

G26 RS Referencing Explanatory Report (RER) Template

RER Submitter: **OASIS (Recognized PAS Submitter)**

Date: **2012-06-28**

RS Originator: **PKWARE, Inc.**

RS Name and Identifier:

“APPNOTE.TXT - .ZIP File Format Specification” **Version 6.2.0, available at**
http://www.pkware.com/documents/APPNOTE/APPNOTE_6.2.0.txt

Note: URLs to specific portions of an organization's web site are acceptable answers throughout this document.

1. Justification Statement

This section shall address the following:

A) What is the relationship of the proposed RS to existing or emerging international standards (and regional or other standards as appropriate)

The ZIP APPNOTE specifies a cross-platform, interoperable, compressed container file. A container file is a single physical file that contains multiple logical files.

ZIP is referenced by existing International Standards such as ISO/IEC 26300 and ISO/IEC 29500. It is also used by EPUB and W3C Widgets, the JAR specification of the Java Programming Language, and Sharable Content Object Reference Model (ADL-SCORM)

B) If the RS is competing with or complementing an existing or emerging international standard, what is the rationale for referencing the RS?

We are not aware of any existing or emerging international standard in this area.

B) What is the degree of market acceptance of the proposed RS?

ZIP is the de facto standard in this area. It has been around since 1989 and is widely used on every major platform.

C) Why (or to what degree) is the transposition of the proposed RS into an IS inappropriate or impractical?

Although in many cases transposition of a consortium specification to an IS is possible, this is not commonly attempted with specifications submitted directly from a corporation. The 1997 PAS submission of the Java Programming Language by Sun Microsystems is an example of the complications that can arise.

2. Co-operative stance

This section shall address the following:

A) Has the RS Originator been notified that JTC 1 is preparing to normatively reference the RS?

Yes.

B) Has the RER Submitter reviewed this RER with an authorized representative of the RS Originator?

Yes.

C) Has the RS Originator indicated any reluctance for JTC 1 to reference the RS?.

No.

2.1 Ongoing maintenance:

This section should address the following:

A) What arrangements have been made for the ongoing maintenance of the RS?

Section XV of the APPNOTE covers the “Change Process” for the APPNOTE, including information for submitting defects reports. Defect reports may also be submitted at <http://www.pkware.com/appnote>.

B) Has consideration been given to maintenance of the RS if the RS Originator ceases operation? If so, what plans are in place to address this?

A copy of the APPNOTE has been deposited with the U.S. Library of Congress.

2.2 Changes

This section should address the following:

A) What is the flexibility of the RS Originator to apply changes to the RS if so requested during the process of balloting the referencing standard?

Existing process, editorial corrections, but no substantive technical changes, especially ones that could impact interoperability.

2.3 Availability of the referenced specification

This section should address the following:

A) What is the status of public availability¹ of the RS on fair, reasonable and non-discriminatory terms and conditions?

¹ Standards that are Publicly Available to implementers, evaluators and other interested parties for as long as the IS that references them is an active document are those which:

- May be obtained from the source organization by any person (with or without payment)

The ZIP APPNOTE is publicly available on the PKWARE website.

B) What is the URL or address where the RS Originator's specifications may be acquired?

http://www.pkware.com/documents/APPNOTE/APPNOTE_6.2.0.txt

3. Intellectual property rights

This section should address the following:

A) Is the IPR policy of the RS Originator publicly available or attached to this application?

See the section entitled 'LICENSE AGREEMENT' in the ZIP APPNOTE

B) Has the RS Originator reviewed this application for accuracy?

Yes.

3.1 Patents:

This section should address the following:

A) Does the RS Originator meet the ISO/IEC policy on patent matters?

i) If not, what difference or differences should JTC 1 be aware of?

Yes.

3.2 Copyrights:

This section should address the following:

A) What copyrights exist, and what copyrights is the RS Originator willing to grant, throughout both the evaluation and the publication cycle?

Copyright (c) 1989 - 2004 PKWARE Inc., All Rights Reserved.

During the evaluation cycle, PKWARE gives permission for Version 6.2.0 of the APPNOTE to be copied and distributed to ISO/IEC JTC1 member National Bodies and Liaison

-
- simply by quoting the reference number given in the IS to the source organization or typical supplier.
 - Are available in one of the official ISO and IEC languages from a publicly accessible source.
 - Are available without contractual limitations relating to its evaluation (other than limitations reasonably intended to restrict duplication and redistribution) and without substantive contractual limits on implementation of the referenced material or the IS as a condition of obtaining access to the referenced material.

organizations for purposes of reviewing this RER and the associated PAS submission of the OASIS OpenDocument Format 1.2 specification.

It is our understanding that the APPNOTE, as an external normative reference within the ODF specification, will be referenced but not published in any resulting published IS.

B) Will the RS Originator allow the text of the RS to be attached to a JTC 1 ballot as part of the ballot package for the referencing specification?

Yes.

3.3 Trademark rights:

This section should address the following:

A) What trademarks apply to the RS and with what conditions?

“PKWARE”, “PKZIP”, “PKUNZIP”, and “PKPatchMaker” are trademarks or registered trademarks of PKWARE, Inc.

We do not believe that any use of these trademarks is necessary in order to implement the APPNOTE.

4. Quality

This section should address the following:

A) Has the RER Submitter established that the proposed RS is of adequate quality, considering topics such as the length of the time the specification has existed, whether products have been implemented using it, whether conformance requirements are clear, and whether the specification is readily and widely available?

Yes.

B) What is the current level of standardization as of the date of this RER?

- Example: for IETF references, state what the level is - Best Current Practice, Proposed Standard, Draft Standard or Internet Standard

The referenced version of the APPNOTE has the status of “Final Publication” within the PKWARE specification process.