### Template for comments and secretariat observations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MB¹</th>
<th>Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex (e.g. 3.1)</th>
<th>Paragraph/ Figure/Table/ Note (e.g. Table 1)</th>
<th>Type of comment²</th>
<th>Comment (justification for change) by the MB</th>
<th>Proposed change by the MB</th>
<th>Secretariat observations on each comment submitted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BR</td>
<td>Part 4, foreword</td>
<td>Page vi, line 2</td>
<td>ed</td>
<td>DIS 29600 is a multi-part document, not a multi-part Standard (the individual parts of this Standard are not themselves standards).</td>
<td>The sentence should be written as: 'This Standard deals with Office Open XML Format-related technology …'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BR</td>
<td>Part 4, All</td>
<td></td>
<td>ge</td>
<td>The document does not make the notice in the introduction as defined in the ISO/IEC Directives, Part 2 – Annex F</td>
<td>Make the proper change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
   "lineWrapLikeWord6"[1],
   "mwSmallCaps"[2], "shapeLayoutLikeWW8"[3],
   "suppressTopSpacingWP"[4],
   "truncateFontHeightsLikeWP6"[5],
   "useWord2002TableStyleRules"[6],
   "useWord97LineBreakRules"[7],
   "wpJustification"[8],
   "wpSpaceWidth"[9],
   "autoSpaceLikeWord95"[10],
   "footnoteLayoutLikeWW8"[11]
whose are defined in terms of mimicking a legacy application’s behavior. The standard contains insufficient detail on how to replicate this behavior. | This group of elements should be more explained, describing details about how to implement it including one example for each case, and all references to mimic actions should be replaced by reproduce actions defined in publicly available external documents by authoritative entities for each element. By authoritative entities we mean the holder of the technical specification and/or the IPR. |                                                  |
| BR  | Part 4                                   |                                             | te               | It is desired to have improved interoperability among other ISO document standards. | Identified (but not limited to) ISO 26300 attributes are: |                                                  |

¹ MB = Member body (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by **)

² Type of comment:  ge = general   te = technical   ed = editorial

NOTE Columns 1, 2, 4, 5 are compulsory.

ISO electronic balloting commenting template/version 2001-10
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MB¹</th>
<th>Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex (e.g. 3.1)</th>
<th>Paragraph/ Figure/Table/ Note (e.g. Table 1)</th>
<th>Type of comment²</th>
<th>Comment (justification for change) by the MB</th>
<th>Proposed change by the MB</th>
<th>Secretariat observations on each comment submitted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MB</td>
<td>Section 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Text blinking;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Table cell protection;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>An option to specify &quot;Numbers of lines&quot; for window or orphans lines;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>'Manual' and 'From left' alignment in tables;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Last line alignment in justified paragraph (provision that we can change the last line of the paragraph as Left, Center and Justify);</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>'Leading' line spacing in a paragraph;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tabs fill character of a paragraph;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>'Title' and 'lowercase' style options;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Table can have 'keep with next paragraph' set;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A 'May Break Between Rows' attribute so as not to split a table;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Allow entire sections to be marked as hidden;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Background Image in Tables;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Contents in a multi-column section can be evenly distributed resulting in balanced columns;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>An option to rotate the text by 90 or 270 degrees;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Any number of rows can be selected for repeating Heading;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Copy Heading