

1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
MB ¹	Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex (e.g. 3.1)	Paragraph/ Figure/Table/ Note (e.g. Table 1)	Type of comment ²	Comment (justification for change) by the MB	Proposed change by the MB	Secretariat observations on each comment submitted
DK	None specific		ge	<p>Ecma 376 is not worthy an ISO approval</p> <p>The specification consists of so many serious mistakes, self-contradictions, legal problems and Microsoft dependencies. EOOXML is surely a document specification, but it's not an open standard for documents.</p> <p>Cultural and linguistic adaptability suffers in OOXML because of closed-ended lists which, although they may match perfectly what Microsoft Office offers today, are not extensible by vendors in an interoperable way.</p> <p>It's not open and it's not standard.</p>		
DK	None specific		Ge	<p>Ecma 376 has not met the stability requirement</p> <p>ISO/IEC JTC 1 Directives, Edition 5, Version 2.0 states that in relation to PAS submissions: "The specification shall have had sufficient review over an extended time period to characterise it as being stable." (JTC1 Directives, Annex M The Transposition of Publicly Available Specifications into International Standards - A Management Guide, M.7.4.1.3)</p> <p>Since the specification was submitted for fast-track resolution almost immediately after its development, and its development was behind closed doors, this requirement has not been met.</p>		
DK	11.3.1		ge	<p>The "compatibility with legacy formats" can only be implemented by Microsoft.</p> <p>* As indicated above, 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.</p> <p>* As indicated above, Ecma 376 requires implementors to support Windows Metafiles instead of ISO 8632. As</p>		

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

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

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

1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
MB ¹	Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex (e.g. 3.1)	Paragraph/ Figure/Table/ Note (e.g. Table 1)	Type of comment ²	Comment (justification for change) by the MB	Proposed change by the MB	Secretariat observations on each comment submitted
				<p>Windows Metafiles are a proprietary technology, only Microsoft can implement this portion of the specification reliably.</p> <p>* 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.</p>		
DK	None specific		ge	<p>Patent rights to implement the Ecma 376 specification have not been granted</p> <p>Read literally, the license documents accompanying Ecma 376 grant no rights for vendors other than Microsoft Corp. to implement the specification. Even ignoring that problem, they are at best ambiguous as to the extent of rights granted and convey no rights for any other version of the proposed standard such as an improved version reflecting JTC-1 criticism. A single vendor in effect retains veto rights over any changes to the specification. Such defects render Ecma 376 unsuitable as an international standard candidate.</p> <p>The bottom line is that the relevant documents present legal quicksand of a depth that could only be determined through litigation. They are an unsuitable legal foundation for an international standard.</p> <p>Rights to implement Ecma 376 are governed by two Microsoft Corp. covenants not to sue, the Microsoft http://www.microsoft.com/interop/osp/default.mspx Open Specification Promise] ("OSP") and an earlier Microsoft Covenant Regarding Office 2003 XML Reference Schemas ("CNS") See Microsoft Open Specification Promise page: "We are giving potential implementers of</p>		

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

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

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

1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
MB ¹	Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex (e.g. 3.1)	Paragraph/ Figure/Table/ Note (e.g. Table 1)	Type of comment ²	Comment (justification for change) by the MB	Proposed change by the MB	Secretariat observations on each comment submitted
				Ecma Office Open XML the ability to take advantage of either the CNS or the OSP, at their choice."		
DK	None specific		ge	<p>End-User License Agreements (EULAs) may forbid full implementation</p> <p>As noted above, many portions of the specification inappropriately require duplication of the functionality of various proprietary products, without a definition of exactly what that behavior is. Even worse, in some jurisdictions it may be illegal for competitors to try to determine what the specification actually means.</p> <p>Many of these products' End-User License Agreements (EULAs) forbid attempts to determine exactly what these products do. It is difficult to find the EULA for Word 6, but later versions are instructive. For example, the "Microsoft Office Standard Edition 2003" (retrieved January 22, 2007) states in "LIMITATIONS ON REVERSE ENGINEERING, DECOMPILATION, AND DISASSEMBLY" that, "You may not reverse engineer, decompile, or disassemble the Software, except and only to the extent that such activity is expressly permitted by applicable law notwithstanding this limitation."</p> <p>Note that these involve copyright and/or contract issues, and thus Microsoft's patent grants do not appear to provide any relief from these provisions.</p> <p>In some jurisdictions, these EULA statements are probably enforceable. Indeed, Virginia and Maryland in the United States have passed a law called "UCITA", and UCITA essentially gives EULAs the force of law. Some jurisdictions do permit reverse engineering for interoperability purposes, but this is not universally true, and in some cases it is not clear that these exceptions are enough to permit legal use. The U.S. Digital Millenium Copyright Act (DMCA) includes an exception permitting reverse engineering for interoperability purposes from its</p>		

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

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

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

Objections to Ecma 376 from OpenOffice.org in Denmark

Date: 25. juni 2007

Document:

