Minutes of OASIS DITA Technical Committee meetings, 2013

Contents

January 2013

8 January 2013

```
   Minutes of the OASIS DITA TC
Tuesday, 8 January 2013
Recorded by N. Harrison

regrets:  Robert Anderson, JoAnn Hackos, Adrian Warman,

Standing Business
=================
minutes from last week:
https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/dita/201301/msg00000.html (Harrison for
 18 December 2012)
moved by Don, seconded by Stan, approved by TC

Subcommittee Reports
None
Upcoming: TechComm SC 1/15

Announcements:
None


Business
========

1. DITA 1.3 proposals, stage 1: http://wiki.oasis-open.org/dita/
DITA_1.3_Proposals-triage

Ready for discussion: None
Ready for vote (simple majority):    None



2. DITA 1.3 proposals, stage 2: http://wiki.oasis-open.org/dita/
DITA_1.3_Proposals-stage2

Ready for discussion:

a. Proposal #13011--Discussion on Using Subelements as Attributes
   https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/dita/201212/msg00028.html (Kravogel)
   Reference to:
   https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/dita/201211/msg00021.html (Eliot's
 submission)
   https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/dita/201211/msg00022.html (issues
 raised)
Status: Waiting for ChrisK or someone from MI SC to be at TC meeting to talk
 about the proposal; Don suggested some discussion on list of latest material
 from ChrisK

b. Proposal #13109: Semiconductor SC
   https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/dita/201212/msg00016.html (Eberlein
 for Beims)
Status: Discussed 11 December; pick back up after SC has met in January and
 reported back

c. Proposal #13004: Scoped keys proposal on hold
```

d. Proposal #13010: Provides an element that specifies the string on which its
 associated element should be sorted. Analogous to <index-sort-as>.
    https://www.oasis-open.org/apps/org/workgroup/dita/download.php/47117/
proposal-13010.html
    This proposal was initially discussed 10 June; does the revised version
 address the concerns raised then? See https://www.oasis-open.org/apps/org/
workgroup/dita/download.php/46241/minutes20120612.txt
Status: Continue discussion when Eliot provides updated materials

e. Proposal #13027 Allow draft-comment everywhere
   https://www.oasis-open.org/apps/org/workgroup/dita/download.php/46215/
proposal-13027.html
   This proposal was initially discussed 10 June; does the revised version
 address the concerns raised then? See https://www.oasis-open.org/apps/org/
workgroup/dita/download.php/46241/minutes20120612.txt
Status: Continue discussion when Eliot provides updated materials

f. Proposal #13035: Provide "xml mention" domain for marking up mentions of
 XML syntactic components
   https://www.oasis-open.org/apps/org/workgroup/dita/download.php/47181/
proposal-13035-xmldomain.html (Updated 14 October 2012)
   Note plugin provided by Eliot for early testers
Status: Continue discussion after input from Tech Comm SC (action item for
 Seth Park)
   (Kimber and Hackos to correspond on the proposal's fit for Tech Com
 package)

3. DITA 1.3 proposals, stage 3: https://wiki.oasis-open.org/dita/
DITA_1.3_Proposals-stage3

 Ready to assign reviewers
        None
 Discussion

a. Proposal 13078: adding @rotate to entry and @orient to table
     https://www.oasis-open.org/committees/document.php?
document_id=47812&wg_abbrev=dita
     https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/dita/201301/msg00001.html
 (discussion on list)

ChrisN summarized; Though the proposals reviewers noted a general
 dissatisfaction with the CALS-compliant markup, his memory of the July
 discussions of this proposal was that the TC preferred to stay with CALS
 rather than add new markup.

