**ISO/IEC JTC 1
Information Technology**

Document Type:	**Other (defined)**
Document Title:	**Report from the SWG-Directives Ad Hoc on JTC 1 Directives Annex H**
Document Source:	**Ad Hoc Convener**
Reference:	**This document is for review and consideration by delegates to the July 2008 JTC 1 SWG-Directives Meeting in Mt. Tremblant, Canada**
Action ID:	**ACT**
Due Date:	
No. of Pages:	**7**

1   The JTC 1 SWG-D Ad Hoc on Annex H is providing this Report for discussion at the SWG-
2   Directives meeting in Mont Tremblant, Canada. Since the last SWG-D meeting, we have met a
3   number of times by telephone, and the participants have included ANSI, BSI, DIN, SC22, SWG-
4   A (via a submission), Canada (via JTC 1 N 8911), France (via JTC 1 N8958), ISO/IEC ITTF and
5   the JTC 1 Secretariat.
6
7   Annex H needs quite a number of editorial corrections. However, the more important topics are
8   policy issues, and we wish to focus SWG-D discussion on these high-level issues, obtain
9   direction/guidance from SWG-D, and then reconstitute the Ad Hoc so that we might prepare a
10 proper textual Annex H revision for consideration at the November JTC 1 Plenary.
11
12 The more important issues are marked with a grey background, to insure they are addressed at
13 the SWG-D meeting; certainly, participants could raise any of the other points shown for
14 discussion.
15
16 As we approach actual editing of Annex H, it will be clear from the material below that significant
17 changes will be made – and while a "change-bar" version of Annex H will be prepared, SWG-D
18 and NBs should be prepared for a full review of the new document as the "change bar" version
19 will not be that useful.
20
21 First, we wish to raise the following points to confirm that SWG-D is in agreement with our
22 position:
23
24   a. We should plan to remove Annex H from the JTC 1 Directives, and issue it as a
25   Standing Document (once we are clear on process for these documents). A close
26   examination of the Directives for references to Annex H (and duplicated text) should be
27   done. Such a Standing Document must be easily accessible by all parties.
28
29   b. Make a clear distinction between tools/formats used to prepare documents and submit
30   them for JTC 1 and/or ISO/IEC ITTF action – and the formats used in the publication of
31   documents. For example, ITTF uses PDF extensively now for publication purposes,
32   even though the source document may have been submitted in some more suitable
33   revisable format. Annex H should be much clearer about these distinctions.
34
35   c. As much as possible, insure alignment with the latest ISO/CS guides and electronic
36   tools, so there is minimal confusion over allowed formats.
37
38 The following sections map to outline in the *Terms of Reference for the Ad Hoc Group*
39 (Recommendation 9, JTC 1 N 8987).
40
41 1. *"This Ad Hoc Group is charged with conducting a thorough review of Annex H and make*
42   *recommendations on how to improve it."*
43   a. As these are policies, closely examine the use of "should", "shall", etc.
44   b. Eliminate all references to Annex H being a "web-based document", as shown in the
45   preamble to Annex H. Modifications to this Annex become effective in the same fashion
46   as any other change to the JTC 1 Directives (or as provided for a Standing Document).
47   c. "H1 Scope" may be simplified to:
48   i. remove all mention of diskette-based distribution.

49   ii. remove references to outdated/non-existent documents, most likely leaving only
50   references to 4 ISO Central Secretariat documents: the *ISO eServices Guide* (and
51   updates, located at http://www.iso.org/e-guides), *Provision of texts and graphics in*
52   *electronic form*, *ITSIG specification for the preparation and exchange of graphics*,
53   and *FAQ for graphics*. The *Tips and Techniques* document and the *ISO ITSIG*
54   *Guide* (which expired in 2001) are no longer used. ISO/CS is now preparing a
55   revision of the *ISO eServices Guide* and will soon be requesting submissions.