1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
MB ¹	Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex (e.g. 3.1)	Paragraph/ Figure/Table/ Note (e.g. Table 1)	Type of com- ment ²	Comment (justification for change) by the MB	Proposed change by the MB	Secretariat observations on each comment submitted
				prohibitions, but it is unclear that this DMCA provision would override EULAs in this case. In any case, this is a legal issue that must be resolved before this specification can even be considered. It is inappropriate to consider an international standard in which some suppliers might be forbidden by law to determine what the specification is.		
DK	None specific		ge	<p>Ecma 376 is a vendor lock-in specification</p> <p>* Adoption of Ecma 376 in its current state would frustrate the ISO goal [PDF] of "one standard, one test, and one conformity assessment procedure accepted everywhere." Yet Microsoft's Alan Yates has freely admitted that the primarily goal of Ecma 376's sponsor is to have two standards instead of one: "What I'm really going to be talking about is Massachusetts actually opening up to more choice and more competition than the current policy has. That's, I think that's the fundamental decision that's before us. Can Massachusetts open up to more choice, additional standards, in order to enable greater value over a period of time?"</p> <p>* Ecma 376 adoption would in effect grant Microsoft a monopoly on the conversion of its binary formats to XML</p> <p>* Ecma 376 is at least arguably violative of an existing antitrust injunction issued by the European Commission DG Competition*</p> <p>* Ecma 376 is at least arguably violative of an antrust injunction issued in U.S. v. Microsoft</p> <p>* Microsoft's refusal to disclose specifications for its binary file formats is under anti-trust investigation by the European Commission</p>		
DK	None specific		ge	<p>Ecma development process not open nor the result of industry consensus</p> <p>Ecma Technical Committee 45 included the following goal</p>		

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

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

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

1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
MB ¹	Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex (e.g. 3.1)	Paragraph/ Figure/Table/ Note (e.g. Table 1)	Type of comment ²	Comment (justification for change) by the MB	Proposed change by the MB	Secretariat observations on each comment submitted
				<p>in its terms of reference:</p> <p>“produce a formal standard for office productivity applications within the Ecma International standards process which is fully compatible with the Office Open XML Formats”.</p> <p>In other words, the technical committee was specifically limited to producing a format that was a subset of a single vendor's own proprietary format. Addressing the needs of users of other products, accomodating the functionality of other products, improving the format, and other such efforts to ensure the widest degree of interoperability were not permitted. The Ecma development process was not an open standards process nor industry consensus, but instead was clearly dominated by a single vendor.</p>		
DK	None specific		ge	<p>Ecma 376 cannot be adequately evaluated within the 30-day evaluation period</p> <p>At over 6,000 pages, the Ecma 376 specification is 10 times larger than the ISO/IEC 26300 OpenDocument specification (at least in part because it fails to reuse many pre-existing standards). It is not possible to review over 200 pages per day with any hope of finding all the major problems in the specification.</p> <p>The Ecma 376 specification lacks any pre-existing industry review with the exception of this document:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Ecma 376 was prepared over-hastily, with a calculated page review/edit/approve rate approximately 20 times faster than other markup standards. * Insufficient time was available for review of the enormous specification; it was finalized by Ecma on December 7 and submitted to JTC-1 less than 30 days later; * When submitted to JTC-1 and to this day, there have 		

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

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

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

1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
MB ¹	Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex (e.g. 3.1)	Paragraph/ Figure/Table/ Note (e.g. Table 1)	Type of comment ²	Comment (justification for change) by the MB	Proposed change by the MB	Secretariat observations on each comment submitted
				<p>been no full-featured reference applications available for testing and evaluation purposes.</p> <p>* Ecma 376 was developed behind closed doors, severely limiting external review during its development cycle and making it unlikely to be the result of an industry consensus.</p> <p>* The work plan of the Ecma technical committee that developed Ecma 376 specifically required compatibility with pre-existing proprietary file formats of a single vendor (Microsoft) that are incorporated by reference but whose specifications are not available. This restriction, the unavailability of the specifications for those formats, and the lack of suitable reference applications blocks review and evaluation of Ecma 376's success in achieving its core goal of compatibility with those legacy binary file formats.</p> <p>* No reference applications that implement even a majority of the features of Ecma 376 were available for testing and evaluation purposes at the commencement of the period for JTC-1 review, nor are they available to the present day.</p> <p>In spite of the short time available and the other restraints, this document preparation process has already found many problematic aspects of Ecma 376. This review is far from comprehensive. A comprehensive review less constrained by a short review period will undoubtedly uncover many more flaws.</p>		
DK	3.17.4.1		Te	<p>The Gregorian calendar is the most widely used calendar in the world. A modification of the Julian calendar, it was decreed by Pope Gregory XIII on 24 February 1582. The Gregorian calendar forms the basis of many international standards such as ISO 8601.</p> <p>"Date Representation", conflicts with the Gregorian</p>	<p>There is a known bug in Microsoft Excel that treats the year 1900 as a leap year. Changing the Gregorian calendar is not necessary (or the best way) to achieve compatibility with spreadsheets that depend on this bug.</p> <p>A better solution is to define the spec correctly,</p>	

