

[Draft] Minutes of the Teleconference of

ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 34/WG4, 2016-04-12

Rex Jaeschke (rex@RexJaeschke.com)

2016-04-12

1. Opening remarks

The meeting started at 21:05 GMT. The convener, Murata-san, welcomed everyone to the 71st 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
Darrin House	Ecma	Microsoft
Aarti Nankani	Ecma	Microsoft
Rich McLain	Ecma	Microsoft
Francis Cave	GB	Francis Cave Digital Publishing

Present were 7 people, from 2 NBs and 1 liaison.

3. Adoption of the agenda

The agenda (SC 34/WG4 N 332) was adopted with the following changes:

- Delete: "Comment disposition of the COR2 ballots on 29500-1/-4", as there were no comments.
- Add: Review of TR 30114-1, Extensions of Office Open XML File Formats -- Part 1 Guidelines
- Add: Review of 29500-1/-4:2016

4. Administration

Approval of Previous Meeting Minutes [WG4 N 0331]

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. **Done**
- Extensions, Part 2: Murata-san will circulate a draft DIS to WG4 members before submitting it for ballot.
Pending
- Murata-san will create and circulate a 29500 version of his re-write of OPC §8.5, based on the version he already distributed, so people can add comments/changes. **Done** (See mail "Rewrite of OPC: Relationships" on 2016-03-18)
- Re DR 10-0015 "OPC: Relationship Markup", Rex will contact Alex again, CC'ing Francis, to get closure on this. If we get no reply before the Prague meeting, we'll assume he's okay with it. **Pending**
- Re the XAdES Part 1 Spec, Francis will forward our feedback on the ETSI spec to the UK-based ETSI Vice-Chair, Nick Pope, who would include it as part of the UK's submission. [Only EU members can submit comments.] **Done**
- Re Extensions, "Part 1: Guidelines for extending OOXML": Rex will do whatever it takes editorially to complete this Part, circulate it to WG4 members for a review, and then submit it for balloting. **Mostly Done** (See mail "PLEASE PROOF: TR 30114-1 Extensions of Office Open XML File Formats -- Part 1 Guidelines" on 2016-03-22)

Report from the WG4 Secretariat

Various NBs and liaisons have registered delegates to WG4. All requests for additions, deletions, and changes to the delegate list should be done via LiveLink, with mail to the WG4 Secretariat (rex@RexJaeschke.com), so the corresponding changes can be made to the WG4 email list.

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>.

5. Defect Reports

The public, online DR log is at

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

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”

See Murata-san’s proposal at

<https://www.assembla.com/spaces/IS29500/documents/dh98p045Kr5yVddmr6bg7m/download/dh98p045Kr5yVddmr6bg7m>, which he announced on 2016-03-06, in mail titled, “A slightly rewritten version of the Kihon Hanmen annex”. In it, he suggests adding new material to Annex L (Primer).

Murata-san needs help w.r.t BIDI, and will contact Darrin re this.

6. Revision of 29500:2 (OPC)

Definition of Relationships

(See Murata-san’s mail “Rewrite of OPC: Relationships” on 2016-03-18, titled, “Re: Rewrite of OPC: Relationships”, and the text at

<https://www.assembla.com/spaces/IS29500/documents/b9gKFG7rer5ykddmr6CpXy/download/b9gKFG7rer5ykddmr6CpXy>)

Murat-san-san gave an overview of this document

7. Review of TR 30114-1, Extensions of Office Open XML File Formats -- Part 1 Guidelines

(See mail on 2016-04-05, “PLEASE PROOF: TR 30114-1 Extensions of Office Open XML File Formats -- Part 1 Guidelines;”)

Here is Caroline’s feedback and Rex’s replies:

1. Introduction

The title includes "Guidelines" (plural) and it seems odd to use the singular in the Introduction, particularly when it certainly isn't a single guideline. I suggest replacing "a guideline" with "guidance" or "guidelines".

Rex> Agreed. I propose changing "a guideline" to "guidance".

2. Scope

I suggest replacing "provides" with "supports" -- the markup doesn't provide round tripping.

Rex> Agreed.

3. Check for appropriate usage (including hyphenation) for round-trip, etc. Probably want to be consistent about whether to use "round-trip" or "round tripping" as the noun form. I prefer "tripping" but don't care about whether "round tripping" is hyphenated or not. I'm certainly happy with "round-trip" as the adjective before "operations" and "scenarios."

Rex> Okay, I'll deal with this.

4. 2.3

I would move "easily" in "While ignorable constructs easily allow markup to be added to documents" yielding: "While ignorable constructs allow markup to be added to documents easily"

Rex> Agreed.

5. 2.3

Perhaps the most technical point is a request for others to determine whether the the Choice block needs explicit treatment for the space between "two" and "formats." The Fallback block does.