Nancy and David had recommended changes to attribute values, but ChrisN and
 Michael Boses said that requests for this functionality had always come from
 people who are already familiar with CALS, so we shouldn't changes it from
 that. Discussion tended to support erring on the side of compatibility, and
 no one on the TC had had requests from customers asking for other things,
 except for Thilo; his customers need for an entry to be able to rotate either
 +90% or -90%.
Since this would be part of base standard, every processor would have to
 support this.
Kris noted that we'd gone through the same discussion at Phase 2 for this
 proposal; we decided it wasn't as good as what some people wanted, but was
 not onerous for tool vendors. So we need to focus only on parts of Phase 3
 proposal that were open to revision.
Don; ChrisN has put forth a good case for maintaining compatibiolity; so
 there's a good rationale for that.
ChrisN; We're haaving a version of a conversation that's been had by 2-3 other
 standards bodies, all of whom came to the decision to favor compatibility
 over enhancement.

```
For example, for SAP, they've aliased many elements/attributes
Deb;  Also, it's a fact that many elements/attribute have difficult names/
values, and many tools /companies alias them. These elements and attributes
 aren't unique in that sense.
Tom Magiery; XMetal doesn't even alias them, and has never had a complaint
Michael Boses; The real question is 'what's normative for a given user?'  In
 many cases 1/0 (vs. yes/no) is normative.
Thilo; We need to stick with the CALS model for now.  Alos, if we were to use
 'yes/no', that's a binary model. If the CALS model changes to allow -1, yes/
no would not be expandable.
Resolution; vote on proposal next week


Ready for vote
        None



New ITEM
Joann brought up the fact that the TechComm SC has a number of Stage 3
 proposals ready for review.  They're looking for outside reviewers for
 troubleshooting note, troubleshooting section, and the troubsleshooting part
 of the step element.
StanD, Eliot, Thilo, and Kris volunteered as reviewers; Kris suggested
 that all reviewers look at earlier discussions, so as to avoid the kind of
 duplication of discussion that we had for 13078 today.
Joann also requested more obvious and accessible links to the Stage 3 proposal
 template, after members noted that the troubleshooting proposals don't
 include information required by that template.
Kris will update the wiki to include those links.
Action Item: Kris will resolve template issue for Phase 3 template.


4. ITEM: Post on dita-comment list
    https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/dita-comment/201212/msg00000.html
 (Jarno Elvirta, 5 Dec 2012)
Status: Left this in December as an action for Nancy to follow up; need to
 track this as an action now (cleanup for Chairs)


*** all remaining items (5 - 9 on agenda) are on hold waiting for actions to
 be comleted***

closed at 11:51
```

15 January 2013

```
Minutes, DITA Technical Committee, January 15 2013
Scribe: Don Day
Chaired by Kris Eberlein
Speakers during today's call:
    KE: Kris Eberlein
    RA: Robert Anderson
    DD: Don Day
    JH: JoAnn Hackos
    SD: Stan Doherty


Status of Tech Comm SC: (JoAnn)
    Had first meeting, Bob Thomas working on Stage 3 proposals with current
 template.
    Seth's team still on Release Management proposal. MP helping on the Steps
 domain for troubleshooting.
    MP asked about XML domain proposals. Kris has put this item on the agenda
 for today under stage 2.
```

    MP wanted feedback on whether TC SC would want that proposal to be part of
 one of their packages. Will discuss
shortly.

Business:

No stage 1

Stage 2
13114 Adding @rev to <title> elements.
    JoAnn reviewed the user requests that motivated the need. Nothing new to
 add.
    Eliot added that his publishing users likely have the same requirement as
 well.
    Because title is required, it has no select-atts, so there is no reason
 @rev should not be allowed.
    RA: Likely an oversight due to original grouping of attributes.
    KE: Will queue this for a vote next week

13035 XML Mention:
    KE: is TechComm SC agreeable to add this item to their package (Eliot
 would still do all the drafting).
    KE: asked JoAnn to take an action to ask the SC about the request.
    Eliot reviewed the basics of the proposal for JoAnn.

Stage 3:
    None for discussion
    For vote:
    Proposal 13078: adding @rotate to entry and @orient to table
    JH: y
    RA: y
    MP: y
    AW: y
    MB: y
    SD: y
    DHe: y
    DD: y
    KE: y
    DB: y
    CN: y
    DHa: y
    EK: y
    TB: y
    Approved by acclamation of present voting members

New items: Difficulties mentioned on dita-users list with product names and
 reuse
    KE: reviewed the discussion on dita-users, referenced her note to the tc
 list
        * https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/dita/201301/msg00010.html
    RA: reminded us of nesting keywords discussion, impact on domain
 specializations (element cloning in unintended
places)
    DD: reviewed tension between schemas that mimic the programming model vs
 need to document parts of content
within that markup.
    EK: keyword is pcdata or text or tm; are there any other elements that
 reuse keyword, and currently not
(Robert's concern).
    RA: Robert would not change the keyword model
    EK: Wintitle does not allow tm, but could. Seems like an oversight
    RA: UIcontrol was motivated by output processing concerns (TM text should
 not appear in a UI)

KE: Can already be abused; perhaps the question is whether wintitle could be specialized from ph instead of keyword.

