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

DOC. TYPE	Summary of Voting/Table of Replies
TITLE	Summary of Voting on SC 34 N 1252, ISO/IEC 29500-4: 2008/DCOR 1,Information technology -- Document description and processing languages -- Office Open XML File Formats -- Part 4: Transitional Migration Features -- TECHNICAL CORRIGENDUM 1
SOURCE	SC 34 Secretariat
PROJECT	JTC 1.34.29500.04.00.01
STATUS	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.
ACTION ID	FYI
DUE DATE	
DISTRIBUTION	P, O and L Members of ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 34 ; ISO/IEC JTC 1 Secretariat; ISO/IEC ITTF
ACCESS LEVEL	Def
ISSUE NO.	103
FILE	**NAME** 1317.pdf **SIZE (KB)** **PAGES** 21

Result of voting

Ballot Information:	
Ballot reference:	SC34N1252
Ballot type:	CIB
Ballot title:	ISO/IEC 29500-4: 2008/DCOR 1,Information technology -- Document description and processing languages -- Office Open XML File Formats -- Part 4: Transitional Migration Features -- TECHNICAL CORRIGENDUM 1
Opening date:	2009-08-04
Closing date:	2009-11-04
Note:	

Member responses:	
Votes cast (32)	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)
	USA (ANSI)

Comments submitted (2)	Portugal (IPQ)
	Spain (AENOR)
Votes not cast (4)	Egypt (EOS)
	Pakistan (PSQCA)
	Sri Lanka (SLSI)
	Venezuela (FONDONORMA)

Questions:

Q.1	"Do you agree with approval of the DCOR Text"
Q.2	"IF you Disappove 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"		
20 x	**Approval as presented**	**Armenia (SARM)**
		Bulgaria (BDS)
		China (SAC)
		Côte d'Ivoire (CODINORM)
		Denmark (DS)
		Finland (SFS)
		Germany (DIN)
		Italy (UNI)
		Kenya (KEBS)
		Korea, Republic of (KATS)
		Lebanon (LIBNOR)
		Malta (MSA)
		Netherlands (NEN)
		Norway (SN)
		Poland (PKN)
		Romania (ASRO)
		Slovakia (SUTN)
		South Africa (SABS)
		Sweden (SIS)
		Thailand (TISI)
5 x	**Approval with comments**	**Canada (SCC)**
		Czech Republic (UNMZ)
		Japan (JISC)
		United Kingdom (BSI)
		USA (ANSI)
2 x	**Disapproval of the draft**	**Brazil (ABNT)**
		Malaysia (DSM)
5 x	**Abstention**	**Chile (INN)**
		Colombia (ICONTEC)
		France (AFNOR)
		India (BIS)
		Switzerland (SNV)

Answers to Q.2: "IF you Disappove the Draft, would you please indicate if you

accept to change your vote to Approval if the reasons and appropriate changes will be accepted?"		
2 x	Yes	Brazil (ABNT) Lebanon (LIBNOR)
0 x	No	
30 x	Ignore	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) Korea, Republic of (KATS) 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)

Comments from Voters		
Member:	Comment:	Date:
Brazil (ABNT)	*Comment File*	2009-11-04 18:15:08
CommentFiles/SC34N1252_ABNT.doc		
Canada (SCC)	*Comment File*	2009-10-27 19:13:23
CommentFiles/SC34N1252_SCC.doc		
Czech Republic (UNMZ)	*Comment File*	2009-11-02 10:42:18
CommentFiles/SC34N1252_UNMZ.dot		

France (AFNOR)	*Comment File*	2009-11-04 15:00:53
CommentFiles/SC34N1252_AFNOR.doc		
Japan (JISC)	*Comment File*	2009-11-04 02:36:56
CommentFiles/SC34N1252_JISC.doc		
Malaysia (DSM)	*Comment File*	2009-11-03 12:18:03
CommentFiles/SC34N1252_DSM.pdf		
Switzerland (SNV)	*Comment File*	2009-10-26 14:16:47
CommentFiles/SC34N1252_SNV.doc		
United Kingdom (BSI)	*Comment File*	2009-11-04 10:33:39
CommentFiles/SC34N1252_BSI.doc		
USA (ANSI)	*Comment File*	2009-11-02 20:18:28
CommentFiles/SC34N1252_ANSI.pdf		

