

Date	Issues	Raised By	Replies	Replied By	Status	Issue Type
08-Jul-07	Microsoft's reply is misleading as the URL link had an email instead of the binaries and that when the email is sent, the format offered is Office 2007 instead of the older binaries. Moreover according to the Microsoft takes no responsibility for presentation fidelity of documents on using Word 2007 formats (that we presume is OOXML). Hence OOXML may not guarantee presentation fidelity, affecting an important characteristics of document interoperability.	Mr Gautam			Pending	
02-Jul-07	Let X be a document from the existing body of Microsoft binary file formats. Let g be a an application that transforms X to Y where Y is a OOXML file format i.e. $g(X) = Y$ . Can $g()$ be defined by OOXML standards completely ?	Dr Bhattacharya				Technical
02-Jul-07	Let f1 be an application that adheres to all mandatory aspects of OOXML and let f2 be an application that processes all optional parts of OOXML. Let f be a conjunction of f1 and f2. For all x belonging to X where X is a body of documents adhering to Microsoft binary file formats, if $f(x) = y$ and $f1(x) = y1$ , will $y = y1$ hold true for all x belonging to X.	Dr Bhattacharya				Technical
02-Jul-07	Let f1 be an application that adheres to all mandatory aspects of OOXML and let f2 be an application that processes all optional parts of OOXML. Let f be a conjunction of f1 and f2. For all x belonging to X where X is a body of documents adhering to OOXML, if $f(x) = y$ , will $f1^{-1}(y) = x$ for all x belonging to X..	Dr Bhattacharya				Technical
02-Jul-07	Does OOXML support macros ?	Dr Bhattacharya				Technical
02-Jul-07	<p>After detailed study of the minutes of the meetings and based on my &gt; knowledge of computer science, my inputs are the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>&gt; 1. I cannot find specifications for rendering of shapes in OOXML, such &gt; as "box", "Polygon" etc that are otherwise used in Microsoft Office</li> <li>&gt; 2. I also find the clarifications on current issues raised quite &gt; unsatisfactory. For example, for the issue "Will a pure OOXML compliant &gt; application be &gt; able to open the existing implementations of the MS Office documents and &gt; all previous versions as indicated in this line", the clarification &gt; column does not contain a "yes" or "no" answer. Based on my &gt; understanding, it will not be possible to open older versions of &gt; microsoft office documents with just OOXML specifications.</li> <li>&gt; 3. The clarification to the question "it is not clear as to what files &amp; &gt; applications are referred to in this line" is given as "The applications &gt; referred to in this line &gt; are versions of Microsoft Office and the files produced using them." I &gt; fail to understand why the Indian government and academicians have to &gt; spend precious national resources to consider standards that support a &gt; specific company's older flawed file formats. The proper conclusion of &gt; the above clarification is that OOXML is a standard to support &gt; Microsofts older and current file formats and hence should be treated as &gt; an internal standard of Microsoft that they or may not choose to &gt; publish. It is extremely inappropriate to even consider it, leave alone &gt; to adopt it as an international standard. In fact OOXML is not even a &gt; national standard of the country of origin of the standard.</li> <li>&gt; 4. I would strongly advice that NIC be requested to take active &gt; participation in these technical discussions. The discussions are &gt; incomplete from an national perspective without inputs from NIC.</li> </ul>	Prof S K Gupta				Technical
13-Jun-07	<p>I am strongly of the view that voting for OOXML by BIS at ISO will increase the digital divide in India and will harm the domestic industry and economy. After discussions with my colleagues, I do not find any reason why a separate document standards of OOXML needs to be adopted when a fully functional ODF standard already exists and has Indian implementations also.</p> <p>Moreover, the stated objective of OOXML is to support Microsoft office. Further, OOXML has only one known implementation . There is no need to make a standard out of a format that has only one known implementation. OOXML will clearly prevent Indian software firms from coming out with their own office productivity solution that is so critical for reducing the digital divide.</p> <p>Given the size of the OOXML documentation, it is also not practically implemetable.</p> <p>Therefore my opinion is that BIS must vote against OOXML at ISO.</p>	Prof S K Gupta				Technical
06-Jun-07	Application independence: IS the OOXML specification free from any references to particular products of any vendor and their specific behavior?	Dr Nagarjuna			Pending	Technical
06-Jun-07	How does OOXML incorporate pre-existing standards in the same area	Dr Nagarjuna			Pending	Technical
06-Jun-07	Backward compatibility for all vendors: Can any third party regardless of business model, without access to additional information and without the cooperation of Microsoft implement full backward compatibility and conversion of such legacy documents into MS-OOXML comparable to what Microsoft can offer?	Dr Nagarjuna			Pending	Technical

06-Jun-07	Proprietary extensions: Does MS-OOXML allow proprietary extensions? Which are the safeguards in the MS-OOXML specification against abusive behavior?	Dr Nagarjuna			Pending	Technical
06-Jun-07	Dual standards: Why did and does Microsoft refuse to participate in the existing standardization effort? Why does it not submit its technological proposals to OASIS for inclusion into ODF?	Dr Nagarjuna			Pending	Technical
06-Jun-07	Is it legally safe. Does the national standardization body have its own, independent legal analysis about the exact nature of the grant to certify whether it truly covers the full spectrum of all possible MS-OOXML implementations?	Dr Nagarjuna			Pending	Technical
13-Jun-07	Refer to the following JTC1 directives (Annexure I) that are mandatory: "Standards designed to facilitate interoperability need to specify clearly and unambiguously the conformity requirements that are essential to achieve the interoperability. Complexity and the number of options should be kept to a minimum and the implementability of the standards should be demonstrable. Verification of conformity to those standards should then give a high degree of confidence in the interoperability of IT systems using those standards. However, the confidence in interoperability given by conformity to one or more standards is not always sufficient and there may be need to use an interoperability assessment methodology in demonstrating interoperability between two or more IT systems in practice." 1. A standard is not supposed to cover the maximum number of features possible but should cover the minimum number of points of standardization. What are the features supported by OOXML that are necessary and are currently not supported by ODF ? 2. How has the verification of conformity to OOXML standards proposed to be done and has it been done till date by an independent third party ?	Dr Bhattacharya			Pending	Technical
04-Apr-07	What are the design goals of OOXML and what are the list of functionalities which OOXML has in excess to ODF that ODF is incapable of supporting now and that is impossible to be made supportable by ODF even after making changes to ODF	Prof Rajanish Dass			Pending	Technical
06-Jun-07	The option of embedding custom XML schema in OOXML defeats the purpose of an open standard. How can one ensure interoperability if custom schemas are supported by OOXML	Dr Nagarjuna			Pending	Technical
04-Apr-07	It is not feasible to analyze the entire 6000+ pages of documentation at such short notice.	Dr Geetika Sharma			Pending	Technical
06-Jun-07	Is there exists any known complete implementation of OOXML other than the claimed Microsoft Office 2007.	Dr Bhattacharya	No	Mr Kapur	Closed	Technical
06-Jun-07	Given that the design goals of OOXML is to support the existing corpus of Microsoft documents, How any company other than Microsoft can decode the existing proprietary/legacy documents, and convert them into open XML by following the published OOXML specification.	Dr Bhattacharya			Pending	Technical
07-May-07	Has compliance of the single implementation of OOXML (i.e MS Office) has been checked by any independent 3 <sup>rd</sup> party in the manner the multiple ODF implementations have been checked.	Dr Bhattacharya	No	Mr Kapur	Pending	Technical
07-May-07	Whether an OOXML compliant application be able to open the existing implementations of the MS Office documents and all previous versions.	Dr Nagarjuna			Pending	Technical
07-May-07	A document encoding standard should be 100% decodable for it satisfy the criteria for being inter operable OOXML fails in this regard.	Dr Nagarjuna			Pending	Technical
07-May-07	A single interoperable standard will lead to wide spread of digital advantage, while multiple standards will block its spread	Dr Nagarjuna			Pending	Technical
07-May-07	Document Encoding must not be application specific; Document belongs to the user and not to the application vendor. OOXML is an application specific encoding.	Dr Nagarjuna			Pending	Technical
25-Jun-07	In the response to my note [Why Ecma 'Why Ecma OOXML is not a free/open document standard?'] Microsoft makes it clear that in their understanding interoperability does not require 100% decodability.[MS's comments on my paper] What they seem to call interoperability is the ability to operate successfully between the vendors with whom they have an understanding. Interoperability is not achieved by this process.  I reiterate: A document encoding standard must be 100% decodable, else it cannot serve the purpose of interoperability.  We must not admit any private language components within the encoding.  If we do not have such an assurance which should be provided by the national standardisation bodies through independent counsel and experts, and in particular not by Microsoft or its business partners, which have a direct conflict of interest on this issue, BIS should say vote against ooxml.	Dr Nagarjuna			Pending	Technical

