

# ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 34 N 1314

DATE: 2009-11-05

## ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 34 Document Description and Processing Languages Secretariat: [Japan \(JISC\)](#)

<b>DOC. TYPE</b>	Summary of Voting/Table of Replies						
<b>TITLE</b>	Summary of Voting on SC 34 N 1247, ISO/IEC 29500-1: 2008/DCOR 1, Information technology -- Document description and processing languages -- Office Open XML File Formats -- Part 1: Fundamentals and Markup Language Reference -- TECHNICAL CORRIGENDUM 1						
<b>SOURCE</b>	SC 34 Secretariat						
<b>PROJECT</b>	JTC 1.34.29500.01.00.01						
<b>STATUS</b>	This document is forwarded to WG 4 for resolution of comments. WG 4 is requested to prepare a disposition of comments report, revised text and a recommendation for further processing.						
<b>ACTION ID</b>	FYI						
<b>DUE DATE</b>							
<b>DISTRIBUTION</b>	P, O and L Members of ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 34 ; ISO/IEC JTC 1 Secretariat; ISO/IEC ITTF						
<b>ACCESS LEVEL</b>	Def						
<b>ISSUE NO.</b>	103						
<b>FILE</b>	<table> <tr> <td><b>NAME</b></td><td>1314.pdf</td></tr> <tr> <td><b>SIZE (KB)</b></td><td></td></tr> <tr> <td><b>PAGES</b></td><td>6</td></tr> </table>	<b>NAME</b>	1314.pdf	<b>SIZE (KB)</b>		<b>PAGES</b>	6
<b>NAME</b>	1314.pdf						
<b>SIZE (KB)</b>							
<b>PAGES</b>	6						

Secretariat ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 34 - IPSJ/ITSCJ (Information Processing Society of Japan/Information Technology Standards Commission of Japan)\* Room 308-3, Kikai-Shinko-Kaikan Bldg., 3-5-8, Shiba-Koen, Minato-ku, Tokyo 105-0011 Japan \*Standard Organization Accredited by JISC  
Telephone: +81-3-3431-2808 ; Facsimile: +81-3-3431-2808; E-mail: [kimura@itscj.ipsj.or.jp](mailto:kimura@itscj.ipsj.or.jp)

## Result of voting

### Ballot Information:

<b>Ballot reference:</b>	SC34N1247
<b>Ballot type:</b>	CIB
<b>Ballot title:</b>	ISO/IEC 29500-1: 2008/DCOR 1, Information technology -- Document description and processing languages -- Office Open XML File Formats -- Part 1: Fundamentals and Markup Language Reference -- TECHNICAL CORRIGENDUM 1
<b>Opening date:</b>	2009-08-04
<b>Closing date:</b>	2009-11-04
<b>Note:</b>	

### Member responses:

<b>Votes cast (32)</b>	Armenia (SARM) Brazil (ABNT) Bulgaria (BDS) Canada (SCC) Chile (INN) China (SAC) Colombia (ICONTEC) Côte d'Ivoire (CODINORM) Czech Republic (UNMZ) Denmark (DS) Finland (SFS) France (AFNOR) Germany (DIN) India (BIS) Italy (UNI) Japan (JISC) Kenya (KEBS) Korea, Republic of (KATS) Lebanon (LIBNOR) Malaysia (DSM) Malta (MSA) Netherlands (NEN) Norway (SN) Poland (PKN) Romania (ASRO) Slovakia (SUTN) South Africa (SABS) Sweden (SIS) Switzerland (SNV) Thailand (TISI) United Kingdom (BSI)
------------------------	--

<b>Comments submitted (3)</b>	USA (ANSI) Mexico (DGN) Portugal (IPQ) Spain (AENOR)
<b>Votes not cast (4)</b>	Egypt (EOS) Pakistan (PSQCA) Sri Lanka (SLSI) Venezuela (FONDONORMA)

Questions:	
<b>Q.1</b>	"Do you agree with approval of the DCOR Text"
<b>Q.2</b>	"IF you Disapprove the Draft, would you please indicate if you accept to change your vote to Approval if the reasons and appropriate changes will be accepted?"