EK: Could break other's current work. Would have been ideal.

KE: has been suggesting that others specialize their own wintitle from ph if needed.

What people want to do is define their productname in an element. Adding tm to wintitle is a different issue.

SD: Has a practice of using a glossary with ph, text, keyword to try to get all terms into one place for reuse--

agrees with the general reuse problem.

EK: there is a proposal to allow text where not currently allowed, might resolve part of the issue, but does not resolve

reusable structures with semantic content (ie, product names with particular renditions)

JH: Noted Troy K's response, intent to keep markup controls out of the source.

KE: Notes that the management process is not available to smaller groups.

MP: conref, conkeyref are all variable controls in DITA; Troy's approach is setting atts on the variable attribute

to identify its usage in speech to aid translators.

DD asked about glossary and part of speech, JH and MP both agree it is not sufficient as is.

MP no mechanism in glossary for indicating same term in variant usage contexts.

MP would explore the idea, though. Might be beyond 1.3.

EK: Thinking of a general mechanism with glossary entry with forms of the term with a unique label for grammatic distinctions.

Would use something like keyword to access the applicable part. Keyword with keyref would open up use of special phrases.

System processing can be problematic.

MP: Of all the ways to do it, let's start wiht the translation SC and capture it as a post1.3 requirement.

KE: Appreciates MP bringing up case and other options. Would writer be responsible for indicating case?

Is that okay for (monolingual) English writers?

MP: Writer just writes it; during translation, turn the variable file into an indexed lookup table that is actually

managed by translators (those who have the linguistic domain knowledge).

JH: affirmed that grad students can't generally diagram a sentence--it is a widespread concern.

KE: outputclass is not available on text element--should this be considered?

RA: explicit decision to keep it as just a pure text variable, with semantics added by other wrappers.

KE: Another argument for not allowing tm in text.

EK: Doesn't like tm, but RA countered with real IBM use cases in support of legal business rules about rendering usage.

RA: When contracts change, an external rules file takes care of changes in rendering rules.

EK: trademark in text should be okay

DD: recalled IBM's use of eServer's special e font--businesses CAN have a reason for supporting presentation in trademarks.

KE: Not much of anything we can do for DITA 1.3

```
    EK: perhaps we can allow text wherever tm is allowed?
    RA: tm is in the basic group used everywhere it is explicitly allowed.
    EK: publishing needs more generality; that is an invalid reason in
general.
    SD: If writers and archs are running into limitations--are there sensible
practices to document? He'be willing
to contribute.
    KE: Would be happy to work with Stan on that document.
        Appreciated the useful conversation, looking forward to what we might
do with glossary.
    EK: be nice if tm were a specialization of text, but that's not possible.
    KE: Thanks all for the time, adjourned the call.
```

22 January 2013

```
Minutes of the OASIS DITA TC
Tuesday, 22 January 2013
Recorded by N. Harrison

regrets:  Kris Eberlein, Chris Nitchie

Standing Business
=================
minutes from last 2 meetings:
https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/dita/201301/msg00000.html (Harrison for
 18 December 2012)
https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/dita/201301/msg00014.html (15 January,
 Day)
    https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/dita/201301/msg00019.html
 (clarification, 15 January, Eberlein)
both moved by Don, seconded by Dick Hamilton, approved by TC


Subcommittee Reports
None
Machine Industry SC for Feb; Don will remind Chris Kravogel (SC chair)


Announcements:
None


Business
========

[ re upcoming proposals, short discussion on what might be in the pipeline
 coming up.]

1. DITA 1.3 proposals, stage 1: http://wiki.oasis-open.org/dita/
DITA_1.3_Proposals-triage

Ready for discussion: None
Ready for vote (simple majority):  None


2. DITA 1.3 proposals, stage 2: http://wiki.oasis-open.org/dita/
DITA_1.3_Proposals-stage2

Ready for discussion: None
Ready for vote (roll call):  #13114

Proposal 13114: Adding @rev to <title> elements
```

```
    https://www.oasis-open.org/committees/download.php/47892/
DITA1.3_13114_Proposal_AddRevToTitle.dita

Robert Anderson   y
Deb Bissantz    y
Michael Boses,    y
Thilo Buchholz   y
Don Day,      y
Joann Hackos,    y
Richard Hamilton,  y
Nancy Harrison,   No obj
David Helfinstine  y
Eliot Kimber.    y
Tom Magliery,    y
Michael Priestley,  y
Seth Park    No obj
Adrian Warman  y
```

