

ISO/IEC DIS 29500 BALLOT RESOLUTION MEETING**Geneva, 2008-02-25..29**

*Red italics are used for actions, “decisions” (consensus or voted) and “resolutions”. The term “decision” does not include editing instructions, whereas the term “resolution” does. Therefore, **at the end of the BRM**, only “resolutions” will be left.*

Numbers are used for “actions”.

Monday 2008-02-25

Locale

AU-28 R 28

AU: Add a Locale attribute of ST type to the F element.

Ecma: list of enumerated values (for Locale attr.?)

1. *AU and Ecma (with US) to develop specific editing instructions: resolution expected later in BRM*

BE

Requests future convergence of all ISs in this area; no editing instruction for Edition 1.

Accessibility

CA-69 (R 119), 72 (120), 73 (R 121), 75 (R 91), 78

Accessibility for people with disabilities

Reference in R 91

Ecma: openxmldeveloper.com/OpenXMLAccessibilityGuidelines.aspx, proposed for incorporation in future maintenance

CA: has submitted 12 pp of comments to these “Guidelines”, the response to which has generated more questions and comments from CA

R 119 (CA-69), R 120 (CA-72), R 121 (CA-73): have generated/will generate proposed additions to the “Guidelines”, which will be added before it is inserted into DIS

Consensus: Informative annex to the DIS in Edition 1:

2. *CA will discuss with Ecma; resolution expected later in BRM*

BR-7 (R 42), compatibility with browsers

Consensus: standards-based;

3. *Ecma will come up with proposal—with no product names—later in BRM (e.g. keep only last two lines of table on p 184, but with more versions of CSS)*

CN, Côte d'I: no editing instructions; CL, CO, Costa Rica absent

CZ-6 (R 16)

4. *Ecma will generate updated table with BCP 47 mapping; final resolution expected later in BRM*

Legacy Language Identifier table is deprecated: so resolved

DK: no editing instructions beyond the Editor's proposed resolutions of DK's comments, which DK finds satisfactory, and would recommend the BRM to resolve to accept them.

EC-1 (R 1009): will support any acceptable solution to the **date** problem.

Unit of measurement

FI-10 (R 705)

Ecma: the goals of Edition 1 are satisfied by the granularity chosen; the improvement proposed should be worked out thoroughly during maintenance.

5. *CZ will provide proposed text; FI & others will discuss with Ecma; final resolution expected later in BRM (to be available Tuesday p.m.)*

FR: wishes a distinction to be made in the standard between specifications for new OOXML docs and specifications for backwards compatibility ("*deprecated*"?), possibly by splitting into separate parts.

DE-28 (R 18), 30 (R 43) and a number of other NB comments: **dates**

DE and a number of NBs propose to use only ISO 8601 format, with a simple flag concerning what assumption about 1900 is implied (since only storage and not algorithmic treatment is concerned); US and many other NBs believe that backwards compatibility should be in an annex and deprecated; CH believes "ISO-8601-only" will not work because it is an oversimplification:

6. *CH will propose text as a follow-up to CH-6 (R 43)*

AU believes the ODF approach would be more effective.

7. *Ecma and all NBs which have proposals or questions will work on the problem (CH, Ecma's 17 pages, ...); working documents will be made available on the SC 34 web site and by memory stick; final resolution expected later in BRM (draft being discussed)*

GR-14 (R 80)

Part 4, 6.1.2.19, equationxml, p 4653:

8. *Draft resolution: The Note shall reference "Recommendation MathML version 2.0", not "Working Draft specification" (UK are checking).*

Ecma: The whole escaping mechanism is deprecated within the VML section.

BR: existence of the future Annex to contain VML is not yet certain.

CN: believes that much that is deprecated is actually derived from actual (past) implementations, and that the number of specifications which are deprecated should be limited.

GB: to improve the syntax as GR suggests may have knock-on effects which would cause damage.

9. *The BRM will discuss whether a VML Annex (deprecated) should be created.*
10. *GR proposal: replace the existing attribute by a child element giving the proper XML form of its content. GR and Ecma to work off-line; final resolution expected later in BRM.*

IN-56 (R 472); see R 92:

Draft resolution (IN, BR): In R 92, p. 404, second para. of Proposed Disposition: accept the editing instruction constituted by the sentence beginning “Accordingly” but replacing the parenthesis by “(including those created by migrating existing binary documents)” and the word “should” by “shall”.

Secretary’s comment: the proposal is equivalent to the following condition: only documents already existing on the day the draft becomes an International Standard can be conformant to it if they contain any deprecated features.

