

ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 34 N 1338

DATE: 2009-12-10

ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 34
Document Description and Processing Languages
Secretariat: [Japan \(JISC\)](#)

DOC. TYPE	Meeting Report						
TITLE	Notes of the First Meeting of ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 34/WG 6, AFNOR, Paris, France, 2009-12-04						
SOURCE	WG 6 Acting Convener [Mr. Francis CAVE]						
PROJECT							
STATUS	This document is circulated to the SC 34 members for information.						
ACTION ID	FYI						
DUE DATE							
DISTRIBUTION	P, O and L Members of ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 34 ; ISO/IEC JTC 1 Secretariat; ISO/IEC ITTF						
ACCESS LEVEL	Open						
ISSUE NO.	109						
FILE	<table border="1"><tr><td>NAME</td><td>1338.pdf</td></tr><tr><td>SIZE (KB)</td><td></td></tr><tr><td>PAGES</td><td>8</td></tr></table>	NAME	1338.pdf	SIZE (KB)		PAGES	8
NAME	1338.pdf						
SIZE (KB)							
PAGES	8						

Secretariat ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 34 - IPSJ/ITSCJ (Information Processing Society of Japan/Information Technology Standards Commission of Japan)* Room 308-3, Kikai-Shinko-Kaikan Bldg., 3-5-8, Shiba-Koen, Minato-ku, Tokyo 105-0011 Japan *Standard Organization Accredited by JISC
Telephone: +81-3-3431-2808 ; Facsimile: +81-3-3431-2808; E-mail: kimura@itscj.ipsj.or.jp

Notes of the First Meeting of ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 34/WG 6

**AFNOR, Paris, France
2009-12-04**

The meeting started at 10:10 CET on Friday 4 December. The Convenor, Francis Cave, welcomed all participants to this first meeting of WG 6.

It was agreed to close the meeting no later than 16:00 CET.

1. Role call of participants

Of a total of 18 registered to participate a total of 10 were present at the meeting:

Name	Affiliation	Employer / Sponsor	Notes
Jirka KOSEK	Czech Republic	University of Economics, Prague	
Olivier COLAS	France	Microsoft	a.m. only
Tony HITTEMA	France	AFNOR	p.m. only
Mario WENDT	Germany	Microsoft	
Svante SCHUBERT	Germany	SUN Microsystems	
Makoto MURATA	Japan	International University of Japan	
Francis CAVE	WG 6 Convenor		
Alex BROWN	UK	Griffin Brown Digital Publishing Ltd	Teleconf.
Dave WELSH	USA	Microsoft	
Doug MAHUGH	Ecma	Microsoft	a.m. only

A total of six National Body Members and one Liaison Member of SC 34 were represented at the meeting.

2. Adoption of the agenda

Document: SC 34 N 1298rev1

Francis Cave proposed adoption of the advertised agenda with the following modifications:

- Item 3 (Future meetings) to be extended to include a discussion of what formal methods of communication should be used by WG 6.
- Item 5 (OASIS ODF TC documents submitted to SC 34) to be taken before Item 4 (comments, defect reports and Project Editor's responses).
- If there were sufficient time, under Any Other Business Francis Cave would report on the

following items:

- JTC 1 request to SCs to comment on ITTF permission notices for using schemas published as part of a standard.
- Activities of WG 5 (document interoperability).

Murata-san asked whether WG 6 should approve the meeting notes from the Ad Hoc Group 3 meeting in Seattle. Francis Cave said he wasn't sure that this was strictly necessary, but agreed that there would be no harm in reviewing the meeting notes following Item 3 and deciding whether or not WG 6 was happy with these notes as a record of the Seattle meeting.

The agenda was adopted as modified.

3. Future meetings and Working Group communication

3.1 Teleconference meetings

There was discussion of whether and how WG 6 should meet by teleconference. It was agreed that meeting by teleconference would enable more experts to participate in meetings. It was noted that the OASIS ODF TC meets exclusively by teleconference. It was agreed that meetings by teleconference should commence at the earliest opportunity.

Francis Cave noted that the JTC 1 Directives require that a minimum of three months' notice must be given for the first of a series of teleconference meetings, but that the notice period required for subsequent teleconference meetings is short.