3. DITA 1.3 proposals, stage 3: https://wiki.oasis-open.org/dita/
DITA_1.3_Proposals-stage3

 Ready to assign reviewers: None
 Ready for discussion: None
 Ready for vote (roll call): #13078

Proposal 13078: adding @rotate to entry and @orient to table
  https://www.oasis-open.org/committees/document.php?
document_id=47812&wg_abbrev=dita (original proposal)
  https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/dita/201301/msg00001.html (discussion
 on list)
  https://www.oasis-open.org/committees/document.php?
document_id=47843&wg_abbrev=dita (updated proposal using stage-3 template;
 contains necessary DTD changes)

```
Robert Anderson  y
Deb Bissantz  y
Michael Boses,    y
Thilo Buchholz  y
Don Day     y
Joann Hackos    y
Richard Hamilton  y
Nancy Harrison   y
David Helfinstine  y
Eliot Kimber    y
Tom Magliery    y
Seth Park    y
Michael Priestley  y
Adrian Warman  y
```

4. Continuing ITEM: Difficulties people experience with product names and
 reuse
   https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/dita/201301/msg00010.html (Eberlein,
 14 January 2013)

- MichaelP said he would like to get Andrej's response to the previous
 discussion.
- Joann noted that the Translation SC has published an article that dealt with
 this topic; the advice was to avoid reuse with less than a sentence. But the
 discussion, including Kris's advice, might make another nice small article.
 Native speakers of English don't realize the problems.
- Robert; Kris already gives that advice to people; Joann will contact Kris
 directly.

- MichaelP: would like to enable the possibility that if someone authors
 'regular' conrefs', and stores them all together in a file, that those
 conrefs can be automatically expanded to a 'morphological list' of the
 possible primitives.
- Joann; the problem is that translator's workbenches today don't allow this ,
 so that represents an enormous change
- MichaelP; We should check with vendors; if the answer comes back 'this is
 too expensive', then we need to let them know that right now there's a major
 cost to either authors or translators to resolve the reuse problem. If we can
 propose a technical solution, that would be nice. If there is no possible
 solution, then it goes back to what we have now.
- Joann; We definitely need to have the translation workbench vendors in that
 discussion.
- Don; But we first need to have a response for what constitutes a 'legal'
 variable.
- MichaelP; I'd like to get into the discussion, though I haven't to date.
 Rather than just saying 'we can't do this', so writers don't do it, I'd
 rather be able to say 'we could do this'. It would be better to try and see
 if there's a technological way thru the complexity.   But now we have no
 cost/benefit analysis, because we have no proposed solution for which to get
 a cost estimate, so 'cost' is 'infinite'
- Joann; how does IBM do this?
- MichaelP: IBM product names are very controlled in order to avoid this
- Robert; Not only are they very strictly controlled, translation of product
 names is prohibited and guidelines for how they can appear are strict.
- MichaelP: Where IBM writer's have hit problems is in ruese of UI interface
 labels; it would be nice to be creating documents using the properties file
 that controls the UI.
- Don; Note that this isn't just a software [documentation] problem; it's a
 hardware one as well.
- MichaelP: Note that what I'm proposing has nothing to do with what IBM does
 today; I'm not weighing in on product names, since it's not IBM's problem.
 Our problem is with UI names. Does anyone else think this is worth exploring?
 if not, I'll back off.
- Jim Tivy; Terminology exchange in translation is well-established in trans.
 mgmt systems. I'd like to hear from vendors how terminology is integated into
 the solution now, and how it could be in the future. I think we should ask
 questions about 'if you get new translations, how can you retain them in the
 TMS instead of just putting them inline? I second Michael's suggestion.
- MichaelP: So I'm on the hook to push out that proposal as part of the
 current discussion. I'll respond to Andrej on the list.
- Jim; I'll also respond; we need to respond to Andrej. People worry about a
 term moving around in the sentence.
- Eliot; Can't you have a situation where you have a term that appears in
 multiple sentences?
- Joann; The sentence is where the part of speech is defined, so we probably
 won't have cross-sentence issues, but I'd defer to Andrej on that
- Jim; Maybe translation workbenches could deal with this as a 'term'.
- Joann; Lots of translation companies/organizations require conrefs to be
 resolved before translation. because of that issue. That's one solution
 translation organizations are using. We're worried that we're promoting
 a practice that may cause really unfortunate problems for writers, and
 we're promoting it without telling people what to do about it, as we did
 with the translation white paper. So one of the things we could do, if
 there's no technical solution, is put this info right in the spec, with
 a section that says 'watch out for this issue!!!' One problem is where
 a legal dept. insists that writers use full product names in all places.
 If we gave them evidence that this is creating real translation problems,
 including completely ungrammatical output, maybe it would be addressed within
 a company.
- MichaelP: An earlier version of translation white paper might have had this,
 then it disappeared. The problem is that it addresses one set of problems
 but not another; if you're using if for something like single-sourcing
 content for multiple similar products, with slightly different product names

```
 with similar features, this does't work.  I'd like a measured response, that
 describes when you can do it and when you can't, not a blanket 'don't do it'
 approach.   But I'd like to explore a technical solution first.


Resolution: 2 Action Items
1. Joann will update the spec so conref description mentions best practices
 wrt translation
2. MichaelP will continue the technical discusion on the list on using conref/
keyref for technical terms without breaking translation.



Note: for next week, we'll have SIDSC on agenda



closed at 11:47
```

