

Minutes for 26 March WBMM Conference Call

Call was started at 12:00 PM EST 26 March 2003

Attendees:

Bob Taylor
Cathy Markle
ElliottBradshaw
Sebastian Ybarra
Ira McDonald
Bill Wagner

Review of Agenda

It was agreed to continue discussion of the use cases as well as the items from the brainstorming at the last f2f.

Review of Last Conference Call Minutes

The 18 March minutes (ftp://ftp.pwg.org/pub/pwg/wbmm/minutes/wbmm_030318.pdf) were accepted without comment

Discussion of Use Cases/Scenarios

The first two of the scenarios that Cathy had provided had been discussed at the 18 March conference call. Discussion continued with the third case.

(ftp://ftp.pwg.org/pub/pwg/wbmm/white/Use_Cases_Cathy.doc).

The **Service Provider Based Management** (W Coyote) Scenario is similar to the scenarios outlined in the original set

(ftp://ftp.pwg.org/pub/pwg/wbmm/white/wbmm_Scope&Start.pdf). However, in discussions, the point was made that certain aspects were quite different. Specifically:

- a. W Coyote was a very small customer (10 units total).
- b. The equipment was distributed one unit per site. Although it is not stated, it can be assumed that these sites were not geographically close.
- c. W Coyote not only demands a minimum of 90% up time, but also requires a monthly, legally certifiable log substantiating uptime.

[The scenario also states a conclusion (with which I do not agree) that because there is just one imaging unit on site, “it is cost prohibitive ...to install an application/appliance at the customer sites”. I suggest that it would cost prohibitive to not have some remote monitoring on site even if embedded WBMM were not available. I suggest that a proxy-based solution should not be precluded although, as in all things, cost is a consideration.]

The implications of this scenario on a WBMM-based solution were discussed:

1. The distribution of the equipment suggests WBMM must do more than provide the uptime record. For a viable implementation, WBMM must support not only problem reporting but remote diagnostics, and if possible, remote repair, possibly by providing detailed instructions to customer personnel. Field trips must be minimized if not eliminated, and those made must be fast and productive. (no going back to the shop for an unanticipated replacement part)
2. The supplier must be able to document down-time that was beyond its control. If someone neglects to supply paper, shuts down power or abuses the equipment, an indisputable record of this (and the times it occurred) must be available.
3. The need to resolve disagreements with logged information suggests that the communicated information must be authenticated, secure and dated.
4. The stated requirement of having a log showing up-time presents several approaches, each offering different challenges:
 - a. the equipment could communicate the value in a local up-time meter to the supplier– but would this be reliable and tamper proof?
 - b. the equipment could communicate whenever it went down and then when it was up again. But can it communicate if it were shut down?
 - c. there could be a periodic “watch-dog” type ping to the remote supplier when the unit is up

Discussion of Use Brainstorming List

The list of WBMM uses generated at the January face-to-face meeting was discussed.

A commented list is available at

(ftp://ftp.pwg.org/pub/pwg/wbmm/white/uses_discussion.pdf)

Main points were:

- a. WBMM is concerned with device or service management. WBMM is NOT concerned with job management. (although there are marginal cases)
- b. At this point, WBMM should not get into the specifics of general logging of information, setting printer policy, etc. since disparate practices and formats for such actions already exist. There may be the need for WBMM to support the communication of “opaque” files supporting such actions. It is possible that the WG may want to expand into such areas in the future

with a dictionary of log-able items, a scheme for policy tied into the printer schema, etc.

- c. Supporting the update and/or versioning of executable code is a major objective and pressing objective of WBMM. The immediate approach would be to support either entire replacement or patching to the extent and in the way provided for by the devices being managed. That is, WBMM would not mandate how update was to be accomplished; rather it would allow the remote management station to supply data compatible and institute an update process compatible with the update mechanism implemented by the device or service.
- d. WBMM may allow for but should not define the mechanism for managing authentication and authorization. If it is necessary to address this, WBMM should revert to currently being defined IETF rules in this area.

Conclusion and Next Steps

1. Ira indicated that the program for MIB recasting appeared to be feasible, but would take some time to implement. He indicated that consultation with Semantic Model and PSI working group personnel concerning datatypes was necessary to ensure a consistent approach. No schedule was established for this.
2. Cathy indicated that she would revise the scenarios she had supplied to reflect the comments and illuminate the salient points. Bill W. indicated that he would also revise the previously submitted scenarios for discussion at the distributed PWG meeting on the week of 31 March.
3. The specifics of the telephone conferences to be held in place of the April face-to-face were not yet firm. The necessary information would be sent out over the mailing list.

The phone conference ended at about 1:15 PM EST.

Many thanks to the participants.

WWagner/28 Mar 2003