Rex> Let's discuss this on the call.

We did and agreed that no change is needed.

6. 2.4

From my perspective, "(see extLst)" would benefit from a section reference and definitely needs a reference to Part 1. Perhaps ISO 29500-1, 18.2.10 which points to 18.2.7 where the most helpful explanation is. However, I see that you dropped my proposed section references from 2.5. I assume there was a reason for that.

Rex> I'm happy to have such references and don't recall intentionally removing previous ones. However, as we're in the process of producing a New Part 1, we'll need to make sure we've got the correct clause numbers.

7. 2.5

Since you changed all my "would be" instances to "is" you also need to change the "was" in the sentence beginning "Thirdly" to "is"

Rex> Agreed.

8. Bibliography

Link to Word Extensions to the Office Open XML (.docx) File Format (in the PDF version of the Guidelines) shows up with a slightly incorrect URL, with a space or %20 in /en-us/ The page appears to load OK, but is missing its left-hand navigation panel, which is where the content actually is. This may be a function of the PDF generation, but the other three similar links are all fine.

Rex> Excellent catch! The superfluous %20 actually is in the DOCX file, and I'll remove that.

WG4 agreed to adopt Caroline's suggestions, as modified by any discussions above.

Action: Rex will apply all these edits, making a new draft, which he will circulate to WG4 members for a 2-week review, and once any remaining issues are resolved, he'll forward the draft to Kimura-san for balloting.

8. Review of 29500-1/-4:2016

Part 4

(See Caroline's two mail messages on 2016-04-07, "PLEASE PROOF: Drafts of 29500-1/-4:2016;" and another on 2016-04-09, which follow below, along with Rex's preliminary responses.)

I noticed odd alignment in the ToC for Clause 16 in the PDF. The same problem shows up in other clause ToCs. Could be a problem related to tabs. Shows up in .docx file too. Alignment in 2012 files is better.

Rex> I presume you are referring to the embedded TOC in 16.2 where 16.6.1 through 16.6.9 have different indenting than 16.6.10->. I should be able to do something about that.

FWIW, I have checked Cor 2 for Part 4 (a single change) and that is fine.

I've been going through Part 4 against Cor 1.

Items 1-5 look OK

6. Internal reference to showBreaksInFrames should be to 14.8.3.36.

Ref to Part 1 is OK.

Rex> Agreed. Excellent catch!

Items 7-32 look OK

I have one small thought as I get started looking at links from Part 4 to Part 1. We eliminated most of the Terms and Definitions in Part 4, rather than repeating those in Part 1 -- but we did not add a note pointing to Part 1 Terms and Definitions. There is an existing note that refers to Part 2 (in both Part 1 and Part 4). I find myself thinking that there should be a reference in Part 4 to the Terms and Definitions section in Part 1. It looks odd to point to Part 2 but not to Part 1. Is that something you can do at this stage?

Rex> Yes, I see no reason to not improve that non-normative text. How about changing the current Note, "[Note: This part uses OPC-related terms, which are defined in ISO/IEC 29500-2. end note]" to "[Note: This part uses terms defined in ISO/IEC 29500-1 and ISO/IEC 29500-2. end note]"?

Part 1

(See Caroline's mail messages on 2016-04-10/-11/-12, "PLEASE PROOF: Drafts of 29500-1/-4:2016", which follow below, along with Rex's preliminary responses.)

Thoughts after going through COR 2 for Part 1.

Items 2-10 look OK.

Item 5 results in new sub-clause numbers from 20.1.10.41

The spacing in the headings for sub-clauses 20.1.10.42 through 20.1.10.87 looks odd. Will need re-checking at whatever stage the add/delete indications get removed.

Rex> Yes, I see what you mean. I'll review those when I adopt the tracked changes.

Item 1 provides two puzzles. As well as replacing the diagram in 17.7.2 with one that is laid out slightly differently, the diagram appears in your draft to add a row/shape for "Numbering." However, 29500:2012 has that row. So I think your new document needs a different "before" diagram. DR 12-0005 includes some substitutions from Murata-san from the BRM time, and his substitution does not have the numbering row.

Rex> The figure in 2012 was correct, but the bottom piece of each row was truncated. COR 1 contained a correction for this, but was missing the "Numbering" row. So, COR 2 provided a complete and correct replacement figure.

When I created this new draft, I applied COR2 to the version of 2012 that already had COR 1 applied. As such, the current draft uses the (incorrect) COR1 figure as the "before" diagram, NOT the 2012 version, so you are correct. However, when I adopt the tracked changes, the incorrect COR1 figure will go away, and the replacement will be correct. So no action is needed here.

