

[Draft] Minutes of the Teleconference Meeting of**ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 34/WG4, 2014-02-04****Rex Jaeschke (rex@RexJaeschke.com)****2014-02-07****1. Opening remarks**

The meeting started at 21:10 GMT. The convener, Murata-san, welcomed everyone to the 58th teleconference of WG4.

2. Roll call of delegates

The following members were present during part or all of the meeting:

Name	Affiliation	Employer/Sponsor
Makoto Murata	WG4 Convener, JP	International University of Japan
Rex Jaeschke	Ecma, Project Editor	Consultant
Jim Thatcher	Ecma, US	Microsoft
Caroline Arms	Ecma	Library of Congress
John Haug	Ecma, US	Microsoft
Chris Rae	Ecma	Microsoft
Francis Cave	GB	Francis Cave Digital Publishing

Present were 7 people representing 3 NBs, and 1 liaison.

3. Adoption of the agenda

The agenda (SC 34 N 1990) was adopted as published.

4. Administration

Approval of Previous Meeting Minutes [WG4 N 0276]

The draft minutes were approved, as circulated.

Outstanding Action Items

None

Report from the WG4 Secretariat

The following NBs and liaisons have registered delegates to WG4: BR, CA, CH, CI, CN, CZ, DE, DK, Ecma, FI, FR, GB, IN, IT, JP, KR, NL, NO, OASIS, PL, US, W3C, XML Guild, and ZA. All requests for additions, deletions, and changes to the delegate list should be sent to the WG4 Secretariat (rex@RexJaeschke.com).

The WG4 email list is e-SC34-WG4@ecma-international.org. The document repository is at http://lucia.itscj.ipsj.or.jp/itscj/servlets/ScmDoc10?Com_Id=w4.

5. Defect Reports

The public, online DR log is at <http://www.29500sc34comments.org/>. Access individual DRs via the hyperlinks contained within the spreadsheet's left-most column.

DR 13-0013 “WML: omissions and inconsistencies in the specification of attributes”

There was some discussion. Chris has done some preliminary work, but a lot more is needed. He'll report on the status in Berlin.

6. Revising Part 2 (Open Packaging Conventions)

We reviewed the following wiki pages:

John's summary at: https://www.assembla.com/spaces/IS29500/wiki/OPC_Revision and https://www.assembla.com/spaces/IS29500/wiki/OPC_Details

And Murata-san's proposed rewrite at <http://mailman.vse.cz/pipermail/sc34wg4/2014-February/003103.html>

In mail on 2014-02-04, Murata-san wrote,

As the owner of the below DRs, I tried to provide a solution. See the attached document. It implements changes sketched in WG 4 N 0207.

- 09-0280 – general DR about sections of OPC assuming non-ASCII is disallowed
- 09-0281 – terminology; all uses of “part” should specify what kind of part is meant
- 09-0283 – similar to 09-0280
- 09-0284 – terminology; need to re-associate the ABNF term names with the prose for part names
- 09-0285 – terminology; use of “part IRI” and “part URI”
- 09-0286 – need to update 9.2 (Part Addressing) to specify the format of a reference, based on the changes to be made to 9.1.1 (Part Names)
- 09-0288 – same as 09-0286, but for 9.3.2 (Relationship Markup)
- 09-0291 – terminology; specify what “Unicode string” means, based on the changes to be made to 9.1.1
- 09-0292 – which characters are allowed in a part name (e.g., whitespace, delimiters, special characters)
- 13-0002 – fix previous changes made to Annex H for introduction of non-ASCII support
- 10-0015 – clarify “source part” for relationships

Murata-san gave a brief overview of the tracked changes in the marked-up spec he’d circulated. We agreed we’d go over these in detail in Berlin.

