CGM OPEN ACTIVITY REPORT — 2002
LONG BEACH TECHNICAL WORKING GROUP

1. Meeting details

1.1 Location and dates

Long Beach, California, September 22, 2002

1.2 Meeting

CGM Open Technical Committee September 22, 2002

1.3 CGMOpen attendees

- Dave Cruikshank – Boeing (Technical Committee Chair)
- Dieter Weidenbrück – ITEDO
- Lofton Henderson – (Program director)
- Andrew Moorhouse – MoD UK
- Bruce Garner – Lone Pine Water Works
- Kevin O'Kane – Auto-trol
- Don Larson – Larson Software Technology
- Ulrich Läsche - Ematek
- John Gebhardt – Corel Corp (invited guest)

2. Agenda

09:00 – 10:30	CGM Open web site vendor information
	Review preliminary website
	Review initial work on pro-forma pages
	Set time line for getting website into production
10:30-12:00	Vendor interoperability (if materials are available)
	Issue tracking process
	Issue resolution process
12:00 – 13:00	Lunch
13:00 – 15:00	WebCGM and SVG
	Discuss navigation questions about SVG
	Review outline of CGM Open position paper on SVG
	Prepare material for ATA GWG meeting
15:00 – 17:00	Review WebCGM DOM progress
	Application of CSS
	DOM Core
	DOM Events

3. Action Items

3.1 Reviewed action items

Item	Who	When	Reference
CGMOpen vendor product web site draft	Weidenbrück	09/16	4.1.1 - Done
Develop viewer pro-forma page	Henderson	09/16	4.1.2 - Done
Develop editor pro-forma page	O'Kane	09/16	4.1.3 - Open
Develop generator library pro-forma page	Cruikshank	09/16	4.1.3 - Open
Develop interpreter library pro-forma page	Carpenter	09/16	4.1.3 - Open
Develop process to track interoperability problems	DuLuc	09/16	4.2 - Done
Develop WebCGM – SVG comparison paper	Henderson	09/16	4.3 - Done
Review CSS for applicability to CGM DOM	Henderson/ Weidenbrück	09/16	4.4 - Done
Review DOM Core for applicability to CGM DOM	Cruikshank	09/16	4.4 - Open
Review DOM Event model for applicability to CGM DOM	Larson/ Läsche	09/16	4.4 - Open

3.2 New action items

Item	Who	When	Reference
Write introduction of vendor product web page	Gebhardt/ Weidenbrück	10/01	4.1.1 - Open
Write WebCGM top level web page	Gebhardt/ Weidenbrück	10/01	4.1.1 - Open
Write web page legal paragraph	Henderson	10/01	4.1.1 - Open
Write explanation sections for product categories	Garner	10/13	4.1.2 - Open
Develop editor pro-forma page	O'Kane	10/13	4.1.3 - Open
Develop interpreter and transcoder pro-forma pages	Larson	10/13	4.1.3 - Open
Assemble and release vendor product web site	Weidenbrück	10/21	4.1.3 - Open
Develop prototype for vendor interoperability problem tracking system	??	??	4.2 - Open
Finish WebCGM – SVG comparison paper	Weidenbrück	12/01	4.3 - Open
Review paper about CSS applicability to CGM DOM	All	10/31	4.4 - Open
Finish paper about CSS applicability to CGM DOM	Henderson	12/01	4.4 - Open

Review DOM Core for applicability to CGM DOM	Cruikshank	10/31	4.4 - Open
Review DOM Event model for applicability to CGM DOM	Larson/ Läsche	10/31	4.4 - Open
Contact GCA to explore their interest in CGMOpen participation on future XML conferences	Henderson	10/01	4.5 - Open

4. Activity Reports

4.1 CGMOpen web site vendor information

4.1.1 Review of preliminary web site

The meeting started with a review of the preliminary web site update submitted by Dieter (see: http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/cgmopen-members/200209/msg00005.html). The general question was if the CGMOpen web site should only list products supporting WebCGM or if it should be open to CGM related products in general. After a lively discussion, including a draw straw poll, we finally decided to only list WebCGM supporting products. The vendors can mention additional products in a comment section of the self-assessment forms (see 4.1.2). In addition, the web site will contain a section briefly describing the differences between the various CGM profiles in response to the large number of according questions. Links to ATA- or PIP-related web sites may be added as well. The main reasons for the restriction to WebCGM are marketing aspects (we don't want to confuse potential users of WebCGM) as well as the self-assessment procedures, which will not be applicable to non-WebCGM products. Further general web site topics under discussion included:

- The listing of vendor products will not be arranged by alphabetical order but will contain a rotation algorithm for products grouped by vendors
- The CGMOpen logo was changed by OASIS without having checked back with us. We want to go back to the original logo again.
- Is it possible to have a WebCGM top-level category in the web site or is the design restricted by OASIS? If we can have a top-level category Dieter & John will write it.

Action Items:

- Introduction of vendor product web page: John & Dieter – 10/01
- If possible (Lofton to clarify), WebCGM top level page: John & Dieter – 10/13
- Legal paragraph of vendor product web page: Lofton – 10/01

4.1.2 Review initial work on pro-forma pages

60 days after a product has been posted on the CGMOpen web site self-assessment needs to be completed by the respective vendor. Otherwise, the product will be removed from the list. The vendor is responsible for filling out the product compatibility statements in due diligence since CGMOpen has no resources for testing or quality assurance.

