

Minutes for 18 March WBMM Conference Call

Call was started at 4:00 PM EST 18 March 2003

Attendees:

Harry Lewis
Bob Taylor
Cathy Markle
Gail Songer
ElliottBradshaw
Ira McDonald
Ted Tronson
Pete Zehler
Bill Wagner

Review of Agenda

Recent emails requested a change in WBMM conference call time because of FSG Job Ticket meeting and because of the desire for European participation. Tentative solution was to shift to 12noon EST (9:00 AM PST) on Wednesday. This is the time for the next conference call, to be held next Wednesday, 26 March..

Review of Last Conference Call Minutes

In reviewing the minutes of the last conference call, it was noted that we did not have consensus on the need for a new information model to replace MIBs. Building on the fact that there was agreement that whatever model WBMM ends up with must map to the existing Printer MIBs, Ira suggested that a mapping of the MIB objects into an XML structure, using the data types identified as part of the Semantic Model/PSI activity, would provide a good starting point. The discussion proceeded, addressing some aspects of the New Data Model Requirements subject. Points made and agreed to were:

1. The WBMM model should follow the precedent of the SM/PSI model and schemas, but whereas the latter are job/document oriented, the WBMM should device/service oriented
2. All objects in the existing printer MIB (and associated MIBs) must be covered in any new modeling
3. The information model must be complete. Any corollary to the printer MIB dependencies on HR MIB objects (and presumably MIB-2 objects?) must be avoided.

Points that were not fully agreed to were:

- a. How to structure the model so that information is grouped by use and application. The example of handing consumables utilization objects groups

together was countered by observing that the same object could logically appear in several use groupings. The alternate way of addressing this is to provide multiple views of the same information. But then it was not clear if all likely views could be predetermined.

- b. Although there was agreement that to recasting MIB information into an XML model would provide a good starting point, and that substantial new information would need to be added to cover things missed or newly created (such as services), there was softness on the amount of rework this starting point would require.

Ira felt that he could “automate” the recasting of the MIBs and he was requested to do so.

Discussion of Use Cases/Scenarios

There was a discussion of two of the scenarios that Cathy had provided just prior to the 4 March conference call

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

. The tool of using scenarios often exposes characteristics and requirements that were not apparent (and perhaps not intended) to the writer. Therefore, reviewing the scenarios and considering the implications is very important.

The main point in the “Management of Web Services Enabled Devices” (BuzzLightyear) Scenario was that

- a. in this scenario, reporting the error condition to the printing client user is a function of the print job submission protocol, not of WBMM
- b. WBMM does provide notification of the paper jam to the management application, and allows for the management application to query the device/service to determine its state and to invoke corrective operations.. However, it was considered that, particularly for a paper jam, it might be better to indicate that the management application can react to the notification by requesting additional information (not just state but where the jam is, perhaps the serial number of the large automated paper supply unit, etc) and initiating diagnostics. Taking remedial action may be outside of the scope of the WBMM.
- c. the ability of the management application to respond to the notification via the WBMM capability is implicit in the scenario. But given the desired to be able to define the same basic capability using different transport mechanisms (specifically HTTP and SMTP), there are difficult questions of how this would be accomplished) and of the latency inherent in the different approaches. The point was made that the management application cannot asynchronously say “get this information”. Rather, the device (or its proxy) must ask “what do you want me to do” and then listen for instructions. Although a basically interactive dialog could be effected if the device initiated an HTTP connection to the server handling the management application, this would require pretty fast turn around on

the port if the server. And the interaction would be quite different if it were over SMTP via a mail server.

The points discussed in the "Printing and Imaging Devices Integrated with Back-end Services" (Fred and Barney) scenario included:

- a. again, affirmation that notification of the user, even in this case, is not the purpose of WBMM. WBMM is to provide interchange with the management application; the management application can notify the user if that is necessary.
- b. in stating that "It grabs a snapshot of the current device configuration and state, formats the data into a XML" the description is unclear. If "It" refers to the management application, which we assume is remote, and the management application does the conversion to XML, it suggests that what is communicated may be of some other form. If "It" refers the management interface either in the device or in a proxy, then the scenario as written suggest that there is always an external agent at the device side, even if the device has a native WBMM capability. However, with some clarification and the avoidance of pronouns, this scenario (which should be specific) may reasonably point to the need for a proxy on the equipment side that communicates with existing equipment via SNMP, CIM, NPAP, HTTP (web pages) etc. and communicates with the remote monitor via the WBMM format. In this case, the scenario would be identifying some very basic requirements (that we may or may not decide to address).
- c. Again, the question of what is implicit in the interaction between the device and the monitor (either through the proxy or directly) comes up, as with the previous scenario.

The meeting ended at 5:00 PM EST. There was good discussion and some progress toward definition. However quite a few items on the agenda had not been touched. It was therefore decided to schedule another conference call for 26 March at 12 noon EST, 9 AM PST. The agenda for this meeting will continue with the review of scenarios and consideration of the approach. Ira may have preliminary results from the MIB recasting, which should aid the consideration of what needs to be done for the new model.

WWagner/19 Mar 2003