# [Draft] Minutes of the Beijing Meeting of

# ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 34/WG4, 2015-09-21/24

## Rex Jaeschke (rex@RexJaeschke.com)

### 2015-09-24

## 1. Opening remarks

The meeting started at 09:20 on 2015-09-21. The convener, Murata-san, welcomed everyone to the 24th 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 |
|------|-------------|------------------|
| Sam Oh | SC 34 Chair | Sungkyunkwan University |
| Toshiko Kimura | SC 34 Secretariat | Japan Standards - ITSCJ |
| Makoto Murata | WG4 Convener, JP | International University of Japan |
| Ning LI | CN | Beijing Information Technology Institute |
| ChunYan Fang | CN | China Electronic Standardization Institute |
| Liu Tao | CN | Kingsoft China |
| Hui Feng | CN | Foxit Software |
| Ying Su | CN | Yozosoft |
| Xia HOU | CN | Beijing Information Science and Technology University |
| 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 |
| Andrew Sales | GB | Andrew Sales Digital Publishing |
| Toshiya Suzuki | JP | Hiroshima University |

| Name | Affiliation | Employer/Sponsor |
|---|---|---|
| Yushi Komachi | JP | Osaka Institute of Technology |
| Jan Rietveld | NL | NEN |

Present were 18 people, from 7 NBs and 1 liaison.

## 3. Adoption of the agenda

The agenda (SC 34/WG4 N 0315) was adopted as published, with the following addition: "Second COR for Parts 1 & 4 and the Consolidated Reprint".

## 4. Administration

**Approval of Previous Meeting Minutes [WG4 N 0316]**

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. **Done (See DR 15-0002 below)**

- 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. **Done**

- Rex and Chris will take Chris' recent draft of the Guidelines for Extensions and apply ISO formatting, and circulate it for committee review. **Done; see N 0318.**

- Rex will create a new DR for Miscellaneous Schema Issues in Part 4, and put this issue, "STs without prose description", plus several other related ones recently posted in that DR. **Done**; See DR 15-0012.

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

- 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. **Done**

- Rex will check with Kimura-san re having a part of a multipart Standard, which is entirely non-normative. **Done**. Kimura-san replied, "It is possible to create multi-parts standards which contain other than IS.  I think it is appropriate to create a Technical Report (TR) if the part contains only informative text." **Done**

**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=ndocslist.

## 5. Second COR for Parts 1 & 4 and the Consolidated Reprint

During the previous two teleconferences, we discussed the possibility of delaying publication of a consolidated reprint of Parts 1 and 4 until a second (quite small) COR could be produced and balloted, and included in that new edition. However, we decided to hold off making a final decision on that until this face-to-face meeting, when more members were present.

After some discussion at this meeting, it was proposed that we move forward on a second COR. There was no objection.

[This new COR is known informally in WG4 as COR3B. Here is our amendment and corrigenda numbering system:

| Abbreviation | Description | Official Document Designation |
|---|---|---|
| COR1 | CORs for Parts 1, 2, 3, 4 | ISO-IEC 29500-*n*:2008.Cor1:2010 |
| AMD1 | AMDs for Parts 1, 4 | ISO-IEC 29500-*n*:2008.Amd1:2010 |
| COR2 | CORs for Parts 1, 2, 3, 4 | ISO-IEC 29500-*n*:2011.Cor1:2012 |
| AMD2 | AMDs for Parts 1, 4 | ISO-IEC 29500-*n*:2011.Amd1:2012 |
| COR3 | CORs for Parts 1, 4 | ISO-IEC 29500-*n*:2012.Cor1:2015 |
| COR3B | CORs for Parts 1, 4 | ISO-IEC 29500-*n*:2012.Cor2:2016 |
| COR4 | CORs for Parts 1, 4 | ISO-IEC 29500-*n*:2016.Cor1:201x |
| REV1 | Revision of Part 3 | ISO-IEC 29500-3:2015 |
| REV2 | Revision of Part 2 | ISO-IEC 29500-2:201x |

We've already closed DRs whose resolutions will not go in COR3 or COR3B, but instead will go in COR4, hence the use of the designation COR3B.]

## ST_OnOff

Although issues were raised about this simple type, it was decided that we would not delay COR3B for this. Instead, it will be addressed by a new DR.

## ST_PitchFamily

From John's email thread, "COR3 issue: ST_PitchFamily" from 2015-09-09:

After digging into this, it seems DR 09-0037 may have been resolved incorrectly – implementations do write out those attributes.  The correct resolution seems to be the other option from that old e-mail.  Which would leave the attributes in CT_TextFont (technically, re-add them) and DR 09-0055 can be applied as we planned and approved.  Shall I file a DR to change 09-0037, assuming we can incorporate that (and 09-0055) into the pending COR3b?