56   iii. note the distinction between documents prepared and published solely for JTC 1
57   internal use; and documents which will be submitted for further processing at the
58   ISO Central Secretariat.

59   iv. focus mainly on differences between JTC 1 policies and those already in place at
60   the ISO Central Secretariat. In particular, Annex H should not attempt to redefine
61   the ISO Central Secretariat provisions for submissions in general, but rather
62   extend/subset those instructions as required for JTC 1 activities. Such deviations
63   could be submitted for possible incorporation into the ISO/CS Provisions.

64   v. Add a sentence or provision concerning accessibility: "In order to make information
65   on ISO/IEC JTC 1 and its activities available to the widest range of audiences, it is
66   essential that documents to be distributed electronically be provided in an
67   accessible format."

68 d. "H2 Medium" should be reworded to state the policy of how JTC 1 documents are
69   provided through the ISO Central Secretariat, the JTC 1 Secretariat and finally by
70   National Bodies. The current "webmaster" and "web browser" language is antiquated.
71   FTP should be kept as a useful transfer protocol, not only for efficiency purposes but
72   also for accessibility purposes (and SC29 uses it).

73 e. "H3 Virus Checking" should clarify that all Secretariats and other entities charged with
74   maintaining repositories should use appropriate anti-virus software, and that document
75   users have a responsibility to notify the JTC 1 Secretariat if a virus is discovered in any
76   distributed JTC 1 document. Appropriate actions to take would be to inform recipients;
77   remove the document; or replace the document with a 'clean' version.

78 f. Note in H4 that Abstracts are required within JTC 1 for all standards and technical
79   reports – but not required for ISO Committees (nor discussed in the ISO/IEC Directives).

80 g. Promote "H4.1 Document Format [Policies]" to a first-level heading as it is a core part of
81   this Annex. Do the same for other H4.x sections.

82   i. H4.1 should reference the content/structure used in the Provisions document
83   describing formats for <u>submitted</u> document (the discussion of <u>publication</u> formats is
84   different):

85   1) Documents intended for further revision – text files, graphic files, etc. It may be
86   appropriate to distinguish between documents which may be further revised
87   within JTC 1 from those modified by the ISO Central Secretariat for general
88   publication. The latter case may have stronger restrictions.
89
90   The following formats are currently accepted via the electronic submission
91   interface (http://isotc.iso.org/livelink/si) :
92
93   Graphic Formats: *.eps *.ps *.dwg *.dwf *.v11 *.ppt *.wmf *.emf *.vsd *.jpg *.jpeg
94   *.tiff *.tif *.gif *.psd *.png *.pcx *.bmp *.pre *.cdr *.dxf

