

**[Draft] Minutes of the Teleconference of**

**ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 34/WG4, 2013-01-09**

**Rex Jaeschke ([rex@RexJaeschke.com](mailto:rex@RexJaeschke.com))**

**2013-01-09**

**1. Opening remarks**

The meeting started at 20:05, GMT. The convener, Murata-san, welcomed everyone to the 49<sup>th</sup> teleconference of WG4.

**2. Roll call of delegates**

The following members were present during part or all of the meeting:

<b>Name</b>	<b>Affiliation</b>	<b>Employer/Sponsor</b>
Makoto Murata	WG4 Convener, JP	International University of Japan
Rex Jaeschke	Ecma, Project Editor	Consultant
Jim Thatcher	Ecma, US	Microsoft
Caroline Arms	Ecma	Library of Congress
John Haug	Ecma, US	Microsoft
Chris Rae	Ecma	Microsoft
Francis Cave	GB	Francis Cave Digital Publishing

Present were 7 people representing 3 NBs and 1 liaison.

### 3. Adoption of the agenda

The agenda ([SC 34 N 1856](#)) was adopted, as published.

### 4. Administration

#### Approval of Previous Meeting Minutes [WG4 N [0249](#)]

The draft minutes were approved as circulated.

#### Outstanding Action Items

1. John H. and Francis will rewrite the current text for 30114-1 (MCE Best Practices). **Done**; Francis circulated his ideas via email on 2013-09-01 (a copy of which is included below in “9. Other Business”). ~~and members should review that before the Copenhagen F2F meeting. This has been posted to the following wiki page:~~ [https://www.assembla.com/spaces/IS29500/wiki/MCE\\_Best\\_Practices](https://www.assembla.com/spaces/IS29500/wiki/MCE_Best_Practices).
2. Murata-san will submit a DR for Part 1 w.r.t. “Which of ext and extLst are application-defined extension elements”. **Pending** (drafted but still under review)
3. John H. to investigate whether an attribute in an ignorable and non-understood namespace should be ignored on an extension element in a namespace that is non-ignorable. **Pending**

#### Report from the WG4 Secretariat

The following NBs and liaisons have registered delegates to WG4: BR, CA, CH, CI, CN, CZ, DE, DK, Ecma, FI, FR, GB, IN, IT, JP, KR, NL, NO, OASIS, PL, US, W3C, XML Guild, and ZA. All requests for additions, deletions, and changes to the delegate list should be sent to the WG4 Secretariat ([rex@RexJaeschke.com](mailto:rex@RexJaeschke.com)).

The WG4 email list is [e-SC34-WG4@ecma-international.org](mailto:e-SC34-WG4@ecma-international.org). The document repository is at [http://lucia.itscj.ipsj.or.jp/itscj/servlets/ScmDoc10?Com\\_Id=w4](http://lucia.itscj.ipsj.or.jp/itscj/servlets/ScmDoc10?Com_Id=w4).

### 5. Defect Reports

The public online DR log is at <http://www.29500sc34comments.org/>. Access individual DRs via the hyperlinks contained within the spreadsheet’s left-most column.

<b>DR 13-0001, “DML: Theme part root element is incorrect”</b>
--

We agreed to move this to Last Call, as proposed in the latest DR log.

## 6. Revising Part 3 (Semantics of Markup Compatibility and Extensions)

(See [https://www.assembla.com/spaces/IS29500/wiki/Semantics\\_of\\_MCE.](https://www.assembla.com/spaces/IS29500/wiki/Semantics_of_MCE.))

The following thread is taken from the email list:

---

**Makoto Murata, 2013-01-08:**

I am reviewing examples in published 29500-3.

I think that, for each example, we should provide some configurations and output documents. Most examples are very useful, while a few examples are not. Here are my comments on all examples.

"Example 10–1. Processing Ignorable attribute" should be moved to a different location. We should provide sample configurations and output documents as well.

"Example 10–2. Processing Ignorable content using namespaces" is not very useful, and can be deleted without loss of information.

"Example 10–3. Processing Ignorable and ProcessContent attributes" should be moved to a different location. We should provide sample configurations and output documents as well.

"Example 10–4. ProcessContent and expanded names" is not very useful, and can be deleted without loss of information.

"Example 10–5. Processing an attribute's prefixed qualified name" and "Example 10–6. Processing a MustUnderstand attribute" should be kept. They demonstrate that the whole point of mustUnderstand is to raise a mismatch error as soon as possible. We should provide sample configurations.

"Example 10–7. Processing AlternateContent markup" and "Example 10–8. Processing AlternateContent markup using namespaces" look very similar. Why do we need both? We should provide sample configurations and output documents as well.

"Example 12–2. An application-defined add-in element" looks useful, but has to be revised using the ExtensionElements attribute.

"Example 13–1. Preprocessing using Markup Compatibility elements and attribu" is useless since it is about subsumption.

**Chris Rae, 2013-01-08:**

I really like the idea of providing output documents for examples.

I agree with all of your comments on the examples we should keep and remove - regarding 10-7 and 10-8, I think the main difference seems to be the use of Ignorable in 10-7. They do cover similar areas, but it might be nice to keep the more fully featured one.

On 12-2 - what is the ExtensionElements attribute? I thought we were going to declare extension elements as an initialisation to MCE (this could be what you mean).

