

Cloud Imaging WG Face-to-Face Minutes August, 2012

Meeting was held at Microsoft facilities in Redmond, Washington, starting at approximately 1:30 PM, PDT, August 6, 2012. A second session was held between 1:30 and 3:00 PM PDT on August 8, 2012.

Attendees

Persons attending either in person or by phone for at least part of one of the meetings are listed below.

- Nancy Chen (Oki Data)
- Mathew Hansen (Toshiba call-in)
- Justin Hutchings (Microsoft)
- Joe Murdock (Sharp)
- Ron Nevo (Samsung) Chair
- Glen Petrie (Epson callin)
- Jerry Thrasher (Lexmark)
- Randy Turner (Amalfi callin)
- Paul Tykodi (TCS callin)
- Bill Wagner (TIC) Vice Chair
- Rick Yardumian (Canon)
- Larry Upthegrove (End User call in)
- Pete Zehler (Xerox)

Introduction and Administrative Issues

1. Slides at <ftp://ftp.pwg.org/pub/pwg/cloud/slides/Cloud-WG-Meeting-Aug-2012.pdf>
2. IP Policy and Minute Taker
 - a. Policy accepted
 - b. Bill Wagner agreed to take minutes
3. Approved last conference call meeting minutes.
<ftp://ftp.pwg.org/pub/pwg/cloud/minutes/cloud-concall-minutes-20120625.pdf>

Status and Action Items Review

1. Document Status review
 - a. Print Job Ticket Specification:
 - i. Approved
 - ii. Pete suggested that document be sent to Google as alternate form of job and printer capabilities definition. Response was to wait until mapping document done.
 - b. Mapping Specification: no new release.
 - i. Justine has provided MSPS info to Ira.
 - ii. Ira will post to FTP site so that others can address mapping (Pete)
 - c. Cloud Printing Model and Requirements: Current Draft:
 - i. <ftp://ftp.pwg.org/pub/pwg/cloud/wd/wd-cloudmodel10-20120723.pdf>
 - ii. Includes revised Use Case discussion and revised overall diagram reflecting reconsideration of what is in scope.

2. Charter Update
 - a. Posted at <ftp://ftp.pwg.org/pub/pwg/cloud/wd/wd-cloud-charter-20120428.pdf>, but not yet approved by SC.
 - b. WG agreed that this draft is valid and requests that it be approved by SC
3. Action Items Review of from June 25 Conference call.
 - a. Action: Bill to post updated Cloud Printing Requirements and Model Interim Draft (DONE)
 - b. Action: Bill to update the current Mapping draft (DONE)
 - c. Action: Larry to post the further Cloud Print Sequence diagrams reflecting information developed on the sequence spreadsheet (DONE)
 - d. Action: Mike to provide updated use cases text for Cloud Print Model; Larry assumed this action item (DONE)
 - e. Action: Mike to provide updated design requirements for Cloud Print Model (PENDING)
 - f. Action: Joe to update definition of visible/visibility to cover AAA (PENDING)
 - g. Action: Ira to work with Justin on MSPS mapping (ONGOING - work started)
 - h. Action: Mike to update PPD Mapping (ONGOING - pending table updates)

Cloud Printing Requirements and Model Interim Draft Review

The August 6 meeting was devoted to a detailed consideration of the Use Cases, section 3.2 in the draft at <ftp://ftp.pwg.org/pub/pwg/cloud/wd/wd-cloudmodel10-20120723.pdf>. The comments were extensive, and the approach was taken to modify the document (<ftp://ftp.pwg.org/pub/pwg/cloud/wd/wd-cloudmodel10-20120807.pdf>) and review the modified sections on August 8 to arrive at consensus on the Use Cases section. (<ftp://ftp.pwg.org/pub/pwg/cloud/wd/wd-cloudmodel10-20120808.pdf>). These minutes document general conclusions reflected in the revised section rather than specific identified changes.

1. As defined in the charter, this first Model and Requirements document is to deal just with cloud printing. This should be reflected in the title.
2. Use cases should not presume the overall design that is to be developed in response to the requirements extracted from the Use Cases. Rather, they should deal with the entities indisputable involved in Cloud Printing: prospective user, the cloud and the printer.
3. Requirements should be derived directly from Use Cases.
4. Some Use Cases illustrate, as their main point, User to Cloud (front end) interactions while others illustrate Cloud to Printer (back end) interactions. Some illustrate both, but without the two necessarily being dependent on one another. Some illustrate end-to-end interactions where the front and back end relationships are interdependent. The use case descriptions should identify the portions of the scenario representing the usage of interest.
5. The Common Preconditions should be broken out as a separate numbered paragraph and itemized. Having done this, it was suggested that the preconditions were, in fact, obvious assumptions, or maybe even requirements, and did not belong under Use Cases. There was no conclusion other than to revisit this issue.
6. The statement that a printer was associated with a device previously was unclear and understood by different people to mean different things. It was considered that such a statement, either because of its vagueness and/or because of its reference to a design detail in a design that does not yet exist did not belong in a use case.
7. Although the discussion identified the first two use cases a push printing and pull printing

respectively, the fact that pull printing means something different to users than it means to designers meant that these terms should not be used. It was considered that simple diagrams would avoid misunderstanding.

8. It was considered that the check printing use case was not a form printing example in the sense that the printer was presented with a form format and then presented with data to fit the form, but rather that the application formatted that data to check form. Also, the interesting factors in the use case were the need for secure printing on custom media.
9. The special format printing example was considered superfluous, and was eliminated.
10. The drug prescription printing example was considered unlikely and had regulatory security issues best avoided. The main points of selection by location and printout by a third party were considered best exemplified by a print to photo service use case.
11. In looking at exceptions, it was considered that Job Cancel was best treated as a use case rather than an exception
12. It was decided that the exceptions section should identify the exceptions, but not the actions to be taken on occurrence. Indeed, there appeared to be much commonality on actions, depending largely upon the degree to which the exception was to cause delay, modification or non performance of the job processing. Actions were to be dealt with under requirements.
13. There were objections that the use cases were all concerned with submitting a job, and did not cover other potential user actions. Pete will propose other user actions.
14. In the editing the section, it was observed that the defined term “User” refers to anyone having an interaction with the print service. However, all of the examples deal with a prospective “Job Originator” (as defined in the MFP model document). It seemed much more compact and easily understood to just give the actors names.

Next Steps and Action Items

1. Next conference call is August 27th at 3pm EDT
2. Work to be done on incorporating Justin’s MSPS information into the Mapping document, V1. Hopefully, either proposed section or updated document posted
3. Work to be done on deriving requirements from reworked Use Cases section. Hopefully, either proposed section or updated document posted
4. Action: Bill to post updated Cloud Printing Requirements and Model Interim Draft (DONE)
5. Action: Larry to continue incorporating contributions into Cloud Printing Requirements and Model.
6. Action: Pete to identify front end Use Cases other than just Job submission.
7. Action: Mike to provide updated design requirements for Cloud Print Model (PENDING)
8. Action: Joe to update definition of visible/visibility to cover IAA (PENDING – definition proposed but subject to rework))
9. Action: Ira to post information on MSPS mapping obtained from Justin.
10. Action: Pete and others to work on MSPS information from Justin for mapping document.
11. Action: Mike to update PPD Mapping (ONGOING - pending table updates)

Submitted by Bill Wagner, Cloud Imaging WG vice-chair, August 14, 2012