	Reference (major)	Reference (clause)	Issue Type (Editorial/ Technical/ Other)	Comment	Status	Change Applied
	A	B	C	D	E	F
2	Editorial	Throughout	Technical	Change "may" to "can" or "might", as appropriate. "may" is a particularly problematic term when used in the negative. Of course, if the use of "may" is intended to be normative, "COULD" or "SHOULD" should be used instead.	Accepted	WD1.1
3	Editorial	Throughout	Editorial	Various on-going editorial tasks: Add non-breaking spaces, as appropriate, so that certain line breaks look better. Add forward references, as appropriate.		
4	Editorial	Throughout	Editorial	Mark all defining entries in the cross-reference index so they appear in bold in the index.		
5	Normative References & Bibliography	Throughout	Editorial	Check all RFCs and other specs referenced in the text to see if they are in the normative references list or bibliography, as appropriate.	Accepted	WD1.1
6	Normative References & Bibliography	Electronic annexes	Editorial	Add text mentioning the electronic versions of schemas and their normative status.	Accepted	WD1.1
7	Editorial	Throughout	Editorial	Consider replacing cross-references of the form 'see §s, "xxx," on page pp' with 'see §s'. Page number references are not really relevant in an electronic document, and it's not clear that having the clause name as well as number is useful.	Accepted	WD1.1
8	Normative References & Bibliography	Draft 1.0.1, 9.3	Technical	Resolve references to .NET and Windows Presentation Foundation.		
9	Colour	Draft 1.0.1, 15.1.8-15.1.9, I, MS00 signature	Technical	Decide what, if anything, to do about private Microsoft ICC and "MS00" signature.		
10	Conformance	Draft 1.0.1, 2, page 3, line 20	Technical	Clause 2, page 3, Software Conformance clause beginning line 20 should explicitly note that consumers are not required to consume XPS documents that have been externally compressed, encrypted or wrapped in any other way such that the resulting file does not directly conform to the XPS specification.		
11	Normative References & Bibliography	Draft 1.0.1, 3, page 5	Editorial	Clause 3, page 5, ISO/IEC 10646:2003 has been added as a normative reference. It was not referenced in the original 1.0 XPS Specification.		
12	Editorial	Draft 1.0.1, 8.1, page 17	Editorial	8.1, page 17, first item, Common Properties clause number appears outside parentheses.	Accepted	WD1.1
13	Editorial	Draft 1.0.1, 8.1, page 17	Editorial	8.1, page 17, Description for Document Structure and Interactivity – "in order" no longer required at end of 1st sentence now that example has been extracted.	Accepted	WD1.1
14	Package	Draft 1.0.1, 9.1, page 19, lines 21 and 22	Technical	9.1, page 19, lines 21 and 22. It seems to say that it is possible to have two or more fixed payloads in an XPS document but only one is discoverable through the XPS Document start part relationship. Is the intent that the relationship could be changed to a different fixed payload? How? And how does this work with the DiscardControl part which is not fixed payload qualified but discovered through a package relationship.	Accepted	WD1.1

	A	B	C	D	E	F
1	Reference (major)	Reference (clause)	Issue Type (Editorial/ Technical/ Other)	Comment	Status	Change Applied
15	Editorial	Throughout	Editorial	The conformance numbers are the same as they were in the original XPS 1.0 document. There the numbers were based on the chapters in which they originally appeared - should they be updated to reflect the clause where they are defined? 2007-09-26: Reference column in App I is all incorrect as well.		
16	Editorial	Draft 1.0.1, 9.1, page 20	Editorial	9.1, page 20, Thumbnail and StoryFragments parts - the clause number references appear outside the parentheses. Also need clause references for ICC profile and DiscardControl parts.	Accepted	WD1.1
17	Package	Draft 1.0.1, 9.1.2, page 23, lines 19-20	Technical	9.1.2, page 23, lines 19-20. States that the reference from the DocumentReference to a FixedDocument should be a relative URI. Should means optional, and the only alternative is that the URI is absolute, and absolute URIs are not allowed in XPS documents. The SHOULD should be a MUST. Technically, relative URIs are resolved to a pack URI, and there is no pack URI format that refers to the containing OPC container. Also applies to 9.1.3, lines 6-7, and 9.1.4, lines 20-21.	Accepted	WD1.1
18	Images	Draft 1.0.1, 9.1.5.1, page 25	Technical	9.1.5.1, page 25. APP13 marker (PhotoShop) - this marker is not a reliable source of information. We have seen JPEG files where all the useful information stored under this marker had been removed. While a consumer could use information held by this marker, a fallback should be defined if no such information is present, or an error might be raised.	Out of scope	N/A
19	Images	Draft 1.0.1, 9.1.5.1, page 25	Technical	9.1.5.1, page 25. For the case of JPEG images with inconsistent resolution data in different markers it is not clear what is the correct behaviour for a consumer.		
20	Images	Draft 1.0.1, 9.1.5.3	Technical	9.1.5.3. The sections for RGB and CMYK images both include "ExtraSamples (0, 1 or 2)", but the BitsPerSample and SamplesPerPixel lines imply a confusion between the count of entries in ExtraSamples and the value of each entry. The text for BitsPerSample and SamplesPerPixel implies that only ExtraSamples with N=1 need be supported. They also imply that a value of 0 for that 1 entry is not allowed, because the supported BitsPerSample and SamplesPerPixel values quoted are not legal if ExtraSamples is [0]. This conclusion is supported by the fact that correct behaviour for ExtraSamples = [1] and [2] are defined elsewhere (e.g. at the top of p29), but not correct behaviour when ExtraSamples = [0].		
21	Colour	Draft 1.0.1, 9.1.5.3	Technical	9.1.5.3. There is a statement of how colour spaces for TIFF data should be treated in the absence of a profile (on page 27). Why is this statement not repeated for JPEG and PNG images?	Accepted	WD1.1
22	Images	Draft 1.0.1, 9.1.5.3, page 29, line 9	Technical	9.1.5.3, page 29, line 9. JPEG compression for TIFF images (compression=6) is set as a requirement. That model is widely held to be fundamentally broken and not implementable. Compression=7, as first published in the Draft TIFF Technical Note #2, 17 March 95, (by Tom Lane, the Independent JPEG Group) and then adopted by Adobe (as Adobe Photoshop® TIFF Technical Notes, March 22 2002) is actually usable.		

	A	B	C	D	E	F
1	**Reference (major)**	**Reference (clause)**	**Issue Type (Editorial/ Technical/ Other**	**Comment**	**Status**	**Change Applied**
23	Normative References & Bibliography	Draft 1.0.1, 9.1.5.4, page 29	Technical	9.1.5.4, page 29. Should Windows Media Photo be replaced with HD Photo throughout?		
24	Fonts & Glyphs	Draft 1.0.1, 9.1.7, page 31, lines 19-20	Technical	9.1.7, page 31, lines 19-20. States that the font fragment must be an integer but defines no syntax for its representation. For example, is the fragment #+2.0 valid to select the third face (indexes being zero based)?	Accepted	WD1.1
25	Editorial	Draft 1.0.1, 9.1.7.3, page 33, line 8	Editorial	9.1.7.3, page 33, line 8. Incorrect numbering of list items (starts at 4).	Accepted	WD1.1
26	Editorial	Draft 1.0.1, 9.1.7.3, page 33, line 21	Editorial	9.1.7.3, page 33, line 21. The S2.19 needs to be outside the Note. Also question how useful the note is.	Accepted	WD1.1
27	Fonts & Glyphs	Draft 1.0.1, 9.1.7.5, page 35-36	Technical	Page 35-36. Paragraph 6 of section 9.1.7.5 mentions that when using the compatibility encoding where the font has a cmap (3,0) encoding, that character codes in the range 0x80-0x9F should not be considered as non-printable Unicode control characters. This is no longer relevant following changes to section 12.1.4 removing a requirement on a consumer to treat non-printable Unicode control characters in a special way.		
28	Fonts & Glyphs	Draft 1.0.1, 9.1.7.5, page 35	Technical	9.1.7.5, page 35. This clause has added a requirement to support fonts containing other than Unicode/Symbol cmaps, by using mapping tables from the Unicode codepoints to alternate character sets that can be used with the other cmap encodings. There are a couple of issues with this.

