

# Printer Working Group Plenary

October 14, 2009

## 1. Attendees

Randy Turner*	Amalfi Systems
Michael Sweet	Apple
Lee Farrell	Canon
Rick Landau*	Dell
Glen Petrie	Epson
Junichiro Hamaguchi	Kyocera
Barry Sia	Kyocera
Jerry Thrasher	Lexmark
Ole Skov	MPI Tech
Ira McDonald*	High North
Nancy Chen	Oki Data
Brian Smithson	Ricoh
Joe Murdock	Sharp
Bill Wagner	TIC
Ajit Sodhi	Toshiba
Paul Tykodi*	Tykodi Consulting
Pete Zehler	Xerox
Tom Hastings*	<independent>

\* via telephone

## 2. Administrivia

Wednesday afternoon, Lee Farrell provided the planned Plenary meeting topics:

- Administrivia
  - \* Introductions
  - \* Assign Scribe
  - \* Approve/Modify Agenda
  - \* Approve Previous Plenary Minutes
  - \* Review PWG Patent Policy
  - \* Agenda for the Week
  - \* PWG Meeting Schedule
  - \* 2009 Membership (current status)
  - \* PWG Financial Overview
- New PWG Officers – September 2009 Elections
- Workflow Orchestration Interface [Nancy Chen]
- ISO Print Ticket [Ira McDonald]
- PWG Working Group Status [WG Chairs]
  - \* IDS (Imaging Device Security)
  - \* IPP (IPP v2)
  - \* MFD (Semantic Model)
  - \* WIMS (DMTF CIM, PMP, Power Management)
- Next Meeting Details

### **3. Minutes Taker**

Paul Tykodi

### **4. Accept August Plenary Minutes**

There was no objection to the previous Minutes.

### **5. Review PWG Patent Policy**

Lee reminded everyone of the PWG Patent Policy, and provided the following information:

- PWG standards may include the known use of essential patents and patent applications provided the PWG Chair receives assurance from the patent holder or applicant with respect to patents whose infringement is, or in the case of patent applications, potential future infringement the applicant asserts will be, unavoidable in a compliant implementation of either mandatory or optional portions of the standard. This assurance shall be provided without coercion. This assurance shall be either:
  - a) A general disclaimer to the effect that the patentee will not enforce any of its present or future patent(s) whose use would be required to implement either mandatory or optional portions of the proposed PWG standard against any person or entity complying with the standard; or
  - b) A statement that a license for such implementation will be made available without compensation or under reasonable rates, with reasonable terms and conditions that are demonstrably free of any unfair discrimination.
- The PWG is not in a position to give authoritative or comprehensive information about evidence, validity or scope of patents or similar rights, but it is desirable that any available information should be disclosed. Therefore, all PWG members shall, from the outset, draw PWG's attention to any relevant patents either their own or of other organizations including their Affiliates that are known to the PWG members or any of their Affiliates, although PWG is unable to verify the validity of any such information.

He also listed several inappropriate topics for the PWG WG meetings:

- Don't discuss the validity/essentiality of patents/patent claims
- Don't discuss the cost of specific patent use
- Don't discuss licensing terms or conditions
- Don't discuss product pricing, territorial restrictions, or market share
- Don't discuss ongoing litigation or threatened litigation

➔ Don't be silent if inappropriate topics are discussed

... do formally object.

### **6. 2009 Meeting Schedule**

The remaining meeting planned for 2009:

- Dec 8-10 Austin, TX [Dell]

**7. 2010 Meeting Schedule**

The schedule for next year’s meeting plan was presented:

- Feb 2-4        Scottsdale, AZ (MWAi)
- Apr 6-8        TBD
- Jun 8-10      Rochester, NY [Xerox] – tentative
- Aug 10-12    Bagsværd, Denmark [MPI Tech] – tentative
- Oct 18 week   Lexington, KY [Lexmark]
- Dec 7-9        TBD

It was noted that Sharp has expressed interest in hosting a meeting in Camas, WA either in April or—if the Denmark meeting does not occur—in August.

Hosts for the April and December meetings are still needed.

**8. 2009 Membership**

PWG membership includes a total of 23 paid companies:

	Signed	Paid		Signed	Paid
366 Software	x	x	MPI Tech	x	x
Apple Inc.	x	x	MWA Intelligence	x	x
Canon, Inc.	x	x	NEC Display Solutions	x	x
Coretronic		x	Northlake Software, Inc	x	x
Dell	x	x	Oki Data	x	x
Epson			Samsung Electronics	x	x
Fuji Xerox	x	x	Sharp Labs of America	x	x
Hewlett-Packard	x	x	Technical Interface Consulting	x	x
InfoPrint Solutions	x	x	Toshiba	x	x
Konica Minolta			Tykodi Consulting Services	x	x
Kyocera Corporation	x	x	Xerox Corporation	x	x
Lexmark International	x	x	Zoran Imaging Division	x	x
Microsoft	x	x			

**9. PWG Officers (September 2009 Elections)**

The new PWG Officers (as of September 1) were officially announced:

- Chair:            Lee Farrell, Canon
- Vice-Chair:    Nancy Chen, Oki Data
- Secretary:     Paul Tykodi, TCS

The new Officers’ terms will continue until August 31, 2011.

