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1. **Opening remarks**

The meeting started at 21:00 GMT. The convener, Murata-san, welcomed everyone to the 68th teleconference meeting of WG4.

1. **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 |
| Darrin House | Ecma, US | Microsoft |

Present were 4 people, from 2 NBs and 1 liaison.

1. **Adoption of the agenda**

The agenda (SC 34 N 2234) was adopted as published, with the following changes:

* For open DRs owned by Chris/John, find new owners.
* Discuss the Beijing Plenary resolution request to have ISO provide multiple versions of a spec.
1. **Administration**

**Approval of Previous Meeting Minutes [WG4 N 0319]**

The draft minutes were approved, as circulated.

**Outstanding Action Items**

* Rex will resolve the problem with Part 4, §20’s missing entries for 20.2, 20.3, and 20.4. **Pending**
* John will send his ST\_PitchFamily proposal to Rex. **Done**
* 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.
* John will send his ST\_Hint proposal to Rex. **Done**
* 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. **Done**
* Once all input for COR3B has been provided to Rex, he’ll produce and circulate new drafts of the DCOR for review. **Pending**
* Once any last minute concerns re COR3B are addressed, Rex will submit the DCORs for an SC 34 letter ballot. **Pending**
* Rex will produce OPC WD2.1, with all changes from WD2, and with accepted tracked changes adopted. **Done (see N 0321)**
* Rex will ask Alex, the submitter of this DR 10-0015 “OPC: Relationship Markup”, if he agrees that his concerns are addressed by OPC WD2 (N 0317). **Done, but no reply yet**
* Murata-san will refine his CJK layout proposal for DRs 11-00??. **Pending**
* Rex will send notification to Charlie re the resolution to DR 15-0002 “SML: Schema for GradientFill does not limit colors” **Done**
* Rex will turn Part 1 of the Extensions spec into a TR, address the current comments in that document, and circulate it for a final review before we start a PDTR ballot. **Done (as N 0318)**
* Chris will reply to Caroline re her feedback on Part 1 of the Extensions spec. **Subsumed by new action item for Caroline (see below)**
* Murata-san will work with the ETSI officers to pin down the details of the co-located meetings. **Done**
* 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. **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 now at <http://isotc.iso.org/livelink/livelink?func=ll&objid=8912947&objaction=ndocslist>.

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

At the Beijing meeting and in several action items assigned there, we agreed on the text of the three DRs that will go in COR3B: DR 09-0037, DR 09-0040, and DR 09-0055. However, since then, several email threads were created that might have impact on COR3B. They were:

* New DR for namespaces?
* Re: COR3 issue: ST\_PitchFamily DR 09-0037
* Re: COR3 issue: ST\_PitchFamily DR 09-0055
* DML attributes are unqualified!

We discussed the issues raised by Murata-san and the merits of possible solutions.

The ideal solution seemed to be to remove namespace names from many attributes in Part 1 and from some in Part 4. And for Part 4, to remove entire subclauses that differed from their Part 1 counterparts by namespace name only. However, this is a non-trivial task, and we weighed that against COR3B being “for high-priority corrections only”.

From Murata-san’s mail of 2015-10-26: “Re: [sc34wg4] Re: COR3 issue: ST\_PitchFamily DR 09-0055”

My original comment is incorrect. As I wrote in another mail "DML attributes are unqualified!", we do not have to add "Namespace: <http://purl.oclc.org/ooxml/drawingml/main>" as part of attribute descriptions. Rather, we should remove it from all DML attributes in Part 1.

We have three choices for COR3B.

* A: Delete all unnecessary (and even harmful) phrase "Namespace: <http://purl.oclc.org/ooxml/drawingml/main>" from attribute descriptions in Part 1.
* B: As part of COR3B, when we reintroduce three attributes to in §19.2.1.13 in Part 1, do not introduce the above phrase. But do not touch other occurrences of this phase in Part1. Wait for another DR and COR.
* C: As part of COR3B, we introduce bugs for compatibilities. That is, we incorporate the harmful phase in Part 1, §19.2.1.13. Wait for another DR and COR.

We decided on Option B. While it doesn’t fix the larger problem, it does ensure we don’t introduce new namespace name errors. We’ll need a new DR to fix the larger problem.

From Murata-san’s mail of 2015-10-26: “Re: [sc34wg4] Re: COR3 issue: ST\_PitchFamily DR 09-0037”

As I reported in another mail "DML attributes are unqualified!", we should not have created §16.6.3 and many other subsubclauses of Part 4 from the beginning.

We have three choices:

* A: Delete all unnecessary (and even harmful) subsubclauses in Part 4 as part of COR3B.
* B: As part of COR3B, delete §16.6.3, since it is relevant to DR 09-0037 and DR 09-0055. But do not delete other subsubclauses. Wait for another DR and COR.
* C: As part of COR3B, do nothing to these subclauses. Do not touch §16.6.3. Wait for another DR and COR.

I am leaning towards B.

We decided on Option B. While it doesn’t fix the larger problem, it does ensure we don’t introduce new namespace name errors. We’ll need a new DR to fix the larger problem.

Rex will produce the final text for COR3B and send it to Murata-san privately for proofing before sending it to the group.