	<p>The OOXML serves the purpose of converting the existing Microsoft owned proprietary documents into an XML serialization. Since the outcome of this will contain elements like "useWord97LineBreakRules", "footnoteLayoutLikeWW8", "autoSpaceLikeWord95" "useWord2002TableStyleRules", etc.</p> <p>E.g: from file wml.xsd:</p> <pre>wml.xsd: &lt;xsd:element name="useWord97LineBreakRules" type="CT_OnOff" minOccurs="0" wml.xsd: &lt;xsd:documentation&gt;Emulate Word 6.x/95/97 Footnote Placement&lt;/xsd:documentation&gt; wml.xsd: &lt;xsd:element name="autoSpaceLikeWord95" type="CT_OnOff" minOccurs="0"&gt; wml.xsd: &lt;xsd:documentation&gt;Emulate Word 95 Full-Width Character Spacing&lt;/xsd:documentation&gt; wml.xsd: &lt;xsd:element name="useWord2002TableStyleRules" type="CT_OnOff" minOccurs="0"&gt;</pre> <p>Such tags have no value to other vendors other than Microsoft. Such a model therefore is meant to preserve some private namespace, and cannot be called a standard. The purpose of a standard cannot be to preserve historical blunders. If accepted, this will also create a undesirable precedent in the standardization process.</p>					
25-Jun-07	Therefore this process will not lead to interoperability.	Dr Nagarjuna			Pending	Technical
25-Jun-07	Who owns the IPR on the OOXML-ODF converters that are being developed under Microsoft sponsorship in open source ?	Mr Gautam			Pending	Technical
25-Jun-07	Since the OOXML to ODF converters that are being developed in the open source domain are funded by Microsoft, what happens if Microsoft decides to stop this funding or Microsoft folds up ? Does Microsoft undertake to fund this converter initiative in perpetuity, supporting all future versions of OOXML and ODF ?	Dr Bhattacharya			Pending	Technical
25-Jun-07	WTO TBT Annexure 3, Code of good practice for preparation, adoption and application of standards clearly indicates avoiding duplication of standards. So how can India vote for adoption of OOXML by ISO in violation of WTO principles	Mr Gautam			Pending	Technical
25-Jun-07	What are the checks and balances to avoid misuse and monopolistic advantage to one single vendor when and if OOXML becomes a defacto standard. What is the market share of the next competing word processor in the market ? Wouldn't a positive vote by BIS violate MRTP	Mr Gautam			Pending	Technical
13-Jun-07	Need more clarity on the Open Specification Promise of Microsoft which claims it wont assert patent claims against those implementing OOXML.	Mr Purkayastha			Pending	Technical
25-Jun-07	Are there any suitable converters for other office suite applications like Spreadsheets and Presentations.	Mr Gautam			Pending	Technical
25-Jun-07	The license agreement of Microsoft which states one can use the technology on offer by Microsoft only if they agree not to allow sub licensing. This will hamper royalty free access to this standard in perpetuity	Mr Purkayastha			Pending	Technical
25-Jun-07	Where is the definition of the Shape in OOXML. More specifically, where is the shape "Explosion" defined in OOXML	Dr Bhattacharya			Pending	Technical
25-Jun-07	In the Microsoft workshop on OOXML, it was stated that OOXML has been started as a standard with community participation for only 13 months. How can such a fundamental piece of technology be accepted for standardization with so little time in public discussions with peer companies and customers ? Most technologies that have been adopted as a ISO standard has been in public discussion for atleast 3 years. Since document format has far reaching implications in the country's quest for reducing digital divide, the standard should be discussed threadbare further in public before being adopted as a global standard. There is no hurry to to adopt OOXML as a global standard without further strengthening it	Dr Bhattacharya			Pending	Technical
25-Jun-07	Open Packaging Convention used in OOXML is used by only Microsoft and Microsoft ISV's who want to use Microsoft's API's. This shows the ability of OOXML: to create vendor lock-in and tremendous dependence on only one technology firm	Mr Gautam			Pending	Technical
25-Jun-07	Security issue: What is malicious code is dropped into the .zip package and passed around as an OOXML file ? What protection does OOXML provide ?	Mr Gautam			Pending	Technical
13-Jun-07	Would BIS or any other national body in India be able to evaluate if a product is OOXML compliant ?	Dr Nagarjuna				Technical
13-Jun-07	Can national bodies reasonably be expected to competently evaluate a proposed standard exceeding 6,000 pages within the time and constraints of fast-track procedures, particularly given the host of issues raised by the particular proposal at issue?	Dr Bhattacharya			Pending	Technical
04-Apr-07	Is the proposed standard necessary nonetheless, i.e., is there a market requirement for a duplicative standard that contradicts ISO/IEC 26300, the Open Document standard?	Dr Nagarjuna	Based on experience, it is quite common to have ISO/IEC standards whose scopes overlap partially or completely. Below are detailed studies of some cases in areas close to this OpenXML discussion. Overlap is warranted when the standards address distinct user requirements and/or allow for diversity and evolution of the technologies.	Microsoft	Pending	Technical
13-Jun-07	The specifications for the binary file formats -- the compatibility with which is the very reason given for the proposed standard -- are nowhere disclosed, which worrying appears to enable extending its existing office software monopoly to monopolize the migration of those binary formats to XML. However, Microsoft's nondisclosure of binary format specifications is at issue in antitrust litigation or under investigation.	Dr Nagarjuna			Pending	Technical

07-May-07	Ecma 376 section 3.17.4.1 page 3305, "Date Representation", conflicts with the Gregorian calendar in the calculation of dates. Specifically, it requires spreadsheet implementations to incorrectly treat the year 1900 as a leap year. This contradicts the Gregorian calendar, ISO 8601 and the civil calendar adopted by most nations of the world. ISO 8601 is the ISO standard for date and time representations. Ecma 376 section 3.17.4.1 page 3305, "Date Representation" stipulates that dates must be represented as numeric codes counting from 1900 or 1904. This is in conflict with ISO 8601. This section also forbids applications from supporting years before 1900, also in conflict with ISO 8601	Mr Gautam	numeric formulas as is normal for spreadsheets. OpenXML supports two systems for converting numbers to their date format representations: 1. The 1900 date base system represents the technical decisions, including technical errors, of a prominent early spreadsheet implementation, namely, Lotus 1-2-3TM. This representation provides legacy compatibility. 2. The 1904 date base system that correctly reflects Gregorian calendar dates. thus OpenXML does not contradict ISO 8601 or the Gregorian calendar.	Microsoft	Pending	Technical
06-Jun-07	Ecma 376 section 2.18.52 page 2530, ST_LangCode requires the use of a fixed list of numeric language codes rather than the already existing set provided by ISO 639. This is a conflict with ISO 639.	Dr Nagarjuna	Comments suggesting a contradiction with ISO 639 appear to be based on a misunderstanding of the specification. OpenXML actually makes full use of the ISO 639-1 standard. The part of the specification in question, where the ST_LangCode simple type is defined (§2.18.52), lists approximately 225 values for different languages; however, that list is not used directly by any element or attribute within the specification. Instead, it is used by a separate simple type, ST_Lang, as defined in §2.18.51. The ST_Lang simple type is defined as being either a string that is an ISO 639-1 letter code plus a dash plus an ISO 3166-1 alpha-2 letter code, or the ST_LangCode. The use of the ISO 639-1 letter code style is the primary use, and the ST_LangCode model is a fallback alternative if the producer would rather use the hexadecimal values as defined in §2.18.52. As such, Ecma sees no contradiction with ISO 639-1.	Microsoft	Pending	Technical
07-May-07	Existence of Embedded Objects (Section 6.2.3.17 ) and Clipboard Format Types(section 6.4.3.1 page 5738) refer to Windows meta files instead of the ISO standards hence causing severe deterrence to interoperability.	Dr Nagarjuna	OpenXML documents can contain embedded graphics files in any format, including Computer Graphics Metafiles (ISO/IEC 8632). In the specific comments about ISO/IEC 8632, two sections in the specification, §6.2.3.17, "Embedded Object Alternate Image Request Types" and §6.4.3.1, "Clipboard Format types" were mentioned as making reference to Windows Metafiles and Enhanced Metafiles. These clauses name Windows Metafiles and Enhanced Metafiles as possible values in enumerated lists; the specification does not require that they be used.  The first clause in question (§6.2.3.17) allows for any graphic format, including a Computer Graphics Metafiles file. The other clause in question (§6.4.3.1) is not used for the actual display or rendering of the object, but instead suggests an application behavior. The suggested behavior is whether there is a specific format to be used if the item is placed on the clipboard. The types of formats to be specified allow for any graphic format, including a Computer Graphics Metafiles file. Some NBs indicated that perceived contradictions with ISO/IEC 8632 had been reported but did not elaborate further. Issues related to perceived contradictions with the Computer Graphics	Microsoft	Pending	Technical
07-May-07	SVG is the W3C standard "for describing two-dimensional vector and mixed vector/raster graphics in XML". Ecma 376 section 14 page 132, "DrawingML" defines a vector drawing XML format in conflict with the industry standard W3C SVG. Ecma 376 section 8.6.2 page 24, "VML", requires support for another drawing XML format in conflict with W3C SVG. Note that VML was proposed by Microsoft as a W3C standard in 1998, but was rejected in favour of SVG.	Dr Nagarjuna				Technical
07-May-07	MathML is the W3C standard for "describing mathematical notation and capturing both its structure and content". Ecma 376 section 7.1 "Math" (page 747) covers mathematical expressions and defines a format in conflict and incompatible with the W3C Recommendation MathML. Note: MathML is included in the ISO/IEC 26300 standard (OpenDocument Format) in section 12.5 "Mathematical Content". As a result, Ecma 376 conflicts with an ISO specification for mathematical notation.	Dr Nagarjuna	unable to use MathML and SVG, etc., because the W3C does not have an MoU with JTC1. There is no binding in ISO or IEC requires that an international standard reuse existing standards	Microsoft	Pending	Technical

30-Jun-07	<p>The above response that Microsoft were unable to use SVG and MathML since W3C does not have an MoU with JTC1 is unsatisfactory since it did not prevent them from using XML and XML schema which are from the W3C. Also ISO definition of a standard says "[A] document, established by consensus and approved by a recognized body, that provides, for common and repeated use, rules, guidelines or characteristics for activities or their results, aimed at the achievement of the optimum degree of order in a given context. NOTE Standards should be based on the consolidated results of science, technology and experience, and aimed at the promotion of optimum community benefits." ( ISO/IEC Guide 2:2004, definition 3.2) .The "consolidated results of science, technology and experience" in the field of markup languages are are clearly the existing set of W3C and ISO standards. So ISO, by definition, implicitly encourages the reuse of existing standards when it says that new standards should be "based on the consolidated results of science, technology and experience"</p>	Dr Nagarjuna		Microsoft	Pending	Technical
04-Apr-07	<p>Ecma 376 section 2.15.1.28 (page 1941) does not follow the advice of any of the international organizations. Instead, it defines new hashing algorithms that have not undergone scrutiny by the cryptographic community. Section 2.15.1.28 (page 1941) defines one; Sections 3.3.1.69 (page 2786) "protectedRange" and 3.2.29 (page 2698) define another very similar algorithm. Nowhere is there clear notification that these algorithms are likely to be extremely flawed and thus should not be used in new applications. This poses two security risks:</p> <p>#1 The immediate risk is that hashed document passwords may be determinable from the hashed value. Since users often reuse document passwords for other documents and other systems (whether they should or not), including an inadequately reviewed hash function risks enabling forgery and identity theft of many other systems by attackers.</p> <p>#2 Defining a new hash function inside an ISO standard (giving it the ISO seal of approval) creates the expectation that this hash function has received proper scrutiny by the cryptographic community (like ISO 10118-3 has) and is secure. This is likely to lead the industry into using the new insecure hash function(s) in a variety of security-critical applications, making many other security-critical applications directly vulnerable as well.</p>	Mr Gautam	OpenXML does not use hash functions for security purposes. Instead, they are used as an obfuscation mechanism for preventing passwords from being reverse engineered based on the hash. This approach in no way contradicts with ISO/IEC 10118-3:2005 as it does not prevent that standard's use on the same system and it enables compatibility with legacy documents. If there is any disagreement on the technical approach used in the password hash, however, that should be addressed during the 5-month ballot.	Microsoft	Pending	Technical
04-Apr-07	<p>The w:sz element is an example of major internal inconsistencies in the specifications measurements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For fonts, the w:sz element specifies the size in half points (2.3.2.36, page 1013).</li> <li>• For frameset, the w:sz element has a string value that could be a relative value, a percentage, or a number of pixels (2.15.2.39, page 2136). The examples on page 2138 do not refer to w:sz at all.</li> <li>• However, as the child of rPr (3.4.1.1, page 2846), its value is in points.</li> </ul> <p>Note that in the Spreadsheet section (section 3), none of the examples have any namespace prefixes. The w:sz attribute is also internally inconsistent:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For table borders, the w:sz attribute is specified in eighths of a point, unless the border style is an art border, in which case the width is in points (2.3.1.4, page 824).</li> <li>• When used as an attribute of restoredLeft (4.3.2.11, page 3786), it specifies the size of a dimension in normal view as a percentage of the screen.</li> <li>• In presentations, as an attribute of the ph element (4.4.1.33, page 3825), it is an enumerated value with choices "full", "half", and "quarter" (4.8.13, page 3957).</li> <li>• When sz is used as an attribute of defRPr (default character properties (5.1.5.3.2, page 4197), it is the size of a font in hundredths of a point.</li> </ul> <p>Such inconsistencies dramatically increase the complexity of implementing the specification. All measurement specifications should be evaluated and adapted as necessary to provide a coherent system of measurements applied throughout the specification consistently to minimize the number of inconsistencies.</p>	Dr Nagarjuna			Pending	Technical
06-Jun-07	Ecma 376 shows inconsistent use of the percentages in certain sections of OpenML specification.	Dr Bhattacharya	percentage used in certain sections of the OpenXML specification and those used in HTML. In §2.15.1.95, "zoom (Magnification Setting)", §2.18.97, "ST_TblWidth (Table Width Units)", and §5.1.12.41, "ST_Percentage (Percentage)", the percentage values allowed have been limited to integers to permit efficient parsing and processing. (Use of the % symbol and allowing non-integer decimal values would introduce parsing complexity.) In §2.18.85, "ST_Shd (Shading Patterns)", the enumerated set of shading patterns includes patterns other than shading densities. The names for the patterns that do represent shading densities are considered names rather than percentage values intended for calculation.	Microsoft	Pending	Technical
04-Apr-07	<p>Ecma 376 uses confusing and inconsistent definitions of values with hexadecimal numbers. For example, section 2.18.52 page 2531, ST_LangCode, is defined on the text as a "two digit hexadecimal code". But the values given cannot be represented by only two hexadecimal digits, but needs four.</p> <p>This is very likely to cause serious confusion in developers trying to implement Ecma 376. However, in other places (such as the definition for ST_LongHexNumber), it notes that 4 octets can store 8 hexadecimal digits (which is correct), so it is not simply a matter of defining "digit" oddly. This problem also suggests a lack of review, since clearly 4-digit values cannot fit in fields where only 2 digits are permitted.</p> <p>More examples: Attribute Page Spec says ST_ShortHexNumber 2591 "two octet hexadecimal number" ST_LongHexNumber 2542 "four octet (eight digit) hexadecimal number" ST_LangCode 2531 "two digit hexadecimal code"</p>	Dr Nagarjuna			Pending	Technical