o Firstly, including additional mapping tables increases the memory footprint for embedded consumers.
o Secondly, for each encoding there are multiple mapping tables available depending on the generating environment. This leads to the likely scenario of differences in mapping behaviour between consumers using alternate tables, as well as to the producer. It would be better to define or specify a single mapping table to be used to ensure consistency of output between all producers and consumers. | | |
29	Normative References & Bibliography	Draft 1.0.1, 9.3, page 42	Editorial	9.3, page 42. In order to standardise XPS as a cross-platform format the comments about the relationship between XPS, WPF, XAML and .Net 3.0 should be removed.		
30	Normative References & Bibliography	Draft 1.0.1, 9.3.1, page 43, lines 14-16	Editorial	9.3.1, page 43, lines 14-16. The Markup Compatibility specification is part of OOXML, not OPC - OPC is but a section of OOXML along with MC.	Accepted	WD1.1
31	Editorial	Draft 1.0.1, 9.3.1, page 43, lines 32-35	Editorial	9.3.1, page 43, lines 32-35. The non-normative note specifies that MC mechanisms do not carry through to any resolved URIs. If this is a functional requirement then it should be normative text.	Accepted	WD1.1
32	Normative References & Bibliography	Draft 1.0.1, 9.3.2, page 43-44	Technical	9.3.2, page 43-44. There is no statement on which XML version is supported.	Accepted	WD1.1

	A Reference (major)	B Reference (clause)	C Issue Type (Editorial/ Technical/ Other)	D Comment	E Status	F Change Applied
33	Editorial	Draft 1.0.1, 9.3.3.2.1, page 45, line 25	Editorial	9.3.3.2.1, page 45, line 25. The forward reference at the end is not particularly helpful, since it points to such a very small part of the subject matter of the clause. More general references to some of the clauses in 18 might be more helpful.	Accepted	WD1.1
34	Syntax	Draft 1.0.1, 10.4, page 62 and page 64 lines 8-11	Technical	10.4, page 62 and page 64 lines 8-11. The EdgeMode attribute is the first attribute which may select a behaviour based upon the absence of the attribute, with no other way of selecting that behaviour. Consequently, there does not appear to be a way to request default rendering of path edges in a Canvas that is itself inside a Canvas with EdgeMode set to Aliased. The description of which child elements are affected by EdgeMode could be made a little clearer, e.g. by explicitly stating that Glyphs are not affected, only Path elements.		
35	Opacity	Draft 1.0.1, 11.1, page 74, line 20	Technical	11.1, page 74, line 20. The OpacityMask does not just affect the fill, it affects the stroke as well.	Accepted	WD1.1
36	Geometry	Draft 1.0.1, 11.2.2.1, page 82, lines 6-8	Technical	11.2.2.1, page 82, lines 6-8. The 2nd sentence of the last paragraph contradicts 18.6.8 for some line caps.		
37	Geometry	Draft 1.0.1, 11.2.2.3, page 86, line 8	Technical	11.2.2.3, page 86, line 8. The text states that the Points attribute contains a multiple of 3 x,y values, but the XSD does not enforce this. A similar situation exists for PolyQuadraticBezier segment in section 11.2.2.5. We noted that the XPS Viewer accepted incorrect numbers of control points, and MS confirmed that this was an error. This could perhaps be addressed in the XSD?		
38	Fonts & Glyphs	Draft 1.0.1, 12.1	Technical	12.1. CFF fonts where the hmtx table widths do not match the CFF table widths can result in different output between consumers. Should one of the two tables always be used? Or should an error be raised? We suggest that a recommendation to use the CFF widths is added.		
39	Fonts & Glyphs	Draft 1.0.1, 12.1.5, page 112	Technical	12.1.5, page 112. We have noted that the XPS Viewer makes an origin shift for bold simulation, moving the glyph up and right, such that the bottom left-hand corner of a glyph such as "L" will still appear to be in the same place. There is no mention of this in the spec.		
40	Editorial	Draft 1.0.1, 12.1.6, page 112, line 45	Editorial	12.1.6, page 112, line 45. IsSideway should be IsSideways.	Accepted	WD1.1
41	Fonts & Glyphs	Draft 1.0.1, 12.1.6.1, page 113	Technical	12.1.6.1, page 113. The calculation of advance width for sideways text does not say to use the vmtx table if present, just goes on to describe how to get the data from os/2 or hhea if it isn't. It also does not say what to do if the os/2 table is present but is of the older Apple format which omits ascender and descender. [The viewer's behaviour (inherited from Windows presumably) is to invent ascender and descender values and NOT use the hhea table as the spec describes.]		
42	Fonts & Glyphs	Draft 1.0.1, 12.1.6, page 117-118, example 12-7	Technical	12.1.6, page 117-118, example 12-7. The Japanese text looks poor - while the example is syntactically correct, the rendered mark-up is typographically incorrect - the ideographic comma and full stop are incorrectly positioned.	Accepted	WD1.1

	A	B	C	D	E	F
1	Reference (major)	Reference (clause)	Issue Type (Editorial/ Technical/ Other)	Comment	Status	Change Applied
43	Fonts & Glyphs	Draft 1.0.1, 12.1.7, page 118, line 19	Technical	12.1.7, page 118, line 19. Suggest change from "exactly one Indices glyph per character in the UnicodeString" to "exactly one Indices glyph per code unit in the UnicodeString"	Accepted	WD1.1
44	Editorial	Draft 1.0.1, 12.1.10.2, page 121, lines 5 & 10	Editorial	12.1.10.2, page 121, lines 5 & 10. Each bullet has an instance of a "section nnn" reference that has not been changed to a clause symbol.	Accepted	WD1.1
45	Editorial	Draft 1.0.1, 13.5, page 153, line 2	Editorial	13.5, page 153, line 2. Another "section nnn" reference that has not been changed to a clause symbol.	Accepted	WD1.1
46	Geometry	Draft 1.0.1, 14.4.3, page 190, example 14-19	Editorial	14.4.3, page 190, example 14-19. This is actually an example of a RenderTransform attribute, not the Path.RenderTransform element, as the title states. Same applies to example 14-20 for Glyphs, example 14-21 for PathGeometry, example 14-22 for ImageBrush, examples 14-23, 24 for VisualBrush, example 14-25 for LinearGradientBrush, example 14-26 for RadialGradientBrush. It would be better to title these examples something like "<element> transform property usage".	Accepted	WD1.1
47	Geometry	Draft 1.0.1, 14.5.2, page 201, example 14-28, lines 7-8	Editorial	14.5.2, page 201, example 14-28, lines 7-8. The introductory text for the example says that both the opacity mask and the fill have linear gradient brushes. The fill is in fact a SolidColorBrush.	Accepted	WD1.1
48	Colour	Draft 1.0.1, 15.1.7, page 206, lines 20-23	Technical	15.1.7, page 206, lines 20-23. Is the use of the PageDeviceColorSpaceProfileURI PT setting meant to control whether colour management happens at all?	Accepted	WD1.1
49	Colour	Draft 1.0.1, 15.1.7, page 206, lines 24-25	Technical	15.1.7, page 206, lines 24-25. The last paragraph requires the consumer to 'identify' the profile as matching the device. Is the intention that the consumer validate that a suitable profile has been selected?	Accepted	WD1.1
50	Colour	Draft 1.0.1, 15.1.8, page 206, line 28	Technical	15.1.8, page 206, line 28. Only version 3.4 of the ICC spec is supported, which defines profiles which are identified as v2.0. Some of the most common profile creation applications, such as Gretag Macbeth's ProfileMaker can no longer make v2.0 profiles, but create v2.4 instead. The European Color Initiative has recently concluded that consumers of files following specifications that require a specific version of ICC profile should be expected to be able to consume all profiles with the same major version number, but later minor versions. Looking at what actually changes between minor versions of the ICC spec, it's: clarifications, new optional tags, new examples (for example with regard to C source code), none of which should prevent an older reader handling the new minor version correctly. Other groups, such as the Ghent PDF Workgroup seem to be planning to adopt the same approach. Would it be appropriate to update the ICC profile version reference to ICC.1:2001-4 (for v2.4 profiles)?	Accepted	WD1.1
51	Colour	Draft 1.0.1, 15.1.8, page 206-207	Technical	15.1.8, page 206-207. It is unclear whether a monochrome (grayTRCTag) profile must be supported by the consumer. These are not N-component LUT-based profiles, and are not, therefore, covered by the statement on channel count in paragraph 2 of this section.	Accepted	WD1.1

