

Draft Minutes of the Teleconference of

ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 34/WG4, 2015-08-20

Rex Jaeschke (rex@RexJaeschke.com)

2015-08-20

1. Opening remarks

The meeting started at 13:00 GMT. The convener, Murata-san, welcomed everyone to the 68th teleconference 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
Rex Jaeschke	Ecma, Project Editor	Consultant
Caroline Arms	Ecma	Library of Congress
John Haug	Ecma, US	Microsoft
Chris Rae	Ecma	Microsoft

Present were 5 people, from 2 NBs and 1 liaison.

3. Adoption of the agenda

The agenda (SC 34/WG4 N 0312) was adopted as published.

4. Administration

Approval of Previous Meeting Minutes [WG4 N 0314]

The draft minutes were approved, as circulated.

Outstanding Action Items

- Re DR 15-0002 “SML: Schema for GradientFill does not limit colors”, Chris will write up a reply to submitter explaining why we’ve closed this DR without action. **Pending**
- Rex will resolve the Category 2 [DR 09-0055, DR 12-0005, DR 12-0025] and category 3b [DR 14-0006] issues identified during the previous teleconference. **Category 2a was researched and discussed by John, Rex, and Murata-san. John started a new email thread on 2015-08-14, “COR3 issue: ST_PitchFamily”, which will result in reopening some old DRs or in the creation of a new DR. Category 2b was resolved by Rex in the new DCOR. Category 3b was resolved by Rex in the new DCOR.**
- Murata-san will resolve the Category 3a [DR 09-0040] issue identified during the previous teleconference. **Was researched and discussed by John, Rex, and Murata-san. John started a new email thread on 2015-08-14, “COR3 issue: ST_Hint”, which will result in reopening some old DRs or in the creation of a new DR.**
- Murata-san will resolve the issue of missing RelaxNG schema files raised by Rex in private mail. **Done**
- Rex will review Murata-san’s report of mismatched figures. **Done [problem solved by tweaking a PDF-generation option]**
- Rex will produce a new DCOR (COR3B) for 29500-1 and circulate it for committee review prior to the next teleconference. **Done immediately following this meeting**
- Rex will produce a new OPC WD from the document Murata-san announced in his mail of 2015-06-26, and circulate it for committee review prior to the next teleconference. **Done. See N 0317 posted on 2015-08-04.**
- Murata-san will review the series of DRs 11-0008, 11-0009, 11-0010, and 11-0011 to see who needs to do what, and make a plan to try to resolve these at the Beijing F2F meeting at which we’ll have experts from CN, JP, and KR present. **Pending**
- Rex and Chris will take Chris’ recent draft of the Guidelines for Extensions and apply ISO formatting, and circulate it for committee review. **Document produced by Rex on 2015-08-08 and circulated to Murata-san and Chris for review.**

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 now at <http://isotc.iso.org/livelink/livelink?func=ll&objid=8912947&objaction=ndocslst>.

Consolidated reprint status

As reported during the previous teleconference, a number of issues were raised as a result of the review of the draft consolidated Parts 1 and 4. The remaining issues are, as follows:

ST_OnOff

From John's email thread, "COR3 issue: ST_OnOff" from 2015-08-14:

Background: See Murata-san's e-mail "ST_OnOff1 in shared-commonSimpleTypes.xsd" (2015-07-04).

MM mail: ST_OnOff1 exists in schema but missing from prose? (from Amd.1?)

29500-4:2012: defined in schema, neither ST_OnOff1 ("on", "off") nor ST_OnOff (union of Boolean & ST_OnOff1) referenced in prose

- 14.5.2 legacy@legacy refers to ST_OnOff from Part 1 22.9.2.7; no other references to that

No changes noted in 29500-4-2012-Cor-1-2015 (WG 4 N 0300)

The immediate question here is whether to add a subclause for ST_OnOff1. The general question is whether there are other simple types in schema missing from prose. Because of 14.5.2, I also wondered whether there were references to simple types in Part 1 that should really refer to the same simple type in Part 4. I did some analysis on 29500-4:2012 and the schemas on the Assembla site, which is attached. Walking through it...

