[Draft] Minutes of the Teleconference Meeting of

ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 34/WG4, 2014-05-13

Rex Jaeschke (rex@RexJaeschke.com)

2014-05-15

1. Opening remarks

The meeting started at 21:05 GMT. The convener, Murata-san, welcomed everyone to the 59th teleconference of WG4.

2. Roll call of delegates

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

Name	Affiliation	Employer/Sponsor
Makoto Murata	WG4 Convener, JP	International University of Japan
Jesper Lund Stocholm	DK	Ciber
Rex Jaeschke	Ecma, Project Editor	Consultant
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 4 NBs, and 1 liaison.

3. Adoption of the agenda

The agenda (SC 34 N 2054) was adopted as published, with the addition of a "Report from Japanese Digital Signature WG meeting on XAdES".

4. Administration

Approval of Previous Meeting Minutes [WG4 N 0281]

The draft minutes were approved, as circulated.

Outstanding Action Items

1. Regarding "Support of XAdES on OPC", Chris will indicate MS's preference from the options i) Do nothing; ii) Standardize the use of XAdES only; iii) Standardize the use of XAdES and MS-specific signed infov1 elements; no later than the Prague meeting. **Pending**
2. John and Chris will ask the OPC designers as to why "content type" and "media type" were separated in the initial spec. **Done** (see Item 5 below)
3. John and Murata-san will create a list of possible restrictions and conventions on the use of XAdES in OPC. **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).

The WG4 email list is e-SC34-WG4@ecma-international.org. The document repository is at http://lucia.itscj.ipsj.or.jp/itscj/servlets/ScmDoc10?Com_Id=w4.

5. Revising Part 2 (Open Packaging Conventions)

Here's a relevant email thread, "More OPC answers", which we discussed at length:

2014-05-11 John Haug:

For Tuesday's call: We received more information this past week on the questions I asked.

1. Regarding steps 1-9 in A.3: They said that the examples in A.4 should illustrate why the steps exist. For example, see the line for the Unicode string "\a.xml" (4th from bottom). Without those steps (in particular, 4 and 5), the result would be "/%5Ca.xml" rather than "/a.xml" because the URI that is run through those steps is "%5Ca.xml".

2. Regarding the text in subclause 9.2.1 (Relative References), "Relative references from a part are interpreted relative to the base URI of that part. By default, the base URI of a part is derived from the name of the part, as defined in §B.3.": This is the output of step 6 in B.3. They suggested that the following might make it more clear: "…the base URI of that part, which in this case is the URI of that part." I believe the crux is "the base URI *of that part*." All six steps in B.3 are required to create a pack URI for the package *and a part*.

3. Regarding the text in subclause 9.3.2.2 (Relationship Element), TargetMode attribute, "For package relationships, the package implementer shall resolve relative references in the Target attribute against the pack URI that identifies the entire package resource. [M1.29] For more information, see Annex B.": This is the output of step 5 in B.3. That output does not contain a part name embedded in the pack URI and thus is the pack URI for the entire package. (The steps in B.3 open with "To compose a pack URI from the absolute package URI *and a part name*, the following steps shall be performed".)

2014-05-12 Murata-san:

[Re John's Point 1]

It appears that the biggest reason for the itemized list is to convert "\a.xml" to "/a.xml" automatically. We have to do that conversion.

I think that this conversion should be done as part of the semantics of the pack scheme, rather than by the resolution of relative references.

But wait! Are "/a.xml" and "\a.xml" equivalent? If so, equivalent as part names or equivalent as relative references (in that case, is "/./a.xml" also equivalent?).

2014-05-13 Murata-san:

[Re John's Point 2]

My rewrite covers all three cases: within non-relationship parts, within relationship parts for other parts, and the relationship part for the entire package.

https://www.assembla.com/spaces/IS29500/wiki/New_text_for_Part_2

I agree that we should rely on the algorithms in B.3.

[Re John's Point 3]

I agree that different pieces scattered in 29500-2 covers all three cases mentioned above. But I think that it should be covered in one place. Strictly speaking, relative references may appear as values of attributes different from @Target, because MCE allows the use of different attributes.

2014-05-13 Murata-san:

[More on Point 1]

First, equivalence of relative references should not be tested. The next para is extracted from RFC 3986.

In testing for equivalence, applications should not directly compare relative references; the references should be converted to their respective target URIs before comparison. ...

Second, it is allowed to test equivalence of URIs after converting the backslash character to the slash character.

The next para is also extracted from RFC 3986.

