

## **Semantic Model Workgroup Meeting Minutes November 30, 2015**

The Semantic Model Workgroup Conference Call was called to order at 3:00PM EST November 30, 2015.

### **1) Attendees**

Daniel Manchala (Xerox)  
Paul Tykodi (TCS)  
William Wagner (TIC)

Ira McDonald was unable to attend but provided his input via the mail list

### **2) Agenda**

- a) **Review of the vF2F minutes**  
(<ftp://ftp.pwg.org/pub/pwg/sm3/minutes/SMWG-f2f-sm3-Minutes-20151103.pdf>).
- b) **check on actions items related to the CIP4 JDF to PWG PJT mapping document**
- c) **consideration of how to maintain and advance the Semantic Model Schema,**

### **3) Review of the vF2F minutes**

- a) **Minutes accepted, with correction of date in heading.**
- b) **It is understood that a seventh vote on the SM charter was received and that quorum has been reached. Although technically the vote on the SM charter remains open until 15 November, it can be assumed that the charter is accepted by the PWG membership.**

### **4) Status Update on JDFMAP:**

- a) **Ira Reported that, on 14 November, he sent a request to Rainer Prosi for a few CIP4 Job Ticket examples (i.e., JDF excerpts) for use in JDFMAP prototyping. He also requested that Rainer consider a Heidelberg prototype effort. He has not had a reply yet, but has pinged Rainer to remind him.**
- b) **Paul reported that, without the examples of relations to be prototyped, he had not yet contacted any PWG members with respect to prototyping the examples.**

## 5) Maintenance and Update of the Schema

a) The suggestions on schema maintenance presented at the November virtual face-to-face meeting were discussed

- i) *A repository be created on GitHub to store, make accessible and track working versions of the schema code.* This was considered a good part of the plan to provide more and controlled access, although it needed to be determined if browseable versions needed to be and could be created and made accessible on GitHub. There is also the question of how to limit modification access to authorized members.
- ii) *A person be assigned responsibility for having the code reflect changes agreed to by the workgroup. That responsible person is to be supported by other volunteers with the tools (possibly provided by the PWG) and access to the code and/or by professional help funded by the PWG.* This was also considered a necessary part of the plan, although more specific details on how this would work needed to be determined.
- iii) *Working level code be firmed up for a named release either periodically and/or after the completion of certain update tasks.* This was discussed and, since the Semantic Model now effectively follows IPP developments, it was decided that, while working versions of the schema could reflect IPP developments that had not yet been finalized, named releases should only reflect approved IPP elements, operations and relationships. Therefore, named releases should be clean and formally-approved versions of the Schema (and WSDL) that include substantive additions and changes developed by another PWG WG and which have been approved according to the standard PWG Formal Approval voting process.
- iv) *Proposed named releases be made generally reviewable without special tools (HTTP versions) and submitted to the PWG membership for review using the PWG Process-defined "Call for Objections" procedure.* This was discussed, and there was agreement on the need for (although not necessarily the method of) providing reviewable versions of the Schema/WSDL as part of a formal approval process. However, although the "Call for Objections" procedure seemed appropriate for minor updates and corrections to a named release, there was objection to using this accept-by-default process for new named releases with significant changes or additions. It was felt that such releases required a standard PWG Formal Approval voting process

b) Discussion of the Development of Semantic Model Maintenance and Approval Process

- i) The Semantic Model Workgroup charter, voted on and approved by the PWG membership, requires that the workgroup maintain the PWG Semantic Model and have it properly reflect the additions and changes developed by other PWG Workgroups. The standard PWG process for developing specification documents does not apply directly since the Semantic Model is defined by XML Schema and WSDL code rather than English text documents. Therefore, a process for proper maintenance and documentation of the PWG Model requires:
  - (1) A mechanism by which a working version of the model is accessed and updated to reflect corrections and changes, while providing suitable revision control. The mechanism should also provide control of formally released versions.**
  - (2) A mechanism by which working versions of the model may be viewed by contributors for comment and contributions, and versions intended for formal release may be viewed by the PWG membership for the formal approval process.****
- ii) Although the GitHub facility might address access with revision control, because the definitive documentation is not a text specification in English (for which there is ample rendering software for review) but rather XML code, it must yet be determined how contributors can view and modify the working versions. Some approaches are:
  - (1) Authorized contributors are comfortable reviewing and modifying the XML code stored in the repository, or have access to graphics programs facilitating review and modification.**
  - (2) The workgroup makes graphic or browse-able renditions of current working versions accessible, either on the web/ftp sites or in the GitHub repository. Contributors can comment and request changes be made by workgroup-designated individuals with tools and capability to make such changes.****
- iii) When a version is to be presented for formal release (to become a "named" version):
  - (1) The SM Workgroup must review the schema content and check for logical inconsistencies and format compatibility with standard viewing and editing programs. This corresponds to workgroup last call. However, it requires that one or more authorized reviewers have the tools, time and talent to check the code for technical problems.**
  - (2) A browse-able version is then made available to the PWG membership for review. It has to be determined whether the current Liquid XML tool available to the Semantic Model workgroup is capable of generating a browse-able version.****

iv) It is clear that, regardless of the specific options chosen for management of the working drafts and approval of the formal releases, the Semantic Model Workgroup will need at least one individual with the capability, time, tools and commitment to be responsible for the technical aspects of the model representation (the XML Expert).

(1) Since this is potentially a major commitment, assuming that such an XML Expert can be located, there needs to be some method of compensating that individual for their time and perhaps for providing tools.

(2) However, responsibility of the content of the model remains with the workgroup, so some effective method must be developed for the workgroup chair (or designated member) to efficiently and accurately communicate model additions, corrections and changes to the XML Expert.

#### 6) Next Steps

a) The items discussed, as outline above, form the basis of the initial proposed Semantic Model Maintenance and Approval Process. Workgroup members and others are invited to comment on these points and, if they wish, to offer different proposals on the SM3 mail list.

b) At the next Semantic Model Workgroup Conference Call, these elements of the process will be discussed and ideally decided on, so that a process draft can be generated for presentation to the PWG Steering Committee.

#### 7) Action Items:

a) Next Semantic Model Workgroup conference call will be at 3PM EST December 14.

#### b) JDF Map Issues

i) Ira to follow up with Rainer Prosi (Heidelberg, CIP4 CTO) with respect to his providing a set of JDF examples to be used to prototype the JDF mapping specification.

ii) Paul to contact PWG members possibly interested in doing the prototype once these examples are available and the prototype task can be scoped.

#### c) Semantic Model Maintenance and Approval Process

i) The Semantic Model Workgroup and other interested parties are to review the ideas and conclusions with respect to the process outlined in

**these minutes, and comment on them or offer alternative approaches via the SM3 mail list.**

- ii) The workgroup is to determine whether the current Liquid XML tool can provide an adequate browse-able version of the model with reasonable effort.**
- iii) Ideas and approaches will be reviewed at the next Semantic Model conference call to select the points for the Semantic Model Maintenance and Approval Process draft.**

Submitted by Bill Wagner 2 December 2015