

Need for TIFF-FX implementations for Draft Standard

Larry Masinter

3/17/2002

Disclaimer

- I work for Adobe Systems Incorporated
- Adobe has claims about IPR that have been discussed
- This talk isn't about Adobe IPR claims

Requirements for Draft Standard RFC 2026

- For each feature
 - Multiple, independent, interoperable implementations
 - independent: different code base
 - interoperable: work together to implement the protocol
- When there are IPR claims (patents, etc.)
 - Each implementation offered should represent “separate exercise of licensing process”
 - Only implementations that have, “by statement of the implementors taken adequate steps to comply with rights or claimed rights” shall be considered

Current “Implementation Report”

www.ietf.org/IESG/Implementations/TIFF-FAX-implementation.txt

- Some problems -- haven't analyzed all problems
- Profiles J and L
- Profile M
- “File Format” or “Internet Fax”

What's a Feature?

- Some judgment as to what constitutes a “feature”
- TIFF-FX “profiles” are certainly a “feature”
- Features *should* testing of combinations of options, parameters, values, etc.
- Haven't analyzed these

Profiles J and L: JBIG

- Implementations not “independent”: most use the “Markus Kuhn free JBIG library”
- No patent statement, although patents known
- No statements by implementors about “having taken adequate steps to comply”
- Markus Kuhn library reported as not having license (distributed outside US).
- Other JBIG sources: no statement of license

Profile M

- Patents belonged to Xerox when test was done, now belong to ScanSoft
- Four implementations
 - Fuji Xerox; Genoa Technology, Xerox, Intel
- License statements from Xerox, Fuji Xerox
 - Use by patent holder or a subsidiary isn't "independent exercise of licensing process"
- License grant from Xerox ambiguous
 - Some claims listed as "considered not essential", but no implementations claim to not infringe those claims
 - Does scope of use ("for TIFF-FX") includes use in TIFF?
- No License statement from Genoa or Intel
 - Genoa web site thanks Xerox for M tests (independent implementation?)
 - Product Manager for Internet Fax at Intel says Intel has T.38 but no T.37 products. Intel address listed as contact is no longer employee, can not find implementation now.

File Format for Internet Fax or just “File Format”

- “not essential” claims may be essential for practical use for Internet Fax
- If just a “file format”, then why is it done in Internet Fax working group?
- If just a “file format”, license grant should cover all uses as a file format.
 - Recent offer by Rob Buckley to license Xerox-owned IP for all uses as a file format
 - Patent in question belongs to ScanSoft, not Xerox
 - No license grant to use as part of TIFF

Request

- Do not analyze patents and IPR statements
Stick to documented IETF process in RFC 2026
- Multiple: at least two writers and two readers for each feature
- Independent: don't count those from same code base
- Each needs a statement of the implementors about having taken steps to comply with all identified IP claims
- Independent exercise of licensing process:
Not from IP owner
- Interoperable: if document is “File Format for Internet Fax” then insure implementations can be used for Internet Fax