ISO/IEC 26300 OpenDocument Format Ballot Comment Responses

OASIS Open Document Format for Office Applications (OpenDocument) Technical Committee

19 Jun 2006

This document collects the responses of the OpenDocument Technical Committee (TC) to the comments that where submitted to the TC as part of the ISO/IEC 26300 balloting process. The TC appreciates all comments it received from the national bodies, and considers them to be very helpful for improving the OpenDocument specification.

In response to these comments, the TC has created an updated OpenDocument v1.0 specification where those comments are resolved that were accepted by the TC, and where the TC agreed that they could be addressed by an editorial change to the specification.

This updated specification has the name “Open Document Format for Office Applications (OpenDocument) 1.0 (Second Edition)”. At the time this document is written, it has the status of a “Committee Draft”. A public review of the changes is scheduled, and the TC intends to vote for the specification as a “committee specification” after the public review has been successfully conducted. The OpenDocument v1.0 (Second Edition) committee draft is available at the following locations:

OpenDocument Format: http://www.oasis-open.org/committees/download.php/18648/OpenDocument-v1.0-cd4.odt

PDF: http://www.oasis-open.org/committees/download.php/18651/OpenDocument-v1.0-cd4.pdf

A document that lists the changes between the original OpenDocument v1.0 specification and its second edition is available at the following locations:

OpenDocument Format:

PDF: http://www.oasis-open.org/committees/download.php/18591/opendocument-v1.0-2nd-edition-changes.pdf

In the following, this document is called the *change-log document*.

Table of Contents

United Kingdom

Comment 1

> The text does not conform to Annex H of the ISO Directives defining acceptable verbal forms for the expression of provisions (i.e. the use of "shall", "should", etc.). It uses the conventions of IETF RFC 2119 instead. Our understanding is that the PAS procedure does not allow exemption from this requirement.

The TC has changed the RFC 2119 terms with terms from Annex H of the ISO Directives in OpenDocument v1.0 (2nd edition). A detailed list of the changes is available in the change-log document.

Comment 2

> The text contains many uses of ambiguous terminology, such as "last page number" meaning "preceding page number".

The TC has only found one occurrence of the term “last page number”, and has replaced that with "preceding page number" in OpenDocument v1.0 (2nd edition).

Further ambiguities were reported at http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/office-comment/200605/msg00002.html. The TC has eliminated those in OpenDocument v1.0 (2nd edition), too.

A detailed list of the changes is available in the change-log document.

Comment 3

> The text frequently uses terms borrowed from other standards but with narrower or in other ways altered meanings.

The information provided in the comment is not sufficient to provide a response to it. The TC may have further responses to this comment when it gets more detailed information.

Comment 4

> There are many occurrences of spelling and punctuation errors and missing inter-word spaces.

The TC has corrected those spelling and punctuation errors in the OpenDocument v1.0 (2nd edition) specification it got aware of. This in particular includes those reported at http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/office-comment/200605/msg00006.html, http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/office-comment/200605/msg00007.html, http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/office-comment/200605/msg00011.html and http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/office-comment/200605/msg00014.html.

A detailed list of the changes is available in the change-log document.

Comment 5

> Some standards that are cited normatively, e.g. RELAX NG, are citing a standard other than the ISO standard.

The OpenDocument v1.0 (2nd edition) specification now cites the ISO RELAX-NG standard.

Comment 6

> The OASIS extension to RELAX NG for specifying default values of attributes should be referenced explicitly in addition to the ISO reference for RELAX NG.

The TC has added a reference to the OASIS RELAX NG DTD Compatibility Specification to the OpenDocument v1.0 (2nd edition) specification.

Comment 7

> Some standards, for example UNICODE and BASE64, are cited without adequate references.

The TC has added normative references for UNICODE and BASE64 to the OpenDocument v1.0 (2nd edition) specification.

Comment 8

> It is suspected that no satisfactory normative reference exists for the ZIP compression format, unless it be a reference to the specification of the Java JAR format. The alternative is that the format should be fully specified.

The TC has replaced the reference for ZIP with the one referenced by the JAR specification in OpenDocument 1.0 (2nd edition).