Answers to Q.1: "Do you agree with approval of the DCOR Text"		
<b>20 x</b>	<b>Approval as presented</b>	Armenia (SARM) Bulgaria (BDS) China (SAC) Côte d'Ivoire (CODINORM) Denmark (DS) Finland (SFS) Italy (UNI) Kenya (KEBS) Korea, Republic of (KATS) Lebanon (LIBNOR) Malaysia (DSM) Malta (MSA) Netherlands (NEN) Norway (SN) Poland (PKN) Romania (ASRO) Slovakia (SUTN) Sweden (SIS) Switzerland (SNV) Thailand (TISI)
<b>6 x</b>	<b>Approval with comments</b>	Canada (SCC) Czech Republic (UNMZ) Germany (DIN) Japan (JISC) United Kingdom (BSI) USA (ANSI)
<b>1 x</b>	<b>Disapproval of the draft</b>	Brazil (ABNT)
<b>5 x</b>	<b>Abstention</b>	Chile (INN) Colombia (ICONTEC) France (AFNOR) India (BIS)

<b>South Africa (SABS)</b>
----------------------------

Answers to Q.2: "IF you Disapprove the Draft, would you please indicate if you accept to change your vote to Approval if the reasons and appropriate changes will be accepted?"

<b>3 x</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>Brazil (ABNT) Korea, Republic of (KATS) Lebanon (LIBNOR)</b>
<b>0 x</b>	<b>No</b>	
<b>29 x</b>	<b>Ignore</b>	<b>Armenia (SARM) Bulgaria (BDS) Canada (SCC) Chile (INN) China (SAC) Colombia (ICONTEC) Czech Republic (UNMZ) Côte d'Ivoire (CODINORM) Denmark (DS) Finland (SFS) France (AFNOR) Germany (DIN) India (BIS) Italy (UNI) Japan (JISC) Kenya (KEBS) Malaysia (DSM) Malta (MSA) Netherlands (NEN) Norway (SN) Poland (PKN) Romania (ASRO) Slovakia (SUTN) South Africa (SABS) Sweden (SIS) Switzerland (SNV) Thailand (TISI) United Kingdom (BSI) USA (ANSI)</b>

Comments from Voters		
Member:	Comment:	Date:
<b>Brazil (ABNT)</b>	<b><i>Comment File</i></b>	2009-11-04 18:05:08
<a href="#">CommentFiles/SC34N1247_ABNT.doc</a>		
<b>Canada (SCC)</b>	<b><i>Comment File</i></b>	2009-10-27 19:07:36
<a href="#">CommentFiles/SC34N1247_SCC.doc</a>		
<b>Czech Republic</b>	<b><i>Comment File</i></b>	2009-11-02

(UNMZ)		11:23:49
<a href="#">CommentFiles/SC34N1247_UNMZ.doc</a>		
<b>France (AFNOR)</b>	<b>Comment File</b>	2009-11-04 14:57:41
<a href="#">CommentFiles/SC34N1247_AFNOR.doc</a>		
<b>Germany (DIN)</b>	<b>Comment File</b>	2009-11-03 11:13:29
<a href="#">CommentFiles/SC34N1247_DIN.doc</a>		
<b>Japan (JISC)</b>	<b>Comment File</b>	2009-11-04 02:33:11
<a href="#">CommentFiles/SC34N1247_JISC.doc</a>		
<b>United Kingdom (BSI)</b>	<b>Comment File</b>	2009-11-04 10:29:20
<a href="#">CommentFiles/SC34N1247_BSI.doc</a>		
<b>USA (ANSI)</b>	<b>Comment File</b>	2009-11-02 20:12:37
<a href="#">CommentFiles/SC34N1247_ANSI.pdf</a>		

Comments from Commenters		
Member:	Comment:	Date:
<b>Mexico (DGN)</b>	<b>Comment</b>	2009-11-03 20:35:06
DGN MX 1 Do you agree with approval of the DCOR Text Approval as presented 2 IF you Disapprove the Draft, would you please indicate if you accept to change your vote to Approval if the reasons and appropriate changes will be accepted? Ignore		
<b>Portugal (IPQ)</b>	<b>Comment</b>	2009-11-04 17:34:25
Abstention		
<b>Spain (AENOR)</b>	<b>Comment</b>	2009-11-04 17:56:14
ABSTAIN		

