

## IPPV2 Conference Call Minutes: May 12, 2008

### Attendees:

Attendee	Company
Ron Bergman	Ricoh
Lee Farrell	Canon
Harry Lewis	InfoPrint Solutions
Ira McDonald	High North
Glen Petrie	Epson
Ted Tronson	Novell
Paul Tykodi	Tykodi Consulting
Mike Sweet	Apple (CUPS)
Bill Wagner	TCI
Pete Zehler	Xerox

### Discussion:

1. Mike provided comments regarding the statement from the May 1<sup>st</sup> minutes.

"Why would CUPS make all IPP operations in v2.0 'not necessary'? Could this be because they are 'not necessary' for an IPPv1.1 compliant implementation."

Mike responded that because we have essentially agreed that a 2.0 device is a Simple Workgroup Printer, these operations are not feasible to implement in this class of printer with limited memory and CPU and generally no disk space.

Ira responded that he would like to see the 'print-uri' and 'send-uri' operations included as required in 2.0. After a brief discussion, it was agreed that these should remain optional at the 2.0 level.

2. Review of the action items: None completed. Open items are:

Ron – Add a list of the current 1.1 mandatory operations as part 1 of the list of current optional operations in the proposed 2.X groups.

Ron – Retitle the current optional operations list (by the proposed 2.X groups) to reflect the associated printer class and also reflect the purpose of the list is to determine which of the current optional operations should be reclassified as required.

The current groups and the associated printer class are:

- IPPV2.0 - Simple Workgroup Printer
- IPPV2.1 - Enterprise Printer
- IPPV2.2 - Production Printer

3. Issue with the Collection Attribute Syntax.

It was noted by both Ira and Mike that the Collection Attribute Syntax was not gracefully ignored, when not supported, by many printer implementations. This is clearly a violation of the current IPP specifications. It was then suggested that conformance to any of the proposed 2.X versions should mandate that this portion of the current IPP specifications be required.

A key feature of IPPv2 over IPPv1.1 should be "robustness".

#### 4. Move Document Object to 2.1.

This suggestion was made by Ira(?). It was noted that this is the major difference between v2.1 and v2.2. It was also noted that Windows drivers, which would be the most common client at the enterprise level, do not support for a document object. Xerox printers do provide this support using a special Windows driver that sends the individual documents, one at a time, through the Windows system. It was agreed to keep the document object only at the v2.2 level.

#### 5. Supported Versions.

Mike indicated that one of the weaknesses of current IPP implementations is the procedure used when the IPP version in the request does not match the supported version of the printer. In this case the application must close the current IPP session and then open a new session with a lower IPP version number.

Mike proposed a procedure where the printer would return the versions supported and the host could then continue the session at a lower support level. Before responding, the printer would first examine the requested operation and attributes to determine if the request could be properly completed.

No negative remarks or concerns were voiced regarding this suggestion.

Next teleconference will be at 4 PM EDT (1 PM PDT) on June 2.