- Searched Part 4 for all references to simple types (i.e., the ST every attribute claims defines its values, at the bottom of every attribute definition)
- Filtered for those referencing Part 1
- Listed all the simple types defined in prose in Part 4
- --> Checked which Part 4 attributes reference a simple type in Part 1 (see below)

- Obtained the simple types (594) from the [Part4UrgentCOR_2015](#) branch
- Obtained the simple types (522) from the [Part1COR_2015](#) branch
 - According to the schemas, Part 4 contains every Part 1 ST plus 72 additional ones)
- --> Checked which Part 4 schema STs do not have a corresponding prose subclause (see below)

Refers to ST in Part 1 but has a same-named ST with prose in Part 4:

- ST_Angle
- ST_ColorType
- ST_PercentageDecimal
- ST_TextBulletSizeDecimal
- ST_TrueFalse

STs in Part 4 schema not in Part 1 schema but with no prose definition in Part 4

- ST_OnOff1
- ST_WebSourceType

For both of these, since they were not part of any DRs handled by this COR (right?), I suggest we ignore them for the COR fixes. Look further and, if appropriate, file a DR for later consideration. Side note: I found that the table of contents for clause 20 is missing entries for 20.2, 20.3, 20.4.

Murata-san proposed we not hold up the new DCOR for a resolution to this. WG4 agreed.

Action: Rex will create a new DR for Miscellaneous Schema Issues in Part 4, and move this issue (plus several other related ones recently posted) to that DR.

Action: Rex will resolve the problem with Part 4, §20's missing entries for 20.2, 20.3, and 20.4.

ST_PitchFamily

From John's email thread, "COR3 issue: ST_PitchFamily" from 2015-08-14:

Background: E-mail "A second COR for 29500-1 and the type ST_PitchFamily in DML" [forwarded below](#)

Background: E-mail "ST_PitchFamily in dml-main.xsd" ([latest reply 2015-07-12](#))

Summary:

- DR 09-0055: CT_TextFont@pitchFamily changed to be of new type ST_PitchFamily (missing in DCOR)
- DR 09-0037 already removed CT_TextFont@charset/panose/pitchFamily

- --> Proposed: back out DR 09-0055, re-open it, look at it from scratch
- ** Why was 09-0037 resolved as it was? ("Reviewed Shawn's email of 2010-03-18. We chose Choice 2, "Remove the attributes from the standard". The e-mail is the same as in the DR log from 2009-06-17.)

Rex> Yes it looks like we need to reconsider these, and as MM suggested in his mail, "Re: A second COR for 29500-1 and the type ST_PitchFamily in DML", on 2015-07-30 [JH: Forwarded below], we NOT include this in the 2nd COR, but rather take our time and fix it next time around. I suggest making a new DR that points to these two.

I think these two DRs need to be looked at together to come to a final conclusion. Because there is such a significant amount of text changed here, I think publishing as is would be a problem and that we should correct this before the Beijing meeting so, the new DCOR ballot (COR3b?) will have it.

From: eb2mmrt@gmail.com [<mailto:eb2mmrt@gmail.com>] **On Behalf Of** MURATA Makoto

Sent: Thursday, July 30, 2015 2:58 PM

To: Rex Jaeschke <rex@rexjaeschke.com>

Cc: John Haug <johnhaug@exchange.microsoft.com>; MURATA Makoto (FAMILY Given) <eb2m-mrt@asahi-net.or.jp>

Subject: Re: A second COR for 29500-1 and the type ST_PitchFamily in DML

Although I agree that we should revise CT_EmbeddedFontListEntry and introduce a type (CT_EmbeddedTextFont) without the three attributes, I do not think that this change is a must for this consolidation. It is not very difficult to address this defect, but if we start to incorporate not-so-difficult DRs as part of the new COR for the remedy, we will run the risk of delaying it and the consolidated text for months.

Makoto

2015-07-31 0:07 GMT+09:00 Rex Jaeschke <rex@rexjaeschke.com>:

Yes, the changes proposed in DR 09-0037 went into COR2 and 29500:2012.

John, if you agree that we have a conflict between 09-0037 and 09-0055, I'll re-post this thread to the committee and create a new DR for it. In that case, should we delay a new COR for resolution of this? After all, it is not related to the recent COR and consolidation.

