

Draft Meeting Minutes

PDF/A Meeting

Thursday, May 17, 2007
AIIM Headquarters
Silver Spring, MD

1. Introductions

The meeting was called to order at 9:10 a.m. by PDF/A committee chair person, Steve Levenson. Those participating in the meeting included:

Steve Abrams (phone)
Rob Buckley (phone)
Jane Cohen
Ebony Downtin
Betsy Fanning
Scott Foshee
Julie Garrett (Phone)
Mark Gavin (phone)
Noah Katz
Butch Lazorchke
Steve Levenson
Dennis Newman (Phone)
Leonard Rosenthol
Dana Stone (phone)
Susan Sullivan
Melonie Warfel

2. Approval of Draft Agenda (PDF-A 2007-002)

The draft agenda (PDF-A 2007-002) for the May 17, 2007 meeting were approved as presented. (Cohen/Foshee)

3. Approval of Draft Meeting Minute, December 11, 2006 (PDF-A 2006-008)

The draft meeting minutes (PDF-A 2006-008) for the December 11, 2006 meeting were approved as presented. (Rosenthol/Sullivan)

4. Work on ISO 19005-2 Draft

The committee reviewed the comments received from Susan Sullivan and the PDF/A Competence Center. In many cases Susan's comments included the comments received from the PDF/A Competence Center. [Note: SS denotes Susan Sullivan and CC denotes PDF/A Competence Center. Comments are numbered as they appeared on the comment form that Susan shared with the listserv. Comments noted as 'Comment moves forward' will become part of the US comments on ISO 19005-2.]

SS1- Comment moves forward.

SS2- Comment does not move forward

SS3- Comment moves forward with clarification. The committee discussed the implications of if a consumer was A1 compliant if you would be A2 compliant as well. *Action for Leonard Rosenthal* - add text to the Application Notes to address the backward compatibility of the versions.

SS4- Comment moves forward with a recommendation that the word 'functionality' be used.

SS5- Comment moves forward – Clarify the text by adding 'PDF/A compliant file attachments and packages'

SS6- Comment moves forward

SS7- Comment moves forward

SS8- Comment does not forward. The Project editor is to mention the intent of the comment at the meeting.

SS9- Comment moves forward

SS10-Comment moves forward. The committee discussed a clarification of Section 5.5, paragraph 4 and the statements regarding colour on output intents (output intents allow rendering of the PDF image on a machine other than the machine on which it was created) and specificity of '...as closely as possible" which is not definable. US will recommend pulling the paragraph and that the associated note be removed. Generally, when a requirement relates to color we need to clearly identify it.

SS11- Comment does not move forward. Since the PDF Reference is sited in the references list, we do not need to include a full reference for it with each reference throughout the document.

SS12- Comment does not move forward. The Crypt Filter is new.

SS13- Comment moves forward. PDF supports JPEG2000 Part 1 and the file format in Part 2. An editor note needs to be added that explains this to the layman and to emphasize the reason for this requirement.

Action for Scott Foshee and Leonard Rosenthal – Investigate vendor defined color spaces in JPEG 2000 and if they should be included and if it may lead to it being prohibited.

SS14- Comment does not move forward. The comment was withdrawn.

SS15- Comment does not move forward. It is enforceable.

CC- Comment moves forward. The two sentences in this section contradict each other. The contradiction should be resolved.

SS16- Comment does not move forward. The current PDF does not make the statement normative; however, this version does make it normative.

SS17-Comment moves forward

SS18-Comment moves forward

SS19- Comment does not move forward. This section deals with digital signature restrictions. It allows certified documents that do not restrict permissions. This is in keeping with our philosophy of encryption. The committee discussed the visual appearance of the signature. This is a digital rights management issue.

SS20-Comment moves forward. The US will recommend the second sentence be removed.

SS21-Comment moves forward. The US will propose an additional note and to renumber the notes.

SS22- Comment moves forward. In the sentence after Note 1 the 'should' should be 'shall'. Comparing profiles is difficult. If the software is smart enough to solve this, then it should be allowed as it will not have a major impact on the document.

SC23- Comment moves forward. The US will propose that we keep the first sentence for single files and move the second sentence to the Application Notes Aggregation Section.

SS24- Comment moves forward. The committee discussed that there are two parts, most of which is unchanged from PDF/A-1 in this section. However, what was added is for the new feature in PDF 1.6 called NChannel colorspace. The words came from PDF/X to restrict NChannel color but it may be necessary to add a note to restrict NChannel color just like we restrict other features. Additionally, the committee discussed if it would make it easier if we introduced another level of conformance.

