

IPPV2

Camas Face-to-Face Minutes

August 15, 2008

Craig Whittle - Secretary

Attendees

| | |
|---------------|----------------------|
| Bill Wagner | TIC (Konica-Minolta) |
| Heo | High North |
| Rick Landau | Dell |
| Pete Zehler | Xerox |
| Harry Lewis | IBM |
| Lee Farrell | Canon |
| Ron Bergman | Ricoh |
| Jerry Thasher | Lexmark |
| Nancy Chen | Okidata |
| Sha Bhatti | Samsung |
| Glen Petrie | Epson |

General Discussion

- ❖ Minutes from the previous teleconference were accepted (see <ftp://anonymous:user%40host.com@ftp.pwg.org/pub/pwg/ipp/ippv2-minutes/IPPV2-ConCall-Minutes-20080721.pdf>)
- ❖ Harry expressed concern about “the label” given for printer types for each version of IPP v2.x. For example, a production printer doesn’t need to have IPP v2.2.
 - Rewording rationale for groups or leaving off label would be better. It’s an “interoperable function set”
 - Action items: follow-up with Ira and Michael on removing label from specification.
 - Action item: Change throughout specification (Harry volunteered)
 - Workgroup Printer → 2.0 Printer
 - Enterprise Printer → 2.1 Printer
 - Production Printer → 2.2 Printer
- ❖ Ron reviewed change in
 - Michael Sweet requested that at least one document format must be supported

- Lee pointed out that this is not in current statement of work
- Do we need to change the statement of work? No (note conclusion below)
- If we specify the proposed set, why not add other formats like XPS, BMLinkS, or others
- Shouldn't there be a CUPS certification that can specify more detailed requirements?
- CONSENSUS: Remove section
- Action: remove from the references section of the specification references to documents that are not longer applicable with the removal of recommended document formats
- Sections of the specification still need to be completed
- Proposed work
 - List each attribute required per operation (complex combinations)
 - Perhaps this should be a new specification or a new revision
 - A new specification might result in delayed implementation – companies may wait till the new revision is available.
 - CONSENSUS: Add attributes per operation to current specification.
 - Can we added XPS as a language to our supported document formats
 - IPP uses MIME type (not change necessary)
 - Printer MIB needs a new enum for XPS (input channel?)

Next Steps / Open Actions:

- Next teleconference on the August 25th
- Action item: Harry to post “contributed specification” with labels removed (e.g., “production” replaced with “2.2 printer”).