29 January 2013

```
Minutes of the OASIS DITA TC
Tuesday, 29 January 2013
Recorded by N. Harrison

regrets:   Kris Eberlein, Thilo Buchholz, Dave Helfenstine, Tom Magliery, Seth
 Park

Standing Business
=================
minutes from last 2 meetings:
https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/dita/201301/msg00050.html (22 January,
 Harrison)
moved by Don, seconded by Eliot, approved by TC


Subcommittee Reports
None
Machine Industry SC for Feb; Don will remind Chris Kravogel (SC chair)


Announcements:
None


Business
========

[ re upcoming proposals, short discussion on what might be in the pipeline
 coming up.]

Eliot was working on a proposal with Joann to add a citation element to
 shortdesc, but it made more sense to broaden it and allow <cite> in title
 content generally; should be ready for discussion next week.


1. DITA 1.3 proposals, stage 1: http://wiki.oasis-open.org/dita/
DITA_1.3_Proposals-triage

Ready for discussion: None
Ready for vote (simple majority):   None
```

```
2. DITA 1.3 proposals, stage 2: http://wiki.oasis-open.org/dita/
DITA_1.3_Proposals-stage2

Ready for discussion: None
Ready for vote (roll call):   none


3. DITA 1.3 proposals, stage 3: https://wiki.oasis-open.org/dita/
DITA_1.3_Proposals-stage3

 Ready to assign reviewers:  None
 Ready for discussion:  None
 Ready for vote (roll call):  None


4. New ITEM: SIDSC request by Bob Beims

Bob Beims discussed work in the SIDSC since the last time teh SIDSC proposal
 for DITA 1.3 was discussed in a TC meeting.
Background: During the last SIDSC teleconference, the SC discussed the
 options of adding our specification to the DITA 1.3 corpus vs. having it
 "stand alone" as a profile. We think we understand the pros and cons of each
 approach, and feel that the profile approach is the more appropriate route
 to take. If you're interested in hearing our thoughts, you can hear the
 recording of the discussion @ https://www147.livemeeting.com/cc/freescale/
view?id=sidsc-130116 "

Bob reviewed the SIDSC discussion on whether to incorporate SIDSC
 specialization within DITA 1.3.

If SIDSC is part of the main DITA 1.3 spec,
Pros:
1. get more 'gravitas', carries a bit more weight
2. gets to 'ride on DITA coattails' for ratification processs
Cons:
- Future SIDSC development has to slow down to match [slow] rate of new
 releases in whole DITA body of work, so if we want to make any changes, we
 have to wait for the next TC release
- Adding SIDSC means adding a large number of elements to an already 'complex'
 DITA model

If SIDSC work becomes a 'profile';
Pros:
- we could could do our own update cycles, so we could add/update SIDSC as
 often as we could get additional work done, without waiting for TC timetable.
Cons:
- SIDSC becomes a 'standalone' item, so we'd have to go through our own voting
 process.  This could be hard to manage, since most OASIS members don't have
 any connection to the semiconductor industry, so lobbying could be very
 substantial.
- If SIDSC is a standalone spec, it could be lost in the 'noise'.

After a lot of discussion, SIDSC decided to go with the profile approach.  If
 anyone has guidance on going thru that process, we could use that.

TC discussion:
- Don; Getting the votes can be a real obstacle, not impossible, just a lot
 of lobbying. Timing is everything; don't do it in the summer or at holiday
 season.
- Bob; at some point we do need to create an OASIS 'look and feel' document.
Is there a standard process for this?
- Robert; We (Kris and I) did that for the DITA 1.2 spec, but we don't have a
 clean process; OTOH, we definitely need one for 1.3, so we'll be creating a
 process to do it.
```