Comment 9

> The ODF schema contains a number of features whose use appears to relate to specific implementation choices or be constrained by a specific implementation restrictions. Examples include features that are application-specific or which would only be available on specific operating platforms (such as DDE, OLE).

Actually OpenDocument v1.0 does not require support for either DDE or OLE and does enable cross-platform information using either application specific feature.

The information from a DDE connection is in fact represented in the OpenDocument file, see for example:

> ***4.4.3 DDE Source***
>
> If sections are linked via DDE, their linking information is represented by `<office:dde-source>` elements. It contains attributes that specify the application, topic and item of the DDE connection. Note that because the section

> contains the XML rendition of the DDE link's content, this information only needs to be processed if updated data from the DDE link are desired.

That is to say that while the OpenDocument schema supports the use of DDE, it does not require its support since the content of any such element is represented in the resulting instance.

Similarly, the OpenDocument schema does not require support for OLE objects, but does support their inclusion in an OpenDocument document, much as it supports the inclusion of any other binary object (not in XML).

> **9.9.3 Objects**
>
> [...]
>
> The `<draw:object>` element represents objects that have a XML representation. The `<draw:object-ole>` element represents objects that only have a binary representation.

Merely providing support for binary objects does not bind any implementor to support any particular binary objects or protocols for their use.

Comment 10

> Some properties whose values are measurements constrain the choice of units of measurement in ways that are implementation-dependent. While it is recognised that not all implementations will be able to support all choices of units of measurement, the format should be flexible enough to allow new implementations that do not impose the same constraints.

The TC intends to clarify which units of measurements should or may be supported by implementations in a future OpenDocument specification.

Comment 11

> The use of patterns to define constraints on string values for measurements is not applied consistently.

The TC intends to define all constrains on string values for measurements by patterns in a future OpenDocument specification.

Comment 12

> Spatial frames of reference for page layout and object rotation are not clearly defined.

The information provided in the comment is not sufficient to provide a response to it. The TC may have further responses to this comment when it gets more detailed information.

Comment 13

> The rationale for mixing functionalities from different sources/namespaces (e.g. XSL-FO, SVG and CSS2) is not properly explained in each case.

The format specifies the different namespaces and how they are used. It is not an expository document making a case for one solution over another. As a standard it is stating the rule, not arguing for it.

Comment 14

> There does not appear to be support for combination of different writing directions within a single paragraph.

OpenDocument v1.0 relies upon a complex relationship between XML, Unicode and the OpenDocument schema to provide the ability requested. Unfortunately, the support of BiDi texts is not gathered to a single location within the text. OpenDocument has the ability requested and that will be covered in detail in the responses to the comments by Egypt. The TC further intends to add some explanations regarding BiDi support to a future version of the OpenDocument specification.

Canada

Comment 1

> [Section 4.6.3] There is a typo in the example. The <text:change-end> element is shown as an end tag, "</text:change-end text:change-id="c001"/>", when it should be an empty tag, "<text:change-end text:change-id="c001"/>".

The example has been corrected in OpenDocument v1.0 (2nd edition).

Comment 2

> [Section 5.8] There is a grammatical error at the end of the first sentence.

The grammatical error has been corrected in OpenDocument v1.0 (2nd edition).

Hungary

Comment 1

> To date, the industry has not served you well when it comes to the office application market. You do not have unconditional control and ownership of your own documents now and into the future. Open Document Format (ODF) addresses these issues by standardizing the file formats so that anyone can use them, anyone can implement them on any platform at any time, and no license or fee is required. This gives you complete control and ownership of your documents, forever. ODF creates an ecosystem, already supported by over 50 organizations, that allows more vendors, more innovations, more office suites, and more variations in office suites leading to more choice for users. ODF enables choice among an unlimited number of interoperable applications.

The OpenDocument TC is deeply honored and encouraged by the comment from Hungary on the Open Document Format. It is indeed the goal of the ODF effort to “...enable choice among and unlimited number of interoperable applications” and to give users “...complete control and ownership of [their] documents, forever.” Support from national bodies in ISO, such as Hungary, encourage us that we are on the right path.

Japan

Comment 1

> URI should be replaced with IRI.