From Murata-san's email thread, "COR3 issue: ST_PitchFamily" from 2015-09-09:

I don't think that we need a new DR.  We only have to reopen DR 09-0037 and add a new solution.  John, could you propose a solution?

FYI: Suzuki-san is aware of the issues, and is going to study them.

From John's email thread, "COR3 issue: ST_PitchFamily" from 2015-09-10:

I'd probably suggest the first of the two options Shawn suggested back then - the one that wasn't chosen.

From Suzuki-san's email thread, "COR3 issue: ST_PitchFamily" from 2015-09-14:

DR 09-0037:

The embeddedFont is an interface element to the embedded font; it has the attributes "charset", "panose" and "pitchFamily". But the font referrer in DrawngML (for example) can specify them independently.

Please think about a document with an embedded font; named "Arial", charset=ANSI, panose=020b0604020202020204, pitchFamily=Swiss/Variable.

If DrawingML tries to use a font named "Arial" but charset=Symbol && pitchFamily=Roman/Fixed, how the implementation should handle the request?

The implementation should take the requested font is not the embedded font even if the family name is same?

Or, as the referrer's attributes are described as the attributes for fallback, the family name matching is already sufficient to use the embedded "Arial"?

Considering that existing implementation write these attributes, I have no objection to these attributes in the specification as far as "how the implementation should use the values" is clarified.

DR 09-0055:

As far as I check the discussion, there is no rationale to keep current loose type definition for ST_PitchFamily. I suggest to use clearer type defined by Murata-sensei.

From John's email thread, "COR3 issue: ST_PitchFamily" from 2015-09-18:

DR 09-0037:

To ensure I'm looking at the same markup you are, do you mean there is potential confusion/conflict between a "font" element under the "embeddedFont" element in the presentation part and a font element ("latin", "ea", "cs", "sym") under a run properties element ("rPr", "endParaRPr") in a slide part?

Presentation part:

```
<p:embeddedFont>
  <p:font typeface="Abadi MT Condensed" panose="020B0506030101010103"
pitchFamily="34" charset="0"/>
  <p:regular r:id="rId5"/>
</p:embeddedFont>
```

Slide part:

```
<a:rPr lang="en-US" dirty="0" smtClean="0">
  <a:latin typeface="Abadi MT Condensed" panose="020B0506030101010103"
pitchFamily="34" charset="0"/> </a:rPr>
```

My initial thought is the same as your conclusion - the font in the rPr is not the same as the embedded font.  But since the description for the charset and pitchFamily attributes of the latin/ea/cs/sym elements says those

values may be used for font substitution, you raise a good question about whether they should be considered when determining whether the rPr font is the same as the embedded font.  I will request an interpretation from the developers here.

From Suzuki-san's email thread, "COR3 issue: ST_PitchFamily" from 2015-09-18: (attachments omitted)

Thank you for comment, just I made a preliminary testing PPTX.

a) a PPTX made by PowerPoint 2010, Title uses Century Gothic, Text uses Century

b) a PPTX with a "broken" embeddedFontLst, whose panose/pitchFamily/charset are exchanged;

* "Century Gothic" entry keeps its name and its reference to embedded font stream, but its panose/pitchFamily/charset are replaced by those in original "Century" entry.

* "Century" entry keeps its name and its reference to embedded font stream, but its panose/pitchFamily/charset are replaced by those in original "Century Gothic" entry.

c) a PPTX with "broken" font referrers, whose familyname "Century Gothic" and "Century" in slideMaster1.xml and slideLayout2.xml are exchanged.

Opening them by PowerPoint 2010, the results I see are:

b) looks same with a)

c) looks differently, uses "Century" on the title, and "Century Gothic" on the text.

According to this result, the font familyname matching seems to be sufficient to identify an embedded font resource, and the different panose/pitchFamily might not have serious impact.

Oh, my test is still insufficient; Century and Century Gothic have same "charset". I will do yet another experiment.

From Suzuki-san's email thread, "COR3 issue: ST_PitchFamily" from 2015-09-18: (attachments omitted)

> Oh, my test is still insufficient; Century and Century Gothic have

> same "charset". I will do yet another experiment.

The results of my preliminary experiments for mismatched charset seem to be complicated than mismatched panose/pitchFamily:

-----------------------------------------------------------------

Experiment 1)

charsets of all referring parts are changed from "0" (ANSI) to "177" (Hebrew), but charsets in embeddedfontlist are left as "0".

--> a dialog is shown "PowerPoint found a problem with content in <filename>, PowerPoint can attempt to repair the presentation"

-----------------------------------------------------------------

Experiment 2)

charsets of all referring parts and embeddedfontlist are changed from "0" (ANSI) to "177" (Hebrew).

