

[Draft] Minutes of the Prague Meeting of
ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 34/WG4, 2014-06-18/20

Rex Jaeschke (rex@RexJaeschke.com)

2014-06-24

1. Opening remarks

The meeting started at 09:15. The convener, Murata-san, welcomed everyone to the 20th face-to-face meeting 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
Xia HOU	CN	Beijing Information Science and Technology University
Xuhong LIU	CN	Beijing Information Science and Technology University
Jirka Kosek	CZ, XML Guild liaison	Consultant
Jesper Lund Stocholm	DK	Ciber
Mario Wendt	DE	Microsoft
Rex Jaeschke	Ecma, Project Editor	Consultant
John Haug	Ecma, US	Microsoft
Chris Rae	Ecma	Microsoft
Francis Cave	GB	Francis Cave Digital Publishing
Gareth Horton	GB	Datawatch

Name	Affiliation	Employer/Sponsor
Jaeho Lee	KR	University of Seoul
SangBeom HAM	KR	Microsoft

Present were 13 people from 7 NBs, and 1 liaison.

3. Adoption of the agenda

The agenda (SC 34 N 2065) was adopted as published, with the addition of the following under “Administration”:

- WG4 web site
- Publication Schedule
 - Part 3 Revision
 - Part 2 Revision
 - CORs
 - Extensions

4. Administration

Approval of Previous Meeting Minutes [WG4 N 0282]

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. **Done.**
2. John and Murata-san will create a list of possible restrictions and conventions on the use of XAdES in OPC. **Dropped**

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>.

WG4 Web Site Change

Rex explained the move to LiveLink for our document repository, and demonstrated access. From now until the September Plenary in Kyoto, he'll maintain both the old and the new repositories, but after the Kyoto meeting, he'll discontinue supporting the old site. In the meantime, [all members should get themselves added to the LiveLink Global Directory for SC 34/WG4 via their National Body or Liaison](#). Without that access, they will not be able to access committee-private WG4 documents.

Publication Schedule

Part 3 Revision

The 5-month DIS ballot on 29500-3 ends on 2014-09-02. Assuming there are no NO votes, no FDIS ballot is needed, and the draft can go straight to publication. We'll know at the Kyoto meeting.

Part 2 Revision

We agreed to aim for a 2-month CD1 after the February/March 2015 meeting, with a 3–4-month CD2 after the September 2015 meeting.

- 2014-09 Kyoto, the scope of digital signature
- 2015-02/03 First CD ballot (2 months) starts after the Feb/March meeting
- 2015-06 CD comment Disposition
- 2015-09 Second CD ballot (4 months) starts after the Sep meeting
- 2016-02/03 CD comment disposition
- 2016-03 start DIS ballot
- 2016-12 IS published

CORs

As Parts 2 and 3 are being revised, COR3 includes edits for Parts 1 and 4 only. 35 DRs are ready for inclusion in a new COR with all 35 affecting Part 1, and 5 affecting Part 4.

Rex proposed the following timeline, which was accepted in principle. And while he'll start preparing the draft CORs soon, WG4 will hold off committing to a cut-off date and in deciding which closed DRs will be included.

Below is an estimate for the completion of the ballot on COR3 for Parts 1 and 4, their integration into a new edition of 29500, and its subsequent publication by ISO.

1. 2014-09-23/25 — WG4 meets in Kyoto, where it freezes the contents of the COR3 set
2. 2014-10-2x — Project editor delivers the COR3 set to WG4 for review
3. 2014-11-2x — Via a teleconference, WG4 authorizes 3-month SC 34 letter ballots on the COR3 set
4. 2014-12-01 — Project editor prepares and submits the final draft of the COR3 set to the SC 34 Secretariat
5. 2014-12-15 — 3-month SC 34 letter ballots on the COR3 set start
6. 2015-03-15 — 3-month SC 34 letter ballots on the COR3 set end
7. 2015-03-2x — Via one or more teleconferences, WG4 processes any comments from the COR3 set ballots
8. 2015-05-01 — Project editor circulates the consolidated version to WG4 for review
9. 2015-06-01 — The consolidated version is submitted to ITTF for processing
10. 2015-11-30 — The consolidated version is published as IS 29500-1/-4:201x

Extensions

Not discussed

5. Revising Part 2 (Open Packaging Conventions)

We discussed XAdES, Base URIs and Part Names. Based on discussions in this meeting, Murata-san will propose a rewrite of OPC as a personal contribution.