	A	B	C	D	E	F
1	Reference (major)	Reference (clause)	Issue Type (Editorial/ Technical/ Other	Comment	Status	Change Applied
52	Colour	Draft 1.0.1, 15.1.8, page 206-207	Technical	15.1.8, page 206-207. When processing ICC profiles with invalid tag element type signatures, should they raise errors or not? How about falling back on the default colorspace for the pixel format?	Accepted	WD1.1
53	Colour	Draft 1.0.1, 15.1.14 - 15.1.16	Technical	15.1.14 - 15.1.16. The whole area of distinguishing between CMYK, N-color, and named color is wordy and confusing (interpretation is dependent on type and values of tags in the ICC profile) We would hope this area could be tidied up.		
54	Colour	Draft 1.0.1, 15.2.4.3, page 215, lines 18-19	Technical	15.2.4.3, page 215, lines 18-19. Is it correct to say that a consumer MUST support CMYK JPEG images?	No change	N/A
55	Colour	Draft 1.0.1, 15.2.9, page 216	Technical	15.2.9, page 216, Table 15-2 lists integer RGB, but does not make any distinction between signed and unsigned integer. We have seen a sample image that is signed integer, and the XPS Viewer appears to treat that as scRGB. Need to clarify the correct treatment of such an image. We note that the HDPhoto Specification (1.4.3) also does not make this clear.		
56	Colour	Draft 1.0.1, 15.2.9, page 216	Technical	15.2.9, page 216. It would be useful to clarify whether an sRGB profile is considered compatible with an scRGB image, and what should be done in this case. We suspect that the Viewer converts scRGB to sRGB and then applies the profile, but the intended behaviour is not clear in the spec. We note that the HDPhoto Specification (1.4.3.2) also does not make this clear.	No change	N/A
57	Colour	Draft 1.0.1, 15.5, page 221	Technical	15.5, page 221. The description for the Print Ticket setting PageICMRenderingIntent says that "This value SHOULD be ignored for elements using a profile that specifies the rendering intent in the profile [S8.13]." ICC profiles always specify a rendering intent in their header. This means that the setting will only apply to elements not using a profile.		
58	Streaming	Draft 1.0.1, 17.1, page 249	Technical	17.1, page 249. Add a note that streaming and handling of discard control are significantly complicated by any requirement for out-of-order page handling, e.g. to produce booklets.		
59	Digital Signatures	Draft 1.0.1, 17.2.1.1, page 260, lines 4-10	Technical	17.2.1.1, page 260, lines 4-10. Since this is a rather complex area, we suggest further explanation or example of steps for producer and consumer of signed content using Markup Compatibility.		
60	Digital Signatures	Draft 1.0.1, 17.2.2, page 262, example 17-4	Technical	17.2.2. In example 17-4 (on page 262) the SignBy value is invalid according to the text in 17.2.2.5 (on page 265, lines 5-6), although the format used in the example is valid according to the quoted document. There is also a typo, "or" for "for" on line 7 on page 265.	Accepted	WD1.1
61	Digital Signatures	Draft 1.0.1, 17.2.2.3, page 263-264	Technical	17.2.2.3, page 263-264. The behaviour of signature spot location in the presence of page transformations is not defined.	Rejected	N/A

	A	B	C	D	E	F
1	Reference (major)	Reference (clause)	Issue Type (Editorial/ Technical/ Other)	Comment	Status	Change Applied
62	Digital Signatures	Draft 1.0.1, 17.2.2.4, page 264	Technical	17.2.2.4, page 264. The DigitalSignature Intent element is defined to be just a string. Must the string be in NFC form? Can a consumer convert the string to any form it wants to help with displaying the intent? What font should be used? Must all consumers have a least one font available to it in order to render the intent string? What should happen for Unicode noncharacters? Or should the string only use a restricted character set? Otherwise a consumer will need to implement a full Unicode character renderer, just for the intent string. We note that this has been made implementation-specific. 2007-09-27: does "string" adequately define character encoding?		
63	Scan conversion	Draft 1.0.1, 18.1.4, page 269	Technical	18.1.4, page 269. The intention of the bullets at the end of this section is unclear. The second bullet (for a bi-tonal implementation) states that the renderer may choose to print either half-tone or not. If the renderer is not half-toning, the "printer MAY draw thin lines with or without drop-outs". Is this intended to mean that: a) the printer draws fine lines according to the rendering rules, and that those will either appear fully, or partially, or not at all depending on exact placement on the page, angle of the line etc; or b) the printer MAY choose to apply some alternative rendering rules specifically for fine lines to ensure that such fine lines do not drop out, but always appear with a thickness of at least one pixel (possibly with a special case for a zero-width rule, as noted just above the bullets).	Accepted	WD1.1
64	Editorial	Draft 1.0.1, 18.1.4, page 269, line 23	Editorial	18.1.4, page 269, line 23. The reference should be to clause 18.6.12.	Accepted	WD1.1
65	Editorial	Draft 1.0.1, 18.4.1, page 281, line 21	Editorial	18.4.1, page 281, line 21. Typo: "mulitplied"	Accepted	WD1.1
66	Colour	Draft 1.0.1, 18.4.1, page 281	Technical	18.4.1, page 281. The description of super-luminous colors does not seem to deal with sub-luminous colors, that is colors with negative color values. Also query behaviour for CMYK.		
67	Geometry	Draft 1.0.1, 18.6.6, page 292	Technical	18.6.6, page 292. It is not clear whether line caps should be drawn for the case of a dashed line with StrokeDashArray = "0 0" We note that the XPS Viewer exhibits inconsistent behaviour, depanding on whether a non-Flat dash cap is set. It is also not made clear what would be the intended behaviour if a non-Flat dashcap were to be used in the example in Figure 18-12. As a more general point on this section, the precision to which the calculation of the start and end points of dashes is carried out could lead to differing output between XPS consumers.		

