

ISO/IEC DIS 29500 BALLOT RESOLUTION MEETING**Geneva, 2008-02-25..29**

*Red italics are used for actions, “decisions” (consensus or voted) and “resolutions”. The term “decision” does not include editing instructions, whereas the term “resolution” does. Therefore, **at the end of the BRM**, only “resolutions” will be left.*

Numbers are used for “actions”.

Monday 2008-02-25

Locale

AU-28 R 28

AU: Add a Locale attribute of ST type to the F element.

Ecma: list of enumerated values (for Locale attr.?)

1. *AU and Ecma (with US) to develop specific editing instructions: resolution expected later in BRM*

BE

Requests future convergence of all ISs in this area; no editing instruction for Edition 1.

Accessibility

CA-69 (R 119), 72 (120), 73 (R 121), 75 (R 91), 78

Accessibility for people with disabilities

Reference in R 91

Ecma: openxmldeveloper.com/OpenXMLAccessibilityGuidelines.aspx, proposed for incorporation in future maintenance

CA: has submitted 12 pp of comments to these “Guidelines”, the response to which has generated more questions and comments from CA

R 119 (CA-69), R 120 (CA-72), R 121 (CA-73): have generated/will generate proposed additions to the “Guidelines”, which will be added before it is inserted into DIS

Consensus: Informative annex to the DIS in Edition 1:

2. *CA will discuss with Ecma; resolution expected later in BRM*

BR-7 (R 42), compatibility with browsers

Consensus: standards-based;

3. *Ecma will come up with proposal—with no product names—later in BRM (e.g. keep only last two lines of table on p 184, but with more versions of CSS)*

CN, Côte d'I: no editing instructions; CL, CO, Costa Rica absent

CZ-6 (R 16)

4. *Ecma will generate updated table with BCP 47 mapping; final resolution expected later in BRM*

Legacy Language Identifier table is deprecated: so resolved

DK: no editing instructions.

EC-1 (R 1009): will support any acceptable solution to the **date** problem.

Unit of measurement

FI-10 (R 705)

Ecma: the goals of Edition 1 are satisfied by the granularity chosen; the improvement proposed should be worked out thoroughly during maintenance.

5. *CZ will provide proposed text; FI & others will discuss with Ecma; final resolution expected later in BRM*

FR: wishes a distinction to be made in the standard between specifications for new OOXML docs and specifications for backwards compatibility (“*deprecated*”?), possibly by splitting into separate parts.

DE-28 (R 18), 30 (R 43) and a number of other NB comments: **dates**

DE and a number of NBs propose to use only ISO 8601 format, with a simple flag concerning what assumption about 1900 is implied (since only storage and not algorithmic treatment is concerned); US and many other NBs believe that backwards compatibility should be in an annex and deprecated; CH believes “ISO-8601-only” will not work because it is an oversimplification:

6. *CH will propose text as a follow-up to CH-6 (R 43)*

CH-0006

The Swiss NB, while wishing to thank the editor for his resolution proposal, still demands the resolution of Swiss comment CH-0006 to be improved as follows:

1) Part 4, 3.17.4, page 2, 522, line 6

The proposed definition of the components of the serial value is still not unambiguous, as it does not contain clear statements about the sign of each component. According to the proposed resolution to part 4, 3.17.4.1, page 2,522, lines 14-22, page 2,533, lines 1-20, in the 1900 date-base system the serial value ranges from -693959 to +2958465, thus includes negative values. The components definition shall express this by stating that the date component is signed, but the fractional component is not, by the following wording: “Each unique instant in SpreadsheetML time is represented as a distinct numeric serial value, which is made up of a signed integer date and an unsigned fractional time component.”

2) *Ibidem*

The currently proposed resolution allows for negative serial values, but fails to unambiguously specify their semantics. Thus add the following to the above definition: “The serial value encodes that date whose (positive or negative) time span from the respective date-base equals the serial value. Note: The serial value -1.25 encodes December 30, 1899, 6:00 p.m.”

3) Part 4, 3.17.4.1, page 2,522, lines 14-22, page 2,533, lines 1-20

The proposed settings of the lower and upper limit conform with those of the ISO 8601:2004 date representation of years CE (i.e. 0000 and later). The Swiss NB fully agrees to rely on ISO 8601:2004 for the date representation, but demands to make full usage of the devices defined therein. As the following references show, these include representations of years well BCE (i.e. before 0000): ISO 8601:2004, section 3.5 defines an expansion facility widening the range to in-

clude dates BCE. Section 3.7 allows the use of this facility "by mutual agreement". The Swiss NB takes the view that the 1900 date-base system should make use of this device and thus demands that the lower limit be extended accordingly. The definition of the 1900 date-base system shall be phrased as follows:

"In the 1900 date-base system, the lower limit is January 1, 9999 BCE, which has serial value -4'346'018. The upper limit is December 31, 9999 CE, which has serial value +2'957'003."

