

[Draft] Minutes of the Teleconference of

ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 34/WG4, 2016-05-10

Rex Jaeschke (rex@RexJaeschke.com)

2016-05-11

1. Opening remarks

The meeting started at 21:00 GMT. The convener, Murata-san, welcomed everyone to the 72nd 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
Francis Cave	GB	Francis Cave Digital Publishing

Present were 6 people, from 2 NBs and 1 liaison.

3. Adoption of the agenda [SC 34/WG4 N 332]

The agenda was adopted with the following changes:

- Add “Review of 29500-1/-4:2016 Feedback”

4. Administration

Approval of Previous Meeting Minutes [WG4 N 0336]

The draft minutes were approved, as circulated.

Outstanding Action Items

- Extensions, Part 2: Murata-san will circulate a draft DIS to WG4 members before submitting it for ballot.

Pending

- 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**
- Rex will apply all the new edits to the TR Extensions, “Part 1: Guidelines for extending OOXML”, 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. **Done**
- Rex will apply all the new edits, making new drafts of 29500 Parts 1 and 4, which he will circulate to WG4 members for review prior to the next teleconference. **Done** on 2016-04-21 as N 0338 and N 0339

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 16-0010 “WML: Confusing example used repeatedly in Descriptions of attribute w:val”

After a brief discussion, we agreed to make this a group activity during the Prague meeting.

6. Revision of 29500:2 (OPC)

Murata-san referred to his latest (private) draft, which he announced on 2016-05-08, “My personal draft of OPC”. This post contained the following:

On the basis of WD 2.1, I created my personal draft.

<https://www.assembla.com/spaces/IS29500/documents/bBXtgyfyyr5QeDacwqjQYw/download/bBXtgyfyyr5QeDacwqjQYw>

This now addresses the pack scheme DR 09-0293.

This draft inherits a rewrite of the definition of relationships from my previous draft. <http://mailman.vse.cz/pipermail/sc34wg4/2016-March/003784.html>

Caroline provided a lot of feedback, which was discussed at length, and Murata-san noted a number of edits for his draft.

7. Review of 29500-1/-4:2016 Feedback

Part 1

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

-----Original Message-----

From: caroline arms [<mailto:caroline.arms@gmail.com>]

Sent: Tuesday, April 12, 2016 6:43 PM

For completeness, here is my review of the few items from Cor 1 for Part 1 that I looked at between the most recent message and the call:

Item 99-100 look OK

Item 101 raises the same issue as item 89. I think there may need to be a value for the min attribute in each of those examples. Unless the default zero value provides the missing information.

Rex> Re #89, we created a new DR, 16-0013. I will extend that to include the following example, from 18.3.1.74 rowBreaks (Horizontal Page Breaks (Row)), requesting clarification about cell B25:

Horizontal page break information used for print layout view, page layout view, drawing print breaks in normal view, and for printing the worksheet. A collection of row breaks (◆18.3.1.3).

[Example: This example shows a break inserted at cell B25:

```
<rowBreaks count="1" manualBreakCount="1">  
  <brk id="24" max="16383" man="1"/>  
</rowBreaks>
```

end example]

Rex> Let's discuss your comment re min on the next call.

Items 102-109 look OK.

-----Original Message-----

From: caroline arms [<mailto:caroline.arms@gmail.com>]

Sent: Tuesday, April 12, 2016 9:29 PM

Continuing with Cor 1 against Part 1 draft

Item 110 doesn't appear to have been applied

Rex> Agreed; I'll fix that.

Item 111 looks OK

Item 112 looks OK. I am happy with your editorial choice to add the note before the table rather than afterwards.

Rex> Actually, Item #3 of Cor2 directed the note go there.

Item 113 looks OK

Item 114 looks OK, although not all changes are indicated

Items 115-116 look OK

Item 117 look OK wrt Cor 1. But reveals another grammar issue. "There two" should be "There are two" in note at end of page 1913 (in PDF)

Rex> Agreed; will fix.

Item 118-119 look OK

Item 120 looks OK, except for need to delete "at all" in attribute row for connection

Rex> Agreed; will fix.

Item 121 looks OK

Item 122 looks OK. Noticed small typo in "ISO 8601, B.1.3 and B2.3"
Probably the second clause # should be B.2.3 -- with an additional period.