In separate mail on 2014-02-04, Murata-san wrote,

In the BRM, it was agreed that OPC conformance is data conformance rather than application conformance. This decision is captured by the last sentence in Clause 2. However, requirements in Part 2 are stated as requirements on package implementers, format designers, format producers, and format consumers. This is because of the lack of time in the BRM. Every requirement should be reworded as a requirement on OPC packages. From the beginning, conformance requirements on format designers are doubtful. Moreover, the classification into four types of players is doubtful and it unnecessarily tie the hand of implementers. I think that all requirements should be reworded as requirements on packages and [as a result] Annex H should be dropped.

Here are John H.’s notes from the call §9.2, “Part Addressing”.

My take on the published clause 9.2 and its sole subclause 9.2.1 is that it exists simply to note how (1) relative references and (2) base URIs are handled. That is: (1) by starting from the part containing the reference rather

than, for example, the .rels file, (2a) what the default base URI is for a part and (2b) that a base URI may be explicitly specified if the content type of the part containing the reference supports that. I think the text under 9.2 is just some trivial introductory verbiage to avoid having an empty clause; 9.2.1 is the real information.

On to 9.3. Relationships exist as an explicit OPC concept and part/markup because the way in which a reference is stored in the core content parts of an OPC package are specific to those parts' content types. Relationships are an OPC-common way to represent those references. They also allow references to have associated metadata information.

9.3.2 Relationship Markup. Murata-san pointed out the last sentence of this subclause, which disallows use of xml:base. Given that entire paragraph, I believe the scope of that is disallowing use of xml:base inside the Relationship element markup to specify a base URI for a relative reference. That is, a value of a Target attribute of a Relationship element that is a relative reference shall always be relative to the part containing the reference – described here as the “Relationships source part” (that language can be improved), aka the part associated with the Relationships part that contains the Relationship element in question.

9.3.2.2 Relationship Element. This specifies the markup requirements, including that the value of the Target attribute must be a URI reference – either a URI or a relative reference, depending on the value of the TargetMode attribute. See [RFC 3986](#): §4.1 - ABNF defining URI reference as a URI or a relative reference; §3 - ABNF defining URI; §4.2 - ABNF defining relative reference.

Given the assertion that 9.2.1 exists to discuss concepts, that Relationships are the only way references are stored at the OPC level, that 9.3.2.2 specifies allowable values for the Target attribute in terms of RFC terminology, and that 9.3.2.2 notes that the value of Target is not restricted to the syntax requirements for part names, I don't think we should apply part name ABNF or prose restrictions to the clause about part addressing (9.2 / 9.2.1), as was proposed. Merging Annex A into this area seems to be a good idea, though.

(Note that all the section numbers in Murata-san's proposed draft document are off by one, since clause 6 Acronyms and Abbreviations seems to be missing from the base document his changes were made to.)

7. Other Business

Pack URI

Jim reported that the current IANA registration points to an expired draft. He proposed we update that registration to point to the appropriate Part of 29500. Murata-san agreed to take that on, but not until after we publish the revised version of 29500-2.

Thanking Host

We thanked Microsoft and Chris Rae for hosting the teleconference.

8. Future meetings

Face-to-Face Meetings:

- 2014-03-03/07, Berlin, DE (with other WGs)

Monday morning: 09:00 WG1

Monday afternoon: WG5 [Cancelled]

Monday afternoon: 15:00 SC 34 re-organization ad hoc [Moved from Tuesday]

Tuesday: WG4

Wednesday: WG4 (continued)

Thursday: WG4 (continued)

Friday morning: WG4 (continued)

- 2014-06-16/20, Prague, CZ (with other WGs)

Monday morning: 10:00 WG1

Monday afternoon: WG5

Tuesday morning: WG4

Tuesday afternoon: SC 34 re-organization ad hoc

Wednesday: WG4 (continued)

Thursday: WG4 (continued)

Friday morning: WG4 (continued)

- 2014-09-22/26, Kyoto, JP (with other WGs, and Opening/Closing Plenaries)

Teleconferences:

- None scheduled

9. Adjournment

Adjourned by unanimous consent at 22:30.