Participants generally supported the proposal that teleconference meetings should be scheduled for every two weeks as a general rule, but that scheduled meetings could be canceled if there were insufficient business.

There was agreement that, although it would only be a week or so before the next SC 34 Plenary, it would be worthwhile to schedule the first teleconference meeting as soon as possible in March 2010, as this would enable work to be done preparatory for a face-to-face meeting immediately prior to the SC 34 Plenary in Stockholm, Sweden.

Various possibilities were discussed. It was noted that the OASIS TCs generally meet on Mondays, Tuesdays or Wednesdays, with the OIC TC generally meeting on alternate Wednesdays. Svante Schubert said that he believed that the OIC TC would have a teleconference meeting on 2010-03-10. Working Group 4 (Office Open XML) generally holds a teleconference meeting on alternate Thursdays. It was agreed that Francis Cave should sound out OASIS and the Project Editor (Patrick Durusau) on a proposal to meet on alternate Wednesdays at 14:00 UTC, with the first meeting being on 2010-03-17.

There was discussion of what teleconferencing facilities should be employed. It was noted that ISO are now able to offer web and phone conferencing facilities (using Citrix GoToMeeting) to SCs and WGs. These have not been tested yet. Murata-san suggested that WG 4 might be prepared to test these facilities at one of their teleconference meetings in January or February 2010. If the ISO facilities prove not to be satisfactory, Doug Mahugh said that Microsoft would be willing to provide teleconference facilities, as they are already doing for WG 4.

3.2 Face-to-face meetings

While teleconference meetings are convenient for more members, it was agreed that face-to-face meetings are sometimes necessary, especially to prepare reports and recommendations for SC 34

Plenary meetings.

It was agreed that a face-to-face meeting should be scheduled for immediately prior to the Stockholm meeting. It was agreed that a single day would be sufficient. It was agreed that, if possible, the WG 6 meeting should be scheduled to take place the day before the Plenary, as some participants would only be interested in attending the WG 6 and Plenary meetings, and not any of the other WG meetings.

It was agreed to postpone until the Stockholm meeting a decision on the possible need for further face-to-face meetings during 2010 in Helsinki, Finland, and in South Africa.

3.3 Working Group communications

There was discussion about what facilities would be needed for email communication. It was agreed that an email distribution list should be established and all email should be available on a public archive, in line with SC 34 policy.

Francis Cave reported that the SC 34 Secretariat would be able to provide an email distribution service but not a public email archive.

Jirka Kosek offered to arrange for the University of Economics, Prague, to provide both an email distribution service and a public email archive. This offer was provisionally accepted, pending confirmation from the SC 34 Secretariat that they would be happy with this arrangement.

There was discussion about the possible need for WG 6 to have its own document repository, separate to that of SC 34 as a whole. It was agreed that this was not needed at the moment, but it might become worthwhile at some future date, if the number of documents being circulated by WG 6 were to become large.

There was discussion about how formal communication between WG 6 and the OASIS ODF TC should be conducted. It was agreed that the correct procedure would be to channel all communication via the SC 34 Secretariat and the Project Editor, as had been discussed at the Ad Hoc Group 3 meeting in Seattle.

Francis Cave proposed that a website for WG 6 should be created when resources could be found to do so. It was agreed that this was a good idea, but not a high priority at present.

4. Review of meeting notes, Ad Hoc Group 3, Seattle, 2009-09-17

Document: SC 34 N 1284

The notes of the meeting of Ad Hoc Group 3 in Seattle, 2009-09-17, were reviewed. It was agreed that these were a satisfactory record of the meeting.

The action items arising from that meeting were reviewed. It was agreed that all actions had either been completed or would be covered later in the agenda of this meeting.

5. Review of OASIS ODF TC documents submitted to SC 34

5.1 Announcement of Public Review for OpenDocument Format 1.2, Part 3

Document: SC 34 N 1320

The meeting noted with interest the announcement of the Public Review for Part 3 of ODF 1.2. WG 6 members are invited to submit informal comments to the OASIS ODF TC via the 'office-

comment' list prior to the deadline of 2010-01-12.

5.2 OASIS ODF TC Status Update for SC 34

Document: SC 34 N 1331

The meeting reviewed the ODF TC Status Update. The following notes deal with items not dealt with under other agenda items later in the meeting.

