Minutes of IPPFax Working Group Meeting

March 7, 2001

1. Meeting Attendees

Toru Maeda	Canon
Lee Farrell	Canon Information Systems
Don Wright (PWG Chair)	Lexmark
John Pulera	Minolta
Koichi "Hurry" Izuhara	Minolta
Mabry Dozier	Minolta QMS
Gail Songer	Netreon

2. Administrivia

Paul Moore could not attend the meeting, so Don Wright led the session.

There had been no established agenda—other than to discuss the latest document drafts.

3. Action Items

The group started by reviewing the action items from the previous meeting:

- Peter Zehler will investigate if anyone within Xerox might be available to propose an alternative to using CONNEG.
  - ➔ Peter has responded via e-mail, essentially saying no.
- Harry Lewis will investigate JDF to determine if it is a possible alternative to CONNEG.
  - ➔ Harry has indicated that JDF is not a reasonable alternative to CONNEG.
- Paul Moore will specify an XML-based encoding of a CONNEG grammar.
  - ➔ Don Wright reported that he suggested to Paul that XPath and XSL filters might be a possible XML method to determine capabilities. Paul has not yet made any comment to the group regarding this suggestion.
- John Pulera will generate a draft document to serve as an "IPP Fax equivalent of RFC 2301."
  - ➔ John reviewed his e-mail response on this topic.

After reviewing John's response, the group decided that original text should be added to the UIF document to serve the equivalent function of RFC 2301.

ACTION: John Pulera will propose new text ["augmented TIFF-FX"] to add to the UIF document.

4. IPP Fax Protocol

Gail Songer led a review of the IPP Fax protocol document. She explained that because there were so many changes from the previous draft, the revision marks were all deleted.

The group did a page-by-page review of the document. Gail recorded several (minor) text editing corrections and/or clarifications that will be included in the next revision.

Don noted that Line 103 has no text, but contains an empty bullet. Why?

Don also noted that the document has the formal attribute definitions listed in a common section. He wondered if the IPP document method of having these definitions occur at the point of initial reference would be more useful. At the least, it would be better to include the data type at that point of reference. The group agreed, and also agreed to replace the current definition section with a summary table.

In Section 6.3 Job Submission, the current text no longer specifies the behavior of the receiver. Although this was noted, it seemed acceptable to the group. Text was added to clarify that the print-job operation MUST include the 'ipp-fax-sender-identity' operation attribute.

While reviewing Section 10.3 ippfax-sending-user-certificate, the following questions were raised:
- Where are certificates defined—RFC 2246?
- Is there only one type of certificate? If so, specify which we will use? (X509V3 seems to be the standard.)

The following documents should be added to the References section:
- ipp-get
- url scheme
- X509V3

5. <u>TIFF-F Use by IPP – aka Universal Image Format (UIF)</u>

Gail led the document review.

Should the title of this document be changed? Suggestion: "TIFF-UIF"? Should the "TIFF-F" in the title change to "TIFF-FX"?

It was noted that there are still several "notes to the editor" in the latest draft—including the Issues and Actions sections. These need to be addressed.

Should 'UIF-scale' be an enum instead of a Boolean? Should values of "shrink/scale," "truncate," and "flow to next page" alternatives be supported? Don suggested that truncation should not be allowed at all, and that any "extra data" should always be printed—either scaled to fit, or on subsequent pages. What about pathological cases where the sent data is *extremely* wide? Could this present buffer limitation problems? Is this a valid concern?

It was agreed that the specification should not allow truncation—unless there is sufficient objection in the future.

There were no other significant comments.

6. <u>Other Issues</u>

What happens if a sender sends something (i.e. a data format) that the receiver cannot support? What should the receiver do? What is the specified behavior? Other than indicating job failure, is there more information that should be supplied?

It was agreed that the information available in the ipp-get specification is sufficient as currently defined.

Maeda-san said that it would be good for the receiver to know which pages were [or were not] printed successfully—especially if the entire job was not a success. The group agreed to mandate support for the Job Progress notification events in IPP Fax.

IPP Fax meeting adjourned.