--> a dialog is shown "PowerPoint found a problem with content in <filename>, PowerPoint can attempt to repair the presentation"

-----------------------------------------------------------------

There is a possibility that mismatched-charset is seriously handled than mismatched-panose and mismatched-pitchFamily.

In addition, there is a possibility that existing implementation checks the mismatch between charset declared by embeddedFontLst and the embedded binary data.

I think a note to encourage the consistency of charsets among the referring XML, referred XML and embedded font data would be safer, if it can cause visible warning in the existing implementation.

John produced a proposal, which he presented Thursday afternoon. There was general agreement.

**Action**: John will send his proposal to Rex.

**Action**: Rex will update 09-0055 in the DR log to reflect John's proposal making it clear as to the changes COR3B will make over and above of what we agreed to previously in COR3. After review by WG4, Rex will add these edits to COR3B.

## ST_Hint

From John's email thread, "COR3 issue: ST_PitchFamily" from 2015-09-09:

We discussed this on the last teleconference. Nobody remembered the details behind this, and some old e-mail dug up by Murata-san and Caroline didn't show a specific decision or reason. Chris and I looked through a trove of public files we have access to and "cs" does appear in some. I think the right resolution here is to keep "cs".

From Suzuki-san's email thread, "COR3 issue: ST_PitchFamily" from 2015-09-14:

DR 09-0040:

The "hint" attribute can take "cs" (complex script) for font slot selection?

The reason why "cs" was to be removed is following; By default, the font slot (from ansi/hansi/ea/cs) is selected by the codepoint of the character to be rendered.

Also it is forcibly changed by w:cs or w:rtl elements.

The default slot selection by the codepoint is sometimes not unique but configurable (e.g. the ellipsis is rendered by for ascii slot by default, but it could be changed to ea slot, by setting hint to ea). For such configurable cases, the codepoint-to-slot table have special descriptions like "use X slot, but if hint is set to Y, Y slot is used".

We should be careful that the hint does not change everything, but changes configurable parts.

At present, the codepoint-to-slot table has no character that cs slot is used by default, or, cs slot could be used by setting hint appropriately. If the table is correct, I'm suspicious if setting hint to cs has any effect.

I think this was background why cs would be removed from the possible values of hint.

There would be a few rationales to permit "cs" value in hint;

  a) the table was incorrect; some codepoints could be configured to use cs font slot, by setting hint to cs.

b) setting hint to cs makes everything rendered by cs font slot, as w:cs and w:rtl.

c) setting hint to cs does nothing, but the values should be permitted because existing implementation could write it (dealing them as "invalid" is problematic).

I think any of above 3 rationales would be reasonable to permit "cs" in hint, however, "what would occur by setting hint to cs" should be clarified.

---

From John's email thread, "COR3 issue: ST_PitchFamily" from 2015-09-18:

I can confirm after talking with a developer here that Word will write hint="cs" and that it appears only to be used when Word writes list formatting in HTML output.  So, hopefully we can agree to keep the attribute value and we are all correct that it has no effect on the giant table added to 17.3.2.26 rFonts by this DR.  Assuming there are no other concerns, we should take a little time to tweak the text on the cs description (and possibly reflect the same in eastAsia) to sound less directive since the actions implementers are to take are defined well in the table added to 17.3.2.26.

This topic was discussed and the group agreed to keep the cs value in ST_Hint because there are implementations that write it out.  However, it does not affect font slot selection as described in the table added to §17.3.2.26, rFonts.

Overnight, John produced a proposal, which he presented Thursday morning. There was general agreement.

**Action**: John will send his proposal to Rex.

**Action**: Rex will update 09-0040 in the DR log to reflect John's proposal making it clear as to the changes COR3B will make over and above of what we agreed to previously in COR3. After review by WG4, Rex will add these edits to COR3B.

**New COR Request**

We agreed to have a resolution at the SC 34 Plenary to authorize a ballot for the new COR.

**Action**: Once all input for COR3B has been provided to Rex, he'll produce and circulate new drafts of the DCOR for review. Once any last-minute concerns are addressed, he'll submit the DCORs for an SC 34 letter ballot.