For this reason, determination of equivalence or difference of URIs is based on string comparison, perhaps augmented by reference to additional rules provided by URI scheme definitions

So, I think that there is nothing wrong in interpreting "\" as "/", after relative references are resolved against the pack URI.

I thus think that we do not need A.3.   All what I need is "additional rules provided by the pack scheme, and the conversion of "\" to "/" is one of them.

The spec seems to allow the use of MCE in OPC. There was a discussion about whether this is true, and if so, whether we should place restrictions on such use.

Re John and Chris's action item to ask the OPC designers as to why "content type" and "media type" were separated in the initial spec, John reported the following:

OPC uses the following terms: "content type" (not defined in RFC 2616), "content-type" (not in the RFC, only used in 10.1.2.3 and may be a typo) and "media type" (defined in the RFC). OPC does not use "Content-Type" (defined in the RFC) but does define a "Content Types" stream. OPC's "content type" is defined the same as the RFC's "media type" except that OPC additionally allows content type to be an empty string.

6. Defect Reports

The public, online DR log is now at

https://onedrive.live.com/?cid=c8ba0861dc5e4adc&sc=documents&sa=501765342&id=C8BA0861DC5E4ADC%21105. Access individual DRs via the hyperlinks contained within the spreadsheet's left-most column.

We discussed briefly the three new DRs from Germany via Ecma. Rex reported that a 4th one was waiting to be posted.

DR 14-0002 "WML: use of "if this element is omitted" in the specification of attributes"

Chris made a short presentation of this, which he now believes is a complete solution to what was formerly part of DR 13-0013. After a short discussion, we agreed to review this and, hopefully, to adopt it in Prague.

DR 14-0003 "SML: Incomplete specification of SpreadsheetML function inputs and outputs"

Chris made a short presentation of this. After a short discussion, we agreed to review this and, hopefully, to adopt it in Prague.

7. Other Business

 Thanking Host

We thanked Microsoft for hosting the teleconference.

Report from Japanese Digital Signature WG meeting on XAdES

Murata-san presented the email below.

2014-05-13 Murata-san: "Report: the digital signature WG of JNSA"

The digital signature WG of the Japan Network Security Association (JNSA) is involved in the standardization and implementation of XAdES among others. This WG and the Japanese SC34 mirror are going to work together for XAdES in OOXML and [ODF].

In 2008, some members of the WG contacted me and requested the addition of XAdES to OOXML. Since then, I have occasionally contacted them. Now that XAdES is now an important topic of both the ODF 1.2 DIS ballot and the revision of 29500-2, they are very interested.

On 2014-05-13, I attended a meeting of this WG. I explained the current status of OOXML, ODF, and EPUB. They explained to me what is going on in ETSI, which develops XAdES, and ISO/TC 154, which standardized XAdES as ISO 14533-2:2012.

As far as I know, experts of office documents do not know digital signature well. Meanwhile, digital signature experts do [not] know office documents well. Nevertheless, both camps are involved in digital signature for office documents. There are certainly overlaps and small conflicts.

Two activities in the digital signature camp appear to be particularly relevant:

- ETSI TS 102 918 – Associated Signature Associated Signature Containers (ASiC). This is a ODF or EPUB-like package format for XAdES.
- D.14 The xadesenv111: Renewed Digests element in Draft EN 319 132-1 V0.0.4 (2013-11) (a revision of XAdES).

It is believed that the use of manifest in OOXML for digital signature is week when hash algorithms are compromised. Renewing digests is created as a remedy.

They are going to participate in the Japanese SC34 mirror committee as observers. I believe that they will contribute to the revision of OOXML Part 2 as well as preparation of the Japanese vote for ODF 1.2.

8. Future meetings

Face-to-Face Meetings:

- 2014-06-17/20, Prague, CZ (with other WGs)

    Tuesday: ~~WG1,~~ 10:00 WG5, 14:00 SC 34 re-organization ad hoc
    Wednesday: 09:00-17:00 WG4

Thursday: 09:00-17:00 WG4

Friday: 09:00-17:00 WG4

- 2014-09-22/26, Kyoto, JP (with other WGs, and Opening/Closing Plenaries)

    Mon: 10:00 SC 34 opening plenary; Afternoon: WG1, WG5

    Tuesday: 09:00-17:00 WG4; 17:30 WG 6 teleconference

    Wednesday: 09:00-17:00 WG4

    Thursday: 09:00-17:00 WG4

    Friday: 10:00 SC 34 closing plenary

- Tentatively 2015-02-23/27 or 2015-03-02/06, location to be determined (with other WGs)

Teleconferences:

- None scheduled

9. Adjournment

Adjourned by unanimous consent at 22:40.