while splitting Table;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Table Shadowing Style;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Vertical numbering in list items;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Image can be positioned absolutely within a frame;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ability to set arbitrary Text background color</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Before/after text around foot notes references,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Keep ratio feature for frames, columns for frames/text-boxes,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ability to assign to assign different page colors through the document,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Note embedded in text-boxes, ability to set each</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ MB = Member body (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by **)

² Type of comment:  ge = general  te = technical  ed = editorial

NOTE  Columns 1, 2, 4, 5 are compulsory.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MB</th>
<th>Clause No./Subclause No./Annex (e.g. 3.1)</th>
<th>Paragraph/Figure/Table/Note (e.g. Table 1)</th>
<th>Type of comment</th>
<th>Comment (justification for change) by the MB</th>
<th>Proposed change by the MB</th>
<th>Secretariat observations on each comment submitted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BR</td>
<td>Part 4, Section 2.2.1 background (Document Background)</td>
<td>page 28, line 1</td>
<td>te</td>
<td>The sentence 'or auto to allow a consumer to automatically determine the background color as appropriate.' does not define the appropriate behavior of the consumer, whereas the definition of the corresponding simple type, found in Part 4, page 1737, explicitly states that 'This value shall be used to specify an automatically determined color value, the meaning of which is interpreted based on the context of the parent XML element.'</td>
<td>Change the text to: ‘… or auto to allow a consumer to automatically determine the background color according to section 2.18.44’.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BR</td>
<td>Part 4, Section 2.2.1 background (Document Background)</td>
<td>page 28, line 1</td>
<td>ed</td>
<td>The definition of the themeColor attribute references the document's Theme part without properly defining it nor providing an explicit reference to the OOOXML section that defines it.</td>
<td>Include the reference to the Theme Part definition section in the text: Part 1, Section 14.2.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BR</td>
<td>Part 4, Section 2.2.1 background (Document Background)</td>
<td>page 27, lines 8 and 21</td>
<td>te</td>
<td>Contradicting use of accent3 and accent5</td>
<td>Make the appropriate corrections.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BR</td>
<td>Section 2.15.1.28 DocumentProtection Pg. 1158</td>
<td>te</td>
<td>The described algorithms make use of byte-level manipulations which depend on the machine architecture (big endian versus little endian).</td>
<td>Make the byte ordering assumptions explicit, both for the input password and the processing steps, in order to allow cross-platform interoperability.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 MB = Member body (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by **)  
2 Type of comment: ge = general  te = technical  ed = editorial  
NOTE Columns 1, 2, 4, 5 are compulsory.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clause No./Subclause No./Annex</th>
<th>Paragraph/Figure/Table/Note</th>
<th>Type of comment</th>
<th>Comment (justification for change) by the MB</th>
<th>Proposed change by the MB</th>
<th>Secretariat observations on each comment submitted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BR Section 2.15.1.28 DocumentPro</td>
<td>Protection Pg. 1158</td>
<td>te</td>
<td>The algorithm description does not specify the Unicode encoding of the input password.</td>
<td>Specify the Unicode encoding (e.g. UTF-16BE, UTF-16LE, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BR Part 4 Section 2.15.2.32</td>
<td></td>
<td>te</td>
<td>This feature has been defined in a way which ignores the existence of current browsers other than Internet Explorer. This section requires that &quot;all settings which are not compatible with the target web browser shall be disabled.&quot;</td>
<td>This item should be reviewed concerning the use of other browsers than IE.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BR Part 4 Section 2.15.3</td>
<td></td>
<td>te</td>
