

DRAFT: PLEASE PROOF

Minutes of the Teleconference of ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 34/WG4, 2009-04-16

Rex Jaeschke (rex@RexJaeschke.com)

2009-04-16

1. Opening remarks

The meeting started at 13:00 GMT. The convener, Murata-san, welcomed everyone to the first teleconference of WG4.

2. Roll call of delegates

The following members were present:

Name	Affiliation	Employer/Sponsor
Makoto Murata	WG4 Convener	Consultant
Jirka Kosek	CZ HoD	Consultant
Jesper Lund Stocholm	DK HoD	Ciber
Rex Jaeschke	Ecma HoD, Project Editor	Microsoft
Isabelle Valet-Harper	Ecma (TC45 co-chair)	Microsoft
Doug Mahugh	Ecma	Microsoft
Shawn Villaron	Ecma	Microsoft
Florian Reuter	Ecma	Novell
Caroline Arms	Ecma	Library of Congress
Juha Vartiainen	FI HoD	Finnish Standards
Mohamed Zergaoui	FR HoD	Innovimax
Mario Wendt	DE HoD	Microsoft
Francis Cave	GB HoD	Francis Cave Digital Publishing
Alex Brown	GB	Griffin Brown Digital Publishing Ltd.

Name	Affiliation	Employer/Sponsor
Dave Welsh	US HoD	Microsoft

3. Adoption of the agenda

It was proposed that under “Any Other Business”, we add

1. Conformance Testing
2. The new work item submitted by Switzerland regarding an informative amendment covering the technical differences between ECMA-376:2006 and IS 29500:2008.

With those changes, the agenda was adopted by unanimous consent.

4. Administration

Approval of Meeting Minutes from Prague [WG4 N 0034]

The minutes were adopted by unanimous consent.

Outstanding Action Items

1. The Convener will raise the issue of publishing email archives in the full Prague Plenary. **Done.**
2. Project Editor will contact ITTF again to clarify the use of reprints with respect to the plan WG4 has at the end of the Prague meeting regarding having multiple CORs and AMDs. **Mail sent, waiting on a reply.**
3. Shawn Villaron and Francis Cave agreed to perform triage on the DRs identified as being questionable for a COR, and to bring their recommendations to WG4. **Done.**
4. Shawn Villaron and Francis Cave will write up the criteria they used to determine if a defect’s resolution should go in a COR or an AMD. (This will serve as the basis for such decisions in the future.) **Done**, see WG4 N 0036, which was presented at the SC 34 Prague Plenary.
5. Jesper will produce a paper on the two remaining alternatives for DR 08-0012 for circulation to WG4. **Done**, see WG4 N 0037.
6. Murata-san will produce a document announcing the four teleconferences to be held on 2009-04-30 and later. **Done**, see WG4 N 0040.

5. Review of Defect Reports

Rex explained that he’d introduced a new DR status category “Closed by Editor” for those trivial technical, or editorial defects that he has resolved personally. This category is intended to let members know that such resolutions have not yet been approved by WG4.

Murata-san proposed another category for those responses proposed by expert members (for example, he submitted some DRs about errors in the RELAX NG schema, and he provided detailed resolutions). These too should be reviewed by WG4 rather than going straight to “Closed”.

It was agreed to replace “Closed by Editor” by “Last Call”, and to have that category apply to both of the scenarios above.

When a revised version of the DR log is distributed, Murata-san proposed that DR resolutions marked “Last Call” be automatically converted to “Closed” after two weeks **unless there is objection by any member**.

At the time each DR log revision is issued, the project editor will remind members which DRs will be closed automatically if members don’t object.

Members agreed to this approach.

Status of DRs processed at this meeting:

08-0012 — SCHEMAS: SUPPOSEDLY INCORRECT SCHEMA NAMESPACE NAMES

Jesper’s paper WG4 N 0037 was discussed.

Several members spoke in favor of a solution that combined both proposals.

Should we address Parts 1 and 4 only, or should we also include a solution for Part 2? Several members spoke in favor of solving the larger problem; one thought Part 2 could wait. Murata-san reminded us of the new DR he submitted, DR 09-0168, which specifically covers namespace version detection for Part 2.

Action: Shawn and Jesper will write a new paper showing the detailed changes needed for an integrated proposal.

6. Future meetings

Face-to-Face Meetings:

The schedule is as follows:

1. 2009-06-22/24 (3rd day in parallel with WG5, which meets 24/26), Copenhagen, DK
2. 2009-09-13/16, Seattle, Washington, US, (in conjunction with the SC 34 plenary)
3. 2009-12-07/11 or 2009-12-14/18 (exact dates to be decided), Paris, FR
4. 2010-03-22/25, Stockholm, SE (in conjunction with the SC 34 plenary)
5. 2010-06-14/18 (proposed; exact dates to be decided), Helsinki, FI
6. 2010-09-??/??, <city?>, ZA (in conjunction with the SC 34 plenary)
7. 2009-12-06/10 or 2009-12-13/17 (exact dates to be decided), tentative offer from CN

Teleconferences:

The schedule is as follows:

1. 2009-04-30, 13:00 GMT (See <http://www.timeanddate.com/worldclock/meeting.html> for translation of GMT to your time zone.) [see WG4 document N 0021 for call-in details]
2. 2009-05-14, 13:00 GMT

3. 2009-05-28, 13:00 GMT
4. 2009-06-11, 13:00 GMT

7. Any Other Business

1. Conformance Testing

Alex spoke briefly re his recent posting regarding the possibility of our working with WG1. His email from 2009-04-14 is shown below.

“Following-up on the discussions about conformance testing of 29500 documents and applications ... WG 1 is the WG within SC 34 that has been responsible for conformance testing and validation. So I think it is likely any work in this area would be assigned to WG 1 by SC 34. However, WG 4 has particular expertise on the details of the 29500 formats, so I'd like to raise the idea of such a project being a *joint* activity between WG 4 and WG 1, with WG 1 leading and WG 4 experts being invited to participate.

The project could be to develop a TR which covers the methodology, tools and test data necessary to perform 29500 conformance testing at the document and application levels. It would probably be based on the layered approach Murata-san has already outlined. There is a precedent for such TRs being developed within JTC 1.

This assumes of course that:

1. Such a project is proposed, and
2. There is consensus among the various stakeholders that this joint approach is a sensible way to proceed.”

Murata-san reminded us about the project driven by Fraunhofer FOKUS. (See http://www.fokus.fraunhofer.de/en/elan/projekte/international/laufende_projekte/Document-Interop_Lab/index.html for details.).

2. The new work item submitted by Switzerland regarding an informative amendment covering the technical differences between ECMA-376:2006 and IS 29500:2008.

In November 2008, Switzerland submitted DR 08-0015, which suggested that some technical changes made at the BRM were not included in the Annexes describing differences between ECMA-376:2006 and IS 29500:2008. WG4's response was that the BRM asked for a list of schema changes only, and that was provided, so the DR was rejected. As a result, this week, Switzerland started the process for a letter ballot to create one new amendment per Part where each amendment will contain an informative list of technical differences.

The ballot to create these new projects will probably end sometime in July (after we [hopefully]

closeout the first set of CORs and AMDs). Then, once Project Editors are proposed, WG4 will have to nominate them to SC 34 at the September Plenary.

3. Review of action items: Rex read out the action items assigned during the meeting.
4. Teleconference support: By acclamation, WG4 expressed its appreciation to Microsoft (Doug) for hosting this teleconference.

8. Adjournment

Adjourned by unanimous consent at 14:30, Thursday, April 16.