**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

**Status of Issues Raised During Reprint Review**

Below is a list of all the issues reported when members reviewed the draft-consolidated reprint of Parts 1 and 4 after Rex incorporated COR3 into 29500:2012:

| Issue | Status | Details |
|-------|--------|---------|
| ST_OnOff | Not for COR3B | |
| ST_PitchFamily | Pending for COR3B | |
| ST_Hint | Pending for COR3B | |
| P1: §17.7.2, "Style Hierarchy" | Done | Correct figure (row missing) |
| P1: §18.8.30, "numFmt (Number Format) | Done | Correct COR3 fix |

| Issue | Status | Details |
|---|---|---|
| COR 1, #49 | Done | MM> The table in the COR differs from that in the DR Log.<br><br>Rex> Agreed. DRs 12-0005 and DR 12-0025 both impact this table. It appears that the row labelled "Numbering" was somehow lost when these two sets of edits were merged. |
| COR 1, #50 | Done | MM> The figure in the COR differs from that in the DR Log.<br><br>Rex> DRs 12-0005 and DR 12-0025 both impact this table. Yes, the figure in the COR differs slightly from that in DR 12-0025, but it is the same as that in DR 12-0005, which I believe is correct, so no change is necessary. |
| COR 1, #85 | Done | MM> "also" in the fourth example is striked out in the DCOR, but not removed in the consolidated text.<br><br>Rex> Agreed; fixed. |
| COR 1, #96 | Done | MM> In the description of @differentOddEven, the COR has "oddHeader/oddFooter", "evenHeader/evenFooter", and "evenHeader/evenFooter", while the consolidated text has "oddHeader / oddFooter", "evenHeader / evenFooter", and "evenHeader / evenFooter".<br><br>Rex> Agreed; fixed. |
| COR 1, #112 | Done | MM> replace "maximise" by "maximize".<br><br>Rex> Agreed; fixed. |

| Issue | Status | Details |
|---|---|---|
| COR 1, #114 | Done | MM> The indentation of the paragraph beginning with "For instance" is mistaken.<br><br>Rex> Agreed; fixed. |
| COR 1, #121 | Done | MM> The description of the attribute sqlType is incorrect.  The consolidated text lacks some<br><br>Rex> Agreed; fixed by restoring the text that was accidentally deleted. |
| COR 1, #134 | Done | MM> The last bullet begins with "The" but it is not the beginning of a sentence.  Should it be in lower case?<br><br>Rex> Agreed; fixed. |
| COR 1, #152 | Done | MM> The second bullet in the COR to Part 1 lacks a verb "is". Although this does not exist in the COR, I think that this editorial error can be fixed.<br><br>Rex> Agreed; will fix. |
| COR 1, #155 | Done | MM> The COR is correct, but the consolidated text does not incorporate this change.<br><br>Rex> Disagree; I see the fix applied in both the DOCX and PDF versions. |
| COR 1, #169 | Done | MM> This change was correctly incorporated, but the layout is broken. See 18.17.7.342 in Part 1.<br><br>Rex> Agreed; the trailing newline should be restored. Will fix. |

| Issue | Status | Details |
|---|---|---|
| COR 1, #174–176 | Done | MM> "unit face value" should be replaced by "units face value".<br><br>Rex> Agreed; will fix. |
| COR 1, #177 | Done | MM> This change was correctly incorporated, but the layout is broken. See 18.17.7.356 in Part 1.<br><br>Rex> Agreed; the trailing newline should be restored. Will fix. |
| COR 1, #187 | Done | MM> Is notesMaster actually a notes master?  This is for both the DCOR text and the consolidated text.<br><br>Rex> The text as balloted in the COR was "notesMaster" set in schema-type font to indicate the element type. (This was cloned directly from 19.3.1.24, "handoutMaster".)<br><br>It seems to me that "notesMaster slide" means "a slide described by an element of type notesMaster", and that seems to me to be equivalent to "a notes master slide".<br><br>I propose we not make any change here. However, if anyone feels strongly about making the change proposed by Murata-san, then for consistency we'd need a new DR to make the corresponding change to 19.3.1.24, "handoutMaster". |

| Issue | Status | Details |
|---|---|---|
| COR 1, #198 | Done | MM> This change was correctly incorporated, but the indentation in the consolidated Part 1 is too much.<br><br>Rex> Agreed; will fix. |
| COR 1, #216 | Done | MM> A sentence should be added to the first para.<br><br>This value is used as one piece of information to guide selection of a similar alternate font if the desired font is unavailable.<br><br>Rex> Agreed; that sentence was in the COR but not in the consolidated draft. I'll add it. |
| COR 1, #222 | Done | MM> The default value is not "nlCheck" but "off"<br><br>Rex> I agree, I got it wrong in the XSD, but right in the RelaxNG. I'll fix that. |
| COR 1, #245 | Done | MM> The figure in the COR differs from that in the DR Log.<br><br>Rex> I don't see any difference in the docx versions of these files. |
| COR 1, #246 | Done | MM> The figure in the COR differs from that in the DR Log.<br><br>Rex> I don't see any difference in the docx versions of these files. |
| COR 1, #252 | Done | MM> The figure in the COR differs from that in the DR Log.<br><br>Rex> I don't see any difference in the docx versions of these files. |