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

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

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

1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
MB ¹	Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex (e.g. 3.1)	Paragraph/ Figure/Table/ Note (e.g. Table 1)	Type of com- ment ²	Comment (justification for change) by the MB	Proposed change by the MB	Secretariat observations on each comment submitted
				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.	and when converting old binary files to the new format, Microsoft Office would (for example) replace WEEKDAY() by WEEKDAY()+1 for any dates affected by this bug. Alternatively, since they have compatibility flags for several other legacy bugs, this could be handled that way as well, e.g., when importing a legacy Excel document, set a flag "LeapYearBug=true", but when creating a new OOXML document this flag would not be set and dates would be described correctly.	
DK	3.17.4.1		te	ISO 8601 is the ISO standard for date and time representations. "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.	Use ISO 8601 for date and time representations	
DK	3.17.7.224		te	An International Standard must take a broader view and provide wide cultural and linguistic interoperability. 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.	
DK	2.18.52		Te	ISO 639 is the set of ISO standards that lists short codes for language names (such as ISO 639-1 and ISO 639-2).	Use ISO 639 for language codes	

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

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

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

1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
MB ¹	Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex (e.g. 3.1)	Paragraph/ Figure/Table/ Note (e.g. Table 1)	Type of comment ²	Comment (justification for change) by the MB	Proposed change by the MB	Secretariat observations on each comment submitted
				<p>ST_LangCode requires the use of a fixed list of numeric language codes rather than the already existing set provided by ISO 639.</p> <p>This is a conflict with ISO 639. The codes standardized by ISO 639 include the use of a Registration Authority to process requests for new language codes. This is preferable to a fixed list attached to a document standard.</p>		
DK	6.2.3.17 6.4.3.1		Te	<p>ISO/IEC 8632 is the ISO standard for computer graphics metafiles: "2D graphical (pictorial) information" consisting of "vector graphics", "raster graphics", and "text" (NIST, 1998).</p> <p>"Embedded Object Alternate Image Requests Types" "Clipboard Format Types" refer to Windows Metafiles or Enhanced Metafiles.</p>	Use ISO/IEC 8632 or W3C SVG instead.	
DK			Te	<p>ISO/IEC 26300 OpenDocument is the ISO/IEC standard for office productivity applications. It covers the functionality needed for text documents, spreadsheets, drawings and presentations for office applications.</p> <p>Ecma 376 duplicates the functionality of the existing OpenDocument standard as its core purpose is to support text documents, spreadsheets, drawings and presentations for office applications. Ecma 376 contradicts ISO 26300.</p>		
DK	14		te	<p>SVG is the W3C standard "for describing two-dimensional vector and mixed vector/raster graphics in XML".</p> <p>"DrawingML" defines a vector drawing XML format in conflict with the industry standard W3C SVG.</p>		
DK	8.6.2		Te	<p>"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.</p>	Defining a new standard for vector drawings is not necessary for compatibility with existing Microsoft Office documents. Even if Ecma 376 legitimately needs drawing functions not available in SVG, it should reference SVG for all features that are	

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

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

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

1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
MB ¹	Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex (e.g. 3.1)	Paragraph/ Figure/Table/ Note (e.g. Table 1)	Type of comment ²	Comment (justification for change) by the MB	Proposed change by the MB	Secretariat observations on each comment submitted
					<p>provided by SVG.</p> <p>ISO 26300 OpenDocument illustrates how to solve this problem:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * There are functions in ISO 26300 that are not present in SVG (3D drawings). * There are functions in SVG not present in ISO 26300 (cubic bezier curves). <p>Therefore, ISO 26300 uses an SVG-compatible namespace for all drawing functions that can be provided by SVG, and a separate namespace for 3D drawing functions. Hence avoiding any conflict with SVG.</p>	
DK	7.1		Te	<p>MathML is the W3C standard for "describing mathematical notation and capturing both its structure and content".</p> <p>"Math" covers mathematical expressions, and defines a format in conflict and incompatible with the W3C Recommendation MathML.</p> <p>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.</p>		
DK	2.15.1.28 3.3.1.69		te	<p>Ecma 376 ignores accepted standards for cryptographic hashes and defies expert standards for cryptography, by proposing its own hash algorithms which are almost certainly flawed.</p> <p>Cryptography, including the constructure of secure hash functions, is very difficult. Weaknesses are regularly discovered even in publicly-vetted cryptographic algorithms long thought secure, whereas proprietary cryptographic methods not subjected to intensive public</p>		