<td>These compatibility settings are only for versions of Microsoft Word. No allowance has been made for legacy settings from other applications.</td>
<td>This section should make clear that all the settings are specific for Microsoft Office and that all other settings should use the extensibility mechanisms described in Part 5 of this specification.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BR Part 4 Section 2.15.3.16</td>
<td></td>
<td>te</td>
<td>Ecma 376 section 2.15.3.16 &quot;doNotLeaveBackslashAlone&quot; (page 2180). &quot;This element specifies whether applications should automatically convert the backslash character into the yen character when it is added through user keyboard input&quot;. This makes reference to dynamic behaviors that are out of the scope of the OOOXML standard proposal.</td>
<td>No application behaviour should be defined</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BR Part 4 Section 2.16.5.33</td>
<td></td>
<td>te</td>
<td>This subclause defines an INCLUDEPICTURE field which &quot;Retrieves the picture contained in the document named&quot;. This does not define how a picture is named.</td>
<td>Use the Open Packaging Convention (Part 2 of this specification) nomenclature to define the relationships.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BR Part 4 Section 2.16.5.77</td>
<td></td>
<td>ed</td>
<td>The example that illustrates USERINITIALS section instead shows USERNAME.</td>
<td>Replace in this section the USERNAME text by USERINITIALS in order to follow the title subject.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BR Part 4 Section 2.16</td>
<td>Page 1487</td>
<td>te</td>
<td>All field definitions from section 2.16.5 give no formal definition for what a 'field value' might be.</td>
<td>Include in lines 17-21 a clear definition for 'field value'.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BR Part 4 Section 2.16.1 Syntax</td>
<td>page 1487, line 23</td>
<td>te</td>
<td>The general syntax does not mention that some fields (described in section 2.16.5) have specific syntax</td>
<td>Explain in the beginning of line 23 that some fields can have specific syntaxes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BR Part 4 Section 2.16.1</td>
<td>page 1489, line 2</td>
<td>te</td>
<td>The field argument syntax does not denote that quotes should be used in pairs between text</td>
<td>The field argument syntax should be written as: &quot;text&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 MB = Member body (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by **)  
2 Type of comment: ge = general te = technical ed = editorial  
NOTE Columns 1, 2, 4, 5 are compulsory.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MB1</th>
<th>Clause No./ Subclause No./Annex (e.g. 3.1)</th>
<th>Paragraph/ Figure/Table/ Note (e.g. Table 1)</th>
<th>Type of comment2</th>
<th>Comment (justification for change) by the MB</th>
<th>Proposed change by the MB</th>
<th>Secretariat observations on each comment submitted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BR</td>
<td>Syntax</td>
<td>Page 1489, line 17</td>
<td>te</td>
<td>The 'one or two Latin letters' sentence does not define clearly define what characters to use</td>
<td>The sentence should be written as 'one or two letters of the Latin alphabet in upper or lower cases.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BR</td>
<td>Part 4, Section 2.16.4.3 General formatting</td>
<td>Page 1501</td>
<td>te</td>
<td>The ALPHABETIC switch argument has no documented ST_NumberFormat equivalent.</td>
<td>Include the text: “Corresponds to an ST_NumberFormat enumeration value of upperLetter.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BR</td>
<td>Part 4, Section 2.16.5.2 ADVANCE</td>
<td>page 1509, line 14</td>
<td>te</td>
<td>The definition of 'switches' given here contradicts the one given page 1489 lines 3-5. (Zero or more versus one or more.)</td>
<td>Make the appropriate corrections</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BR</td>
<td>Part 4, Section 2.16.5.2</td>
<td>Page 1510</td>
<td>ed</td>
<td>The \d, \l, \r, \u, \x and \y switch arguments definitions refer to 'text in this switch's field-argument' using a font that suggests that 'text' is a structural subpart of 'field-argument'</td>
<td>Correct the text formatting to avoid confusion (no italics).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BR</td>
<td>Part 4, Section 2.16.5.2</td>
<td>page 1510, line 3</td>
<td>te</td>
<td>The example is not given in XML</td>
<td>Adjust the example, showing it in XML syntax.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BR</td>
<td>Part 4, Section 2.16.5.12 BIDIOUTLINE</td>