| Issue | Status | Details |
|---|---|---|
| DR 09-0040 | Done | CA> in 17.3.2.26, the added example is incorporated correctly, but I note that it mentions the two-step algorithm, before the algorithm has been introduced.  I would add "below" following "algorithm" in its first occurrence in the Example.<br><br>Rex> Agreed; will fix.<br><br>Table entry on page 303 for cs (Complex Script Font)  is missing the insertion of <w:cs /> in the sample markup<br><br>Rex> Agreed; will fix.<br><br>Same problem on 304 for cstheme (Complex Script Theme Font)   is missing the insertion of<br><w:cs /> in the sample markup<br><br>Rex> Agreed; will fix. |
| DR 12-0005 | Done | CA> Replacement diagrams in 17.7.2 and 17.7.3 are not showing up properly in the PDF.<br><br>Rex> Agreed; will fix. |
| DR 13-004 superseded by DR 13-009  (edits are in N270) | Pending final pass of reprint | CA> All looks OK (in Parts 1 and 4), assuming that the diagrams in deleted clauses in L.7.3.4 are really deleted.  I believe they are but it will be worth checking.<br><br>Rex> I'll check this when I adopt the changes. |

| Issue | Status | Details |
|---|---|---|
| DR 14-0004 | Done | CA> CT_Font does appear to be defined at line 3797.  But the link in 18.8.22 still doesn't work.<br><br>Rex> Agreed; will fix.<br><br>CA> If you look at the definition for CT_Fonts in A.2 (line 3484) its element CT_Font doesn't link to anything either.  Same bad link in CT_Dxf.  Does that indicate that a problem remains?<br><br>Rex> Agreed; will fix. |
| P4: 14.4.1, 14.4.2, 14.4.3, and 14.4.4 | Will do | MM> 14.4.1, 14.4.2, 14.4.3, and 14.4.4 mistakenly reference Part 1, §17.4.34, §17.4.35, §17.4.36, and §17.4.37. They should reference 17.4.33, 17.4.34, 17.4.35, and 17.4.36. We might have made similar mistakes.<br><br>Rex> Editorial; will fix. |
| P4: 14.10.7 hyperlink (Hyperlink) | No action needed | MM> I think that 14.10.7 hyperlink (Hyperlink) in the consolidated Part 4 is not needed because it does not introduce any attributes but merely repeats the description of an attribute already specified in Part 1.<br><br>Rex> Interesting, but no action needed. |
| P4: 14.11.8 | Will do | MM> 14.11.8 references 9.10.11, but it should reference 14.11.11.<br><br>Rex> Editorial; will fix. |

| Issue | Status | Details |
|---|---|---|
| P4: ?? | Not for COR3B | MM> "decimalFullWidth2" is mistakenly allowed by strict ST_NumberFormat.<br><br>Rex> Requires a new DR, but not for COR3B. |
| P4: ?? | Not for COR3B | MM> We forgot to introduce the use and default attributes to the attribute definition of charSpace of docGrid elements. We introduced them only to the strict schema. Did we make the same mistakes for all SML attributes?<br><br>Rex> Requires a new DR, but not for COR3B. |
| P4: ?? | Not for COR3B | MM> Should we be more explicit in allowing VML For WML background and Object elements?<br><br>Rex> Requires a new DR, but not for COR3B. |
| P4: ?? | Not for COR3B | MM> Should we explicitly allow numberingChange elements in fldChar elements?<br><br>Rex> Requires a new DR, but not for COR3B. |
| P4: WML ?? | Not for COR3B | MM> No subclause for ST_TextScaleDecimal.<br><br>Rex> Requires a new DR, but not for COR3B. |
| P1: WML ?? | Not for COR3B | MM> ST_NumberFormat in Part 1 schema has "decimalFullWidth2" but it shouldn't. (This is actually a bug of strict wml.xsd)<br><br>Rex> Requires a new DR, but not for COR3B. |

| Issue | Status | Details |
|-------|--------|---------|
| P4: WML ?? | Not for COR3B | MM> ST_StyleSort in schema does not allow 0 thru 5.<br><br>Rex> Requires a new DR, but not for COR3B. |
| P4: SML ?? | Not for COR3B | MM> Part 4 does not clearly specify where legacyDrawing and legacyDrawingHF can occur.<br><br>Rex> Requires a new DR, but not for COR3B. |
| P4: PML ?? | Not for COR3B | MM> I am wondering why CT_HtmlPublishProperties is defined and never used in the strict PML schema. It is used only in the transitional PML schema.<br><br>Rex> Requires a new DR, but not for COR3B. |
| P4: PML ?? | Not for COR3B | MM> Is 16.6.3 (Changed attribute for font element) of the consolidated part 4 really correct?  We made a mistake in Part 1 about font-related DRs.  Did we also make a mistake here?  In particular, do we need a list of permissble values here? |

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

We walked through WD2 accepting, rejecting, or amending all the tracked changes, and adding new comments, as necessary.

