

ISO/IEC DIS 29500 BALLOT RESOLUTION MEETING

Geneva, 2008-02-25..29

EDITED NOTES OF THE MEETING

GB 2008-03-01 18:30

Legend:

Red italics are used for Resolutions.

CY-nnnn (where CY is a two-letter ISO country code) =
comment no. "nnnn" from country "CY" contained in SC 34 N 980.

R mmmm =
Response "mmmm" contained in SC 34 N 980, i.e. a disposition of comments proposed by the Editor of ISO/IEC DIS 29500.

The day shown does not usually correspond to the day the Resolutions were finally taken, but to the day the subject was first raised.

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.?).

Resolution 1: The BRM approves the editing instructions contained in <http://www.itscj.ipsj.or.jp/sc34/def/BRM/AU28-draft.htm> as a replacement for R 28—so resolved.

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

CA-69 (R 119), 72 (R 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.

Resolution 2: The BRM decides to accept the instructions contained in http://www.itscj.ipsj.or.jp/sc34/def/BRM/Response_CA-0075_and_CA-0078_Accessibility_Annex_V2.doc as a replacement for R 91; those in http://www.itscj.ipsj.or.jp/sc34/def/BRM/Response_CA-0072_Document_Navigation.doc as an addendum to R 120, which is accepted; those in http://www.itscj.ipsj.or.jp/sc34/def/BRM/Response_CA-0073_Image_Maps.doc as a replacement for R 121; those in http://www.itscj.ipsj.or.jp/sc34/def/BRM/Response_NZ-0011_Table_Captions.doc as a replacement for R 94; and those in http://www.itscj.ipsj.or.jp/sc34/def/BRM/Response_CA-0069_Labels.doc as an addition to R 119, which is accepted—so resolved.

BR-7 (R 42), compatibility with browsers:

Resolution 3: The BRM accepts the proposed response to BR-7 contained in http://www.itscj.ipsj.or.jp/sc34/def/BRM/Response_BR-0007_Web_Browsers.doc but with an addition which makes it clear that the list is open-ended and with a correct reference for each entry—so resolved.

CN, CI: no editing instructions; CL, CO, CR absent at that time.

CZ-6 (R 16)

Resolution 4: The BRM accepts the proposed response to CZ-6 contained in http://www.itscj.ipsj.or.jp/sc34/def/BRM/Response_CZ-0006_ST_LangCode.doc as a replacement for R 16, but with the following change: column 2 of the first table shall be headed “Description (informative)” —so resolved.

The BRM decided that “the Legacy Language Identifier table shall be ‘transitional’.”

DK: no editing instructions beyond the Editor’s proposed resolutions of DK’s comments, which DK finds satisfactory, and would recommend the BRM to resolve to accept them.

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

Units 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.

Resolution 5: The BRM accepts the editing instructions contained in http://www.itscj.ipsj.or.jp/sc34/def/BRM/Response_FI-0010_measurements_v2.doc with “informal” being replaced by “informative”, in replacement of R 364, R 19, R 705, R 362, R 620 and R 103—so resolved.

Resolution 6: Additionally, the BRM accepts the editing instructions contained in http://www.itscj.ipsj.or.jp/sc34/def/BRM/Response_FI-0010_percentages.doc but with the following changes: throughout the text, add the specific Unicode value U+0025 for the percentage sign; and change all ranges to use the English words “from x up to [and including] infinity”, “inclusive[ly]”/“exclusive[ly]” etc.—so resolved.

KR objected to Resolution 6.

p. 9: 92.000 or the alternative, but not both.

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.

AU believes the ODF approach would be more effective.

Decision: The BRM decided to retain the valIso, val, maxValIso, maxVal, refreshedDate and refreshedDateIso attributes and mark val, maxVal, refreshedDate “transitional”.

ZA and DE opposed the above decision.

