

# **Semantic Model Workgroup Meeting Minutes**

## **August 12, 2015**

Meeting was called to order at 9:00am PT August 12, 2015.

### **1) Administrivia and Introduction**

- a) Slides: [http://ftp.pwg.org/pub/pwg/sm3/slides/Semantic-Model-Aug\\_15-meeting.pdf](http://ftp.pwg.org/pub/pwg/sm3/slides/Semantic-Model-Aug_15-meeting.pdf)
- b) Introduction intended as brief statement of Semantic Model WG origin and statement of current situation. There was no discussion.
- c) Attendees
  - Russell Brudnicki (Kyocera Document Solutions)
  - Paul Henerlau (Sharp)
  - Daniel Manchala (Xerox)
  - Ira McDonald (High North)
  - Joe Murdock (Sharp)
  - Mike Sweet (Apple)
  - Paul Tykodi (TCS)
  - William Wagner (TIC)
  - Rick Yardumian (Canon)

### **2) Status of Current Projects**

- a) Schema: it was suggested that periodic review of the schema for additions and corrections be a regular part of workgroup efforts.
- b) JDF Mapping:
  - i) acknowledgement to Rainer in JDF mapping specification
  - ii) mapping is quite complete with few areas of no correspondence to PJT
  - iii) mapping prototype could be sponsored by PWG if member company does not volunteer
- c) There were no comments on presented status of other projects

### **3) Role of the SM Workgroup**

- a) Ira commented on now inappropriate personal phraseology in initial charter, but agreed it was a valid role description at the time.
- b) Extensive discussion of “evolution” diagram
  - i) Desirability to update diagram with additions and updates including influence on WiFi Direct, Mopria, MSPS, Bluetooth, CSS Print Standard, etc.
  - ii) Check with Pete on form evolution slide to allow update (**Action item: Daniel**)

- iii) Novell: discussions suggest that they continue to maintain print service based on Semantic Model.
  - iv) Likely that organizations that based their service on the model tend to modify it on their own without reference to current form of model.
  - v) Question whether semantic model should reflect model changes and additions implemented by others or just those in IPP. Later suggested that PWG additions and modification should be addressed but not those of other organizations. However, it appears that IPP is the only other active workgroup in the PWG,
  - vi) Suggestion that SM WG should monitor and comment on deviations in derivatives of model to the extent that members are aware of these. This was not accepted by Ira.
- c) In response to questions posed on slide:
- i) How do we get consensus within the PWG as a whole on the current mission of the PWG.
    - (1) Out of scope for SM WG
    - (2) Use procedure in Process document to establish workgroups, charters, projects.
  - ii) How do we get consensus on the role of the Semantic Model WG in addressing this mission?
    - (1) Use procedure in Process document to establish charters, projects.
  - iii) How to we get and maintain the degree of member participation necessary to satisfy this mission?
    - (1) Use procedure in Charter Process to establish projects.

#### **4) Consideration of SM Projects**

- a) Schema and WSDL (opinions, not necessarily conclusions)
  - i) Representation of IPP model in schema is useful in interchange with other technologies but not useful for implementing since details are lost.
  - ii) Schema should be maintained and reflect IPP (or PWG) changes and additions. (What should be done with elements of current schema that go beyond what is in IPP?)
  - iii) Lack of interest in updating model because model as it exists is perceived to be sufficient
  - iv) WSDL is not necessary since web services binding will not be implemented; but question as to whether WSDL is necessary to define SM operations, in which case it should be retained and maintained.
  - v) If WSDL is used, it should be WSDL 2.0
  - vi) Suggestion of alternative representation should refer to *RELAX NG* (REgular LAnguage for XML Next Generation) schema versus XML schema, not RDF.
  - vii) Consideration of whether a named version of schema can be normative. That is, can a normative version of the semantic model exist without a written specification subjected to PWG voting? Ira suggested that it could be, analogous to MIBs. Michael feels that XML schema would not be sufficiently reviewable to be voted on. This brings up interesting point: if the normative document is a specification, must that specification include all of the

information in the schema which is to be standardized or is a reference to the schema in the specification sufficient?

viii) It was suggested that, if the schema is to be maintained, present content derived from non-pwg specification should be removed. Specific reference was made to information obtained from WS Print.

b) SM3 Specifications

i) Michael-opines that SM 3 specification is not necessary  
ii) No one presents strong argument for SM3 specification, but it is left that SM WG can propose SM3 spec(s) project (or any other project) following the Charter Process.

## 5) Next Steps

- a) Current SM WG charter will be withdrawn and replaced with a charter:
  - i) Scoping the role of the Semantic Model Workgroup
  - ii) Defining the maintenance of the Semantic Model Schema (including a modeling of operations) as the primary project
  - iii) Identifying the JDF mapping document as an ongoing project
  - iv) No other specifications or projects will be included. The may be added later in accord with the current Charter Process.
- b) Paul Tykodi will have a first draft of this revised charter posted for constitution at the next SM conference call
- c) Details about the SM Schema will be worked out by the SM WG and will be ready before the next face-to-face meeting. These details include:
  - i) Responsibility and staffing for the schema project. It was suggested that the workgroup could propose that the PWG retain a professional to handle the details of maintenance and update.
  - ii) Scope of project (e.g., will non IPP material be included? Will such material that is included be removed?)
  - iii) Schedule.
  - iv) Use of an alternate schema language may be considered, although consensus at meeting was that this would best be a future action.
- d) This charter will be voted on by the PWG voting membership, subject to the same requirements as any new charter. The charter draft defining responsibility and scope plus the current schema will be presented in lieu of the white paper. The objective is to present the charter for vote by the November face-to-face meeting.
- e) Next SM WG conference call will be on August 24 at 3 PM ET.

## **6) Action Items**

- a) Daniel will ask Peter Z. for editable copy of the “Evolution” document, with intent of updating it.
- b) Paul T. will have initial draft of new charter posted before August 24 conference call.

Bill Wagner, 13 August 2015.