<td>page 1518, line 22</td>
<td>te</td>
<td>The text 'A paragraph number' is dubious.</td>
<td>The text should be written as: 'Numeric value representing the paragraph number'.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BR</td>
<td>Part 4, Section 2.16.5.3 ASK</td>
<td>page 1510, line 14</td>
<td>ed</td>
<td>The 'Prompts the user to enter information...' sentence explicitly references a runtime behavior.</td>
<td>The text should be written as: 'The consumer may enter information to be assigned to the bookmark designated by field-argument-1 to represent the user's response. Text in field-argument-2 specifies the prompt text, which should be displayed in a proper input device'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 MB = Member body (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by **)  
2 Type of comment: ge = general  te = technical  ed = editorial  
NOTE  Columns 1, 2, 4, 5 are compulsory.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MB1</th>
<th>Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex (e.g. 3.1)</th>
<th>Paragraph/ Figure/Table/ Note (e.g. Table 1)</th>
<th>Type of comment2</th>
<th>Comment (justification for change) by the MB</th>
<th>Proposed change by the MB</th>
<th>Secretariat observations on each comment submitted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BR</td>
<td>Part 4, Section 2.16.5.24 FILESIZE</td>
<td>page 1531, line 26</td>
<td>ed</td>
<td>The <em>Retrieves</em> verb explicitly references a runtime behavior.</td>
<td>The text should be written as: 'The size of the current document in bytes'.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BR</td>
<td>Part 4, Section 2.16.5.24 FILESIZE</td>
<td>page 1531, line 27</td>
<td>te</td>
<td>The sentence &quot;It needs to be obtained from the file system&quot; denotes an specific application behavior</td>
<td>The sentence should be removed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BR</td>
<td>Part 4, Section 2.16.5.40 LISTNUM</td>
<td>page 1544, line 2</td>
<td>te</td>
<td>The values given in the table make no sense. Most probably, 'iii' instances stand for 'i' instances.</td>
<td>Make the appropriate corrections to the table.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BR</td>
<td>Part 4, Section 2.16.5.40 LISTNUM</td>
<td>page 1543, line 12 and 13</td>
<td>te</td>
<td>The definition for 'LISTNUM' is built upon the concepts of 'current' or 'specific' or 'next series', which are not defined in this context.</td>
<td>Those concepts should be defined in the text, and their definition should either be copied or referenced in the context of the definition for 'LISTNUM'.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BR</td>
<td>Part 4, Section 2.16.5.43 MERGEREC</td>
<td>page 1546, line 17</td>
<td>ed</td>
<td>The sentence ‘Results in «MERGEREC».’ Is meaningless.</td>
<td>Remove the sentence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BR</td>
<td>Part 4, 2.16.5.65 SKIPIF</td>
<td>page 1560, line 8</td>
<td>te</td>
<td>The field name written in syntax definition is wrong</td>
<td>The field name in syntax definition should be written as &quot;SKIPIF&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BR</td>
<td>Part 4, Section 2.16.5.71 TEMPLATE</td>
<td>page 1565, line 4</td>
<td>te</td>
<td>The <em>Retrieves</em> verb explicitly references a runtime behavior.</td>
<td>The text should be written as: ‘The file name of the template used by the current document.’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BR</td>
<td>Part 4, Section 2.16.5.71 TEMPLATE</td>
<td>page 1565, line 5</td>
<td>te</td>
<td>The sentence 'The disk file name of the template used by the current document’ explicitly references a runtime behavior.</td>
<td>The text should be written as: ‘The file name of the template used by the current document.’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BR</td>
<td>Part 4, Section 2.16.5.72 TIME</td>
<td>page 1565, line 18</td>
<td>ed</td>
<td>The <em>Retrieves</em> verb explicitly references a runtime behavior. The sentence 'The Gregorian calendar is always used' is inadequate.</td>
<td>The text should be written as: ‘The current date and time, as represented in the Gregorian calendar’.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 MB = Member body (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by **) 
2 Type of comment: ge = general     te = technical     ed = editorial 
NOTE Columns 1, 2, 4, 5 are compulsory.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MB1</th>
<th>Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex (e.g. 3.1)</th>