	A	B	C	D	E	F
1	Reference (major)	Reference (clause)	Issue Type (Editorial/ Technical/ Other)	Comment	Status	Change Applied
68	Geometry	Draft 1.0.1, 18.6.10, page 298, lines 10-12	Technical	18.6.10, page 298, lines 10-12. This paragraph does not cover all cases clearly. It needs to be made clear which type of cap (start/end/dash) needs to be added for cases where it is the first segment, a middle segment or the final segment that is unstroked, and also depending on whether or not the Path is closed.		
69	Schemas	Draft 1.0.1, B, page 361	Technical	B, page 361. There are three patterns used in the schema to represent real numbers: 1) a general fractional value of the form m.nEp with signs on the mantissa and exponent, 2) a positive fractional value which does not allow for a leading negative sign, and 3) a decimal, which is a fractional value of the form m.n, i.e. no exponent, and it cannot have a leading positive sign. The third form is used for scRGB and ContextColor values. To simplify the job for implementers, and prevent application incompatibility, we suggest removing the third form in favour of the general exponent form.	Rejected	N/A
70	Schemas	Draft 1.0.1, B, page 361	Technical	B, page 361. Related to the above, there is a second point about representing the range restriction through syntactic patterns, which is that implementers may feel bound to report the error as a parse error (syntactic level) rather than a range error (semantic error). We understand why this is done, there is apparently no way in XSD to put a range restriction on a complex type, however we would like to confirm that this is not prescriptive about how implementations report limitations.		
71	Geometry	Draft 1.0.1, B, page 376-377	Technical	B, page 376-377. A case of a degenerate Path in abbreviated geometry consisting only of a Move command appears to be valid according to the XSD but not according to the rules for generating abbreviated geometry (in F). It is unclear how this should be rendered, if at all.		
72	Editorial	Draft 1.0.1, F, page 397, line 66	Editorial	F, page 397, line 66. There is a "Left" that should be "Let"	Accepted	WD1.1
73	Normative References & Bibliography	Draft 1.0.1, J, page 455, line 6	Editorial	J, page 455, line 6. The reference for WMPhoto is just a link to the XPS page on MS website.		
74	Package	Draft 1.0.1, 9.2, page 40	Technical	On page 40, line 38, the description says that a Font part name SHOULD append the segment "Fonts/" to the resource part name prefix specified above. This is reflected in the font example for an individual document (i.e. "/Documents/1/Resources/Fonts/Arial.ttf"), but not in the example for fonts to be shared between documents (i.e. "/Resources/R2ABC7B7-C60D-4FB9-AAE4-2CA0F6C7038A.odttf"). The same problem applies to the examples for resource dictionaries, although not to the examples for images.	Accepted	WD1.1

	Reference (major)	Reference (clause)	Issue Type (Editorial/ Technical/ Other)	Comment	Status	Change Applied
	A	B	C	D	E	F
1						
75	Fonts & Glyphs	Draft 1.0.1, 12.1.2.3, page 107	Technical	On page 107, Example 12-3, the graphic example lists the Unicode for the characters as being 0e20, 0e31, 0e33, 0021. On the second line of the text example (line 15) the UnicodeString is described as "ภ้ำ!". The second entry doesn't match and I suspect that it should.		
76	Fonts & Glyphs	Draft 1.0.1, 12.1.2.4, page 108	Technical	On page 108, Example 12-4, the GlyphIndices in the image are numbered 0099, 006A, 007c, 00a2. In the Indices parameter of the code example (line 19) they are 94,76,88,162, not matching the diagram. (A GGS developer took a look at this one, and believes that it is the diagram that is incorrect.)		
77	Colour	Rendering Intent	Technical	Mechanism to specify output [destination] rendering intent on a per object basis. Color management improvement: Print tickets are inadequate to specify the rendering intent to use in the 'output' [i.e., destination] profile. Rendering intent should be a function of object type and in some cases also the source color encoding. Pages with multiple kinds of objects can need different output rendering intent selection for different objects. Recommend to allow using per object 'object output RI' and if 'object output RI' is not present then page level 'output RI' in print ticket is used.		
78	Colour	Rendering Intent	Technical	Mechanism to specify source [input] rendering intent on a per object basis. Color management improvement: Current concept to use rendering intent bit in the source profile to indicate the source rendering intent is not adequate. Profiles are built to handle conversion from / to a particular color space and are not typically modified when they are associated with a particular object. For example, a graphic object can be sRGB and an image can be sRGB. In the default case, for typical color management, these two objects should use different rendering intents. Recommend to allow using per object 'object source RI', and if 'object source RI' is not present then page level 'source RI' in print ticket is used.		

	A	B	C	D	E	F
1	**Reference (major)**	**Reference (clause)**	**Issue Type (Editorial/ Technical/ Other**	**Comment**	**Status**	**Change Applied**
79	Streaming	Performance	Technical	Add a rule to require packages to contain a relationship part for each FixedDocumentSequence, FixedDocument, and FixedPage part.

Performance and memory improvement:
Discussion: Currently printing consumers must search for a print ticket part for each FixedDocumentSequence, FixedDocument, and FixedPage part. However, a consumer cannot know that there is no print ticket unless it reads the appropriate relationship part. If that relationship part is missing, the consumer must buffer the whole package in local storage looking for the non-existent relationship part – i.e., the non-existent print ticket. The practical effect is that nearly every document printed from Vista must be buffered entirely in RAM within the printer before the first page can be processed. This concern is partially addressed in Section 17.1, describing the rules for interleaving optimizations. However, we believe that if each relationship part were required, jobs that have not had interleaving optimizations applied will print faster because the first page can be typically be printed without buffering the whole package. This minimal provision for printing consumers would benefit the printing of XPS documents that have not gone through a vendor's driver (such as "Save As XPS" from an application).
Summary issue: Basic requirement must be to enable XPS consumers to begin processing pages before the entire package is available in local storage. To do that -- printers need to know in the relationship parts whether a print ticket is going to be present. Recommend to require a relationship part at or near the beginning of every FixedDocumentSequence part, FixedDocument part, and FixedPage part to specify the presence/absence of a print ticket.   Require the relationship part to be present even when there is no print ticket so that the consumer knows not to search for the print ticket. This recommendation would enable half of streaming consumption (printing pages as they arrive on the port) for typical MS driver-generated jobs, even when a vendor's DiscardControl filter is not present in the XPS filter pipeline.
Note: central directory of the zip container [which indicates the presence of the relationship parts] is located at the end [per longstanding zip definition] and so is not useful for streaming situations. | | |
| 80 | Opacity | Performance | Technical | Add a mechanism for specifying whether transparency is present.

Performance and memory utilization improvement.
Rendering of pages requires searching for transparency – unnecessarily slowing the rendering of pages that do not have transparency.
Recommend page level –"transparency on this page" attribute. This could be done as an attribute of the FixedPage start tag. Consumers need this to be required of the producers. [e.g., PDF makes it trivial to determine transparency – all transparency is noted in the PDF resource dictionary of each page.] | | |

	A	B	C	D	E	F
1	Reference (major)	Reference (clause)	Issue Type (Editorial/ Technical/ Other)	Comment	Status	Change Applied
81	Images	Draft 1.0.1, 9.1.5.1, page 27, APP markers	Technical	Clarify consumer support for JPEG APP1, APP13 and APP14 markers Clarify consumer expectations for all externally defined constructs: It is unclear exactly what a consumer must do for these markers. Which fields are relevant? Where are the authoritative specifications for the markers? In creating the standard – all items that are defined or 'spec'd' outside of XPS itself must be fully specified. That means each must have a normative reference that provides a complete unambiguous definition.	Out of scope	N/A
82	Normative References & Bibliography		Editorial	Update references to ICC profile specification. ICC.1:2004-10 (Profile version 4.2.0.0) was published in 2004 and is freely available [with errata incorporated, 5/22/2006]. OR: ISO 15076-1, Image technology colour management — Architecture, profile format, and data structure — Part 1: Based on ICC.1:2004-10		
83	Scan conversion	Sub-pixel	Technical	Change requirements concerning low level sub-pixel rendering to informative notes only, e.g., S11.5 requirement pertaining to abutting shapes can be stated without specifying the sub-pixel rendering. Change requirements to informative notes on how to do the low level sub-pixel rendering. E.g., S11.2, S11.3, S11.5, S11.6, S11.7. Specific sub-pixel rendering 'should' statements are not applicable to some printing technologies. For this reason they are preferably stated as informative notes rather than as "should" requirements.		
84	Colour	Draft 1.0.1, 15.1.14, 15.1.15, and 15.1.16, Color code value scaling	Technical	Clarify 15.1.14, 15.1.15, and 15.1.16 using scaled values "If the value is used as input for an ICC profile color transformation, it MUST subsequently be linearly scaled to the range from 0 to 255 or from 0 to 65535, depending on whether the profile uses 8-bit or 16-bit input tables [M8.31]." Clarify such as: "If the value is used as input for an ICC profile color transformation, it MUST be linearly scaled [with specified rounding/clipping] to the range from 0 to 255 or from 0 to 65535, depending on whether the profile uses 8-bit or 16-bit input tables [M8.31] before input to the profile."		