# Template for comments and secretariat observations

Date: 2009-11-04

Document : ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 34 N 1247

1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
MB <sup>1</sup>	Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex (e.g. 3.1)	Paragraph/ Figure/Table/ Note (e.g. Table 1)	Type of com- ment <sup>2</sup>	Comment (justification for change) by the MB	Proposed change by the MB	Secretariat observations on each comment submitted
BR	93, 95, 104, 234, 236		te	New elements were included into existing elements in the specification making changes to the Schema.	Move the proposal to an Amendment, because the proposed change could break compatibility with existing implementations	
BR	173, 174		te	Changes on strict and relaxed version of wml.rsd and wml.rnc were proposed	Move the proposal to an Amendment, because the proposed change could break compatibility with existing implementations	
BR	239		te	The proposed solution makes changes to the description of an element, removing an extract of text that reflected incorrect behaviour of the element.	Move the proposal to an Amendment, because the proposed change could break compatibility with existing implementations	
BR	247		te	The proposed solution moves an element to the Transitional Schema, making changes to Part 1 and 4.	Move the proposal to an Amendment, because the proposed change could break compatibility with existing implementations	
BR	260, 269, 275, 277, 279, 280, 281, 282, 284, 285, 294, 298, 299, 300, 301		te	A new attribute was included on several existing elements of the Schema	Move the proposal to an Amendment, because the proposed change could break compatibility with existing implementations	
BR	292		te	A new range of legal values is proposed to an existing attribute	Move the proposal to an Amendment, because the proposed change could break compatibility with existing implementations	
BR	305, 306		te	The proposed solution deals with an technical error on the description of an element. This kind of subject fails to be treated as DCOR only material	Move the proposal to an Amendment, because the proposed change could break compatibility with existing implementations	
BR	314		te	New error values were added to the element	Move the proposal to an Amendment, because the technical addition proposed could break compatibility with existing implementations.	
BR	319		te	Adds a new error value. This is a technical addition, and could break compatibility with existing implementations	Move the proposal to an Amendment, because the technical addition proposed could break compatibility with existing implementations.	
BR	320		te	Change the range of supported values (Technical Addition). NOTE: on the log of DR 09-0007 (N1253), there is a recommendation from WG4 - "The solution to this DR should be published in an Amendment"	Move the proposal to an Amendment, because the technical addition proposed could break compatibility with existing implementations.	
BR	321, 441, 489, 574		te	Changes the range of supported values.	Move the proposal to an Amendment, because the technical addition proposed could break compatibility with existing implementations.	
BR	322		te	Changes the scope of named cells from Worksheet to	Move the proposal to an Amendment, because the	

1 **MB** = Member body (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by \*\*)

2 **Type of comment:** **ge** = general **te** = technical **ed** = editorial

**NOTE** Columns 1, 2, 4, 5 are compulsory.

# Template for comments and secretariat observations

Date: 2009-11-04	Document : ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 34 N 1247
------------------	---------------------------------------