- Bob; Thanks for any help; we'll be coming back for more of it.
- Don; where is SIDSC in getting critical mass for committee members and use cases for SIDSC to demonstrate interoperability between multiple companies?
- Bob; we're still not up do critical mass.   But Altera is joining, and that will help.
- Joann, what about Magillen, a tools vendor who services the semiconductor industry and is appearing at DITA/NA in April?
- Don; good thought, tools vendors, if they're in OASIS, would be good to approach for involvement.
- Bob; we do need to talk to vendors, we're working in the space on the boundary of tech docs and chip/hardware design. Tools vendors should be interested.
- MikeB; I'm not totally clear on the implementation requirement for a standard. If this becomes a profile; does this require 2 companies to have implemented the specialization?
- Bob; I had that question too
- Don; SIDSC should ask Chet Ensign
- Don; there's a specification for graphics exchange called IGES (http://mmace.nrl.navy.mil:8080/mmace/mmace_docs/mm-tech-mm-iges.html). It might be a lead to companies that have the need to do the kind of interchange SIDSC is working on; may have similar interchange concerns. In any case, keep in touch if things come up and you want to contact the TC list.

5. New ITEM: Possible Proposal to Discuss: Product names and reuse (Hackos)
     https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/dita/201301/msg00047.html
6. Continuing ITEM: Difficulties people experience with product names and reuse
     https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/dita/201301/msg00010.html (Eberlein, 14 January 2013) Continuing ITEM: Difficulties people experience with product names and reuse
   https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/dita/201301/msg00010.html (Eberlein, 14 January 2013)

[joint discussion of these 2 related items]

- Joann; This came up in offline discussion with Christian Lieske of SAP, who sent me the 'best practices' paper from W3C's I18N Tag Set (ITS) working group (http://www.w3.org/TR/xml-i18n-bp/), He noted BP #22 (Working with inserted text) which discusses this issue; it suggests using @its:locnote (localization notes) from the ITS namespace. It's a way of telling translators what they're dealing with. So the question arises, should we incorporate that in DITA, or somehow allow DITA to use it, or ??
- Eliot; we might require a specialization of <foreign> that would include ITS elements, or a domain that included the elements from that namespace
- Joann; it's a pretty big domain
- Nancy, we could just take part of it a la our use of the XNAL dmomain
- Joann; there's a lot of documentation of the ITS namespace; we should look at it and see if we want to use pieces of it.
- Don; The issue for us is that there's a tension between users' strong interest in teuse of content, and a fairly universal need for translation. So anything we include here would become a necessary part of the TechComm domain.
- Joann; Translation is a major DITA driver, so we should do that.
- Don; If we put ITS content into the TechComm specialization, what are the implications for generalization? Wouldn't you lose context?
- Stan; When you're integrating keywords and terms with software, e.g., doing product rebranding, anything that adds context is useful, so 'locnote' would be also.
- Eliot; as a convention you could use a name value; we could use it as either an element or an attribute.
- MichaelP; The problem with an attribute is that DITA doesn't allow human readable text in an attribute.
- Joann; Translation workbenches may be able to be set up to read locnote.