Resolution 7: The BRM resolves to accept the editing instructions contained in http://www.itscj.ipsj.or.jp/sc34/def/BRM/Response_DE-0028_dates_v9.doc in replacement of R 18 and R 43, but with the following corrections: the words “ISO value” shall be replaced by the words “ISO 8601 value”; page 9, line 24 shall be restored and line 23 shall be marked “transitional”; and all changes as well as choices among alternatives rendered necessary by the Decision above shall be made—results of the vote: 19 in favour; 3 against (EC, US, ZA); 9 abstentions (JP, KR, IE, AU, BR, CN, NL, MX and GR): so resolved.

GR-14 (R 80)

Resolution 8: In Part 4, 6.1.2.19, equationxml, p 4653, the Note shall reference “Recommendation MathML version 2.0”, not “Working Draft specification”—so resolved.

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.

Resolution 9: The BRM resolves to accept the editing instructions contained in http://www.itscj.ipsj.or.jp/sc34/def/BRM/Response_GR-0014_equationxml.doc in replacement of R 80, but with the following change: the attribute proposed for removal shall be made into a “transitional” attribute instead of being removed, with a note making clear that the new mechanism is preferred—so resolved by consensus, with CZ, DE and JP dissenting.

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”.

Resolution 10: The BRM accepts R 92 and R 992 with the changes to these responses contained in http://www.itscj.ipsj.or.jp/sc34/def/BRM/CA_Conformance_Class_Proposa_Draft4.doc—so resolved.

Original CA proposal: “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?

IN, BR, CA, US, IE 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 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 Word-ProcessingML.

IE proposal:

Draft Resolution: Accept R 34 with the deletion of the sentence: “In addition, we will remove each of these settings (and all other application compatibility settings) from their current location in the specification (Part 4, §2.15.3, pages 1,368-1,487), and place them into a new annex for deprecated features”—rejected.

Resolution 11: The BRM decides to accept R 34 with the change contained in <http://www.itscj.ipsj.or.jp/sc34/def/BRM/IE-0010r.doc>—so resolved.

IL-23 (R 729):

Previous resolution:

- 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”.

Resolution 12: The BRM decides to accept the changes contained in http://www.itscj.ipsj.or.jp/sc34/def/BRM/Response_IL-0023_bidirectional_annex.doc in replacement of R 729—so resolved.

- 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—to be decided on Friday morning.

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

JP-40, 46:

Resolution 13: The BRM accepts the proposed response to JP-40 and JP-46 contained in http://www.itscj.ipsj.or.jp/sc34/def/BRM/JP-040_and_JP-046 OPC Conformance_-_Revised_v3.doc, in amendment of R 224 and R 211 which are otherwise accepted—so resolved.

Previous draft: 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:

Resolution 14: The BRM accepts the editing instructions contained in the section “ECMA: Proposal for Reorganizing DrawingML” of <http://www.itscj.ipsj.or.jp/sc34/def/BRM/KR-18-24-DrawingML-ECMA.doc> —so resolved.

Resolution 15: The BRM accepts the editing instructions contained in the following three files: http://www.itscj.ipsj.or.jp/sc34/def/BRM/Part_1_of_5_Conformance.doc , http://www.itscj.ipsj.or.jp/sc34/def/BRM/Part_5_of_5_Conformance.doc and http://www.itscj.ipsj.or.jp/sc34/def/BRM/US-multi-part_proposal_final.doc; with the understanding that the Scopes may be changed in a later Resolution, and the following changes: the proposed Part 4 (Primer) and the Annex covering accessibility guidelines shall become Annexes of the new Part 1; the following sentence shall be added after the sentence commencing “The Editor shall”: “The Editor is instructed to use ISO conformance language, ‘shall’, ‘should’ etc., in all normative text”—so resolved.

CA:

Resolution 16: Remove “(all parts)” from any reference in the text to ISO/IEC 10646:2003: so resolved.

MY-16: Names

No consensus emerged on the MY proposal; a reformulation by MY remained possible.

Tuesday 2008-02-26

MX-3 (R 857), MX-6 (R 92)

Part of “deprecate” discussion. All of VML will be displaced into a (normative) (“deprecated”) Annex.