Rex> Agreed; will fix.

Items 123-128 look OK

Item 129 look OK wrt Cor 1. New issue: "quotient from number-1 / number-2," should be "quotient from complex-number-1 / complex-number-2,"

Rex> Agreed; will fix.

Items 130-151 look OK

-----Original Message-----

From: caroline arms [<mailto:caroline.arms@gmail.com>]

Sent: Wednesday, April 13, 2016 7:46 AM

Continuing with Cor 1 against Part 1 draft

Item 152.

Part 1, 18.17.7.260, PROB

An "is" was added in error (i.e., not reflecting Cor 1) to the second bullet -- the condition for the "sum of the values". However, the correction in Cor 1 to this bullet is clearly wrong, because

If the sum of the values in probability-range ≤ 1 , makes no mathematical/logical sense.

I believe the "<" should be deleted. Then the condition makes

logical and mathematical sense and clearly would represent an error condition for this function.

Rex> Agreed. I'll remove both occurrences of "is".

Re "<>", that is correct; it is the not-equal operator (as described in 18.17.2.2).

Looking at "legislative" history:

>>>>

The relevant DR is DR 14-0003. At the top of the DR, I see "[Ed. The list of issues and their proposed fixes are documented in the file Proposed changes for DR-14-0003 attached to mail of the same name, posted on 2014-05-11.] "

But I don't find that message at

<http://mailman.vse.cz/pipermail/sc34wg4/2014-May/date.html>

This makes me think that the mail was not to the WG4 list. I don't find anything in my own mail backup. I'm assuming Rex embedded the content as is into the DR. The DR was discussed and approved at a face-to-face in June 2014.

The content of Cor 1 for this change is the same as in the DR document.

>>>>

So there is nothing to suggest that this error was introduced in the editorial process of applying Cor 1 to the current draft. I suspect that it simply escaped the notice of any (MS experts or WG4 members) who reviewed the solution for DR 14-0003 after MS experts provided Chris with the relevant information.

Aside, I think the "is" added to the first bullet is unnecessary, because it is implied in the = symbol. In general, there is no "is" in similar conditions in 18.17.7.

Bottom line on item 152 in Cor 1:

- * Not correctly reflected in Part 1 draft
- * Incorrect substance -- does this need new DR?

-----Original Message-----

From: caroline arms [<mailto:caroline.arms@gmail.com>]

Sent: Wednesday, April 13, 2016 9:12 AM

Continuing on with Cor 1 against draft of Part 1:

Items 153-162 look OK

Item 163. OK wrt Cor 1. But Description was unclear to me. I would change

For symmetry, TRIMMEAN excludes a single value from the top and bottom of the data set.

to

For symmetry, TRIMMEAN excludes the same number of data points from the top and bottom of the data set.

Rex> I agree that the existing text is unclear, and that your suggestion is better.

Arguments table, 3rd column, very last line of text, 2 from the top, change “rom” to “from”.

Items 164-176 look OK.

This completes going through changes to function specifications -- focus on full specs for error conditions, mainly from DR 14-0003.

-----Original Message-----

From: caroline arms [<mailto:caroline.arms@gmail.com>]

Sent: Wednesday, April 13, 2016 9:34 AM

Back to item 152.

I'm remembering that there were a bunch of formula-related changes made during the period when ODF 1.2 Part 2 (Recalculated Formulas) was being reviewed by MS. I suspect DR 14-0003 relates to things discovered then.

So I have looked at the ODF spec for the PROB function, which says.

Constraints:

? The sum of the probabilities in Probability shall equal 1.

? All values in Probability shall be > 0 and <= 1.

? COUNT(Data) = COUNT(Probability)

Looking at https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/List_of_mathematical_symbols#Symbols_based_on_equality,

I see "<>" mentioned, but only in a note in the row for ?. The note indicates the use of a variety of ASCII-only ways to indicate "is not equal to".

So MS should confirm that the second bullet in 18.17.7.260 is supposed to mean the same as the first ODF bullet. Assuming that "is not equal to" is what is meant, I recommend using words or ? rather than the symbol "<>". The audience for this standard is not limited to programmers in languages that use "<>" for this conditional. Such a fix would be editorial, I believe.

