IDS Working Group
2008-06-05 Conference Call Minutes

1. Attendees

Attendees: Lee Farrell (Canon), Ira McDonald (High North), Dave Whitehead (Lexmark), Nancy Chen (Okidata), Ron Bergman (Ricoh), Ron Nevo (Sharp), Brian Smithson (Ricoh), Bill Wagner (TIC), Pete Zehler (Xerox)

2. Agenda

1. Identify minutes taker
2. Approve minutes from May 8 teleconference
3. Review action items
4. Microsoft team discussion
5. NEA team discussion
6. Do we need to define any PWG printer attributes, parameters, values, etc?
7. Begin draft?
8. Next teleconference (June 18)

3. Identify Minutes Taker

Lee Farrell

4. Accept Previous Minutes

There were no objections to the previous teleconference Minutes.

5. Review Action Items

ACTION: Jerry Thrasher will send a note to Cisco to find out if there is an information path we can develop to learn about attributes (e.g., if there is a better source of information.)
→ *A note has been sent, but no reply received yet.* **OPEN**

ACTION: Ron Nevo will contact the TNC Chair to try to get the TNC attributes information.
→ *A note has been sent, but no reply received yet.* **OPEN**

ACTION: Jerry Thrasher will start a Definition of Terms list (i.e., some documentation)
→ *Started a list of terms, but definitions not yet complete.* **OPEN**

6. The Teams

Microsoft NAP Team	NEA Team
Joe Murdock	Shah Bhatti
Peter Cybuck	Brian Smithson
Nancy Chen	Ron Bergman

7. Discussion

Neither team had any discussion points to comment on. Nor were there any open action items for them to do so.

Ron Bergman noted that there is not a lot of difference between the two technologies of NAP and NEA.

Nancy said the "quarantine state packet" attribute is a combined status attribute. Ira said it originates in a request from the client—not from the server.

Ron B. feels that the Microsoft protocol is further along (i.e., more completely defined according to the documentation that we can find). Based on this observation, he suggests that we should focus on NAP first—and determine how printers should interact with it.

Ron Nevo said that he can only attend Wednesday of the face-to-face meeting, at which he will present a comparison of the NEA and NAP attributes.

> ACTION: Ron Nevo will report the differences of the attributes between NEA and NAP
> protocols at the June face-to-face meeting.

Ron B. then encouraged everyone to read the Microsoft documents for a better understanding of the protocol details.

Nancy indicated that the MS-SOH document and the MS-WSH document are the two significant documents for understanding the core protocol. Ira recommended reading the MS-SECO document.

Ron B. also suggested that in order to do an implementation, several of the other Microsoft documents (found in "the zip file") will also need to be read. He mentioned that the NAP group should gain a better understanding of exactly which other protocols are necessary for the printer/MFD to implement to adequately support NAP. For example, he thinks RADIUS might be necessary—but is not yet sure.

> ACTION: Ron Bergman will send out a list of Microsoft documents that he recommends for
> getting a better sense of NAP implementation details.

> ACTION: All participants in the group—especially the NAP team members—will examine the
> relevant Microsoft documents to obtain a clearer sense of the requirements for NAP
> implementation on a printer/MFD. Prepare to develop a protocol stack diagram for
> IDS documentation.

8. Microsoft NAP Team Discussion

None.

9. NEA Team Discussion

None.

10. Do we need to define any PWG printer attributes, parameters, values, etc?

Ron B. said the group is not yet ready to discuss this topic.

11. Begin draft?

Not yet.

12. Next Teleconference

June 19, 1:00pm EDT.