25-Jun-07	<p><b>Unspecified terms: plain text</b> Ecma 376 section 11.3.1 ((page 38) "Alternative Format Import Part", allows content in "plain text". The encoding for "plain text" is not specified (is it 7-bit ASCII? ISO 8859-1? UTF-8?). As specified it will not allow international interoperable use.</p>	Dr Nagarjuna		Pending	Technical	
07-May-07	<p>Ecma 376 contradicts the goals of XML which are: 6. XML documents should be human-legible and reasonably clear. 10. Terseness in XML markup is of minimal importance.</p> <p>Instead, Ecma 376 often uses unclear names and inconsistent naming conventions. These include unnecessary vowel removals, name truncations, and unusual abbreviations. These bizarre names: • Reduce readability, making understanding such files and tools to process them unnecessarily more difficult. • Greatly increase the risk of misunderstandings and confusion among developers, increasing the risk of incorrectly generated or processed documents. • Make the specification unnecessarily hard to understand by developers whose native language is not English - inappropriate for an international standard.</p>	Dr Nagarjuna		Pending	Technical	
13-Jun-07	<p><b>Inflexible numbering format</b> Section 2.18.66 page 2554, ST_NumberFormat, Numbering Format for number lists (2.9.18 page 1581), footnotes (2.11.17 page 1645), endnotes (2.11.18 page 1646), captions (2.15.1.16 page 1912) and Page numbers (2.6.12 page 1412). • Fixed to a few countries. Many regions are not included. • Contradicts W3C XSLT which ISO 26300 uses. • Contradicts Unicode ISO 10646.</p>	Dr Nagarjuna		Pending	Technical	
13-Jun-07	<p><b>Section 6.2.3.23 page 5197 Attribute "href" (Hyperlink Target) uses a Namespace "urn:schemas.microsoft.com:office:office". An Ecma standard must not reference company-specific namespaces. This should be replaced by an Ecma namespace.</b></p>	Dr Nagarjuna		Pending	Technical	
07-May-07	<p><b>Nonstandard, inflexible paper-size naming</b> Sections 3.3.1.61 (page 2770) and 3.3.1.62 (page 2774), both of which involve printer settings, define a "paperSize" attribute whose value is an integer representing one of 68 fixed paper sizes. These papersize codes are apparently based on corresponding [http://support.microsoft.com/kb/135639 paper-size registry codes] in Microsoft Windows, rather than using the standard paper-size names as defined in [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Paper_size ISO 216, ANSI Y14.1, and similar standards]. In contrast, ISO 26300 employs a much more flexible scheme: it simply describes the paper size by recording the physical width and height of the page, leaving the assignment of symbolic paper-size names to the user interface.</p>	Mr Gautam	The paper size enumerations in OpenXML are not in contradiction with ISO 216 as the enumerations include values for common use ISO 216 paper sizes as well as paper, envelope, fanfold, and specialty dimension media in common use and applicable within the specifications' scope and context. The paper size enumerations are documented within, and maintained as part of OpenXML. Any other aspects of the perceived contradictions related to paper size are matters for the 5-month ballot.	Mr Kapur	Pending	Technical
06-Jun-07	<p>Ecma 376 uses bitmasks, inhibiting extensibility and use of standard XML tools. OOXML makes use of "bitmasks" to encode multiple boolean (true/false) values into a single integer. Although this was once common 20 years ago when programming in C in constrained memory environments, it is considered very bad style in XML. It makes processing by standard XML tools like XSLT extremely difficult, since these tools lack bit-level operations needed to effectively process data at the bit level.</p>	Dr Nagarjuna		Pending	Technical	
13-Jun-07	<p><b>Undisclosed proprietary specifications</b> Section 6.2.3.17 "Embedded Object Alternate Image Requests Types" (page 5679) requires implementors to support the proprietary Windows Metafiles.</p>	Dr Nagarjuna	Regarding the lack of description of "OLE, macros/scripts, encryption, and DRM", while the level of documentation is not an issue of contradiction, it is important to point out that implementing OpenXML places no requirements on support for proprietary technologies. Macros, encryption, and DRM are not used in the OpenXML specification, and therefore no further documentation is necessary for full compliance. OLE is referenced within the OpenXML specification, but as an example method for embedding objects from external applications. There is no requirement that OLE be used as the technology for such embedding.	Mr Kapur	Pending	Technical
25-Jun-07	<p>the WordProcessingML part of OOXML lists a large number of "Compatibility Settings"<sup>4</sup> which provide Microsoft the ability to store information related to various behaviors from their legacy applications. These settings have names like: "footnoteLayoutLikeWW8", "autoSpaceLikeWord95" and "useWord97LineBreakRules."<sup>5</sup> However, the OOXML specification merely lists the names of these settings. It does not define them. Microsoft alone knows what these settings mean, but it declines to give a precise definition of them. This clearly is not precise and certainly does not provide for repeatable or common practice of these features.</p>	Dr Bhattacharya		Pending	Technical	
13-Jun-07	<p>The response given by Microsoft w.r.t the length of the specification that the core of ECMA 376 lies in Part I and part 3 and that it covers all the basic concepts in 474 pages is misleading. It is in fact the Part 4 which is at over 5000 pages which is the core of the specification, since it is where all the technical specification is present.</p>	MR Gautam		Pending	Technical	
25-Jun-07	<p>the WordProcessingML part of OOXML lists a large number of list styles representing various different writing systems, language and business conventions.<sup>7</sup> These are given names such as "chicago", "ideographDigital", "ideographLegalTraditional", "koreanDigital2" and "koreanLegal". These are merely labels, and again, are not precisely defined. The would-be implementors of the OOXML specification are told that something called "Korean Legal Numbering" exists, but they are not told what it means or how to practice it in their application</p>	Dr Bhattacharya		Pending	Technical	

25-Jun-07	<p>The SpreadsheetML part of OOXML describes a "securityDescriptor" attribute, which according to the specification8:</p> <p>"...defines user accounts who may edit this range without providing a password to access the range. Removing this attribute shall remove all permissions granted or denied to users for this range."</p> <p>This is an important security-related feature that tells the application which users are allowed to edit a range in a spreadsheet without a password. A would-be programmer implementing this feature would need to know how these user accounts are represented in the document. Are they comma-delimited? Semi-colon delimited? Space-delimited? OOXML does not provide those details (although it does imply that more than one name is allowed). Also, there is no universal concept of digital identity. We all have multiple user accounts, for email, for database, for machine access, for domain controllers, for LDAP, etc. Which one is intended here? This function lacks sufficient definition to allow interoperability, which in the end is what repeatable, common use is all about.</p>	Dr Nagarjuna			Pending	Technical
26-Jun-07	<p>Industry records its best practices through standardization. The existing body of document and markup standards represents a compendium of reviewed, approved, and implemented best practices. The work of the World Wide Web Consortium (W3C)9 is especially relevant to XML document formats, since they maintain the core XML standard as well as related standards such as XHTML, CSS2, XSL, XPath, XForms, SVG, MathML and SOAP, the standards that represent the very backbone of XML and XML-related technologies.</p> <p>OOXML, however, incorporates very little of the consolidated best practices of the industry. Worse, would-be implementors of OOXML are asked to use Microsoft's proprietary, legacy formats, even when relevant and superior W3C standards are at hand.</p>	Mr Gautam			Pending	Technical
26-Jun-07	<p>Not only does OOXML fail to provide a consolidation of best practices from science, industry and experience, it fails to provide a consolidation of Microsoft's own best practices. OOXML recommends that print settings (number of pages to print, which pages to print, orientation, print quality, etc.) be stored in a platform-specific binary format. For example on Windows their guidance is to store in what is called the "DEVMODE" structure.16 Doing so would render the print settings platform dependent and prevent interoperability. But at the same time, Microsoft's new specification, "XML Paper Specification" (XPS) offers a PrintTicket element of which Microsoft says:</p> <p>"PrintTicket technology is the successor of the current DEVMODE structure. It is an eXtensible Markup Language based document that specifies and persists information about job formatting and print job configuration.... Relative to the current print subsystem, the PrintTicket technology enables all components and clients of the print subsystem to have transparent access to the information currently stored in the public and private portions of the DEVMODE structure, using a well-defined XML format."17</p> <p>Why is OOXML getting the inferior, binary, unportable, platform- and application-dependent print settings, when Microsoft's own recommended practice is to move to a "well-defined XML format?"</p>	Dr Nagarjuna			Pending	Technical
25-Jun-07	<p>OOXML defines a ST_CF type21, which records the allowed clipboard formats which may be used with a graphical object. The allowed values of this type, EMF, WMF, etc., are all proprietary Windows formats. No allowance has been made for use by other operating systems. For example, in Linux images are typically copied on the clipboard in an open standard format like PNG. But if a vendor encodes "PNG" into a document record of this type, the document will be invalid, and the document and the application will not conform to the OOXML specification.</p>	Dr Nagarjuna			Pending	Technical
25-Jun-07	<p>The definition of a password hashing algorithm in SpreadsheetML is given by presenting 5-pages of C-language source code, likely extracted from Excel. However, the bit manipulations of this code are inherently machine-dependent, and will give different results depending on the processor architecture. A document created on one machine may not be readable on a different machine. OOXML has not provided a portable definition of this function.</p>	Dr Nagarjuna			Pending	Technical
26-Jun-07	<p>The "optimizeForBrowser" element of WordProcessingML has been defined in a way which ignores the existence of current browsers other than Internet Explorer. What about Firefox? What about Safari? What about Opera? None of these can be set as target browsers. This section in OOXML requires that "all settings which are not compatible with the target web browser shall be disabled." What if I want my application to produce standards-compliant output? So yes to PNG, no to VML, yes to MathML and SVG? A would-be implementor is not able to specify this with the way OOXML has been designed.</p>	Dr Nagarjuna			Pending	Technical
26-Jun-07	<p>The "Slide Synchronization Properties" feature of DrawingML, provides the ability for a presentation to synchronize slide content with centrally-stored slides on a server. This is a feature of Microsoft PowerPoint and SharePoint. However, the description of this feature in OOXML lacks sufficient details. What is the communication protocol? What is the data model? Although standards exist for describing a client-server protocol of this sort, namely the various Web Services standards, OOXML gives no information. Independent interoperable implementations of this function are prevented and the one implementation that exists will be tied to SharePoint.</p>	Dr Bhattacharya			Pending	Technical

