

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. *Draft Resolution: the BRM approves the editing instructions contained in <http://www.itscj.ipsj.or.jp/sc34/def/BRM/AU-0028-draft.htm> —to be voted on on Thursday a.m.*

BE

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

Accessibility

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

Accessibility for people with disabilities

Reference in R 91

Ecma: [openxmldeveloper/./OpenXMLAccessibilityGuidelines.aspx](http://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 (one or two draft resolutions expected by 2008-02-27 11:00)*

BR-7 (R 42), compatibility with browsers

Resolution: The BRM accepts the proposed response to BR-7 contained in http://www.itscj.ipsj.or.jp/sc34/def/BRM/Response_BR-0007_Web_Browsers.doc

but with an addition which makes it clear that the list is open-ended and with a correct reference for each entry—so resolved

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

CZ-6 (R 16)

4. *Draft resolution: The BRM accepts the proposed response to CZ-6 contained in http://www.itscj.ipsj.or.jp/sc34/def/BRM/Response_CZ-0006_ST_LangCode.doc and issues it as editing instructions, but deleting line 1279, changing the BCP-47 code for Arabic-Morocco (6145) to ar-MA, and changing the rationale:*

[Rationale: This list is maintained for compatibility with documents containing these values, and the use of these identifiers is discouraged. end rationale]

to:

...

—to be resolved on Thursday.

Decision: Legacy Language Identifier table is deprecated: so decided

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 (separately for units and for percent); FI & others will discuss with Ecma; final resolution expected later in BRM (to be taken up on Thursday)*

Draft resolution: The BRM accepts the proposed response to FI-10/CZ-45 contained in <http://www.itscj.ipsj.or.jp/sc34/def/BRM/CZ-0045-FI-0010-proposal-for-different-unit-me-v3.doc> —to be revisited on Thursday

Draft resolution: The BRM accepts the proposed response to FI-10/CZ-45 contained in <http://www.itscj.ipsj.or.jp/sc34/def/BRM/CZ-0045-FI-0010-proposal-for-percents.doc> —to be revisited on Thursday

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). http://www.itscj.ipsj.or.jp/sc34/def/BRM/Response_GR-0014_equationxml.doc*

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”.

10a. *Draft resolution (CA): The BRM accepts R 92 and R 992 with the changes to these responses contained in http://www.itscj.ipsj.or.jp/sc34/def/BRM/CA_Conformance_Class_Proposa_Draft3.doc —to be voted upon Thursday a.m.*

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.

IE proposal:

Draft Resolution: Accept R 34 with the deletion of the sentence: “In addition, we will remove each of these settings (and all other application compatibility settings) from their current location in the specification (Part 4, §2.15.3, pages 1,368-1,487), and place them into a new annex for deprecated features”—rejected.

11a. Draft Resolution: Accept R 34—[implied by discussion on IE Proposal?]

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:

12a. Draft resolution: The BRM accepts the proposed response to JP-40 and JP-46 contained in http://www.itscj.ipsj.or.jp/sc34/def/BRM/JP-040_and_JP-046_OPC_Conformance.doc—draft to be reviewed by NBs, who are requested to provide feedback to Ecma (point 4 will be completed, so new draft should be looked for); for resolution later in the BRM.

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 is continuing to discuss with KR some restructuring proposals and will provide results on Thursday.

CA:

*Resolution: Remove “(all parts)” from 4th bullet on p 126 of Response 32: so re-
solved (insofar as the Response itself is approved as a resolution).*

Draft Resolution [implied by the above]: Accept R 32—

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: BRM accepts http://www.itscj.ipsj.or.jp/sc34/def/BRM/MX-003_and_MX-006_VML.doc subject to necessary adaptations to fit with other resolutions concerning “deprecated” features—CA, DE and other NBs interested will react to Ecma to see whether draft needs changing; to be resolved later in the BRM.*

NL: no draft editing instructions or discussion points.

NZ-11 (R 94) Accessibility: five proposals

Resolution: 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 by 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 pro-*

duced 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 in 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 together with DE-xx.

GB-182 et al (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)
http://www.itscj.ipsj.or.jp/sc34/def/BRM/Response_0135_bitfields.doc — to be voted on on Thursday.*

US-75 (R 65): 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: BRM accepts the editing instructions contained in http://www.itscj.ipsj.or.jp/sc34/def/BRM/CA-041_BR-043_Security_Descriptor.doc —will be examined by NBs and voted on on Wed. p.m. or Thursday.

