PWG IPPv1 Standards Declaration

(as recorded by Harry Lewis - Vice Chair of the PWG and Secretary of the IPP Working Group)

PWG IPPv1.0 Affirmations at Savannah (9/98)

The following is an excerpt from the minutes of activities which took place in conjunction with the IPP working group meeting in Savannah during September, 1998. This represents a decision, which was voted on by the PWG in Savannah, to close the IPPv1.0 specification, declaring it a PWG standard. These events are being reported separately, outside of the context of the IETF IPP working group mailing list, in an attempt to follow IETF guidelines.

The Background

The IPP working group developed the drafts for IPP in less than 1 year but they have been on hold with the IETF for over 8 months while issues with Internet security are debated. Although unintentional, the IETF is effectively stalling IPP with requirements that the Security (not Printing) group should be progressing. Wide participation and interoperability of IPP was demonstrated at the bakeoff in September. PWG participants feel that the benefits of IPPv1 should be brought to market now, as is. There remains a desire to work with the IETF on security issues if and when they reach a better level of definition in the Internet.

We also reviewed and rejected alternatives presented by Carl-Uno.

- Convince IETF that IPP scheme is optional
- Introduce a new version (2.0) in place of our current drafts
- Withdraw IPP from the IETF

The Motion

In keeping with the growing sentiment regarding the desire to deliver the benefits of IPP to the marketplace, there was a motion from Paul Moore (Microsoft) that the June 30 drafts, amended for any errors , inconsistencies or misunderstandings discovered since June 30, including information from the September Bakeoff, be declared a PWG IPPv1.0 standard. Of all those in attendance, there were no objections. The PWG vote was 13 companies in favor, no against and 1 abstention based on not understanding exactly what changes would be in the revised documents (i.e. Not having seen the final draft).

The Documentation

We agreed to update the current drafts per the motion (above), create an improved implementor's guide (migrating a lot of HTTP related tips from the current model and protocol documents into the implementor's guide) and resolve that the wire protocol for IPPv1 is no longer subject to change. The final documents will be submitted to the IETF for their approval as either Proposed, Experimental or Informational. At this point, the significance of one "draft status" vs. another is less interesting in light of the fact that everyone expects to implement the PWG standard.

Any references to TLS security will go into our implementor's guide, not into our drafts. Until clear specifications and/or implementor's guides exist from the security group, it is premature for the PWG to attempt to document it's use. In general, we think it is redundant (at least) and possibly even dangerous for our specs to mandate schemes on the underlying protocols. However, Hints and Tips about how to use SSL3, TLS, SASL etc. may be useful in the implementor's guide.

PWG IPPv1 Standards Declaration

(as recorded by Harry Lewis - Vice Chair of the PWG and Secretary of the IPP Working Group)

Where do we go with the IETF?

The PWG IPPv1 definition will result in revised Model and Semantics, Encoding and Transport and Implementor's Guide documentation which will be issued to the IETF for acceptance as either Standard, Experimental or Informational status RFC's - as the IETF sees fit. IPPv1 will not address the IPP scheme. We should, further, create a IPPv1.1 requirements document that addresses IPP scheme, MIB access, Notifications etc.

Questions

This PWG resolution was not without some concerns and comments. While the resolution stands, a brief summary of each concern (with rebuttal) is listed below for completeness.

1. Can we legitimately say we have fulfilled the requirements of our charter? We haven't baked off HTTP1.1 authentication, for example. An alternative was proposed that, since we are probably not meeting all the requirements as it is, why not raise the bar a bit farther, go ahead and add the IPP scheme, but agree to miss this target, also.

(That way we can watch the dynamite burn from both ends until it blows up in our faces!)

2. Because this document set will not include the IPP scheme and Security parameters—as requested by the IESG—it is not expected that *PWG* IPPv1.0 will be used for publishing as an IETF standard track.

(The standard will exist in plain view. There isn't much we can do for the IETF if they choose to ignore it.)

3. Will there be a problem with getting IANA to register our new set of IPP operations if the standard is experimental?

(We think they are already registered - need to confirm)