The TC has (with one exception in the non-normative appendix E1 Changes from “Open Office Specification 1.0 Committee Draft 1”) replaced all occurrences of the term URI with IRI in OpenDocument v1.0 (2nd edition).

Comment 2

> Remove the unstable normative references (such as DOM level 3 and CSS3) and add the corresponding specifications within this standard.

The specification cites the CSS3 Text Module. The purpose of this citation is for comparison and not a normative reference. Material cited for comparison and not reference need not be normative and stable standards. The text of sections 15.4.33 and 15.4.34 was modified in OpenDocument v1.0 (2nd edition) to emphasize that the reference to the CSS3 Text Module is non-normative.

The specification further cites DOM level 3 events. The purpose of the citation is to provide typical event names for use with OpenDocument. The TC is considering for the future the possibility of replacing the reference to DOM Level 3 Events with a reference to DOM Level 2 Events in a future version of the OpenDocument specification.

Comment 3

> Add the features of accessibility, if possible.

The TC acknowledges the comment by the Japanese National Body on accessibility issues. The OpenDocument TC's Accessibility Subcommittee has reviewed the OpenDocument v1.0 specification, has identified 9 accessibility issues in OpenDocument v1.0, and proposes candidate solutions to them. With these changes, we believe that OpenDocument will meet or exceed the accessibility support provided in all other office file formats as well as that specified in the W3C Web Content Accessibility Guidelines 1.0.

Due to structures on the revision process in OASIS and time constraints we were unable to add these features to the current version of OpenDocument submitted to ISO, but they shall be added to the next revision of OpenDocument. We appreciate the Japanese National Body correcting our oversight in this area.

Egypt

Comment 1

> ISO/IEC DIS 26300 document does not include requirements necessary for Arabic language users. To be useful to the Arabic user, the standard needs to take into consideration requirements necessary for Arabic language formatting styles and presentation… Those are summed up in the following
>
> - Orientation: Right to Left (RTL) versus Left to Right (LTR) for different elements including text, tables and other elements...
> - Numeric digits presentation for Arabic Indic digits.
> - Calendar support for Hijri Lunar based Islamic calendar and other local calendars.
>
> [...]

OpenDocument v1.0 has BiDi support, as well as support for text orientations, directions, numeric digits presentations and calendars. Unfortunately, the support of these features is not gathered to a single location within the text. An explanation of the features can be found at the following location: http://www.oasis-open.org/committees/download.php/18630/06-06-08-bidi-appendix

The TC intends to add a non-normative appendix which explains these features to a future version of the OpenDocument specification.

Comment 2 to Comment 11

> [Chapter 4 to 15] attributes 1,2,3 from above comments on document in general

The TC considers these comments to be sub-comment of comment 1.

Germany

Comment 1

> A clause normative references as used in ISO/IEC Standards should be included in the front matter of the standard.

The OpenDocument v1.0 (2nd edition) specification now cites the ISO RELAX-NG standard. See also United Kingdom Comment 5.

Israel

Comment 1

> Since ODF is based on XML and XML is built on Unicode, it should clarify the relation between the "writing-mode" property used in ODF and the "paragraph embedding level" used by Unicode (see http://www.unicode.org/reports/tr9/tr9-16.html#BD4).

The TC intends to explain the relation between the writing-mode properties of OpenDocument and the Unicode BiDi algorithm in a non-normative appendix to a future version of the OpenDocument specification. See also Egypt Comment 1.

Comment 2

> The concept of direction (e.g. left-to-right or right-to-left) is relevant not only for text documents. We suggest to add clarification how the proper direction can be specified for other types of documents like drawing documents, presentation documents, spreadsheet documents, chart documents.

OpenDocument uses a single schema for text within text documents, spreadsheets, drawing documents and charts. All concepts of direction that are available for text documents therefore are also available for the other document types. The TC intends to clarify this in a non-normative appendix to a future version of the OpenDocument specification. See also Egypt Comment 1.

China

Comment 1

> Considering the market relevance, ODF should be integrated with China national standard final draft — Unified Document Format (UOF) as much as possible, as well as Microsoft's Open XML Format.