- 10a. *Draft resolution (CA): Change-tracked version of R 992 (to come)*

Original CA proposal: “Deprecated” is renamed as “Class 2”, feature by feature. In addition to all the conformance conditions not involving Class 2 features, the conformance clause is modified so that a Class 1 conformant document shall only contain Class 1 features; a document containing one or more Class 2 features is a Class 2 conformant document.

Ecma: the attempt to translate a document containing deprecated features, into one without them, sometimes involves loss of information.

GB: A phased approach to the migration from deprecated features to the others is needed, including the possibility to write documents with deprecated features.

DE: would favour this phased approach only for unmappable (i.e. not perfectly mappable) features.

AU: two conformance levels (two classes to which conformity may be claimed): full OOXML and legacy OOXML?

11. *IN, BR, CA, US, EI and any others will consult to describe the different cases of “deprecated”, to try and clarify the issues connected with legacy features. A draft resolution will be produced, for decision later in the BRM.*

IE-2 (dates), 4 (ST_LangCode), 9 (Deprecation): already decided for more discussion (*action items: 7, 4, 11*). and resolution later in the BRM.

IE-10 (R 34, Compatibility settings):

Draft resolution: An informative Annex giving references to all deprecated features, including compatibility settings, will be inserted in the standard.

Draft resolution: The semantics for compatibility settings should be included in the body of WordProcessingML.

IL-23 (R 729):

Resolved:

- *p 1688, add to 1st bullet): Similarly, a run with rtl=0 shall not contain strong RTL characters*
- *p 1692 l 5: directionality → order*
- *p 1684, “bdo” → “dir” x 2 in box at top of page*
- *p 1692, l 4 of table: “bdo” → “dir”.*

12. *Following items to be discussed by IL and Ecma, for later resolution in the BRM (draft on the way):*

- *five terms to express “right-to-left” (to be supplied by IL); replace by e.g. “rtlDisplay”*
- *p 1685 ff: ensure all features provided in x.2 to apply to x.3, x.4 and x.5*

IT-2: would like to invite any NBs interested in this proposal to contact the IT delegation.

JP-40, 46:

Draft resolution: (to come after JP review)

Previous draft: Accept the Conformance clause (clause 2) for Part 2 as specified in R 202 (DE-154) and R 992 (JP-27,28,29) with the following two modifications:

- 4th para to be repeated for data streams, i.e. add the following paragraph: “A data stream is defined to be of conformance class OPC if it satisfies all the conditions applicable to data streams listed in this Part.”;
- in 4th para, add “applicable to applications” in the relevant place.

KE: no editing

KR-18 to 24: proposal to remove components and/or separate them into different parts:

13. *US will make some restructuring proposals which may help with this proposal.*

CA:

Remove "(all parts)" from 4th bullet on p 126 of Response 32: so resolved (insofar as the Response is approved as a resolution).

MY-16: Names

Tuesday 2008-02-26

MX-3 (R 857), MX-6 (R 92)

Part of “deprecate” discussion? (*actions 10a, 11*). All of VML will be displaced into a (normative) (“deprecated”) Annex.

14. Draft resolution: Adopt the Annex A of Part 4 as in the draft revised R 92 text (to be supplied), subject to actions 10a and 11.

NL: no draft editing instructions or discussion points.

NZ-11 (R 94) Accessibility: five proposals

WAI document reference to be inserted into draft: so resolved

15. Multiple-level table headers (R 928 contains proposed resolution) (NZ willing to work on detail with Ecma etc.).

16. Table summaries, not merely a work-around (NZ willing to work on detail with Ecma etc.).

17. Right-to-left concerns should be correctly addressed for accessibility.

NO-1 (R 925), Scope

Draft resolution

Make the overall scope of ISO/IEC DIS 29500 the following:

“This International Standard defines a set of XML vocabularies for representing word-processing documents, spreadsheets and presentations. The goal of this standard is to represent faithfully the existing corpus of word-processing documents, spreadsheets and presentations that have been produced by Microsoft Office applications. It also specifies requirements for consumers and producers of Office Open XML.”

—result of the vote: for 10; against 13. Rejected.

18. Draft resolution, to be revisited after actions 10a and 11 and the possible splitting into parts are resolved, and after more consideration by NBS: Replace first para of Part 1, Clause 1 of scope of ISO/IEC DIS 29500 the following:

“This International Standard defines a set of XML vocabularies for representing word-processing documents, spreadsheets and presentations. The goal of this standard is to represent faithfully the existing corpus of word-processing documents, spreadsheets and presentations that have been produced by Microsoft Office applications (Microsoft Office 97 and later). It also specifies requirements for consumers and producers of Office Open XML.”