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

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

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

1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
MB ¹	Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex (e.g. 3.1)	Paragraph/ Figure/Table/ Note (e.g. Table 1)	Type of comment ²	Comment (justification for change) by the MB	Proposed change by the MB	Secretariat observations on each comment submitted
				<p>scrutiny are nearly always found to be seriously flawed (see e.g. Schneier).</p> <p>Several government agencies and standards bodies with expertise in encryption have made lists of recommended hash functions, all of which have received extensive scrutiny by cryptographers. For example, in the area of secure hash functions:</p> <p>* ISO has chosen the "Whirlpool" algorithm as standard ISO 10118-3.</p> <p>* The W3C, in its XML-ENC standard, includes a list of algorithms: SHA1, SHA256, SHA512, RIPEMD-160.</p> <p>* The European NESSIE project recommends: ISO 10118-3 ("Whirlpool"), SHA-256, SHA-384 and SHA-512.</p> <p>* In the USA, NIST recommends SHA1, SHA224, SHA256, SHA384, and SHA512.</p> <p>* In Japan, CRYPTREC recommends: MD5, RIPEMD-160, SHA1, SHA256, SHA384, and SHA512.</p> <p>Ecma 376 does not follow the advice of any of these organizations. Instead, it defines new hashing algorithms that have not undergone scrutiny by the cryptographic community.</p> <p>Ecma 376 defines two very similar algorithms. Nowhere is there clear notification that these algorithms are likely to be extremely flawed and thus should not be used in new applications.</p> <p>The Emca 376 hash functions are almost guaranteed to be flawed and insecure. 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</p>		

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

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

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

1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
MB ¹	Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex (e.g. 3.1)	Paragraph/ Figure/Table/ Note (e.g. Table 1)	Type of comment ²	Comment (justification for change) by the MB	Proposed change by the MB	Secretariat observations on each comment submitted
				<p>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>		
DK	4.4		Te	<p>SMIL is the W3C standard for "synchronized multimedia presentation". As the Recommendation states, with SMIL an author can:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Describe the temporal behavior of the presentation. 2. Describe the layout of the presentation on a screen. 3. Associate hyperlinks with media objects. <p>"Animation" covers presentation animations (slide transitions), in conflict with the W3C Recommendation SMIL.</p>	<p>It is not necessary to define a new standard for slide transitions to achieve compatibility with existing Microsoft Office documents. Even if Ecma 376 legitimately needs slide transition functions not available in SMIL, it should reference SMIL for all features that are provided by SMIL.</p> <p>ISO 26300 OpenDocument illustrates this point. ISO 26300 uses SMIL-compatible attributes for slide transitions whenever such an attribute exists. In a similar way, if there is functionality in Ecma 376 that legitimately cannot be represented in SMIL, Ecma 376 must still use SMIL-compatible tags for all the features that can be expressed in SMIL.</p>	
DK	5.1.12.42 5.9.2.1 2.18.105		te	<p>Many attributes throughout the Ecma 376 spec take values in "English Metric Units" (EMU). For example, attributes of type ST_PositiveCoordinate are measured in EMUs. This is not a known unit in existing literature. It is only defined inside a paragraph in section 5.9.2.1, so that "91440 EMUs/U.S. inch, 36000 EMUs/cm". Similarly, 2.18.105 specifies "twips"—twentieths of a point (1/1440th of an inch).</p>		
DK	2.3.2.36		ge	<p>The w:sz element is an example of major internal</p>	<p>Such inconsistencies dramatically increase the</p>	

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

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

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

1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
MB ¹	Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex (e.g. 3.1)	Paragraph/ Figure/Table/ Note (e.g. Table 1)	Type of comment ²	Comment (justification for change) by the MB	Proposed change by the MB	Secretariat observations on each comment submitted
	2.15.2.39 3.4.11 2.3.1.4 4.3.2.11 4.4.1.33 4.8.13 5.1.5.3.2			<p>inconsistencies in the specifications measurements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * For fonts, the w:sz element specifies the size in half points (2.3.2.36). * 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. The examples do not refer to w:sz at all. * However, as the child of rPr (3.4.11), its value is in points. <p>Note that in the Spreadsheet section (section 3), none of the examples have any namespace prefixes.</p> <p>The w:sz attribute is also internally inconsistent:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * 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). * When used as an attribute of restoredLeft (4.3.2.11), it specifies the size of a dimension in normal view as a percentage of the screen. * In presentations, as an attribute of the ph element (4.4.1.33), it is an enumerated value with choices "full", "half", and "quarter" (4.8.13). * When sz is used as an attribute of defRPr (default character properties (5.1.5.3.2), it is the size of a font in hundredths of a point. 	<p>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>	
	2.18.4		te	<p>Ecma 376 lists numerous styles such as apples, scaredCat, heebieJeebies, etc. However, the specification does not fully define these styles (e.g missing height, width, color-depth, orientation). The style basicThinLine describes behaviour for horizontal, vertical and corner scenarios but many styles (e.g babyRattle, balloonsHotair, etc) provide no such details.</p>		