As I investigated this oddity, I noticed that the text description below does not match the ordering of style application shown in the diagram wrt paragraph and numbering. And the diagram in L.1.8.10 Style Application puts Numbering above Paragraph. The textual description suggests that application of numbering and paragraph styles are somewhat interwoven. Maybe the diagram Murata-san supplied was intended to address that by dropping the separate Numbering row.

If we want to address the inconsistency of the diagrams in 17.7.2 and L.1.8.10 that would be a new DR, I think.

Rex> I'm inclined to agree on a new DR, as the problem COR1 and now COR2 were trying to solve was to fix the truncated row pictures only.
WG4 agreed to make this a new DR.

Aside on normative reference ISO/IEC 14496-22

Normative reference is to ISO/IEC 14496-22:2009. In the text, I see the standard mentioned without a year, with year 2007, and with year 2008. There is now a 2015 version. Am not sure whether all of this matters and am sure it is not worth wasting time on at this point.

But may be worth a look over in the future.

Rex> That certainly sounds inconsistent. I propose adding this to the general editorial DR for the next revision of Part 1

Moving on to checking Part 1 draft against Cor 1 (Cor 3 in the DR Log).

Items 1-4 look OK.

Item 5 looks OK, but I think the inserted text could do with a link to 18.2.10 for extLst

Rex> I agree.

Items 6-13 look OK.

Item 14. One insertion was missed, the comma after i.e.

Rex> I agree.

Items 15-16 look OK

Item 17 looks OK, except:
missed substitution of "1" for "on" in beforeAutospacing example

Rex> I agree.

Items 18-20 look OK

Item 21 seems to have two problems

1. The cstheme row in table on page 303 has some extra periods compared to Cor 1.

Rex> I agree.

2. This is not a problem with copying from Cor 1 to Part 1, but applies to Cor 1 as well. Unless I'm going blind (or am just confused by Arabic scripts/fonts, which other readers may be), I am seeing two instances of the same example markup that are explained to have DIFFERENT results.

The first instance is the first example in the subclause 17.3.2.26 <w:r> <w:rPr> <w:rFonts w:ascii="Courier New" w:cs="Times New Roman" /> </w:rPr> <w:t>English ??????? </w:t> </w:r>

followed by:

In this run, both English and ??????? should be in ASCII font slot, according to the two-step algorithm below. Therefore, both of them should be in the Courier New font face.

The second instance is immediately before the attributes table <w:r> <w:rPr> <w:rFonts w:ascii="Courier New" w:cs="Times New Roman" /> </w:rPr> <w:t>English ??????? </w:t> </w:r>

followed by:

This text run must therefore use the Courier New font for all characters in the range U+0000 to U+007F, and must use the Times New Roman font for all characters in the Complex Script range.

I have managed to download DR 9-0040, but do not have time now to follow it through to see if I can figure out when/why the duplication appeared or which might be correct.

Rex> I don't have the expertise to comment on this.

We agreed to cover this in a new DR.

Items 22-24 look OK

Item 25 looks OK wrt Cor 1, but I'm suspicious there might be another problem. Should "not to use the fidelity" be "not to lose the fidelity"? If that is not what is meant, some clarification is probably in order. The current wording is confusing.

Rex> In the table entry for attribute fieldCodes (Field Switches), I see the following, non-normative: "[Rationale: Legacy word processors used fields to represent embedded objects - this element stores the field switches not explicitly defined for embeddings so as not to use the fidelity of their contents. end rationale]"

I'm inclined to agree with your analysis.

WG4 agreed.

Items 26-34 look OK.

Item 35. Mostly OK, but missing an added space in ancestorstructured in xPath row in attributes table

Rex> I agree.

Items 36-39 look OK

Item 40 looks OK, but I suspect a typo that was not noticed before. I think "default gallery hall" should be "default gallery shall".

Rex> I agree.

Items 41-48 look OK

Item 49 is related to Item 1 in Cor 2, for which I noted an issue a few days ago.

Item 50 looks OK -- but there is no indicator of a change

Rex> I agree that is odd. During the final pass, I'll review this.

Items 51-52 look OK

Items 53-59 look OK wrt Cor 1. However, I see another problem in the displacedByCustomXml table entries in the Attributes tables in all these subclauses. We need to close up the attribute name and uppercase the "b" in

w:displaced byCustomXml="next"

yielding

w:displacedByCustomXml="next"

I leave others to determine whether this can be fixed as editorial or needs a DR.

Rex> It is clear to me these are errors made during editing, and that we can fix them here.

Item 60 looks OK -- but I notice a typo in "attibute" in the unchanged text here and quite frequently, including near the next few items. Replacing "attibute" by "attribute" looks like an editorial fix to deal with now.

Rex> I see them, and I'll fix them.

Items 61 and 62 look OK per se but also have 'w:displaced byCustomXml="next"' which should be 'w:displacedByCustomXml="next"'

Rex> I see them, and I'll fix them.