PL-3 (R 190): errors in XML examples

UK: found many genuine errors (beyond ellipses and the fragment-ness of the examples), and are willing to share the results of the software tool used to check XML.

Resolution: All examples throughout ISO/IEC DIS 29500 shall be well-balanced XML feasibly valid to the normative schemas, taking account of ellipses which may be used to shorten examples. The Editor of the DIS is instructed to make these corrections, for checking by ITTF—so resolved.

PT-60 (R 98):

Proposal:

19. *Draft Resolution: Add here (Part 4, 2.16.5.33) and in other relevant places (see PT-61 (R 100); PT-89 (R 93); PT-110 (R 80); PT-104 (R 78); PT-111 (R 82); PT-112 (R 84)):*
“The part xxxxx this element may be ignored by a document consumer unless it is in one of the supported formats.”
—PT, DK, US will consult with Ecma on the final form of this draft resolution; to be resolved later in the BRM.

ZA-6 (R 6)

Restructuring into parts (“deprecated”, Primer): there should be a clear Scope for any (new) Part decided.

Ecma: R 6 gives a road map (overall architecture) of the Parts proposed.

ZA: believes R 6 is not precise enough and requests clear instructions to the Editor to be generated. (The proposed treatment of the Primer is acceptable.)

US: is already working with BR, KR & Ecma on this problem, and would be glad to involve other NBs: what new structure (Parts),

AU: R 6 meets AU’s requirements already, and AU proposes to accept it (for now).

20. *Decision: ISO/IEC DIS 29500 shall be split into multiple Parts (29500-1, 29500-2, 29500-3 etc.). Conformance criteria shall be clearly stated for each Part—so decided.*

BR objected to the above decision.

Proposed: The proposal in R 6 for 29500-1, 29500-2 and 29500-3 is accepted in principle. A Resolution must be drafted to describe precisely what is in each Part (including the Primer, “deprecated” features, conformance classes, etc.), and conformance must be clearly stated for each Part.

CH-17 (R 43)

21. *Draft resolution: Adopt CH input on dates:*
http://www.itscj.ipsj.or.jp/sc34/def/BRM/CH0006_update.pdf
—to be resolved after discussion later in the BRM.

UK (R 135): bit masks for values

Proposal: change from bit fields to XML elements, except for fonts (which follow the relevant ISO standard).

DK: supports

22. Draft resolution: Adopt UK-Ecma proposal to change bit fields to XML elements, except for fonts (which follow the relevant ISO standard)—URL to follow, to be resolved later in the BRM.

US-75 (R): enumeration formats (Part 4):

23. Draft resolution: solve the following enumeration formats issues:

- p 278 decimalEnclosedCircl (redundant)*
- p 296 lowerLetter (and upperLetter): Ecma will examine;*
- p 298 ordinal and ordinalText*
- "Russian" → "Cyrillic passim"*
- Hebrew issue (ref IL)*

—Ecma will examine and respond later in the BRM (Wed. a.m.).

AU-12 (R 9):

The repetition of complex type declarations in Part 4 introduces errors and gives duplicate and redundant normative text.

CA: some constraints may not be present elsewhere; even if they are, more work may be involved in looking them up if they are not included in line.

Resolution: ISO/IEC DIS 29500 shall be changed so that the XML schemas are normative. The schemas shall be contained in a normative Annex and shall be line-numbered—so resolved.

Resolution: No part of the schemas shall be repeated normatively in the body text. The body text shall refer to schema constructs by: Annex number, clause or sub-clause number, and declaration name; and by the line number for convenience—so resolved.

CA objected to the above resolution.

Draft resolution: No part of the schemas shall be repeated in the body text—results of the vote: 7 for, 19 against—*rejected*.

IL: same applies to descriptions of complex types: will be dealt with when separately raised.

BE

CA-64 (R 84)

Non-XML characters

CA Proposal: inclusion of non-XML characters should be “deprecated” (or equivalent)

BR proposal: OPC should be only method used for binary encapsulation.

Ecma: agrees with BR; word “binary” should be deleted; only strings are intended. Agrees with CA to “deprecate”.

CA: software can easily make sure that no such characters are written; future standard should guarantee this.

24. Ecma will propose a definition of “new document”, as in “A new document shall not be created using deprecated features; only revision of an existing document may do this.”

