

CGM Open Minutes for 1998-03-10

(Submitted by: Lofton Henderson, 1998-03-23)

1. Introduction

Location: Memphis, TN, Crowne Plaza hotel.

Date: 10 March 1998, approximately 6:00 – 9:00 pm.

Purpose: Regular meeting of CGM Open; Technical Meeting with W3C

Presiding: John Gebhardt moderated the meeting

Recording: Lofton Henderson recorded and prepared minutes

Regular business of CGM Open, particularly the continuation of the incorporation and set-up process, took nearly three hours on the scheduled evening of the meeting.

Because a representative of W3C (Roy Platten) attended the meeting, for the purpose of discussing technical topics related to the proposed Web Profile of CGM, a second meeting was held the morning of 11th March.

2. Attendance

22 people attended the meeting. See attendance list at the end of this minutes. It was noted that there was an approximate balance between numbers of vendors and industry users, and that government and W3C were represented as well.

3. Proceedings

3.1. Approval of Agenda

It was moved and seconded (Wiedenbrück/Mulraney) to approve the draft agenda for the meeting. Unanimous.

3.2. Approval of Minutes

It was moved and seconded (Cruikshank/DeWilde) to approve the minutes of two previous meetings, as posted on <http://www.cgmopen.org>: Springfield meeting (1997-09-22), and Washington DC meeting (1997-12-09). Unanimous.

Springfield was the first regular meeting of CGM Open, and the Washington meeting was a drafting meeting to advance the charter and bylaws.

3.3. Web Site

Dieter Wiedenbrück reported that the setup of the Web site – <http://www.cgmopen.org> – had been completed after some delays, and current versions of all minutes, announcements, and draft charter and bylaws are posted there.

The mailer – cgmopen@cgmopen.org – is operational as well and has 62 subscribers.

There was discussion about content for the Web site and setting up discussion groups for topics of interest. Topics discussed:

1. Agreed to take the CGM tutorial information from NIST, edit, and post it on CGM Open Web site (with pointer from NIST). NIST certification and validation lists will remain in place (with pointer from CGM Open site). Action: Dieter Wiedenbrück to do content editing and posting of material.
2. Agreed that we should draft guidelines for reference to CGM Open by members, to avoid inappropriate claims of special status or special relationship.: Alan Porter to draft “CGM Open Referencing Guidelines”.
3. Discussion of additional educational material, white papers, etc. Possibilities include:
 - Reference to *The CGM Handbook*, Henderson & Mumford, Academic Press 1992.
 - A copy of Gilbane Report article of Gebhardt & Henderson, “CGM: SGML for Graphics”. Action: Gebhardt, Henderson to investigate.
4. Pointer (future) to CGM:1998, which will be posted by ISO on the Web in HTML format.
5. Newsgroups?
6. A way to submit defect reports? This is probably best left to ISO procedures.
7. Current ISO defect resolutions for CGM:1992? This was discussed and it was agreed to post the existing defects eventually (after there was some more positive content).

It was agreed that all of these ideas would be pursued, but after CGM Open incorporation is finished. It was also agreed to start working on more attractive structuring of the Web site. An open invitation for volunteers was issued — any volunteers should make up a few sample pages in HTML format and bring to the next regular CGM Open meeting.

3.4. Logo Contest

There will be an open contest for design of the CGM Open logo. Submissions must be made by 30th April. Submissions should be in GIF or JPEG format and sent to Dieter Wiedenbrück. Voting will be by the Web voting procedure from VRML Consortium, and will close on 15th May. Action: Gebhardt to set up Web voting procedure.

3.5. Incorporation, Charter, and Bylaws

All agree that immediate incorporation is the highest priority, so that CGM Open is an established entity with legal standing. Goal: incorporation by end of April.

The charter and bylaws, as amended by the 12//97 drafting meeting in Washington, were accepted without change (see, however, discussion of membership fee structure below).

