Cloud Imaging WG Conference Call Minutes

The scheduled Cloud WG conference call commenced at 3PM EDT on 18 February, 2013

Attendees

The following members called in:

> Daniel Manchala (Xerox)
> Carl Mikkelsen (Conexant)
> Glen Petrie (Epson)
> Norbert Shade
> Larry Upthegrove (End User)
> Bill Wagner (TIC)
> Rick Yardumian (Canon)

Introduction and Administrative Issues

1. IP Policy: Policy accepted
2. Minute Taker : Since the secretary was not attending, Bill Wagner agreed to take minutes
3. Minutes Review: Approved last face to face meeting minutes without comment..
   ftp://ftp.pwg.org/pub/pwg/cloud/minutes/cloud-f2f-minutes-20130206.pdf
4. Webex facility: although a Webex link had been provided, no one knew the originator login code so the meeting continued without Webex

Action Items Review

1. Action: Larry to do additional sequence diagrams and changes in section 4 of the model(Pending)
2. Action: Bill to generate an initial list of Cloud Print Service operations for section 4.4 (Pending)
3. Action: Glen to find out if he can spend time making a proper subset of PWG PJT for GCP/CDD (DONE)
4. Action: Mike to send email to Pete requesting copy of JSON files for PWG PJT (pending)
5. Action: Mike to provide updated text for Cloud Model introduction (pending)

Consider Glen's Support Level contribution

1. Glen posted at ftp://ftp.pwg.org/pub/pwg/cloud/white/pwg.pjt.level.config.for.PWG.h a tabular listing of the elements and element values in the PWG Print Job Ticket and Associated Capabilities Version 1.0 standard, grouping them into three sets
2. The sets represent three levels of the PWG Job Ticket and Printer Capabilities complexity, intended for:
   a. Very Low end- Minimal SOHO
   b. Enterprise
   c. Full Featured Production (full set as identified in the PWG Print Job Ticket and Associated Capabilities Version 1.0)
3. This tabulation is in the form of an 'include' file, but can be read as a text file using MS Word
4. The elements and element values are annotated to indicate the suggested support level and, for some elements, the assumed value (D) when multiple values are not supported.
5. Following the email discussions between Glen and Pete, it is to be understood that, with a few

exceptions, most elements and element values are optional both for capabilities and job ticket. However, these sets are to represent PWG consensus on suggested support levels for Cloud Print Services in reporting Printer Capabilities to Print Clients. The Cloud Print Clients may then expose some or all of these capabilities to the User and, based on the User response will generate a Print Job Request using some or all of these elements and values.

6. It was agreed that:
    a. the current tabular form (perhaps better in an MS Word format) is optimum for evaluation by the PWG membership
    b. a reorganization into three separate tables, one for each level, might be more suitable for presentation to Google and other potential Cloud Print Service and Client providers.
    c. these tables, with explanations, will be in a white paper for distribution, not a formal specification or Best Practices document.

Consideration of Google Specifications

1. Attention was drawn to the Cloud Device Local Discovery/API protocol specification referred to in Mike Sweet's recent email. It appears that Kelly's original email may not have made it to the email list.
2. Members indicated that, although they were aware the specification had been posted on the FTP site, most had not had a chance to read it.
3. Larry indicated that the specification was for local discovery as a prelude to registering a device on the Cloud, and that he felt the approach allowed a device to be registered only once, which was undesirable.
4. It was clear that members needed to review this specification and post their comments on the email list.
5. With respect to the GCP Device Capability Subsystem specification, the group agreed to continue with the approach selected at the February face-to-face meeting. This approach included submitting the PWG Job ticket and the suggested element/values subsets to Google both as an alternate to the PPD and XPS formats and as a guide to what Google should include in its Capabilities structures.

Consider Larry's Draft for Imaging Model

1. Larry had posted a lashup of a general Imaging Model Requirements and Model document at
   . ftp://ftp.pwg.org/pub/pwg/cloud/white/wd-cloudimagingmodel10-20130206.docx
2. Larry explained that his idea was to avoid creating a single all-inclusive Imaging document covering all services by having a general Model document and smaller service specific documents. However, Larry did not agree that he intended this approach to be analogous to that used for the MFD Semantic Model, apparently feeling that the general document would not be of the magnitude of the overall MFD Common Semantics and Model.
3. It was suggested that it was important that at least the Cloud Print portion be completed quickly and that it would be undesirable to take an approach that delayed this effort.
4. However. no conclusion was reached on the approach or how it would affect current activities. This remains an item to be discussed further.

Cloud Printing Model Requirements and Model

Larry had not yet posted new sequence diagrams and Bill had not yet posted the updates to the Use Cases or the list of 'standard' operations applicable to the Client/Cloud Print Manager interface. However, there were some questions:

1. In Print-by-reference, should the Client use a Validate Job Ticket operation to ascertain whether the Cloud Print Service (or some component down stream) be able to access a referenced document? It was suggested that this was unnecessary. If the Cloud Print Service indicated that it had Print-by-reference capability (an element yet to be added), then the Print Job Request should be issued and an error returned if the document could not be accessed.
2. In the Print-by-reference discussion, it became apparent that there was the general issue of the Cloud Print Service (or some component downstream) being able to "see" the document and the more complicated issue of the User somehow transferring its security-based access rights to the Cloud Print Server to allow the CPS to access the document for printing. This would be done via a token of some sort. This latter case, which could include things ranging from FTP site access passwords to personal account logins to PDF access passwrods, appears fraught with security issues and it is unclear to what extent it must be addressed in the model.
3. In considering the Client-Cloud Print Service operations, it was unclear that all of the standard operations should be made available. This needs to be discussed.

Next Steps and Action Items

1. Next conference call is March 4 at 3pm EST
2. Action: Bill to Update Section 3 of the Requirements and Model Document with the new Use Cases
3. Action: Larry to do additional sequence diagrams and changes in section 4 of the model
4. Action: Bill to generate an initial list of Cloud Print Service operations for section 4.4
5. Action: Glen to provide Elements/Values tabulations in MS Word form
6. Action: Mike to send email to Pete requesting copy of JSON files for PWG PJT
7. Action: Mike to provide updated text for Cloud Model introduction
8. Action: WG to Review and Comment on:
   a. Glen's Job Ticket element/values levels
   b. Google's GCP Device Capability Subsystem specification
   c. Google's Cloud Device Local Discovery/API protocol specification
   d. Approach to and priority of working on Print Service vs Imaging Service Requirements and Model Documents

Submitted by Bill Wagner, Cloud Imaging WG vice-chair, February 18, 2013