Resolution 17: The BRM accepts the editing instructions contained in http://www.itscj.ipsj.or.jp/sc34/def/BRM/Response_MX-0003_VML.doc, as an amendment to R 92 in addition to those in Resolution 10—so resolved.

NL: no draft editing instructions or discussion points.

NZ-11 (R 94) Accessibility: five proposals.

Resolution 18: The BRM decides that a reference to the W3C “WAI” document on accessibility shall be inserted by the Editor—so resolved.

NO-1 (R 925), Scope

Draft resolution

Make the overall scope of ISO/IEC DIS 29500 the following:

“This International Standard defines a set of XML vocabularies for representing word-processing documents, spreadsheets and presentations. The goal of this standard is to represent faithfully the existing corpus of word-processing documents, spreadsheets and presentations that have been produced by Microsoft Office applications. It also specifies requirements for consumers and producers of Office Open XML.”

—result of the vote: for 10; against 13—**rejected**.

Resolution 19: The BRM decides that the text “(from Microsoft Office 97 to Microsoft Office 2008 inclusive)” shall appear in Scope texts after the text “Microsoft Office applications”—votes in favour: 17; against: 6; abstentions: 9; so resolved.

Resolution 20: The BRM decides to accept the editing instructions contained in <http://www.itscj.ipsj.or.jp/sc34/def/BRM/MultPartAndScope.doc>, ignoring everything after “Proposed resolution”, and with the following additions: a forward pointer to any terms defined elsewhere shall be used as necessary; and the text “(from Microsoft Office 97 to Microsoft Office 2008 inclusive)” shall appear after “Microsoft Office applications”—so resolved.

FR objected to Resolution 20.

It was previously proposed to replace the Scopes of the various parts by the relevant re-edited versions of the following:

“This International Standard defines a set of XML vocabularies for representing word-processing documents, spreadsheets and presentations. The goal of this standard is, on the one hand, to represent faithfully the existing corpus of word-processing documents, spreadsheets and presentations that have been [previously?] produced by Microsoft Office applications (from Microsoft Office 97 to Microsoft Office 2008 inclusive) and, on the other hand, to facilitate extensibility and interoperability. It also specifies requirements for consumers and producers of Office Open XML.”

Resolution 21: The BRM decides to instruct the Editor to incorporate an informative specification of the following, with a reference to it from the Scope:

- All XML elements which appear in ISO/IEC 29500 but do not appear in ECMA-376:2006
 - All XML elements which do not appear in ISO/IEC 29500 but appear in ECMA-376:2006
 - All XML attributes which appear in ISO/IEC 29500 but do not appear in ECMA-376:2006
 - All XML attributes which do not appear in ISO/IEC 29500 but appear in ECMA-376:2006
 - All enumeration values which appear in ISO/IEC 29500 but do not appear in ECMA-376:2006
 - All enumeration values which do not appear in ISO/IEC 29500 but appear in ECMA-376:2006
 - All simple types which appear in ISO/IEC 29500 but do not appear in ECMA-376:2006
 - All simple types which do not appear in ISO/IEC 29500 but appear in ECMA-376:2006
- so resolved.

PL-3 (R 190): errors in XML examples

UK: found many genuine errors (beyond ellipses and the fragment-ness of the examples), and are willing to share the results of the software tool used to check XML.

Resolution 22: The BRM decides that all examples throughout ISO/IEC DIS 29500 shall be well-balanced XML feasibly valid to the normative schemas, taking account of ellipses which may be used to shorten examples. The Editor is instructed to make these corrections, for checking by ITTF—so resolved.

PT-60 (R 98):

Resolution 23: The BRM accepts the editing instructions contained in <http://www.itscj.ipsj.or.jp/sc34/def/BRM/PT-60A2.doc> as modifications to R 93, R 98, R 78, R 80, R 82 and R 100, which are otherwise accepted except as modified in other Resolutions; with the following changes: the MIME type of text shall be given as “text/plain” and the MIME type of HTML shall be given as “text/html”; and “Open XML Math” shall be replaced with a reference to the appropriate part of this specification—so resolved.