95
96   Text Formats: *.doc *.rtf *.wp *.fm *.sgml *.sgm *.xml *.xls *.txt
97
98   (The *.docx and *.odf formats are <u>tentatively</u> planned to be accepted for
99   submissions beginning in 05-2009, and there will be further discussion about
100   related XML-based formats such as .pptx, etc.)
101
102   (Further discussion is needed on .htm and .pdf as they are missing from the
103   above list from ISO/CS.)
104
105   (It is also noted that the electronic ballot system does not use all the formats
106   listed above, and further rationalization may be needed)
107   2) Documents not intended for further revision – PDF and similar formats (further
108   clarification needed on the precise PDF version number, use of PDF/A, etc.).
109   3) HTML and XHTML files (note that HTML 4.1 – ISO/IEC 15445:2000 – would be
110   an appropriate reference)
111   4) Compression formats - *.zip, *tar, *.gzip, etc. (pending further clarification).
112   ii. SWG-A has recommended the use of ODF1.1 instead of ODF1.0 (ISO26300) for
113   accessibility reasons.
114   iii. Use the format variations/notes as specified in the Provisions document – for
115   example, the use of Word 97 should be deprecated in favor of Word 2003 (though
116   existing documents in earlier formats could be stored). The Notes shown for Word
117   97 could be removed.
118   iv. The use of ISO/IEC 8859-1 should be deprecated as it does not support all the
119   characters used in French nor the Euro sign. ISO/IEC 10646-1 is preferred.
120   v. Remove the recommendation to use HTML for files "viewed on the web".
121   vi. Delete H4.1.1, as it discusses considerations when changing/updating
122   applications; the focus of this Annex is on formats, and appropriate applications are
123   required to properly process the formats. At the time that any changes are made to
124   the specified formats, consideration must be given to the availability of appropriate
125   tools.
126 h. Incorporate "H4.2 Graphics…" into H.1 at the appropriate places, so that all policies
127   concerning formats are in one section. Add PNG (as noted above in the list of ISO/CS
128   allowed formats). SWG-A recommends inclusion of SVG, and that from an accessibility
129   perspective both SVG and PNG should be preferred over JPEG and GIF.
130 i. "H4.3 Document Structure" should capture all policies related to structure, and where
131   templates are noted some indication of where to find them.
132 j. "H4.4.1 Directory Naming Structure" might be eliminated. Discussion may be needed on
133   the listed limit of 128 characters in a fully qualified file name.
134 k. "H4.4.2 File Naming Schema" could exist as a major section. The following points are
135   noted:
136   i. Many of these rules are commonly violated today, for example:
137   1) "j1nxxxx" is not always used for JTC 1 ("JTC001-N-nnnn" is used)
138   2) The letters Y and Z are used

139   3) The "a" identifier for file categories does not seem to be used; further discussion
140   is needed.

141   ii. It may be appropriate to consider allowing the nnnn field to expand to 5 digits or
142   more. There should be no need to reference an ISO "wizard" if the formats are
143   properly specified; alternatively, the location of the "wizard" and how to use it
144   should be given.

145   iii. Proper definition of the .zip format should be given.

146   iv. File extensions should be listed with their allowed format in a previous section.

147   v. Comments about a "document summary" should be placed with the description of
148   the format, as not all formats allow for an included set of metadata; further, the
149   structure of the metadata could be different.

150   vi. SWG-A asks that "meaningful short titles" be used along with document numbers
151   of all files distributed electronically, and any constraint on file name length be
152   consistent with this concept.

153   vii. France suggests relaxing the number of allowed file name characters from 32 to a
154   number between 70 and 255, and to keep the leading string well-defined (e.g.
155   *JTC1-N-8860_and_some_more_title_words*).

156   l. "H4.4.3 Document Register Log" should be a major section, and the policy clarified to
157   shows which JTC entities (Secretariats, particularly) must follow this policy. The
158   information on registry structure from Annex HG, Part II, should be moved to this section
159   and properly combined. Further discussion may be needed to understand which
160   elements are actually being used today.

161   m. "H4.4.4 Announcement…" should clarify which entities are required to announce
162   document availability, and the appropriate timelines. As users will fetch documents as
163   needed, the reference to a "batched mailer" may be deleted. The email message
164   contents will need to be validated against current JTC 1 Secretariat use. This could be a
165   high level section, and mention the use of LiveLink.

166   n. "H4.4.5 Use..." could be combined with the reference to the document Register Log in
167   H4.4.4.

168   o. "H4.5 Web Site Document Retention…" should be removed as JTC 1 Directives 4.6
169   covers this topic.

170   p. "H5 Compression Utilities" should be eliminated. If a compressed format is allowed, it
171   should be adequately described in the section denoting allowable formats for
172   submission.

173   q. "H6 Direct Electronic Distribution" could be converted to cover only email lists, as H6.2
174   and H6.3 are no longer needed.

175   r. "H7 Access Control…" is an important topic and should be retained. The provision that
176   passwords should be changed once or twice per plenary cycle should be examined as it
177   is likely not being followed.

178   s. "Annex HB" contains examples which do not follow the formats shown in H4.4.2.
179   Discussion is needed to see whether these examples are too complex for common use.

180   t. "Annex HC" should be eliminated in favor of a reference to ISO 8859-1 in the text.