1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
MB <sup>1</sup>	Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex (e.g. 3.1)	Paragraph/ Figure/Table/ Note (e.g. Table 1)	Type of comment <sup>2</sup>	Comment (justification for change) by the MB	Proposed change by the MB	Secretariat observations on each comment submitted
				Workbook.	technical addition proposed could break compatibility with existing implementations.	
BR	334		te	Adds a new error value. This is a technical addition, and could break compatibility with existing implementations	Move the proposal to an Amendment, because the technical addition proposed could break compatibility with existing implementations.	
BR	360		te	Defines "Sunday" as the first weekday	Move the proposal to an Amendment, because the technical addition proposed could break compatibility with existing implementations.	
BR	361		te	It seems a editorial correction, but it is an important technical complement (binary representation of font names and family)	Move the proposal to an Amendment, because the technical addition proposed could break compatibility with existing implementations.	
BR	363		te	Adds a new functionality (Support for black and White Frames)	Move the proposal to an Amendment, because the technical addition proposed could break compatibility with existing implementations.	
BR	367, 371, 418, 483, 629		te	Changes the percentage usage base (from 1000ths of a percent to percentage)	Move the proposal to an Amendment, because the technical addition proposed could break compatibility with existing implementations.	
BR	391, 392		te	Changes the base of the blue color (from absolute value to relative from input color)	Move the proposal to an Amendment, because the technical addition proposed could break compatibility with existing implementations.	
BR	394, 395		te	Changes the base of the green color (from absolute value to relative from input color)	Move the proposal to an Amendment, because the technical addition proposed could break compatibility with existing implementations.	
BR	397, 398		te	Mixes an editorial error (blue instead of luminance), but also changes the base of the luminance color (from absolute value to relative from input color)	Move the proposal to an Amendment, because the technical addition proposed could break compatibility with existing implementations.	
BR	400, 401		te	Mixes an editorial error (blue instead of red), but also changes the base of the luminance color (from absolute value to relative from input color)	Move the proposal to an Amendment, because the technical addition proposed could break compatibility with existing implementations.	
BR	403, 404		te	Mixes an editorial error (blue instead of saturation), but also changes the base of the luminance color (from absolute value to relative from input color)	Move the proposal to an Amendment, because the technical addition proposed could break compatibility with existing implementations.	
BR	410		te	The change proposed solves an ambiguity between schema and prose, but it could break compatibility with existing implementations that decided to use the current prose "optionality"	Move the proposal to an Amendment, because the technical addition proposed could break compatibility with existing implementations.	

1 **MB** = Member body (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by \*\*)

2 **Type of comment:** **ge** = general **te** = technical **ed** = editorial

**NOTE** Columns 1, 2, 4, 5 are compulsory.

# Template for comments and secretariat observations

Date: 2009-11-04	Document : ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 34 N 1247
------------------	---------------------------------------

1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
MB <sup>1</sup>	Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex (e.g. 3.1)	Paragraph/ Figure/Table/ Note (e.g. Table 1)	Type of com- ment <sup>2</sup>	Comment (justification for change) by the MB	Proposed change by the MB	Secretariat observations on each comment submitted
BR	413, 414, 415, 416, 417			It seems a editorial correction, but it is an important technical complement (binary representation of font names and family)	Move the proposal to an Amendment, because the proposed change could break compatibility with existing implementations.	
BR	427, 432, 433, 435, 436, 468			Changes the white space treatment, making its preservation option explicit.	Move the proposal to an Amendment, because the proposed change could break compatibility with existing implementations.	
BR	428, 434			Changes the range of supported values and also expand the chart types.	Move the proposal to an Amendment, because the proposed change could break compatibility with existing implementations.	
BR	429, 430			Changes the white space treatment, making its preservation option explicit.	Move the proposal to an Amendment, because the proposed change could break compatibility with existing implementations.	
BR	431			Adds a new possible relationship to an existing attribute.	Move the proposal to an Amendment, because the proposed change could break compatibility with existing implementations.	
BR	442			Changes the data type (from Unsigned Byte to Unsigned Int), and changes the maximum supported value (from 255 to unbounded).	Move the proposal to an Amendment, because the proposed change could break compatibility with existing implementations.	
BR	443, 490			Adds a new supported enumeration value.	Move the proposal to an Amendment, because the proposed change could break compatibility with existing implementations.	
BR	444			Changes the data type (from percentage to one-half degrees). The proposal also changes the supported data range, but this could be accepted to solve an existing contradiction.	Move the proposal to an Amendment, because the proposed change could break compatibility with existing implementations.	
BR	445			Changes the data type (from unsigned short to unsigned int)	Move the proposal to an Amendment, because the proposed change could break compatibility with existing implementations.	
BR	452, 453, 455, 457, 459, 460, 461, 465, 466, 475, 507			Expands the list of supported child elements.	Move the proposal to an Amendment, because the proposed change could break compatibility with existing implementations.	
BR	477			Expands the list of supported attributes	Move the proposal to an Amendment, because the proposed change could break compatibility with existing implementations.	
BR	480, 550			Adds a new attribute (bwMode).	Move the proposal to an Amendment, because the proposed change could break compatibility with	

