

1 Subj: Minutes of IPP Telecon, Oct 7, 1998

2 From: Tom Hastings

3 Date: 10/9/1998

4 File: ipp-telecon-981007.doc

5 Attendees: Hugo Parra, Pete Zehler, Ira McDonald, Ron Bergman, Bob Herriot, Carl

6 Kugler, Harry Lewis, Tom Hastings

7 **1 Interoperability Test and Test Suites**

8 Peter is still collecting results of the September bake-off. Participants are expected to fill
9 in section 4 of the Interoperability Test document (IPP-Test-Plan-980916.doc) with the
10 results of their tests with TS1, TS2 and TS3 test suites. Peter has sent out reminders to
11 those participants who did not post their results at the bakeoff.

12 Peter will take all the results and produce a single Section 5 to show the coverage of the
13 interoperability tests. If two clients and two IPP Printers successfully interoperated on an
14 operation or attribute, Peter will mark it in the combined Section 5.

15 During the bake-off, most of the bugs in the scripts were fixed. However, participants are
16 not expected to re-run their tests with the final scripts from the bakeoff. However,
17 participants and others are encouraged to use scripts that were improved during the bake-
18 off as bugs in the scripts were reported. The final Xerox scripts from the bake-off were
19 posted in:

20 ftp://ftp.pwg.org/pub/pwg/ipp/new_TES/Test_Scripts/Xerox/Xerox_Bake_Off/

21	-rw-rw-r--	1	pwg	staff	5503	Sep 30 01:12	BO21-22.test
22	-rw-rw-r--	1	pwg	staff	23287	Sep 30 01:13	BO214.test
23	-rw-rw-r--	1	pwg	staff	2660	Sep 30 01:13	BO23.test
24	-rw-rw-r--	1	pwg	staff	29107	Sep 30 01:13	BO24.test
25	-rw-rw-r--	1	pwg	staff	31205	Sep 30 01:13	BO25.test
26	-rw-rw-r--	1	pwg	staff	58385	Sep 30 01:13	BO26-27.test
27	-rw-rw-r--	1	pwg	staff	10699	Sep 30 01:14	BO28.test
28	-rw-rw-r--	1	pwg	staff	29747	Sep 30 01:14	BO29.test
29	-rw-rw-r--	1	pwg	staff	9603	Sep 30 01:14	MyPrinterDefs.test
30	-rw-rw-r--	1	pwg	staff	14357	Sep 30 01:14	StdDefs.test

31 Over the next few weeks, additional Xerox scripts that were in the test plan, but not
32 provided, will be produced that implementers can use to further test their
33 implementations and to further test the clarity of the specifications. Any problems in
34 these scripts should be reported to the ipp@pwg.org and [xerox-ipp-
35 tools@cp10.es.xerox.com](mailto:xerox-ipp-tools@cp10.es.xerox.com) with TES at the beginning of the Subject line. Any problems
36 in the specifications should be sent to just ipp@pwg.org with MOD or PRO at the
37 beginning of the Subject line as usual.

38 Swen responded to the problem of running the Xerox test suite of how to get just the
39 unexpected results, rather than the full script output. To get less output, run the program
40 "by hand" and omit the "-report" switch (this is equivalent to saying "-report summary").

41 In the output, you will see any mismatches, plus script annotations (lines in the script
42 beginning with "@"). To be even more terse, you can get rid of the annotations by
43 specifying "-report mismatches".

44 We re-confirmed that the next bake-off will be in February 1999.

45 **2 Review of Clarification Issues**

46 We decided to lengthen the review of the proposed resolutions to the issues to give a full
47 two weeks of review. So we will have three telecons, Oct 7, 14, and 21 and two weeks of
48 discussion on the mailing list Oct 7 through Oct 21. Any issues that have no comments
49 against them at either a telecon or on the mailing list for two weeks will be considered
50 resolved using the explicit text in the Answer section of:

51 <ftp://ftp.pwg.org/pub/pwg/ipp/proposed-clarifications/ipp-issues-list-mod-1.3.pdf>

52 I will edit those proposed text clarifications into the IPP Model and Semantics
53 specification starting Oct 21, 1998.

54 **2.1 Issue 1.10 - Case sensitiveness in URLs**

55 We agreed that the Model document sentence in Section 4.1.5 'uri':

56 The URI and URL standards allow for mixed-case values that are case-sensitive.

57 needed to be changed to not re-specify anything about the case of URL, but to refer to the
58 new RFC 2396 "Uniform Resource Identifiers (URI): Generic Syntax" which is now an
59 IETF Proposed Standard (which REQUIRES that the scheme and host name be case-
60 insensitive, but that the path and parameters MAY be case-sensitive).

61 Harry Lewis took an action item to propose a statement for the IIG which is:

62 IPP client and server implementations must be aware of the diverse
63 uppercase/lowercase nature of URLs. [RFC 2396] defines URL schemes and Host
64 names as case insensitive but reminds us that the rest of the URL may well
65 demonstrate case sensitivity. When creating URL's, where the choice is
66 completely arbitrary, it is probably best to select lower case. However, this
67 cannot be guaranteed and implementations MUST NOT rely on any specific case
68 type in the URL beyond the URL scheme and host name.

69 Any additional discussion on this statement that is agreed to will be included in the IIG.

70 **2.2 1.33 Equality between different syntaxes?**

71 Reviewing the proposed Answer section of Issue 1.33 in the Issue list, V1.3, we agreed:

72 1. change the case-insensitive matching rules for attributes with the 'name' attribute
73 syntax from SHOULD to MUST, since such attributes are completely within the

74 province of IPP, and are not the subject of other standards and are not handled by any
75 off-the-shelf code conforming to other standards.

76 2. Since there are currently no 'text' matching attributes specified in MOD, that MOD
77 would be silent on any rules for matching 'text' attributes. So the proposed resolution
78 to Issue 1.33 only applies to the 'name' attribute syntax.

79 3. to remove any statement about any other equivalencies, such as accent insensitiveness
80 or other character equivalencies, such as Unicode composed accented letters versus
81 composite accented letters.

82 4. change from MAY to SHOULD that a language without a country matches a
83 language with a country.

84 The editors of MOD (Tom Hastings) and PRO (Bob Herriot) will propose new text for
85 any issues for which there is discussion to the mailing list before incorporating it into the
86 Issue list document. This will reduce the number of versions of the Issues document.