Meeting was called to order at approximately 3:00pm ET September 10, 2012.

Attendees

Nancy Chen (Oki Data)
Justin Hutchings (Microsoft)
Smith Kennedy (HP)
Tim McCann (Konica Minolta)
Ira McDonald (High North)
Glen Petrie (Epson)
Paul Tykodi (TCS)
Larry Upthegrove (End User)
Bill Wagner (TIC)
Rick Yardumian (Canon)
Pete Zehler (Xerox)

Agenda Items

1. IP Policy and Minute Taker
   a. Policy accepted with Paul taking the minutes in Mike’s absence

2. Introduction of Smith Kennedy from HP
   a. Andrew Mitchell of HP called in at the beginning of the meeting to introduce his colleague Smith Kennedy. Smith will be participating in selected PWG meetings going forward.

3. Review Previous Minutes:
   a. The minutes were not reviewed.

4. Review Last Call Comments for the IPP Everywhere Specification

There were 153 comments received. One hundred twenty six (126) of the comments were resolved. It was requested that all members who posted comments, which were resolved, to please review the changes made and determine whether they were acceptable. If someone who posted a comment had questions about the resolution, they were asked to post their question(s) to the IPP mailing list for further discussion.

A significant portion of the meeting was focused on discussing the twenty seven (27) comments, which were rejected. Twenty (20) of the rejections were accepted and seven (7) were not. The seven rejections needing further effort, in order to be resolved, are listed below as new Action Items.

The twenty rejections accepted were as follows:
GP 2, 16, 32, 36, 57, 58, 63, 68, 74, 78, 79, 80, 86, 87, 89
JH 13
JT 4
WW 1, 7, 12
New Business

5. Review new IPP Everywhere comments from Glen Petrie posted to the IPP Mailing List shortly before the start of the meeting. Comments have been added as italicized text within the body of Glen’s original note.

From: ipp-bounces@pwg.org [mailto:ipp-bounces@pwg.org] On Behalf Of Petrie, Glen
Sent: Monday, September 10, 2012 12:15 PM
To: Michael Sweet; ipp@pwg.org
Subject: RE: [IPP] IPP Everywhere Review Draft

Michael,

Line 232: I don't believe that a Printer creates or manages a "Document". What seems to be described here is Job-Ticket and for an IPP's scenario; indeed the "printer" creates and manages a Job-Ticket that contains the description, processing and status information.

Summary of Meeting Discussion – Users typically create documents, which at times they may want to submit for print processing. If the environment used for submission is IPP Everywhere enabled, the definition of Document on line 232 is correct. The issue is that the IPP Everywhere Document definition effectively collides with a User's perception of a "document" when it is not being submitted for print processing.

Consensus of Discussion – most likely the comment will be REJECTED as the definition is correct. The issue of the perception of “document” outside of IPP Everywhere conflicting with the IPP Everywhere definition is potentially worth considering. Finding some further descriptive text to reduce the possibility of implementer’s being confused by the specific IPP Everywhere definition of Document (i.e. an Object) is probably a worthwhile goal.

Line 274: I still find the word "control" strange in this sentence. Would "manage" be a better word

Consensus of Discussion – the word “control” might not be the best choice for describing the Operator’s interaction with the device. This comment will most likely be RESOLVED.

Line 406 and 411 and 575: Is the word "enumeration" supposed to be the word "Enumeration" defined in the definition section?

Consensus of Discussion – The word should be Enumeration. This comment will be RESOLVED.

Line 587 and 602 (and may be others): Service here, I believe, does not correspond to the "Service" in the definition section; thus, should it be "service"

Consensus of Discussion – service (lowercase) is correct. The whole document needs to be searched to find instances where “Service” from the definition section should not be used. This comment will be RESOLVED.
Line 527: Since the words "with generic drivers" was not deleted; I content there needs to be a wording change. It is not a "generic driver". As it will always be, there is a device specific driver in the print-stream somewhere; mostly likely within a printer or virtual printer controller. Anyway, I believe the term "driver" should be replaced with something else.

Summary of Meeting Discussion – currently the group has a significant number of widely disparate views regarding what the term “generic drivers” actually means.

Ira mentioned that the IPP Everywhere specification needed to stay synchronized with the existing IPP Everywhere charter. Specifically OBJ-6 from the current charter which states “Design to allow the use of vendor-neutral generic print drivers (e.g., one per document format) by IPP Everywhere and IPP Multifunction clients.”

The group discussion confirmed that “generic print drivers” is not a reference to the generic print drivers developed by many device manufacturers, which are able to support multiple devices from the manufacturer’s portfolio of products.

There was also significant discussion about the entities, which might decide to create IPP Everywhere conforming drivers.