Incorporation in Delaware is preferred, and as a 501C non-profit corporation was agreed. It was agreed to seek volunteer legal help from prospective initial member companies, to get the incorporation finished as quickly and cheaply as possible.

InterCAP volunteered its legal services to do the incorporation, and InterCAP, ITEDO, and Canon volunteered to split the cost. Action: Gebhardt to initiate incorporation actions with InterCAP corporate counsel.

3.6. Membership and Fees

The membership and fee structure provided the only significant discussion of the charter and by-laws. The charter was borrowed from and modeled after the charter of the VRML Consortium.

The by-laws are borrowed from and modeled after SGML Open (now renamed OASIS and with expanded scope). The membership categories (Sponsor, Contributor, and Participant), associated rights and privileges, and fee structure match OASIS exactly.

A lower introductory prices structure was proposed and discussed. Argument: initially, most benefits do not exist, and a lower initial price would attract more members. Examples would be half-price, or two years at Sponsor level for the cost of one (initially). A straw poll showed that with the fees as in the draft by-laws, there would be:

| | | |
|--------------|---|-------------|
| Sponsors | 6 | (@ \$7,500) |
| Contributors | 4 | (@ \$4,000) |
| Participants | 5 | (@ \$2,000) |

With half-price charter membership fees:

| | |
|--------------|----|
| Sponsors | 10 |
| Contributors | 2 |
| Participants | 4 |

There would apparently be a few more Sponsor members, but a significant net decrease in initial revenue. The idea was not discussed further (but the 2-years-for-price-of-1 proposal has since been circulated to the mail exploder).

The idea of “contingent commitment to join” was discussed – prospective members would commit to join at a given level assuming successful incorporation within a given time. Instead it was decided to pursue rapid incorporation, then open up the membership for joining.

3.7. OASIS / SGML Open

SGML Open has redefined its charter and/or by-laws to broaden its scope, and has renamed itself OASIS: Organization for the Application of Structured Information Standards.

Discussions at the Washington meeting (12/97) and subsequently between Gebhardt and the Board of Directors reveal mutual interest in collaboration or possible consolidation. See documents on Web page.

At this Memphis meeting, it was agreed to “stay in touch” with OASIS (action: John Gebhardt).

Note: Lofton Henderson, Bill Smith, and Carla Corkern had some subsequent informal discussions at the Inso User Conference, 3/98. Possible structures were discussed, with the goals and constraints:

- to allow for sharing of infrastructure and governing structure,

- exploitation of obvious synergies,
- preservation of an appropriate level of autonomy for CGM program and interests.

We agreed that a positive step forward would be for OASIS to draft and submit a strawman proposal for a consolidation. OASIS will also submit material about its various active programs (e.g., “Summer Camp”).

3.8. W3C and Web Profile

Roy Platten, from Rutherford Appleton Labs (RAL), attended the CGM Open meeting to discuss the Web Profile for CGM. An initial meeting between W3C and CGM Open was held in San Jose, CA, January 1998, and the results are reported in “Report of W3C and CGM Open Meeting...” (on the Web page).

Roy is the editor designated by W3C to do the Web Profile work. Some time was spent discussing who would play what roles, and what is a reasonable way forward.

There is some uncertainty about whether W3C needs a Working Group for the CGM profile (Chris Lilley thought not, at San Jose meeting). There is also uncertainty about what standing CGM Open would have, to participate in the W3C project. Finally, it was noted that there is not high enthusiasm in W3C for the necessity of a Web vector format, and therefore comments to W3C from its members would be useful.

Organizational issues aside, it was agreed that it would be useful for CGM Open to make significant technical contributions, perhaps as a set of comments in the form of “editing directives” against a base document. The base document would be produced by Roy and would correspond to ATA Grexchange 2.4, as modified by agreements from the San Jose meeting.

