IPP FAX - Meeting Minutes

September 15, 2000
Chicago, Illinois

Attendees:

Ron Bergman	Hitachi Koki
Dan Calle	Digital Paper
Lee Farrell	Canon Info Systems
Satoshi Fujitani	Ricoh
Roelop Hamberg	Oce
Tom Hastings	Xerox
Robert Herriot	Xerox
Harry Lewis	IBM
Toru Maeda	Cannon
Carl-Uno Manros	Xerox
Lloyd McIntyre	Xerox
Paul Moore	Peerless
Hugo Parra	Novell
Stuart Rowley	Kyocera
Richard Shockey	Newstar
Geoff Soord	Software 2000
Jerry Thrasher	Lexmark
Shinichi Tsuruyama	Epson
Shigeru Udea	Canon
Bill Wagner	NetSilicon/DPI
Don Wright	Lexmark

Minutes:

Introduction and Background:

This is the first official meeting of the IPP FAX working group. The positions of chairman (Paul Moore), co-chairman (Harry Lewis), scribe (Ron Bergman), and document editor (Tom Hastings) were proposed by Paul Moore and approved by the group.

Paul recommended that anyone who is interested in this project should be registered on the IPP FAX mail list ifx@pwg.org.

Richard Schokey presented a brief history of IPP FAX . Attempts to charter this effort within the IETF has not been successful due to the current overload in the IETF applications area. After a two year effort to obtain an IETF charter, it was decided to make this project a PWG sponsored effort.

Tom Hastings commented that there appears to be a lack of participation by fax vendors at this meeting. Although, it was noted that Xerox and Cannon both had representatives that were directly involved with facsimile products. Don Wright responded that the next IPP FAX meeting will be in conjunction with the MFPA meeting in Boston and it is expected that this will allow us to attract some additional fax experts to that meeting. Don is planning to provide some appropriate publicity.

The primary competition with IPP FAX is the ITU T38 standard, which is currently not well supported and is not likely to be widely adopted in the near term. Richard stated that T38 is currently very dependent upon the H.323 standard, which is very difficult to implement and current implementations are not interoperable. Work is planned to port T38 to the IETF Session Initiation Protocol (SIP, RFC 2) and when this effort is complete T38 may become widely adopted.

Bill Wagner voiced a concern about our work following too late on the heals of the IFAX momentum and solutions. Richard Shockey responded that the most serious problem with the use of email in the Internet Fax project is the ability of the user to repudiate the sending of an acknowledgement of delivery. This is a major operational difference from the current fax model and is expected to be a major advantage of IPP FAX over the current Internet Fax.

Charter Review:

The following comments were made relative the draft charter generated by Paul Moore.

Under the heading "SAFE" it was noted that a statement regarding non-repudiation needs to be added.

The compatibility with current fax systems is not currently mentioned in the charter. This has the potential of putting us into the huge "rat hole" known as gateways. It was agreed that the addition of a simple note that these scenarios will not be precluded is necessary.

Richard Shockey presented a scenario where a third party (such as UPS or FedEx) receives the output and is responsible for distributing to the intended party. Paul agreed to add a statement regarding this scenario in the charter.

It was agreed that we should publish the results as a PWG standard and then submit the document to other standards bodies such as the IETF or the ITU for publication as deemed necessary. Interim versions of the documents will be submitted to the IETF as Internet-Drafts. Progress on this effort will be communicated to outside groups on a continuous basis. The copy-write on the document will remain with the PWG, even on the Internet-Drafts that are submitted to the IETF.

It was proposed and agreed to add a possible deliverable of a Implementor's Guide.

It was noted that the PWG rules do not require license-free technology, only reasonable and non-discriminatory licenses. The charter goal will be changed to require a cost-free technology.

Bill Wagner noted that the charter should prohibit work on corner cases but not preclude work on those areas in the future. Paul agreed to craft some words to convey this message.

There was significant support to have a IPP FAX demo at a trade show late next year.

Paul updated the charter document during the lunch break and, after a complete review of all changes, it was unanimously accepted by the group.

Proposed project name:

The following names were suggested and then voted upon by the group:

> IPP Fax (11 votes)
> Quality Document Exchange (QDX) (3 votes)
> Internet Fax Protocol (IFP) (2 votes)
> Internet Fax Exchange (IFX)

Project Requirements:

Image requirements:

After a long discussion, the following was agreed:

1. *Sender makes right*. It is the senders responsibility to ensure that the data transferred is compatible with the capability of the receiver

2. We will define a set of capability values, for example 300, 600 , and 1200 dpi. We will mandate the support of some of these defined values. Vendors may add additional values (1201 dpi for example).

3. We will recommend that the default behavior shall be; "If a sender has a choice of values then it will choose the value that results in the 'best' quality print."

___ISSUE:___ ___What will a receiver do with data that it does not support?___

 Some examples:

- Color on a mono engine

- 1200dpi data sent to a 600 dpi printer

___ISSUE: What color spaces should be supported?___   CIELAB is the standard for TIFF-FX. Inputs are requested from all interested companies regarding the required color space(s).

Timely delivery: This is not an issue since IPP is not a store and forward protocol.

Proof of Delivery / Receipt: The ippget notification method was suggested as the ideal solution and it was proposed that IPP FAX receivers must be capable of providing this notification type. Mailto was also mentioned as a possible notification method.

Paul suggested that a unique notification is not required. The fact that the file is transferred on a TCP/IP connection is sufficient due to the connection oriented nature of TCP.

___ISSUE:___ ___Should a notification method, such as ippget, be a mandatory requirement? Or, is the reliability provided by TCP/IP sufficient?___

Security: This can be provided through the use of TLS, but TLS is not an IPP requirement.

Cancel should never be allowed by a fax user and the printer should respond with "not authorized". Job Queries should also be respond to in the same manner.

Homework items:

Does there exist an XML version of vCard? Harry Lewis volunteered to do this research. (a potential contact is phoffman@imc.org)

What is the current status of conneg (content negotiation)? Paul believes that there is an effort in process to create an XML conneg version. Bob Herriot agreed to contact Graham Klyne to try to obtain additional information.

What are the date and time stamp requirements for fax? Richard Shockey provide further definition of this item.

Next Meeting:

The next meeting will be on October 26, 2000, in conjunction with the MFPA conference in Boston. The meeting location and hotel information will be announced shortly.