4) *Ibidem*

The current proposed resolution defines four date-base systems. We propose to de-pricate the two backward-compatible ones, with the following text: "The 1900 backward-compatible and the 1904 backward-compatible date-base system are deprecated."

5) Part 4, 3.17.4.1, page 2,522, lines 14-22, page 2,533, lines 1-20 (editorial)

Write "lower limit" and "upper limit", consistently without a delimiting "-".

AU believes the ODF approach would be more effective.

7. *Ecma and all NBs which have proposals or questions will work on the problem (CH, Ecma's 17 pages, ...); working documents will be made available on the SC 34 web site and by memory stick; final resolution expected later in BRM*

GR-14 (R 80)

Part 4, 6.1.2.19, equationxml, p 4653:

8. *The Note shall reference "Recommendation MathML version 2.0", not "Working Draft specification": **draft resolution** (GR will check).*

Ecma: The whole escaping mechanism is deprecated within the VML section.

BR: existence of the future Annex to contain VML is not yet certain.

CN: believes that much that is deprecated is actually derived from actual (past) implementations, and that the number of specifications which are deprecated should be limited.

GB: to improve the syntax as GR suggests may have knock-on effects which would cause damage.

9. *The BRM will discuss whether a VML Annex (deprecated) should be created.*

10. *GR proposal: replace the existing attribute by a child element giving the proper XML form of its content. GR and Ecma to work off-line; final resolution expected later in BRM.*

IN-56 (R 472); see R 92:

Draft resolution (IN, BR): In R 92, p. 404, second para. of Proposed Disposition: accept the editing instruction constituted by the sentence beginning "Accordingly" but replacing the parenthesis by "(including those created by migrating existing binary documents)" and the word "should" by "shall".

Secretary's comment: the proposal is equivalent to the following condition: only documents already existing on the day the draft becomes an International Standard can be conformant to it if they contain any deprecated features.

Draft resolution (CA): "Deprecated" is renamed as "Class 2", feature by feature. In addition to all the conformance conditions not involving Class 2 features, the conformance clause is modified so that a Class 1 conformant document shall only contain Class 1 features; a document containing one or more Class 2 features is a Class 2 conformant document.

Ecma: the attempt to translate a document containing deprecated features, into one without them, sometimes involves loss of information.

GB: A phased approach to the migration from deprecated features to the others is needed, including the possibility to write documents with deprecated features.

DE: would favour this phased approach only for unmappable (i.e. not perfectly mappable) features.

AU: two conformance levels (two classes to which conformity may be claimed): full OOXML and legacy OOXML?

11. IN, BR, CA, US, EI and any others will consult to describe the different cases of "deprecated", to try and clarify the issues connected with legacy features. A draft resolution will be produced, for decision later in the BRM.

IE-2 (dates), 4 (ST_LangCode), 9 (Deprecation): already decided for more discussion (*action items: 7, 4, 11*). and resolution later in the BRM.

IE-10 (R 34, Compatibility settings):

Draft resolution: An informative Annex giving references to all deprecated features, including compatibility settings, will be inserted in the standard.

Draft resolution: The semantics for compatibility settings should be included in the body of WordProcessingML.

IL-23 (R 729):

Resolved:

- p 1688, add to 1st bullet): Similarly, a run with rtl=0 shall not contain strong RTL characters*
- p 1692 l 5: directionality → order*
- p 1684, "bdo" → "dir" x 2 in box at top of page*
- p 1692, l 4 of table: "bdo" → "dir".*

12. Following items to be discussed by IL and Ecma, for later resolution in the BRM:

- five terms to express "right-to-left" (to be supplied by IL); replace by e.g. "rtlDisplay"*
- p 1685 ff: ensure all features provided in x.2 to apply to x.3, x.4 and x.5*

IT-2: would like to invite any NBs interested in this proposal to contact the IT delegation.

JP-40, 46:

Draft resolution: Accept the Conformance clause (clause 2) for Part 2 as specified in R 202 (DE-154) and R 992 (JP-27,28,29) with the following two modifications:

- *4th para to be repeated for data streams, i.e. add the following paragraph: "A data stream is defined to be of conformance class OPC if it satisfies all the conditions applicable to data streams listed in this Part.";*
- *in 4th para, add "applicable to applications" in the relevant place.*

KE: no editing

KR-18 to 24: proposal to remove components and/or separate them into different parts:

13. US will make some restructuring proposals which may help with this proposal.

CA:

Remove "(all parts)" from 4th bullet on p 126 of Response 32: so resolved (insofar as the Response is approved as a resolution).

MY-16: Names

