1   Subj: Minutes of IPP Telecon, Oct 14, 1998
2   From: Tom Hastings
3   Date: 10/14/1998
4   File: ipp-telecon-981014.doc

5   Attendees: Ron Bergman, Maulik Desai, Tom Hastings, Bob Herriot, Swen Johnson,
6   Carl Kugler, Harry Lewis, Ira McDonald, Hugo Parra, Pete Zehler

1   Test Suites

8   Hugo Parra and Bob Herriot reported that there are some problems with the Xerox Test
9   Suite V2 versus V3 with the bo26-27 and bo29 scripts.   The V2 version may work better
10 for those scripts than V3. However, V2 doesn't work well for Windows 95, because you
11 can't display output and put it to the log as the same time.

12 ACTION ITEM (Swen): Confir with Hugo and Bob on fixing these problems.

2   Interoperability Test results

14 Peter is nearly 80% complete on compiling the results of the interoperability tests. The
15 p7 printer vendor did not supply Peter with any results. He has sent e-mail several times.
16 The p3, p5, p11, and p15 vendors have not supplied Peter with the summaries requested
17 in the Test Plan. He will produce the results by the end of this week whether he gets the
18 missing data from these vendors or not.

3   IFAX and IPP compatibility

20 Ron Bergman reviewed the results of Richard Shockley's document examining the
21 suitability of using IPP for IFAX.

22 ACTION ITEM (Ron): Request that Don setup a new mailing list on the PWG server for
23 the IFAX and IPP discussion and invite the IFAX folks to join the discussion. The name
24 will be "ifx", following our convention of three letter names for mailing lists.

25 Ron clarified that what IFAX means by re-direction is quite different from what HTTP
26 means by re-direction. For IFAX re-direction means either (1) that the phone number can
27 be included in the URL explicitly, or (2) that a URL can represent a phone number or a
28 set of phone numbers implicitly. In either case the IPP Printer object would dial the
29 appropriate phone numbers to make the connection, after receiving the print job.

30 IFAX needs access to date and time, but that access could be obtained by an IPP Printer
31 object from the network, if the IPP Printer didn't have an internal date and time clock.

32 The requirement for a banner on top is the responsibility of the application that generates
33 the PDL data and is not a feature that requires any change to the IPP spec.

34 One of the attractions of using IPP for IFAX, is that the client can query the IPP Printer
35 for the supported document-formats and other capabilities. With IFAX over e-mail, the

36   sender has to assume TIFF/F. Only if the sender knows that the recipient supports
37   TIFF/FX, can it send TIFF/FX. Supporting query with e-mail is very problematic.

38   ACTION ITEM (Ron): Ffind out more about what IFAX means by "Job Ticket".
39   Richard's document mentions "Job Ticket" and "VCARD" which is virtual (business)
40   card.

41   **4   Simplifying Natural Language Override Support**

42   There are two proposals to simplify the Natural Language Override mechanism in the
43   Model and Semantics document:

44   *4.1   Remove the job-level natural language override for Get-Jobs*

45   Remove the optimization that allows an IPP object in the Get-Jobs Response to return the
46   "attributes-natural-language" attribute for each job that has a natural language which is
47   different than the natural language being returned for the response as a whole. If the
48   natural language is different for an attribute than the response as a whole, require the IPP
49   object to return the attribute using the 'nameWithLanguage' or 'textWithLanguage'
50   attribute syntaxes that explicitly specifies the natural language.

51   ACTION ITEM (Tom): Send out a request for vote on the mailing list to remove the job-
52   level natural language override for Get-Jobs.

53   *4.2   Remove the entire Natural Language Override mechanism*

54   Remove the 'textWithoutLanguage' and 'nameWithoutLanguage' attribute syntaxes
55   altogether. They add complexity to the protocol which may introduce bugs or
56   interoperability problems. They are only optimizations of responses. In fact, they are not
57   very good optimizations, because it requires a response to have more than 5 or 6 text
58   and/or name attribute values (of the same language), before the number of octets is less
59   than if each attribute used the 'textWithLanguage' representation. This is because the
60   "attributes-natural-language" operation attribute requires about 37 octets, and each
61   attribute only requires about 6-9 extra octets per value to represent the natural language
62   explicitly. This simplification does not reduce any functionality. It had been suggested
63   by Keith Moore last May as well.

