

PWG Port Monitor MIB

Post Prototype Test Meeting Minutes

July 15, 2005

Cupertino

Harry Lewis
07/19/2005

Attendees

Paul Danbold	Apple
Lee Farrell	Canon
Harry Lewis*	IBM
Yasuji Takeuchi	Konica Minolta
Jerry Thrasher	Lexmark
Mike Fenelon	Microsoft
Ron Bergman	Ricoh
George Liu	Ricoh
Senthil Selvaraj	Ricoh
Craig Whittle	Sharp
Joe Murdock	Sharp
Ira McDonald*	High North
Stuart Rowley	Kyocera

* Phone

Port Mon MIB Discussion

This meeting was held Friday, July 15, 2005 following an evening of prototype testing the previous Thursday.

See <ftp://ftp.pwg.org/pub/pwg/pmp/interop/PortMonMIB-Proto-Results.zip> for a summary of the prototype test results.

One of the key findings at the prototype test had to do with how the MIB represents external or physical ports (like on a ENA) vs a Network or logical port (like you see with 515 LPR, 9100 Raw etc). How can the OS distinguish a

ENA with multiple (ex. LPR) ports such that each physical port has a known preferred port? We also discussed the multihomed INA. It was finally agreed that multihomed devices are out of scope since, in practice, they most likely appear to the management application as one interface.

Alternatives were discussed such as using a Preferred Port Index or hrDeviceIndex to describe which transports are associated with which physical ports.

A final decision was made to create 2 tables, one for Physical ("[ppmPrinterTable](#)") and one for Logical ports. Every Physical port can have 1 to n associated logical ports. The Logical port table is basically what was defined, already, during the test.

Vendors are cautioned to only expose the number of ports they want to be visible at time of installation with OS. It may be helpful to have some examples from major OS implementations to guide the implementer in knowing what results they will achieve in the OS install GUI.

Observed: ppmPortLprByteCountEnabled is duplicated for non-LPR port types.
Consensus: live with unnecessary duplication.

Other Discussion

It was decided not to have a press release at this time regarding the prototype testing.

It was agreed that, while this test activity was very valuable, that the major issues have been discovered and handled and there will be no need for a follow-on f2f prototype test. Follow-on testing can be achieved by vendors making their implementations accessible via the Internet and/or they can work directly with Microsoft and Apple, from this point. Note, this is sufficient to take the Port Mon MIB to Candidate Standard but, per our Process, a full interop test will be required to move to PWG Standard.

Actions

Ira McDonald will post updated ASN.1 (completed at this writing).

Vendors to supply examples of ppmPortDescription since test implementations varied considerably

-

Next Conference Call

A conference call will be scheduled following posting of the ASN.1. Time and date are T.B.D.