	A	B	C	D	E	F
1	**Reference (major)**	**Reference (clause)**	**Issue Type (Editorial/ Technical/ Other**	**Comment**	**Status**	**Change Applied**
85	Colour	N-channel	Technical	Enable use of N-Channel 2-channel data [15.1.15] and clarify the use of N-channel profiles. Remove the restriction to have a N-channel profile with a minimum of 3-channels (which also requires that the unused ones are set to zero). ICC profile spec supports 2 channel minimum [Section 7.2.6 Table 15]. Clarify as follows: "N-channel color is defined using a N-component LUT-based output profile with a colorantTableTag. The colorimetric values for the N-Channel colors can be determined from the profile and then color managed to the intended color output encoding, if the N-Channel profile does not pertain to the intended output device. An XPS consumer that is aware of N-Channel colors looks for the colorantTableTag to find out if a specific ContextColor designates a N-Channel color description."		
86	Colour	Named colors	Technical	Correct the definition of named colors and the use of ICC profiles for named colors. [15.1.16]. Allow use of 2 color named color profiles. "A named color is expressed as a combination of an ink name stored in the ICC profile and a tint level (percentage ink dilution). The ink name for the tint is contained in the colorantTable clrt tag. This tag is not defined for ICC Version 3.4 profiles, and its presence is benignly ignored by ICM V2 implementations. Therefore, it is used in XPS Documents to specify the names of named colors." Clarify as follows: "A named color is expressed as a combination of an ink name stored in the ICC profile and a tint level (percentage ink dilution) given in TintFloat. The ink name for the named color is contained in the colorantTableTag and namedColor2Tag of the profile. The colorimetric value for the required tint of the named color can be determined from the profile and then color managed to the intended target output encoding, if the particular named colorant is not installed in the intended output device." Also: "An XPS consumer that is aware of named colors looks for the clrt tag to find out if a specific ContextColor designates a named color description." Should be: "An XPS consumer that is aware of named colors looks for the namedColor2Tag to find out if a specific ContextColor designates a named color description."		

	A	B	C	D	E	F
	Reference (major)	Reference (clause)	Issue Type (Editorial/ Technical/ Other)	Comment	Status	Change Applied
87	Digital Signatures	Performance	Technical	Our interpretation of the XPS 1.0 specification is that direct consumption device support of the JobDigitialSignatureProcessing feature is optional. Clarify required aspects. 17.1.5 Interleaving Optimizations and Digital Signatures states: "In general, it is not feasible to produce well-ordered, interleaved ZIP packages and apply digital signatures in a way that enables reasonable consumption scenarios for the following reasons: * Producers cannot create the digital signature parts before producing the signed packages. * There are cyclic dependencies with signed relationship parts containing the relationship to the signature parts themselves. * Therefore, when adding a digital signature to an interleaved package, producers of digitally signed documents that are intended for streaming consumption SHOULD add all digital signature parts and the package relationship to the digital signature parts at the beginning of the package, before adding any other part [S10.10]." Summary: Although the discussion indicates that digital signature parts have to be organized properly for streaming consumption – the requirement is only stated as a should for producers. Change to "must" for producers. Optimize files for reading rather than for writing.		
88	PrintTicket	Normative subset	Technical	Need to distinguish Print Schema normative vs. informative Print Ticket [Print Schema] is used in two ways 1) defining essential aspects of XPS file interpretation, e.g., blending space, 2) conventions that can be optionally used among implementers [tray selection, media selection] Aspects of the Print Schema that are essential for XPS interpretation must be incorporated as normative, either by reference or by direct inclusion. E.G. a. Page scaling refers to Print Schema b. Printing Signed Documents [17.2.1.5] E.g., Producers MAY include the JobDigitalSignatureProcessing setting in the job-level PrintTicket within the XPS Document content [O10.11]. Consumers SHOULD process this PrintTicket setting, if present [S10.12]. For more information, see the Print Schema specification [print ticket schema].		

	A	B	C	D	E	F
1	Reference (major)	Reference (clause)	Issue Type (Editorial/ Technical/ Other	Comment	Status	Change Applied
89	Streaming	Performance	Technical	Improve DiscardControl Currently the DiscardControl part in package – indicates that on page N the consumer can discard specific objects on pages N-1 through page 1. Recommend that DiscardControl part on page N also indicate that object x on page N is used only on page N [not further on pages N+1 etc] and is used exactly T times on page N if that is the case. This could be optional – however should be recommended to optimize for streaming. For example, this would enable a consumer to incrementally discard a large part that it knows will only be used once in the document.		
90	Opacity	Alpha Channel	Technical	Image Opacity and Alpha Channel Avoid creating images with alpha channel unless the alpha channel is meaningful. Create a 'should' recommendation for producers to use the Opacity attribute in ImageBrush elements to indicate constant opacity. This method is much preferred over creating a constant alpha channel in the image raster itself. If the pixel data is interleaved a constant alpha channel value can make image files significantly larger. Also an alpha channel with constant value makes unnecessary overhead for consumers.		
91	Digital Signatures	Draft 1.0.1, 17.2.1, p.258, Signature Policy	Technical	17.2.1, p.258, line 21-22. This sentence is complicated and not clear, we request adding further explanation.	Accepted	WD1.1
92	Normative References & Bibliography	HD Photo	Technical	Section 9.1.5 (Image Parts) covers the inclusion of Windows Media Photo (aka HD Photo). HD Photo is currently proposed for standardization with SC29 (JPEG). The normative reference for 'HD Photo' needs to be updated to reflect activities within SC29. [Page 24 in WD 1.0]		
93	Conformance	Namespace	Technical	Table H-2 describes namespace URIs that use a Microsoft domain. [Page 405 in WD 1.0]		
94	PrintTicket		Technical	From the Cambridge meeting I understood that TC46's standard will not include PrintSchema(PrintTicket). However, the current working draft mentions PrintTicket many times.		
95	Normative References & Bibliography	Draft 1.0.1, 9.1.5, 9.1.5.4, Table H-4	Technical	Windows Media Photo should be replaced with HD Photo.	Duplicate	N/A