Under the heading *Liaison Status*, the meeting took note that OASIS positions are formally recorded in both meeting minutes and liaison messages, and that it would therefore be sensible to review ODF TC meeting minutes as well as liaison messages submitted to SC 34.

The meeting noted the progress report on *ODF 1.2*, in particular that Part 1 is expected soon to be submitted for public review.

Under *ODF 1.0 maintenance* the meeting took note that progress on issues raised by defect reports can be tracked in the ODF TC's JIRA issue tracking database, a link to which can be found in the Status Update.

The meeting noted the ODF TC's comments on the set of defect reports submitted by the UK national body (SC 34 N 1309). These would be considered later in this meeting.

Regarding the proposal to amend ISO/IEC 26300:2006 to align with ODF 1.1, the meeting noted that the ODF TC has not yet reached a consensus on whether or not to submit the text of ODF 1.1 for preparation of such an amendment. The meeting agreed that concern should be expressed to the ODF TC about any delay in resolving the current status of ISO/IEC 26300:2006, which is not aligned with the current published version of the OASIS standard and also does not align with the majority of known current implementations of ODF.

There was discussion about what alternatives there might be to amendment of ISO/IEC 26300:2006. There was concern that, given the length of time it is taking for ODF 1.2 to be developed, it might be as much as two years before this is published as a JTC 1 standard, assuming that OASIS were to decide to submit a published ODF 1.2 standard to the JTC 1 PAS transposition process. Francis Cave reminded the meeting that the only practical options, apart from doing nothing, would be Amendment or Withdrawal. It was agreed that doing nothing was an unattractive option, due to the unsatisfactory status of the published standard.

Francis Cave asked meeting participants whether they were able to indicate national body positions on this issue. Jirka Kosek reported that the Czech national body position was in favour of alignment with ODF 1.1. Alex Brown reported that the UK national body position was also in favour of alignment with ODF 1.1. Murata-san said that the Japanese national body position is that alignment with ODF 1.1 is urgently needed, and this has been their position for a long time.

There was consensus among meeting participants that alignment of ISO/IEC 26300:2006 with ODF 1.1 remains the desirable option.

The morning session of the meeting ended at this point.

6. Defect reports

6.1 First set of defect reports submitted by the Japanese national body

Document: SC 34 N 0942

Francis Cave reported to the meeting that he understood that a text would shortly be provided by

the Project Editor for DCOR ballot, based upon the ODF 1.0 Approved Errata 01 (SC 34 N 1230).

6.2 Second set of defect reports submitted by the Japanese national body

Document: SC 34 N 1078

The meeting addressed the request from the OASIS ODF TC, contained within their Status Report (see item 5.2 above), for further feedback from WG 6 regarding the Project Editor's draft response (SC 34 N 1259) to the second set of defect reports submitted by the Japanese national body (SC 34 N 1078).

The meeting was reminded that the Project Editor's draft response (N 1259) had been discussed at the Ad Hoc Group 3 meeting in Seattle, and that meeting had requested that the Project Editor revise the draft response by providing a list of the defects to be resolved by adding text to explain that a feature is either implementation-defined or implementation-dependent.

The meeting noted that, as recorded in the minutes of its meeting of 2009-11-30, the ODF TC has considered this request and concluded that it cannot add text to explain that a feature is implementation-defined, because this would introduce a new conformance requirement.

The meeting discussed the position taken at the ODF TC meeting and agreed that the addition of "implementation-defined" to the text specifying a feature would indeed imply a new conformance requirement. However, the minutes of the ODF TC meeting don't record any discussion of the alternative suggested at the Ad Hoc Group 3 meeting, to specify a feature as being implementation-dependent. It was agreed that the ODF TC would be asked whether they had considered this alternative, which does not appear to involve the introduction of a new conformance requirement.

Francis Cave asked whether the Japanese national body would be satisfied by a response from the Project Editor that all under-specified features would have text added to indicate that the feature is implementation-dependent. Murata-san responded that this would be an acceptable response to defects of this kind, where no better response could be found.

The meeting discussed what might be done if the OASIS ODF TC are unable to add this alternative text. One option might be to develop a separate specification containing a stricter set of conformance requirements for an application profile of ISO/IEC 26300:2006.