**Makoto Murata, 2013-01-09:**

I extracted example input documents from 29500-3 and added output documents, which should be created by the MCE processor. I checked in quite a few examples in the subversion repository.

While doing so, I find a number of problems in the existing examples. First, there are quite a few syntax errors.

Second, output documents shown in Example 13–1 are very incorrect, unless I am mistaken.

What I checked in are available at:

<https://www.assembla.com/code/IS29500/subversion/nodes/branches/Part3TestData>

---

We discussed this thread at length.

We agreed to try to freeze the Part 3 wiki at, or soon after, the Copenhagen F2F, to allow integration of the wiki into the base document (with change tracking) and a general copy-editing review, prior to the June F2F meeting.

**Action:** Murata-san and Rex will write up the front matter regarding the reasons for the revision of Part 3 and a list of the major changes.

## 7. Revising Part 2 (Open Packaging Conventions)

There was some discussion about Digital signature support [and XAdES](http://blogs.msdn.com/b/david_leblanc/archive/2010/05/30/office-2010-digital-signatures-and-xades.aspx). (See [http://blogs.msdn.com/b/david\\_leblanc/archive/2010/05/30/office-2010-digital-signatures-and-xades.aspx](http://blogs.msdn.com/b/david_leblanc/archive/2010/05/30/office-2010-digital-signatures-and-xades.aspx) for some background.)

**Action:** John H. to report re the addition of Digital Signature support for OPC.

There was some discussion about encryption.

There was some discussion about ~~external metadata. The discussion was not really about "external" metadata, but about~~ an extension to OPC to allow the addition of a metadata part to an OPC package (by making external metadata into internal metadata) in a way that it would not be discarded by tools that did not understand the particular metadata scheme. In relation to MS Office software, the metadata would be generated externally, but it would be "in" the package once added, even if ignored by Office. It was agreed that more discussion of OPC revision would be on the agenda for Copenhagen.

## 8. Preparation for the Copenhagen F2F Meeting

All to review the MCE Best Practices email thread.

We'll see if remote access is possible at that meeting.

## 9. Other Business

Francis' email re 30114-1 (MCE Best Practices) from 2013-01-09:

Dear members of WG 4,

I had hoped to have got rather further forward with thinking about MCE Best Practices. Rather late in the day I have finally looked at the material that we have, and have tried to formulate some initial ideas.

### 1. Project aim

The aim, as I see it, is to draft a document with working title 'MCE Best Practices' – a longer title, more helpful to those outside the Working Group, will probably eventually be needed, but that will do for now – that will provide supplementary material to assist implementation of ISO/IEC 29500:3.

We need to decide whether the document should address ALL implementations of MCE or only implementations that are based upon ISO/IEC 29500. In the former case there would be a wider community of interest than just WG 4, and it would undoubtedly take longer to develop a document that we could be confident would meet a wide range of use cases. One possibility would be to start off by attempting to write the document for the more limited audience of ISO/IEC 29500 implementers, and only aim wider once we are confident that the we are developing something of use to at least one community of implementers.

## 2. Scope

The document should, I suggest, cover the following topics:

- What is meant by markup extensibility?
  - Extensible markup applications and the key role of namespaces in their design
- What kinds of applications might benefit from using MCE?
- What are the key features of MCE?
  - Alternative Content Blocks
  - Ignorable and “must understand” namespaces
  - Application-defined extension elements.
- For each of the above, guidance as to appropriate (and possibly some inappropriate) uses of the feature, with examples.

## 3. Relationship between this document and ISO/IEC 29500:3

This document could either form an informative annex in a future revised edition of ISO/IEC 29500:3, or a Part of the new multi-part standard (ISO/IEC 30114), or it could be a stand-alone document. I can see potential benefits in the document starting out as a separate Technical Report, especially if it is generally felt that this document will take time to develop and stabilise. Once a broad consensus on MCE best practices has been reached, the content of the Technical Report could at that stage become an informative annex of Part 3 or become a Part of the multi-part standard. However, whatever decision is taken, this document will need to reflect closely the current text of Part 3, and care will be needed to ensure that they don't conflict or have too much unnecessary overlap.

## 4. References

The following documents are available for reference in preparing an initial Working Draft:

- Current edition of ISO/IEC 29500:3
- Semantics of MCE Wiki, including examples
- SC 34/WG 4 N 223 MCE Best Practices (Microsoft, February 2012)

Not very much, to be sure, but I hope this is starting off in the right direction at least.

The immediate priority is to discuss the timetable and resources for moving this activity forward. Unfortunately I shall not have any time to work on this before the Copenhagen meeting, so would prefer a longer timescale leading up to having a full working draft in time for discussion at the Seattle meeting. If anyone else (other than John and myself) would like to work on this, we would obviously make more rapid progress.

## **10.Future meetings**

### **Face-to-Face Meetings:**

- 2013-02-04/06, Copenhagen, DK (with WG1 and WG5, but no plenary; in sync with XML Prague 2013-02-08/10)
- 2013-06-17/20 (Monday afternoon through Thursday noon), Seattle, Washington, US (with other WGs)
- 2013-09-09/13, Delft, NL (with other WGs and Plenary)

**Teleconferences:** None

## **11.Adjournment**

Adjourned by unanimous consent at 22:00.