1 **MB** = Member body (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by \*\*)

2 **Type of comment:** **ge** = general **te** = technical **ed** = editorial

**NOTE** Columns 1, 2, 4, 5 are compulsory.



# Template for comments and secretariat observations

Date: 2009-11-04	Document : ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 34 N 1247
------------------	---------------------------------------

1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
MB <sup>1</sup>	Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex (e.g. 3.1)	Paragraph/ Figure/Table/ Note (e.g. Table 1)	Type of com- ment <sup>2</sup>	Comment (justification for change) by the MB	Proposed change by the MB	Secretariat observations on each comment submitted
					existing implementations.	
BR	491			Changes the data type (from unsigned byte to unsigned int), and removes the upper limit	Move the proposal to an Amendment, because the proposed change could break compatibility with existing implementations.	
BR	492			Changes the data type (from unsigned short to unsigned int)	Move the proposal to an Amendment, because the proposed change could break compatibility with existing implementations.	
BR	496			Change the list of supported child of (EG_OMathElements).	Move the proposal to an Amendment, because the proposed change could break compatibility with existing implementations.	
BR	508			Define a new type inside WordprocessingML	Move the proposal to an Amendment, because the proposed change could break compatibility with existing implementations.	
BR	524			Insert a new supported attribute sml_CT_DynamicFilter (SpreadsheetML)	Move the proposal to an Amendment, because the proposed change could break compatibility with existing implementations.	
BR	525			Changes the structure of sml_CT_ExternalLink in SpreadsheetML	Move the proposal to an Amendment, because the proposed change could break compatibility with existing implementations.	
BR	575			Insert a new supported value.	Move the proposal to an Amendment, because the proposed change could break compatibility with existing implementations.	
BR	576, 577			Changes the data type (from Unsigned Byte to Unsigned Int), and changes the maximum supported value	Move the proposal to an Amendment, because the proposed change could break compatibility with existing implementations.	
BR	587			Changes the supported elements on m_EG_OMathElements	Move the proposal to an Amendment, because the proposed change could break compatibility with existing implementations.	

1 **MB** = Member body (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by \*\*)

2 **Type of comment:** **ge** = general **te** = technical **ed** = editorial

**NOTE** Columns 1, 2, 4, 5 are compulsory.

## Annex

Date Oct 21, 2009	Document <b>N1247 - 29500-1: 2008/DCOR 1 -- Part 1: Fundamentals and Markup Language</b>
----------------------	---

National Committee	Clause/ Subclause	Paragraph Figure/ Table	Type of comment (General/ Technical/Editorial)	COMMENTS	Proposed change	OBSERVATIONS OF THE SECRETARIAT on each comment submitted
Canada	Change 1		Editorial	This changes the cited ISO/IEC 10646:2003 edition to an undated, floating, reference.	Canada encourages an editorial change to this reference to clarify exactly what an "undated reference" means. For example, the W3C XQuery 1.0 Recommendation's normative reference to ISO/IEC 10646 states:  ISO (International Organization for Standardization). ISO/IEC 10646:2003. Information technology—Universal Multiple-Octet Coded Character Set (UCS), as, from time to time, amended, replaced by a new edition, or expanded by the addition of new parts. [Geneva]: International Organization for Standardization. (See <a href="http://www.iso.org">http://www.iso.org</a> for the latest version.)  Using the above kind of normative reference would make it very clear to implementers what an "undated reference" means.	

## Template for comments and secretariat observations

Date: 2009-10-05

Document: ISO/IEC 29500-1: 2008/DCOR 1

1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
MB <sup>1</sup>	Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex (e.g. 3.1)	Paragraph/ Figure/Table/ Note (e.g. Table 1)	Type of com- ment <sup>2</sup>	Comment (justification for change) by the MB	Proposed change by the MB	Secretariat observations on each comment submitted
CZ	§630 on p. 161		ed	Duplicated equations intended for removal are not visually marked.		

