Semantic Model Workgroup Meeting Minutes
February 10, 2016

The Semantic Model Workgroup Face-to-Face Meeting was called to order at about 10:30 PST on February 10, 2016 and ended about 12:00 PST.

1) Administrivia and Introduction

(a) Slides: http://ftp.pwg.org/pub/pwg/sm3/slides/Semantic-Model-Feb_16-meeting.pdf

(b) Daniel Manchala (chair) officiated.

(c) Attendees

1. Haisong Gu (Konica Minolta)
2. Gyaneshwar Gupta (Oki Data, call-in)
3. Smith Kennedy (HP Inc)
4. Daniel Manchala (Xerox, SM WG Chair)
5. Ira McDonald (High North, call-in)
6. Ole Skov (MPI Tech)
7. Alan Sukert (Xerox, call-in)
8. Mike Sweet (Apple)
9. Kim Engedahl (MPI Tech)
10. Paul Tykodi (TCS, IPP WG Co-Chair, call-in)
11. Bill Wagner (TIC, SM WG Secretary)
12. Rick Yardumian (Canon)

(d) Acceptance of Minutes

There were no objections to the following minutes, so they are accepted.

1. ftp://ftp.pwg.org/pub/pwg/sm3/minutes/SMWG-sm3-Minutes-20151130.pdf
2. ftp://ftp.pwg.org/pub/pwg/sm3/minutes/SMWG-concall-minutes-20160125.pdf

(e) Action Items

1. Ira to follow up with Rainer Prosi for JDF examples to be used to prototype JDFMAP: no response yet
2. Paul to contact PWG members to prototype JDFMAP: awaiting JDF examples
3. Progress on Semantic Model Schema development and approval process: Done; draft process to be discussed
4. Determine whether the current Liquid XML tool can provide an adequate browseable version of the model: Done; it can.
5. Semantic Model Maintenance and Approval Process draft: not reviewed.

2) Project Status (see F2F slides referenced above)

(a) Semantic Model

(b) Mapping CIP4 JDF to PWG Print Job Ticket v1.0 (JDFMAP)

3) Proposed Process for Maintaining and Approving the Model

(a) It was agreed to use the approach of generating a general PWG Process for Schemata (such as the Semantic Model XML) along with a specific SM Workgroup plan for applying this process to the Semantic Model Schema.

(b) The PWG Policy for Maintenance and Approval of Schemata Draft at: ftp://ftp.pwg.org/pub/pwg/sm3/wd/wd-sm3-policy-schemata20160125.docx was reviewed with the following comments:

1. The working drafts are to be stored on GitHub and use the version control provided by that site.
2. The definitive, formal, approved versions are stored on the PWG FTP/HTTP site.
3. Although browseable (e.g., HTML) versions may be used during development and for approval, the definitive version is the basic code (e.g., XML). It is assumed that the tools used to make the code easily reviewable accurately reflect the basic code.
4. During development, code changes should be highlighted, wherever possible using change marking provisions in the tools used to generate a browsable or more easily comprehensible form of the code.
5. Major (versus minor) revision levels must reflect code changes that result in implementations made from the previous version incompatible (i.e., breaking implementations). Changes breaking previous implementations must be marked as major (first order) version changes. Wherever feasible and reasonable, additions should be made 'optional' and deletions avoided in favor of deprecations.

(c) With respect to applying the general process to the Semantic Model Schemata:

1. The Liquid XML tool can provide for both maintenance and generation of browseable versions of the Semantic Model (XSD files) and the Operations Schema (WSDL) .
2. Ira provided references to documents from other organizations dealing with the versioning of XML flies. These should be considered in applying the general process to the Semantci Model XML schemata.
   a. http://www.w3.org/TR/2007/WD-xmlschema-guide2versioning-20070720
   b. https://wiki.ucar.edu/download/attachments/23364539/VersioningNotes.pdf
   c. http://www.xfront.com/Versioning.pdf

4) Coordination of SM with other workgroups

(a) Active SM workgroup membership should overlap with membership in other PWG workgroups sufficiently to properly address considerations of:

1. What changes/additions considered in the other workgroup need be reflected in the Semantic Mode.
2. How these changes would be accommodated, what effect they would have on other aspects of the model, and to what extent they are compatible with not just specfic aspects but also the general approach of the model.

(b) Although, between influencing the change/addition in the originating PWG workgroup and reflecting how this change is made in the Model, the objective is to make the Model and the implementation compatible, there may be instances where this is considered detrimental to the integrity of the Semantic Model. In such cases, the differences must be annotated in the Model documentation and an explanation provided.

5) Questions on Model Update and Maintenance

(a) Should the PWG Semantic Model SM3 be changed to reflect changes previously discussed in SM WG and/or IPP?

1. Elimination of EmailIn, EmailOut and FaxIn services*? These Services should be deprecated, and added to a new, optional "light weight" services class.*

2. Change of System Control Service to System Service? *IPP System Service 100% derived from System Control Service (except for Resource Service incorporation). Change in name or structure should not be necessary.*
3. Elimination of Resource Service and incorporation of Resource Service elements into System Service? *Resource Service should be deprecated; still need to consider how Resource fits into System Control Service.*

(b) Should Cloud Imaging Model be incorporated into SM3? *Yes, but in way as to not require major revision.*

(c) In cases where the IPP Infra and Cloud Imaging Model differ, which should be reflected in the SM3 model? *Version that is most consistent with the Semantic Model. See item 4(b).*

(d) Should IPP 3D Printing work be in SM3, in an SM4 or should a 3D Printing System be maintained as a model separate from the existing MFD model? *3D Printing is covered in a super set of IPP. The Semantic Model should add new optional 3D Print and 3D Scan Services in SM3 since (and in a way that) does not break backward compatibility.*

6) Next Steps and Action Items

(a) Next Semantic Model Workgroup conference call will be at 3PM EST, February 22.

(b) Action Items:

1. Ira to follow up with Rainer Prosi for JDF examples to be used to prototype JDFMAP
2. Paul to contact PWG members to prototype JDFMAP pending JDF examples
3. Process for Schemata Development and Approval document to be updated. (Bill)
4. Specific Semantic Model application of Process to be considered. (all)
5. Identify necessary changes and implement Update of Semantic Model Schema (all)
6. Create Semantic Model directory in GitHub and start phasing XML development code to this directory. (Michel and Daniel)

Submitted by Bill Wagner 16 February 2016