Francis Cave asked the meeting whether there should be any further discussion of the Project Editor's draft response (N 1259). It was agreed that there was no necessity to review it further. It was agreed that, if the Project Editor is able to provide a revised response in which text is added to indicate features that are implementation-dependent, he should be asked to prepare a text for DCOR ballot.

6.3 Defect reports submitted by the UK national body

Document: SC 34 N 1309

Alex Brown presented the UK's first set of defect reports. He explained that these had been submitted as much as anything as a test of procedure, and there are roughly a further 100 potential defect reports that the UK is considering submitting, all of which have been informally submitted to the ODF TC via the 'office-comment' mailing list. Alex Brown went on to present a few of the defect reports that address significant procedural as well as technical issues.

UK defect report GB-26300-107a concerns unclear language. In addressing this kind of defect, should the Project Editor be encouraged to adopt ISO formal language, such as "shall" instead of "must"? The JTC 1 Directives make it clear that the PAS transposition process does not require the

formal language of Part 2 of the ISO/IEC Directives to be adopted, but are Technical Corrigenda exempt in the same way? These questions are not clearly answered by the Directives, so some clarification in such cases may need to be sought from the SC 34 Secretariat and ITTF.

UK defect report GB-26300-328 concerns under-specification of a feature, in this case dependent upon the interpretation of the term “harsh”. This kind of defect may be addressed by the approach being suggested for many of the defects reported by Japan in N 1078, i.e. by the addition of text to indicate that the meaning of “harsh” is implementation-dependent.

The meeting noted that, as recorded in the minutes of its meeting on 2009-11-30, the ODF TC is considering **UK defect report GB-26300-709**.

UK defect report GB-26300-34 concerns the interpretation of white-space characters, and in particular the phrase “optional white-space characters”. A literal interpretation of the text would lead to white-space characters being discarded where it clearly makes no sense to do so, and known implementations do not do so.

The meeting thanked the UK for submitting these defect reports. The meeting noted that the UK's intention had been for these defect reports to be discussed by WG 6 prior to formal submission, but that the document had nevertheless been treated as a formal submission both by the SC 34 Secretariat and by OASIS.

There was discussion about how national bodies should approach submission of defect reports. The meeting noted that it is the right of every national body to submit defect reports on ISO/IEC 26300:2006 without any prior presentation or discussion within WG 6. If national body experts would like to discuss potential defect reports with other expert members of WG 6, they are encouraged to do so informally via the WG 6 email discussion list.

7. Review of issues raised informally on the 'office-comment' list and logged in JIRA

There was insufficient time to carry out a review of other issues raised on the 'office-comment' list and logged in JIRA.

Francis Cave encouraged WG 6 members to monitor 'office-comment' and the JIRA issue tracking system to keep abreast of progress on issues already logged as well information submission of new issues, so that these can be taken into account when preparing new defect reports and avoid unnecessary duplications.

Francis Cave observed that, in addition to 'office-comment' and the JIRA issue tracking system, the OASIS ODF TC also maintained a Wiki, and it was unclear whether this contained information not available from the other two OASIS resources. He undertook to seek clarification from the OASIS ODF TC on this point.

8. Any other business

Francis Cave reported briefly on the discussions that had taken place earlier in the week in the WG 1 and WG 4 meetings, regarding a possible response from SC 34 to the request from JTC 1 for comments on the suitability of the ITTF legal notices that accompany downloads of free standards, particularly as they concern the use of schemas and similar resources. It was agreed that, as the schemas associated with ISO/IEC 26300:2006 are currently covered by OASIS IPR terms and conditions, WG 6 probably doesn't have anything to add to what has already been said by WG 1 and WG 4, but this may be a point that will need to be watched in future.

There was insufficient time to review the work of WG 5. Francis Cave suggested that WG 6

members should review the WG 5 meeting notes and other WG 5 documents, to familiarise themselves with the work being done within WG 5 relating to document format interoperability.

9. Acclamations

The meeting thanked Jirka Kosek and the University of Economics, Prague, for offering to host an email distribution service and archive for WG 6.

The meeting thanked Tony Hittema and AFNOR for the provision of meeting facilities and refreshments.

The meeting thanked IBM, Microsoft and AFNOR for the reception provided on the Wednesday evening for those attending the SC 34 Working Group meetings.

The meeting closed at approximately 16:00 CET.