Rex

From: eb2mmrt@gmail.com [mailto:eb2mmrt@gmail.com] **On Behalf Of** MURATA Makoto

Sent: Thursday, July 30, 2015 2:10 AM

To: Rex Jaeschke <rex@rexjaeschke.com>

Subject: Re: A second COR for 29500-1 and the type ST_PitchFamily in DML

I think that DR 09-0037 should have introduced a new complex type, say CT_EmbeddedTextFont, to dml-main.xsd. Its definition should be:

```
<xsd:complexType name="CT_EmbeddedTextFont">
  <xsd:attribute name="typeface" type="ST_TextTypeface" use="required"/>
</xsd:complexType>
```

This complex type should be used only for 19.2.1.13 font (Embedded Font Name) .

```
<xsd:complexType name="CT_EmbeddedFontListEntry">
  <xsd:sequence>
    <xsd:element name="font" type="a:CT_EmbeddedTextFont" minOccurs="1" maxOccurs="1"/>
  ...
</xsd:complexType>
```

Then, no other elements will be affected by this change.

Yes, we have to revise 19.2.1.13 font (Embedded Font Name) significantly.

Are the changes in DR 09-0037 incorporated now?

Makoto

2015-07-30 5:23 GMT+09:00 Rex Jaeschke <rex@rexjaeschke.com>:

[I'm starting off with just the 3 of us. If/when we make progress, I'll post to the whole of WG4.]

One of the issues Murata-san raised recently (See issue Category 2a from the teleconference minutes of 2015-07-28.) was the fact that the definition of the new type we added way back, ST_PitchFamily, did not have a formal description in the Simple Types clause. This was supposedly resolved in DR 09-0055. When I first had a

detailed look at that DR, I found that quite a lot of text that WG4 probably (I can't be certain) agreed to, didn't make it into the COR and subsequent consolidated reprint.

Today, I started creating a new DR to fix any errors that occurred in processing DR 09-0055. Unfortunately, this looks like it has led to a larger problem.

We adopted the resolution to DR 09-0055 at the Berlin Meeting on 2011-06-20/22.

That resolution added the schema for the new type, ST_PitchFamily, and changed CT_TextFont to refer to that new type. This occurred for both Parts 1 and 4. However, the narrative definition of the type was NOT added, even though it existed in the earlier part of the DR log. Clearly, that seems wrong; if we added the schema for a new simple type, we should have added the corresponding text to describe it.

Separately, 15 months earlier, at the Stockholm meeting on 2010-03-23/25, we closed out DR 09-0037, which involved REMOVING the following attributes from CT_TextFont: charset, panose and pitchFamily. These removals are reflected in the resulting COR and the following consolidated reprint, 29500-2012. However, if the pitchFamily attribute no longer existed, it couldn't be changed by DR 09-0055. But if we remove these changes from DR 09-0055, the only changes left are to define the new type's schema, but never to refer to it anywhere in the schema, which sounds very strange, indeed.

Looking at DR 09-0037 further, although we agreed to remove the 3 attributes, the resolution and resulting COR did NOT actually remove them from the schema definition for that type. It seems to me that they should have. Also, a number of other types contain elements of type CT_TextFont, yet 09-0037 didn't say to remove those 3 attributes from them (see §21.1.2.3.x for cs, ea, latin, sym, and buFont). Also, even after the attributes were removed from the narrative in 19.2.1.13 font (Embedded Font Name), an example remains there that uses the attributes pitchFamily and charset, which were removed!

Bottom line, in the unused proposal text of DR 09-0055, attribute pitchFamily was to be greatly simplified with a pointer made to the new type ST_PitchFamily. Yet, DR 05-0037 said to remove this attribute altogether. All the other edits in the unused proposal of DR 09-0055 refer exactly to the descriptions of the same attribute (pitchFamily) in the cs, ea, latin, sym, and buFont elements mentioned earlier. So it seems that all the proposed text (both used and unused) hits all the related places in the spec.

It is clear that the resolutions we can imply from what was recorded in DRs 09-0037 and 09-0055 can't coexist, as they are contradictory. If we adopt the supposedly omitted text from 09-0055, we contradict the intent of 09-0037.

Maybe the solution is simple: adopt option 1 from DR 09-0037 instead of Option 2, massaging it to accommodate DR 09-0055's complete proposal.

Rex

John will own this issue. Once he circulates a proposal, we can discuss it on the email list before trying to resolve it at the Beijing meeting. Its resolution will go in COR3B.

ST_Hint

From John's email thread, "COR3 issue: ST_PitchFamily" from 2015-08-14:

Background: E-mail "Leftover from DR 09-0040" (latest reply 2015-08-03)

Summary:

ST_Hint (DR 09-0040)

- DR removed "cs" value
- --> Murata-san to remove "cs" from schemas
- ** Only the value "default" remains; where did "eastAsia" get removed? DR 09-0040 adds lots of text referring to "cs" and "eastAsia" values of the hint attribute for some CTs, which is of type ST_Hint. DR 09-0040 is therefore internally inconsistent and should not be applied as is. I haven't yet rediscovered why ST_Hint had items removed.

