

Preliminary Draft of Survey

Imaging System Power MIB Interoperability Demonstration

The PWG approved the –“PWG Power Management Model for Imaging Systems 1.0” ([PWG Candidate Standard 5106.4-2011](#)) and its MIB binding “PWG Imaging System Power MIB v1.0” ([PWG Candidate Standard 5106.5-2011](#)) in February 2011. The charter for the Imaging System Power Management Project included a Power MIB Interoperability event, basically a demonstration that client and server implementations of the MIB are interoperable. This survey of PWG members is intended to determine from PWG members their interested in whether, when and how such an interoperability event (or demonstration) should occur. We request that any PWG member that has an interest in participating in such a demonstration, whether of client or printer or both respond to this survey before the next face to face meeting on August 1. Member responses to this survey will be accessible to the PWG steering committee members but will not be made public.

Note that an interoperability demonstration is a necessary but not sufficient step toward advancing a PWG candidate standard to full standard; and the issue of working to advance the standard is presented as a separate question.

Q1. Please identify your company.

Q2. Provided that the schedule and nature of the demonstration are acceptable, would your company be interested in participating in an Imaging Power MIB Interoperability demonstration. (check all that apply)

- ✓ YES Printer (Agent)
- ✓ YES Client application
- ✓ NO

Q3. What would be your preferred time frame for this demonstration (please check one)

- ✓ 2011 Quarter 3
- ✓ 2011 Quarter 4
- ✓ 2012 Quarter 1
- ✓ Some time after 2012 Quarter 1
- ✓ Not Applicable

Q4. There may be certain logistic problems in holding an actual event with the printers and client applications physically co-located. Therefore, we considered some alternatives to how and when the demonstration is run. Please check all that may be acceptable to you.

- ✓ A classic “bakeoff” event in which all candidate implementations are physically brought to the interoperability event. All agent tests run with the same PWG acquired SNMP program.
- ✓ Using a third party testing service to demonstrate compatibility with the MIB (costs money)
- ✓ A test tool, script or procedure written to demonstrate compatibility and MIB compliance, run by your personnel at your location, at your convenience, which provides a record of your devices response
- ✓ Something else?
- ✓ Not Applicable

Q4. Anticipating that the majority of implementations will be of the printer, that it is poor practice to test a management application with an untested agent (or vice versa) and that client implementations may not exercise all MIB objects, we are considering using a developed tool or standard MIB browser to show printer implementation compatibility. A suitable test record of the devices response would need to be provided to a restricted group of evaluators. What demonstration approach would be acceptable to you? (check all that apply)

- ✓ A written procedure using a browser application of your choice.
- ✓ A written procedure using a specific "freeware" browser (e.g., ServersCheck MIB Browser)
- ✓ A "script" for a standard (not necessarily free) browser application
- ✓ A custom written "tool" running on a Windows computer (cost of writing tool to be determined)
- ✓ Something else?
- ✓ Not Applicable

Q5. If it is determined that a browser printout providing sufficient information to validate the SNMP agent response is not available with the exercising tools to be used, would you object to provide a *.pcap type network trace (such as produced by the Wireshark Network Protocol Analyzer) to the evaluators?

- ✓ YES
- ✓ NO
- ✓ Not Applicable

Q6. The participants in the demonstration will be identified, but the PWG will not make public the results of a particular company's demonstration. However the company will be free to do so. Therefore, for this reason and for the agreed upon utility of the demonstration, what is tested should be meaningful but not excessively restrictive. Recognizing that most of the MIB groups, including all mandatory groups, are read-only, what do you consider a sufficient test for interoperability of each object?

- ✓ MIB walk showing that objects are supported
- ✓ MIB Walk showing reported values agree with actual power state
- ✓ For read-write and read-create objects, showing a successful write (rows may have be created by some other mechanism)
- ✓ For read-create objects, exercising of SNMPv2 RowStatus elements in optional groups to create, modify and destroy rows.
- ✓ Other
- ✓ No Opinion

Q7. In line with Question 6, what would you regard as a sufficient number of elements to be tested to fully demonstrate MIB interoperability? (Note that not all implementations would need to support optional objects, but all objects must be supported by at least one implementation.)

All objects in all mandatory groups are supported

- ✓ All objects in all mandatory groups respond with at least all mandatory values.
- ✓ All objects in the MIB are supported
- ✓ All objects in the MIB, reflecting all mandatory values.
- ✓ All objects in the MIB, with row-status column fully exercised to maximum extent allowed by MIB
- ✓ Other
- ✓ No Opinion

Q8. Would you like to see the Imaging Power Management MIB (and the associated model document) advanced to PWG full standard in conjunction with this interoperability demonstration?

- ✓ YES
- ✓ NO
- ✓ Don't Care

Q9. It is anticipated that at least one Imaging Power Management MIB management application will be ready to engage in an interoperability demonstration. If you have implemented the MIB in an agent, would you be interested to work with the client supplier to show client-server interoperability?

- ✓ YES
- ✓ NO
- ✓ Not Applicable