SS25 & CC- Comment moves forward. We need to identify what is hidden and not hidden and cite the PDF Reference section that is used in this section. It is also noted that

we should consider the use of Non-visible rather than hidden. CC recommends that hidden elements include OCR. This would also need to include TR3 (text render mode 3) which should be considered "hidden" in this context. The term 'Hidden' should be added to the terms section.

SS26- Comment does not move forward. In Orlando, it was decided to introduce a new conformance level, Level U for Unicode. The last paragraph should not be 'Alt Entry' but 'text entry' as pointed out by CC. The committee discussed the PDF conformances and that level 1 was burdensome. Level U with Unicode was added to provide a middle ground conformance level while providing flexibility with tagging. The Level U is Conformance Level B with Unicode.

SS27- Section 6.3.9 was proposed by the German delegation
Accept the comment and move forward. We will propose Susan's note as well.

SS28-Comment moves forward. The committee discussed the need to make the section more explicit by adding a note stating that if the writer has a document information dictionary it would need XMP. We will recommend the table be added back but leave it as a recommendation not a requirement for a replication scheme. Although, we want to save the document information, it must be replicated as XMP without a requirement for a specific scheme.

SS29-Comment moves forward with the modification to remove the editor's note. The US does not want to require any XMP fields beyond what XMP requires.

SS30- Comment moves forward. The US would like to modify note to add 'annotation for each widget annotation' following the word dictionary.

SS31- Comment moves forward. The US feels we need to clarify the second sentence to address archival needs for OCG instead of those for the print/publishing industry.

SS32-Comment moves forward. It was agreed that Name is used for out of band and should be ambiguous. The committee also agreed that the word 'strong' should be removed as it is not required but recommended.

SS33-Comment will not move forward. However, the editor will remove his note.

CC-URL before Table 3 (section 6.7.8) is incorrect – project editor will fix this after the discussions in Berlin.

CC- would like the committee to consider the fact ISO 19005-2 identifies 2 conformance levels/requirements. Since we know that we have conforming viewer requirements, are there things that we would do now, with our knowledge that we did not know before as it is difficult to archive a form with all the integrity in tact. Doing this requires the removal of Java script. If we have a conforming viewer requirement, would we be willing to relax the requirements.

US Position should be to push this discussion to ISO 19005-3.

Discussion on Optional Content –

Optional Content is a feature of PDF that allows some content to appear sometimes but not at other times. The PDF/X-4 committee discussed 2 positions. 1st - There should be no automatic changing of content (unacceptable to show on print but not on screen, etc.). Disallowed autostates would prohibit the automatic characteristics. 2nd – wanted one and one only state that the user sees, DKey (default key). Users want to have multiple versions available so they can change without of band information. JDF file will specify using OCCD and turns off the ability for a user to see anything in the user interface. This topic was in PDF-X-4 and copied into PDF-A-2. A discussion in Bangkok concluded that if multiple versions/renditions existed, it would make sense to allow a user to select a predefined a conforming reader that would present the options thus allowing end users to select. The US will recommend that SC2 WG5 accept the PDF-X/4 language in PDF/A2.

For archival documents, there is less need to disallow the user from manually changing states. However, users should be able to manually change the states. US will recommend that we reopen the discussion on the previous decision taken. As long as the automatic feature is removed then allowing the end user to manually select will be fine. A potential exists to state that the default is that all levels are visible or on when stored. Discussed whether a layer was different from a page.

One option delete Note 2 and the line ahead of the note in Section 6.10.

The US Committee agreed to the deletion of the language around Optional Content. The US will recommend that the topic of Optional Content be addressed in the Application Notes.

After reviewing the US comments and the committee went through the document by section excluding the Foreword, Introduction.

The committee discussed the concept of 'static' documents and may be revising the scope. Since the US is not satisfied with the proposed scope, the comment to be submitted will be to revamp the scope to better reflect the presence/ use of optional content regardless of if the content is static and viewing is dynamic.

It was also noted that we need to recommend to add Level U to 5.5 paragraph 3, fix references to page numbers to section numbers, fix note numbers, add a section to the application notes about keeping PDF subsets consistent/compatible.

5. New Business and Next Steps

The tentative delegation (no one is under obligation to carry out the intent to attend) to ISO TC 171 SC2 WG5 in Berlin in August is:

Melonie Warfel
Scott Foshee

Leonard Rosenthol
Susan Sullivan
Steve Levenson

Arrangements have been made for the US to stay at the Crowne Plaza Berlin City Center. The caucus on the first night before the meeting will be held at the Crowne Plaza beginning at 4 p.m. on Monday, August 27. We will hold another caucus each night after the meetings.

The US committee's next meeting which will be to prepare for the Berlin meeting will be on August 16. The location is yet to be determined. An agenda for the meeting will be distributed shortly.

6. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 2:55 p.m. (Cohen/Warfel)