

**PDF/A US Draft Meeting Minutes
December 11, 2006**

**Adobe Offices
Tysons, Virginia**

Participants:
Rob Buckley (T)
Mary Abbott
Leonard Rosenthol
Melonie Warfel
Macduff Hughes
Scott Foshee
Susan Sullivan
Ebony Downtin
Betsy Fanning
Dave McDowell
Dennis Newman (T)
Butch Lazorchak
Noah Katz

1. Introductions

The meeting was called to order at 9:11 a.m. by Steve Levenson. The meeting participants, as listed above introduced themselves.

Ebony Downtin, AIIM Standard Program Coordinator, was introduced to the committee. Ebony will be filling the vacancy from Renee Georges' resignation.

2. Approval of Draft Agenda (PDF/A 2006-007)

The agenda (PDF/A 2006-007) for the December 11, 2006 meeting was approved with the addition of a presentation prior to A-2, discussing the adoption of PDF 1.7 as the base of A-2 and the appointment of a project editor for SC2 WG5 to be recommended at the ISO meeting.

Warfel/McDowell
Unanimously approved.

3. Approval of Draft Meeting Minutes, August 3, 2006 (PDF/A 2006-005)

The draft meeting minutes for the August 3, 2006 (PDF/A 2006-005) meeting were approved as presented.

Newman/Foshee
Unanimously approved.

4. Appointment of project editor for 19005-2, PDF/A-2

ISO 19005-1, Part 1, was edited by Stephen Abrams who due to other work commitments is not able to edit the Part 2 document has requested to be removed as the project editor. The US recommends Leonard Rosenthol be appointed the project editor for ISO SC2 WG5.

McDowell/Macduff
Unanimously.

The US will make this recommendation at the Orlando meeting and have resolution drafted for approval.

5. Status on Application Notes

Leonard Rosenthol reviewed the application notes, mostly spelling and grammar or formatting changes were made to the wiki since the last meeting. A placeholder was included in the application notes for PDF/E. When the PDF/E section is added Leonard will create a PDF version to be posted on the AIIM and NPES web sites.

The committee discussed ensuring that the verbs used in connection with standards are carried through to the App Notes such as shall, should, etc.

The committee decided that crypto-certified documents should not be used.

It is noted that displaying the contents value of annotation notes should be brought to the forefront for developers through the App Notes. See PDF Reference 6.5.1.

PDF Reference 1.4 does not reference XFA (extensible forms architecture). The committee discussed XFA and that it is disallowed in PDF/A-1. PDF/A-1 allows "private" (non-renderable) data. A PDF-A-1 conformant reader would ignore XFA such that you could not have an XFA and a PDF/A conformant reader. While it is not prohibited, it is also not recommended.

The committee discussed the wording in the app notes to clarify the use of XFA and redrafted the section in the app notes to reference that XFA should not be used as it would modify the visual representation such that PDF/A could not handle the change.

A review of the history on the forms discussion and the original need for this was conducted.

Historical and archival value of the information determines the format to be used. Appraisal is important to determining the format to preserve the format of the information to be used. A combination of formats may be used.

PDF-A-1 allows private data. XFA is an example of private data. Private data, according to the rules of readers in the PDF spec will not be rendered but may be made accessible through the application. It should be remembered that we only guarantee reliably rendered text but not globally can we guarantee the rendering of all the text.

6. Work on ISO 19005-2, Part 2 – Application of PDF 1.6

Leonard reviewed the changes between PDF 1.6 and 1.7. His Powerpoint slides will be made available to the committee in the near future.

New features:

- New viewer preferences – should not have an effect on the spec and should not be disallowed. Does not affect the rendering. It will be passively accepted in the standard.
- New annotation type-Redact
- PDF Collections/Packages
- Document Requirements
- Digital Signature Requirements

Improvements:

- 3D artwork – A2 does not provide for 3D so are not needed to be examined. The 3D becomes a part of the parent to be addressed for the full document. This needs to be determined as we consider all the PDF standards as a family that feed off of one another.
- Tagged PDF – already addressed and is required in A1a and becomes additional features that would be useful to provide accessibility should continue in same manner.
- Annotations – Same as with the Tagged PDF. Annotations are a static rendering that cannot be changed. These new features will not impact the annotations as presented in A1.

The committee needs to consider:

- Is this a significant change from 1.6?
- If not, do we need to address it within the committee?
- If it is a significant change, do we need to reexamine the draft?

Reminder that PDF/A as written is a restrictions document.

Redact Annotation – marks an area to be reacted at a future point which makes the document a document in process rather than an archival version. Part 1 select areas to be redacted and Part 2 actually remove the data.

Digital signature requirements – document can have metadata that specifies requirements on a digital signature when it is signed. An algorithm will be applied when the document is signed. This limits the types of signatures that can be used.

The committee needs to give additional consideration to the issue of enabling a document to put requirements on a viewer when currently the document requires a compliant PDF/A-1 viewer to view it.

PDF Collections/Portable Collections/Packages are extensions to existing features (embedded files). A-1 and A-2 currently restrict embedded files but could specify that if they are PDF-A files that they would be able to be embedded.