**Action**: Rex will produce WD2.1, with all changes from WD2, and with accepted tracked changes adopted.

We agreed to ask SC 34 for permission to run a CD ballot sometime before the 2016 Plenary.

In order to support WG4's work with XAdES in the 29500-2 (OPC) revision, WG4 is pleased to accept ETSI's request to be a Category C liaison.

## 7. 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 10-0015 "OPC: Relationship Markup"**

---

**Action**: Rex will ask Alex, the submitter of this DR, if he agrees that his concerns are addressed by OPC WD2 (N 0317).

---

**DR 11-0008 "WML: Kihon-hanmen-based page design"**
**DR 11-0009 "WML: The margin specified in the w:pgMar element and the margin in effect"**
**DR 11-0010 "WML: The number of characters per line"**
**DR 11-0011 "WML: The number of lines per page"**

---

From Murata-san's email thread, "Comments on the latest proposal for DR 11-0008 — WML: Kihon-hanmen-based page design" from 2015-09-13:

I plan to make real progress in Beijing, although I don't think that we can close this DR there.

First, I now think that we should not provide *procedures* for computing margins from Kihon-hanmen or computing Kihon-hanmen from margins. Rather, we should provide some *declarative relationships* among Kihon-hanmen parameters and margin parameters. This is because there are more than one way to make these parameters consistent. For example, when character pitches are changed, should we change margins or should we change the number of characters per line? Both are sensible. Another example is changing line pitches. Should we then change margins or the number of lines per column? We do not want to tie the hands of developers by mandating some procedure.

Second, I also think that we should first explain margins, paper sizes, columns, and gaps for horizontal writing and vertical writing. In particular, we should carefully explain which value is physical (i.e., independent from the writing-direction) and which value is logical (i.e., dependent on the writing-direction). This explanation is useful even when Kihon-hanmen is not used. Moreover, description of Kihon-hanmen and declarative relationships becomes much easier since we can use column widths and heights rather than margins.

I will further improve my PPTX document, incorporate sketch of proposed changes, and explain them in Beijing.

From Murata-san's email thread, "Diagrams for understanding Kihon Hanmen or CJK document grid" from 2015-09-14:

Different versions of MS Word handle <w:adjustRightInd/> of WML differently.  MS Word 2013 appears to always adjust the right margin, while MS Word 2007 ajusts it only when @val of this element is true. More about this, see files available at:

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

From Murata-san's email thread, "Initial draft for addressing CJK layout grid DRs" from 2015-09-22:

Here is a very early draft.

1) Additions to 17.6.3  (Single Column Definition )

When vertical writing is chosen by the value of the val attribute of the textDirection element (17.6.20) for the current section, columns are arranged from top to bottom and the column spacing is vertical.

2) Additions to 17.6.4 (Column Definitions)

If a w:cols element is not present, <w:cols w:equalWidth="1" w:num="1"/> is assumed.  (Note: Is this true?)

If a w:cols element does not have the equalWidth attribute, it is assumed to have w:equalWidth="1" (Drafting note: Is this true?)

When vertical writing is chosen by the value of the val attribute of the textDirection element (17.6.20) for the current section, columns are arranged from top to bottom and the column spacing is vertical.

3) Additions to 17.18.14 ST_DocGrid (Document Grid Types)

Drafting note: Clarify the differences between "linesAndChar" and "snapToGrid".  In particular, make clear that "linesAndChar" does not indicate alignment to the character grid.

4) Modifications to 17.3.2.34 snapToGrid (Use Document Grid Settings For Inter-Character Spacing)

Additional character spacing is ALWAYS added.

Alignment to the character grid is guaranteed only when the val attribute of this element is "true" or "1".

5) New subclauses or annex

X.1 Paper size, page margins, and columns

Drafting note: Introduce the first five diagrams and add explain them in prose.  Reference 17.6.13 (Page size) and 17.6.11 (Page margins)

X.2 Establishing the Document Grid

Drafting note: Introduce the next four diagrams and explain them in prose.  Reference 17.6.5 (Document Grid) and 17.18.14 ST_DocGrid

(Document Grid Types).

Murata-san presented his document (see N 0320). There was considerable discussion (spread over several days).

**Action**: Murata-san will refine his CJK layout proposal.

---

**DR 11-0030 "OPC: Obsolete version of W3C XML Digital Signature 1.0"**

This was recorded in the DR log as being closed; however, as the solution has not yet been applied to the OPC spec, we changed the status of this DR to "Open, REV2".

