Internet Printing Protocol
Birds of a Feather Session

December 12, 1996

The meeting was called to order at 1:03 PM

Carl-Uno Manros (proposed Chair) reviewed the agenda for the meeting

Carl-Uno gave a short talk about the lack of IETF standards for printing. He also discussed how this effort started under the Printer Working Group.

Don Wright presented an overview of the Internet printing requirements. The following were significant issues raised by the attendees:

- firewalls
- there are no “operators”, only users
- using HTTP as a transport
- LPR/LPD/RFC1179 discussion

Carl-Uno presented the charter

- Will address needs of normal, end-user roles
- Will not address needs of the operator and administrator roles
- The group will strive to build on existing standards and technologies
- Would like to use existing standards for directories
- The submitting protocol should not exclude other devices (fax, etc.)

Harald Alvestrand stated that HTTP 1.0 is not an IETF standard. HTTP 1.1 is a proposed standard that might be applicable to IPP.

Suggestion from the meeting -- don’t explicitly tie IPP to HTTP.

Keith Moore: Should there be a scenario statement of how to use IPP without a directry server?

Carl-Uno presented the planned drafts list which included:

Requirements (Informational)
MIME Types for IPP (Standards Track)
Application Protocol - IPP (Standards Track)
IPP on HTTP (Standards Track)
IPP Directory Support -LDAP Object Classes for Printers (Standards Track)

Carl-Uno presented the deliverables and milestones for the project.

There was a discussion as to whether the group should do the work on the various drafts in parallel versus serial. Several combinations of serial and parallel were also discussed. No conclusion.

Scott Isaacson presented the IPP protocol document. The following issues were raised:

- Will the protocol support printer configuration - No, not in 1.0
- Continued discussion on using HTTP.

Open Discussion:

1) Ray Lutz raised a concern that there was some overlap between the work proposed by the proposed fax group and the proposed print group. This overlap will be assessed by the directors.

2) HTTP issue again. Suggested using specific HTML as well to more strong tie IPP to HTTP.

3) A concern was raised about running over HTTP to get through firewalls. This plan was called “bogus” by one on the attendees.

4) Steve Zilles reminded the group that HTTP can be used in both directions to not only send the job but also to retrieve status, etc.

5) Suggestion to define the MIME objects and encoding first.

6) Harald Alverstrand wanted the charter to be simplified by removing some of the work items such as removing the LDAP mapping and the HTTP mapping.

7) More discussion about using RFC1179. Someone suggested the group should fix RFC 1179 as a part of this project. There was no interest on the part of the core group to do this.

Carl-Uno asked for a show of hands as to whether this effort was worthy of a being charter. Approximately half of the attendees felt it was. When asked who thought the effort shouldn’t be charter, only 1 person raised his hand. That person’s convern was that the proposed charter was too broad.

The meeting ended at 3:08PM