Products are grouped by categories requiring different sets of self-assessment procedures and pro-forma pages (see Lofton's contribution: http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/cgmopen-members/200208/msg00000.html). The web site draft under discussion does not contain a description of what a product category exactly means.

Lofton presented a viewer pro-forma draft (see http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/cgmopen-members/200208/msg00001.html) based on the NIST WebCGM test suite. In addition, Lofton enhanced the test suite for traceability, i.e. links to the WebCGM profile documents for retrieving the exact functionality under test. There is need for some test suite refinement (e.g., testing of Unicode, Tile Array compression, more dynamic tests) but the available material will allow already for detailed viewer self-assessment. The other pro-forma pages (generator, parser, editor) have not been submitted but are badly needed (see 4.1.3).

As a final topic on the pro-forma page discussion we decided that old pro-forma pages are being kept and listed at the bottom of the most recent pro-forma to keep track of product version improvements thus helping users to sort out compatibility problems.

Action Item: Bruce will write an explanation section for each of the 4 product test categories currently on the web site – 10/13.

4.1.3 Set time line for getting web site into production

We want to go live with the updated web site on 10/21. If a pro-forma is not available by then the product category will not be released on the web. All assignments have to go to Dieter for integration into the initial web site.

Action Items:

- "Editor" pro-forma page: Kevin – 10/13
- "Interpreter" & "Transcoder" pro-forma page - Don – 10/13
- Assembling and releasing updated web site - Dieter – 10/21

4.2 Vendor interoperability

This topic dealt with the mail Franck sent shortly before the meeting (09/21). Since Franck was absent during Sunday we could only briefly discuss the intention of his suggestions. Apparently, the form Frank sent is meant to collect the input that will prepare the database format Lofton proposed in an earlier response.

To start a beta problem report system we do not necessarily need a fully implemented system with web forms, database, etc. A preliminary system based on XSL/XSLT could be set up to prove the concepts. Especially, vendor acknowledgement time, assignment time (30 days?), keyword handling and storage, exact meaning of a keyword etc, need to be verified. Other questions included: When should an answer or problem been published on the web? Incomplete answers or analyses should not be posted. What about quality assurance?

Action Item: A follow-up meeting was scheduled for Wednesday for the people who would still be around (Dave, John, Franck?). They should form a task team and should eventually come up with a working prototype.

4.3 WebCGM & SVG

Lofton presented the draft for a (Web)CGM – SVG comparison paper. Initially planned to serve as background material for the GWG meeting later this week this paper should now become a document targeted at the growing number of managers and technicians asking for the benefits of SVG in the ATA context. Likewise, it will be useful for CGMOpen (part of Q&A section on web site).

To capture the interest of less technically oriented managers the paper should contain an initial chapter ("Executive Summary") outlining the major arguments for using CGM for the purpose of technical documentation. Additional chapters with a detailed discussion of technical differences are provided for illustrators with a profound understanding of graphical methods. Specifically, we need to emphasize the advantages of (Web)CGM in the areas object-to-object linking, navigating (no BHO approach in SVG), zoom model, highlighting, screentips and file size issues (embedded raster compression). Statements need to be carefully worded since W3C won't approve a document containing negative statements towards SVG.

Action Item: Lofton presented an updated version of this paper during the GWG meeting already. Dieter will finalize the paper before XML 2002.

4.4 Review WebCGM DOM progress:

Lofton presented a paper about the application of CSS on CGM (see: http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/cgmopen-members/200208/msg00002.html). This document on "Stylable CGM" reflects the current status of the DOM discussion. Questions that came up when browsing through the paper included:

- How can the style sheet be communicated to the viewer using the API?
- How do you turn off a style sheet once it was applied (apply – unapply methods)?
- Should we focus on single picture files and neglect multi-picture CGMs to simplify the DOM discussion?

Additional questions are summarized in the "Processing Model" section of this document. Input to DOM Core (Dave) and Event Model (Ulrich/Don) has not been submitted so far. No discussion took place.

Action Items:

- All – Comments to the questions – 10/31
- Lofton – Receive comments, finish document – XML 2002
- Dave/Don/Ulrich - Submit draft on DOM topics – 10/31

4.5 Next Meeting / GCA relationship:

Since the XML 2002 conference in Baltimore will not be attended very well by CGMOpen members (see below), the next meeting will take place in Pittsburgh, PA, Spring 2003, in combination with the next ATA GWG meeting. However, to keep things moving we should have at least one phone conference per month.

Concerning the relationship to GCA: Please check the XML conference web site (http://www.xmlconference.org/xmlusa/2002/schedule.asp), there is no Graphics Track at all. Dieter's talk about "WebCGM beyond Basics" is the only graphics related talk and was put on the last possible slot Friday morning. Other WebCGM related papers were rejected while SVG is not covered at all. Should we continue working with GCA in the future? Are there more Graphics oriented events we could focus on?

Action Item: Lofton will talk to GCA about their interest in CGM-related talks at future XML conferences.