<th>Paragraph/ Figure/Table/ Note (e.g. Table 1)</th>
<th>Type of comment2</th>
<th>Comment (justification for change) by the MB</th>
<th>Proposed change by the MB</th>
<th>Secretariat observations on each comment submitted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BR</td>
<td>Part 4, Section 2.18.4</td>
<td></td>
<td>te</td>
<td>The artwork provided here is of poor quality providing neither intended scale, spacing, color depth, etc. A small example diagram is an insufficient definition.</td>
<td>The artworks presented should be more precise in terms of definitions (scale, spacing, color, depth)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BR</td>
<td>Part 4, Section 2.18.45</td>
<td></td>
<td>te</td>
<td>Length is said to be “exactly 3 characters”. This is inconsistent with the example given which has a length of 6 characters.</td>
<td>This item should be reviewed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BR</td>
<td>Part 4, Section 2.18.52</td>
<td></td>
<td>te</td>
<td>This type is defined as containing, “a two digit hexadecimal language code”. It is further stated that, “This simple type’s contents must have a length of exactly 2 characters”. However, two hex digits can count up to 255 and the values enumerated in this clause go far beyond that.</td>
<td>The size of this element should be reviewed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BR</td>
<td>Part 4, Section 2.18.57</td>
<td></td>
<td>te</td>
<td>The description of this type says it contains four hexadecimal digits, four hexadecimal octets and exactly four characters. These definitions are not compatible. A hexadecimal octet is two hexadecimal digits.</td>
<td>This item should be reviewed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BR</td>
<td>Part 4, Section 2.18.66</td>
<td>Pg. 1771</td>
<td>te</td>
<td>This section lacks normative definitions of the enumeration values mentioned (eg. Korean Chosung Numbering).</td>
<td>Make the proper references to the normative definitions of the enumeration values.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BR</td>
<td>Section 2.18.66</td>
<td>Pg. 1771</td>
<td>te</td>
<td>Several counting systems are defined to use letters of the alphabet, but nothing is mentioned about how counting continues once the letters of the alphabet are exhausted (e.g. lowerLetter and upperLetter).</td>
<td>Define in the specification the method to be used when the letter of the alphabet are exhausted.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BR</td>
<td>Section 2.18.66</td>
<td>Pg. 1771</td>
<td>te</td>
<td>Format requires use of “dash” to surround the number, but no indication of which Unicode dash is intended. (e.g. en-dash, em-dash, hyphen-minus, figure-dash, quotation-dash, etc).</td>
<td>Define the Unicode dash symbol to be used.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BR</td>
<td>Section 2.18.66</td>
<td>Pg. 1771</td>
<td>te</td>
<td>The formatting system described here is not comprehensive, lacking, for example, support for Armenian, Tamil, Greek alphabetic, Ethiopic and Khmer numerations, all in use today, as well as the various historical systems still used by scholars.</td>
<td>Change to use a more flexible, extensible, generative approach to numeration, such as that used by the W3C’s XSLT specification (RFC’s or STD’s) in their xsl:number support</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BR</td>
<td>Section 2.18.66</td>
<td>Pg. 1772</td>
<td>te</td>
<td>Format is defined in reference to the “Chicago Manual of Style”, but no edition or page reference is provided.</td>
<td>Either include the entire definition in the standard, or provide a proper external reference.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 MB = Member body (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by **)  
2 Type of comment: ge = general  te = technical  ed = editorial  
NOTE Columns 1, 2, 4, 5 are compulsory.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MB1</th>
<th>Clause No./Subclause No./Annex (e.g. 3.1)</th>
<th>Paragraph/Figure/Table/Note (e.g. Table 1)</th>
<th>Type of comment2</th>
<th>Comment (justification for change) by the MB</th>
<th>Proposed change by the MB</th>
<th>Secretariat observations on each comment submitted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BR</td>
<td>Section 2.18.66</td>
<td>Pg. 1772</td>
<td>te</td>
<td>The example given does not show enclosed alphanumeric glyph characters and so contradicts the normative text.</td>
<td>Correct the example given, showing the enclosed alphanumeric glyph characters.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BR</td>
<td>Section 2.18.66</td>