According to the funding and scheduling constraints, work must be finished by the end of 1998. We agreed that this meant any contribution from CGM Open should happen soon and the draft Web Profile must be ready for W3C review around the end of May.

As it was too late in the evening to begin technical work, it was agreed to reconvene in the morning to review the outstanding technical issues from the San Jose meeting. The results of the 11 March morning meeting are reported in a separate document, “Supplement to CGM Open Minutes for 1998-03-10.”

4. Next Meetings & Action Items

4.1. Next Meetings

It was agreed that CGM Open should not attempt to meet during the ATA GWG meetings, but rather before or after (this was the original plan for Memphis). An exception could be an evening administrative or directors meeting, but the technical agenda is already too time consuming.

The next regular CGM Open meeting will be in conjunction with the next ATA GWG meeting, Washington DC, June 1998.

There will be a technical working meeting to complete the CGM Open contribution to W3C on the

Web Profile. The date will be 17th April in Chicago. The tentative location is the Inso offices (320 Wacker Dr., Chicago).

We discussed the possibility of meeting with W3C in Paris, around SGML/XML Europe, as a number of principals of both organizations will be present. Decision deferred until we confer further with W3C on appropriate roles in the Web Profile development.

4.2. Action Items

Summary of action items from the meeting:

1. Porter – draft “CGM Open Referencing Guidelines” for review and adoption.
2. Wiedenbrück – edit NIST’s CGM overview and tutorial material and transfer to Web site.
3. Gebhardt & Henderson – look into “CGM: SGML for Graphics?” for the Web site.
4. All – generate submissions for CGM Open logo and submit for Web posting and voting.
5. Gebhardt – set up Web voting procedure on or before 4/30/98 (for logo contest).
6. Gebhardt – initiate CGM Open incorporation InterCAP corporate.
7. Powell – draft, and circulate for review, the press release that we will make upon incorporation.
8. Gebhardt (& Henderson) – “Stay in Touch” with OASIS (formerly SGML Open).
9. Henderson – investigate use of Inso Chicago facilities for 4/17/98 meeting.

5. Attendance List

| Name | Company | Email |
|------------------|--------------------|--|
| Ty Bartosh | Jeppesen | tybartosh@jeppesen.com |
| Bruce Garner | LLNL/Consultant | bruceg@wenet.net |
| Lynne Rosenthal | NIST | lsr@nist.gov |
| Roy Platon | RAL | r.t.platon@rl.ac.uk |
| Gary Lyle | Boeing | gary.w.lyle@boeing.com |
| Harry Whittaker | NSWCCD | whittake@dt.navy.mil |
| Brad Powell | Zeh | bpowell@zeh.com |
| Dave Rahnis | Bentley Systems | dave.rahnis@bentley.com |
| Lofton Henderson | HSI / Inso Boulder | lofton@cgm.com |

| | | |
|--------------------|----------------------------|--|
| Suresh Makhijani | Canon USA | makhijani@worldnet.att.net |
| Franck Duluc | Aerospatiale / Airbus | franck.duluc@avions.aerospatiale.fr |
| Don Larson | Larson Software Technology | dlarson@cgmlarson.com |
| Richard Wilber | Pratt & Whitney | wilberre@pweh.com |
| Alan Hester | Xerox | Alan.Hester@wb.xerox.com |
| Alan Porter | InterCAP | ajp@intercap.com |
| Forrest Carpenter | System Development | forrest@sysdev.com |
| Geraldine Doná | Bombardier Aerospace | gdona@dehavilland.ca |
| Dieter Wiedenbrück | ITEDO Software | dieter@isodraw.com |
| Andre DeWild | United Airlines | a.dewilde@ual.com |
| Steve Mulvaney | Rolls-Royce | stephen.s.p.mulvaney@rolls-royce.btx400.co.uk |
| Dave Cruikshank | Boeing | david.w.cruikshank@boeing.com |
| Victor Osei | Bombardier Aerospace | vosei@dehavilland.ca |