CA and CZ objected to Resolution 23.

Resolution 24: The BRM accepts the editing instructions contained in <http://www.itscj.ipsj.or.jp/sc34/def/BRM/PT-60B2.doc>—so resolved.

ZA-6 (R 6)

Restructuring into parts (“deprecated”, Primer): there should be a clear Scope for any (new) Part decided.

Ecma: R 6 gives a road map (overall architecture) of the Parts proposed.

ZA: believes R 6 is not precise enough and requests clear instructions to the Editor to be generated. (The proposed treatment of the Primer is acceptable.)

US: is already working with BR, KR & Ecma on this problem, and would be glad to involve other NBs: what new structure (Parts),

AU: R 6 meets AU’s requirements already, and AU proposes to accept it (for now).

The BRM decided that ISO/IEC DIS 29500 would be split into multiple Parts (29500-1, 29500-2, 29500-3 etc.). Conformance criteria needed to be clearly stated for each Part.

BR objected to the above decision.

Proposed: The proposal in R 6 for 29500-1, 29500-2 and 29500-3 is accepted in principle. A Resolution must be drafted to describe precisely what is in each Part (including the Primer, “deprecated” features, conformance classes, etc.), and conformance must be clearly stated for each Part.

CH-17 (R 43)

Dates settled in a previous Resolution.

GB-182 et al (R 135): bit masks for values.

Proposal: change from bit fields to XML elements, except for fonts (which follow the relevant ISO standard).

DK: supports.

Resolution 25: The BRM decides to accept the editing instructions contained in http://www.itscj.ipsj.or.jp/sc34/def/BRM/Response_0135_bitfields.doc in place of R 135, replacing “deprecated” by “transitional”, and with the following addition: The Editor shall ensure that all existing attributes defining the bitfields described above shall be “transitional”—so resolved.

US-75 (R 65): enumeration formats (Part 4):

Resolution 26: The BRM decides to accept the editing instructions contained in http://www.itscj.ipsj.or.jp/sc34/def/BRM/Response_US-0075_numbering.doc as a replacement for R 65, replacing in lowerLetter and upperLetter descriptions the word “language” with “script” and striking out the word “modern”—so resolved.

AU-12 (R 9):

The repetition of complex type declarations in Part 4 introduces errors and gives duplicate and redundant normative text.

CA: some constraints may not be present elsewhere; even if they are, more work may be involved in looking them up if they are not included in line.

Resolution 27: The BRM decides that ISO/IEC DIS 29500 shall be changed so that the XML schemas are normative. The schemas shall be contained in a normative Annex and shall be line-numbered—so resolved.

Resolution 28: The BRM decides that no part of the schemas shall be repeated normatively in the body text. The body text shall refer to schema constructs by: Annex number, clause or subclause number, and declaration name; and by the line number for convenience—so resolved.

CA objected to Resolution 28.

Draft resolution: No part of the schemas shall be repeated in the body text—results of the vote: 7 for, 19 against—*rejected*.

IL: same applies to descriptions of complex types: will be dealt with when separately raised.

BE

CA-64 (R 84): non-XML characters

CA Proposal: inclusion of non-XML characters should be “deprecated” (or equivalent).

BR proposal: OPC should be only method used for binary encapsulation.

Ecma: agrees with BR; word “binary” should be deleted; only strings are intended. Agrees with CA to “deprecate”.

CA: software can easily make sure that no such characters are written; future standard should guarantee this.

Ecma will propose a definition of “new document”, as in “A new document shall not be created using deprecated features; only revision of an existing document may do this.”

Resolution 29: The BRM decides to accept the editing instructions contained in http://www.itscj.ipsj.or.jp/sc34/def/BRM/Response_CA-0064_escaped_characters.doc in addition to R 84, which is otherwise accepted—so resolved.