Rex> Rejected. WML fields and SML formulas use <> to represent not equal, not only in narrative, but as part of expression syntax in the grammars.

-----Original Message-----

From: caroline arms [<mailto:caroline.arms@gmail.com>]

Sent: Wednesday, April 13, 2016 4:05 PM

More review of Cor 1 against draft of Part1.

Item 178 looks OK. No marks appear on draft. The intent is to keep captions for diagrams with the diagrams -- or at least, not to end pages with orphaned captions. A quick skim looked OK. Worth a later review after changes are accepted.

Items 179-180 look OK.

Item 181. Looks OK wrt Cor 1. Intent was to make clear that the element related to the Normal Slide View mode.

However, there appears to be a mix-up over the horizontal and vertical splitter bars. The sentences beginning "The region to be maximized" in the attribute descriptions for horzBarState and vertBarState seem to conflict with the labels in the diagram.

Rex> I agree that the final sentences of the paragraphs of each description appear to be swapped over. Separately, the new edit to add "primary" and "content" to "slide region" in the description of vertBarState doesn't seem correct, as the name of the region in the diagram was not changed to match. And "primary slide content" is not used elsewhere. These two new words might need to be removed.

Let's creating a new DR for this.

Items 182-187 look OK

-----Original Message-----

From: caroline arms [mailto:caroline.arms@gmail.com]

Sent: Monday, April 18, 2016 9:32 AM

Re 152 and "<>". In this context (which is not in a marked up formula but in a more narrative explanation), I'd prefer words.

-----Original Message-----

From: caroline arms [mailto:caroline.arms@gmail.com]

Sent: Monday, April 18, 2016 8:26 AM

A few more checks from Cor 1 against draft of Part 1:

Items 188-190 look OK.

Item 191 is OK wrt Cor 1. But there is a vary awkward page break after the header row in the Constants subtable that follows. Worth a check after accepting changes.

Rex> For some years now, I've had pages occasionally break after the initial header of a table, and as far as I have been able to determine, there is no way to inhibit that programmatically. As such, during my very last pass over a new edition, I've manually inserted page breaks, as I've spotted this kind of thing.

Item 192 is OK wrt Cor 1. The line that marks the change overlays the table when shown at the right-hand side of the page in the PDF. But presumably that will be fine once the changes are accepted.

Rex> Agreed.

Items 193-197 look OK wrt Cor 1.

Noticed use of "we" in example in 20.1.4.2.2 (changed in item 197) and elsewhere.

"In this example, we set the fill ..."

Would probably be better as "This markup example sets the fill..."

Rex> Agree; I'll fix that.

Items 198-199 look OK

Item 200 looks OK wrt Cor 1. Is there a reason for some entries in the Classification column being in italics and others not?

Rex> Not that I can see. I'll make them all Roman (that is, remove the italics).

Items 201-203 look OK. See also Cor2.

Items 204-216 look OK.

Item 217. You have changed one "which" to "that" but not the one that was in Cor 1. I think both should be "that."

Rex> Agreed; good catch.

Items 218-232 look OK.

Item 233 has "0" in Cor 1 and "zero" in draft of Part 1

Rex> I will fix the printed schema to match Cor1.

Items 234-243 look OK.

That gets to a convenient break (at the end of Annex B).

-----Original Message-----

From: caroline arms [<mailto:caroline.arms@gmail.com>]

Sent: Tuesday, April 19, 2016 1:17 PM

Continuing the pass through Cor 1 against the Part 1 draft.

Items 244-247 look OK.

Item 248 doesn't match Cor 1 in the color for the third diagram.

Looking at Cor 1 and the 2012 standard, what you have done looked OK to me -- for color and for layout. However, looking at the DR, I see that one complaint was the illegibility of the black text against the blue background. Perhaps it makes sense to use a lighter shade of blue. Or use the green as in Cor 1.

Rex> I don't have the original artwork, so did the best I could at the time with this without resorting to redrawing the figure. That said, I'll take another shot at it.

Item 249 doesn't seem to have delete and insert indicators and have change lines against only one of the diagrams. However, things look OK to me wrt the extraneous bullets mentioned in the DR.