26-Jun-07	<p>An example of a concern is the spreadsheet function NETWORKDAYS(). This function is defined by OOXML to return the number of working days between two dates, exclusive of any weekends in that interval. For some cultures, the weekend is Saturday and Sunday. For others, the days of rest are either Thursday/Friday or Friday/Saturday. OOXML does not define "weekend" and does not provide a way for the user to define it either. As implemented in Excel the function assumes the weekend is always Saturday/Sunday. This spreadsheet function is defined in a way which renders an incorrect answer for potentially billions of people across the globe. OOXML lacks cultural adaptability. Compare this to the same function in OpenDocument Format, where the user may pass in an additional parameter to override the default definition of a weekend.</p> <p>This is in clear violation of ISO/IEC JTC1 Directives, 5<sup>th</sup> Edition, Version 3.0, Section 1.2 which says: "A purpose of IT standardization is to ensure that products available in the marketplace have characteristics of interoperability, portability and cultural and linguistic adaptability."</p>	Dr Bhattacharya			Pending	Technical
25-Jun-07	<p>WordProcessingML defines a number of numeration styles for numbered lists. These numeration styles were essentially only labeled, but not defined. These styles are also defined as a closed list, again matching what Microsoft Word supports, but they are not extensible by other vendors. However, the list of styles provided is incomplete, lacking, for example, support for Armenian, Tamil, Greek alphabetic, Ethiopic and Khmer numerations, as well as the larger number of historic systems used by scholars. The preferred solution is to use a declarative/generative approach, such as used by the W3C's XSL:FO and OpenDocument Format. This allows an open-ended list of numeration styles to be used, each self-defining.</p>	Mr Gautam			Pending	Technical
26-Jun-07	<p><b>The "compatibility with legacy formats" can only be implemented by Microsoft</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• As indicated, Ecma 376 requires implementors to emulate the behaviour of previous Microsoft products. As the behaviour is not specified, and the products are proprietary, only Microsoft can implement those portions of the specification.</li> <li>• Ecma 376 requires implementors to support Windows Metafiles instead of ISO 8632. As Windows Metafiles are a proprietary technology, only Microsoft can implement this portion of the specification reliably.</li> <li>• Ecma 376 section 11.3.1 "Alternative Format Import Part" allows implementations to insert content in alternate file formats such as RTF. RTF is a Microsoft proprietary format. Microsoft can support old binary documents simply by embedding the RTF content. But other implementors cannot reliably support those documents because the specification for RTF is not included in Ecma 376.</li> </ul>	Dr Bhattacharya			Pending	Technical
30-Jun-07	<p>No full Mac OOXML implementation from Microsoft – It demonstrates that even Microsoft's own engineers are unable to implement OOXML on a platform other than Windows.</p> <p>Ref: <a href="http://www.microsoft-watch.com/content/business_applications/the_pointless_office_converter_delay.html?kc=MWF">http://www.microsoft-watch.com/content/business_applications/the_pointless_office_converter_delay.html?kc=MWF</a></p>	Dr Bhattacharya			Pending	Technical
30-Jun-07	<p>Part 4, Section 2.15.1.28 says that document protection "shall be enforced". "Shall" indicates required behavior. But then a few sentences later it says that document protection "may be ignored".</p> <p>Clarify this contradiction.</p>	Mr Gautam			Pending	Technical
30-Jun-07	<p>Part 4, Section 2.15.1.28 - A hash algorithm is provided, likely based on a legacy algorithm used in Word. This legacy algorithm is known to be a weak algorithm and has effectively been cracked. One could argue that no hash algorithm would be effective in OOXML, since a user could simply unzip the document and hand edit the XML to remove the hash or to set it to some known value. However, some application types such as online editing via Google Docs, or other similar applications, can secure physical access to the document via other means. Editing access to the document does not necessarily presuppose physical access to the document's XML. So there is a necessity for a secure &amp; interoperable hash algorithm, such as SHA-256 for document protection.</p> <p>Use a standard, FIPS-180 compliant hash algorithm as the default. Legacy hash algorithms should be supported via the described extension mechanism.</p>	Mr Gautam			Pending	Technical
30-Jun-07	<p>Part 4, Section 2.15.1.28 Line 16 - What if the entered password is shorter than 15 characters? Do we truncate to the actual length? Or fill with 0's? Or something else?</p> <p>Clarify this processing step.</p>	Mr Gautam			Pending	Technical
30-Jun-07	<p>Part 4, Section 2.15.1.28 Lines 6-9, Page 1159 - The described processing steps are not ambiguous. In particular SHR and SHL give different results on different machines and with signed and unsigned values.</p> <p>Describe the hash algorithm in a platform independent manner.</p>	Mr Gautam			Pending	Technical
30-Jun-07	<p>Part 4, Section 2.15.2.32 - This feature has been defined in a way which ignores the existence of current browsers other than Internet Explorer. What about Firefox? What about Safari? What about Opera? None of these can be set as target browsers. This section requires that "all settings which are not compatible with the target web browser shall be disabled." But what if I want my application to produce standards-compliant output? So yes to PNG, no to VML, yes to MathML and SVG?</p> <p>Ecma should rethink the entire optimizeForBrowser subclause. It looks very much like it is mapping directly to the arbitrary choices of a single vendor's application. This clause should be rewritten to express this feature in an application and platform neutral way.</p>	Mr Gautam			Pending	Technical
30-Jun-07	<p>Part 4, Section 2.15.3 - These "compatibility" settings solve no general problem. They are merely a museum of settings from previous versions of Microsoft Word. No allowance has been made for legacy settings from other applications. Better to have these be application-specific settings using the existing extensibility mechanisms of OOXML.</p> <p>Remove the compatibility settings from OOXML.</p>	Mr Gautam			Pending	Technical
30-Jun-07	<p>Part 4, Section 2.15.3.26 - This is the "footnoteLayoutLikeWW8" element, which is defined in terms of mimicking a legacy application's behavior. The standard contains insufficient detail on how to replicate this behavior.</p> <p>Define the intended behavior.</p>	Mr Gautam			Pending	Technical

30-Jun-07	Part 4, Section 2.15.3.31 - This is the "lineWrapLikeWord6" element, which is defined in terms of mimicking a legacy application's behavior. The standard contains insufficient detail on how to replicate this behavior. Define the intended behavior.	Mr Gautam			Pending	Technical
30-Jun-07	Part 4, Section 2.15.3.32 - This is the "mwSmallCaps" element, which is defined in terms of mimicking a legacy application's behavior. The standard contains insufficient detail on how to replicate this behavior. Define the intended behavior.	Mr Gautam			Pending	Technical
30-Jun-07	Part 4, Section 2.15.3.41 - This is the "shapeLayoutLikeWW8" element, which is defined in terms of mimicking a legacy application's behavior. The standard contains insufficient detail on how to replicate this behavior. Define the intended behavior.	Mr Gautam			Pending	Technical
30-Jun-07	Part 4, Section 2.15.3.51 - This is the "suppressTopSpacingWP" element, which is defined in terms of mimicking a legacy application's behavior. The standard contains insufficient detail on how to replicate this behavior. Define the intended behavior.	Mr Gautam			Pending	Technical
30-Jun-07	Part 4, Section 2.15.3.54 - This is the " uiCompat97To2003" element, which is defined as: "Disable UI functionality that is not compatible with Word97-2003". But what use is this if I am using OOXML in OpenOffice or WordPerfect Office? What if I want to disable UI functionality that is not compatible with OpenOffice 1.5? Or WordPerfect 8? Or any other application? Where is the ability for other implementations to specify their preferences? Define this an application neutral way. If it is truly a Word-only feature, then remove it from OOXML and express as an application-defined extension.	Mr Gautam			Pending	Technical
30-Jun-07	Part 4, Section 2.15.3.54 - This is the "truncateFontHeightsLikeWP6" element, which is defined in terms of mimicking a legacy application's behavior. The standard contains insufficient detail on how to replicate this behavior. Define the intended behavior.	Mr Gautam			Pending	Technical
30-Jun-07	Part 4, Section 2.15.3.6 - This is the "autoSpaceLikeWord95" element, which is defined in terms of mimicking a legacy application's behavior. The standard contains insufficient detail on how to replicate this behavior. Define the intended behavior.	Mr Gautam			Pending	Technical
30-Jun-07	Part 4, Section 2.15.3.63 - This is the "useWord2002TableStyleRules" element, which is defined in terms of mimicking a legacy application's behavior. The standard contains insufficient detail on how to replicate this behavior. Define the intended behavior.	Mr Gautam			Pending	Technical
30-Jun-07	Part 4, Section 2.15.3.64 - This is the "useWord97LineBreakRules" element, which is defined in terms of mimicking a legacy application's behavior. The standard contains insufficient detail on how to replicate this behavior. Define the intended behavior.	Mr Gautam			Pending	Technical
30-Jun-07	Part 4, Section 2.15.3.65 - This is the " wpJustification" element, which is defined in terms of mimicking a legacy application's behavior. The standard contains insufficient detail on how to replicate this behavior. Define the intended behavior.	Mr Gautam			Pending	Technical
30-Jun-07	Part 4, Section 2.15.3.66 - This is the "wpSpaceWidth" element, which is defined in terms of mimicking a legacy application's behavior. The standard contains insufficient detail on how to replicate this behavior. Define the intended behavior.	Mr Gautam			Pending	Technical
30-Jun-07	Part 4, Section 2.16.5.33 - This field says that it merely retrieves the picture contained in the named document. Is nothing else to be done with the picture? For example, should it be displayed? Define what is to be done with the picture once it is retrieved.	Mr Gautam			Pending	Technical
30-Jun-07	Part 4, Section 2.16.5.33 - This does not define how a picture is named. Is it by a URI? By a local file system path? Either? The example given has a DOS file path, a construct which is not portable. Define how pictures are named.	Mr Gautam			Pending	Technical
30-Jun-07	Part 4, Section 2.16.5.33 - This subclause defines an INCLUDEPICTURE field which "Retrieves the picture contained in the document named". However, no mention is made of what formats are permissible for the picture. There should be specified at least a small set of interoperable formats.	Mr Gautam			Pending	Technical
30-Jun-07	Part 4, Section 2.16.5.34 - This does not define how a document is named. Is it by a URI? By a local file system path? Either? The example given has a DOS file path, a construct which is not portable. Define how documents are named.	Mr Gautam			Pending	Technical
30-Jun-07	Part 4, Section 2.16.5.34 - This subclause defines an INCLUDEDTEXT field which "Inserts all or part of the text and graphics contained in the document named". However, no mention is made of what formats are permissible for the retrieved text. There should be specified at least a small set of interoperable formats.	Mr Gautam			Pending	Technical
30-Jun-07	Part 4, Section 2.16.5.34 - The \t flag will apply a named XSLT transform to the input XML file and insert the resulting output. However, no proper reference is given to XSLT, so we do not know what version XSLT transform is permitted here. Provide a proper external normative reference for the XSLT which is allowed here.	Mr Gautam			Pending	Technical
30-Jun-07	Part 4, Section 2.16.5.40Lines 12 & 13, Page 1543 - The definition for 'LISTNUM' is built upon the concepts of 'current' or 'specific' or 'next series', which are not defined in this context (a backward search on 'series' shades no light on this). 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'. Expand or reference the definition for 'series', and/or clarify the definition for 'LISTNUM' by any appropriate means.	Mr Gautam			Pending	Technical
30-Jun-07	Part 4, Section 2.16.5.41 - This describes a "MACROBUTTON" field which can run a designated macro or command. But there is no mention of what programming language or API's are allowed for such a designated macro or command. Described this feature to a level where cross-platform, cross-application interoperability is possible.	Mr Gautam			Pending	Technical