<td>Pg. 1773</td>
<td>te</td>
<td>There are several mentions of double-byte and single-byte Arabic numbering schemes. Since the conformance clause for DIS 29500 requires the use of Unicode either UTF8 or UTF16 encodings, there should be no mention of other encodings.</td>
<td>Make references according to the conformance clause.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BR</td>
<td>Part 4, Section 2.18.72</td>
<td></td>
<td>te</td>
<td>No definition is provided for a “Panose-1 classification” of a font. Length is said to be “exactly 10 characters”. This is inconsistent with the example given which has a length of 20 characters.</td>
<td>This item should be reviewed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BR</td>
<td>Part 4, Section 2.18.85</td>
<td></td>
<td>te</td>
<td>The fill patterns lack definitions. The illustrations given are insufficient. An application needs to know what in these illustrations are required behaviors and what are not.</td>
<td>This element should have more details in order to explain how to implement it.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BR</td>
<td>Part 4, Section 2.18.86</td>
<td></td>
<td>te</td>
<td>The description of this type says it contains two hexadecimal digits, two hexadecimal octets and exactly two characters. These definitions are not compatible. A hexadecimal octet is two hexadecimal digits.</td>
<td>This item should be reviewed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BR</td>
<td>Part 4, Section 2.18.106</td>
<td></td>
<td>te</td>
<td>Length is said to be “exactly 1 character”. This is inconsistent with the earlier language and the schema fragment given which defines it as being 1 octet long or two characters.</td>
<td>This item should be reviewed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BR</td>
<td>Part 4, Section 3.2.29</td>
<td></td>
<td>te</td>
<td>The conversion from input password to single byte string is ambiguous. Certainly the input password could contain characters from more than one script, say some Korean, some Chinese. No normative description of the password hashing algorithm is provided, so interoperability of this feature cannot be assumed. In an informative section, 5-pages of C-language source code is provided as “an example”, and this appears to involve machine-dependent bit manipulations.</td>
<td>This item should define the encoding, and has to describe how to deal with scripts from different languages such as (but not limited to) Korean or Armenian. This description should be more well explained, and the example should be done in a different way – with independence of machine or OS.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BR</td>
<td>Section protectedRa</td>
<td></td>
<td>te</td>
<td>No normative description of the password hashing</td>
<td>Provide a normative, cross-platform definition of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<thead>
<tr>
<th>MB¹</th>
<th>Clause No./Subclause No./Annex (e.g. 3.1)</th>
<th>Paragraph/Figure/Table/Note (e.g. Table 1)</th>
<th>Type of comment²</th>
<th>Comment (justification for change) by the MB</th>
<th>Proposed change by the MB</th>
<th>Secretariat observations on each comment submitted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MB¹</td>
<td>3.3.1.69</td>
<td>nge Pg. 2003</td>
<td>ge</td>
<td>algorithm is provided, only an example is given. The interoperability of this feature cannot be assumed.</td>
<td>the hashing algorithm.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BR</td>
<td>Section 3.3.1.69</td>
<td>protectedRange Pg. 2004</td>
<td>te</td>
<td>The securityDescriptor attribute, “defines user accounts who may edit this range without providing a password to access the range”, but no information is given as to what user accounts are referred to here, or what the delimiter is.</td>
<td>Substitute &quot;user accounts&quot; with a more generic account (e.g. security account), and define this account, in order to provide cross platform implementation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BR</td>
<td>Section 3.13.12</td>
<td>textPage Pr Pg. 2471</td>
<td>te</td>
<td>The values for the codePage attribute are presented only as an example list. There is not a normative reference for the valid code pages.</td>
<td>Make the proper normative reference to the code pages standard.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BR</td>
<td>Part 4, Section 3.17.4 Dates and Times</td>
<td>page 2522, lines 7 and 8</td>
<td>te</td>
<td>The sentence ‘As dates and times are numeric 8 values, they can take part in arithmetic operations.’ might be misleading since arithmetics on dates and times can result ill-formed values</td>