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

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

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

1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)		
MB ¹	Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex (e.g. 3.1)	Paragraph/ Figure/Table/ Note (e.g. Table 1)	Type of comment ²	Comment (justification for change) by the MB	Proposed change by the MB	Secretariat observations on each comment submitted		
				The problem with this is that a single style can be interpreted differently by different vendors/implementers. Also, these styles provide no generality.				
	2.18.52		te	<p>Ecma 376 uses confusing and inconsistent definitions of values with hexadecimal numbers.</p> <p>For example, 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>One possible interpretation is that by "digit" the spec sometimes means "octet" (i.e., a byte). An octet/byte is equivalent to two hexadecimal digits. If this interpretation is correct, then the specification clearly needs repair, since this is very likely to cause serious confusion in developers trying to implement Ecma 376.</p> <p>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:</p> <table border="1"> <tr> <td>ST_LangCode</td> <td>"two digit hexadecimal code"</td> </tr> </table>	ST_LangCode	"two digit hexadecimal code"		
ST_LangCode	"two digit hexadecimal code"							
DK	11.3.1		Te	<p>"Alternative Format Import Part", allows content in "plain text". The encoding for "plain text" is not specified</p> <p>Is it 7-bit ASCII? ISO 8859-1? UTF-8?. As specified it will not allow international interoperable use.</p>				
DK	5.1.10.45 2.15.1.78		te	<p>Ecma 376 contradicts the goals of XML which are:</p> <p>*XML documents should be human-legible and reasonably clear.</p>	There is no benefit to these bizarre names. In particular, they do not reduce the size of the file being saved or transmitted, since the file is compressed first.			

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

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

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

1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
MB ¹	Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex (e.g. 3.1)	Paragraph/ Figure/Table/ Note (e.g. Table 1)	Type of comment ²	Comment (justification for change) by the MB	Proposed change by the MB	Secretariat observations on each comment submitted
				<p>*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.</p> <p>These bizarre names:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * 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>Here are some examples:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * in VML (5.1.10.45) "outerShdw (Outer Shadow Effect)" has its second word devoid of vowels. And yet its Child Elements and Attributes have different naming conventions, e.g. scrGbClr, algn, blurRad, dir, dist, rotWithShape * in WordprocessingML (2.15.1.78) "settings(Document Settings)" has a large list of Child Elements, and within that it has significant contradictory naming conventions, e.g. ActiveWritingStyle, attachedSchema, documentType, docVars, endnotePr, hdrShapeDefaults. 		
DK	2.18.85 2.15.1.95 2.18.97 5.1.12.41		Ge	<p>Ecma 376 uses four inconsistent notations for percentage units, at least one of which is particularly inflexible:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Section 2.18.85 uses predefined symbols (like "pct15" for 15%) in 5 or 2.5 percent increments (which is inflexible and difficult to process with standard XML tools, compared to a generic number-valued field) 	In contrast, for example, the W3C SVG and W3C CSS standards both consistently use a single notation—decimal percentages followed by the "%" symbol—s described in section 7.10 of the W3C SVG 1.1 specification and section 4.3.3 of the CSS 2.1 specification.	

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

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

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

1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
MB ¹	Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex (e.g. 3.1)	Paragraph/ Figure/Table/ Note (e.g. Table 1)	Type of comment ²	Comment (justification for change) by the MB	Proposed change by the MB	Secretariat observations on each comment submitted
				<p>* Section 2.15.1.95 uses a decimal number giving the percentage</p> <p>* (Section 2.18.97 uses a number in 50ths of a percent</p> <p>* Section 5.1.12.41 uses a number in 1000ths of a percent</p>	<p>There is no need for this inconsistency or inflexibility to achieve compatibility with pre-existing Microsoft Office documents. A generic decimal percentage would suffice to express all of the above numeric values, while being much easier to process with existing XML tools. The precision with which a number is expressed in the file can easily be independent of the precision with which it is implemented (e.g. a particular implementation may be limited to distinguishing 5-percent increments, and could achieve this by rounding the percentage internally as needed).</p>	
DK	2.15.3.16		Te	<p>"doNotLeaveBackslashAlone". "This element specifies whether applications should automatically convert the backslash character into the yen character when it is added through user keyboard input".</p> <p>This is an application setting, not a document setting.</p>		
DK	2.16.5.79 2.16.5.76– 2.16.5.78		te	<p>In Section 2.16.5.79 "XE" (full name not defined) defines 'b', 'i' as bold and italic, which is contrary to XML and CSS.</p> <p>Similarly for other sections in 2.16.5, such as 2.16.5.76–2.16.5.78, which define "* Caps", "* FirstCap", "* Lower", and "* Upper" to format the capitalization of preceding text.</p>		
DK	2.16.5.77		Te	<p>The text that describes USERINITIALS, instead discusses USERNAME.</p>		
DK	2.18.66 2.9.18 2.11.17 2.11.18 2.15.1.16 2.6.12		Te	<p>Inflexible numbering format: ST_NumberFormat, Numbering Format for number lists (2.9.18), footnotes (2.11.17), endnotes (2.11.18), captions (2.15.1.16) and Page numbers (2.6.12).</p> <p>* Fixed to a few countries. Many regions are not included.</p> <p>* Contradicts W3C XSLT which ISO 26300 uses.</p>		