64   There was considerable support for this proposal. On the other hand, implementations of
65   IPP have been announced, so that we need to get real feedback from the participants on
66   whether to make this simplification. We also need to see whether the complete spec in
67   the Model document for Natural Language Override mechanism was actually
68   implemented or not.

69   ACTION ITEM (Tom): Send out a request for vote on the mailing list to remove the
70   'textWithoutLanguage' and 'nameWithoutLanguage' attribute syntaxes.

71 **5   Review of Issues**

72 We reviewed the proposed Answer text in the Issues List posted on Oct 6 in:

73 ftp://ftp.pwg.org/pub/pwg/ipp/proposed-clarifications/ipp-issues-list-mod-1.3.pdf

74 Any issues that have no comments against them at either a telecon or on the mailing list
75 for two weeks will be considered resolved using the explicit text in the Answer section.

76 ACTION ITEM (Tom): Edit those proposed text clarifications into the IPP Model and
77 Semantics specification starting Oct 21, 1998 that have no comments.

78 **_5.1   Issue 1.10 - Case sensitivity in URLs_**

79 There were no comments on the proposed text in the e-mail message from me on
80 Monday, Oct 12, for the model document. For the IIG, we should add a sentence
81 pointing out that HTTP/1.1 contains more descriptions of how to compare URLs.

82 **_5.2   Issue 1.24 - Definition of 'successful-attributes-substituted-or-ignored'_**
83 **_and unsupported attribute values in Get-Xxxx operations_**

84 ACTION ITEM (Tom): Propose the text for adding the reason for returning this status
85 code and all status codes for each operation specification in the Model.

86 **_5.3   Issue 1.28 - What MUST an IPP object do if Create-Job never gets an_**
87 **_Add-Document or Send-Document with 'last-document' set to 'true'?_**

88 We discussed that we had forgotten that the June Model and Semantics document
89 contains a "multiple-operations-time-out" Printer Description (see section 4.4.28) that
90 allows the IPP Printer to indicate the length of time before it closes down multi-document
91 jobs that haven't had another operation performed on them.

92 We agreed to the following:

93　　1. Clarify that "multiple-operations-time-out" is a "minimum", not a promise to
94　　　　close the job after exactly that much time.

95　　2. We reconfirmed that it is a requirement of the IPP Printer to clean up such jobs,
96　　　　not the client.

97　　3. The "multiple-operations-time-out" attribute is an OPTIONAL attribute, but that
98　　　　an IPP Printer MUST support the "multiple-operations-time-out" Printer
99　　　　Description attribute if it supports the Create-Job and Send-Document operations,
100　　　i.e., if it supports multi-document jobs.

101　　4. The system administrator can set the "multiple-operations-time-out" attribute to
102　　　　any value. He/she is not restricted to a one to four minute value. Instead, the one

103   to four minute value will be the RECOMMENDED default value for this
104   attribute.

105   ACTION ITEM (Tom): Update the proposed text for Issue 1.28 for another two week
106   review.

5.4   Issues 1.4, 1.10, 1.12, 1.14, 1.24

108   We reviewed the proposed text for these issues and no comments or objections were
109   raised.

110   ACTION ITEM (all): Carefully review the proposed text in each Answer section of the
111   Issues list by Oct 21, 1998 and send any comments to the mailing list.

112   ACTION ITEM (Tom and Bob): Propose new text for any issues for which there is
113   discussion to the mailing list before incorporating it into the Issues List document. This
114   will reduce the number of versions of the Issues List document.

6   SLP and new "pages-per-minutes" Printer Description attribute

116   Ira McDonald is updating the SLP directory schema for Printers. This schema is
117   intended to cover both IPP and LPD. We agreed that the SLP schema must align with
118   our current documents. However, a directory entry should have some indication of the
119   speed of a printer. So we agreed that we should propose a new "pages-per-minute"
120   Printer Description attribute for registration. Then the SLP spec can reference it.

121   We agreed that the attribute should not attempt to be precise about the performance of the
122   printer. Instead, it should be the "optimal nominal speed for simplex black and white that
123   is used in marketing literature to generally describe the device".

124   ACTION ITEM (Tom): Propose specific text for this OPTIONAL Printer Description
125   attribute.

126   ISSUE: But how can the SLP spec reference an IPP attribute if we can't officially
127   register an attribute until the IPP documents are approved as RFCs. So maybe we should
128   consider adding this attribute to the Model and Semantics document? Or would the SLP
129   spec just not reference the IPP Model and Semantics document for this one directory
130   attribute?