PWG MFD Working Group Teleconference Meeting Minutes
November 12, 2009

Attendees:

Nancy Chen,	Oki Data
Lee Farrell,	Canon
Ira McDonald,	High North, Inc.
Bill Wagner,	TIC
Peter Zehler	Xerox

1. Identify Minute Taker – Nancy Chen

2. Approval of minutes

The last teleconference meeting minutes: ftp://ftp.pwg.org/pub/pwg/mfd/minutes/pwg-mfd-minutes-20091029.pdf was approved without change.

3. PWG process

Attendees were informed that the meeting is held in accord with the PWG Intellectual Property Policy. There was no objection.

4. Agenda bashing

We decided to discuss Bill Wagner's questions/comments for Overall document updates, then discuss the Copy Service specification reviewed in the last meeting beginning at Section 8.

5. Discuss Bill Wagner's questions/comments for Overall document updates

(file: ftp://ftp.pwg.org/pub/pwg/mfd/wd/pwg-ftf-mfd-overall comments-20091013-14.doc)
Note: The file attached above contains a copy of AI/comments/discussion consensuses captured in the last face-to-face MFD WG meeting minutes pertaining to the MFD Overall Semantic document (ftp://ftp.pwg.org/pub/pwg/mfd/wd/wd-mfdoverallmod10-20090922.pdf). Bill highlighted those items already made into his updated Overall document in "yellow". Those highlighted in "blue" are items he has questions or comments. Those un-highlighted items are AIs he has been waiting for someone else to complete. Bill will not publish the updated Overall document unless all are resolved.

- Figure 4 should be revised to non-Scan specific. Pete to provide the updated, more generic diagram.
  - ⇨ Bill got updated Figure 3. Pete agreed to provide Fig 4.
- AI: Ira to re-do Section 2.6 Data Types.
  - ⇨ Ira will do.
- Section 3.3 – CoverState should be SubunitState. Ira and Pete will work together to get schema aligned with MIB and CIM and send the result to Bill. The Schema shows there is a mapping issue between rfc2790 & rfc2805.
  - ⇨ Pete and Ira agreed to work this out tomorrow. Pete will then update schema for Bill to update Overall document.
- Section 3.4 – FaxModem, needs a lot of references in Table 7. Need experts to provide inputs on this section.

47   ⇨ Ira will ask Samsung's expert again.
48 • Processors:
49   ⇨ Bill to make a reference to Printer MIB system controller object in hrDevice table
50   from which MFD Processors are abstracted. Ira to send this reference text to Bill.
51   ⇨ Ira will help.
52 • AI for MarkerAddressabilityBasis, etc.: The group needs to discuss all the Basis elements
53   that abstract out of band values from Printer MIB properties and from where they are
54   derived.
55   ⇨ Closed. The group now view everything is consistent with CIM.
56 • StorageIsRemovable in not in the MIB. However it's important for P2600 security
57   requirement which should be the reference, not rfc2790. Need the correct reference if it
58   comes from DMTF CIM. (What is the correct reference?)
59   ⇨ Ref should be P2600.
60   ⇨ There is a property in MIB for hrStorage entry for device table.
61 • StorageMake and StorageModel should be combined into StorageMakeAndModel which
62   exists in Printer MIB. AI: Pete to change the Schema for Storage, Bill to change the
63   elements in the Table. Sorry, has this been done?
64   ⇨ Done
65 • AI: Pete and Ira to investigate and arrive a better mapping between the Schema and the
66   Model information. Ira to look into IETF Entity MIB which is an extension to the host
67   MIB on describing component and subcomponent.
68   ⇨ Leave this as a future WG work item. Entity MIB can represent the concept of
69   container. For example, it can address chassis that contain subunits. The current
70   schema does not represent this type of containment.
71 • MFD Subunits can be distributed across the network. However, currently in the model
72   there is no way to correlate a particular Cover instance with the subunit that utilizes the
73   Cover. The only way to resolve this is to add a vendor subunit that knows how to
74   construct a device using a particular Cover instance. Are we to do something about this?
75   ⇨ No.
76 • Section 4: Fix the mixed text with Figure 42, and a lost table for JobTable. (???)
77   ⇨ Bill will fix this shown only in PDF version.
78 • (CopyRegion now eliminated)
79   ⇨ Correct.
80 • Section 4.4, Table 31 – MediaBox:
81   o RegionUnits – This is not a list of keyword, this is an inseparable set of keyword
82   and its allowed value. True for Scan Region too??
83   ⇨ Yes. Bill made some changes to the values, needs to be checked.
84 • Section 4.5, Table 35 – regarding Media and MediaCol,
85   ⇨ Bill's understanding from the minutes is correct.
86 • Line 1100 (1144) "The values of the elements can be administratively set and/or can be
87   modified directly or indirectly through an operation." But currently there is no such
88   administrative operation defined. This will be defined later. So what should the text say?
89   ⇨ No change to the text.
90 • Section 7.3
91   ⇨ Change (a), (b), (c), (d) to
92   (a) Through a local Client (via the MFD user interface), or

93	(b) Through a remote Client via its software application user interface.
94	• Section 7.3
95	▪ Add Cancel<service>Jobs: This operation has two parameters: MyJobs –
96	boolean and optional JobIDs. If MyJobs is 'true', it cancels all jobs of a
97	user's. An administrator can cancel other users' jobs specified in JobIDs,
98	but the operation does not delete the canceled jobs from History. Later in
99	IPP WG meeting, this operation is split into two operations: (1)
100	CancelMyJobs for users to cancel his/her own jobs. If any job is not
101	owned by the user, a client-error-not-authorized is returned. (2)
102	CancelJobs for administrator to cancel all jobs. If any job is not
103	cancelable, client-error-not-possible is returned. Client-error-not-
104	authorized takes precedence over client-error-not-possible.
105	Do we adopt IPP operations as general? Is it Cancel<Service>MyJobs or
106	CancelMy<Service>Jobs? Do we get into returned messages , error messages.
107	⇨ Add three operations: Cancel<service>Job, Cancel<service>Jobs,
108	CancelMy<service>Jobs in schema, and document.
109	⇨ Yes, all the returned messages, error messages need to be described as shown.
110	• Requirement document for Overall Semantics
111	⇨ Yes, need uses cases for all different MFD services.

6. Next Steps

113	• Teleconferences on next week Nov. 19, and Dec. 3, Thursdays, 3pm EDT.
114	• We will review the rest of Copy Service specification next week.
115	• Pete and Bill publish updated documents ready for face-to-face meeting after next
116	teleconference. Plan for face-to-face meeting on Dec. 3 teleconference; no further
117	document review in the teleconference.