<td>The sentence should be removed or be written as: ‘As dates and times are numeric 8 values, they can take part in arithmetic operations. Arithmetic operations on dates and times can result ill-formed values.’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BR</td>
<td>Section 3.17.4.1</td>
<td>Pg. 2522</td>
<td>te</td>
<td>The restriction to only two date bases limits the range of serial dates starting from 01-01-1900, limiting the representation of historical dates.</td>
<td>Allow a range of other declared date bases or allow explicitly negative date serial values to express dates prior to 1900.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BR</td>
<td>Section 3.18.30</td>
<td>ST_FileType Pg. 2859</td>
<td>te</td>
<td>This element defines values for use on Windows and Macintosh platforms, but not for any other operating systems.</td>
<td>Define values to allow cross platform interoperability.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BR</td>
<td>Part 4, Section 3.18.86</td>
<td></td>
<td>te</td>
<td>Length is said to be “exactly 4 characters”. This is inconsistent with the schema fragment given which defines it as being 4 octets long or 8 characters.</td>
<td>This item should be reviewed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BR</td>
<td>Part 4, Section 3.18.87</td>
<td></td>
<td>te</td>
<td>Length is said to be “exactly 2 characters”. This is inconsistent with the schema fragment given which defines it as being 2 octets long or 4 characters.</td>
<td>This item should be reviewed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BR</td>
<td>Part 4, Section 5.1.12.28</td>
<td></td>
<td>te</td>
<td>Length is said to be “exactly 3 characters”. This is inconsistent with the schema fragment given which defines it as being 3 octets long or 6 characters. This type is used in only two places, 5.1.2.2.32 and 5.1.2.2.33, in both cases to represent an RGB color value. Since you already have defined a ST_HexColorRGB type that should be used.</td>
<td>This item should be reviewed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ MB = Member body (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by **)  
² Type of comment: ge = general te = technical ed = editorial  
NOTE Columns 1, 2, 4, 5 are compulsory.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MB</th>
<th>Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex (e.g. 3.1)</th>
<th>Paragraph/ Figure/Table/ Note (e.g. Table 1)</th>
<th>Type of comment</th>
<th>Comment (justification for change) by the MB</th>
<th>Proposed change by the MB</th>
<th>Secretariat observations on each comment submitted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BR</td>
<td>Part 4, Section 5.1.12.37</td>
<td></td>
<td>te</td>
<td>Length is said to be &quot;exactly 10 characters&quot;. This is inconsistent with the schema fragment given which defines it as being 10 octets long. No font distance metric or font matching heuristic is described.</td>
<td>This item should be reviewed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BR</td>
<td>Part 4, Section 5.1.3.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>te</td>
<td>No mention is made of what audio formats or codecs are permitted.</td>
<td>This item should be reviewed considering interoperability and flexibility.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BR</td>
<td>Part 4, Section 5.1.3.4</td>
<td></td>
<td>te</td>
<td>This describes the attachment of a QuickTime video to a presentation object. No description of the QuickTime format is provided. Without specifying a version and supported codecs, there will be no interoperability.</td>
<td>This item should describe the supported codecs and version of the Quicktime.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BR</td>
<td>Part 4, 6.1.2.1 arc</td>
<td>page 4352</td>
<td>te</td>
<td>The description of the 'dgmlayout' attribute states that 'The possible values for this attribute are defined by the XML Schema integer datatype', while the preceding description only assigns meanings to the 0, 1, 2 and 3 values.</td>
<td>Make the proper change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BR</td>
<td>Part 4, Section 6.1.2.1 arc (Arc Segment)</td>
<td>page 4393</td>
<td>ge</td>
<td>The Cascading Style Sheets, Level 2 specification is defined by an external document.</td>
<td>The reference should be removed from this section and a proper reference should be included in Part 1, Annex A, Bibliography.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BR</td>
<td>Part 4, Section 6.1.2.19</td>
<td></td>
<td>te</td>