Rex> I just checked MM's mail, "Leftover from DR 09-0040" of 2015-08-02, and his proposed schema fix only removes cs; eastAsia is still there.

However, on close inspection, the way the Enumeration Value table is written in the COR (see entry #81) is that this is the complete table. As eastAsian was never intended to be removed, I should have shown an empty row after the default row, containing ..., indicating that the remainder of the table stays as is. And even though the COR didn't contain that ..., when I applied the COR to 2012, I did NOT remove eastAsian, 'cos there was no delete (strike-through in red) instruction in the COR to do so.

Regarding, “DR 09-0040 adds lots of text referring to “cs” and “eastAsia” values of the hint attribute for some CTs, which is of type ST_Hint. DR 09-0040 is therefore internally inconsistent and should not be applied as is”, I see there is a cs element APART from the cs enumeration value in ST_Hint. (I also see that eastAsia is also an attribute name as well as an enum value.)

I think this needs to be looked at to determine whether the cs attribute value should be removed and to confirm whether eastAsia was to be removed (and if so whether it ought to). Because there is such a significant amount of text changed here, I think publishing as is would be a problem and that we should correct this before the Beijing meeting so, the new DCOR ballot (COR3b?) will have it.

Should we keep the cs attribute?

John will own this issue. Once he circulates a proposal, we can discuss it on the email list before trying to resolve it at the Beijing meeting. Its resolution will go in COR3B.

New COR Request

At the Beijing meeting, WG4 will ask SC 34 to authorize a ballot for the new COR, referred to here as COR3B.

Proposed COR Ballot and Consolidated Reprint schedule

Below is an estimate for the completion of the ballot on COR3B for Part 1 and possibly Part 4, their integration into a new edition of 29500, and its subsequent publication by ISO:

1. 2015-09-21/25 — WG4 meets in Beijing, where it freezes the contents of the COR3B set
2. 2015-10-2x — Via a teleconference, WG4 wraps up the final contents of COR3B set
3. 2015-11-xx — Project editor delivers the COR3B set to WG4 for review
4. 2015-12-xx — Via a teleconference, WG4 authorizes 3-month SC 34 letter ballots on the COR3B set
5. 2015-12-xx — Project editor prepares and submits the final draft of the COR3B set to the SC 34 Secretariat
6. 2016-01-02 — 3-month SC 34 letter ballots on the COR3B set start
7. 2016-04-02 — 3-month SC 34 letter ballots on the COR3B set end
8. 2016-04-xx — Via a teleconference, WG4 processes any comments from the COR3B set ballots
9. 2016-05-01 — Project editor circulates the consolidated version to WG4 for review
10. 2016-06-01 — The consolidated version is submitted to ITTF for processing

11. 2016-10-30 — The consolidated version is published as IS 29500-1/-4:2016

12. 2016-12-30 — The consolidated version is published as ECMA-376-1/-4:2016

5. Revising Part 2 (Open Packaging Conventions)

Rex posted WD2 on 2015-08-04 as document N 0317. We agreed to adopt this as our new base.

Action: Murata-san will talk with ETSI regarding the possibility and possible schedule of their XAdES group having a co-located meeting with WG4 in the first half of 2016.

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.

No DRs were discussed.

7. Extensions

Part 1: Guidelines for extending OOXML

We expect to start a CD ballot on this at the Beijing meeting.

Action: Rex will check with Kimura-san re having a part of a multipart Standard, which is entirely non-normative.

8. Other Business

We thanked John and Microsoft for hosting this meeting.

9. Future meetings

Face-to-Face Meetings:

- 2015-09-21/25, Beijing, CN (with other WGs, and Opening/Closing Plenaries)
- 2015-02-xx/xx, TBD (Candidates are Dublin, IE, and Barcelona, ES, co-located with ETSI)
- 2015-06-xx/xx, TBD (Candidates are Barcelona, ES, co-located with ETSI, and Prague, CZ)
- 2016-09-26/30, Seoul, KR (with other WGs, and Opening/Closing Plenaries)

Teleconferences:

- None are scheduled

10.Adjournment

Adjourned by unanimous consent at 14:10.