

Proposed Resolution of JP-040 and JP-046 (OPC Conformance)

Japan has noted that:

- The Scope statement for Part 2 promises conformance requirements for “package implementers, producers, and consumers”, but the Conformance statement does not deliver on this promise.
- Document conformance must also be defined, but conformance for package implementers need not be since it is already covered by conformance for producers and consumers.
- The title of Annex H is somewhat misleading, since (although it is informative) it refers to normative material.
- Annex H summarizes statements from the normative material and includes copies of those statements for convenience. Many of these statements are currently phrased as requirements for “package implementers”, but ought to be phrased as requirements for documents.

To address these issues, Japan and Ecma have agreed upon the following changes and propose them to the BRM:

1. **Section 1, “Scope”**. This Open Packaging Conventions specification specifies ~~conformance~~ requirements for **documents** ~~package implementers~~, producers, and consumers. Conformance requirements are identified throughout the text of this specification. **A formal conformance statement is given in Section 2, “Conformance”**. **A non-normative summary of requirements relevant to particular classes of developers** is given in Annex H.
2. **Section 2, “Conformance”**. Replace the last paragraph with a new one that consists of these three statements:
 - A document is of conformance class OPC if it obeys all syntactic constraints specified in this Part.
 - A producer is of conformance class OPC if is able to write documents of conformance class OPC.
 - A consumer is of conformance class OPC if it is able to read documents of conformance class OPC and reject documents that are not of conformance class OPC.
3. **Annex H**. Rename to “Guidelines for Meeting Conformance”.
4. **“Package implementers” (ideally)**. Rephrase all normative requirements (and their copies in Annex H) as requirements for documents instead of requirements for “package implementers”.
5. **“Package implementers” (alternative if #4 is not possible during BRM)**. Add the following statement after Section 7, Line 23: “ Conformance requirements written as requirements for package implementers (e.g., M1.1) are document conformance requirements.”.