PWG WIMS **CIM Alignment**
Las Vegas Face-to-Face Minutes
January 20, 2006

Craig Whittle - PWG WIMS/CIM Co-chair
Meeting was called to order at approximately 9 a.m. PDT January 20, 2006 by Bill Wagner.

**Attendees**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attendee</th>
<th>Company</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bill Wagner</td>
<td>TIC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ira McDonald</td>
<td>High North</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rick Landau</td>
<td>Dell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pete Zehler</td>
<td>Sharp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harry Lewis</td>
<td>IBM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lee Farrell</td>
<td>Canon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stuart Rowley</td>
<td>Kyocera</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ron Bergman</td>
<td>Ricoh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jerry Thasher</td>
<td>Lexmark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MPI Tech</td>
<td>Ole Skov</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**General Discussion**

- John Crandall (DMTF) hosted a teleconference with PWG WIMS CIM working group.

- Rick Landau presented the current plan (PowerPoint Presentation URL: [ftp://www.pwg.org/pub/pwg/general/presentations/wd-wimscimalign-3SlidesForCoreConcall-200601.pdf](ftp://www.pwg.org/pub/pwg/general/presentations/wd-wimscimalign-3SlidesForCoreConcall-200601.pdf)) for making changes to CIM.

- Scope of CR discussed. John Crandall suggested writing a big CR (separate document not needed) and then deciding if it needs to be broken up into smaller CRs.

- CIM 2.12 closing in early March. Release actually happens six weeks later. CIM changes about every 6 months.

- John described how deprecation works in the DMTF. With major releases (3.0), previously deprecated elements go away.
Phase 3: John Crandall recommended writing an “experimental” CR and then removing the “experimental” label (within four months). Two different implementations needed to move from “experimental”. A PWG extension is not needed (nor desired).

Most people start with a UML diagram then describe the properties (settings and capabilities).

WP#1 doesn’t require much CIM education. Existing enums must be preserved.

Examples of settings and capabilities are good in the core model. Capabilities must answer what is supported and defaults settings. Conditional settings present additional challenges. John suggested just getting started, move things along, and then refine the settings and capabilities properties.

Printing Semantic Model is mature. The biggest challenge is to understand how to apply the model to CIM.

Option #1 and #2 will not need much support from CIM core (“simple discussion”). Phase #3 might require more interaction with CIM Core.

The WIMS CIM CR should be posted as a ballot or presented to CIM Core (added to a future teleconference agenda).

Sample CRs are in members review area. SMWG is a good example.

WIMS-CIM (phase 4) should consider adding a profile. This describes how CIM components work together. The interoperability requirements of a profile define normative behavior giving client vendors greater confidence. Indications should also be considered.

Bill asked about size of CR. Size is not so much an issue; controversial issues are the bigger hang up.

CIM has 12 printing classes total, 4-5 classes impacted in WP#1.

Suggestion was made for a white paper to provide background for “non-printing” people (or reference existing documentation like the printer MIB rfc in the CR). Mapping strings can go to many external documents (clarification to Ira’s questions).

Phase 2 should be put in a single CR.
• Send questions to alias (wg-cimcore.dmtf.org). If there are specific (1 minute) questions, call John Crandall. E-mail should be sent to John Crandall and Jon Hass (Dell) with a cc to the CIM Core alias.

• John Crandall suggests we move things along quickly.

• Consensus feedback from teleconference:
  
  o Teleconference went well.
  o The WIMS CIM WG now has direction.
  o Phase II may be more controversial
  o PWG Semantic Model issue may not map cleanly

• Next joint CIM teleconference will not be scheduled pending internal next steps discussion with the WIMS CIM.

**Next Steps / Open Actions:**

• Next WIMS CIM teleconference will be next week.