---

**DR 15-0002 "SML:  Schema for GradientFill does not limit colors"**

**Private mail from Chris to submitter, Charlie Clark, on 2015-09-16:**

WG4 discussed this in the previous face-to-face meeting and agreed to close the defect report without action. You're absolutely right that Excel appears to limit the number of gradient stops and that the standard doesn't. However, I think this is a case where the standard should actually be left unbounded so that a different (dare I say "better"?) spreadsheet application could in fact implement more gradient stops if it wished. And I suspect

this was the intention of the original authors as well, given that they wrote "at least two" in the description of the stops.

The right thing to happen in this case is for Microsoft to document their own limitation - which has happened, but in a rather roundabout way. Our implementer notes for IS29500 (https://msdn.microsoft.com/en-us/library/ee908652(v=office.12).aspx) mention in section 2.1.704 that the @position attribute of the "stop" element is unbounded in the standard, but that Office requires it to be between 0 and 1. This has the net effect of limiting the number of gradient stops to two.

**Private mail from submitter, Charlie Clark, on 2015-09-17:**

I understand, as long as we make some progress.

> WG4 discussed this in the previous face-to-face meeting and agreed to

> close the defect report without action. … And I suspect this was the intention of

> the original authors as well, given that they wrote "at least two" in the description of the stops.

Sure, multiple gradients (fade-in, fade-out) are not uncommon.

> The right thing to happen in this case is for Microsoft to document

> their own limitation … This has the net effect of limiting the number of

> gradient stops to two.

The problem is interoperability. I'm enclosing a valid file with three stops which causes Excel (even Excel 2016) to fail gracelessly; OpenOffice and LibreOffice just blend; Numbers actually makes a fair stab but stick to the last two colours. Users are going to blame my library and not Excel for this. And I think the chances of Excel learning not to fail here "because some guy in Germany points out the file really is valid" are pretty slim! ;-)

The specification is of little value in such situations. The narrative specification also assumes there are only ever two colours. Could we at least have an explanatory note?

After consideration of Charlie's feedback, WG4 members agreed with Chris' recommendation to make no change; this is an implementer issue.

**Action**: Rex will send notification to Charlie re this.

| DR 15-0007 "PML: animMotion attribute path is inadequately specified" |
| --- |

After a short discussion, ownership was assigned from Rex to Chris. We recall having talked at length about this at the London F2F meeting in 2015-06, but no one could find any details of the problems we identified as remaining. Can anyone shed any light on this?

## 8. Extensions

**Part 1: Guidelines for extending OOXML**

[This document was recently posted as N 0318.]

We reviewed this draft and made some small, editorial changes.

**Action**: Rex will turn this Part into a TR, address the current comments in that document, and circulate it for a final review before we start a PDTR ballot.

In mail from Caroline Arms on 2015-09-21:

> I have one immediate set of thoughts about the MCE Best Practices document – which goes back to the topic of embedding rich metadata in OOXML packages.  I'm attaching what I believe to be the last email (from Francis) on that topic.  Francis's email points out that LibreOffice does not preserve foreign parts (or the version he tried didn't).  Is the Best Practices document intended to encourage LibreOffice to preserve them?

> Has using rich XML metadata been considered as a second example of a foreign part?  I would very much like to see that added.  ONIX (as used by Francis) is a good example for a DOCX document.  ISO 19139 (Geographic Information – Metadata – XML schema implementation) might be appropriate for an XLSX document.

We discussed this Wednesday morning. The consensus was that we want implementations to do the best they can at preserving things. Chris will look at adding another example.

**Action**: Chris will reply to Caroline

In mail from Francis Cave on 2015-09-23:

> Caroline, … Thank you for reminding me about my earlier contribution. I have looked at this again and have two observations:

1) The requirement for consumers to "not fail to load a document containing unknown relationships" is in §9.1.7 of Part 1.

2) This same clause makes it clear that consumers that are also producers "can, but are not required to roundtrip and preserve unknown relationships and their target parts".

This means that the divergent behaviours of MS Office and LibreOffice is allowed by the standard.

This divergent behaviour applies regardless of whether the unknown relationship is added to the package-relationship item or is added to the main document part-relationship item (see §11 of Part 1).

I have considered the "guidance" provided at the end of §9.1.7 of Part 1, to "use instead the known relationship type for Custom XML Data Storage parts", as defined in §15.2.4. However, I'm not sure of the status of this feature - I don't believe it is implemented any longer due to IPR issues - so we should consider whether it would be best practice to ignore this guidance and just use unknown relationships for incorporating foreign parts that aren't able to use any other known relationships.

**Comment disposition of ISO/IEC CD 30114-2.2 (Part 2: Character Repertoire Checking)**

There were no NO votes, and the only comments were from GB. We disposed of all of them with GB's approval.

We agreed to ask SC 34 for permission to move to the DIS stage.