BR-43 (R 74) (related to CA-41): securityDescriptor

Resolution 30: The BRM decides to accept the editing instructions contained in http://www.itscj.ipsj.or.jp/sc34/def/BRM/CA-041_BR-043_Security_Descriptor.doc in replacement of R 74, but changing maxOccurs of the securityDescriptor element from 255 to unbounded—so resolved.

CZ-53 (R 41)

Resolution 31: The BRM decides to accept the editing instructions contained in <http://www.itscj.ipsj.or.jp/sc34/def/BRM/CZ-0053-corrected.pdf> in replacement of R 41, and also to correct in the same way all other occurrences of UTF-16 in the context of serializing Unicode strings for cryptographic operations—so resolved.

Resolution 32: The BRM decides to accept¹ the new text contained in http://www.itscj.ipsj.or.jp/sc34/def/BRM/Response_CZ-0053_hashing.doc —so resolved.

ZA: The hash algorithm should be improved in spite of the desire to guarantee backwards compatibility.

DK, US: The hashes actually stored in legacy documents must be able to be dealt with in some fashion.

CA: Any use of an unsatisfactory hash, including that stored in a legacy document, raises incorrect expectations as to the document’s integrity, and so it should be omitted totally.

DK: It would be even worse if the spec mentioned nothing. Whether false expectations are set is up to the application.

CA: With the two sets of attributes the following may be the correct solution: when there is no algorithm name and the attributes are transitional ones, apply the legacy algorithm; if the attributes are strict ones the algorithm name must be specified.

¹ *Note possible interference with R 102.*

US: Clarify strict vs. transitional; default hash; thoroughly check this redesign. The issue is not a security one for the document (which is not protected), but only to protect the unencrypted version of the password itself.

ZA, CA, DK, US will work on this, for possible solution before Friday 17:00.

DK

Resolution 33: With respect to “compatibility settings” the BRM accepts the Editor’s proposed editing instructions on this subject as captured by responses 122, 123, 124, 125, 126, 127, 128, 129, 130, 131, 132, 133 and 34, but additionally the Editor shall include a bi-directional cross-reference between the legacy compatibility settings and the new compatibility settings element—so resolved.

BR objected to Resolution 33.

EC-1

Wishes to consider a text from GR on dates, and will work with GR off-line.

FI-6 (R 21)

R 21 raises a question on redundancy of complex type attribute descriptions.

Resolution 34: The BRM decides to accept the instructions contained in http://www.itscj.ipsj.or.jp/sc34/def/BRM/Response_FI-0006_repeated_complex_types.doc as an addition to R 21 which is otherwise accepted—so resolved.

FR has no items it wishes to have discussed currently.

DE-150 (R 140), 161

Ecma is willing to remove this feature.

Resolution 35: The BRM decides to accept the instructions contained in http://www.itscj.ipsj.or.jp/sc34/def/BRM/Response_DE-0150_alternative_format_import_part.doc as a replacement for R 140, with the following changes: the MIME types shall be corrected as in Resolution 23—so resolved.

CZ objected to Resolution 35.

US:

Delete lines 15-17 of page 28 of ISO/IEC DIS 29500 (Part 1, 11.3.1).

UK

GR-92 (R 93)

GR: extra functionality provided by OO Math Markup Language can better be implemented as a separate namespace vocabulary in MathML, rather than as an incompatible self-contained specification as is contained in ISO/IEC DIS 25900.

AU: elements not allowed by the schema being used are not possible in MathML v3 (schemas specify the elements they will allow, and if this is a closed set—no wildcard—then foreign elements will be illegal) [this was later contradicted].

Ecma: MathML is not designed to be extended (as confirmed by W3C), and the OOXML solution was proposed for this reason.

ZA: OO MML is a large innovation, so an approach such as that suggested by GR would have merit.

CA: accessibility remains important, as much for OXML as for MathML, and CA is willing to work with others to advance this in the future.

IN-51 (R 973)

Ref. to external web site: ISO/IEC JTC 1 Directives and ITTF policy cover this, and the required specification will be and remain publicly available to users of International Standards.

IE-9 (R 92)

Continued compliance of legacy documents once future editions of OOXML are published (which presumably lose “deprecated” features).