<td>This describes the &quot;equationxml&quot; attribute of &quot;shape&quot; elements, &quot;used to rehydrate an equation using the Office Open XML Math syntax&quot;. However, the &quot;actual format of the contents of this attribute are application-defined&quot;, which makes them impossible to exchange between applications. If we're going to have a new math markup language in XML, and ignore the existing MathML, let's at least use the new markup in its elemental form, as well-formed XML (not stuffed into an attribute value), and without extending it in application-dependent ways.</td>
<td>This element attribute should be clearly defined or removed from this document.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BR</td>
<td>Part 4 Section 6.1.2.19</td>
<td></td>
<td>te</td>
<td>Describes a &quot;gfxdata&quot; attribute for the &quot;shape&quot; elements, which &quot;contains DrawingML content&quot; that is &quot;base-64 encoded&quot;. However, the &quot;contents of this package are application-defined&quot;, so even though they &quot;shall use the Parts defined by this Standard whenever possible&quot; there</td>
<td>This element attribute should be clearly defined or removed from this document.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BR</td>
<td>Part 4 Section 6.2.2.14</td>
<td></td>
<td>te</td>
<td>This describes an &quot;ink&quot; element which stores &quot;ink annotations in an application-defined format.&quot; This is apparently intended to store annotations, used with tablet input devices to add hand-written annotations to documents. These annotations are often a vital part of documents and their specification is undefined in OOXML. We are opposed to standardizing placeholder elements for entirely application-dependent proprietary formats without also specifying an interoperable format for those who wish to create interoperable formats.</td>
<td>This element attribute should be clearly defined or removed from this document.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BR</td>
<td>Part 4 Section 6.4.3.1 and 6.4.2.10</td>
<td>Pg. 4955, Pg. 4927</td>
<td>te</td>
<td>The allowed values of this enumeration, EMF, WMF, etc., are Windows specific formats. No allowance seems to have been made for use by other operating systems.</td>
<td>Allow full cross platform interoperability to formats that are used by other operating systems (e.g. PNG, OGG, etc.).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BR</td>
<td>Part 4 Section 7.4.2.4</td>
<td>Pg. 5122</td>
<td>te</td>
<td>The presence of non-XML characters, escaped, or not escaped in an OOXLM document, is contrary to interoperability of XML and XML-based tools.</td>
<td>The W3C's Internationalization states &quot;Control codes should be replaced with appropriate markup.&quot;, the bstr type should be revised and the control codes that demands this data type should be properly converted to XML, based on the OPC-Open Package Convention specification.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BR</td>
<td>Part 4 Section 7.4.2.5</td>
<td>Pg. 5122</td>
<td>te</td>
<td>This element defines values for use on Windows and Macintosh platforms, but not for any other operating systems.</td>
<td>Define values to allow cross platform interoperability.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BR</td>
<td>Section 7.4.2.5</td>
<td>Pg. 5122</td>
<td>te</td>
<td>There is not enough information given to achieve interoperability (e.g. the allowed values and meanings for a &quot;built-in Windows clipboard format value&quot; are not presented).</td>
<td>Clarify the meanings and values of the terms used.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BR</td>
<td>Section 7.4.2.5</td>
<td>Pg. 5122</td>
<td>te</td>
<td>The value of -3 specifies a GUID that contains a format</td>
<td>Specify GUID and FMTID.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BR</td>
<td>Section 7.4.2.5</td>
<td>stringsAsNull pg. 5122</td>
<td>te</td>
<td>The usage of null-terminated C-style strings is avoiding XML and will cause the markup to interoperate poorly with XML-based tools.</td>
<td>Rewrite the clause to express this feature in an application and platform independent way.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BR</td>
<td>Section 2.15.3</td>
<td>Pg. 1368</td>
<td>te</td>
<td>The &quot;Compatibility Settings&quot; are not available to understand how the document is rendered.</td>
<td>The references in the &quot;Compatibility Settings&quot; section should be made to full publicly available information.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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