<sup>1</sup> **MB** = Member body (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by \*\*)

<sup>2</sup> **Type of comment:** **ge** = general **te** = technical **ed** = editorial

**NOTE** Columns 1, 2, 4, 5 are compulsory.



### **Reasons for the French Abstention on ISO/IEC 29500 -1: 2008/ DCOR 1**

France abstains on ISO/IEC 29500 -1: 2008/ DCOR 1 (**SC 34 N 1247**) since the package of corrections proposed is incoherent with the standard and leads to irresolvable contradictions.

An example of an identified incoherence may illustrate this:

The provided schemas for Part 1 of the published standard are all in a new namespace. Those changes of namespace ARE NOT in the DCOR Text. Therefore France cannot reach a position on such a document

# Template for comments and secretariat observations

Date: 2009-10-07	Document: ISO/IEC 29500-1:2008 COR1:2009
------------------	--

1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
MB <sup>1</sup>	Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex (e.g. 3.1)	Paragraph/ Figure/Table/ Note (e.g. Table 1)	Type of com- ment <sup>2</sup>	Comment (justification for change) by the MB	Proposed change by the MB	Secretariat observations on each comment submitted
DE	09-0005	COR1 Part 1	te	DR is correct but supposed changes belong also to §21.2.2.136	Please add changes to §21.2.2.136 too  Germany will submit an add DR to clarify the metric range (360 degree) instead of 240 degrees	
DE	09-0122	COR1 Part 1	ed	Incomplete correction in §17.15.1.46 P1160:  <w: donNotuseMarginsForDrawingGridOrigin w: val="true" />	<w: donNotUseMarginsForDrawingGridOrigin w: val="true" />	
DE	09-0152	COR1 Part 1	ed	The example seems to be too complex because of the different use of the element e	Pls simplify the example and make it more consistent	
DE	09-0226	COR1 Part 1	ed	The example uses the words "slide" and "side" but only "side" seems to be correct  ST_TransitionSideDirectionType for type but  Transition Slide Direction Type for parameter	Pls revise the example	
DE	09-0251 09-0252 09-0253 09-0254 09-0255 09-0256 09-0257 09-0258 09-0259 09-0260 09-0261 09-0262 09-0263 09-0264 09-0265	COR1 Part 1	te	The correction affects the consistent use of Percentage in different examples. In §19.5.44 for example the incorrect value "50000" has been changed to "50%". See also 21.1.2.4.9  In the examples about color modifications a change of xy% is denoted as "xy.000%" what of course is correct but inconsistent to the above mentioned examples and to the textual parts of the examples using a value of xy% without the three "000".	§20.1.2.3.1 / .2 / .5 / .11 / .13 / .14 / .15 / .16 / .19 / .20 / .24 / .26 / .31 / .34  Use 50% instead of 50.000%  §20.1.2.3.3  Use -10% instead of -10.000%  §20.1.2.3.4 / .10 / .13 / .14 / .16 / .19 / .23  Use 100% instead of 100.000%  §20.1.2.3.6 / .12 / .21 / .25 / .28  Use -20% instead of -20.000%	

1 **MB** = Member body (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by \*\*)

2 **Type of comment:** **ge** = general **te** = technical **ed** = editorial

**NOTE** Columns 1, 2, 4, 5 are compulsory.

# Template for comments and secretariat observations

Date: 2009-10-07

Document: ISO/IEC 29500-1:2008 COR1:2009

1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
MB <sup>1</sup>	Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex (e.g. 3.1)	Paragraph/ Figure/Table/ Note (e.g. Table 1)	Type of com- ment <sup>2</sup>	Comment (justification for change) by the MB	Proposed change by the MB	Secretariat observations on each comment submitted
	09-0266				<p>§20.1.2.3.19 / .27</p> <p>Use 20% instead of 20.000%</p> <p>§20.1.2.3.30 / .32</p> <p>Use 50% instead of 50000 (not included in COR1)</p> <p>Replace  &lt;a: scrgbClr r="50000" g="50000"  b="50000"/  by  &lt;a: scrgbClr r="50%" g="50%" b="50%"/</p>	
DE	09-0266	COR1 Part 1	te	<p>In COR1 the xml part of the example has been changed from alpha to shade:</p> <p>&lt;a: <del>alpha</del>shade val="50.000%"/&gt;</p> <p>but the first line of the text has not been changed accordingly.</p>	<p>Pls revise the text as follows:</p> <p>Specifies the <del>opacity</del> shade as expressed by a percentage value.</p>	

<sup>1</sup> MB = Member body (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by \*\*)

<sup>2</sup> Type of comment: ge = general te = technical ed = editorial

NOTE Columns 1, 2, 4, 5 are compulsory.