Comments from Commenters		
Member:	Comment:	Date:
Portugal (IPQ)	*Comment*	2009-11-04 17:35:55
Abstention		
Spain (AENOR)	*Comment*	2009-11-04 17:57:44
ABSTAIN		

Template for comments and secretariat observations

			Date: 2009-11-04		Document: : **ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 34 N 1252**	

1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
MB[1]	Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex (e.g. 3.1)	Paragraph/ Figure/Table/ Note (e.g. Table 1)	Type of com-ment[2]	Comment (justification for change) by the MB	Proposed change by the MB	Secretariat observations on each comment submitted
BR	3		te	Removes the UCS (Universal Character Set) reference version	Move the proposal to an Amendment, because the change proposed could break compatibility with existing implementations.	
BR	5		te	Removes the version of the UNICODE reference	Move the proposal to an Amendment, because the change proposed could break compatibility with existing implementations.	
BR	6		te	Changes the XML specification reference from version 1.1 to 1.0	Move the proposal to an Amendment, because the change proposed could break compatibility with existing implementations.	
BR	7		te	Changes the "Namespaces in XML" reference version from 1.1 to 1.0	Move the proposal to an Amendment, because the change proposed could break compatibility with existing implementations.	
BR	9, 13, 14		te	Adds a new subclause	Move the proposal to an Amendment, because the change proposed could break compatibility with existing implementations.	
BR	10		te	Adds a new enumerator	Move the proposal to an Amendment, because the change proposed could break compatibility with existing implementations.	
BR	11		te	Expand the supported attributes list	Move the proposal to an Amendment, because the change proposed could break compatibility with existing implementations.	
BR	16		te	Changes and expand the Word ML schema	Move the proposal to an Amendment, because the change proposed could break compatibility with existing implementations.	
BR	17		te	Expands the supported types for Math	Move the proposal to an Amendment, because the change proposed could break compatibility with existing implementations.	
BR	19		te	Adds a new supported attribute and changes the use of an existing one from "required" to optional	Move the proposal to an Amendment, because the change proposed could break compatibility with existing implementations.	
BR	20		te	Changes the structure of CT_ExternalLink	Move the proposal to an Amendment, because the change proposed could break compatibility with existing implementations.	
BR	22		te	Adds a new supported value (bwMode) to CT_GraphicalObjectFrame	Move the proposal to an Amendment, because the change 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.

ISO electronic balloting commenting template/version 2001-10

1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
MB[1]	Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex (e.g. 3.1)	Paragraph/ Figure/Table/ Note (e.g. Table 1)	Type of com- ment[2]	Comment (justification for change) by the MB	Proposed change by the MB	Secretariat observations on each comment submitted
BR	29, 120		te	Changes the minimum value of an existing simpleType	Move the proposal to an Amendment, because the change proposed could break compatibility with existing implementations.	
BR	30, 121		te	Adds a new supported value to an existing simpleType	Move the proposal to an Amendment, because the change proposed could break compatibility with existing implementations.	
BR	31, 32		te	Changes the base type from unsignedByte to unsignedInt	Move the proposal to an Amendment, because the change proposed could break compatibility with existing implementations.	
BR	36		te	Changes and expand the Word ML schema	Move the proposal to an Amendment, because the change proposed could break compatibility with existing implementations.	
BR	52		te	Changes and expand the supported types on Word ML	Move the proposal to an Amendment, because the change proposed could break compatibility with existing implementations.	
BR	53		te	Adds a new type to Word ML	Move the proposal to an Amendment, because the change proposed could break compatibility with existing implementations.	
BR	68		te	Adds a new attribute to an existing complex type sml_CT_CalcCell	Move the proposal to an Amendment, because the change proposed could break compatibility with existing implementations.	
BR	69		te	Changes the structure of CT_ExternalLink	Move the proposal to an Amendment, because the change proposed could break compatibility with existing implementations.	
BR	95, 114		te	Appears to be an editorial error, but the proposed solution could break compatibility with existing applications	Move the proposal to an Amendment, because the change proposed could break compatibility with existing implementations.	
BR	96		te	Adds a new supported value (bwMode) to CT_GraphicalObjectFrame	Move the proposal to an Amendment, because the change proposed could break compatibility with existing implementations.	
BR	122		te	Changes the base type from unsignedByte to unsignedInt and expands its maximum value (from 255 to 4294967295)	Move the proposal to an Amendment, because the change proposed could break compatibility with existing implementations.	
BR	123		te	Changes the base type from unsignedShort to unsignedInt	Move the proposal to an Amendment, because the change 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.