30-Jun-07	Part 4, Section 2.18.4 - No mechanism for expanding the set of art borders is provided. Since the specified art borders are heavily Western-oriented, it would be good to provide a way for an application to supplement these styles with graphics that provide more regional flavor. Provide an interoperable extensibility mechanism for a document author or application to specify their own art border graphics.	Mr Gautam			Pending	Technical
30-Jun-07	Part 4, Section 2.18.45 - Length is said to be "exactly 3 characters". This is inconsistent with the example given which has a length of 6 characters. Clarify the definition. In particular note that xsd:hexBinary measure length in octets, not characters.	Mr Gautam			Pending	Technical
30-Jun-07	Part 4, Section 2.18.66 - 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. Use a more flexible, extensible, generative approach to numeration, such as that used by the W3C's XSLT standard in their xsl:number support.	Mr Gautam			Pending	Technical
30-Jun-07	Part 4, Section 2.18.66 - There is nothing in this section which is normatively defined except some enumeration values. No normative meanings to these values are given. An informative example is insufficient in all but the most trivial cases. For example, where is "Korean Legal Counting System" defined? Give explicit definitions of these numbering styles or proper external normative references.	Mr Gautam			Pending	Technical
30-Jun-07	Part 4, Section 2.18.66 "Chicago" - Format is defined in reference to the "Chicago Manual of Style", but no edition or page reference is provided. Either include the entire definition in the standard, or provide a proper external reference.	Mr Gautam			Pending	Technical
30-Jun-07	Part 4, Section 2.18.66 "decimalFullwidth", etc. - There are several mentions of double-byte and single-byte Arabic numbering schemes. Since the conformance clause for OOXML requires the use of Unicode in UTF8 or ITF16 encodings, there should be no mention of other encodings. Reconcile the text and the conformance clause.	Mr Gautam			Pending	Technical
30-Jun-07	Part 4, Section 2.18.66 "lowerLetter", etc. - 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. Clarify the text to explicitly cover this case.	Mr Gautam			Pending	Technical
30-Jun-07	Part 4, Section 2.18.66 "numberInDash", etc. - Format requires use of "dash" to surround the number, but no indication of which Unicode dash is intended, en-dash, em-dash, hyphen-minus, figure-dash, quotation-dash, etc. Specify the intended dash explicitly.	Mr Gautam			Pending	Technical
30-Jun-07	Part 4, Section 2.18.72 - No definition is provided for a "Panose-1 classification" of a font. Provide a proper external normative reference for this term.	Mr Gautam			Pending	Technical
30-Jun-07	Part 4, Section 2.18.72 - Length is said to be "exactly 10 characters". This is inconsistent with the example given which has a length of 20 characters. Clarify the definition. In particular note that xsd:hexBinary measure length in octets, not characters.	Mr Gautam			Pending	Technical
30-Jun-07	Part 4, Section 2.18.85 - 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. For example, is the exact dithering pattern used in the illustration required? Provide full normative definitions for these graphical elements.	Mr Gautam			Pending	Technical
30-Jun-07	Part 4, Section 2.18.86 - 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. Clarify the definition. In particular note that xsd:hexBinary measure length in octets, not characters.	Mr Gautam			Pending	Technical
30-Jun-07	Part 4, Section 2.2 Main Document Story Lines 24 & 27, Page 26 - These lines define the contents of an OOXML document of type Wordprocessing in terms that are not compatible with the definition of OOXML documents given in Part 1, Section 4. Definitions, page 7, lines 1 to 3. Note that Section 2.2 as a whole is affected by that inconsistency. Rewrite or remove Section 2.2. May consider explaining what a OOXML story would be in terms of documents renditions by applications.	Mr Gautam			Pending	Technical
30-Jun-07	Part 4, Section 2.2 Main Document Story Lines 247& 28, Page 26 - The definition of 'story' is inappropriate. We shouldn't be defining a markup standard in application terms. We should be defining markup in markup terms. Where the user can type is immaterial. Clarify the definition of 'story'.	Mr Gautam			Pending	Technical
30-Jun-07	Part 4, Section 2.2.1 Line 1, Page 28 - 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.' Define the characteristics of the auto value for the color attribute of the background element properly.	Mr Gautam			Pending	Technical
30-Jun-07	Part 4, Section 2.2.1 Line 0, Page 29 - There are several instances of the word 'border' that are meaningless in this context (the text is supposed to describe the 'background' element at that location and no "border" has been defined). Clarify which border the text refers to (if any notion of border must be introduced here) or else rewrite the text so that it makes sense.	Mr Gautam			Pending	Technical
30-Jun-07	Part 4, Section 2.2.1 background (Document Background) Lines 1 & 2, Page 27 - Contradicting use of accent3 and accent5 - the text says one thing, but the example says another. Fix the contradiction.	Mr Gautam			Pending	Technical

30-Jun-07	Part 4, Section 2.3.1.8 - This element uses a bitmask to specify various paragraph conditional formatting properties.. The use of bitmasks rather than a set of boolean types makes this data almost impossible to work with standard XML tools like XSLT which lack bit-level operations. Rewrite this subclause to express the feature using XML constructs rather than bitmasks.	Mr Gautam			Pending	Technical
30-Jun-07	Part 4, Section 2.3.3.19 - This says that "The layout properties of this embedded object are specified using the VML syntax". However, in Part 1, Section 8.2.6 says, "VML should be considered a deprecated format included in Office Open XML for legacy reasons only and new 9 applications that need a file format for drawings are strongly encouraged to use preferentially DrawingML" Certainly a new document creating an OLE embedding should not be using VML. Otherwise, all OOXML consumers will need to support VML, even where legacy documents are not present. Define layout properties of embedded objects using DrawingML rather than VML	Mr Gautam			Pending	Technical
30-Jun-07	Part 4, Section 2.4.51 - This element uses a bitmask to specify various table style formatting properties.. The use of bitmasks rather than a set of boolean types makes this data almost impossible to work with standard XML tools like XSLT which lack bit-level operations. Rewrite this subclause to express the feature using XML constructs rather than bitmasks.	Mr Gautam			Pending	Technical
30-Jun-07	Part 4, Section 2.4.52 - This element uses a bitmask to specify various table style formatting exceptions. The use of bitmasks rather than a set of boolean types makes this data almost impossible to work with standard XML tools like XSLT which lack bit-level operations. Rewrite this subclause to express the feature using XML constructs rather than bitmasks.	Mr Gautam			Pending	Technical
30-Jun-07	Part 4, Section 2.4.7 - This element uses a bitmask to specify various table cell formatting properties.. The use of bitmasks rather than a set of boolean types makes this data almost impossible to work with standard XML tools like XSLT which lack bit-level operations. Rewrite this subclause to express the feature using XML constructs rather than bitmasks.	Mr Gautam			Pending	Technical
30-Jun-07	Part 4, Section 2.4.8 - This element uses a bitmasks to specify various table row formatting properties.. The use of bitmasks rather than a set of boolean types makes this data almost impossible to work with standard XML tools like XSLT which lack bit-level operations. Rewrite this subclause to express the feature using XML constructs rather than bitmasks.	Mr Gautam			Pending	Technical
30-Jun-07	Part 4, Section 2.8.2.16 - This element uses a set of bitmasks to specify which code pages a given font supports. The use of bitmasks rather than an XML Schema derived type makes this data almost impossible to work with standard XML tools like XSLT which lack bit-level operations. One of the advantages of XML is that we don't need to encode data like this any more. Rewrite this subclause to express the feature using XML constructs rather than bitmasks.	Mr Gautam			Pending	Technical
30-Jun-07	Microsoft says, "The first part of the fast-track process of Ecma376 at ISO , i.e. the first part of the fast-track process of Ecma376 at ISO , i.e. the Contradiction Period, has concluded that there is no issue regarding a contradiction between DIS 29500 and other standards and has moved to the next phase of the process. " This is a misrepresentation of JTC1 Directives (repeated again in his point 16) No one has made any determination that there is no issue regarding a contradiction with existing standards. In fact, the next phase has begun only because the JTC1 Secretariat was unable to resolve the contradictions. This does not mean that these contradictions do not exist or that a NB can not raise these contradictions again.	Dr Nagarjuna			Pending	Technical
30-Jun-07	In response to several queries Microsoft has repeatedly mentioned that "there is no ISO requirement regarding that particular issue". However the point to note is that A NB is not limited to requests that are minimum ISO requirements. Any reasonable request or criterion that a NB wishes to make, that falls within the rules of their committee and national rules is permitted. The aspiration should be to encourage the creation of high quality standards, not just look for the minimum possible requirements that must be met. Is India best served by a document standard that barely meets the minimum requirements? Or does India want something that is more aspirational, something that encodes best practices, uses the latest existing standards, etc	Dr Nagarjuna			Pending	Technical
30-Jun-07	For the ISO comments, another member of BIS (read Microsoft) should not be responding to the comments. These should be responded to officially by Ecma after the ballot has been submitted. In particular, if something is unclear in the standard, it does not become clear by Microsoft explaining it in a meeting. It only becomes clear by Ecma changing the text to clarify it. Hence BIS officially shud be asking Ecma for this.	Dr Nagarjuna			Pending	Technical
30-Jun-07	In the one page, "Response to the Question by Dr. Nagarjuna" the Key line is: "The design goal, as specified in the Open XML Overview document was that it should faithfully represent the pre-existing corpus and this does not mean the ability to decode the binary formats". However OOXML does not define the behavior of the features of an office document. It merely provides a way to represent these features. So no one, except a native creator of that office (namely Microsoft) will be able to fully read and write these documents. As for the availability of the binary formats, the text given suggests it is available for, "analysis and forensic reference purposes". It is unclear whether the royalty-free terms apply to those who would use the documentation in completing applications.	Dr Nagarjuna			Pending	Technical

