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Craig Whittle - PWG WIMS/CIM Co-chair

Meeting was called to order at approximately 11 a.m. EDT July 20, 2006 by Ron Bergman.

Attendees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ron Bergman</th>
<th>Ricoh</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ira McDonald</td>
<td>High North</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craig Whittle</td>
<td>Sharp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harry Lewis</td>
<td>IBM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lee Farrell</td>
<td>Canon</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

General Discussion

- There are few IPP implementations of collections. These do not interoperate.

- Proposal: Abandon Ira’s proposals #3 (collections) #4 (first-class objects) and discuss pro’s and con’s of proposal #1 (single string) or proposal #2 (new attributes).
  
  o CONSENSUS: OK to abandon for now. Harry to check with Carl Mansfield to see if he has any input

  o Any new objects created (proposal #2) would complement, not contradict the existing attribute and values.

- If we were to only use existing attributes (printer-state-reasons). We would lose prtAlertDescription [needs to be localized].
  
  o Harry suggested creating a registry of “loc codes” within the PWG. This would not include registering “loc’s” for legacy devices.

- Does the PWG take over the registry process? This would allow more flexibility for vendors while under the control of the PWG. This might be too constraining for vendors.
The current IPP values registered with IANA do not have suffixes (registration of all combinations would be unruly)
  o Suffixes should be handled in specification as they are now.

**Next Steps / Open Actions:**

- Ira to look into expanding a description of proposals #1, #2 and possibly adding another proposal for adding suffices to printer-state-reasons
- Next teleconference schedule for August 3rd at 11 a.m. EDT