance Requirements

A conforming client MUST support all REQUIRED operations as defined in this document. For each parameter included in an operation request, a conforming client MUST supply a value whose type and value syntax conforms to the requirements of the Model document as specified in Sections **Error! Reference source not found.**. A conforming client MAY supply any extensions in an operation request, as long as they meet the requirements in Section 0.

When sending a request, a conforming client NEED NOT supply any parameters that are indicated as OPTIONALLY supplied by the client.

A client MUST be able to accept any of the elements defined in the model, including their full range, that may be returned to it in a response from a Scan Service

 An operation response may contain elements and/or values that the client does not expect. Therefore, a client implementation MUST gracefully handle such responses and not refuse to inter-operate with a conforming Scan Service that is returning extended elements and/or values that conform to Section 0. Clients may choose to ignore any parameters, elements, or values that they do not understand.

Scan Service Conformance Requirements

This section specifies the conformance requirements for conforming implementations with respect to objects, operations, and attributes.

Objects

 Conforming implementations MUST implement all of the model objects as defined in this specification in the indicated sections:

    Section **Error! Reference source not found.**- Scan Service
    Section **Error! Reference source not found.**- Scan Job
    Section **Error! Reference source not found.**- Scan Document

Operations

Conforming Scan Service implementations MUST implement all of the REQUIRED model operations, including REQUIRED responses, as defined in this specification in the indicated sections:

    CancelScanJob (section **Error! Reference source not found.**) REQUIRED
    CreateScanJob (section **Error! Reference source not found.**) REQUIRED
    GetActiveScanJobs (section **Error! Reference source not found.**) REQUIRED
    GetScanDocumentElements (section **Error! Reference source not found.**) REQUIRED
    GetScanJobElements (section **Error! Reference source not found.**) REQUIRED
    GetScanJobHistory (section **Error! Reference source not found.**) REQUIRED

GetScanServiceElements (section **Error! Reference source not found.**) REQUIRED
ValidateScanTicket (section **Error! Reference source not found.**) REQUIRED

Conforming Scan Service MUST support all REQUIRED operation elements and all values of such elements if so indicated in the description. Conforming Scan Service MUST ignore all unsupported or unknown operation elements received in a request, but MUST reject a CreateScanJob request that contains an unknown element that contains the MustHonor attribute with a value of 'true'.

Scan Service Elements

Conforming Scan Service MUST support all of the REQUIRED object elements, as defined in this specification.

 If an object supports an element, it MUST support only those values specified in this document or through the extension mechanism described in section 0. It MAY support any non-empty subset of these values. That is, it MUST support at least one of the specified values and at most all of them.

Extensions

Conforming Scan Service MAY support extensions. To extend the model the extensions MUST be fully qualified. The qualified name MUST NOT be in the PWG target namespace. When extending the model with new elements the new elements MUST be added at the extension points at the end of the associated sequence of elements. Extended values for elements MUST conform to the extension patterns defined in the element schema. Implementers are free to add vendor specific operations to the service.

4. Section 11 was [TBD]

Resolution: Inserted the following text:

5. PWG Registration Considerations

Once the specification and associated schema is published it will require a new version of the specification to register extensions to the ScanService model. Vendors are may use extensions in their own namespace until such time as an update to the specification is under review. At that time the extension can be registered with the PWG and included in the PWG specification.

6. Section 11 was [TBD].

Resolution: Action item for PZ to get appropriate test to insert.

7. AccessModes of Scan Service (Section 7.2.5.1)

AccessModes of Scan Service (Section 7.2.5.1)

This sentence in the description is a little confusing:

"Site-specific policies, e.g., Access Control Lists (ACLs), MUST NOT reduce the security required by this AccessMode element but MAY further restrict   that security."

Isn't AccessModes is part of the "Site-specific policies" and thus set by the site Administrator accordingly? The wording sounds like these two are   separately set, and need to be synch'd carefully when being set separately.

I would word it as follows:

"As part of the site-policies, AccessModes must be set by authorized persons accordingly. Other parts of the site-specific policies such as Access   Control Lists (ACLs) MUSTNOT reduce the security required by this AccessMode element but MAY further restrict that security."

Resolution: Awaiting group consensus

8. Would like the group to consider the use of the same element names for those having the same semantics as WSD-Scan. This will reduce any syntactic   mapping efforts required between WSD-Scan and PWG Scan Service for implementors. Increase the interests of implementing PWG Scan Service standard

Resolution: Need specific recommendations

9. Line 715 Change {SHA] to [SHA]

Resolution: Change made

Peter Zehler, Chairman MFD WG/ PWG