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

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

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

1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)																					
MB ¹	Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex (e.g. 3.1)	Paragraph/ Figure/Table/ Note (e.g. Table 1)	Type of comment ²	Comment (justification for change) by the MB	Proposed change by the MB	Secretariat observations on each comment submitted																					
				* Contradicts Unicode ISO 10646.																							
DK	6.2.3.23		Te	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.																						
DK	2.18.46 5.1.12.48		te	Ecma 376 contradicts the standard SVG Color Keyword Names's hexadecimal RGB values for given color names. <table border="1"> <tr> <td>Color Name</td> <td>SVG</td> <td>Ecma 376</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Dark blue</td> <td>00008B</td> <td>000080</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Dark cyan</td> <td>008B8B</td> <td>008080</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Dark gray</td> <td>A9A9A9</td> <td>808080</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Dark green</td> <td>006400</td> <td>008000</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Dark red</td> <td>8B0000</td> <td>800000</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Light gray</td> <td>D3D3D3</td> <td>C0C0C0</td> </tr> </table> Independent of Ecma 376's failure to adopt the SVG standard, its subtle redefinition of existing standardized terms will only lead to further confusion. In contrast, section 5.1.12.48 "ST_PresetColorVal" (Preset Color Value) matches SVG colors well. Unfortunately, it renames "darkGray" to "dkGray" to avoid self-contradiction at the cost of reducing agreement with the SVG standard.	Color Name	SVG	Ecma 376	Dark blue	00008B	000080	Dark cyan	008B8B	008080	Dark gray	A9A9A9	808080	Dark green	006400	008000	Dark red	8B0000	800000	Light gray	D3D3D3	C0C0C0	There is no need to redefine color names in order to achieve compatibility with existing Microsoft Office documents. Microsoft is free to use whatever color names it wishes on its application interface, and store the hexadecimal color value in the file.	
Color Name	SVG	Ecma 376																									
Dark blue	00008B	000080																									
Dark cyan	008B8B	008080																									
Dark gray	A9A9A9	808080																									
Dark green	006400	008000																									
Dark red	8B0000	800000																									
Light gray	D3D3D3	C0C0C0																									
DK	3.3.1.61 3.3.1.62		Te	Sections 3.3.1.61 and 3.3.1.62, both of which involve printer settings, define a "paperSize" attribute whose value is an integer representing one of 68 fixed paper sizes. These paper-size codes are apparently based on corresponding [http://support.microsoft.com/kb/135639 paper-size registry codes] in Microsoft Windows.	Use 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																						

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

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

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

1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)																												
MB ¹	Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex (e.g. 3.1)	Paragraph/ Figure/Table/ Note (e.g. Table 1)	Type of comment ²	Comment (justification for change) by the MB	Proposed change by the MB	Secretariat observations on each comment submitted																												
					user interface.																													
DK	2.8.2.16 2.3.1.18 2.4.7 2.4.8 2.4.51 2.4.52 2.15.1.86 6.1.2.7		te	<p>Many element attributes in Ecma 376 are defined as bitmasks. For example:</p> <p>2.8.2.16 "sig (Supported Unicode Subranges and Code Pages)" describes the <w:sig> element whose attributes are all bitmasks. For example, take the attribute csb1:</p> <p>"Specifies a four digit hexadecimal encoding of the upper 32 bits of the 64-bit code-page bit field that identifies which specific character sets or code pages are supported by the parent font"</p> <p>This attribute takes the following values:</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Bit</th> <th>Description</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr><td>0-15</td><td>Reserved for OEM</td></tr> <tr><td>24</td><td>IBM Turkish</td></tr> <tr><td>16</td><td>IBM Greek</td></tr> <tr><td>25</td><td>IBM Cyrillic</td></tr> <tr><td>17</td><td>MS-DOS Russian</td></tr> <tr><td>26</td><td>Latin 2</td></tr> <tr><td>18</td><td>MS-DOS Nordic</td></tr> <tr><td>27</td><td>MS-DOS Baltic</td></tr> <tr><td>19</td><td>Arabic</td></tr> <tr><td>28</td><td>Greek (former 437G)</td></tr> <tr><td>20</td><td>MS-DOS Canadian French</td></tr> <tr><td>29</td><td>Arabic (AMSO 708)</td></tr> <tr><td>21</td><td>Hebrew</td></tr> </tbody> </table>	Bit	Description	0-15	Reserved for OEM	24	IBM Turkish	16	IBM Greek	25	IBM Cyrillic	17	MS-DOS Russian	26	Latin 2	18	MS-DOS Nordic	27	MS-DOS Baltic	19	Arabic	28	Greek (former 437G)	20	MS-DOS Canadian French	29	Arabic (AMSO 708)	21	Hebrew		
Bit	Description																																	
0-15	Reserved for OEM																																	
24	IBM Turkish																																	
16	IBM Greek																																	
25	IBM Cyrillic																																	
17	MS-DOS Russian																																	
26	Latin 2																																	
18	MS-DOS Nordic																																	
27	MS-DOS Baltic																																	
19	Arabic																																	
28	Greek (former 437G)																																	
20	MS-DOS Canadian French																																	
29	Arabic (AMSO 708)																																	
21	Hebrew																																	