Date	Issues	Raised By	Replies	Replied By	Comments on the reply	Commented By	Status	Issue Type
06-Jun-07	Application independence: IS the OOXML specification free from any references to particular products of any vendor and their specific behaviour?	Dr Nagarjuna	The goal of Open XML is to have compatibility with the existing base of Office documents. In the cases such as this, it uses capabilities to best enable interoperability between implementing applications. <b>The syntax for identifying these properties are fully specified in the standard, which provides for better interoperability than if they had been left out.</b> As these represent legacy behaviour though, the TC decided that it was not valuable to fully specify how an implementer would actually mimic this behaviour, <b>and the use of these settings are completely optional.</b> If an application already knows how this behaviour is implemented, then the spec gives them guidance on how to read and write that setting. If they do not understand the behaviour though, they can just ignore the setting. For more information please reference the technical description at: <a href="http://blogs.msdn.com/brian_jones/archive/2007/01/09/specifying-the-document-settings.aspx">http://blogs.msdn.com/brian_jones/archive/2007/01/09/specifying-the-document-settings.aspx</a> . Also please see the attached document - "Explanation of Document Settings". It is worth noting that there is precedent in ISO - in fact the standardisation of PDF accurately reflects how PDF behaves and to have not done so would have greatly diminished the value of the standard. <b>This point should be closed as there is no contradiction.</b>	Mr V. Kapur	"If they do not understand the behaviour though, they can just ignore the setting" This is what is unacceptable in any standard. Standards are not made to ignore and promote uninterpretable (non-decodable) components and proceed carrying such 'stones' to be interpreted by MS at its mercy. The core issue that we need to understand is: what are the conditions which make a vendor not to understand the behavior. If you don't understand ignore it, is a very irresponsible reply. Instead, identify why other vendor's cannot understand and resolve the problem. <b>Therefore, this issue cannot be considered closed.</b>	Nagarjuna G.		
06-Jun-07	How does OOXML incorporate pre-existing standards in the same area	Dr Nagarjuna	There is no ISO requirement for this. As an example DSSSL was a pre-existing ISO Standard in the same area that ISO 26300 does not support. Nevertheless, it supports the use of standards such as Dublin Core, XML 1.0, ISO 629-1 plus ISO 3166-1 alpha-2 for Languages, ISO 8601, Data elements and interchange formats — Information interchange — Representation of dates and times, ISO/IEC 9594-8 Public-key and attribute certificate frameworks (x.509 Certificate), ISO/IEC 10646 (all parts), Information technology — Universal Multiple-Octet Coded Character Set (UCS). This has also been addressed in the response provide earlier - We would like to clarify that the use of pre-existing standards is not mandatory by ISO and therefore there is not explicit requirement to provide a rationale for not using pre-existing standards. Nowhere (ISO, ITU, IEC) is anything stated wherein proposed international standards must use existing standards of the similar kind. <b>This point should be treated as closed as there is no contradiction.</b>	Mr V. Kapur	We are not here to certify whether a given requirement conforms to ISO or not. We are here to study the implications of a technology standard for India at large. We should ensure to see that the proposal provides a desirable situation in future. MS's repeated arguments that "it is not an ISO requirement", "there is a precedence" etc. are too weak arguments. This displays complete lack of commitment to promote a healthy digital culture. Instead, MS is arguing always that ISO does not need it. Core question to ask here is: what is the desirable situation: should we use an existing standard if the purpose is same or invent another. Any standards advocate will naturally choose the former, for it saves the effort of so many vendors. It enhances people's adoption. It relates to the existing canons, thereby enhances coherence in the computing environment leading to excellent and consistent performance, and the objective of interoperability. Therefore, we should not accept MS's lack of commitment to known canons of knowledge. <b>The issue cannot be closed, MS's response is weak.</b>	Nagarjuna G.		
06-Jun-07	Backward compatibility for all vendors: Can any third party regardless of business model, without access to additional information and without the cooperation of Microsoft implement full backward compatibility and conversion of such legacy documents into MS-OOXML comparable to what Microsoft can offer?	Dr Nagarjuna	Implementing backward compatibility is an application function not a file format specification requirement. The ECMA 376 specification is capable of faithfully representing information in the legacy binary file formats. This point was treated in detail in the response to the question raised by Dr. Nagarjuna. <b>Availability of Binary File Formats</b> It is to be noted that Microsoft has made the .doc, .xls, and .ppt binary file format specifications available under a royalty-free covenant not to sue to anyone who wishes to implement all or part of these specifications in their products. Anyone can get access to the specification now, using the method described in the following Knowledgebase article at the link: <a href="http://support.microsoft.com/default.aspx?kb/840817">http://support.microsoft.com/default.aspx?kb/840817</a> - How to extract information from Office files by using Office file formats and schemas (relevant extract below) With both format specifications being available for a developer, a converter can be written in such a way that a DOC or XLS document can be converted into an Open XML document with content and representation intact. <b>This point should be treated as closed as there is no contradiction.</b>	Mr V. Kapur	Availability of the specification of binary formats does not solve the problem of another vendor's ability to implement. What is required is a mapping between the existing proprietary formats and OOXML if the stated objective of OOXML, namely, to faithfully represent legacy formats in XML is to be met. The link provided by MS is not an article. It is misleading to say so. MS did not publish the specification of proprietary documents at any accessible place. They are promising to provide to those who sign an MOU with the company. This is unacceptable since, implementing this standard mandates the need for private understandings. That is not the purpose for which standards are specified. They are specified precisely to eliminate such a requirement. The question asked was a very serious and a CORE issue: the answer given is not satisfactory. A satisfactory answer to this consists in publishing the mapping between OOXML and proprietary documents. Since this is not the case, the issue is open, and forms a sufficient reason to vote against OOXML.	Nagarjuna G.		
06-Jun-07	Proprietary extensions: Does MS-OOXML allow proprietary extensions? Which are the safeguards in the MS-OOXML specification against abusive behaviour?	Dr Nagarjuna	No. <b>Part 5</b> fully describes an extension mechanism to allow well-behaved evolution. However, as with ODF and HTML, etc. there is no limitation on the content types that can be part of the ZIP package. Also, where there are no cross-platform standards for interfacing with the operating system or windowing environment or scripting, a platform-neutral approach is taken by ECMA 376. <b>This point should be treated as closed as there is no contradiction.</b>	Mr V. Kapur				
06-Jun-07	Dual standards: Why did and does Microsoft refuse to participate in the existing standardization effort? Why does it not submit its technological proposals to OASIS for inclusion into ODF?	Dr Nagarjuna	This is irrelevant to the ISO process. The same question can be asked of IBM participation in ECMA TC 45. <b>This point should be treated as closed as there is no contradiction.</b>	Mr V. Kapur	But this is relevant to India. India cannot afford to create a situation where interoperability becomes a PAIN. Standards adoption process should evolve into a PAINless situation, and not a possible situation. Therefore, accepting multiple standards for the same task is not going to give India a desirable situation. Knowing fully well, inviting trouble is stupidity. <b>Therefore, saying that such an important question is irrelevant to ISO process is not an acceptable answer.</b> We have to assess, whether inviting multiple standards is good for the country or not?	Nagarjuna G.		