**10. Workflow Orchestration Interface – and MPSA**

Nancy Chen presented her slides. [See Plenary slides at [ftp://ftp.pwg.org/pub/pwg/general/Plenary/PWG-Plenary-October-2009-v1.0.pdf](http://ftp.pwg.org/pub/pwg/general/Plenary/PWG-Plenary-October-2009-v1.0.pdf) ]

She encouraged people to think about defining a standard Workflow Orchestration Interface – and whether companies are interested in supporting such an effort. She also proposed that the PWG maintain a liaison relationship with the MPSA (Managed Print Service Association.)

As background, she explained that MFDs must also be able to interface with the workflow orchestrators which drive automated collaboration and optimized execution of business processes / solutions.

She said that Many workflow standards exist today which cover common business workflow problems, but they have deficiencies:

- Might not solve the problems for solutions that require MFD web service job-specific information in the format required by the standard workflow languages and maybe APIs
- Might not support automated and bi-directional workflow orchestration for interfaces with MFDs

For this reason, she believes there is a need for defining a common set of MFD semantics and an interface standard for workflow orchestration.

She summarized the proposed objectives:

- Cover majority of MFD-related workflow problems for vendors and customers that are not solved by existing standards (at least 80%)
- If needed, collaborate with other related industry organizations such as
  - \* AIIM (Association for Information and Image Management)
  - \* OASIS (Organization for Advancement of Structured Information Standards)
  - \* MPSA (Managed Print Service Association)... for the following items:
  - \* Solution / process workflow requirements for MFDs
  - \* Other workflow orchestration technical /standard conformance – BPEL, WS-Coordination, BPML, XPDL, ...
- Develop MFD common semantics and interface standard for workflow orchestration

Nancy then provided some information on the MPSA (Managed Print Service Association), and her reasons to establish a liaison relationship with them:

- From device management perspective, if MPSA is to “set standards around MPS (Managed Print Service)”, some coordination between MPSA and PWG is desired
- It has been clarified by the President of MPSA that MPSA will not engage in any project overlapping other organization’s effort, and will refer PWG standards to its members/ user community
- MPSA does seem a good source for vendor-independent user information for PWG
- MPSA is in its early stage of formation. PWG should start to track its activities and form liaison relationship when necessary
- Collaborate with MPSA for collection of user information for PWG standard development
- Promote consistency with PWG standard in MPSA standard development, if there is any

She noted that the President of MPSA works at Oki Data, and she has contacted him about her interests. He seemed to indicate a willingness to consider a liaison relationship with the PWG.

Should the PWG establish a relationship with MPSA?

➔ The group agreed to “keep an eye” on the MPSA for future coordination. The PWG should understand whether the data they want instrumented is adequately represented in the MFD model. For the near-term future, Nancy and Bill will maintain an informal liaison with the MPSA. They will report on any interesting information they discover.

Nancy then suggested that the PWG should adopt, endorse, or develop a workflow interface standard—and proposed that a new Working Group should be started to do so.

It was generally felt that the PWG does not need to adopt or endorse a single MFD workflow interface. A few people indicated that we should not limit our support to only one, but we should prepare to be able to support them all—or at least the more popular ones.

Pete Zehler said that he went through a sample exercise of trying to do a workflow with the Copy Service. He felt that it was a good exercise, and did not see any major issues. He does, however, want to evaluate whether the MFD Semantic Model adequately supports such efforts, and workflow orchestration in general.

Ira suggested that the group could create a PWG informational document that describes how to integrate [workflow] with the MFD Services. This would not necessarily need to be a detailed binding specification.

Should the PWG start a new WG to develop the MFD workflow interface standard?

➔ No. The attendees generally felt that this would be inappropriate for the PWG.

## **11. ISO Print Ticket**

Ira McDonald provided some background on the surfacing of a possible activity within the ISO (JTC1 SC28) for the development of a Print Ticket. It is only a question that has been raised to attempt to determine the level of interest. It is in the \*very\* early stage.

The PWG Steering Committee has agreed that the PWG should consider writing a letter requesting a formal liaison with the ISO for technical relationship on imaging device standards.

