

ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 34
Document Description and Processing Languages
Secretariat: [Japan \(JISC\)](#)

DOC. TYPE	Expert Contribution	
TITLE	Identifiers for ODF and OOXML Constructs	
SOURCE	Mr. Patrick DURUSAU	
PROJECT	29166	
STATUS	This document was presented at the WG 5 meeting held in Okinawa, Japan, 2009-01-28/30.	
ACTION ID	FYI	
DUE DATE		
DISTRIBUTION	P, O and L Members of ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 34 ; ISO/IEC JTC 1 Secretariat; ISO/IEC ITTF	
ACCESS LEVEL	Def	
ISSUE NO.	61	
FILE	NAME	1143.pdf
	SIZE (KB)	
	PAGES	12

Secretariat ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 34 - IPSJ/ITSCJ (Information Processing Society of Japan/Information Technology Standards Commission of Japan)* Room 308-3, Kikai-Shinko-Kaikan Bldg., 3-5-8, Shiba-Koen, Minato-ku, Tokyo 105-0011 Japan *Standard Organization Accredited by JISC
 Telephone: +81-3-3431-2808; Facsimile: +81-3-3431-6493; E-mail: kimura@itscj.ipsj.or.jp

Identifiers for ODF and OOXML Constructs

Patrick Durusau
OpenDocument Format Editor
ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 34/WG 5
Okinawa, Japan
29 January 2009

Introduction

- Interoperability is not:
 - Extolling one standard over another
 - My feature beats your feature
 - I'm less broken than you

Introduction II

- Interoperability is:
 - Syntax only? No
 - Semantics only? No
 - Syntax + Semantics? No
 - Syntax + Semantics + Implementation? No

Introduction III

- Interoperability is:
 - Syntax + Semantics + Implementation + User Requirements
- Interoperability **is for a reason** (not an abstract exercise)

ODF ↔ OOXML

- Every application that reads ODF/OOXML and “saves-as” the other format, has such a mapping.
- Format1 → In Memory Form → Format2
- That is “a” mapping
- These mappings are not always:
 - Public (some are, some aren't)
 - Documented (impliedly in some cases)
 - Standardized (none)

Maps And Identifiers

- Maps, even of a single format, are composed of things that are identified
- What is identified controls the uses of the resulting map
- Identifying only syntactic constructs may have different uses than identifying semantic constructs
- Identifiers should be separate from the constructs that they identify

Identifiers

- ODF and OOXML overload names
- Reliance on names alone can lead to confusion in what is being identified
- Moreover, semantics vary depending on context
- Identifiers need to capture names, context, semantics and more
- Identifiers must support machine based matching and human validation

Identifier Example: ODF

- Name: fo:font-style
- Namespace:
urn:oasis:names:tc:opendocument:xmlns:xml
ns:xsl-fo-compatible:1.0
- Construct: Attribute
- Defined: ODF 1.2, Section 18:415 (current draft, this is changing)
- BasedOn: XSL 1.0, Section 7.8.7
- Omits: backslant and inherit as values
- IRI: http://somewhere.com/odf_1.0_fo_font-style.html

Published Subject Identifiers (PSIs)

- Web based identifiers that:
 - IRIs used to distinguish “what” is being represented
 - Text so that human users can ascertain “what” is being represented
- Avoids “name” limitation
- Can contain arbitrary other information
- Arbitrarily fine grained identification of the construct it represents

Published Subject Identifiers (PSIs) II

- Can identify the standard from which its construct is drawn
- Can point to reference documentation (such as standard text)
- Can include pointers to implementation notes or text
- Can include commentary on the construct

Next Steps

- Create illustrative identifiers (PSIs) for constructs in ODF and OOXML
- PSIs should reflect a range of choices for what information to include
- Identify issues and problems with PSI construction
- Working paper for discussion by WG 5 in Prague