

PWG WIMS

Las Vegas Meeting

January 20, 2006

Harry Lewis - PWG Chairman; WIMS w/g Secretary
1/21/2006

Attendees

Ron Bergman	Ricoh
Lee Farrell	Canon
Harry Lewis	IBM
Ira McDonald	High North
Stuart Rowley	Kyocera
Ole Skov	MPI Tech
Jerry Thrasher	Lexmark
Bill Wagner	TIC
Craig Whittle	Sharp Labs
Pete Zehler	Xerox

Introduction

This WIMS face to face meeting took place on January 20, 2006 in Las Vegas.

There were 4 topics.

1. Address comments from the WIMS protocol and schema Last Call, which closed at the Plenary January 19, 2006, and determine criteria for initiating Formal Approval.
2. Plan how the WIMS working group will proceed in creating a binding document and, in particular, how to go about generating normative, on-the-wire, examples.
3. MFD Modeling (impromptu topic)
4. Moving forward with WSDM and WS-Management

WIMS Last Call and Formal Approval

WIMS protocol (abstract specification) and schema Last Call officially ended at the PWG Plenary face-to-face, January 19, 2006. (Note that last Call results must still be approved by the PWG Steering Committee to verify that the Last Call process has been conducted properly). The process allows a reasonable time period following Last Call for last minute issues to be addressed and rejected or resolved into the draft.

Editorial Last Call Comments

There was evident confusion about what constitutes a proper WIMS Manager-Agent-Target relationship. There were also several minor editorial and punctuation findings.

Action -

Bill - Fix definition for "agentReference" to resolve confusion and show that agent is closest to Manager not Target Device. Review throughout for consistency.

Bill - Incorporate submitted editorial and punctuation corrections.

Multi-level Proxies

One very significant last call comment was received during the final day of Last Call, at the face-to-face. The comment basically translates into a new requirement which the WIMS working group discussed and is acknowledging as valid and desirable. This is the requirement for WIMS to facilitate a multi-level proxy environment. Multi-level proxies will allow scaling within the enterprise while maintaining a minimum (preferably, one) of external communication paths that must traverse the firewall.

To achieve the goal of multi-level proxies, the "target object" must be modified to reflect a recursive data structure. This will allow visibility of the target object at the top-level manager no matter how many proxies there are in the path between the manager and the target.

Action -

Ira - Post fragment of schema for schedule with pointer inside the action object to allow paths in actions.

Someone (Bill?) - Provide description of multiple proxy operation with example(s), topology and sequence diagrams. Likely sections to be updated include Sections 4 and 6.

Binding Specification and Examples

Because protocol bindings will be defined separately, it is not mandatory that a binding be defined in order to move the abstract protocol forward. Enough members of the WIMS working group, however, feel that a better practice would be to delay Formal Approval of the WIMS (abstract) Protocol until we have a good handle, and are making progress, on defining at least one normative binding.

Agreement -

Agreement was reached that WIMS Protocol and Schema Formal Approval may be delayed, at discretion of the WIMS working group, WIMS Chairman and PWG Steering Committee, until adequate progress has been made in generating SOAP examples in the context of a normative binding.

WIMS Protocol Binding Document

During preparation for Last Call, the working group decided to separate WIMS protocol bindings into a separate specification. This serves two purposes. It allowed WIMS protocol to progress through Last Call as an abstract specification and also provides a means for defining multiple bindings without bloating the WIMS protocol spec.

A protocol binding specification is only useful when the fully structured operation for each defined action and the wire-level communication (SOAP headers and data packets) are defined precisely in such a way that independent implementations may interoperate. The unstable maturity of underlying and supportive technology such as SOAP, WSDL and associated tools, presents a challenge to the WIMS working group in terms of how to create and validate normative on-the-wire examples.

Agreement -

WIMS working group recommends to the PWG Steering Committee that SOAP v1.2 become the PWG accepted interop message format. Normative SOAP bindings should be accompanied by informative WSDL v2.0 (and possibly WSDL v1.1).

Action -

PWG SC - Review and clarify policy and procedure (if necessary) regarding requirements for protocol bindings for abstract protocols as well as current best practice for defining web services bindings and their application within the PWG. The PWG SC should validate any decisions recorded on this topic during this WIMS working group.

Action -

Ira/Pete - Ira will complete WSDL v1.1 conversion from existing WSDL v2.0. Target - March 1. Pete will run through SOAPScope and generate sample requests and responses.

Action -

Harry/Others - We need a WSDL v2.0 validator. Harry will investigate within IBM. Others are invited to seek tools within their company or externally.

MFD Modeling

The topic of modeling the multi-function device for monitoring and management has been discussed in the PWG periodically, over several years. Most recently, we considered full modeling of the MFD as part of WIMS but a call for interest among PWG members was not well received. WIMS decided to proceed with a medium weight model to facilitate counters for all MFD services. As time passes, the PWG continues to encounter motivation to model the MFD (for CIM, RDF, WSDM etc.). In Vegas, a new proposal was introduced to specify alerts for MFDs. The proposal called for a light weight yet extensible MFD model. This reopened discussion about MFD modeling and led to some conjecture about whether WIMS should be postponed until a complete MFD model has been installed.

Agreement -

The MFD model represented by WIMS is not in conflict with the MFD alerts proposal. There is no reason to expect future MFD modeling to disrupt or conflict with the established WIMS model for MFD counters. Even if the MFD Alerts work results in revisiting shelved proposals or creating new MFD models, we do not anticipate the WIMS MFD model for counters to result in any conflict. There is no need to delay WIMS specifically due to the lack of a full MFD model (and doing so would conflict with previous the previous PWG decision to move forward with WIMS).

WSDM and WS-Management

Evolving from the WIMS-CIM project has been the notion of working with the OASIS WSDM or WS-Management groups, directly, to develop MFD support on those management platforms.

Agreement -

WSDM or WS-Management are best pursued, initially, as part of the Semantic Model working group by incorporating the WIMS Counter schema and writing an RDF mapping of the PWG Semantic with these management paradigms in mind.

Agreement -

WIMS and SM will share the Wednesday meeting slot. No meeting next week.

Next Conference Call

Wednesday, 2-1-2006

Noon Eastern (NYC)

Toll Free: 1-866-365-4406

International: 00+1+303-248-9655

Passcode: 2635888#