5.1 XAdES

1) Three options discussed in Berlin

WG4 discussed three options: i) Do nothing; ii) Standardize the use of XAdES only; iii) Standardize the use of XAdES and MS-specific signed infov1 element. Everybody likes ii) and nobody supports i) or iii).

2) Japanese position

Murata-san explained the following Japanese position on the introduction of XAdES to OPC.

1. Reference ISO 14533-2, which provides two conformance levels of XAdES.
2. Introduce two conformance levels of OPC. One is based on XAdES-T while the other, XAdES-A.
3. Allow validation restricted to XAdES-T and allow validation including XAdES-A.
4. Introduce an informative annex for depicting the workflow around long-term digital signature. It should describe the grace period clearly.
5. Introduce a remedy for compromised hash algorithms. Since OPC uses ds:Manifest, such compromise allows potential attacks to XAdES signatures. D.14 of the latest draft of XAdES from ETSI (see http://docbox.etsi.org/esi/Open/Latest_Drafts/prEN-319132-1v004-XAdES-core-STABLE-DRAFT.pdf) already introduces such a remedy.
6. Make clear which option of XAdES is allowed and which is disallowed in OPC. For example, are counter signatures allowed?

John Haug expressed concerns about concentrating XAdES-A and XAdES-A, and explained why MS Office does not provide XAdES-A.

WG4 did not make a decision about the Japanese position this time, but plans to make a decision in the Kyoto meeting. In preparation, each member body is encouraged to speak with XAdES experts in advance.

5.2 Part name

Murata-san explained his proposed rewrite of the definition of part names, and received some useful comments from WG4 experts. In particular, it was pointed out that lowercase a-z and uppercase A-Z have to be treated as equivalent. Murata-san will improve the rewrite accordingly.

5.3 Resolution of relative references

OPC already uses pack URIs as base URIs for resolving relative references, and RFC 3986/3987 already provides the procedure for resolving relative references against base URIs. Murata-san insisted that OPC should continue to use pack URIs as base URIs and rely on RFC 3987/3987 for the resolution of relative references.

Then, he further claimed that the preprocessing (represented as an itemized list) in A.3 is harmful and should be dropped. After lengthy discussions, WG4 agreed that it should be retained as an optional procedure, and that it should be accompanied by notes about its risks.

5.4 Editorial reorganization

Murata-san pointed out that the current scope does not look like a scope but it is rather a description of mechanisms. He presented a rewrite, but it requires many improvements.

He proposed to reorganize Annex A (Pack URIs) as 8.3. In his opinion, Pack URIs should be introduced earlier, since play a key role in the resolution of relative references.

He also proposed to create a new subclause (8.4) for the determination of base URIs. This determination has three cases but they should be covered in one case.

Finally, he proposed to introduce an informative subclause (8.5) for providing examples of the resolution of relative references.

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.

DR 09-0168 “OPC: No mechanism to distinguish ECMA-376:2006 from IS 29500”

Agreed to close this without action.

DR 09-0281 “OPC: Use of the term “part””

There was some discussion. Closed without action, as the term “part” will be defined under the larger revision work, eliminating the need for this DR.

DR 09-0288 “OPC: Target attribute value needed to reference OPC parts”

This issue is subsumed by 09-0286. Closed without action.

DR 10-0048 “OPC: Processing model for handling ZIP encryption”

After quite a bit of discussion questioning the words we had previously agreed to, Chris agreed to review the tables and to come back with a new proposal.

DR 11-0029 “OPC: Do not copy text or schemas from W3C XML Signature”

It seems like a good idea to avoid duplication of text.

DR 11-0030 “OPC: Obsolete version of W3C XML Digital Signature 1.0”

We re-affirmed our decision from 2012-02-06/08, Prague F2F Meeting, and will incorporate this in the revision.

From §3, “Normative References”, we agreed to strike the entry “Namespaces in XML 1.1”.

DR 12-0001 “OPC: Correct Spelling of “relationship part””

We confirmed our previous decision.

