

# Cloud Imaging WG Conference Call Minutes

## June 6, 2011

Meeting was called to order at approximately 1:00pm (EDT) June 6, 2011. As agreed at the May face-to-face meeting, Cloud Imaging meetings would be extended to two hours to accelerate the scenario/use cases effort. Meeting ended just after 3:00PM ET.

## 1 Attendees

Danny Brennen(IBM)  
Nancy Chen (Oki Data)  
Justin Hutchings (Microsoft)  
Ira McDonald (High North/Samsung)  
Russell Neville (Xerox)  
Ron Nevo (Samsung)  
Glen Petrie (Epson)  
Jim Sommer (Monotype Imaging)  
Larry Upthegrove (end user)  
Bill Wagner (TIC)  
Rick Yardumian (Canon)  
Peter Zehler (Xerox)

## 2 Agenda Items

1. Administrivia
  - a. PWG IP Policy was cited; there were no objections
  - b. Bill Wagner volunteered as Minute Taker in the absence of the working group secretary, Michael Sweet.
  - c. Ron indicated that Bill Wagner was to be appointed Vice Chair ; there were no objections
  - d. Ron indicated that the Cloud Imaging charter would be updated to reflect that Andrew Mitchell had withdrawn as co-chair and Bill Wagner had been appointed vice-chair.
  - e. The last conference call minutes (<ftp://ftp.pwg.org/pub/pwg/cloud/minutes/cloud-concall-minutes-20110509.pdf>), and the last face-to-face minutes (<ftp://ftp.pwg.org/pub/pwg/cloud/minutes/cloud-f2f-minutes-20110525.pdf>) were accepted, with the notation that the spelling of Justin Hutchings ' name should be corrected on both.
2. Action Items from both minutes
  - a. • Action: Mike to update F2F meeting page with new schedule (DONE)
  - b. • Action: Mike to post final cloud slides (DONE)
  - c. • Action: Mike to maintain a word document containing all use cases - post as PWG whitepaper ((listed as done, but update reflecting May face-to-face conclusions is not yet posted. Use Cases document is still 24 May version.)
  - d. Action: Everyone send their pending use cases to cloud and ipp mailing lists (no new use cases/scenarios have been received.)
3. Review use cases for IPP/Cloud Imaging.  
[Caution: many ideas evolved over the course of this meeting. Do not take any "conclusions" reached as final, in that several were later discarded.]
  - a. Approach
    - i. There was some discussion about more specifically how the use case review would be approached, and whether the discussion should be in regard to the submitted "use cases" (that had been agreed should be changed to scenarios) in <ftp://ftp.pwg.org/pub/pwg/cloud/white/use-cases-20110425.pdf>; or with respect to the versions processed by Michael Sweet (<ftp://ftp.pwg.org/pub/pwg/general/wd/wd-commonusecases10-20110524.pdf>)
    - ii. It was decided that the effort should be an attempt to convert into a scenario the first use case (titled "Mobile phone user prints to IPP Everywhere printer") in the April 25 document.
  - b. Discussion of Scenarios vs. Use Cases
    - i. Larry Upthegrove suggested that there should be but a few very general scenarios; e.g., [printing from some device to some printer and having copies delivered). The distinction between what kind of device, what kind of link, what environment., etc would be done in

the use cases extracted from the scenario. Some felt that this was too broad, and that a scenario should give information that the user was likely aware of... such as where he was, where the printer was, what kind of device he had, the fact that he wanted to select options in printing, etc.

- ii. The specific scenario of a user remotely submitting a print job where the printed material were to be delivered to some location was identified as a "new" scenario and Larry was requested to submit a writeup of this to the Cloud Mailing list.
  - iii. Justin Hutchings observed that scenarios should be very general and should not go stale as technology changes (although the use cases would change). This seems at odds with his earlier suggestion that the scenarios should be tagged with the use cases each aspect of the scenario refers to. It was suggested that having the tagging refer to a class of use case (e.g., type of device, basis for printer selection, need for security) might resolve this question.
- c. Conversion of "Mobile phone user prints to IPP Everywhere printer" to a Scenario"
- i. Since it was unclear that there was consensus on what level of detail was commensurate with a Class of Scenario, Scenario, Class of Use Case and Use Case, attention returned to conversion of subject use case into a scenario.
  - ii. Title change was suggested to more accurately reflect situation: "Mobile phone user prints document resident on phone to Local printer".
  - iii. It was noted that there would be reasonable variations on this scenario dealing with different user devices, different connection methods, public vs. private networks, remote vs. local printer, externally resident document versus phone resident, selection of printer vs. preprogrammed printer, home vs. business environment, etc.
  - iv. In considering the conversion to a scenario, it was suggested that all of the pertinent information should be in the description, and all other sections in the original use-case format should be dropped. The pertinent information was proposed to include (and not include):
    1. Client and printer or print manager are connected
    2. Business environment
    3. Security and Accounting required
    4. User using phone
    5. Type of connection (encrypted WI-FI network?)
    6. Printer is local, one of several preconfigured on that phone
    7. Selection on basis of capabilities not needed, but printing options necessary to configure the print job were available (e.g., phone provided dialog for installed printer much like conventional computer would provide)
    8. All mention of IPP-everywhere to be removed
    9. "Steps" should be in description, and should include user actions (including perhaps receiving notification of job status and taking the printed sheets off the printer)
    10. Alternate flows are "exceptions", and are dealt with separately, perhaps in a separate scenario or set of scenarios
  - v. That being nominally settled, the question can up of whether variations of this scenario should be generated (e.g.,
    1. Use of different user device – such as a Tablet computer
    2. Selection of a printer on basis of characteristics
    3. Printing of file not resident on user device
    4. Etc
  - vi. Conclusion was to leave description as it is, except to:
    1. Remove reference to IPP Everywhere
    2. Add indication that accounting is necessary
  - vii. This would act as sample scenario from which classes of use cases would be derived, And we will see how that works.
4. Incidental tangential discussion.
- In response to a suggestion that a scenario might preclude an IPP-Everywhere solution because IPP Everywhere was a direct client to printer capability, Ira objected.
  - Although later clarifying that he was referring to IPP and not necessarily IPP Everywhere, Ira maintained that since the Cloud Imaging Charter includes reference to an IPP binding, IPP is not limited to a client to printer applications and must also be defined for client to server connections and entire cloud support.

- Because the distinction between what applied to IPP Everywhere and what applied to IPP was not made early and clearly, this appeared to be a departure from what previously and recently had identified IPP- Everywhere as a Client-to Printer capability.
- However, since the Cloud Imaging group is concerned primarily with the model, the task of making IPP capable of supporting all aspects of the model is a function of the IPP group and not the Cloud Imaging group.

### **3 Next Steps / Open Actions**

- ACTION: All members -Review these minutes to ensure that both the conclusion and the path by which that conclusion was reached are accurately documented (because I suspect we will go this route again some time)
- ACTION: All members - Review Michaels document (<ftp://ftp.pwg.org/pub/pwg/general/wd/wd-commonusecases10-20110524.pdf>)
- ACTION: All members – With the identified mode of converting the “Mobile phone user prints to IPP Everywhere printer” use case into a scenario as stated in line 3.C.vi of these minutes, consider the use cases/use case classes represented in this scenario and correlate them to Michaels document.
- ACTION: Larry Upthegrove – Provide set of Scenarios representing characteristic user situations
- It is intended to continue this discussion at the Use Cases portion of the IPP teleconference next Monday.
- Next Cloud Imaging conference call: June 20.