06-Jun-07 Is it legally safe. Does the national standardization body have its own, independent legal analysis about the exact nature of the grant to certify whether it truly covers the full spectrum of all possible MS-OOXML implementations?	Dr Nagarjuna	Microsoft has offered the Open Specification Promise (OSP) at <a href="http://www.microsoft.com/interop/osp">http://www.microsoft.com/interop/osp</a> with regard to Open XML, and the OSP has been publicly supported by OSS supporters. The standard itself is publicly available. This is entirely consistent with both Ecma and ISO/IEC IP policies, and criticisms over IP policies should be directed to the organization, not to this submission. Just as Sun did with ODF, Microsoft is making it clear that it will not assert its patents against software that is implementing the requirements of the standard, even if that software is not implementing the entire standard. Microsoft's pledges go far beyond what is required by the patent policy of either Ecma or ISO/IEC. Please also see the report "Standardisation and Licensing of Microsoft's Office Open XML Reference Schema" by Baker and McKenzie. It is also pertinent to point out that the Open XML Standard is already being implemented by a number of software vendors and Governments. The Government of Denmark has already mandated the adoption of Open XML as an open standard. Novell, Corel and Microsoft Office have already announced support for Open XML Formats in their products. Novell and Microsoft have already introduced support, and Corel will provide Open XML support later this year. Furthermore, the point raised does not present any specific evidence that there is something in the Open XML spec around IP which impedes the implementation of the specification on technical grounds – the actual test ISO uses. To be amply clear, before Open XML became an Ecma standard it had to pass the IPR rules Ecma has, and more immediately relevant to the discussion (by the formal ISO rules) JTC 1 has already reviewed the trademarks, IP, etc, around Ecma Open XML before the Fast Track process began last January. <b>This point should be treated as closed as there is no contradiction.</b>	Mr V. Kapur	Customization and extending an encoding scheme is useful in any language, for it makes the language evolve. However, if the embedded customization is done without publishing the vocabulary, syntax and semantics in a standard way, interoperability suffers. What seems absent in OOXML is the absence of such a provision. Since such a prescription is absent, customXML elements should not be part of the standard. Clue: customization and extension can be done by following say a standard like RDF or CL as customization languages, then it is acceptable to me. Such a provision will ensure evolution of language without arbitrary insertions, for to the best of todays computer science FOL (first order logic) can represent everything computable. <b>Therefore, unless this issue is resolved OOXML cannot lead to interoperability.</b>	
13-Jun-07 Refer to the following JTC1 directives (Annexure I) that are mandatory: "Standards designed to facilitate interoperability need to specify clearly and unambiguously the conformity requirements that are essential to achieve the interoperability. Complexity and the number of options should be kept to a minimum and the implementability of the standards should be demonstrable. Verification of conformity to those standards should then give a high degree of confidence in the interoperability of IT systems using those standards. However, the confidence in interoperability given by conformity to one or more standards is not always sufficient and there may be need to use an interoperability assessment methodology in demonstrating interoperability between two or more IT systems in practice".1. A standard is not supposed to cover the maximum number of features possible but should cover the minimum number of points of standardization. What are the features supported by OOXML that are necessary and are currently not supported by ODF ?2. How has the verification of conformity to OOXML standards proposed to be done and has it been done till date by an independent third party ?	Dr Bhattacharya	1. One of the goals of Open XML is to have compatibility with the existing base of Office documents. To best enable interoperability between implementing applications the standard fully specifies the required properties by fully specifying the syntax in the standard, which provides for better interoperability. It is perfectly possible to store a document both in ODF and Open XML format on a single system and have them consumed by the same application. If one were to accept the logic proposed here, then there would one single format used to store graphic images in a system, and clearly this is incorrect.2. The conformance requirements for the standard are based on validation against a schema. The schema is provided both in W3C XML Schemas and in ISO/OASIS RELAX NG. Both these schema languages have multiple mature implementations, both proprietary and open source, and are well-regarded. <b>This point should be treated as closed as there is no contradiction.</b>	Mr V. Kapur		
04-Apr-07 What are the design goals of OOXML and what are the list of functionalities which OOXML has in excess to ODF that ODF is incapable of supporting now and that is impossible to be made supportable by ODF even after making changes to ODF	Prof Rajanish Dass	The purpose of ECMA 376 is stated in Section 2 of the Open XML Overview Document. Furthermore, DIS 29500 document is divided into five parts. Each part is a standard and the scope specifies what each part defines. For example: The scope of Part 1: Fundamentals given here states- "This Standard defines Office Open XML's vocabularies and document representation and packaging. It also specifies requirements for consumers and producers of Office Open XML." The main reason behind representing files in XML was to allow interoperability across environments that do not support 'Legacy Binary Format', and independence from a dedicated OS. Then, even if it is a representation of a legacy binary format in XML, with many more additional features such as inclusion of 'Drawing ML' and 'MathML', and advantages of a smaller file size, along with lesser risk of losing the file contents after corruption, it's very much satisfying criteria of its formation. It also allows the use of custom schemas. It should be noted the current process is not about a comparison between ODF and Open XML but about the technical examination of the ECMA 376. While there may be an observation that DIS29500 "does it differently than ODF" or similar, in fact a user is entirely free to implement either or both standards on the same system, with no issues. It should also be noted that these two standards address different user requirements and provide different implementation styles; this is entirely consistent with ISO/IEC standards in other areasA comparison of features only is not meaningful as there is considerable difference in the underlying document model of the two specifications. <b>This point should be treated as closed as there is no contradiction.</b>	Mr V. Kapur		
06-Jun-07 The option of embedding custom XML schema in OOXML defeats the purpose of an open standard. How can one ensure interoperability if custom schemas are supported by OOXML	Dr Nagarjuna	This would appear to be a misunderstanding of the specification. Implementing custom Schema is not contrary to a standard. The process for implementing Custom Schemas is fully specified in ECMA 376 and as such there is no impact on interoperability. There are two specific mechanisms for supporting custom schemas:a. An XML part based on a custom schema can be embedded in the document. In this scenario, the custom XML part is separate from the Open XML markup -- the custom XML part is 100% custom XML (no Open XML markup), and the Open XML parts are 100% Open XML (no custom markup).b. Custom XML markup can be applied to the content of a WordprocessingML document. In this scenario, the custom schema's elements appears as attributes of the customXml element, which is part of the WordprocessingML schema. As above, there is no arbitrary XML markup added to the document, only the customXml element itself.This custom schema support is extremely useful, because it allows users to embed their own schemas in documents and thereby bridge the worlds of documents and data. <b>This point should be treated as closed as there is no contradiction.</b>	Mr V. Kapur		Nagarjuna G.
04-Apr-07 It is not feasible to analyze the entire 6000+ pages of documentation at such short notice.	Dr Geetika Sharma	The process for the examination of ECMA 376 commenced in Jan 2007 giving a full six months. This is as per JTC 1 Directives. While one might have some sympathy for the concern over the size of the specification, there is no provision in the Directives related to "size of submission"; if there is a concern in this area (or any other aspect of the Fast-Track "process"), we should make an appropriate Contribution on the topic for discussion in the JTC Plenary and not hold up a valid DIS ballot. <b>This point should be treated as closed as there is no contradiction.</b>	Mr V. Kapur		

06-Jun-07 Is there exists any known complete implementation of OOXML other than the claimed Microsoft Office 2007.	Dr Bhattacharya	<p>No. However, the absense of a complete implementation other than MS Office is not an issue as the Standard clearly permits implementation in full or in part and there are numerous implementations of the standard. ECMA 376 has been successfully implemented by numerous implementations on the Windows platform (by Microsoft and companies other than Microsoft) and on other platforms (Linux, Macintosh, PalmOS) – for e.g. Novell Open Office, NeoOffice2.1, Dataviz Documents to Go on the Palm OS, MindJet MindManager. Other implementations include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• OpenOffice Novell edition</li> <li>• Corel Office which is slated to debut in mid 2007</li> <li>• NeoOffice 2.1 on MacOS</li> <li>• DataViz Documents to Go on PalmOS</li> <li>• Mindjet MindManager</li> <li>• Altova XMLSpy XML editor</li> <li>• OpenXML Writer</li> <li>• Gnumeric</li> <li>• Altsoft XML2PDF Server 2007</li> <li>• Datawatch Monarch V9.0</li> <li>• EMS SQL Manager 2007 for MySQL</li> <li>• EDIAKT II and ebInterface of the Austrian Government.</li> </ul> <p><b>This point should be treated as closed as there is no contradiction.</b></p>	Mr V. Kapur		
06-Jun-07 Given that the design goals of OOXML is to support the existing corpus of Microsoft documents, How any company other than Microsoft can decode the existing proprietary/legacy documents, and convert them into open XML by following the published OOXML specification.	Dr Bhattacharya	<p>This has already been answered in detail previously in response to a question by Dr. Nagarjuna. Please see the paper "Response to Dr. Nagarjuna Question.pdf" <b>This point should be treated as closed as there is no contradiction.</b></p>	Mr V. Kapur		
07-May-07 Has compliance of the single implementation of OOXML (i.e MS Office) has been checked by any independent 3rd party in the manner the multiple ODF implementations have been checked.	Dr Bhattacharya	<p>No. But this is not a requirement and MS Office is not being offered as a reference implementation of ECMA 376. This cannot be considered to be an issue. <b>This point should be treated as closed as there is no contradiction.</b></p>	Mr V. Kapur		
07-May-07 Whether an OOXML compliant application be able to open the existing implementations of the MS Office documents and all previous versions.	Dr Nagarjuna	<p>The specification can be implemented in part. So an application can be using whatever part of functionality they need. This issue has also been addressed in the response to Dr. Nagarjuna provided earlier. <b>This point should be treated as closed as there is no contradiction.</b></p>	Mr V. Kapur		
07-May-07 A document encoding standard should be 100% decodable for it satisfy the criteria for being inter operable OOXML fails in this regard.	Dr Nagarjuna	<p>ECMA 376 is fully "decodable" as the entire specification is available. Furthermore, from an implementation perspective, Section 2.6 - "Interoperability Guidelines" state that "For the guidelines to be meaningful, a software application should be accompanied by publicly available documentation that describes what subset of this Standard it supports." That is for interoperability the application should provide documentation on application specific data. It is requested that rather than a very broad statement, specific instances of where interoperability is not possible may please be provided so that a specific response can be given. <b>Specific instances can be addressed as and when provided. This point should be closed as there is no contradiction.</b></p>	Mr V. Kapur	<p>In fact, the statement by MS that whenever a vendor encounters stuff that cannot be understood (decoding makes understanding possible) the vendor is asked to ignore, but preserve the 'stone' while saving the document. MS already agreed that non-decodable elements are possible, and what vendors should do in such cases. <b>Therefore there exists a contradiction, and so this issue cannot be closed.</b></p>	Nagarjuna G.
07-May-07 A single interoperable standard will lead to wide spread of digital advantage, while multiple standards will block its spread	Dr Nagarjuna	<p>This is a matter of opinion and there is no evidence to support it. <b>This point should be treated as closed as there is no contradiction.</b></p>	Mr V. Kapur	<p>What a pity. I gave examples several times. It does not reach MS's ears. So, let me repeat again: adoption of a single protocols/standards like TCP/IP, HTTP, HTML, Unicode did lead to REVOLUTIONARY spread of digital technology. A universal standards to measure the world in terms of SI units, IUPAC nomenclature for elements etc. eliminated enormous amount of confusion from science. Are these matters of opinion? How can we ignore such lessons from history? How can we ignore the very idea of standardization? MS's response in this case demonstrates their total incompetence to handling a serious question such as this. Therefore if they cannot admit this truth, we have sufficient reason to doubt their credentials for they don't understand the objectives of standardization. <b>A very strong reason to vote against ooxml.</b></p>	Nagarjuna G.
07-May-07 Document Encoding must not be application specific; Document belongs to the user and not to the application vendor. OOXML is an application specific encoding.	Dr Nagarjuna	<p>The goal of Open XML is to have compatibility with the existing base of Office documents. In the cases such as this, it uses capabilities to best enable interoperability between implementing applications. The syntax for identifying these properties is fully specified in the standard, which provides for better interoperability than if they had been left out. As these represent legacy behaviour though, the TC decided that it was not valuable to fully specify how an implementer would actually mimic this behaviour, and the use of these settings is completely optional. If an application already knows how this behaviour is implemented, then the spec gives them guidance on how to read and write that setting. If they do not understand the behaviour though, they can just ignore the setting. For more information please reference the technical description at:  <a href="http://blogs.msdn.com/brian_jones/archive/2007/01/09/specifying-the-document-settings.aspx">http://blogs.msdn.com/brian_jones/archive/2007/01/09/specifying-the-document-settings.aspx</a>. Also please see the attached document - "Document Settings" It is worth noting that there is precedent in ISO - in fact the standardisation of PDF accurately reflects how PDF behaves and to have not done so would have greatly diminished the value of the standard. <b>This point should be treated as closed as there is no contradiction.</b></p>	Mr V. Kapur		

