

PWG WIMS

Conference Call Minutes

November 2, 2009

1 Attendees

Lee Farrell	Canon
Rick Landau	Dell
Ira McDonald	High North (Samsung)
Jerry Thrasher	Lexmark
Bill Wagner	TIC

2 General

- Meeting was convened at 2:00 PM EDT on 2 November, 2009.
- Bill Wagner agreed to take minutes
- Notice was made that the meeting was held in accord with the PWG Intellectual Property Policy
- The October 13 minutes (<ftp://ftp.pwg.org/pub/pwg/wims/minutes/09OCT-Cupertino-WIMS-CIM-face-to-face.pdf>). were accepted without objection.

3 Action Items Review

- With regard to Microsoft preference for langXPS addition, Ira has sent out a email indicating the results of communications with Microsoft, indicating their preference for separate Microsoft XPS and ECMA XPS listings in the IANA Printer. Ira's message is to be considered by the WIMS over the next week. Barring objections, we will request the indicated additions.

Mike Fenelon proposed two enums and this justification:

"The OpenXPS spec is already complete and it does have differences from the MS spec. Since the 2 specifications/types have completely different namespaces I think it is pretty important to have 2 definitions.

There are already a number of devices that support the current specification: langXPS. And all Windows 7 clients will generate this format. And MS and others have committed to supporting the new OpenXPS spec also. It is very important to know which."

In PprtInterpreterLangFamilyTC, after 'langC4(65)' add:

```
langXPS(66),      -- Not in RFC 3805
                  -- Microsoft XML Paper Specification
                  -- http://www.microsoft.com/whdc/xps/xpsspec
langOpenXPS(67)  -- Not in RFC 3805
                  -- ECMA OpenXPS
                  -- http://www.ecmainternational.org/
                  -- publications/standards/Ecma-388.htm
```

- Ira noted that the ABNF in the Device ID "COMMAND SET" PWG spec draft needs some correction. He intends to post an update to the by the next WIMS ConCal.. A couple of MIB walks can be used as examples of prototyping/implementation. The intent is still to fast-track this document.
- WIMS is awaiting a volunteer to create the MOFs for the CIM Print Service classes.
- Rick pointed out that the Change Requests for the CIM Print Device Class corrections that arose from the Printing CIM Provider Prototype experience should be done quickly to avoid incorrect

implementations. Rick volunteered to do the CRs, and Ira volunteered to do the MOFs. These CRs will have higher priority than the CIM Print Service Class CRs.

4 Power Management Spec draft

➤ Drafts Review

Because there have been two document updates since the last review, but the redlines are not cumulative, Ira suggested that the review should first examine the change log relating to the 22 October draft, then the change log for the 28 October draft and finally to the 28 October markup for comments.

- a. Ira identified an issue of power state change notifications, with the suggestion that such notifications be included as an extension of the existing device alert set rather than be defined as an independent power alert set. There was basic agreement.
- b. In this vein, Bill suggested that an implementation that relied upon “standard” definitions of power states might get confused between the Power Terminology in defined in paragraph 2.4 (which is understood to reflect terminology used in DMF, IEEE and ACPI documents) and the comprehensive list of Power States listed in Table 2. Ira pointed out that Paragraph 2.4 identified three power modes, ON, OFF, and SLEEP as well as Hibernate which is one state of the OFF mode and Suspend and Standby which are two power states of the SLEEP mode.
- c. Bill observed that there must be other states of the OFF mode (e.g, off but not Hibernate) and other states of the SLEEP Mode (SLEEP but neither Standby nor Suspend) and that, since the Imaging Power Model elements refer to Power States, not Power Mode, it is confusing to define a mixture of modes and some (but not all) states in the terminology section, especially when the undefined states happen (in some systems) to have the same name as the modes. Ira’s draft refers to some aspects of this confusion in paragraph 1.3. Ira pointed out that many of the states in Table 2 were transitory or otherwise not applicable to imaging devices. He maintained that there were just five standard states in the Imaging Power Model: Off, Hibernate, On, Sleep, Standby and Suspend He indicated that he would make sure that these were clearly stated as the applicable states and clearly defined in the terminology section.
- d. In Section 4.3, Bill suggested changing “Service” to “Services” to agree with the Semantic Model. Ira agreed and indicated that this should also be done in Section 4.2 for “Subunit.”
- e. There were some other editorial suggestions, which were agreed to.

➤ Next Steps

- a. Ira mentioned that both he and Pete Zehler are “ready to stop gilding this lily” – and move forward. Although the request for additional Use Cases has repeatedly been made, they have not been offered. By moving forward, Ira meant to the Power MIB definition. Advancing the specification is, of course, subject to working group and PWG processes.
- b. It was agreed that there has been sufficient time for Use Cases to be presented. However, advancing the Power Model draft out of the Prototype stage would require an actual prototype, and since this is an abstract spec, prototype must be by prototyping one of the bindings (which it is expected, would be a MIB implementation)
- c. Ira observed that so far, he was not aware of any firm commitment to prototype the Imaging Power MIB. It might be expected that the Power MIB and Power Model would not be advanced to Stable status, and subject to ballot until some time in 2010.

5 Next Teleconference

- ##### ➤ November 16, 2:00 PM Eastern Time.

Bill Wagner, 2 November, 2009