

From: Nettie Lagace  
Subject: Re: IET Comment/Vote on NISO Ballot re ISOSTS  
Date: August 5, 2015 at 8:42:39 AM EDT  
To: "Baldwin,Hannah"

hi Hannah, thanks for this. I have also benefitted from having The IET's input/perspective.

I can easily edit the vote (and add this email as a paper-trail) so that it's clear your organization has abstained. I will do so this morning.

Thank you very much!  
Nettie

On Aug 5, 2015, at 4:19 AM, Baldwin,Hannah wrote:

Hi Nettie

Thank you for arranging this response.  
We are happy to change our vote to abstain.  
Is that something you can do? I tried but can't seem to do it as the vote is closed.

Thanks  
Hannah

-----Original Message-----

From: Bruce Rosenblum  
Sent: Tuesday, August 04, 2015 6:16 PM  
To: Nettie Lagace; Baldwin,Hannah; Sharman,Sara  
Cc: Robert Wheeler  
Subject: Re: IET Comment/Vote on NISO Ballot re ISOSTS

Hi Hannah and Sara,

I'd like to provide a bit of background. As recently as five years ago, almost every use of XML to markup standards by publishers was done with a proprietary DTD or schema. Some organizations, like ASTM, were using completely proprietary DTDs. Others, like ASME, were using DTDs based on existing standards like DocBook.

But the vast majority of standards publishers were not using XML at all in their production workflow. There were several reasons for this:

- \* Most standards publishers used (and often still use) a Word to PDF workflow so they can return a Word document to the committee for the next round of revisions. Integrating XML into this workflow is challenging

- \* The lack of standard tag sets make both production and interchange use of XML more difficult to achieve.

ISO created a derivative of JATS (NISO Z39.96) in 2011 to aid in their internal production. They made this DTD freely available, and it has been adopted by a number of standards publishers including CEN, Austrian Standards, Standards Norway, SFS (Finland), NEN (The Netherlands), and BSI. A number of SDOs in the US became aware of this DTD and determined that it will be a more effective way for them to move ahead than their proprietary DTDs

(ASTM, ASME), and a number of other standards publishers (SAE, IEEE, ASCE) are also interested in working with a common DTD. All of these organizations believe that developing the standard will facilitate production and content interchange activities.

Rob and I are aware that some organizations, including The IET, NFPA, and the Hydraulic Institute, use DITA. If that is working well for your requirements, then we're delighted to know and encourage you to continue using it. Just because a standard exists, it does not come with a requirement that all parties use it. For example, JATS has been widely adopted by journal publishers, but Elsevier, Springer, and Wiley-Blackwell continue to use their proprietary DTDs to markup their journal articles. However the existence of JATS has made all of the benefits of XML available to a wide range of publishers who might not otherwise have had the resources to embark on a large scale XML project.

Throughout the time that JATS has been within NISO, Elsevier and Wiley-Blackwell (as NISO members) have not voted against JATS. I believe that is because they see the use for others even while they may elect not to use it themselves.

So voting for this project or abstaining does not commit The IET to any change in policy about The IET's use of DITA. It would indicate consensus that this project may be of interest to members of the community even if The IET is not interested in or does not have use for this project.

I hope this information provides some context about this project. Please feel free to contact Rob, Nettie, or myself with any questions or comments.

Best regards,

Bruce

At 12:10 PM 8/4/2015, Nettie Lagace wrote:

hi Hannah and Sara,

Thanks for this email. I am copying in Bruce Rosenblum of Inera and Robert Wheeler of ASME.

They are the proposed co-chairs for our project and will be better placed to answer your questions about the schema and correspond with Sara. Bruce, Robert, could you please address the general questions on the ISOSTS schema for IET?

Depending on what transpires with the correspondence I might suggest that your vote be changed to "abstain" rather than a negative vote but I certainly am in favor of learning more about your point of view.

Thank you!  
Nettie

On Aug 4, 2015, at 12:03 PM, Baldwin, Hannah wrote:

Hi Nettie

Thanks for this.

In principle we don't object to the project going forward but we wanted to raise the point that with our standards material an article based schema will not meet our requirements. Would it be possible to provide more detail on your schema? This may help address our concerns.

I have copied in Sara Sharman, our Production Manager, so you can liaise directly with her - she is close to the detail.

Many thanks  
Hannah

-----Original Message-----

From: Nettie Lagace  
Sent: Tuesday, August 04, 2015 2:55 PM  
To:  
Subject: IET Comment/Vote on NISO Ballot re ISOSTS

hi Hannah,

Thank you for your input on the recent ballot to advance the formalization of ISOSTS as an ANSI/NISO standard.

You voted "No" and wrote, "The IET has chosen to use DITA for publishers for its Standards content. The Wiring Regulations are very granular and required a tagging suite that was not focused around an article based construct. DITA is also very good for content re-use."

Can you please clarify - are you objecting to the project going forward?

As we strive toward consensus, our procedures require that we resolve negative votes at various stages of the process. A better understanding of your reaction to this proposed project would help me in that resolution.

Thank you!

Sincerely,  
Nettie

-----  
Nettie Lagace  
Associate Director for Programs  
National Information Standards Organization (NISO)  
3600 Clipper Mill Road, Suite 302  
Baltimore, MD 21211