ISO electronic balloting commenting template/version 2001-10

Template for comments and secretariat observations					Date: 2009-11-04	Document: **: ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 34 N 1252**

1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
MB[1]	**Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex** (e.g. 3.1)	**Paragraph/ Figure/Table/ Note** (e.g. Table 1)	**Type of com- ment[2]**	**Comment (justification for change) by the MB**	**Proposed change by the MB**	**Secretariat observations** on each comment submitted
BR	133		te	Change the supported elements of Math	Move the proposal to an Amendment, because the change 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.

ISO electronic balloting commenting template/version 2001-10

Annex

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 and 2		Editorial	These corrigenda are given with a blue underline, which according to the "Notational conventions" given for this document indicates that it is an addition. However, no indication is given as to whether this text is appended, pre-pended or inserted into the existing text.	Canada recommends that the text from #2 be appended to the existing material in the Scope clause, and that that text be followed by the text from #1. This would be in line with what Canada proposed at the BRM.	
Canada	Change 3		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 http://www.iso.org 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: 2009-11-02	Document: **N1252**, ISO/IEC 29500-4: 2008/DCOR 1

1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
MB[1]	**Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex** (e.g. 3.1)	**Paragraph/ Figure/Table/ Note** (e.g. Table 1)	**Type of com- ment[2]**	**Comment (justification for change) by the MB**	**Proposed change by the MB**	**Secretariat observations** on each comment submitted
CZ		Par. 68 on p. 15	te	Attributes r and ref should be made mutually exclusive. This is not possible in W3C XML Schema, but it is possible in RELAX NG schema.	Change schema to: `sml_CT_CalcCell = (attribute r { sml_ST_CellRef } | attribute ref { sml_ST_CellRef }),` …	

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.

ISO electronic balloting commenting template/version 2001-10

Reasons for the French Abstention on ISO/IEC 29500 -4: 2008/ DCOR 1

France abstains on ISO/IEC 29500 -4: 2008/ DCOR 1 (**SC 34 N 1252**) 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 schema for Part 4 contains modifications that could make the existing document invalid (such as change for ST_TextScale) and which ARE NOT reflected in the DCOR Text. Therefore France cannot reach a position on such document

JNB Comments on ISO/IEC 29500-4/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 in introduced in the Part 4 DCOR 1 but also those introduced in the Part 4 FPDAM 1. Since it is unclear whether the Part 4 FPDAM 1 will be approved, Japan strongly requests that the schema attachment files should contain only those changed introduced in the Part 4 DCOR 1.

Japan has created schema files dedicated to Part 4 DCOR 1 as well as schema files dedicated to Part 4 FPDAM 1. They are available at: https://code.assembla.com/IS29500/subversion/nodes/branches?rev=44

2) Use snapToChars rather than snapTOCar

In 29500-4, 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) #31

#31 of the Part 4 DCOR and the schema file attachment is inconsistent, since the following line appears only in the schema file dml-chart.xsd.

      <xsd:maxInclusive value="4294967295"/>

3) #70

This change introduces a new schema SpreadsheetML_VML_Drawing.rnc   in Appendix B. However, it is missing in the attachment zip files for schemas.