## **JNB Comments on ISO/IEC 29500-1/DCOR 1**

### **Major comments**

#### **1) Eliminate changes by the FPDAM 1 from the schema attachment files**

The schema attachment files contain not only those changes introduced in the Part 1 DCOR1 but also those introduced in the Part 1 FPDAM 1. Since it is unclear whether the Part 1 FPDAM 1 will be approved, Japan strongly requests that the schema attachment files should contain only those changes introduced in the Part 1 DCOR 1.

Japan has created schema files dedicated to Part 1 DCOR 1 as well as schema files dedicated to Part 1 FPDAM 1. They are available at:

<https://code.assembla.com/IS29500/subversion/nodes/branches?rev=44>

#### **2) Use snapToChars rather than snapTOCar**

In 29500-1, the text uses snapTOCar while the schema attachment files use snapToChars. In the DCOR, both the text and schema attachment files use snapTOCar. Japan believes that snapToChars is correct, and requests that both the text and schema attachment files be corrected.

### **Minor comments**

#### **1) Validation by major validators**

As part of the vote on DIS 29500, Japan pointed out interoperability problems of the XSD schemas and requested that they should be processible by major validators such as MSXML, Xerces-J, and MSV.

This comment was accepted and the schemas have been modified (see the BRM resolution 39).

However, after the DCOR was sent for a ballot, it was pointed out that earlier versions of MSXML cannot handle OOXML XSD schemas. Japan requests that the OOXML XSD schemas (attachment files) be tested and modified, if necessary and possible.

**2) DR 09-0122**

Although several changes have been made in reply to DR 09-0122, three errors about right and left elements in examples still remain. They should be fixed as part of the Part 1 DCOR 1.

w:left and w:right in M 1.5.1(pp. 5077),  
w:left and w:right in M 1.5.2(pp. 5100), and  
left and right elements in 18.8.5(pp. 1943).

**3) #483**

This replaces

```
default="100000"
```

by

```
default="100%"
```

However, from the beginning, both versions of dml-main.xsd in Appendix A and attachments contain

```
default="100%"
```

**4) #477**

#477 is different from the schema attachment file.

In the attachment file,

```
<xsd:attribute name="val" type="xsd:double" use="optional"/>  
<xsd:attribute name="type" type="ST_DynamicFilterType" use="required"/>
```

In 477,



```
<xsd:attribute name="type" type="ST_DynamicFilterType" use="required"/>  
<xsd:attribute name="val" type="xsd:double" use="optional"/>
```

5) #523

Since the RELAX NG schema was generated from attachment files, #523 and the RNC attachment file does not follows #477.

---

# Template for comments and secretariat observations

Date: 2009-10-30	Document: ISO/IEC 29500-1:2008/DCOR 1
------------------	---------------------------------------