	A	B	C	D	E	F
1	Reference (major)	Reference (clause)	Issue Type (Editorial/ Technical/ Other	Comment	Status	Change Applied
96	Images	Draft 1.0.1, 9.1.5.1	Technical	Method to calculate resolution of JPEG image should be clarified. The relation between resolution of JPEG image and that of EXIF image should also be clarified (ex. which resolution is valid when resolutions of JPEG image and EXIF image both exist).	Duplicate	N/A
97	Images	Draft 1.0.1, 9.1.5.4, Table9-6	Technical	The features listed in Table 9-6 is a subset of HD Photo. Shouldn't all of the features of HD Photo be listed in this table?		
98	PrintTicket	Draft 1.0.1, 9.1.9; 9.2, p41, line 37-46; 10.3.4, p56, line 24; 15.1.7; 15.4; 15.5; 17; 18.3.1.2	Technical	Description concerning PrintTicket should be revised. See TC45 committee document 2007/020, "Print Ticket in XPS", for details.		
99	Normative References & Bibliography	Draft 1.0.1, 9.3, p42, line 26-41	Technical	Is specification proprietary to Microsoft suitable to this specification?	Duplicate	N/A
100	Fonts & Glyphs	Draft 1.0.1, 12.1.6.1	Technical	**We** agree with GGS's comment in issue 41.	Duplicate	N/A
101	Fonts & Glyphs	Draft 1.0.1, 12.1.6.2, page 119, Example 12-7	Technical	Conforming to the XPS specification, the poor example shown in Example 12-7 is correct. However, a sample that is correct in terms of Japanese should also be shown and described in this specification.	Duplicate	N/A
102	Package	Draft 1.0.1, 12.1.7	Technical	DeviceFontName seems unsuitable in a specification to be standardized.		
103	Geometry	Draft 1.0.1, 14.3	Technical	This specification could be read that Clip applies to fill only, but Clip should apply to stroke also.	Accepted	WD1.1
104	Colour	Draft 1.0.1, 15.1.9, 15.1.10	Technical	WCS is proprietary to Microsoft, so specification that includes WCS should be deleted.		
105	Conformance	Draft 1.0.1, 18.2, page 272, Table 18-1	Technical	The requirements listed in Table 18-1 seem unrealistic. The expression "at least 16" is ambiguous to creators. Requirements that are 32-bit based altogether is desirable.	Accepted	WD1.1
106	Geometry	Draft 1.0.1, 18.6.4.5, page 293, Figure 18-7	Technical	Figure 18-7 does not match its description. The dotted lines in the figure should be solid lines.	Accepted	WD1.1
107	Editorial		Editorial	This Working Draft is provided in Word format, so the page numbers differ depending on the environment this document is viewed in.	No change	N/A
108	Page Geometry	Draft 1.0.1, 10.3	Technical	We feel that some guidance on clipping of page content, for example to the ContentBox or page width/height area in the absence of a BleedBox, would be a useful addition to this section.		

	A	B	C	D	E	F
1	Reference (major)	Reference (clause)	Issue Type (Editorial/ Technical/ Other)	Comment	Status	Change Applied
109	Fonts & Glyphs	Draft 1.0.1, 12.1.2, page 105, lines 19-20	Technical	The use of the word "typically" is somewhat ambiguous. XPS depends on an implementation treating the UnicodeString attribute value "as if" it was UTF-16 encoded. Subsequent clauses (e.g. 12.1.3.1, lines 9-11 and table 12-2) define functionality that can only be satisfied with this requirement in effect. We cannot find any other statement in the document making this clear.		
110	Editorial	Draft 1.0.1, 13.6, Example 13-24, page 163	Editorial	The example text flows around the example output, and the page line numbers are obscured.	Accepted	WD1.1
111	Colour	Draft 1.0.1, 13.7, page 166	Technical	The annotation for Color attribute states that a sRGB color can be specified with a 6-digit hexadecimal number. It should be 6- or 8-digit hexadecimal to allow for sRGB with transparency. Also applies to the Color attribute annotation in Clause 13.1.		
112	Editorial	Draft 1.0.1, 14.4.1, page 186, example 14-10	Editorial	The matrix brackets do not span the contents.	Accepted	WD1.1
113	Colour	Draft 1.0.1, 15.1.9, page 207, table 15-3	Technical	The initial content is described as the MS10-type signature, but lines 12 and 22 on the same page talk of the MS00 signture. Which is it?		
114	Colour	Draft 1.0.1, 15.2.2	Technical	We could not find the following formats from the list in 15.2.2: WICPixelFormat64bppRGBFixedPoint, WICPixelFormat128bppRGBFixedPoint and WICPixelFormat64bppRGBHalf listed in the HDPhoto spec.		
115	Colour	Draft 1.0.1, 15.2.3	Technical	Is the final item in the list of HDPhoto pixel formats, WICPixelFormat32bppGrayFloat, supposed to have "(scRGB range)" indicated?		
116	Schemas	Draft 1.0.1, B, page 376	Technical	The pattern used to validate ContextColor specifications is not ideal. Currently it is: ContextColor +[\S]+ ?[dec]([scs][dec]){3,8} which allows for one or more spaces between ContextColor and the start of the profile URI, and one optional space between the profile URI and the alpha value. Two points: 1. The XSD type ST_Color has a whitespace facet of collapse, which will result in all runs of two or more spaces in the attribute value being replaced with a single space, allowing multiple spaces is redundant. 2. The space after the profile URI is optional, which means it could not end with a digit as it would be impossible to distinguish between the end of the URI and the start of the alpha value. Making the space required solves this. A better pattern to use would be the following: ContextColor [\S]+ [dec]([scs][dec]){3,8}		

	A	B	C	D	E	F
1	Reference (major)	Reference (clause)	Issue Type (Editorial/ Technical/ Other)	Comment	Status	Change Applied
117	Metadata	Draft 1.0.1,	Technical	What has been nice for years is how markup generating apps put their names in the PDF and PS they output. You get to know what to expect, and if a problem has been seen before with the apps. It would be helpful if XPS generating apps did the same. Perhaps the CorePropeties part and the creator element could be recommended for XPS creators.		
118	Normative References & Bibliography	Draft 1.0.1, 9.1.5.1, Table 9-13	General	Note that the "Reference (section)" entry incorrectly refers to table 9-13; it should be 9-3. **APP0 JFIF specification** Available from http://www.w3.org/Graphics/JPEG/jfif3.pdf, referenced from http://www.w3.org/Graphics/JPEG/, but not (as far as I can see) an official W3C document. As Wikipedia says "The standard appears to have lost ownership, since C-Cube Microsystems are now defunct, and further development of the standard is dead." The official SPIFF standard (see part 3 of the JPEG standard itself) is similar, but not widely used; the point of supporting JFIF is because many, many files conform to it. There does not seem to be a reference that fully matches the ISO normative reference requirements. **APP1 EXIF extension defined by JEIDA/JEITA** Exif 2.1 (JEIDA-49-1998) is available at http://it.jeita.or.jp/document/publica/standard/exif/english/jeida49e.htm Exif 2.2 (JEITA CP-3451, also known as Exif Print) and the 2.21 amendment (CP-3451-1) are available for order at http://www.jeita.or.jp/english/standard/list/list.asp?cateid=1&subcateid=4. It seems to be possible to download them for free elsewhere (e.g. exif.org), but the official copies must be bought. **APP2 ICC profile marker defined by the ICC specification** Defined in section B.5 of ISO 15076-1 (Image technology colour management — Architecture, profile format, and data structure — Part 1: Based on ICC.1:2004-10) **APP13 Photoshop 3.0 extension** Partial definition in "PhotoShop File Formats" tech note for PhotoShop versions 5 and 6. Later versions require registration as a CS3 developer, which I have not done, but I am told that they are similar. Adobe colleagues report that the rest of the data (a couple of lines of instructions on how an APP13 table is created from the data format described in "file formats") is not currently formally available anywhere. So this is a partial, proprietary, vendor-specific specification (although it is widely implemented). **APP14 Adobe DCT Filters in PostScript Level 2 extension** The specification is available for download from http://partners.adobe.com/public/developer/en/ps/sdk/5116.DCT_Filter.pdf, and APP14 (referred to in hex as APPE) is described in section 18. This is a proprietary, vendor-specific specification (even though it is widely implemented, including in Sun's Java SDK). Of the five references required, we therefore have two (APP1 and APP2) that are described in standards meeting the ISO requirements, and three that are not. The remaining three are very widely implemented, by very many different companies, but ...I tried alternative approaches, and I'm wondering if perhaps Istvan can help here, as he has far more background in the JPEG world.There are no direct references to any of the APP markers in the JPEG spec (at least in the ITU versions, which are supposed to be identical to the ISO ones; I have not double-checked the ISO ones). So we can't use an indirect reference through that. My next thought was to reference indirectly through an accredited registration authority. Parts 2 and 4 of the standard between them claim to define a registration authority framework for APP markers, but it doesn't make any sense to me (I'm probably missing something). There's a clear mechanism for the creation of registration authorities for registering specific images, and there seems to be an assumption that the same mechanism would be used for registering APP marker definitions ... but it doesn't seem to work as there's nowhere to denote which registration authority registered an APP marker, or anything to prevent clashes between different authorities. Despite that here does seem to be at least one registration authority; or at least a web site that claims to represent one, see http://jura.jpeg.org/ItemM_ca.htm. That page, however, notes that ITU has registered APP1, and therefore JEITA can't register APP1, even though the JEITA definition is the widely used one (at least in digital photography). There also seems to be a clash between other ITU-registered markers and both the ICC APP2 and the Adobe PhotoShop APP13 marker. In fact we can't reference via this registration authority for any of the five markers required, possibly because JURA says that the specifications will be made available to all through JURA, which may cause problems for some submitters. At this point I'm out of ideas for providing fully compliant references. Suggestions are welcome.	Accepted	WD1.1
119	Normative References & Bibliography	Throughout	General	How do we refer to specifications that are not accredited or formal standards? This includes JFIF, PhotoShop APP13 specification, ZIP etc. List of referenced specifications will be generated by Rex under issue 5.		
120	Digital Signatures	Draft 1.0.1, 17.2.2.3, p264, line 1.	Editorial	Optional requirement is labeled as [M2.72], should be [O###]		