## **12. PWG Working Group Status**

In the interests of time, the WG Status slides were only briefly reviewed, because the attendees were already aware of the information. Non-attendees can obtain the information at:

<ftp://ftp.pwg.org/pub/pwg/general/Plenary/PWG-Plenary-October-2009-v1.0.pdf>

### **12.1 Imaging Device Security (IDS)**

It was reported that the IDS group now has two new co-Chairs: Joe Murdock (Sharp) and Brian Smithson (Ricoh.)

Current Status highlights:

- HCD Assessments Attributes document was developed and it is in stable condition now  
<ftp://ftp.pwg.org/pub/pwg/ids/wd/wd-idsattributes10-20090623.pdf>

- HCD-NAP Binding Document under development  
<ftp://ftp.pwg.org/pub/pwg/ids/wd/wd-ids-napsoh10-20090917.pdf>
  - \* Target completion date of Q4 2009 (?)
- HCD-NEA Binding Document has been started  
<ftp://ftp.pwg.org/pub/pwg/ids/wd/wd-ids-map-nea-03.pdf>
  - \* Target completion date of Q1 2010 (?)
- Recent/ongoing discussions with assessment protocol designers (Microsoft/NEA) to finalize and endorse the IDS Binding documents
- There is an issue about how to deploy HCD NAP in practice: how can we get MS's SHV to recognize and apply HCD\_ATR?

Next Steps:

- Address final comments on attributes specification.
- Review and implement action items from the F2F Meeting with Microsoft NAP group - in Redmond 8/17/2009
- Finish NAP binding specification – (Q4 2009?)
- Develop NEA binding specification – (Q1 2010?)
- Seek approval/adoption w.r.t. assessment protocol vendors.
- Possible interop (?)
- Address deployment issues
  - \* How to securely populate and update SHVs with HCD attributes and base values from vendors?
  - \* Should we first target the MS SCCM SHV by defining HCD responses that do not require SHV changes?
- Address remediation issues.
  - \* Should remediation mechanisms be vendor-specific? Or HCD-industry specific? Or can it be solved in a general way?

## 12.2 Internet Printing Protocol (IPP)

Next Steps:

- IPP Production Printing Set 2
  - \* Revise Prototype Draft per review at October F2F
  - \* Prototype at Xerox (or elsewhere)
  - \* PWG Last Call in Q1 2010 (w/ IPP Version 2.0 2nd Ed)
- IPP Version 2.0 Second Edition
  - \* Initial draft in Q4 2009 – add IPP/2.2 (Prod Print)
  - \* Include all IETF and PWG IPP extension specs
  - \* PWG Last Call in Q1 2010 (w/ IPP Prod Print Set2)
- IPP 2.0/2.1/2.2 Interoperability Testing
  - \* Interoperability event in Q3/Q4 2010
- IPP Everywhere
  - \* BOF at PWG F2F in February 2010 (Mike Sweet)

### 12.3 MFD Semantic Model

Schema status:

- Copy Service is now included in schema
- A straw man version of Power has been added under SystemDescription

Services planned to be addressed after the current Services are complete (might change based on group consensus):

- FaxIn Service
- EmailIn Service
- EmailOut Service
- Transform Service

Next Steps:

- Work to complete the MFD specification.
- Delay PWG wide Last Call and Formal Vote until at least one service normatively dependent on this specification reaches Last Call status
- Resume FaxOut work using normative dependencies on MFD specification
- Continue development of Copy Service working draft

Pete Zehler noted that there are only a few active contributors in the MFD WG. He is having difficulty finding someone to volunteer as Editor for the remaining Service specifications.

### 12.4 Workgroup for Imaging Management Solutions (WIMS)

Bill Wagner provided the list of activities that were discussed in Tuesday's meeting, covering the following topics:

- CIM Classes and Printer Proxy
- Printer MIB and IEEE1284 Device ID "COMMAND SET" specification
- Image Power Management

Bill also identified some potential MIB activities for the future:

- Printer Port Monitor MIB
  - \* update spec
  - \* interoperability testing ?
  - \* advance PPM to PWG standard ?
- Identify Printer MIB Problems
  - \* MIB will be basis for future WS management. Therefore, MIB problems will delay development and/or restrict effectiveness of WS Imaging Management utilities
  - \* Users and Fleet Management Agencies both need to understand some of MIB implementation variations, and should have some place to voice the questions
- MFD MIB or MIB extensions?
  - \* Many attempts, of varying completeness, started in the past, especially MFD Alerts
  - \* MFD group is addressing service semantics; need to address management elements

Next Steps:

- Continue with the CIM effort, eventually to include the CIM Printer Profile

- Continue the Hardcopy Imaging Device Power Management Project, including the abstract specification of elements and the Hardcopy Imaging Device Power Management MIB
- Develop Hardcopy Imaging Device Power Management MIB
- Maintain and update existing set of Printer- and MFP-related specifications
- Attempt at increased contact with user community understand needs and identify real use cases

PWG Plenary adjourned.