CA: has some text concerning conformance classes which will be proposed when ready.

US: the corpus using “deprecated” features will continue to exist, and will continue to be conformant, because NBs will probably decide to retain the legacy features in future editions of ISO/IEC 29500.

MX: Legacy documents may be conformant to a specific part of 29500, which exists precisely to cover the existing corpus before edition 1 of 29500.

Wednesday 2008-02-27

Editorial: list provided by the Convenor:

Resolution 36: The following responses are accepted and the corresponding editing instructions are issued to the Editor with the additional instructions given at the end: 104, 171, 193, 197, 217, 218, 219, 242, 250, 253, 259, 260, 262, 275, 277, 278, 281, 297, 298, 314, 320, 321, 360, 367, 381, 382, 395, 398, 399, 400, 401, 404, 406, 407, 408, 420, 437, 442, 443, 446, 449, 451, 455, 456, 457, 459, 460, 478, 487, 488, 496, 513, 518, 520, 523, 524, 525, 527, 528, 547, 549, 560, 561, 563, 565, 608, 611, 632, 637, 638, 639, 648, 649, 650, 651, 652, 653, 654, 655, 656, 657, 661, 662, 663, 664, 665, 666, 667, 668, 669, 670, 671, 672, 673, 674, 675, 677, 679, 680, 681, 682, 683, 684, 685, 686, 687, 688, 737, 739, 740, 768, 814, 825, 827, 851, 852, 868, 873, 881, 896, 912, 916, 919, 922, 941, 984. In R 651, “when” shall be deleted. In R 739 and R 768 the NB proposed change shall be implemented. The change described in the NB proposed change in R 768 shall also be made in 2.16.5.44 and 2.16.5.45. In R 941 only the change from “contain” to “have” shall be made—resolved by consensus with three NBs opposed: BR, MY, ZA.

Three priority issues: dates; conformance classes incl. “deprecation”; restructuring (linked to previous item).

Ecma update on ongoing tasks.

Discussion on possible treatment of all responses which will not have been discussed by the end of the BRM: the Convenor presented four options.

Draft Resolution “Option 1”: The BRM decides to accept and implement all the dispositions of comments proposed by the Editor (“Responses”) which have not been explicitly accepted or rejected by the BRM in other ways (list enclosed)—no consensus.

Draft Resolution “Option 2”: The BRM decides to reject all the dispositions of comments proposed by the Editor (“Responses”) which have not been explicitly accepted or rejected by the BRM in other ways (list enclosed)—no consensus.

Option 3 received no significant support.

Option 4 was modified in discussion (Option 4 prime):

*Resolution 37 "Option 4 prime": The BRM decides to use the following form to decide, by majority voting, on each disposition of comments proposed by the Editor ("Response") which has not been explicitly accepted or rejected by the BRM in other ways (list enclosed). A simple majority of "Approved"s of the votes on that "Response" will be required to implement each Response; abstentions are not counted. In the event of a tie on a "Response", no editing instruction will result from that "Response"—results of the vote: 29 in favour; none against; two abstentions (DE, BE): **so resolved**.*

ISO/IEC DIS 29500 Ballot Resolution Meeting

== Voting Paper ==

National Bodies are requested to use this form to record their positions on proposed dispositions by the Project Editor as recorded in N 980, in accord with the resolution passed by the meeting.

Note: decisions taken in meeting sessions which apply to proposed dispositions shall override any results arrived at through counting National Body votes as registered using this form.

National Body _____

We wish to record the following position for responses not otherwise decided upon in the resolutions of the meeting.

Approve [] Disapprove [] Abstain []

We do not wish to record any position []

Exceptions

Exceptions to the above default position (if any) may be recorded in the following table. If no default position is given above, the following are the votes we wish to submit.