	A	B	C	D	E	F
1	Reference (major)	Reference (clause)	Issue Type (Editorial/ Technical/ Other)	Comment	Status	Change Applied
121	Parts and Relationships	Performance / File size	Technical	Lack of templating syntax and support for the <Path> element's attributes. Results in bloated file size when dealing with lots of rendition changes. difficult to use the resource dictionary mechanism to fake such templates. Need to re-use styles, similar to css, to simply content.		
122	Discard Control / Print Ticket	Large Format / Performance	Technical	Streaming and discard control to improve performance. Need additional elements to address plot optimization for discard control and byte streaming settings		
123	Rendering Rules	Large Format	Technical	lack of double precision support in the MS XPS consuming software, resulting in rendering artifacts for most AutoCAD published drawings. This is an consumer implementation problem, not a spec problem. Requires convoluted code in software to re-transform coordinates so that they don't need a translation component when projected.		
124	Images / Print Ticket	Large Format / Performance	Technical	Banding / streaming on images during large format printing/plotting. Need streaming/optimization information to optimize plot. Add optional tags to identify the algorithm to use.		
125	Brushes / Print Ticket	Large Format	Technical	Lack of plotter pen support Large format customers need this capability		
126	Colour	Alpha Channel	Technical	color profile should support pantone standard	Withdrawn	N/A
127	Rendering Rules / Print Ticket	Large Format	Technical	Blending and line merge control Need rules on alpha blending and line merge control		
128	Rendering Rules / Print Ticket		Technical	Define hairline / minimal width of lines Units need to be relative (as percent of page size) or absolute measurement		
129	Rendering Rules / Print Ticket	Large Format	Technical	Define relative and absolute units for line widths Units need to be relative (as percent of page size) or absolute measurement		
130	Parts and Relationships / Document Content	3D	Technical	Optional: Define optimized 3D content stream for use in documents and pages. Content mimetype to be determined. optimized 3D content to includes basic 3D visulation requirements such as 3d points, faces, face groups (or objects/object groups), textures, texture mappings, and animation control		

	A	B	C	D	E	F
1	Reference (major)	Reference (clause)	Issue Type (Editorial/ Technical/ Other)	Comment	Status	Change Applied
131	Colour	Draft 1.0.1, 15.5, Table 15.3	Technical	The color control statements for PageDeviceColorSpaceUsage are ambiguous. Need to clarify.		
132	Colour	Draft 1.0.1, 9.1.5.1, Table 9.3	Technical	Table 9-3 identifies APP2 marker as containing an ICC profile. This is correct, however the EXIF spec (support of which is stated as a must in the paragraph above) also uses APP2.		
133	Colour	Draft 1.0.1, 9.1.5.1	Technical	Second paragraph below Table 9-3 states: "Therefore, the use of CMYK images is NOT RECOMMENDED in XPS Documents because rendering results can differ significantly between implementations."	Accepted	WD1.1
134	Colour	Draft 1.0.1, 15.3, page 217, lines 3-5	Technical	15.3, page 217, lines 3-5 sentence does not make sense. Suggest change to "A named color used for markings that are intended to be rendered on every layer when separating can be specified with the DocumentImpositionColor PrintTicket setting."		
135	Streaming	Draft 1.0.1, 17.1.4.1, page 256, lines 7-9	Technical	17.1.4.1, page 256, lines 7-9 states that "DiscardControl parts are stored in XPS Documents in an interleaved fashion, allowing a resource-constrained consumer to discard a part as soon as it appears in the DiscardControl part." This isn't really true, as later clauses explain that a part can be discarded according to the rules found in the Discard elements.		
136	Streaming	Draft 1.0.1, 17.1.4.1, page 256, lines 14-15	Technical	17.1.4.1, page 256, lines 14-15 states that "DiscardControl parts that are not well-formed SHOULD NOT be processed and an error SHOULD NOT be reported [S10.8]." However, the spec does not define the term well-formed. In XML this relates to the XML syntax but does not say anything about attribute values or character data. In light of this, where lines 12-13 say "The DiscardControl part MUST NOT reference itself [M10.6]; doing so is considered an error." and the DiscardControl part is well-formed XML but references itself, should the consumer report an error? The suggestion is that lines 14-15 should be rewritten to be more general to cover both invalid XML structure (i.e. not well-formed XML) as well as invalid content should not result in an error being reported.		
137	Streaming	Draft 1.0.1, 17.1.4.1.2, page 257	Technical	17.1.4.1.2, page 257 There is no explicit restriction on the parts referenced by SentinelPage or Target attributes. Suggest making clear the part types that are allowed (or not allowed) for these attributes, and what should be done if they are not valid.		
138	Streaming	Draft 1.0.1, 17.1, page 249	Technical	17.1, page 249 Suggest that the list of interleaving optimizations should include an entry to help with the location of DiscardControl parts, e.g.
The relationship for the DiscardControl part SHOULD be written in the same portion of the relationship part as the start part relationship, and the portion of the DiscardControl part that targets a FixedPage part SHOULD be written to the package before that part.		

	A	B	C	D	E	F
1	**Reference (major)**	**Reference (clause)**	**Issue Type (Editorial/ Technical/ Other**	**Comment**	**Status**	**Change Applied**
139	Package	Draft 1.0.1, 9.1.7, page 31, lines 15-16	Technical	9.1.7, page 31, lines 15-16 The statement that font references must be internal to the package is redundant - clause 9.1.1 has already said that XPS documents must not reference external resources. There is a similar statement for image parts in 9.1.5, but not for other types of part.	Rejected	N/A
140	Conformance	Draft 1.0.1, I	Technical	There is information in Annex I that is not stated clearly in the normative parts of the spec. Examples: a) M2.13 Exactly one StartPart relationship is REQUIRED. The "exactly one" part of this does not appear to be stated explicitly in the main body of the document. b) M2.36 and M2.37 thumbnail requirements in the annex have annotations to indicate that they are not required for consumers that don't use thumbnails. Where these requirements are stated in the main body of the text, the limitation to consumers that use thumbnails is not mentioned.		
141	Editorial	Draft 1.0.1, Figures, Tables Examples	Editorial	The numbering of the figures, tables and examples needs checking (plus any references to them in the text). In particular: - The tables for clause 11 start at 11-9 - The examples in the Glyphs clause start again at 12-1 after 12-4 - The tables in clause 15 are labelled 15-3, 15-1, 15-2, 15-3 - The figures for clause 18 start at 18-2	Accepted	WD1.1
142	Digital Signatures	Draft 1.0.1, 17.2.2, page 262, example 17-4	Technical	From issue 60: We should also consider an addition to the text for the SpotId attribute (clause 17.2.2.1) to explain the format requirements, if we agree that the XPS Viewer is correct in its error report. I was unable to find the appropriate information in the OPC spec.		
143	Editorial	Draft 1.0.1, I	Editorial	The tables in Annex I each have a Reference column. Unfortunately, all the references listed are hard-coded, so they are off by 7 because of the addition of the 7 front-matter clauses to WD1.0. These all need to be turned into electronic links, so they get updated correctly.	Accepted	WD1.1
144	Streaming	Draft 1.0.1, 9.3.1, page 43	Technical	Request is to add DiscardControl to this list so that XPS consumers can extend DiscardControl functionality to provide better streaming support than is possible without extending the DiscardControl markup. This change would be consistent with the extension intent in the current spec.		