25-Jun-07 In the response to my note [Why Ecma 'Why Ecma OOXML is not a free/open document standard?'] Microsoft makes it clear that in their understanding interoperability does not require 100% decodability.[MS's comments on my paper] What they seem to call interoperability is the ability to operate successfully between the vendors with whom they have an understanding. Interoperability is not achieved by this process. I reiterate: A document encoding standard must be 100% decodable, else it cannot serve the purpose of interoperability. <b>We must not admit any private language components within the encoding.</b> If we do not have such an assurance which should be provided by the national standardisation bodies through independent counsel and experts, and in particular not by Microsoft or its business partners, which have a direct conflict of interest on this issue, BIS should say vote against ooxml.	Dr Nagarjuna	ECMA 376 is fully "decodable" as the entire specification is available. Furthermore, from an implementation perspective, Section 2.6 - "Interoperability Guidelines" state that "For the guidelines to be meaningful, a software application should be accompanied by publicly available documentation that describes what subset of this Standard it supports." That is for interoperability the application should provide documentation on application specific data. It is requested that rather than a very broad statement, specific instances of where interoperability is not possible may please be provided so that a specific response can be given.The goal of Open XML is to have compatibility with the existing base of Office documents. In the cases such as this, it uses capabilities to best enable interoperability between implementing applications. The syntax for identifying these properties is fully specified in the standard, which provides for better interoperability than if they had been left out. As these represent legacy behaviour though, the TC decided that it was not valuable to fully specify how an implementer would actually mimic this behaviour, and the use of these settings is completely optional. If an application already knows how this behaviour is implemented, then the spec gives them guidance on how to read and write that setting. If they do not understand the behaviour though, they can just ignore the setting. For more information please reference the technical description at: <a href="http://blogs.msdn.com/brian_jones/archive/2007/01/09/specifying-the-document-settings.aspx">http://blogs.msdn.com/brian_jones/archive/2007/01/09/specifying-the-document-settings.aspx</a> . Also please see the attached document - "Explanation of Document Settings". It is worth noting that there is precedent in ISO - in fact the standardisation pf PDF accurately reflects how PDF behaves and to have not done so would have greatly diminished the value of the standard. <b>Specific instances can be addressed as and when provided. This point should be closed as there is no contradiction.</b>	Mr V. Kapur	this is a repetition. As stated above, MS admits that there will be situations where some components cannot be decoded. Therefore this issue cannot be closed.	Nagarjuna G.
25-Jun-07 The OOXML serves the purpose of converting the existing Microsoft owned proprietary documents into an XML serialization. Since the outcome of this will contain elements like "useWord97LineBreakRules", "footnoteLayoutLikeWW8", "autoSpaceLikeWord95" "useWord2002TableStyleRules", etc. E.g: from file wml.xsd: wml.xsd: <xsd:element name="useWord97LineBreakRules" type="CT_OnOff" minOccurs="0" wml.xsd: <xsd:documentation>Emulate Word 6.x/95/97 Footnote Placement</xsd:documentation> wml.xsd: <xsd:element name="autoSpaceLikeWord95" type="CT_OnOff" minOccurs="0"> wml.xsd: <xsd:documentation>Emulate Word 95 Full-Width Character Spacing</xsd:documentation> wml.xsd: <xsd:element name="useWord2002TableStyleRules" type="CT_OnOff" minOccurs="0">Such tags have no value to other vendors other than Microsoft. Such a model therefore is meant to preserve some private namespace, and cannot be called a standard. The purpose of a standard cannot be to preserve historical blunders. If accepted, this will also create a undesirable precedent in the standardization process. Therefore this process will not lead to interoperability.	Dr Nagarjuna	The goal of Open XML is to have compatibility with the existing base of Office documents. In the cases such as this, it uses capabilities to best enable interoperability between implementing applications. The syntax for identifying these properties is fully specified in the standard, which provides for better interoperability than if they had been left out. As these represent legacy behaviour though, the TC decided that it was not valuable to fully specify how an implementer would actually mimic this behaviour, and the use of these settings is completely optional. If an application already knows how this behaviour is implemented, then the spec gives them guidance on how to read and write that setting. If they do not understand the behaviour though, they can just ignore the setting. For more information please reference the technical description at: <a href="http://blogs.msdn.com/brian_jones/archive/2007/01/09/specifying-the-document-settings.aspx">http://blogs.msdn.com/brian_jones/archive/2007/01/09/specifying-the-document-settings.aspx</a> . Also please see the attached document - "Document Settings" It is worth noting that there is precedent in ISO - in fact the standardisation of PDF accurately reflects how PDF behaves and to have not done so would have greatly diminished the value of the standard. <b>This point should be treated as closed as there is no contradiction.</b>	Mr V. Kapur	repetition, therefore already replied above.	
25-Jun-07 Who owns the IPR on the OOXML-ODF converters that are being developed under Microsoft sponsorship in open source ?	Mr Gautam	The translator is an open source project hosted on SourceForge. It's IPR is not of consequence to the process of ECMA 376 in ISO. <b>This point should be treated as closed as there is no contradiction.</b>	Mr V. Kapur		
25-Jun-07 Since the OOXML to ODF converters that are being developed in the open source domain are funded by Microsoft, what happens if Microsoft decides to stop this funding or Microsoft folds up ? Does Microsoft undertake to fund this converter initiative in perpetuity, supporting all future versions of OOXML and ODF ?	Dr Bhattacharya	This is not relevant to the discussion pertaining to the ISO standardisation of ECMA 376. However, in terms of support for Open XML, Microsoft has committed to supporting the Open XML Formats in Microsoft Office for at least one more major product release. From the standpoint of Microsoft support policy, this means that Microsoft Office customers will benefit from support for Open XML in a supported product until AT LEAST 2017. The next release of the Microsoft Office (which, based on history, will likely happen 24-48 months after the current release, would extend full support for the Open XML formats in Microsoft Office until 2021, according to the Microsoft support policy defined at <a href="http://www.microsoft.com/support">http://www.microsoft.com/support</a> . <b>This point should be treated as closed as there is no contradiction.</b>	Mr V. Kapur		
25-Jun-07 WTO TBT Annexure 3, Code of good practice for preparation, adoption and application of standards clearly indicates avoiding duplication of standards. So how can India vote for adoption of OOXML by ISO in violation of WTO principles	Mr Gautam	The Code of Good Practice applies to national and regional standardization efforts. "This Code is open to acceptance by any standardizing body within the territory of a Member of the WTO, whether a central government body, a local government body, or a non-governmental body; to any governmental regional standardizing body one or more members of which are Members of the WTO; and to any non-governmental regional standardizing body one or more members of which are situated within the territory of a Member of the WTO (referred to in this Code collectively as "standardizing bodies" and individually as "the standardizing body")." It further provides that national standards bodies should defer to international standards where possible. "F. Where international standards exist or their completion is imminent, the standardizing body shall use them, or the relevant parts of them, as a basis for the standards it develops, except where such international standards or relevant parts would be ineffective or inappropriate, for instance, because of an insufficient level of protection or fundamental climatic or geographical factors or fundamental technological problems." Open XML is an international standard and therefore it cannot constitute a barrier to international trade. In fact, countries like Denmark have already mandated it as an Open Standard. <b>This point should be treated as closed as there is no contradiction</b>	Mr V. Kapur		
25-Jun-07 Are there any suitable converters for other office suite applications like Spreadsheets and Presentations.	Mr Gautam	These are also under development. However, this is again not the issue under consideration. <b>This point should be treated as closed as there is no contradiction</b>	Mr V. Kapur		

25-Jun-07 The license agreement of Microsoft which states one can use the technology on offer by Microsoft only if they agree not to allow sub licensing. This will hamper royalty free access to this standard in perpetuity	Mr Purkayastha	It is not clear which licence agreement is being referred to. However, Microsoft has offered the Open Specification Promise (OSP) at <a href="http://www.microsoft.com/interop/osp">http://www.microsoft.com/interop/osp</a> with regard to Open XML, and the OSP has been publicly supported by OSS supporters. The standard itself is publicly available. This is entirely consistent with both Ecma and ISO/IEC IP policies, and criticisms over IP policies should be directed to the organization, not to this submission. Just as Sun did with ODF, Microsoft is making it clear that it will not assert its patents against software that is implementing the requirements of the standard, even if that software is not implementing the entire standard. Microsoft's pledges go far beyond what is required by the patent policy of either Ecma or ISO/IEC. Please also see the report "Standardisation and Licensing of Microsoft's Office Open XML Reference Schema" by Baker and McKenzie. It is also pertinent to point out that the Open XML Standard is already being implemented by a number of software vendors and Governments. The Government of Denmark has already mandated the adoption of Open XML as an open standard. Novell, Corel and Microsoft Office have already announced support for Open XML Formats in their products. Novell and Microsoft have already introduced support, and Corel will provide Open XML support later this year. Furthermore, the point raised does not present any specific evidence that there is something in the Open XML spec around IP which impedes the implementation of the specification on technical grounds – the actual test ISO uses. To be amply clear, before Open XML became an Ecma standard it had to pass the IPR rules Ecma has, and more immediately relevant to the discussion (by the formal ISO rules) JTC 1 has already reviewed the trademarks, IP, etc, around Ecma Open XML before the Fast Track process began last January. <b>This point should be treated as closed as there is no contradiction.</b>	Mr V. Kapur
25-Jun-07 Where is the definition of the Shape in OOXML. More specifically, where is the shape "Explosion" defined in OOXML	Dr Bhattacharya	This is defined in Part 4, Section 5.1.12.56 1 ST_ShapeType (Preset Shape Types)	Mr V. Kapur
25-Jun-07 In the Microsoft workshop on OOXML, it was stated that OOXML has been started as a standard with community participation for only 13 months. How can such a fundamental piece of technology be accepted for standardization with so little time in public discussions with peer companies and customers? Most technologies that have been adopted as a ISO standard has been in public discussion for atleast 3 years. Since document format has far reaching implications in the country's quest for reducing digital divide, the standard should be discussed threadbare further in public before being adopted as a global standard. There is no hurry to to adopt OOXML as a global standard without further strengthening it	Dr Bhattacharya	This is not a barrier for standardisation. As an example, DIS 26300 had glaring omissions such as a lack of formula specifications and since it becoming an ISO standard in May 2006 it has already undergone revision to ODF 1.1 and again to ODF 1.2. As is evident, the deficiency of the issues now being covered by the revisions did not prevent ODF from being standardised. It should be noted that maintenance of a standard is an essential element of the standardisation process and is meant to incorporate such changes that may be required to the standard. It should also be noted that the core technologies on which Open XML is based are mature and have been around for over 20 years. In fact some of the work on Open XML predates the work on ODF <b>This point should be treated as closed as there is no contradiction.</b>	Mr V. Kapur
25-Jun-07 Open Packaging Convention used in OOXML is used by only Microsoft and Microsoft ISV's who want to use Microsoft's APIs. This shows the ability of OOXML: to create vendor lock-in and tremendous dependence on only one technology firm	Mr Gautam	The OPC is fully specified in ECMA 376 in Part 2 of the Standard. It is open to all to implement. The Open Packaging specification describes an abstract model and physical format conventions for the use of XML, Unicode, ZIP, and other openly available technologies and specifications to organize the content and resources of a document within a package. It is essentially a ZIP file with some XML files which describe the relationships between the various entries, their content types, etc. Creation of open source APIs are already underway - see <a href="http://www.openxml4j.org">http://www.openxml4j.org</a> . It does not tie any one to Microsoft. <b>This point should be treated as closed as there is no contradiction.</b>	Mr V. Kapur
25-Jun-07 Security issue: What is malicious code is dropped into the .zip package and passed around as an OOXML file? What protection does OOXML provide?	Mr Gautam	This is not a security issue. Ecma 376 deprecates the use of Macros. Macro-enabled formats (.docm, .dotm, .xlsm, .pptm, etc.) are not part of the submission to Ecma international and ISO for standardization. As such, Open XML improves security in the sense that files with embedded code and macros are easy to identify and isolate. Files that are not enabled to run code or macros will ignore any code that is embedded. This will improve security by isolating instances of embedded code. Also, packages can be digitally signed using x.509 certificates, and you can sign all parts of the package, including macro parts if required. This is not currently possible with ODF. <b>This point should be treated as closed as there is no contradiction.</b>	Mr V. Kapur