Response Number	Position
	Approve [] Disapprove [] Abstain []
	Approve [] Disapprove [] Abstain []
	Approve [] Disapprove [] Abstain []
	Approve [] Disapprove [] Abstain []
	Approve [] Disapprove [] Abstain []
	Approve [] Disapprove [] Abstain []

Responses decided upon in the BRM and therefore not subject to voting by the voting form:

9, 16, 18, 19, 21, 28, 30, 34, 41, 42, 43, 65, 74, 78, 80, 82, 84, 91, 92, 93, 94, 98, 100, 103, 104, 119, 120, 121, 122, 123, 124, 125, 126, 127, 128, 129, 130, 131, 132, 133, 134, 135, 140, 147, 171, 190, 193, 197, 211, 217, 218, 219, 224, 231, 242, 250, 253, 259, 260, 262, 275, 277, 278, 281, 297, 298, 314, 320, 321, 344, 360, 362, 364, 367, 381, 382, 395, 398, 399, 400, 401, 404, 406, 407, 408, 420, 437, 442, 443, 446, 449, 451, 455, 456, 457, 459, 460, 478, 487, 488, 496, 513, 518, 520, 523, 524, 525, 527, 528, 547, 549, 560, 561, 563, 565, 608, 611, 620, 632, 634, 637, 638, 639, 648, 649, 650, 651, 652, 653, 654, 655, 656, 657, 661, 662, 663, 664, 665, 666, 667, 668, 669, 670, 671, 672, 673, 674, 675, 677, 679, 680, 681, 682, 683, 684, 685, 686, 687, 688, 701, 703, 705, 726, 729, 732, 736, 737, 739, 740, 768, 814, 825, 827, 851, 852, 868, 873, 881, 890, 896, 912, 916, 919, 922, 925, 941, 973, 984 and 992.

Thursday 2008-02-28

Two rounds of review of all, and adoption of some, outstanding draft resolutions.

IL-31, IL-27, IL-4, IL-1, IL-19:

Resolution 38: The BRM accepts, as a modification to the relevant Responses 703, 701, 726, 732 and 736 respectively which are otherwise accepted, the editing instructions contained in the five files:

<http://www.itscj.ipsj.or.jp/sc34/def/BRM/IL-0001-Mati.doc>,

<http://www.itscj.ipsj.or.jp/sc34/def/BRM/IL-0004-Mati.doc>,

<http://www.itscj.ipsj.or.jp/sc34/def/BRM/IL-0019-Mati.doc>,

<http://www.itscj.ipsj.or.jp/sc34/def/BRM/IL-0027-Mati.doc> and

<http://www.itscj.ipsj.or.jp/sc34/def/BRM/IL-0031.doc>, with the following change: example 2.18.44 shall be updated in an identical manner to example 2.3.1.13—so resolved.

IT: on a BE comment (R 44): proposal to come.

JP:

Resolution 39: The BRM accepts R 344—so resolved.

R 229, R 634—JP & Ecma

Resolution 40: The BRM accepts R 634 and the editing instructions contained in

http://www.itscj.ipsj.or.jp/sc34/def/BRM/Response_JP-0070.pdf—so resolved.

CL-108 (R 147): How many /e switches are allowed? Arbitrarily many (like all switches).

Resolution 41: The BRM accepts R 147—so resolved.

MY-15 (R 30)

Resolution 42: The BRM accepts the editing instructions in the section “Option 2” contained in <http://www.itscj.ipsj.or.jp/sc34/def/BRM/MY-0015-CEILING-Response-30-v9.pdf> as a replacement of R 30—so resolved.

MX-1 (R 231)

Resolution 43: The BRM accepts R 973, and the instructions contained in

http://www.itscj.ipsj.or.jp/sc34/def/BRM/MX-0001_ZIP_compression_Proposal.doc as a replacement of R 231—so resolved.

NL: none to discuss.

NZ-6, NZ-12, NZ-14, NZ-15, NZ-52: document provided on Thursday; resolved elsewhere.

NO:

R 425, R 624, R 977: object linking.

Draft Resolution: The BRM accepts R 425, R 624, R 977—was intended to be decided on Friday.

Friday 2008-02-29

Discussions and approval/rejection of various draft resolutions.

END