

All,

The objective of this note is to gauge the level of support for pursuing a data model for Multifunction Device (MFD). The MFD model will cover, at a minimum, the objects and attributes relating to the System, its Subunits and Services, and the Jobs and Documents associated with the Services. The Services include Print, Scan, Copy, FaxIn, FaxOut among others. The model will also include abstract definitions for the interfaces offered by the System and its Services. I am not proposing a specific protocol mapping although a schema and probably WSDL files will be developed to insure the validity of the schema in a Web Services mapping.

A scalable model for an MFD will benefit all our companies just as the Printer MIB, IPP model, and Semantic Model v1 has for printing in various network environments. The alignment of semantics in IPP, UPnP, and WS-Print allows the semantics of printing to be implemented in our products once and simplified protocol gateways make the internal system available to a number of network environments. The result is reduced costs for products across the industry. The PWG can help drive alignment of semantics for the devices and system we produce. Anyone who has implemented IPP, UPnP, JDF Digital Print or WS-Print has benefited from previous efforts of PWG members to maintain semantic alignment across these environments.

The PWG/DMTF alignment effort is an example of the role of the PWG as the source of expertise in the domain of Print systems. The Printer MIB is very useful for device management. Even though the CIM representation of the Printer was based on the MIB, the two have diverged. The current effort will realign the models. Looking forward the PWG Semantic model v1 will help align the print service aspects of the PWG and DMTF. I hope the PWG can extend the role as domain experts to all the functions offered by the MFDs our companies now produce. I hope members of the PWG can be instrumental in the alignment of MFD Services not only in PWG and DMTF but also in other environments.

I believe an industry wide agreement on an MFD model is of great value. However, a common model for MFDs can not be based on the opinion of a few individuals. We need wider PWG support to negotiate a fair representation that maps as easily as possible to our companies implementations or needs. I remain committed to the development of an industry wide MFP model in the PWG forum or through other venues. I would prefer to see this work done in an open forum such as the PWG. I have no interest in developing shelfware. Therefore I need to know if the members of the PWG see this work as useful and more importantly if there will be active support for the work going forward.

It is time to work on detailed service specifications for the services offered by MFDs. It is up to us to prioritize the order the services will be worked on and if more than one service will be worked on at a time. We need to document the new objects and attributes to the level of detail found in rfc2911. (I am NOT advocating the publishing of rfcs. I expect the documents to be published as PWG specification.) Nothing in version 2 of the Semantic Model is cast in concrete. I am willing to continue as chair of the Semantic

Model Working Group. I am willing to make any changes to the current schema and WSDL files as agreed to by the PWG. I am willing to update PWG 5105.1 as the MFD work progresses. I am willing to actively participate in the drafting of the service specification. It is time now to see exactly what interest the members of the PWG have in this effort. Without editors for the Service specification, the Semantic Model Working Group will not move forward

ACTION ITEM: All members of the PWG need to inform me of their intent for participation in the MFD modeling effort. I would like to receive responses by close of business March 21, 2007. The responses should be one of the following:

Our company has no interest in supporting this effort

Our company feels this is a worthwhile effort but is unable to provide any support

Our company feels this is a worthwhile effort but would like to monitor progress (i.e. attend some of the phone conferences, monitor mailing list)

Our company feels this is a worthwhile effort and can participate (i.e. attend phone conferences, review and comment on specification, take on limited Action Items per your consent)

Our company feels this is a worthwhile effort and can serve as an editor of a Service specification

Peter Zehler

XEROX

Xerox Research Center Webster
Email: Peter.Zehler@Xerox.com
Voice: (585) 265-8755
FAX: (585) 265-7441
US Mail: Peter Zehler
Xerox Corp.
800 Phillips Rd.
M/S 128-25E
Webster NY, 14580-9701