PWG WIMS **CIM Alignment**

Face-to-Face Meeting Minutes

October 27, 2005

Craig Whittle - PWG WIMS/CIM Co-chair

Meeting was called to order at approximately 9 a.m. CDT on October 27, 2005 by Bill Wagner.

**Attendees**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Company</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lee Farrell</td>
<td>Canon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill Wagner</td>
<td>TIC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ole Skov</td>
<td>MPI Tech</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ira McDonald</td>
<td>High North</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fumio Nagasaka</td>
<td>Seiko-Epson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harry Lewis</td>
<td>IBM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jerry Thrasher</td>
<td>Lexmark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craig Whittle</td>
<td>Sharp Labs of America</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**General Discussion**

- Slide 4 - PWG Semantic Model is the basis for WIMS-CIM activities
- Ira: DMTF (WS-Management standard not expected for a couple of years at the current rate / process)
- Both WSDM and WS-Management XML structures do not map well to CIM. DMI/MIF mapping will be difficult. CIM uses DTD not XSD (big effort).
- WS-Management -> CIM <- WSDM (CIM is in the middle politically)
- Semantic content could be lost in the translation from XML-based content to CIM
- Rick Landau is not available due to a medical condition
• DMTF has reinvented itself many times over the years. Could they “jump the gap” and go right to schema when they realize the scope of the work?
  o Will PWG waste time going to the wrong target (CIM)?
  o Is CIM really the near-term avenue?
• PWG should do editorial and technical “fix up” to establish relationship with DMTF
• Reviewed Work Register
  o PWG was under the impression that the work would be a cooperative effort with some participation from DMTF
• PWG Actions
  o CIM realignment WG formed
  o Weekly teleconferences working well
  o Failed attempts to form a working relationship with CIM
    ▪ Inconclusive feedback from Rick’s presentation to CIM Core
• Comments on “CIM Printer”
  o Structural problems, vague or meaningless properties, mapping strings, read / write, attributes, mutable / modifiable, incompleteness
• No cooperative effort thus far with DMTF
  o John Crandall has not responded to Harry’s request for participation from CIM
  o John Crandall is trying to contact Steve Jerman
  o CIM core made “off the core” comments
  o DMTF general management needs to be educated on the management requirements for imaging devices
    ▪ PWG members should educate other CIM participants in their companies
    ▪ IBM uses WebSphere and CIM for printer management
• Work products (see slides)
  o WP #1 and WP #2 should happen in succession. WP #2 should happen without waiting for WP #1 CR to complete the standards process.
  o WP #3 and #4: Could be this done as WSDM?
    ▪ Introduce new native WSDM imaging classes (general mapping) into CIM, WS-M, as PWG classes.
  o Need greater participation and implementation of WS management
• Job management
  o Microsoft: Vista uses a static, XML-based capabilities description for job tickets.
  o Apple: also supports a XML-based job ticket (internal API)
  o Is a consistent PWG Job Management Model for imaging desirable?
  o What’s the value of this from a printer vendor’s perspective?
    ▪ History: Printer MIB (HP involved), IPP (MS involved)
    ▪ Now: MS doing another proprietary Job Ticket XML format
• Standards participation and adoption barriers
  o Waiting for critical mass as opposed to promoting it
  o Affect on Linux (as a lead adopter of standards)
    ▪ CUPS, next version, passes job ticket information
  o End-user vs. administrator / accounting management model
  o Risks of early adoption may be barriers
  o “Chicken / egg” syndrome
  o Standardization requires consensus on obvious
• Create common applications validation tool to ensure compliance with Semantic Model?
  o For whom? Under what circumstances?
    ▪ General fleet management (not vendor specific) / enterprise
    ▪ Building commonality infrastructure in industry
    ▪ No. If vender pushing own product
  o The alternatives (WS-management defines standard independently) are less desirable
• Is the PWG Semantic Model the best existing basis for such a model?
  o Yes
• Is DMTF/CIM the best an appropriate vehicle for establishing the PWG model within the general context of Management, and of Web Services based Management?
  o Go straight to WSDM? Prototype?
  o Create white paper that maps Semantic Model to WSDM (borrowing from WS-CIM white paper)
  o Risks of starting with WSDM (still need to end up in CIM)
    ▪ Perhaps CIM will be developed incorrectly
  o Work Products #3 and #4 might be worked using WSDM (later)
• Can PWG Membership encourage CIM Co-operation?
  o Where in DMTF? Different people?
  o How to we get parallel political leverage?
  o Consensus is just complete WP #1
• Will PWG Membership participate in the effort?
  o Work is underway - level adequate for work required
  o Level of participation won’t be the same as before (IPP days)
• What is a reasonable goal?
  o See work products
• Next WIMS/CIM concall on 11/10 at same time
Next Steps / Open Actions:

- Complete work product #1
- Next WIMS/CIM concall on 11/10 at same time.
- Harry to contact John Crandall to see if we can get greater participation from CIM Core. John will also contact Steve Jerman.