181 u. "Annex HD" was reviewed by ISO/CS to confirm that it matches existing practice, and
182   the JTC 1 Secretariat concurs. The large footnote at the end should be moved to H7 and
183   better organized for readability; the comment about the POCOSA agreement is out of
184   place and should be deleted.
185
186   ISO/CS notes: "The reference is to our commercial policy (POCOSA) and for the rights
187   and obligations of ISO members in this respect. We have adjusted this policy to the age
188   of electronic distribution of our standards, which has become the major channel. The
189   protection of our copyright, and of the related revenue, raises new challenges as a result
190   of the distribution of our deliverables through the WWW, for which solidarity between the
191   members of ISO is crucial, as stated in our Code of Ethics."

192 v. "Annex HE" might be better positioned in-line with the description of formats in H4.1, as
193   it must be consistent with that material. The phrase "No guidance" in the KEY should be
194   better explained or deleted.

195 w. "Annex HF" should be deleted.

196 x. "Annex HG" would be better positioned in the mainline text than as an annex – but it
197   needs to be retained. Some material has been previously stated and should be
198   removed. Indentation and other editorial corrections are needed. Non-policy information
199   could be place elsewhere, for example in a guide or similar document. The reference to
200   "commonly available browsers" and executable code will need discussion.
201
202   SWG-A requests that this section include a policy statement regarding accessibility; that
203   any mandatory elements must be accessible; and item III.5.a should include the use of
204   the draft W3C specification WAI-ARIA (Accessible Rich Internet Applications) as an
205   appropriate acceptable format.
206

207 2. *"Specifically, they are requested to focus on:"*

208 a. *"the availability of recommended tools"*

209   • The ISO Central Secretariat, JTC 1 Secretariat and SC Secretariats should be asked
210   to comment on whether they have the tools needed to process each of the allowed
211   document types (both as documents submitted to them and on formats used for
212   publication).

213   • It is agreed that any particular SC might use other tools (troff, LaTeX, XML, SGML,
214   etc.) during specification development within the SC, but in submissions to JTC 1 or
215   higher, the provisions of Annex must apply.

216   • If new tools are required, appropriate training may be needed.

217 b. *"the relevance of the formats listed"*

218   • It may be wise to distinguish between file formats for new documents and those that
219   should no longer be used for new documents. Such historical formats could be listed.

220   • A survey or canvass of SC secretariats might be useful to determine which formats
221   they wish to use and which are not currently supported.

222 c. *"the availability of new formats"*

223   • New formats, such as the text and image processing document formats specified in
224   IS26300 and IS29500, should be allowed, dependent on ISO/CS and JTC 1

225   Secretariat capabilities to process them (see the earlier comment about acceptability
226   of these formats in 2009).

227   d.   *"the lay-out of the document"*

228   •   The current structure of text sections followed by referenceable tables is appropriate,
229   but should be a separate Standing Document.

230   •   Some annexes (HG, for example) are better suited for inclusion in the main-line text.

231   e.   *"whether or not this should be an annex or standing document"*

232   •   It would be preferred to make Annex H a JTC 1 Standing Document.

233   f.   *"ensure that revisable versions of meeting reports and resolutions are made available"*

234   •   This Ad Hoc concluded that this requirement would be better expressed as the ability
235   to easily <u>extract</u> data from factual, read-only reports and resolutions. There should be
236   no intent to allow revision of published documents except through authorized
237   processes.

238   •   This Annex H should prescribe the various formats which simplify the extraction of
239   material may be used for reports/resolutions, and it would be more appropriate to
240   establish a policy which requires the use of such formats by amending JTC 1
241   Directives section 8.3.4/8.3.5 (which describes such documents) or 7.10.4 (meeting
242   reports).

243   g.   *"retention issues in line with the requirements in 4.6 of the Directives"*

244   •   The policies for document retention are noted in Directives 4.6 and should remain
245   there, with just a reference in this Annex.