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)—draft from CA and other changes proposed by US will be posted; to be resolved later in the BRM.*

DK

Resolution: With respect to “compatibility settings” the BRM accepts the Editor’s proposed editing instructions on this subject² as captured by responses 122, 123, 124, 125, 126, 127, 128, 129, 130, 131, 132, 133 and 34, but additionally the Editor shall include a bi-directional cross-reference between the legacy compatibility settings and the new compatibility settings element—so resolved.

BR objected to the above resolution.

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 will provide draft Wed. p.m., 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

29a. *Draft resolution: Remove the Alternative Format Import Part feature—DE draft will be distributed Thursday a.m.*

² If the text is not placed in an Annex, the editing instructions are to apply to the text in its current place.

US:

29b. 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.

Wednesday 2008-02-27

Editorial: list provided by the Convenor

32. *Draft resolution: The following responses are accepted and the corresponding editing instructions are issued to the Editor with the additional notes given at the end: 104, 171, 193, 197, 217, 218, 219, 242, 250, 253, 259, 260, 262, 275, 277, 278, 281, 297, 298, 314, 320, 321, 360, 367, 381, 382, 395, 398, 399, 400, 401, 404, 406, 407, 408, 420, 437, 442, 443, 446, 449, 451, 455, 456, 457, 459, 460, 478, 487, 488, 496, 513, 518, 520, 523, 524, 525, 527, 528, 547, 549, 560, 561, 563, 565, 608, 611, 632, 637, 638, 639, 648, 649, 650, 651, 652, 653, 654, 655, 656, 657, 661, 662, 663, 664, 665, 666, 667, 668, 669, 670, 671, 672, 673, 674, 675, 677, 679, 680, 681, 682, 683, 684, 685, 686, 687, 688, 737, 739, 740, 768, 814, 825, 827, 851, 852, 868, 873, 881, 896, 912, 916, 919, 922, 941, 984. In R 651, “when” shall be deleted. In R 739 and R 768 the NB proposed change shall be implemented. The change described in the NB proposed change in R 768 shall also be made in 2.16.5.44 and 2.16.5.45. In R 941 only the change from “contain” to “have” shall be made—to be resolved on Thursday **without discussion**.*

Three priority issues: dates; conformance classes incl. “deprecation”; restructuring (linked to previous item).

Ecma update on ongoing tasks

Discussion on treatment of all responses which will not have been discussed by the end of the BRM

Draft Resolution “Option 1”: The BRM decides to accept and implement all the dispositions of comments proposed by the Editor (“Responses”) which have not been explicitly accepted or rejected by the BRM in other ways (list enclosed)—**no consensus**.

Draft Resolution “Option 2”: The BRM decides to reject all the dispositions of comments proposed by the Editor (“Responses”) which have not been explicitly accepted or rejected by the BRM in other ways (list enclosed)—**no consensus**.

Resolution “Option 4 prime”: The BRM decides to use the following form to decide, by majority voting, on each disposition of comments proposed by the Editor (“Response”) which has not been explicitly accepted or rejected by the BRM in other ways (final list enclosed at the end of the meeting). A simple majority of “Accepted”s of the votes on that “Response” will be required to implement each Response; abstentions are not counted. In the event of a tie on a “Response”, no editing instruction will result from that “Response”—results of the vote: 29 in favour; none against; **approved**.

Responses mentioned / decided upon in
the BRM:

Editorial (Resolution no. x)	104
	171
	193
	197
	217
	218
	219
	242
	250
	253
	259
	260
	262
	275
	277
	278
	281
	297
	298
	314
	320
	321
	360
	367
	381
	382
	395
	398
	399
	400
	401
	404
	406
	407
	408
	420
	437
	442
	443
	446
	449
	451
	455
	456
	457
	459
	460
	478

487
488
496
513
518
520
523
524
525
527
528
547
549
560
561
563
565
608
611
632
637
638
639
648
649
650
651
652
653
654
655
656
657
661
662
663
664
665
666
667
668
669
670
671
672
673
674
675
677
679

680
681
682
683
684
685
686
687
688
737
739
740
768
814
825
827
851
852
868
873
881
896
912
916
919
922
941
984

Responses replaced by Resolutions:

28
42
16
705
18
43
80
472
92
992
729
202
857
94
928
925
190
98
100
93
80

78
82
84
6
43
135
65
9
74
41
122
123
124
125
126
127
128
129
130
131
132
133
34
21
140
93
92

Responses accepted in Resolutions 119
120
121
91
34
973