**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. 2015-11-05 — Via a teleconference, WG4 wraps up the final contents of COR3B set
2. 2015-11-16 — Project editor delivers the COR3B set to WG4 for review
3. 2015-12-10 — Via a teleconference, WG4 authorizes 3-month SC 34 letter ballots on the COR3B set
4. 2015-12-xx — Project editor prepares and submits the final draft of the COR3B set to the SC 34 Secretariat
5. 2016-01-02 — 3-month SC 34 letter ballots on the COR3B set start
6. 2016-04-02 — 3-month SC 34 letter ballots on the COR3B set end
7. 2016-04-xx — Via a teleconference, WG4 processes any comments from the COR3B set ballots
8. 2016-05-01 — Project editor circulates the consolidated version to WG4 for review
9. 2016-06-01 — The consolidated version is submitted to ITTF for processing
10. 2016-10-30 — The consolidated version is published as IS 29500-1/-4:2016
11. 2016-12-30 — The consolidated version is published as ECMA-376-1/-4:2016
12. **Defect Reports**

Given John and Chris’s departure, we reassigned ownership of their DRs, as follows:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| [09-0040](https://onedrive.live.com/view.aspx/Public%20Documents/2009/DR-09-0040.docx?cid=c8ba0861dc5e4adc) | ~~John Haug~~/Rex | WML/DML: Complex scripts |
| [09-0055](https://onedrive.live.com/view.aspx/Public%20Documents/2009/DR-09-0055.docx?cid=c8ba0861dc5e4adc) | ~~John Haug~~/Rex | PML, Presentation: Type of the attribute pitchFamily is too loose |
| [10-0048](https://onedrive.live.com/view.aspx/Public%20Documents/2010/DR-10-0048.docx?cid=c8ba0861dc5e4adc) | ~~Chris Rae~~/Murata-san | OPC: Processing model for handling ZIP encryption |
| [14-0009](https://onedrive.live.com/view.aspx/Public%20Documents/2014/DR-14-0009.docx?cid=c8ba0861dc5e4adc) | ~~Chris Rae~~/Darrin | SML: Named Styles |
| [14-0014](https://onedrive.live.com/view.aspx/Public%20Documents/2014/DR-14-0014.docx?cid=c8ba0861dc5e4adc) | ~~Chris Rae~~/Darrin | SML: Merging Cells  |
| [14-0015](https://onedrive.live.com/view.aspx/Public%20Documents/2014/DR-14-0015.docx?cid=c8ba0861dc5e4adc) | ~~Chris Rae~~/Darrin | SML: Cell Styles  |
| [15-0006](https://onedrive.live.com/view.aspx/Public%20Documents/2015/DR-15-0006.docx?cid=c8ba0861dc5e4adc) | ~~Chris Rae~~/Darrin | PML: ST\_TLBehaviourAdditiveType is not well-specified |
| [15-0007](https://onedrive.live.com/view.aspx/Public%20Documents/2015/DR-15-0007.docx?cid=c8ba0861dc5e4adc) | ~~Chris Rae~~/Darrin | PML: animMotion attribute path is inadequately specified |
| [15-0009](https://onedrive.live.com/view.aspx/Public%20Documents/2015/DR-15-0009.docx?cid=c8ba0861dc5e4adc) | ~~John Haug~~/Darrin | SML: Conversion between rgb and hsl when tint has value |
| [15-0010](https://onedrive.live.com/view.aspx/Public%20Documents/2015/DR-15-0010.docx?cid=c8ba0861dc5e4adc) | ~~Chris Rae~~/Darrin | WML: Differences between the elements fldChar and hyperlink |
| [15-0013](https://onedrive.live.com/view.aspx/Public%20Documents/2015/DR-15-0013.docx?cid=c8ba0861dc5e4adc) | ~~Chris Rae~~/Darrin | SML: Handling empty rIds |

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 did not process any DRs.

1. **Extensions**

**Part 1: Guidelines for extending OOXML**

From the Beijing minutes:

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

**Action**: Caroline will write up the problem and post it to the email list. We’ll need someone else (Francis perhaps?) to turn that into an example.

**Action**: Murata will write text for the Scope and decide whether we need an Introduction.

**Action**: Darrin will confirm the Bibliographic entry URL listed in the comment in §3.1.

**Action**: Rex will integrate everyone’s changes and delete the Annex placeholder.

**Part 2: Character Repertoire Checking**

**Action**: Murata-san will circulate a draft DIS to WG4 members before submitting it for ballot.

1. **Other Business**

**Thanking Meeting Host**

We thanked Darrin House and Microsoft for hosting this teleconference.

**Having ISO provide multiple versions of a spec**

We had a resolution for this in Beijing; however, the JTC 1 chair requested more information. Specifically, in mail from 2015-10-21, she wrote:

I asked ITTF to look at the request to provisionally retain a previous edition and I received the response below:

The rationale for provisional retention needs more technical justification, in my opinion.  The current text appears incomplete.

Going back to TMB resolution 24/2014, in addition to a solid rationale, we also need to know how long the standard needs to be provisionally retained.

Please provide the above details and submit a new request.

ISO rarely allows multiple editions of a spec to be available at the same time; the latest always supersedes the previous.

In our case, we’d like all versions to be made available and certainly the oldest one, whereas if ISO allows this, they typically allow the previous edition only. They also require a time limit, but we want retention to be indefinite, which isn’t likely to be permitted. As such, refining and resending the request likely won’t succeed, but we can discuss this at the Barcelona F2F. The good news is that all versions are available (for free) on the Ecma website.

1. **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:

* 2016-02-29/03-02, Barcelona, ES (co-located with ETSI, to discuss XAdES)
* 2016-06-13/15 or 2016-06-20/22, 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)

**Teleconferences:**

* 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)
1. **Adjournment**

Adjourned by unanimous consent at 22:40.