PWG Sematic Model
Conference Call Minutes
April 5, 2007

Participants:

Bill Wagner	TIC
Craig Whittle	Sharp
Harry Lewis	IBM
Ira McDonald	High North
Jerry Thrasher	Lexmark
Kei Sando	Okidata
Lee, Farrell	Canon
Nancy Chen	Okidata
Pete Zehler	Xerox
Takeshi Nakamura	Kyocera Mita
Walt Filbrich	Samsung

Results of Semantic Model interest Poll:

16 companies responded to the poll. (1 decision still pending) There was no response from Microsoft or Apple although I did not follow up with them for a response. The follow ups were targeted at manufacturers of multifunction devices. The results indicate that there is sufficient interest in continuing. The results of the poll is as follows:

Our company has no interest in supporting this effort
(HP)

Our company feels this is a worthwhile effort but is unable to provide any support
(Bitstream)

Our company feels this is a worthwhile effort but would like to monitor progress (i.e. attend some of the phone conferences, monitor mailing list)
(Canon, Epson, Fuji Xerox, Konica/Minolta, Kyocera, Shaw, IBM*)

Our company feels this is a worthwhile effort and can participate (i.e. attend phone conferences, review and comment on specification, take on limited Action Items per your consent)
(Brother, Sharp, Okidata*)

Our company feels this is a worthwhile effort and can serve as an editor of a Service specification
(Lexmark, *anonymous*, Xerox)

Outstanding: Ricoh

* indicates possibility of operating at next highest level

General Discussion

One side benefit of the poll was a renewed enthusiasm for this working group. The teleconference attendance was improved and the contributions by all were considerably increased.

Some of the conversation focused on what is the basic objective for this group moving forward? We are pursuing a good model for MFDs, of course, but to what end? Do we have a clear vision?

- The PWG is an open forum to drive towards industry agreement on the model.
- The benefit to participating companies is the ability to implement semantics for MFDs once in their products and map to various protocols (Microsoft WSD, Linux IPP etc.).
- A complete model/protocol solution requires buy-in and support from OS vendors.
- We should strive to develop a starting position in PWG to use to influence Microsoft as they extend WSD into MFD.
- A roadmap sketch may help some people justify participation. The entire MFD model is too big to bite off. We need to pick one service and model that service and its associated information (e.g. Job, Document).

Some of the conversation focused on Microsoft and WSD

- WS-Print and WS-Scan are private docs right now.
- If the PWG creates a WS-FAX protocol, we probably do not have the ability to reuse the print and scan elements directly from the Microsoft namespace.
- We have limited ability to extend existing Microsoft WS-Print/WS-Scan semantics.
    - Extending operations, (hold-job, release-job) are invisible to Windows. WSDL definition is fairly static and is not normally dynamically discovered.
    - Extending a property (e.g. JobAccountingId) can be made visible because the schema have extension points

Some of the conversation focused on DMTF and CIM

- Does it make sense to work into DMTF as a WS* spec?
    - The DMTF would urge management of the service so extensions to the CIM core model would have to fall out simultaneously.
    - The DMTF will only standardize on CIM-XML
    - Capabilities & settings are linked to all classes in CIM. This would be how processing and some description elements would need to be implemented.
    - The PWG Model relies almost entirely on simple containment to represent relationships between elements
    - At this time we have no plans to re-architect the PWG Model to a CIM Class based model
- Start with an abstract model in xml and provide a CIM mapping for management and specific protocol mapping for job submission.
- CIM mapping is required for WS-Management and/or WSDM.
- WSDM and WS-Management are anticipated to converge mid 2008.
- A CIM model mapping will be needed for generic management

Some of the conversation focused on semantic and protocol mappings

- We consider the PWG SM to be a reasonable conceptual model for services offered by multifunction devices
- The PWG SM can be used as source for MFD semantics in IPP, WSD or MOF mappings
- A PWG web service for faxing could be beneficial or the IPP protocol could be extended. This is also true of the other services defined in the PWG SM. (IPP has support in Apple and Linux).
- We can prototype a simple web-service to insure agreement across all MFD manufactures and to demonstrate that the semantics are easily mapped to internal models.
- PWG SM provides domain specific administrative operations (e.g. HoldJob, PauseService)
- Focuses on job submission and job/queue management (i.e. administrative) operations
- More manpower on Printer device mapping to CIM is needed
- Service modeling in MOF will require further resources down the road. We need to first reach agreement on the abstract definitions in the PWG SM.

Next Steps/Action Items

We will need teleconferences on April 12 and 19 to drive towards consensus and closure.
Next week…

- More discussion on goals and roadmap.

We will need to determine how the SM session of the Face to Face will be used.
F2Fpossibilities include

- Work out next phase of the SM.
- Plan details of a high-level description (human consumable) of a particular service and surrounding semantics.
    - Get editors assigned etc.
- Discuss tool limitations and current schemas
    - Code generation tools not compatible with our sophisticated class hierarchy
    - Relative schema approach