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

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

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

1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
MB ¹	Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex (e.g. 3.1)	Paragraph/ Figure/Table/ Note (e.g. Table 1)	Type of comment ²	Comment (justification for change) by the MB	Proposed change by the MB	Secretariat observations on each comment submitted
				30 WE/Latin 1 22 MS-DOS Icelandic 31 US 23 MS-DOS Portuguese The other attributes of <w:sig> have similar definitions as bitmasks. Many other element attributes in Ecma 376 have similar definitions as bitmasks. For example: * Section 2.3.1.18, Paragraph conditional formatting. * Section 2.4.7, Table cell conditional formatting. * Section 2.4.8, Table row conditional formatting. * Section 2.4.51, Table style conditional formatting settings. * Section 2.4.52, Table style conditional formatting settings exceptions. * Section 2.15.1.86, Suggested filtering for list of document styles . * Section 2.15.1.87, Suggested sorting for list of document styles (page 2036) * Section 6.1.2.7, tableproperties attribute of shape group.		
DK	2.4.51 2.4.52 2.15.1.86 2.15.1.87 2.8.2.16 2.18.57 2.3.1.8 2.4.7 2.4.8		te	The bitmasks specified by Ecma 376 are mostly of fixed length (a fixed number of bits). For example, the bitmasks used in sections 2.4.51, 2.4.52, 2.15.1.86, and 2.15.1.87 are all of type ST_ShortHexNumber, which is defined as consisting of exactly 4 hexadecimal digits (16 bits, see above regarding conflicting definitions). The bitmasks in section 2.8.2.16 are of type ST_LongHexNumber (2.18.57) which is defined as consisting of exactly 8 hexadecimal digits (32 bits, see above regarding	XML formats have no need for bitmasks. XML provides much richer structures, and the original benefits of bitmasks do not apply to XML formats. The theoretical memory saving is irrelevant if you are encoding the number in ASCII and surrounding it by text tags. In addition, Ecma 376 documents (like ISO 26300) are compressed anyways.	

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

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

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

1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
MB ¹	Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex (e.g. 3.1)	Paragraph/ Figure/Table/ Note (e.g. Table 1)	Type of comment ²	Comment (justification for change) by the MB	Proposed change by the MB	Secretariat observations on each comment submitted
	2.18.11 6.1.2.7			<p>conflicting definitions). The bitmasks in sections 2.3.1.8, 2.4.7, and 2.4.8 are of type ST_Cnf (2.18.11), which is defined as consisting of exactly 12 binary digits (12 bits). The bitmask in section 6.1.2.7 consists of exactly "three bits".</p> <p>Because it is not possible to add new bits to a fixed-length bitmask, extensibility is extremely limited.</p> <p>Also, bitmasks require that some other data be encoded into numbers to be used in the bitmasks. For example, see the language encodings discussed earlier: every language must be assigned an arbitrary numeric code before it can be used. Keeping this mapping up-to-date requires constant maintenance by some body. If not carefully handled, a single vendor could end up having de facto control over this mapping, and as a result that vendor could determine what could be done or not by the format (by refusing to assign mappings useful to a competitor).</p> <p>Using bitmasks creates a new data model, separate from the XML data model. In particular, the bitmask cannot be described in or validated by XML Schema, Relax NG, Schematron or any standard XML schema language or current validator.</p> <p>XSLT is the W3C standard for manipulating and converting XML documents, and is by far the most popular tool for working with XML. XSLT has no tools for bitwise operators, since bitmasks are not part of the XML data model.</p> <p>The TC45 is the Ecma Technical Committee charged with developing the Ecma 376 specification. The charter of the TC45 includes the specific goal of:</p> <p>"...enabling the implementation of the Office Open XML Formats by a wide set of tools and platforms in order to</p>		

