

# Teleconference Minutes

## Printer MIB Extension for MFP Devices

### August 10, 2006

Ron Bergman - Chairman Printer MIBs Working Group

### Attendees:

|                |         |
|----------------|---------|
| Ron Bergman    | Ricoh   |
| Walt Filbrich  | Samsung |
| Thomas Silver  | Xerox   |
| Jerry Thrasher | Lexmark |
| Pete Zehler    | Xerox   |

### Agenda:

**1. Review and approval of the July 13 Meeting minutes.**

[ftp://ftp.pwg.org/pub/pwg/pmp/minutes/mfp/MFP\\_Minutes\\_20060713.pdf](ftp://ftp.pwg.org/pub/pwg/pmp/minutes/mfp/MFP_Minutes_20060713.pdf)

**2. Call for volunteers to prototype.**

**3. Review of the latest changes to the Printer MIB Alert Table Groups Extension Specification.**

<ftp://ftp.pwg.org/pub/pwg/pmp/wd/wd-mfp-alert-groups10-20060720-rev.pdf>

**4. Review of Ira's Imaging System MIB.**

<ftp://ftp.pwg.org/pub/pwg/pmp/wd/wd-pmpimagingmib10-20060418.mib>

### Discussion:

**1. July 13 Meeting Minutes**

The minutes were approved as presented.

**2. Call for volunteers to prototype**

To meet the PWG requirement for the publication of candidate standard, there must be at least two independently developed implementation based upon the document. To date there are no commitments to prototype the MFP Alert Groups. If no companies are planning to support this feature, should any further efforts be expended for its completion?

Thomas Silver indicated that he will attempt to find a group within Xerox willing to implement. However, he was unsure of the requirements for an implementation. Ron stated that the implementation only needed to be a prototype and no interoperability testing (such as a bake-off) would be necessary. The purpose of the implementation was only to verify the accuracy and completion of the specification.

So at this time there are only two potential (Xerox and Kyocera) prototype implementations.

It was also noted that the specification did not provide a new protocol, but was only a new set of Printer MIB enumerations with guidelines for their use. There is a possibility that the PWG Steering Committee could accept the document for publication prior to the completion of any prototypes.

### **3. MFP Alert Groups Specification**

The changes incorporated in the document since the last teleconference were reviewed.

The following changes were discussed and agreed for the next version:

- In section 3.3b, Change “New alert groups are to be defined for...” to “New alert groups are only to be defined for...”.
- In Section 3.3c, Add a reference to section 7, “Recommended Indexing Method”

Tom Silver would also like to include an additional use model for Windows functions and volunteered to provide.

### **4. Imaging System MIB**

Ron indicated that this MIB is very different from the Printer and Finisher MIB and wanted to determine if a job centric approach or the current hardware orientation is desired. Both Peter and Thomas expressed a desire for a mechanism to expose services and believed the Imaging MIB was the correct approach. There were no opposing opinions.

Thomas indicated he had reviewed the Imaging MIB and had some desired changes. He will send the proposed changes to the list.

## **Next Teleconference:**

The next teleconference is scheduled to be held two weeks following this conference.

i.e. August 24, 2006 at 11:00 AM EDT (8:00 AM PDT)