- Operating System Vendors
- Printer and MFP manufacturers
- Commercial Software Vendors

The discussion ended with some items left unresolved.
   a. Would using the title cased term Generic Drivers be helpful?
   b. If the answer to item a. was Yes, a new definition would need to be created.
   c. On line 645, the items currently delineated by commas should each be listed separately as design requirements

Line 656: Suggest: "IPP Everywhere aware Clients"

Consensus of Discussion – the wording did not need to be changed. The comment will most likely be REJECTED

Line 695 and the new section 4.2.3.3: Is the word "service" supposed to be "Service"

Consensus of Discussion – The whole document needs to be searched to find instances where “Service” from the definition section should and should not be used. This comment will be RESOLVED.
Line 714 to Line 721: I would like to suggest a table for like…

| Table X List of TXT Key/Value Pairs from Most Important to Least Important |
|---------------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| **Most Important**               | **For Access Info to Printer** | **For identify the Printer** | **For Capabilities and/or Printer Selection Criteria** | **For Legacy Printer Selection** |
| ---                               | "rp"             | "UUID"          | "Color"         | "Product"       |
| "txtvers"                        |                  | "DUUID"         | "Duplex"        | "usb_MFG"       |
| "priority"                       | "ty"             | "Copies"        | "usb_MDL"       |                  |
| "qtotal"                         | "Collate"        |                  | "usb_CMD"       |                  |
| "note"                           |                  | "PaperMax"      | "pdl"           |                  |
| "air"                            |                  | "PaperCustom"   |                 |                  |
| "TLS"                            |                  | "Bind"          |                 |                  |
| "adminurl"                       | "Punch"          | "Sort"          | "Staple"        |                  |

**Consensus of Discussion** – *The table is a good idea and should be accepted. This comment will be RESOLVED.*

Figure 1: Elsewhere (I did not check everywhere) you changed "IPP Everywhere Service" to "IPPEverywhere Service" but not in the Figure.

**Consensus of Discussion** – *The group understood why the change was made but the result seems confusing. Maybe we can find a different way to express the special case of needing to show we are defining a service. This comment will be RESOLVED.*

Line 1369 and 1384: why was the phrase "so-called" inserted?

**Consensus of Discussion** – *The phrase “so-called” needs to be removed and the actual name as mentioned in the relevant standard(s) “C0 Control Character Set” needs to be used in our document. This comment will be RESOLVED.*

Line 1439, 1446, 1456, 1462: The section reference values are missing.

**Consensus of Discussion** – *The section references are missing and need to be added. This comment will be RESOLVED.*

Glen

6. Discuss comments made by Nancy Chen, which referred to section 6.0

**Consensus of Discussion**

a. *IPP Everywhere is defining a functional subset of capabilities by referring to the IPP 2.x specifications. For this reason, there is no IPP Everywhere Printer (conformance item) defined by this specification. The term IPP Everywhere Printer needs to be replaced in all locations where it has been used in the document with alternative text.*
b. The text on lines 1324 through 1329 needs to be re-written for clarity. Minimally a formal reference to IPP 2nd Edition is needed in order to help explain the conformance values IPP/2.0 Printer, IPP/2.1 Printer, and IPP 2.2 Printer.

c. Each conformance item (link between a conformance requirement and an IPP/2.x Printer) should be represented in a separate sentence for clarity.

Open IPP Everywhere Last Call Comment Action Items

IPP Everywhere Last Call Comments needing further effort to be RESOLVED:

GP28: Section 3.2.2: The Client queries the printer, not the User. – The term User can refer to both a person or to Automata. We need to select a different term to refer to actions only undertaken by people (not Automata) in the use cases.

GP30: Section 3.2.2.x: “Jane” instead of “User”? – Same issue to be resolved as item GP28.

GP39: Section 3.2.2.4: “provides a preview” instead of “displays a preview”

REJECTED: We’re talking about the user interface, not the implementation details. – Because we are talking about a user interface for people, we need to resolve the same issue as GP28 and GP30.

GP70: Section 4.2.3.1: Expand “air” to “auth-info-required (air)” – air is a word with a standard definition. Where we are using the term as an abbreviation, the use of “air” in this entry needs further clarification.

GP95: Section 6.1: Change “Figures 2 through 5” to “Figures 2 through Figure 5”? – change to read "Figure 2 through Figure 5"

GP106: Section 12: Expand IANA

GP107: Section 13.1: Expand ISO – Ira explained there is a new best practice he learned about when working on the IPP over HTTPS Transport Binding and ‘ipps’ URI Scheme draft. The IETF is now asking authors to place the expanded information and URL reference in an Informative Appendix. Ira will provide further guidance to Mike on these two items.
Next Steps/Open Actions

• Next conference call is September 24th at 3pm ET
• Discuss priorities for future work
• Discuss possible PWG Certification of IPP Everywhere
• Action: Ira to change informative reference to IPP Everywhere in IPPS URI Scheme to point to the IPP WG instead (PENDING)
• Action: Ira/Bill to submit technical errata to RFC 3805 to replace CR with CR + LF to be consistent with 5198 and others (PENDING)
• Action: Ira/Mike to contact IETF ADs to get IPPS URI schema RFC pushed through (PENDING)
• Action: Mike to change document template to use static date in header (ONGOING - pending upload to ftp server)
• Action: Ira to check syntax for multi-valued strings and length limits in LDAP Printer schema (ONGOING)
• Action: Ira and Mike to review 5100.x specs to remove action items, fix boilerplate copyright text in early specs, fix header/footer/document titles as needed, and fix normative references to drafts, etc. (ONGOING)
• Action: Ira and Mike to work with IANA to update registry to include a "set allowed" column for attributes and improve the plain text formatting (ONGOING)
• Action: Mike and Paul to reach out to label/portable printer vendors to join IPP WG discussions (ONGOING - Paul to send out before next concall)