25. Draft resolution: independently of what is decided for other “deprecated” features, ISO/IEC DIS 29500 shall only allow escaped non-XML characters to be read, and not written¹

- to be rephrased so that only **existing** documents are conformant if they contain them, and not documents written after the standard was published*
- or not “new documents” as per Ecma definition.*

—to be discussed and drafted by Ecma, CA, US, ...; for resolution later in the BRM.

BR-43 (R 74) (related to CA-41): securityDescriptor

26. Draft resolution: Accept R 74 but change the last-but-one sentence on p 438 to “implementation-defined”, and improve the syntax of the securityDescriptor, and/or make it optional—CA, BR and Ecma will discuss, for resolution later in the BRM—CA, BR and Ecma will discuss, for resolution later in the BRM

¹ Secretariat note:

Possible interpretation:

Doc. conformant **and** last modified before date of publication of standard

⇒

escaped non-XML characters must be expected

Doc. conformant **and** last modified on or after date of publication of standard

⇒

escaped non-XML characters need not be expected

Possible alternative interpretation:

Doc. conformant **and** created before date of publication of standard

⇒

escaped non-XML characters must be expected

Doc. conformant **and** created on or after date of publication of standard

⇒

escaped non-XML characters need not be expected

CZ-53 (R 41)

Resolution: Adopt the modified disposition in <http://www.itscj.ipsj.or.jp/sc34/def/BRM/CZ-0053-corrected.pdf> and also correct in the same way all other occurrences of UTF-16 in the context of serializing Unicode strings for cryptographic operations—so resolved.

27. *Draft resolution: Make clear that strings shall be converted to a UTF-16 encoding prior to being processed (in the same contexts as previous resolution)—CA, CZ and Ecma will discuss; to be resolved later in the BRM.*

DK

28. *~~Draft Resolution: With specific response to DK-0010 through DK-0022 and DK-0041, all relating respect to “compatibility settings” Denmark would like to request for the acceptance of the BRM accepts the Editor’s proposed editing instructions on this subject as captured by responses 122, 123, 124, 125, 126, 127, 128, 129, 130, 131, 132, 133 and 993—NBs will check these responses, for resolution later in the BRM (checkpoint: Wednesday 09:00).~~*

EC-1

Wishes to consider a text from GR on dates, and will work with GR off-line.

FI-6 (R 21)

R 21 raises a question on redundancy of complex type attribute descriptions:

29. *Draft resolution: The following repeated complex type attribute descriptions shall be replaced by references to the first occurrence: xx,yy—FI and Ecma to produce a list, for resolution later in the BRM.*

FR has no items it wishes to have discussed currently.

DE-150 (R 140), 161

Ecma is willing to remove this feature

Draft resolution: Remove the Alternative Format Import Part feature

US:

Draft resolution: Delete lines 15-17 of page 28 of ISO/IEC DIS 29500 (Part 1, 11.3.1)—

UK:

30. *Draft resolution: Add an attribute to show...—UK & Ecma to discuss, for possible resolution later in the BRM.*

GR-92 (R 93)

GR: extra functionality provided by OO Math Markup Language can better be implemented as a separate namespace vocabulary in MathML, rather than as an incompatible self-contained specification as is contained in ISO/IEC DIS 25900

AU: elements not allowed by the schema being used are not possible in MathML v3 (schemas specify the elements they will allow, and if this is a closed set—no wildcard—then foreign elements will be illegal).

Ecma: MathML is not designed to be extended (as confirmed by W3C), and the OOXML solution was proposed for that reason.

31. GR (with ZA cooperation) will check the situation with MathML v2 (and as far as practicable with what v3 will contain) and the consequent feasibility of its proposal.

ZA: OO MML is a large innovation, so an approach such as that suggested by GR would have merit.

CA: accessibility remains important, as much for OXML as for MathML, and CA is willing to work with others to advance this in the future.

IN-51 (R 973)

Ref. to external web site: ISO/IEC JTC 1 Directives and ITTF policy cover this, and the required specification will be and remain publicly available to users of International Standards.

IE-9 (R 92)

Continued compliance of legacy documents once future editions of OOXML are published (which presumably lose “deprecated” features).

CA: has some text concerning conformance classes which will be proposed when ready.

US: the corpus using “deprecated” features will continue to exist, and will continue to be conformant, because NBs will probably decide to retain the legacy features in future editions of ISO/IEC 29500.

MX: Legacy documents may be conformant to a specific part of 29500, which exists precisely to cover the existing corpus before edition 1 of 29500.