Rex> So long as the final result is good (which I think we agree that it is), I'll leave it as is. I do recall have quite some difficulty with change-tracking switched on in getting the correct changes. So I switched it off. (Sometimes Word tried way toooooo hard to help me when I don't want it to!)

Items 250-257 look OK.

Items 258-261 look OK. However, I notice that by deleting all these subclauses, clauses L.7.3. and L.7.3.4 become problematic, because they assume 7.3.4.2 is present and don't make sense without some discussion of Alternate Content Blocks. Would it be acceptable at this stage to create a new 7.3.4.2 that simply refers to Part 3?

Rex>I'll make these dangling places point to Part 3, and check with Caroline.

Item 262 looks OK and links are correct

Item 263 is in Electronic Annex. Not checked.

Part 1

(See Murata-san's mail messages starting on 2016-04-16, "PLEASE PROOF: Drafts of 29500-1/-4:2016", which follow below, along with Rex's preliminary responses.)

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

Sent: Tuesday, April 12, 2016 4:50 PM

Why is the header of Subclause 11.8 of Part 1 indented?

Rex> I see the problem and will fix that.

See my replies inline. Rex

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

Sent: Saturday, April 16, 2016 7:12 AM

Is it possible to specify that the para containing the table should not be separated from the next para by page breaks?

Rex> I'll see what I can do in that regard.

2016-04-13 2:29 GMT+09:00 Rex Jaeschke <rex@rexjaeschke.com>:

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 I have no control over how the PDF generator handles this, I don't see there is anything I can do re this.

Rex

-----Original Message-----

From: caroline arms [mailto:caroline.arms@gmail.com]

Sent: Tuesday, April 12, 2016 7:31 AM

17.4.22 does look better in Word than in the PDF.

17.4.24 does 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.

Caroline

On Tue, Apr 12, 2016 at 12:03 AM, MURATA Makoto <eb2m-mrt@asahi-net.or.jp> wrote:

> 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.

>

> Regards,

> Makoto

>

> 2016-04-12 12:50 GMT+09:00 MURATA Makoto <eb2m-mrt@asahi-net.or.jp>:

>>

>> The diagram in 17.4.10 in the Word version and that in the PDF

>> version look different. The same discrepancy appear in 17.4.11.

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

Sent: Saturday, April 16, 2016 7:13 AM

I reported discrepancies between figures in the PDF version of the consolidated Part 1 and those in the Word version. Most of them are not real, but are caused by a non-acrobat PDF reader and my XSLT script that extracts figures and tables.

However, two of them are real. The figures in 17.4.22 17.4.24 of the PDF version and those in the word version do look different. I guess that this difference is caused by a bug of MS Word. We can address this issue by creating small images for the example tables, but I am wondering if we can do so as part of this consolidation.

Rex> I'll experiment using images as replacements.

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

Sent: Sunday, April 17, 2016 5:37 PM

The mathematical equation in 18.17.7.131 (GAMMADIST) is duplicated: once as a mathematical equation and once as a figure. The same problem occurs in 18.17.7.164 (IMSUB).

Rex> Agreed; I will fix those.

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

Sent: Saturday, April 16, 2016 7:14 AM

First, the header in the table in 17.13.5.21 should be "Attributes" rather than "ttributes". This can be fixed as part of this consolidation.

Rex> I see it. Yes, we can fix that.

Second, in 17.18.3, the description of four values, pushPinNote1, pushPinNote2, shorebirdTracks, and snowflakes, appear to be mistaken. This requires another DR, and cannot be addressed as part of this consolidation.

Rex> We thought that these figures look OK, but if Murata-san finds a problem, we'll make that a new DR.

Action: Rex will produce new drafts of Parts 1 and 2 that incorporate all the changes agreed to above.

8. Other Business

Thanks

We thanked Darrin House and Microsoft for hosting this teleconference.

We thanked Caroline Arms and Murata-san for their excellent work proofing the 29500 Parts.

9. Future meetings

Face-to-Face Meetings:

- 2016-06-14/16, Prague, CZ (WG4 only): Primary agenda topics: OPC, DRs, Extensions spec, Part 2, Close-out 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:

- None

10.Adjournment

Adjourned by unanimous consent at 22:00.