

Notes on Mapping Document / PWG F2F meeting - SM WG May 16, 2013 1:00 – 5:00 PM; Apple Campus - Cupertino, CA

Mapping 1.0 review – Paul Tykodi.

In the mapping of MSPS to PWG PJT

Add a foot note: JobDuplexAllDocumentsContiguously – single document new sheet, single document multiple sheets; This mapping only works on the PWG side (it does not apply in all cases) depending on the values Multiple document handling (separate collated, separate uncollated → document duplex).

Add a foot note: For more details on the mapping LayoutIntent@Sides see section xyz in JDF document. (line 326)

A.I: Paul to post a link to integrated digital printing v1.3 ICS Feb 2009. //

Not all mapping are appropriate. We look at certain one way mappings. Mapping from xxx job ticket to PWG mapping is appropriate. The mapping in the opposite direction is extraneous and tiresome. One such mapping allows an Adobe generated JDF ticket (or Xerox / Ricoh / ASCII job ticket) to be mapped to PWG ticket used by IPP printers. Like-wise from non-PWG PJT to PJT tickets.

Move DocumentPrimaryCoverBack one line up and make the next line blank (the line that has CoverType on the PWG PJT) in Table 1 – line 301. There is no need to have <none> on the LHS of table 1. Add a couple of paragraphs to explain some of the mapping.

A.I: Rick Y to help Ira M on completing the mapping from JDF to PWG PJT – since this needs a little more work. It is 85% done so far.

Ira – state diagram section 4.2 - Job and document state (and not printer/service or page state). See also section 10.2 for June 4, 2012. Ira recommends to have a small team to work on the mapping, as discussing this in a regular meeting.

Change title : Mapping Related Standards to PWG PJT v 1.0 (PJTMAP)

Update the abstract. (remove “and from”) line 3. When we break the document into multiple documents then change “normative” to “informative”. Thus this becomes a best practice document and not a standard and make this a numbered document (such as BP1, BP@, ...)- since there are other informative documents (Best Practices, Requirements – IPPFax, MFD, ) within the PWG.

Semantic Model 2.0 discussion

Take the MFD 1.0 and use the schema to fill up the missing. Have a common namespace for each binding. Have a namespace for SM say .../.../sm2.xy. There may be some irregularities within the schema or we could catch inconsistencies between those in the schema and the one in this document. There could be some attribute keyword values that could have been defined in the spec, reported into IANA,

but the schema has not been updated. New pieces to be added to the schema. There are bindings of the semantic model – ipp, wsdl and soap.

Fold EmailIn, EmailOut, FaxIn, FaxOut, Print, Scan into Semantic Model 2.0. Transform Service would live on its own. Resource Service should initially be added into the SM 2.0 and gauged later to see if it is ok to remain in SM 2.0 or as an independent spec.

Take info from rqts document. Go through the common model. Service descriptions to be added at the end.

A.I: Ask Pete for a 1.x MFD update. Bill Wagner to assemble the document.

Job Model, Document Model, Service Model and a Theory of Operation – in each of them there would be a state diagram.

Transform service needs the use cases and design requirements. Pete originally wrote this document. Check to see if there was any prototyping done for the transform service.

Paul to write the MFD/SM charter. No milestones to be included.

Rename Copy Service → PrintServiceWithHardCopy. This service is removed as a first class service from the SM. Have a use case for copy. In the chapter on PrintService add a note that says that copy service is obtained from the print service.

Do not mention the word workflow in the charter. Problems with integrating with a certain workflow languages.

Resource Service (?) should this be part of SM 2.0. Bill wants to initially place it into the SM 2.0 model, but if there is not much commonality, we will remove it from SM 2.0.

SM 2.0 will consider security requirements (security ticket and access control w.r.t user roles). May need to look at IDS abstract model and scope it down slightly.