DR 12-0022 “WML: Settings, transformation details missing”

We agreed on the following changes:

Part 1, §17.15.1.76, “saveThroughXslt (Custom XSL Transform To Use When Saving As XML File)”, p. xxx

This element specifies the location of a custom XSL transform ~~which~~~~that~~ shall be used when this document is saved as a single XML file (in an [application-defined](#) format ~~not defined by ISO/IEC 29500~~). [*Guidance*: Because this setting specifies behavior when saving to an alternative file format not defined by ISO/IEC 29500, this behavior is optional. *end guidance*]

...

Attributes	...
solutionID (Local Identifier for XSL Transform)	Specifies a string identifier which that can be used to locate the XSL transform to be applied. The semantics of this attribute are not defined by ISO/IEC 29500 application-defined - applications can use this information in any application-defined manner to resolve the location of the XSL transform to apply. ...

...

Part 1, §17.15.1.91, “useXSLTWhenSaving (Save Document as XML File through Custom XSL Transform)”, p. xx

...

If the saveXmlDataOnly element (**\$Error! Reference source not found.**) is specified, then the single XML file to be transformed is the custom XML markup of the document, otherwise, it [is in an implementation-defined format](#) ~~outside the scope of ISO/IEC 29500~~. If the XSL transform specified by the saveThroughXslt element is not present, then this setting should be ignored.

...

Closed.

DR 13-0003 “General: Parts 1 and 4 Miscellaneous Editorial Nits”

Closed Issues #14–17 inserting “color” after “fill” for the attribute description in Issue #15.

DR 13-0013 “WML: omissions and inconsistencies in the specification of attributes”

There was a short discussion; no progress.

DR 13-0015 “Copy-paste errors”

Accepted proposed solution; closed.

DR 14-0002 “WML: use of ‘if this element is omitted’ in the specification of attributes”

Agreed with Chris’s proposed solution with edits from Francis and the committee during the discussion. See revised docx file. On Friday, John raised more issues. He’ll circulate a new draft.

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

Accepted proposed solution; closed.

DR 14-0004 “SML: Broken Link to Schema”

Accepted proposed solution; closed.

DR 14-0005 “SML: Issue in Shared String Table”

We revised Chris’s proposed edits and added in Jesper’s suggestions, as follows:

Part 1, 18.4, “Shared String Table”

~~A workbook can contain thousands of cells containing string (non-numeric) data. Furthermore this data is very likely to be repeated across many rows or columns. The goal of implementing a single string table that is shared across the workbook is to improve performance in opening and saving the file by only reading and writing the repetitive information once.~~

String values may be stored directly inside spreadsheet cell elements (§18.3.1.4); however, storing the same value inside multiple cell elements can result in very large worksheet Parts, possibly resulting in performance degradation. The Shared String Table is an indexed list of string values, shared across the workbook, which allows implementations to store values only once.

WG4 discussed this and agreed that duplicates are possible. Members were also aware of applications that relied on this, so no other changes will be made.

Closed, with Rex to reply to submitter.

DR 14-0006 “General: Values that exceed the Specification”

After some discussion, we assigned ownership to Chis. Murata-san will examine min/max issues.

DR 14-0007 “SML: Guidance as to the use of attributes or child elements for optional, single-valued items”

After some discussion, we agreed to close this DR without action. Our response to the submitter is, as follows:

“Thanks for your submission regarding IS 29500. WG4 discussed this and agreed that there are design inconsistencies in the use of attributes to store property values. Unfortunately, it’s impossible to address this without breaking compatibility between existing implementations, and, as such, while acknowledging the inconsistent original design, we believe that it’s not worth breaking application interoperability to address it.”

7. Other Business

Thanking Host

We thanked Jirka for hosting the teleconference.

8. Future meetings

Face-to-Face Meetings:

- 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)
- 2015-06-15/17, BSI, London, UK (possibly with other WGs)

Teleconferences:

- 2014-07-17, 13:00 GMT (US/PT 06:00, GB 14:00, DE/DK/FR/CZ 15:00, JP 22:00)
- 2014-08-21, 13:00 GMT (US/PT 06:00, GB 14:00, DE/DK/FR/CZ 15:00, JP 22:00)

9. Adjournment

Adjourned by unanimous consent at 11:40 on 2014-06-20.