PWG WIMS \textit{CIM Alignment}
Conference Call Minutes
March 22, 2007

Meeting was called to order at approximately 2 p.m. EDT March 22, 2007.

\textbf{Attendees}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</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>Craig Whittle</td>
<td>Sharp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pete Zehler</td>
<td>Xerox</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lee Farrell</td>
<td>Canon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harry Lewis</td>
<td>Ricoh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jerry Thrasher</td>
<td>Lexmark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walt Filbricht</td>
<td>Samsung</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textbf{General Discussion}

- Minutes from the March 8\textsuperscript{th} teleconference (see ftp://ftp.pwg.org/pub/pwg/wims/minutes/cim_070308.pdf) were approved.

- Rick slides were reviewed presentation sent to e-mail reflector:
  - CIM Core suggested that the WIMS-CIM WG revamp the current model and add new classes and objects. They suggested adding more management information to the work product. A capabilities class (hardware-supplied value that is read-only?) was suggested to differentiate from a manager supplied value (read-write?).
  - No increase in functionality provided with the additional 6 -10 classes (15 already proposed) and an additional 15 – 30 instances (50 – 80 already planned).
  - For read-write properties (more than 2 or 3 in a class) the property should be shifted to a capabilities class.
  - These changes add significant complexity creating additional adoption barriers for potential implementers.
• Three alternatives were proposed:
  
  o Proposal #1: simplify by reducing scope (remove less commonly used management functions—classes and/or properties, e.g., output tray).
  
  o Proposal #2: focus on read-only properties only (not requiring capabilities class)—this may be the common for proxy implementations.
  
  o Proposal #3: Change priority of classes / properties focusing on most used / needed management objects (e.g., alerts over channels).
  
• Consensus: Reexamine management functions with the restrictions in mind with an objective to simply effort. Perhaps the focus should be on classes that do not require a separate capabilities class (with some exemptions).
  
• If new capabilities classes are used, two new properties should be used: ElementNameEnabledProperty (and mask).
  
• Rick suggested that Harry send a mail note to Winston encouraging CIM Core to give feedback earlier in the review cycle to minimize rework.
  
• Lee suggested we step back further and examine our ultimate goal of having Web-based imaging services.
  
• Rick explained that anything that goes into the MOF will go into Web services using the automated tools.
  
• Ira expressed concern for a deviation from SM 1.0.
  
• Harry suggested that the CIM path was the more “credible path” or “visible path” when first proposed.
  
• Can we leverage WS-* (print and possibly scan) to shorten the path to an Imaging Web service definition?
Counter Specification:

- Ira to adopt the proposed changes to the counter specification by Bill:
  1. "raw traffic" - change to "activity" or "workload", or include definition
  2. add definition of "Single-sided" as a synonym of "Simplex"

Next Steps / Open Actions:

- WIMS-CIM WG to consider alternative paths to Web services for imaging devices.
  - Including proposals suggested by Rick.
- Next telecom scheduled for April 5, 2007