4) #121

This change is not implemented in the schema dml-chart.rnc

5) #122

#122 replaces

maxInclusive = "255"

by

maxInclusive = "4294967295"

but this maxInclusive should be simply removed.

Template for comments and secretariat observations Date: Document:

1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
MB[1]	Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex (e.g. 3.1)	Paragraph/ Figure/Table/ Note (e.g. Table 1)	Type of comment[2]	Comment (justification for change) by the MB	Proposed change by the MB	Secretariat observations on each comment submitted
3	te	Removal of the UCS (Universal Character Set) version		As the change breaks compatibility with existing implementations, the change is not suitable as Corrigendum and should be moved into an Amendment.		
5	te	Removal of Unicode version		As the change breaks compatibility with existing implementations, the change is not suitable as Corrigendum and should be moved into an Amendment.		
6	te	Change of XML specification version from 1.1 to 1.0		As the change breaks compatibility with existing implementations, the change is not suitable as Corrigendum and should be moved into an Amendment.		
7	te	Change of "Namespaces in XML" version from 1.1 to 1.0		As the change breaks compatibility with existing implementations, the change is not suitable as Corrigendum and should be moved into an Amendment.		
9	te	Adding new subclause		As the change breaks compatibility with existing implementations, the change is not suitable as Corrigendum and should be moved into an Amendment.		
10	te	Adding more enumeration values in ST_NumberFormat		As the change breaks compatibility with existing implementations, the change is not suitable as Corrigendum and should be moved into an Amendment.		
11	te	Adding more attributes in dynamicFilter element		As the change breaks compatibility with existing implementations, the change is not suitable as Corrigendum and should be moved into an Amendment.		
13	te	Adding new subclause		As the change breaks compatibility with existing implementations, the change is not suitable as Corrigendum and should be moved into an Amendment.		
14	te	Adding new subclause		As the change breaks compatibility with existing implementations, the change is not suitable as Corrigendum and should be moved into an Amendment.		
16	te	Change in schema		As the change breaks compatibility with existing implementations, the change is not suitable as Corrigendum and should be moved into an Amendment.		
17	te	Change in schema		As the change breaks compatibility with existing implementations, the change is not suitable as Corrigendum and should be moved into an Amendment.		

19	teChange in schema	As the change breaks compatibility with existing implementations, the change is not suitable as Corrigendum and should be moved into an Amendment.
20	teChange in schema	As the change breaks compatibility with existing implementations, the change is not suitable as Corrigendum and should be moved into an Amendment.
22	teChange in schema	As the change breaks compatibility with existing implementations, the change is not suitable as Corrigendum and should be moved into an Amendment.
29	teChange in schema	As the change breaks compatibility with existing implementations, the change is not suitable as Corrigendum and should be moved into an Amendment.
30	teChange in schema	As the change breaks compatibility with existing implementations, the change is not suitable as Corrigendum and should be moved into an Amendment.
31	teChange in schema	As the change breaks compatibility with existing implementations, the change is not suitable as Corrigendum and should be moved into an Amendment.
32	teChange in schema	As the change breaks compatibility with existing implementations, the change is not suitable as Corrigendum and should be moved into an Amendment.
36	teChange in schema	As the change breaks compatibility with existing implementations, the change is not suitable as Corrigendum and should be moved into an Amendment.
52	teChange in schema	As the change breaks compatibility with existing implementations, the change is not suitable as Corrigendum and should be moved into an Amendment.
53	teChange in schema	As the change breaks compatibility with existing implementations, the change is not suitable as Corrigendum and should be moved into an Amendment.
68	teChange in schema	As the change breaks compatibility with existing implementations, the change is not suitable as Corrigendum and should be moved into an Amendment.
69	teChange in schema	As the change breaks compatibility with existing implementations, the change is not suitable as Corrigendum and should be moved into an Amendment.
95	teChange in schema	As the change breaks compatibility with existing implementations, the change is not suitable as Corrigendum and should be moved into an Amendment.
96	teChange in schema	As the change breaks compatibility with existing implementations, the change is not suitable as Corrigendum and should be moved into an Amendment.
114	teChange in schema	As the change breaks compatibility with existing implementations, the change is not suitable as Corrigendum and should be moved into an Amendment.
120	teChange in schema	As the change breaks compatibility with existing implementations, the change is not suitable as Corrigendum and should be moved into an Amendment.

