|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| GB 001 |  |  |  | ED | The references to parts of ISO/IEC 29500 should all follow the correct ISO style for the presentation of (undated) references to International Standards, i.e. ‘ISO/IEC 29500-1’, ‘ISO/IEC 29500-2’ and ‘ISO/IEC 29500-3’ and not any of the abbreviations in the current text (i.e. ‘29500-1’, ‘IS 29500-1’, ‘IS 29500-2’, ‘29500-3’, ‘IS 29500-3’).. | **WG4 Response**  Agreed. All occurrences of “[IS] 29500 …” will be changed to “ISO/IEC 29500 …”. |  |
| KR 002 |  |  |  | ge | The text should be provided with line numbers so that comments can make easy references. | **WG4 Response**  A useful suggestion. No action needed now. |  |
| CZ 003 |  | 02.02 | First source code example | Ed | Missing quotes around namespace URI in declaration of xmlns:w | Add quotes  **WG4 Response**  Agreed: Changed to  xmlns:w="<http://schemas.openxmlformats.org/wordprocessingml/2006/main>" |  |
| CZ 004 |  | 02.03 | First source code example | Ed | Missing quotes around namespace URI in declarations of xmlns:w and xmlns:mc | Add quotes  **WG4 Response**  Agreed: Changed to  <w:document xmlns:mc= "<http://schemas.openxmlformats.org/markup-compatibility/2006>" xmlns:w="<http://schemas.openxmlformats.org/wordprocessingml/2006/main>" |  |
| CZ 005 |  | 02.04 | First source code example | Ed | Missing quotes around namespace URI in declaration of xmlns:mymodel | Add quotes  **WG4 Response**  Agreed: Changed to  <ext xmlns:mymodel="<http://myspreadsheetapp.com/modelInputsAndOutputs>" |  |
| KR 006 |  | 02.04 | Paragraph 4 | ed | 1st line | … contains an exLst element, 🡪  …contains an extLst element,  **WG4 Response**  Agreed: Changed to  “The CT\_Cell type in SpreadsheetML contains an extLst element, …” |  |
| KR 007 |  | 02.04 | Paragraph 4 | ed | 3rd line | The resulting sheetdata 🡪  The resulting sheetData  **WG4 Response**  Agreed: Changed to  “The resulting sheetD~~d~~ata for a given spreadsheet …” |  |
| KR 008 |  | 02.04 | Paragraph 5 | ed | 6th line | and adjust them 🡪  and adjusts them  **WG4 Response**  Agreed: Changed to  “It assumes that they will contain spreadsheet row/column references and adjusts them appropriately …” |  |
| KR 009 |  | 02.05 | Paragraph 4 | ed | 1st line | the \\_rels\.rels part 🡪  the \_rels\.rels part  (This is to be consistent with the style of “[Content\_Types].xml” in the 5th paragraph)  **WG4 Response**  \*\*Unresolved\*\* see discussion below  The spec currently states, “Secondly, a relationship item is added to the \\_rels\.rels part.” Throughout the OPC revision we’re working on, we use the leading “\”, so it seems appropriate to leave it there.  The 5th paragraph referred to contains, “Thirdly, an element is added to the [Content\_Types].xml stream, unless an appropriate element is already present.”  Then later in that same subclause, it states, “If not already present in the [Content\_Types].xml stream, the following addition would be appropriate:”  In OPC WD3, [Content\_Types].xml occurs only once, and then with a leading “/”.  I see 3 options:   1. Leave it as is; it’s correct, 2. Remove the leading “\” from “\\_rels\.rels part” 3. Add a leading “\” to both occurrences of “[Content\_Types].xml”   Any one of which needs an accompanying explanation. |  |
| KR 010 |  | 02.05 | Paragraph 6 | ed | 2nd line | it into XML this extension 🡪  it into XML, this extension  **WG4 Response**  Agreed: Changed to  “… there is no requirement to serializ~~s~~e it into XML, this extension mechanism …”  [Note the British-English spelling of “serialize”, as this was written by Scotsman]. As we’ve used US-English spelling throughout 29500, this was changed as well.] |  |
| KR 011 |  | Bibliography |  | ed | 1st line | The following are 🡪  The followings are  **WG4 Response**  Rejected:  In this context, the word “following” is used as an adjective with an implied noun of “item[s]”. If it were written out in full, it would be  [plural case] The following references are useful for implementers …  Or  [singular case] The following reference is useful for implementers …  In neither case does “following” change.  The proposed word “followings” is the plural form of the noun “following”, and is not appropriate in this case. |  |