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

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

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

1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
MB ¹	Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex (e.g. 3.1)	Paragraph/ Figure/Table/ Note (e.g. Table 1)	Type of comment ²	Comment (justification for change) by the MB	Proposed change by the MB	Secretariat observations on each comment submitted
				foster interoperability across office productivity applications and with line-of-business systems" Since bitmasks cannot be implemented in any of the standard tools for XML data formats, their use is in conflict with the TC45's charter.		
DK	6.2.3.17		te	"Embedded Object Alternate Image Requests Types" requires implementors to support the proprietary Windows Metafiles.		
DK	2.15.3.6 2.15.3.26 2.15.3.31 2.15.3.32 2.15.3.41 2.15.3.51 2.15.3.53 2.15.3.54 2.15.3.63 2.15.3.64 2.15.3.65 2.15.3.66		te	Several sections require the implementor to clone the behaviour of a proprietary product, where the behaviour to clone is not specified. For example: * Section 2.15.3.6, autoSpaceLikeWord95. * Section 2.15.3.26, footnoteLayoutLikeWW8. * Section 2.15.3.31, lineWrapLikeWord6. * Section 2.15.3.32, mwSmallCaps. * Section 2.15.3.41 shapeLayoutLikeWW8. * Section 2.15.3.51, suppressTopSpacingWP. * Section 2.15.3.53, truncateFontHeightsLikeWP6. * Section 2.15.3.54, uiCompat97To2003. * Section 2.15.3.63, useWord2002TableStyleRules. * Section 2.15.3.64, useWord97LineBreakRules. * Section 2.15.3.65, wpJustification. * Section 2.15.3.66, wpSpaceWidth. Specifications that say "clone this product," instead of explicitly stating what behavior is required, have no place in an international standard. It may also be illegal in some jurisdictions to determine what such a non-specification means, as discussed below regarding end-user license agreements (EULAs).	Attributes like these have no place in an international standard, and are not needed for compatibility with existing documents. The correct way to achieve compatibility is through generic tags. For example: * autoSpaceLikeWord95 should be replaced by a generic character-spacing attribute that takes a numeric value or set of numeric values. * wpSpaceWidth should be replaced by by a generic space-width tag that takes a numeric value or set of numeric values. * Even attributes as obscure as lineWrapLikeWord6 can be generalized into a line-wrap-style attribute. Using a more general solution offers far more extensibility and flexibility.	
DK	6.1.2.19 6.2.2.14 2.7.4		te	Ecma 376 often relies on "application-defined" behaviors to support important functionality that should be documented or supported via existing standards. The		

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

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

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

1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
MB ¹	Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex (e.g. 3.1)	Paragraph/ Figure/Table/ Note (e.g. Table 1)	Type of comment ²	Comment (justification for change) by the MB	Proposed change by the MB	Secretariat observations on each comment submitted
				<p>reliance upon application-defined formats inhibits the goal of interoperability and prevents the exchange of valuable information contained within a document.</p> <p>Examples include:</p> <p>* Section 6.1.2.19 defines the "equationxml" attribute of "shape" elements, "used to rehydrate an equation using the Office Open XML Math syntax". This information is apparently intended to allow mathematical equations in drawings to be edited and interpreted based on their underlying mathematical structure rather than as simple graphical objects, a critically important feature for users of equations in illustrations and presentations. However, the "actual format of the contents of this attribute are application-defined", which makes them impossible to exchange between applications. (Even though "they shall contain Office Open XML Math", this could be arbitrarily and unnecessarily obfuscated by the presence of other application-specific information, application-specific encodings, and so on.)</p> <p>* "gfxdata" attribute for the "shape" elements, which "contains DrawingML content" that is "base-64 encoded". However, the "contents of this package are application-defined", so even though they "shall use the Parts defined by this Standard whenever possible" there is not sufficient information for an independent implementation to read this data or display the "DrawingML content" contained therein. (The stated rationale for this attribute is to allow "VML to represent graphical content while still persisting DrawingML for consuming applications that support DrawingML" — but this only highlights the duplicative nature of Ecma 376, which defines two new vector-graphics XML formats, VML and DrawingML, instead of using a single standard one such as W3C SVG.)</p> <p>* Section 6.2.2.14 defines an "ink" element which stores</p>		

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

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

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

1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
MB ¹	Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex (e.g. 3.1)	Paragraph/ Figure/Table/ Note (e.g. Table 1)	Type of comment ²	Comment (justification for change) by the MB	Proposed change by the MB	Secretariat observations on each comment submitted
				<p>"ink annotations in an application-defined format." This is apparently intended to store Microsoft Ink annotations, used with tablet input devices to add hand-written annotations to documents. These annotations are often a vital part of documents and their specification is undefined in Ecma 376. Moreover, the use of unspecified formats is entirely unnecessary, as the W3C PNG specification could be used for transparent raster image data and the W3C SVG specification could be used for vector or mixed vector/raster data. Microsoft, in contrast, reports that it uses one of two proprietary formats for Ink content: an Ink Serialized Format (ISF) encoding the user's pen-stroke information as well as other metadata (using an undocumented compressed format), as well as a "fortified" GIF format including ISF meta-data.</p> <p>* Numerous elements are not required by the standard, but if omitted lead to "application-defined" default behaviors—a completely unnecessary barrier to interchange between applications (causing the same document with "default" styles to appear completely different in two conforming programs), as opposed to simply defining the defaults in the standard. For example, sections 2.7.4 defines elements to specify default paragraph and run properties (docDefaults, pPr, pPrDefault, rPr, and rPrDefault); if these are omitted "the defaults are therefore application-defined".</p>		

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

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

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