121 teChange in schema	As the change breaks compatibility with existing implementations, the change is not suitable as Corrigendum and should be moved into an Amendment.
122 teChange in schema	As the change breaks compatibility with existing implementations, the change is not suitable as Corrigendum and should be moved into an Amendment.
123 teChange in schema	As the change breaks compatibility with existing implementations, the change is not suitable as Corrigendum and should be moved into an Amendment.
133 teChange in schema	As the change breaks compatibility with existing implementations, the change is not suitable as Corrigendum and should be moved into an Amendment.

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.

ISO electronic balloting commenting template/version 2001-10

Swiss Comment on Sc34N1252 (ISO/IEC 29500-4 DCOR 1)

The Swiss National Body votes ABSTAIN, as no consensus could be reached in the Swiss mirror group.

1. Concerns

Concerns were raised against this corrigendum as to introduce the serial date format into the transitional conformance class.

Removal of change no.12 from this DCOR would resolve this concern.

1.1 Reasons for Concern

Sc34N1252 states:

12. §10.7, "Additional representation for dates and times (Part 1, Section
18.17.4)"

[DR 09-0274]

For a document of a transitional conformance class, each unique instant in SpreadsheetML time shall be stored as an ISO 8601-formatted string or as a serial value.

Firstly, according to ISO/IEC 29500-1:2008, 18.17.4.1, (cit.) "all date values stored in cells within a SpreadsheetML file are stored in the ISO 8601 format".   This text is not here by accident, but according to BRM-Resolution #7 (see Sc34N989) referencing document http://www.itscj.ipsj.or.jp/sc34/def/BRM/Response_DE-0028_dates_v9.doc instructing the project editor to insert this text into former section 13.17.4.1.

This issue was extensively discussed at the BRM, and it was explicitly decided to allow nothing but ISO 8601 format for the document exchange format, for documents of transitional and strict conformance.

Secondly, change no.12 poses a technical problem, as it allows an Ecma-376:2006 conformant Excel sheet containing the dates 1900-01-01 to 1900-02-28 to be interpreted as an ISO/IEC 29500:2008-conformant document containing the dates 1899-12-31 to 1900-02-27. Therefore Ecma-376:2006 Transitional conformant documents must be well distinguishable from ISO/IEC 29500:2008 Transitional.

1.2 Procedural Considerations

This ballot is subject to the JTC1 Directives, 5th Edition Version 3.0, section 9.11. It is for vote by the Sc34 members.

The ballot document, numbered 34N1252, consists of 154 changes, concerning a variety of issues different of that of change no.12.

A change so sensitive as change no.12 should have been balloted in a separate document.

According to the minutes of the WG4 telephone conferences change no.12 was applied last-minute. It was not present in the Sc34/Wg4/N0062 draft of 2009-07-03, which contained only 97 changes.

The majority of Wg4 participants did not welcome change no.12. It was not for technical reasons that the group finally accepted incorporation of this change into the ballot document, but only to avoid further delay.

The conference call minutes and other Wg4 documents do not substantiate any technical reasons for change no.12, nor have we received any such reasons from those Wg4 members asked since we became aware of this change.

The document version available at the Sc34 Copenhagen Plenary was far away from the ballot draft. The ballot text has only been available to those Sc34 P-members participating to Wg4, and even they have seen the ballot version only end of July, immediately before it was forwarded for vote.

The JTC1 Directives, section 9.11.2 demand "Consideration of successive DCORs shall continue until the substantial support of the P-members of the committee has been obtained or a decision to abandon or defer the project has been reached."

As the preceding paragraphs prove, regarding change no.12 such substantial support has not been achieved.

Therefore we suggest that Sc34 re-submit a revised text for DCOR ballot after Wg4 has reached consensus about what technical issues need to be resolved and how they should be resolved.

