

PWG WIMS CIM Alignment

Conference Call Minutes

July 27, 2006

Bill Wagner, Chairman WIMS WG

Attendees

Conference call was at 2 PM EDT, 27 July, 2006.

Rick Landau	Dell
Harry Lewis	IBM
Ira McDonald	High North
Bill Wagner	TCI
Pete Zehler	Xerox

General Discussion

- In accord with the 13 July conference call action item, Rick posted a table of the Printer MIB properties with columns to indicate his take on priorities.
ftp://ftp.pwg.org/pub/pwg/wims/cim/ftp://ftp.pwg.org/pub/pwg/wims/cim/PrinterMibObjectsToAdd_20060725.xls
The table has columns for other group members to indicate their priorities.
- This conference call was called to discuss this table and the associated document on selection rationale that Rick posted.
ftp://ftp.pwg.org/pub/pwg/wims/cim/PrinterMibObjectPriorities_Reasoning_RBL_20060724.rtf
- Rick went over the logic of his selections – “Solve the big problem first... Pick a target. Aim low, at least to start negotiations... [Consider ‘vanilla’] shared office printers that are monitored and managed remotely.”
- Although there was no objection to ‘stake and ground’ approach as starting point, There was a desire to
 - include all basic features of enterprise level (not production) printers

- call for PWG review cycle to make sure that no common feature has been omitted.
- It was further pointed out that in many cases it is easier to include a property with enums that exist in the MIB, even though some enums may represent attributes beyond the above criteria for inclusion.
- A differentiation between CIM and SNMP was made in that CIM is procedure based rather than data based – data is produced on demand, unlike MIBs which imply data base retained in the device. On the other hand, CIM notifications are TCP (reliable) based so possibility of “lost” notifications is low.
- In reviewing the criteria, exception was taken to the “no options except duplex” statement. It was requested that common options features such as stapling, sorting/collating/multiple outputs(mailboxes) and asset management features should be included. However, it was generally agreed that “Finisher MIB” objects would not be included.
- There was discussion of another criteria that objects not mandatory in the printer MIB should not be included in CIM. Agreement was this may be a guideline, but that each instance must be considered individually since objects that seemed optional when the MIB was released may be more critical today.
- In a initial review of the table:
 - prtGeneralCurrentLocalization – support localization in CIM as an explicit string rather than an index to a list
 - Reset – do not include element; however functions are retained as part of CIM
 - Cover discussion – Rick suggested that detailed cover information was not necessary; however Ira indicated that it may be easier to keep the MIB enums

There was insufficient time for detailed consideration of all printer MIB objects. The discussion is to resume next week when group members have completed their consideration of the table.

Next Steps / Open Actions:

- Rick will revise the criteria and (if necessary) the table to reflect inclusion of sorting/collating/multiple outputs(mailboxes) and asset management features.

- Rick will add notes to table to identify instances where MIB function is to be retained but in a radically different form.
- Group members will annotate Rick's table with their preferences for elements to be included in CIM and submit for consideration.
- Although the action item remains for Ira to generate a list of possible CIM elements derived from IPP printer properties, it is understood that he will not have the time to do this for some while.
- There will be a CIM conference call on Thursday, 3 August, at 2 PM EDT to further consider the list of elements to be added to the CIM printer class.