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**Issue #1**

§17.15.1.70 and §17.15.1.71 both correctly define an RSID as an ST\_LongHexNumber (defined in §17.18.50), but incorrectly describe this as a four-digit hex number instead of an eight-digit hex number. The examples shown are, correctly, eight-digit hex numbers (although the implementation I use [MS-Word] uses only 6 of the 8 digits).

**Issue #2**

In §17.15.1.72, RSIDroot is defined as “the revision save ID which was associated with the first editing session for this document”.  
  
In §17.15.1.72, RSIDS is defined as “the set of revision save ID values for the current document”.  
  
In §17.15.1.70, RSID is defined as “the revision save ID that was associated with a single editing session for a document”.  
  
The implication of these in combination is that a document's RSIDroot is its first revision save ID and that all the others listed in its RSIDS element postdate it. In fact, in my implementation, the RSIDS element inherits all the revision save IDs from the template from which the document was made.  
  
The note added to the definition of RSID amplifies the implication saying, “the meaning of two revision save IDs is not defined for documents with a different RSIDroot”. I presume it should say "the meaning of a revision save ID shared by two documents with a different RSIDroot is not defined". If so, although it does not say so explicitly, it implies that a shared revision save ID is not meaningful unless the rsidRroot is also shared. In fact, when the rsidRoot is different, although a single shared revision save ID might be coincidental, several shared revision save IDs almost certainly originate from a common template.

I would very much like to know whether ECMA-376/IS 29500 is a bit misleading, or if my implementation is non-compliant in its use of templates (in which case it should be mentioned in its implementer notes).

Solution Proposed by the Submitter:

None
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