1.3 Conformance and Backward Compatibility

The proposed change re-introduces the legacy serial date/time format into the transitional conformance class and creates an air of ISO/IEC 29500 transitional conformance for documents conforming to Ecma-376:2006, implemented by Microsoft Office 2007 and 2008.

Indeed, it was made to resolve DR 09-0274, which is related to DR 09-275, both arising from recent WG4 conference calls where Ecma-376 vs. 29500 transitional conformance was extensively discussed.

While DR 09-0274 claims that (cit.) "… the BRM never intended to disallow serial dates in Part 4", DR 09-275 claims (cit.) "As a result of changes made at the BRM, a number of existing Ecma-376 documents were unintentionally made invalid against the IS 29500 transitional schema."

But at the BRM the Ecma-376 and the IS 29500 schema were strictly distinguished. Therefore BRM Resolution 21 instructs the editor to "incorporate an informative specification of the following, with a reference to it from the Scope[1]: - All XML elements which appear in ISO/IEC 29500 but do not appear in ECMA-376:2006; - All XML elements which do not appear in ISO/IEC 29500 but appear in ECMA-376:2006; …".

A particular concern of the BRM was to exclude the leap-year bug inherent to MS Excel's legacy versions from IS 29500. To this end ISO 8601 format was chosen to replace the prior serial date format. The Swiss delegation making contributions to the serial-date issue as well as to the scope was, like other delegations, perfectly well aware of the impact on the transitional conformance class. It is not the case that the idea was to continue the use of serial dates in transitional documents.

So, to make some existing Ecma-376 documents invalid against the requirements of IS 29500 was not unintentional, but in contrary the explicit will of the majority of the Sc34 members attending the BRM. Therefore the scope of ISO/IEC 29500-1:2008 states the goal (cit.) "to be capable of faithfully representing the preexisting corpus of word-processing documents, spreadsheets and presentations that had been produced by the Microsoft Office applications (from Microsoft Office 97 to Microsoft Office 2008, inclusive) at the date of the creation of ISO/IEC 29500."

Now "faithful representation" must not be confused with conformance, as DR 09-0275 does. Nobody ever aimed to assign 29500 conformance to the old binary formats of Microsoft Office 97. But the transitional conformance class of 29500 contains elements required to faithfully represent them: They can be converted into transitional format without loss, but not necessarily into strict format.

The scope attributes the same to Microsoft Office 2007 and 2008 documents: They are convertible into 29500 transitional format, but not necessarily conformant with it. The scope only promises faithful representability, i.e. convertibility, not conformance. As a matter of fact, to avoid inconsistencies it is essential that such documents can be clearly distinguished from documents conformant to the transitional or strict conformance class.

ISO/IEC 29500 provides extensive support for the faithful processing of serial dates. E.g. the dateCompatibility attribute (see part 1 18.17.4) allows the use of the year 1900 and 1904 date base systems during processing. Nevertheless, the file format is 8601, and nothing else.

Coexistence of non-conformant to IS 29500 (but conforming to some other specification such as e.g. Ecma-376:2006), transitionally conformant and strictly conformant documents is easily handled by suitable import and export filters, provided that these different formats can be distinguished from each other.

---

[1] This reference is missing, which is yet another defect of the current text.

1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
MB[1]	Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex (e.g. 3.1)	Paragraph/ Figure/Table/ Note (e.g. Table 1)	Type of com-ment[2]	Comment (justification for change) by the MB	Proposed change by the MB	Secretariat observations on each comment submitted
GB	Corrig. 5		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. 6		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	

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.

ISO electronic balloting commenting template/version 2001-10

1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
MB[1]	Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex (e.g. 3.1)	Paragraph/ Figure/Table/ Note (e.g. Table 1)	Type of com-ment[2]	Comment (justification for change) by the MB	Proposed change by the MB	Secretariat observations on each comment submitted
US	**ISO/IEC 29500-4: 2008/ DCOR 1**		ge	*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.*		

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.

ISO electronic balloting commenting template/version 2001-10