Item 63 is OK but has the "atttribute" problem (at least twice)

Rex> Got it.

Item 64 is OK but has the 'w:displaced byCustomXml="next"' problem

Rex> Got it.

Item 65 looks OK

Item 66 was not implemented as in Cor 1 -- which added a reference in a new location. The draft replaces a different (and still correct) reference with the new one.

Rex> I agree. The view element reference should be restored and the new reference added to print layout view, as shown in COR1.

Item 67 looks OK but needs a special track after accepting Track Changes wrt parentheses and

Rex> I agree; something isn't quite right there.

Items 68-80 look OK.

Item 81 looks OK. See also item 2 in Cor 2.

Item 82 looks OK. But I also note a typo: "justfied" needs an "i" (last sentence in example). [Note: I found other instances of "justfied"]

Rex> Agreed; I'll fix these.

Item 83 looks OK. However I see another instance of "the Open Database Connectivity interface" which probably needs to be changed to ODBC. In example at end of same subclause.

Rex> Agreed; I'll fix this.

Item 84 looks OK

Item 85 looks OK wrt Cor 1. However I notice a minor grammatical problem: "always formula" should be "always a formula" in example just above Attributes table. Personally I stumbled over the use of the verb "defines" in "This element defines a defined name..." -- but I can understand why changing that doesn't make sense for the sake of consistency. Although I see that 18.3.1.37 does begin "This element specifies...".

Rex> I'll add the article.

Items 86-88 look OK

Item 89 looks OK wrt Cor 1. However, I don't understand how the markup specifies the location of the break at C3 in the example.

Rex> I don't understand what C3 is either.

WG4 agreed to make this a new DR.

Items 90-93 look OK

Items 94-95 look OK except that "can not" should be closed up, I assume.

Rex> Yes, two occurrences were missed, and there are others elsewhere, as well. I'll fix them.

Item 96 looks OK (although I didn't check everything in detail.

Except the color in the &K row in the Formatting Code table doesn't show in the draft.

Rex> It's missing from the PDF because it's also missing from the DOCX. I'll fix that.

Items 97-98 look OK

In several messages on 2016-04-11/12 titled, “Re: PLEASE PROOF: Drafts of 29500-1/-4:2016”, Murata-san wrote,

“The diagram in 17.4.10 in the Word version and that in the PDF version look different. The same discrepancy appears in 17.4.11.”

And

“I find similar discrepancies in 17.4.22 and 17.4.24. The table in 17.4.26 looks nice in the Word version, but looks broken in the PDF version.”

Caroline responded: For me, the diagrams in 17.4.10 and 17.4.11 look the same in both versions of the Part 1 draft. But the 17.4.11 diagram runs over the right margin in both. I'm on a Mac, running Word for Mac 2011 and Adobe Reader 9.5.5.

17.4.22 and 17.4.24 do look better in Word than in the PDF. I agree that the diagram in 17.4.26 looks better in Word than in the PDF, but for me the mis-alignment is not serious enough to affect understanding. Also, the mis-alignment changes nature if I zoom the PDF View.

Rex responded: I also don't see any differences between the two versions, and agree with Caroline that the second one runs off the right margin. I'm running MS Word 2103 and Adobe Acrobat X 10.1.16.13.

Certainly, something has been lost in the first conversion to PDF, and it's unfortunately that there is a page break between the two rows. As for 17.4.22 and 17.4.24, As I have no control over how the PDF generator handles this, I don't see there is anything I can do re this.

[It appears that different PDF readers are showing different things. No change needed to the spec.]

WG4 agreed to adopt all feedback suggestions, as modified by any discussions above.

Action: Rex will apply all these edits, making a new draft, which he will circulate to WG4 members for review prior to the next teleconference.

9. Other Business

Thanks

We thanked Darrin House and Microsoft for hosting this teleconference.

We thanked Caroline Arms for her excellent work proofing the TR and 29500 Parts.

10. Future meetings

Face-to-Face Meetings:

- 2016-06-14/16, Prague, CZ (WG4 only): Primary agenda topics: OPC, DRs, Extensions spec, Part 2, discussion of next edition of 29500-1/-4.
- 2016-09-26/30, Seoul, KR (with other WGs, and Opening/Closing Plenaries)
- 2017-02-??/03-??, TBD (WG4 only)
- 2017-06-??, TBD (WG4 only)
- 2017-09-??, Berlin, DE (with other WGs, and Opening/Closing Plenaries)

Teleconferences:

Note that we changed from the usual Thursday/Friday to Tuesday/Wednesday

- 2016-05-10 (Tue/Wed), 21:00 GMT (US/PT 14:00, GB 22:00, DE/DK/FR/CZ 23:00, JP 06:00)

11. Adjournment

Adjourned by unanimous consent at 22:30.