- MichaelP; It's a W3C item, but we don't know how well it's supported in
  tools
- Joann; Should we have Christian talk to this TC
- Don; If he's willing, it would be useful
- Joann; I'll send him a message and try to set up a time
- Don; Rather than <foreign> element, what about specializing <draft-comment>
- Eliot; That's a good idea, since it'll only show up in draft mode
- MichaelP; Would that be granular enough? It might be able to replace a
  locnote element, but not an attribute.
- Jim Tivy; Do we want to alllow all ITS attributes in a DITA domain?
- MichaelP; There's a good possiblity we do, e.g., a pseudo-namespace, like
  xml-lang:
- Joann; Would these show up for the translator?
- MichaelP; If we added it to global-atts, yes, it would show up everywhere.
- Joann; What if we added it as an element; would it show up in enough places?
- MichaelP; We really need to understand transalation workbenches.
- Nancy; I'll try to contact someone from SDL's translation side about this
- Joann; Another thing came out of the Adoption TC minutes, the Adoption TC
  will develop a set of 'best practices' notes just like the ITS one. Now
  we're collecting topics that would be good best practices, so if everyone
  would start creating or accumulating such things, that would be great. not
  just for translation issues but for adoption issues in general. [Joann will
  send out a note on this request.]

Action items;
- Joann to send out note to [TC and SC?] members asking for 'best practices'
  papers
- Nancy to contact someone from translation side at SDL

Discussion of DITA Fest in Japan

PTC and SDL have both left membership in the Japan DITA Consortium.

- Joann; PTC is advising people to not go to DITA; they're still supporting
  DITA, but they don't want to tie themsleves to DITA, so they downplay it.
  Joann noted that what concerns her particularly is that PTC is telling people
  not to use conrefs.
- ChrisN; Some people at PTC feel strongly against conrefs. A big driver is
  wanting customers to use their own storage solution, Windchill, which has no
  XML referential integrity. Of course this means also discouraging keyrefs,
  which is the only way to do robust conditional publishing.
- Joann; they're strongly discouraging going to DITA 1.2 at all.

NB: Joann and Don will be both out for 2 weeks
Kris will chair next 2 meetings

closed at 11:59

February 2013

5 February 2013

```
DITA TC meeting
5 February 2013
Minutes taken by Seth Park

Roll call: qoroum met


Meeting minutes, seconded by Stan D.; no objections; minutes approved by
 acclamation.


1. DITA 1.3 proposals, stage 2: http://wiki.oasis-open.org/dita/
DITA_1.3_Proposals-triage

Proposal 13116: Add the <cite> element to the content of title, xref, and
 other title-like elements (Kimber)

https://www.oasis-open.org/committees/download.php/48137/
DITA1.3_13116_Proposal_AddCiteTitle.html


Discussion: Eliot's analysis reveals that the semantic purpose of "cite" is
 more similar to "keyword" than a traditional "xref". No objections and the
 example provided by Eliot demonstrates a good valid usecase for adding "cite"
 to title-like elements


Action: ready for vote; move to the agenda for next time.


2. Continuing discussion on product names, terms, and reuse: WWW3 @its:locnote

New e-mail: https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/dita/201301/msg00052.html
 (Kimber, 29 Jan 2013)

New e-mail: https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/dita/201301/msg00054.html
 (Tivy, 29 Jan 2013)


Discussion: Eliot's email outlines the options, including use of "foreign" or
 "data"

Kris requested examples and feedback from a translation service provider.
 Thilo to have discussion with a colleague and ask him to attend.
The enumerated options raised several questions.


3. SAP product name variability/translation, etc.
```

Use of DITA "strings" for stem sentences and answers (true/false) or "select
 one of the following below" "pick an item from column A and column B". Works
 well for these kind of things; 800 strings reused directly and well today.

Units of time don't translate.
Works with "generated text" not "authored text" (Kris summarized)

4. Continuing discussion about product names, terms, and reuse: DITA and
 translation workbenchs

New e-mail: https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/dita/201301/msg00055.html
 (Tivy, 30 Jan 2013)

Kris: asked Michael about last week's minutes about engaging with TMS

MP: complexity of conref; thinking through challenges.

Kris: general gap in knowledge around reuse mechanisms for swapping out
 product names, etc. Other complexity when reusing strings across two
 different products.

Kris: not likely we'll be able to make any changes to address the need in 1.3.

Seth asked whether a TSP would be motivated to solve these challenges? Can
 we rely on the open market to find a solution? Kris says that the open
 market has not addressed it yet and the TC should be able to supply enough
 information to assist the open market in finding a workable solution.

5. New item: DITA TC processes for creating OASIS-branded documents (ran out
 of time; on agenda for next week)

Overview of DITA 1.2 work and where we are now
State of DITA-OT plug-in for generating CHM, XHTML, zipped XHTML, and PDF
Need for redesign of "Contain" and "Contains by" tables
Need of method for generating "Contain" and "Contains by" tables

12 February 2013

Minutes go here