	A	B	C	D	E	F
1	**Reference (major)**	**Reference (clause)**	**Issue Type (Editorial/ Technical/ Other**	**Comment**	**Status**	**Change Applied**
145	Colour	Draft 1.0.1, 15	Technical	Clause 15.1 starts off with information that appears to apply to both vector and image data - 15.1.1 to 15.1.10 discuss color spaces and profiles in a way that seems to apply to both, but then from 15.1.11 onwards the focus switches to vector data. We then have 15.2 for image data. A re-grouping of the sub-clauses might make things clearer, for example: 15.1.x for information that applies to both vector and raster data 15.2.x for information specific to vector data 15.3.x for information specific to raster data The thing that highlighted this issue for us was the proposal under item 52 to clarify error handling. The proposed change is to a clause that appeared to apply to both vector and raster data, but the proposed forward reference is to a clause that applies specifically to raster data. We should clarify which bits apply to which types of object, and it would be useful to know what the original intent was.		
146	Digital Signatures	Draft 1.0.1, 17.2, pp. 258	Technical	Detailed behavior of how valid and invalid digital signatures is provided in this section for consumers that implement digital signature handling. However, this is not a requirement. The result is that consumers that do not implement digital signatures will print all documents as though they were valid, regardless of whether the signature is valid or invalid.		
147	PrintTicket Color Settings	Draft 1.0.1, 15.5, pp. 221	Technical	This section defines a PrintTicket parameter PageBlackGenerationProcessing which described details of black generation and undercolor removal. However, it is not clear how this parameter is supposed to be introduced into the color model. I believe the intent is to describe a conversion step between device CMY and device CMYK, but there is no definition of how to get to device CMY in XPS. We need more specific definition of how this parameter is intended to affect color conversion in XPS.		
148		Draft 1.0.1, 15.1	Technical	Clarification of application of clauses to vector and image content Clause 15.1 starts off with information that appears to apply to both vector and image data - 15.1.1 -15.1.3 explicitly state apply to both. 15.1.4 -15.1.9 discuss color spaces and profiles in a way that seems to apply to both, but then from 15.1.11 onwards the focus switches to vector data. We then have 15.2 for image data. A re-grouping of the sub-clauses might make things clearer, for example: 15.1.x for information that applies to both vector and raster data 15.2.x for information specific to vector data 15.3.x for information specific to raster data		

	A	B	C	D	E	F
1	Reference (major)	Reference (clause)	Issue Type (Editorial/ Technical/ Other)	Comment	Status	Change Applied
149		Draft 1.0.1, 15.2 15.4	Technical	15.2 and 15.4 – ambiguous term 'rich' colors – meaning assoc with scRGB or 'ICC profile'. 'Rich color' – intended to indicate color beyond sRGB gamut. Color Ad Hoc agrees: Eliminate term "rich color" and keep technical content that it referred to.		
150		Draft 1.0.1, 9.5	Technical	9.1.5 is a SHOULD for consumer using an embedded profile supplied by the producer. On the other hand in 15.2.9 and 15.1.11 the fallback cases for missing or broken profiles are MUST. This seems backwards – consider whether if the producer puts in a profile the consumer MUST use it. If decide to make it a must – include clarify statement that device colors are still controlled by print ticket settings and there is still path to not re-render device colors.		
151		Draft 1.0.1, 15.2.9	Technical	CMYK default for raster specifically when no profile is present document: Three choices – further discussion to select one of these: 1. State that default CMYK should be 'determined by the consumer'. A consumer may choose to abort the job. – Downside to this approach is inconsistent output worldwide. Note that in a region and for a particular set of users this would produce results consistent with user expectation. 2. Use a MUST single default CMYK – worldwide print results may not match expectation in a region –but would be more likely to match worldwide. Producers will have to be sure to tag the images if they want a result other than the default CMYK. 3. Use a SHOULD single default CMYK – worldwide print results may not match expectation in a region. Producers will have to be sure to tag the images if they want a result other than the default CMYK.		
152		Draft 1.0.1, 15.2.9	Technical	CMYK default for raster specifically when a profile is present but cannot be used: In 15.2.9 Add new clause dealing with present but broken CMYK profiles.		
153		Draft 1.0.1, 15.2.9	Technical	Dealing with grayscale/monochrome profile missing and broken.		
154		Draft 1.0.1, 15.2.8	Technical	"An associated color profile overrides an embedded color profile and is processed instead of any embedded color profile." Does not clarify whether it is a MUST or a SHOULD. Adrian thinks this is meant to be a MUST in terms of prioritizing the associated profile over the embedded – and deferring to the logic of 9.1.5 and 15.2.9 as far as what 'processed' means.		
155		Draft 1.0.1, 15.2.8	Technical	If both embedded and associated profiles for an object and the associated profile that should be used is broken – need to explicitly state consumer MUST { a}if associated profile is not usable then use embedded – then if embedded is not usable use default OR b) if associated profile is present but not usable – then do not use embedded profile - rather use default directly}.		

	A	B	C	D	E	F
1	Reference (major)	Reference (clause)	Issue Type (Editorial/ Technical/ Other)	Comment	Status	Change Applied
156	Package	Draft 1.0.1, 9.1, page 19, lines 21 and 22	Technical	At the Las Vegas meeting, this issue was spun-off from issue 14. Add text (in 8.1?) explicitly saying that a package may carry additional parts, that an editing application is not required to maintain those, and a consumer may ignore them.		
157		Throughout	Editorial	Change "schema" to "W3C schema" throughout. Watch out for "print schema". Approved.	Accepted	WD1.1
158	Schemas		Editorial	Consider providing Relax NG schema alongside W3C schema (as an informative annex). Editor to discuss with Murata-san (JP).		
159	Schemas		Technical	Test schemas through a variety of parsers. Avoid import feature. Committee members should validate proposed changes to schemas through parsers used in their own products before approving those changes.		
160	Page Geometry	Draft 1.0.1, 10.3	Technical	We feel that some guidance on clipping of page content, for example to the ContentBox or page width/height area in the absence of a BleedBox, would be a useful addition to this section.		
161	Definitions	Draft 1.0.1, 4	Technical	Add use of "compliant digital signature" in text. Check dig sig states and ensure that all are used appropriately. Also review "or similar problems" in "broken digital signature" definition.		
162	Schemas		Technical	Decide on the final names for the schema files, which are currently called DiscardControl.xsd DocStructure.xsd RDKey.xsd S0schema.xsd SignatureDefinitions.xsd		
163	Geometry	Draft 1.0.1, 18.6.4	Technical	The sub-clauses of 18.6.4 for the various dash cap shapes all specify the shape to be drawn for a zero-length dash. They do not, however, specify the orientation of that shape if it appears at a join in the path. Should it be aligned with the direction of the segment before the join or the one after the join, for example?		