## 9. Other Business

**Thanking Meeting Host**

We thanked Chunyan FANG and China Electronic Standardization Institute, and Ning LI and Xia HOU and Beijing Information Science and Technology Institute for hosting this meeting, for the catering each day, and the most enjoyable social event.

**Resolutions to be Presented to the SC 34 Plenary**

**Resolution xx: Progression of Technical Corrigendum 2 to ISO/IEC 29500-1: 2012 and to ISO/IEC 29500-4: 2014**

SC 34 notes that WG 4 is preparing Technical Corrigendum 2 to ISO/IEC ISO/IEC 29500-1: 2012 and to ISO/IEC 29500-4: 2012, respectively. SC 34 instructs its Secretariat to initiate three-month DCOR ballots

when texts are submitted by the project editor.  SC 34 delegates its authority for resolution of comments and recommendation for further processing to WG 4 until the next plenary.

**Resolution xx: Request to ITTF for publishing the consolidated texts of ISO/IEC 29500-1:2012 and ISO/IEC 29500-4: 2012 with their respective Technical Corrigenda**

SC 34 requests ITTF to publish the consolidated texts of ISO/IEC 29500-1: 2012 and ISO/IEC 29500-4: 2012 incorporating their respective COR 1 and COR 2 (to be balloted) with the following justification.

> The two CORs contain important corrections which require timely disclosures to users. Considering its complexity of the content, publication of the consolidated versions is necessary rather than as separated COR documents.

**Resolution xx: Change of Status from IS to TR on Project 30114-1, Extensions of Office Open XML File Formats -- Part 1: Guidelines**

SC 34 resolves to change the project for 30114-1 from IS to TR since it will contain only non-normative information as such, it appropriate to be a Technical Report.

**Resolution xx: Progression of Project for TR 30114-1: Extensions of Office Open XML File Formats -- Part 1: Guidelines**

SC 34 instructs its Secretariat to initiate a two-month PDTR ballot when the text is submitted by the project editor.  SC 34 delegates its authority for resolution of comments and recommendation for further processing to WG 4 until the next plenary.

**Resolution xx: Progression of Project for ISO/IEC 30114-2, Extensions of Office Open XML File Formats -- Part 2: Character repertoire checking**

SC 34 approves the disposition of comments on CD 30114-2 prepared by WG 4 and instructs its Secretariat to submit a revised text to ITTF for DIS processing when the text is submitted by the Project Editor.  SC 34 delegates its authority to WG 4 for resolution of comments on DIS and recommendation for further processing until the next plenary.

**Resolution 11: Progression of Project for Revision of ISO/IEC 29500-2, Office Open XML File Formats -- Part 2: Open Packaging Conventions**

SC 34 instructs its Secretariat to initiate a two-month CD ballot when the text is submitted by the project editor.  SC 34 delegates its authority for resolution of comments and recommendation for further processing to WG 4 until the next plenary.

**Resolution xx: Establishment of Category C Liaison between ETSI TC ESI and SC 34/WG 4**

SC 34 welcomes and approves the request from ETSI TC ESI (Electronic Signatures and Infrastructures) for establishing a Category C liaison with SC 34/WG 4 as contained in SC 34 N xxx .

SC 34 instructs its Secretariat to submit the request for liaison to JTC 1 for approval.

SC 34 appoints Dr. MURATA, Makoto as WG4's representative to ETSI TC ESI.

## 10.Future meetings

**Face-to-Face Meetings:**

Based on the projected work involved in producing and processing a new COR and the continued work on the 29500-2 revision, we agreed to have three Face-to-Face meetings in 2016, as follows:

- 2016-02-29/03-04, Location TBD (Barcelona, ES, co-located with ETSI, with Dublin, IE, as a fall back)
- 2016-06-xx/xx, TBD (Dublin, IE, if possible, with Prague, CZ, as a fall back)
- 2016-09-26/30, Seoul, KR (with other WGs, and Opening/Closing Plenaries)

**Action:** Murata-san will work with the ETSI officers to pin down the details of the co-located meetings.

**Action**: Rex will monitor the hosting situation. If ETSI can host in February/March, he'll notify IE we won't go there then, but would like to go in June if that suits.

**Teleconferences:**

- 2015-11-05 (Thu/Fri), 21:00 GMT (US/PT 13:00, GB 21:00, DE/DK/FR/CZ 22:00, JP 06:00 next day)
- 2015-12-10 (Thu/Fri), 21:00 GMT (US/PT 13:00, GB 21:00, DE/DK/FR/CZ 22:00, JP 06:00 next day)
- 2016-01-14 (Thu/Fri), 21:00 GMT (US/PT 13:00, GB 21:00, DE/DK/FR/CZ 22:00, JP 06:00 next day)

## 11.Adjournment

Adjourned by unanimous consent at 15:10 on 2015-09-24.