

WebCGM Telecon – 20060503

Attendees

Dave Cruikshank
Andrew Moorhouse
Stuart Galt
Ben Bezaire
Lofton Henderson
Chris Lilley (guest)
Forrest Carpenter
Don Larson
Franck Duluc
Ulrich Laesche

Agenda

Overview

Chris Lilley from W3C attended the telecon as a guest. This telecon was devoted to discussing possible resolutions to preliminary comments made by Chris on WebCGM 2.0 (http://www.oasis-open.org/committees/download.php/17844/CL-comments_proposed_resolution.htm).

Discussion

Lofton opened the discussion by summarizing the current status of the comments proposed resolutions. There were four items that the group needed clarification from Chris on and three items that the group is still working on.

[CL-c1:](#)

LH: International linking is allowed in profiles. A note is added to the requirements document to cover the differences here.

CL: It is important that other national bodies be able to adopt WebCGM without profiling. The note that was added seems to cover comment

[CL-c2:](#)

LH: We have had additional discussion nailing down the use cases and scenarios. The metafile is restricted to 1 picture in 2.0. The original wording of 2.0 restricted the fragment syntax picseqno to 1, but we have resolved to remove that restriction. We will specify what to do in all cases.

CL: Then a WebCGM 2.0 file can point to WebCGM 1.0 file and use the WebCGM 1.0 syntax?

LH: The fragment syntax of WebCGM 2.0 file would allow you to use the fragment sequence when pointing to WebCGM 1.0 file.

CL: Both the outgoing syntax and incoming syntax needs to be addressed.

LH: With that caveat we will revise text appropriately. [CL-c7](#) and [CL-c10](#) are also addressed here.

[CL-c3:](#)

CL: Part A is editorial and satisfied. Part B relates to how charmod is used. The requirement in IRI about normalization only applies if text is not Unicode. Which character maps to which Unicode character needs to be done, so you need normalization to make things work.

LH: UTF-8 and UTF-16 saves us from normalization work.

CL: Resolved

LH: [CL-c1](#), [CL-c4](#), and [CL-d1](#) are related and resolved.

CL-c4:

LH: WebCGM 2.0 allows 8859-1 OR UTF-8 OR UTF-16

CL: Resolved

[CL-c5](#):

CL: OK – resolved.

[CL-c6](#):

LH: In dealing with relative URI's, its unclear that we are using a non-standard approach,.

CL: RFC-3986 page 28 – base URI – 4 layers around base. URI says it needs to resolved relative to the base document.

LH: You mean any href in the XML. In this section we are only talking about the relative URI in the XCF fragment production. We may need to address in terms of relative URI's in content.

CL: In the content case we need to do what everyone else done. I may have misunderstood the intent here.

LH: We will look for potential holes for content case.

[CL-c7](#):

See [CL-c2](#) – resolved.

[CLI-c8](#):

CL: As a clarification, SVG adopted behaviors from WebCGM 1.0. Does SVG need to adopt what 2.0 has done?

LH: The three old behaviors did not give the control needed by applications. We derived the thirteen we now have by defining a new set of navigation basics and a new set of highlighting basics, and adding their cross products to form the new set of object behaviors. We had long discussions on behaviors resulting in what we did in WebCGM 2.0.

CL: SVG 1.1 adopted the behaviors. There may be an action for SVG to close the gap. How is highlight realized?

LH: The highlights are resolved in an implementation dependent manner

CL: OK – resolved.

[CL-c9](#):

LH: Editorial – accepted

[CL-c10](#):

LH: We are replacing the table with prose to clarify. This is an informative section (not normative).

CL: [ed note: missed this comment, but it had something to do with the use of the use of the frame target name and the object tag]

LH: We will stack this for later, pending completion of research action item (BB) into the CDF connection. SVG 1.1 has target behaviors as in WebCGM 1.0. WebCGM 2.0 behaviors are the same as WebCGM 1.0 behaviors.

[CL-d1](#):

LH: We will update the reference – resolved

[CL-d2:](#)

LH: We will update the reference – resolved

[CL-d3:](#)

LH: We have agreed on improved wording for spec.

BB: Alpha is linear. Compositing is done in color model in effect.

CL: Do you allow alpha in other than [ed note: missed this context]

LH: There is no group compositing.

CL: OK, all set except for documenting – resolved

[CL-d4:](#)

LH: Editorial – resolved

[CL-d5:](#)

CL: Is this block on inline text? The behavior is different.

LH: We have deferred search functionality for a later version of WebCGM.

BB: Para is not a text element and the content attribute is available for searching. If you had a “hello” in a raster element within para, you could put a content element containing “hello”.

CL: How would use subpara?

DC: We use it to identify a sub element of para that may have a link associated with it.

CL: You need to specify use of subpara. This is the kind of thing internationalization and accessibility people will look at. If you have a para with multiple subparas it will sound like para is a block and subpara is an inline

LH: We don't have block flow para text like SVG:

CL: OK, but the other groups will need more explanation. I will provide a pointer to what he's talking about

LH: We will continue our investigation.

LH: WebCGM does not have accessibility features like 'alt'. Are we likely to get comments against WebCGM 1.0 on this?

CL: It depends on the outcome of para/subpara resolution. What does this really mean?

[CL-d6:](#)

See discussion of [CL-d5](#)

[CL-d7:](#)

CL: This was a misunderstanding on my part – OK

LH: We will clarify – resolved

[CL-d8:](#)

LH: This is editorial. When we updated the spec we missed a sentence in informative section. That has been corrected. It now points to 3.1.1.4 which is clarified

CL: What does that say?

LH: It is carefully explained there and will result in an erratum for WebCGM 1.0

CL: OK - resolved

[CL-d9:](#)

LH: Editorial - is URI acceptable here?

CL: In this case it really in an IRI.

LH: We will look at all occurrences of URI and see if we mean IRI..

CL: OK - resolved

[CL-d10:](#)

See resolution of [CL-c2](#) and [CL-c7](#).

General Discussion:

LH: We would like to apply some comments that we have found that we would like to incorporate in W3C WG before going to LC. Can we treat these comments the same way?

CL: What you need is agreement in the W3C working group before you can apply changes.

DC: Can the working group be formed at close of AC ballot?

CL: Yes, but a participation call will go out and other participation will have to be considered first.

LH: Will the staff contact help us set up web pages, etc.

CL: Yes

LH: Are there new tools for administration?

CL: Yes dealing with processes for membership and issue control.

BB: Can we expect more comments from you?

CL: Not in near future. I attempted to catch obvious ones to reduce comments during last call.

DC: Has Lockheed responded to AC ballot?

CL: No, not yet,

DC: I will contact Lockheed to pursue comments and participation.

At this point Chris signed off.

Additional agenda items:

Actions:

Test Suite slackers:

Dave

Stuart

Dieter – Update of the unicode test with unicode tests in apsid and references only.

Need to simplify

Lofton and Ben to review Chris' email on IRC.

No standardized search functionality – how would you use content to do this – need to specify

Franck item – closed (<http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/cgmo-webcgm/200605/msg00009.html>)

Couple of other open action on CL comments