The TC believes that harmonization between various standards is a desirable and worthy goal. Clearly harmonization must occur between willing partners. It is encouraging to learn that the PRC is willing to harmonize UOF with ODF once UOF is adopted as a national Chinese standard. This could be done either within the context of the ODF TC (as a sub-committee) or as a separate OASIS TC. As regards harmonization with Microsoft's Open XML Format, that would depend on what Microsoft (and ECMA) decide to do about this issue.

Comment 2

> XSLT Style sheets should be provided to facilitate the conversion among the mainstream document formats.

The purpose of the OpenDocument TC is to create an open, XML-based file format specification for office applications. While the TC considers the development of XSLT style sheets for the conversion between OpenDocument and other formats to be useful, this is not within the scope of the OpenDocument TC itself. It may be the subject for a new OASIS TC, or some other initiative like that.

Comment 3

> UNO implementation of ODF should conform to CORBA specification.

UNO (Universal Network Objects) is the component model of the OpenOffice.org application, which is one of many applications that implement OpenDocument. It is not related to OpenDocument, and therefore it is not within the scope of the OpenDocument TC. The OpenDocument TC will forward this comment to the OpenOffice.org project.

Comment 4

> ODF in W3C schema should be provided in addition to RelaxNG specification.

The OpenDocument schema is specified in Relax-NG, which is an ISO standard. The purpose of the schema is the validation of OpenDocument instances. Providing a W3C XSD schema would be possible, but since not all concepts that exist in Relax-NG also exist in W3C XSD and vice versa, the W3C XSD schema would not accept exactly the same set of documents as the Relax-NG schema. It therefore could not be used for validation purposes. Providing a W3C XSD schema for this reason seems not be reasonable.

Comment 5

> The document structure should be described by means of hierarchical elements for better extensibility, whereas the current version uses too many attributes.

There are many factors that have influenced whether information is represented as an attribute or an element in OpenDocument. One major factor was whether the information is represented as element or as attribute in the standards OpenDocument is based on.

Because there are no major differences how elements and attributes are specified in Relax-NG, the OpenDocument TC is not aware of any advantages regarding extensibility that the use of elements has over the use of attributes.

Comment 6

> ODF should add in support for user defined XML data.

OpenDocument already supports the inclusion of user-defined XML data through its XForms feature, described in section 11.2

Comment 7

> Different compression algorithms should be adopted according to different media types appeared in the content rather than using ZIP only.

In OpenDocument v1.0, the specification of the package format is included within the specification document itself. To simplify the reuse of the package format specification in other specification and to be able to extend it independently of the OpenDocument specification, the OpenDocument TC s considering for the future the possibility of moving the package format specification into a separate document. This will also provide the option of being able to specify alternative compression algorithms. Your comment reinforces this thought.

Comment 8

> Extension facilities should be provided for particular software products to allow them use product specific features.

OpenDocument v1.0 allows software products to include arbitrary product specific formatting properties (see section 15.1.3). OpenDocument further allows application to store arbitrary application specific settings (see section 2.4) and meta data (see section 3.3).

Comment 9

> Text table is hard to transform into other formats due to its faulty design.

The information provided in the comment is not sufficient to provide a response to it. The TC may have further responses to this comment when it gets more detailed information.

Comment 10

> Representation of graphics and chart is imperfect, e.g., the incompact chart description in spreadsheet.

The information provided in the comment is not sufficient to provide a response to it. The TC may have further responses to this comment when it gets more detailed information.

Comment 11

> Field representation is inexplicit and incomplete.

The information provided in the comment is not sufficient to provide a response to it. The TC may have further responses to this comment when it gets more detailed information.

Comment 12

> Some values adopted are not described clearly in the standard document, e.g., some string and enumerate values.

The information provided in the comment is not sufficient to provide a response to it. The TC may have further responses to this comment when it gets more detailed information.

Comment 13

> International markup. i.e., multilingual and localized tags should be supported.

The information provided in the comment is not sufficient to provide a response to it. The TC may have further responses to this comment when it gets more detailed information.

Comment 14

> Function related to Chinese processing should be enhanced, e.g., to support binding lines and diagonally divided table cells.

OpenDocument supports diagonal border lines. They are described in section 15.11.8

The information provided in the comment regarding binding lines is not sufficient to provide a response to it. The TC may have further responses to this comment when it gets more detailed information.