

# Minutes of the Job MIB Project of the PWG

LA - 12/5/97

## Attendance

Chuck Adams - Tektronix  
Ron Bergman - Dataproducts  
Tom Hastings - Xerox  
Henrik Holst - i-data International  
Harry Lewis - IBM  
Bob Pentecost - HP  
Stuart Rowley - Kyocera

## Review of Job Submission Protocol Mapping

### Recommendations

1. Review and acceptance of Ron's most recent changes.
2. Further, minor editorial changes noted - Ron will update original.
3. Tom has mapped DPA attributes to JMP but has applied an IPP filter on this mapping. Tom will review DPA for attributes outside IPP which also map to JMP.
4. Tom will determine if there are any exceptions to PrintXchange based of the DPA mapping.
5. Harry will determine if there are any exceptions to PSM based of the DPA
6. Harry will map IPDS.
7. Entire Postscript mapping has been rewritten. Ron recommends using the comment field in Postscript to include % Job Submission Id = "id string". We further suggest %%JMPJobSubmissionId: (id string) which conforms to document structuring conventions. This convention will be for Postscript level 1 and 2. If Future versions of Postscript or, for example, the PDF Portable Job Ticket, have a jobsubmissionID then that convention will be favored over this one.
8. Chuck Adams will study the Adobe Portable Job Ticket Format to see if it has a jobsubmissionID or what it has that might map well..
9. The PServer mapping defines the "directory path name of the print file" combined with the "Pserver job number assigned" to construct the jmJobSubmissionID. We really don't know how job position and job priority map to JMP in Pserver and may want to remove these attributes from the mapping. Ron will talk with Scott.
10. SMB and TIPSII mappings were added.
11. Tom has posted an updated DPA mapping to JMP. We need to review this and Ron will incorporate this into his mapping document.
12. The goal is to submit this mapping document at the same time as the Job MIB is submitted to the IETF. We want to have final reviews completed before the January meeting.
13. The Introduction should indicate that the derived jmJobSubmissionID, from these legacy mappings, are not the only, or necessarily the preferred method of establishing a jmJobSubmissionID. The preferred method is to use a bidi protocol (such as IPP) and/or submit the id with the job. Ron will add a statement to this effect.

# Minutes of the Job MIB Project of the PWG

LA - 12/5/97

## Multiple jmJobSubmissionIDs

1. We reenacted the discussion about nested jmJobSubmissionIDs which had already occurred via teleconference in November. Again, there was difficulty describing the actual problem in concrete terms other than there MIGHT be some reason why more than one jmJobSubmissionID is useful for a given job. Nonetheless, we ended up reinforcing the earlier decision to accept multiple jmJobSubmissionIDs per jmJobIndex as the solution to this potential problem. Now, the agent will create an entry in the jobID table for each jmJobSubmissionID it encounters with the job or is capable of and chooses to derive from submission information such as that which may be provided by the network card in an LPR or Pserver environment.
2. Tom will remove the DEFVAL he had defined for jmJobSubmissionID because this is not valid for an inaccessible OID or index.

## Misc Job MIB changes

We reviewed various changes which appeared in the new v.87 version of the job MIB.

1. New PWG OIDs.
  - a. We decided not to use an experimental OID for the Job MIB because it should be considered far enough along that experimental is not necessary.
2. Add Natural language support similar to IPP
  - a. Tom added processingMessageNaturalLanguageTag for text processing messages generated by the device or supplied with the job.
3. Make the document into an informational draft
  - a. This is an agenda item we did not get the opportunity to discuss. We need to determine how and when the job MIB will be submitted to the IETF as an informational RFC.
4. New jmJobSubmissionID's
  - a. There are some new ID formats in v.87. We did not get the opportunity to discuss.

## Monitoring Job Progress

1. Big discussion about impressionsCompleted. Whether or not to count blank pages. Agreed to define that blank impressions are always counted in impresionsCompleted in duplex mode. Two optional attributes, blank impressions printed and blank sheets suppressed were also proposed but rejected as going too far.
2. We had to redefine what "impression" to prevent counting blank sides of a simplex sheet. So an impression is a sheet side that goes through the marking engine whether or not it incurs marks and independent of the number of times it travels through the marking engine. This clarifies that we're counting bland sides of duplex jobs as one impression (not 4 in the case of process color, for example), but not counting the blank sides of simplex sheets.
3. We changed the name of currentCopyNumber to sheetCompletedCopyNumber and currentDocumentNumber to sheetCompletedDocumentNUmber to emphasize that these copy and document counters refer to the sheet which has been completed NOT to the copy or

# Minutes of the Job MIB Project of the PWG

LA - 12/5/97

document which is currently under construction, in the boundary condition between documents or copies.

4. Requested values may be updated by the agent. We agreed that the agent will always supply the latest and most accurate value for impressionsRequested, or any requested attribute, for that matter. This means it can use a value passed in on submission but later replace this with a value determined from the actual number of impressions interpreted per copy and further modify the value based on knowledge of actual impressions MADE on the first copy.
5. The required number and names of copy or collation types was heavily discussed. It was agreed to call this object jobCollationType (not copyType), that 3 types are necessary to distinguish between purely uncollated copies exiting the marker vs. collation in reference to documents (which, if identified must, themselves, be made up of collated sheets). The names we finally decided on for the 3 types of collation are uncollatedsheets(3) collatedDocuments(4) and uncollatedDocuments(5).

## Issues related to Documents

1. Should documentCopiesRequested and documentCopiesCompleted be made multivalued
  - a. Accounting applications will probably not make use of this
  - b. No extra overhead for the single document printer
  - c. All attributes are inherently potentially multivalued. So the index (1) is already there. It's only a matter of does our spec allow the index to increase.
  - d. Although this may have been a good idea, the whole issue of documents had left the discussion weary and this topic was rejected as being out of scope and/or unnecessary.

## Misc.

1. Reviewed and accepted Tom's other changes v.87 - see red copy.
2. jobURI is not multi-row to accommodate URL's longer than 64 octets via concatenation, if necessary.
3. The meeting ended with the observation of a discrepancy between impressionsRequested (which is defined as "per Job") and sheetsRequested which assumes the agent will multiply by the number of document and/or job copies. IPP shares this discrepancy. This needs to be resolved via e-mail.

## Traps

1. This topic was on the agenda in case we had time but we did not get to it. At the January meeting, we will have a firm agenda slot to discuss the feasibility of addressing standard traps for the job MIB as a separate RFC.