



Reader Management 1.0.1

Martin Jackson (Wal-Mart Stores), RM Co-Chair





Introduction

- Why do we need to update RM?
- Preserving interoperability with 1.0
- What changes were made?
- What impact will there be to conformance tests?



Why do we need to update RM?

- After ratification, the reader management working group was notified of discrepancies between the “abstract model” and XML binding on one hand and the SNMP MIB on the other.
 - The abstract model is supposed to govern the data and behavior for both XML and SNMP bindings (and any future binding)
 - The group concurred that the discrepancies mentioned would cause undue confusion and create an undesirable difference in capabilities between the XML and SNMP bindings
 - At the same time, the discrepancies were in optional parts of the specification



What changes were made?

- As specified in RM 1.0, the granularity of alarm controls was inconsistent between the Abstract Model and SNMP. The changes bring the SNMP binding into alignment with the abstract model.
- But note: In RM 1.0.x, all alarms are optional
- Addition of a data type (administrative status) with its own enumeration
- Addition of an element from Reader Protocol to the IOValue enumeration
- Deletion of Antenna-level alarm controls
- Addition of per-antenna/per-tag-operation-level alarm controls



Preserving interoperability with 1.0

- In terms of network protocol, SNMP maps human-readable terms to numbers
- That means you can change SNMP MIB human readable parts, but if you keep the numbers the same, the protocol is not impacted
- We deleted (optional) elements that didn't belong
- We added the elements that were overlooked
- We changed one definition, but preserved the numeric mapping of its predecessor



What impact will there be to conformance tests?

- All additions and changes were to optional areas of the specification
- No changes were made to the Abstract Model or XML binding
- Conformance testing is not affected