1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
MB <sup>1</sup>	Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex (e.g. 3.1)	Paragraph/ Figure/Table/ Note (e.g. Table 1)	Type of comment <sup>2</sup>	Comment (justification for change) by the MB	Proposed change by the MB	Secretariat observations on each comment submitted
GB	Corrig. 2		te	An undated reference to an RS is prohibited by the JTC 1 Directives Annex N which states: "any reference shall be specific and indicate the publication date and/or version number as appropriate".	Omit this correction.	
GB	Corrig. 3		ed	The footnote appears to say nothing of value, since any normative reference to a Reference Specification that has a date and/or edition number may need to be revised when the Reference Specification is revised. It's inclusion in the standard is therefore unnecessary and open to misinterpretation.	Replace the footnote text with the following text, or similar:  Implementers should be aware that a further correction of the normative reference to XML to refer to the current Edition will be necessary when the related Reference Specifications to which this International Standard also makes normative reference and which also depend upon XML, such as XSLT, XML Namespaces and XML Base, are all aligned with the latest Edition	
GB	Corrigs. 86, 93, 95, 104, 208, 209, 217, 234, 236, 292, 321, 363, 367, 371, 418, 431, 631		ed	Unspecified reference or references to "\$xx" occur in the text.	Replace \$xx in each case with the correct Clause reference.	
GB	Corrig. 127		ed	The text "The use or omission conditional formats" is missing the word "of".	Insert "'of" between "omission" and "conditional formats"	
GB	Corrig. 201	Example	te	The penultimate XML fragment in the example contains whitespace text nodes which have not been "ignored".	Clarify that whitespace in this fragment is included for readability, or remove it.	
GB	Corrig. 208		ed	A space is missing in "isprovided" in the second line. Also, the font used for "provided" appears to be incorrect.	Insert a space between "is" and "provided" and correct the font used for "provided".	
GB	Corrig. 208		ed	The meaning of the term "match" in "If the password supplied does not match the hash value..." is unclear.	Insert "the hash value derived from" between "If" and "the password".	
GB	Corrig. 209, 217		te	The phrase "all resulting files must not exceed 8.3 octets in length" does not make sense.	Insert "the file names for" before "all resulting files"	

1 **MB** = Member body (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by \*\*)

2 **Type of comment:** **ge** = general **te** = technical **ed** = editorial

**NOTE** Columns 1, 2, 4, 5 are compulsory.

## Template for comments and secretariat observations

Date: 2009-10-30	Document: ISO/IEC 29500-1:2008/DCOR 1
------------------	---------------------------------------

1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
<b>MB<sup>1</sup></b>	<b>Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex (e.g. 3.1)</b>	<b>Paragraph/ Figure/Table/ Note (e.g. Table 1)</b>	<b>Type of com- ment<sup>2</sup></b>	<b>Comment (justification for change) by the MB</b>	<b>Proposed change by the MB</b>	<b>Secretariat observations on each comment submitted</b>
GB	Corrig. 262		te	The phrase "allows file names longer than 8 octets" does not appear to allow for a 3 octet extension. Compare with Corrigenda 209, 210 and 217.	Insert "with 3 octet extension" after "8 octets".	
GB	Corrigs. 308, 309		ed	Spelling error in heading text ("Definiton")	Replace "Definiton" with "Definition".	
GB	Corrig. 367, 371		ed	The phrase "Values range from [-100%,100%] does not make sense.	Replace "Values range from" with "Values are in the range [-100%,100%]".	
GB	Corrig. 371		ed	The meaning of the terms "blue", "green" and "red" in the descriptions of each attribute is unclear.	Insert "component luminance" following each of "blue", "green" and "red" in the descriptions of each attribute.	

<sup>1</sup> **MB** = Member body (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by \*\*)

<sup>2</sup> **Type of comment:** **ge** = general **te** = technical **ed** = editorial

**NOTE** Columns 1, 2, 4, 5 are compulsory.

# Template for comments and secretariat observations

Date: 2009-10-22	Document: <b>SC 34 N 1247</b>
------------------	-------------------------------

1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
<b>MB<sup>1</sup></b>	<b>Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex (e.g. 3.1)</b>	<b>Paragraph/ Figure/Table/ Note (e.g. Table 1)</b>	<b>Type of com- ment<sup>2</sup></b>	<b>Comment (justification for change) by the MB</b>	<b>Proposed change by the MB</b>	<b>Secretariat observations on each comment submitted</b>
US	<b>ISO/IEC 29500-1: 2008/ DCOR 1</b>		ge	<b><i>Concerns were expressed with the breadth of changes present in the DCORs for part 1 and part 4 of ISO/IEC 29500 and whether some of these changes would have been more appropriately processed by the amendment procedure. The US will follow up with a contribution of proposed guidelines for the scope of corrections versus amendments to approved standards.</i></b>		

1 **MB** = Member body (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by \*\*)

2 **Type of comment:** **ge** = general **te** = technical **ed** = editorial

**NOTE** Columns 1, 2, 4, 5 are compulsory.