The committee reviewed ISO 19005-2 (PDF-A-2) discussing the following items:

Section 5.4, Conforming readers was taken from X-4 draft. There are color issues here that the committee needs to deal with.

Embedded files as they relate to packages. The committee needs to discuss if it wants to recommend that the standard allow embedded PDF/A files.

6.1.13 Optional Content (currently not allowed) – could either keep what we have or adopt X4. To keep compatibility with PDF-X, it would be advantageous to adopt the X-4 language. This would allow additional information to be carried in the document and preserve the one, single view. Optional text can be anything that can be displayed.

Output Intent – the same name key should be used with no special designation to the A2. Leonard recommended additional clarification on the Output Intents.

6.2.3.3 Uncalibrated colour space – incorporate the X4 wording is better and should be incorporated

Add NChannel color from PDF/X-4

Will not allow half-tone phases (HTP) key as it is not allowed in X4. Clarification from X4 to be added to these sections.

Content Streams – coordinate the language from X4 to PDF/A to clarify.

6.3.5 will define all required glyphs.

6.3.6 Font metrics is incomplete and not entirely useful. Integrating the language from X4.

6.3.8 – need to correct the section regarding fonts by removing '..or that use the predefined Identity H or Identity V CMAPS...'

6.4 Transparency – incorporated X-4 wording.

6.5 Annotations – add blend mode from X-4 to ensure compatibility.

6.5.3 – Annotation Dictionaries – the first line in the section needs to be removed to reflect the additional knowledge gained on transparency.

6.5.3, 1st paragraph after Note 1, could be eliminated to open or not limit the color space.

6.6 Actions – five new ones added – SetOCCState, Rendition(Use with multimedia), Transitions (Dynamic presentation), GoTo3DView and GoToE (embedded file) should all be forbidden.

6.6.1 – incorporate Hide action into A2 should not be allowed in PDF/A-2 but was allowed in A-1.

Need to keep a list of items for Technical Corrigenda for 19005-1 should another one be produced in the future to restrict/prohibit Hide.

6.6.2 – Trigger events – A1 allowed the AA entry with page actions which should have been disallowed at page level. Go to E (allows embedded files)

Hide Action should not be allowed.

Disallow the AA from the page. This was missed in PDF/A-1.

Crosswalk – needs to be insync with X4.

6.8.2 Tagging – this is an issue that needs further discussion as to the level of tagging necessary. US should explore what UA has developed. As a document can be termed a tagged PDF/A document without having tags.

6.9 Interactive forms – required every form field to have an appearance dictionary in A-1 which required an empty entry in the appearance dictionary. Recommended putting in a form field that appears as an empty rectangle.

XFA forms – to not permit the forms to remain in compliance with X-4.

AlternatePresentations and PresSteps not allowed (from X4)

Certified document – introduced in X4 which is a digital signature and dictionary entry that describes what may be done with the document after it has been certified. X4 may certify a document and may provide any usage rights. We should explore allowing certified documents and disallow usage rights.

The Technical Corrigendum should be incorporated into PDF/A-2.

7. Review Comments Received on Collections and Digital Signature

The committee discussed the US legislative view of digital signatures and the verifiable nature of the signatures and their use on long-term agreements. We then reviewed and discussed the responses to the Digital Signatures needs statement. The US does not see a need for developing a Technical Report or ISO Standard on digital signatures in PDF/A. We note that there is a need for clarification on digital signatures that can be handled in the application notes. Additionally, Adobe may provide a white paper on digital signatures issues as related to PDF standards. Once written, the PDF/A committee would publish this white paper on the AIIM and NPES web sites. Leonard is to call Dennis Newman as he is drafting the white paper to ensure that the PDF/E concerns are covered. We then reviewed and discussed the responses to the Collections/Shared Resources needs statement. The US believes that sharing resources in PDF/A collections goes against the spirit of PDF/A in terms of preserving a self-contained document.

US position - Australian comments are largely handled in the PDF Reference. The US supports the use of digital signatures in PDF/A but believes their technical implementation details are beyond the scope of the standard. However, the US TAG/Adobe will provide a white paper discussing the digital signatures issues in regards to PDF Standards. Once developed, this white paper will be posted on the AIIM and NPES web sites.

Regarding specifying PDF/A collections to share resources, we do not feel this is in the spirit of PDF/A (i.e., self-contained) and should not be addressed.

8. Logistics

US Delegation to the SC2 WG5 meeting in Orlando will consist of:

Mary Abbott
Dave McDowell
Scott Foshee
Steve Levenson
Susan Sullivan
Leonard Rosenthol
Macduff Hughes
Dennis Newman
Melonie Warfel

A caucus meeting will be held at 7 p.m. on Sunday evening at the Rosen Plaza hotel where the meetings will be held.

AIIM send a reminder to delegation for the meeting, hotel reservations and caucus meeting.

9. New Business and next steps

The next steps for the document that need to be determined were discussed

The US should recommend a comment period for the document prior to issuing the CD document. Also, it is noted that there may not be a need to meet in London but hold a fall meeting in the US in early Fall 2007. The committee will recommend the formation of an editing committee to interact on the draft and get the draft out the end of March.

10. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 3:30 p.m.

McDowell/Foshee