

Teleconference Minutes

Printer MIB Extension for MFP Devices

March 28, 2006

Ron Bergman - Chairman Printer MIBs Working Group

Attendees:

Charles Baxter	Xerox
Ron Bergman	Ricoh Printing Systems, America
Ira McDonald	High North
Jerry Thrasher	Lexmark
Thomas Silver	Xerox
Bill Wagner	TIC
Pete Zehler	Xerox

Agenda:

1. **Fax Modem.** Discuss model details (channel or Interface) and what additionally will be necessary for alerts?
2. **MFP Alert Objects.** Pros and cons relative to alerts. Is there any support for this effort?
3. **MFP Services.** Do we need a method to link the affected service to the alert? Alerts in the printer MIB are not explicitly linked to a service.

Discussion:

1. Fax Modem

Fax Modem: The Printer MIB current defines a Channel Type of "chFax(18)". Ira mentioned in the MFP Alerts BOF that this has been modeled as an interface by other groups. An Interface group also has been included within the Counters MIB. What information is required to adequately model a Fax Modem?

There appeared to be agreement that the definition of a fax channel implicitly includes the interface and is an adequate model. However, it was also expressed that it will be

necessary to include the Modem MIB (RFC 1696) for those implementations that desire to fully describe the Fax Modem device.

Note: RFC 1696 status is "historic" and there does not appear to be a more current document. All other Modem MIB RFCs are related to DOCSIS cable modems.

2. MFP Alert Objects

MFP Alert Objects: Xerox (Thomas Silver) previously indicated they would like to make a proposal on this subject. It has been noted that the generation of even a small number of objects will certainly be a much more significant undertaking than the other task. However, we should carefully examine the benefit of additional objects and, if the value is significant, they will be added.

Thomas Silver reiterated the need for more than just a new set of Alert Table Groups to provide an appropriate error management of multi-function devices. This information is currently provided in some devices using private MIBs, which make it difficult to manage equipment from different vendors with the same application. Those devices that do not include MFD information even in their private MIB present a even more difficult problem.

Tom indicated that he expects to have a draft proposal available prior to the meeting next week that will contain at least an outline of his proposed MIB. In addition, he is advocating the enhancement of hrPrinterDetectedErrorState, which should also be included within the document.

The pros and cons of including new MFD MIB objects was extensively discussed. Part of the resistance for any new objects involves how they will blend with the existing Printer MIB objects and the expected negative reaction from the IETF regarding any changes we would propose.

One new topic was the desire to create new values for hrDeviceTypes to be able to use the values of hrDeviceIndex to represent the subunits. Ira indicated that the Printer MIB explicitly states that the usage of hrDeviceIndex within the MIB, including the Alert is absolutely restricted to only device types of Printer. Ira will send an email with the three quotations from the MIB that explain this restriction.

3. MFP Services

Service: From the minutes of the last teleconference; "It was also noted that to properly define alerts, services as well as physical entities are needed". There appears to also be a counter argument. We need to obtain a "rough" consensus on this issue and then take the appropriate action.

There was not sufficient time for any new discussion on this topic.