
DITA 2.0 proposed feature #350: Remove Machinery Task document type

Remove the machinery task and the associated Task requirements domain from the DITA 2.0 specification.

Date and version information

Include the following information:

Date that this feature proposal was completed

March 17, 2020

Champion of the proposal

Zoë Lawson

Links to any previous versions of the proposal

N/A

Links to minutes where this proposal was discussed at stage 1 and moved to stage 2

<https://www.oasis-open.org/apps/org/workgroup/dita/email/archives/202003/msg00021.html>

Reviewers for Stage 2 proposal

- Robert Anderson

Links to e-mail discussion that resulted in new versions of the proposal

N/A

Link to the GitHub issue

<https://github.com/oasis-tcs/dita/issues/350>

Original requirement or use case

As discussed March 3, 2020 and many times before, the goal is to remove the Machinery task from the official OASIS 2.0 release. We can still create a 2.0 compatible version of the grammar files for release on GitHub, but the TC does not currently have anyone with the expertise to validate the content model/elements/specification documents as needed for compatibility with 2.0.

Use cases

The current Machinery Task type and associated Task Requirements domain contains several very specific elements for specific use cases that are no longer well understood by the Technical Council. Maintaining these elements without the domain knowledge would provide a lower quality product than the Technical Council wants to provide.

Removing this document type and associated domain will reduce the complexity of the specification and reduce the technical burden on the people maintaining the grammar files.

New terminology

None

Proposed solution

Remove the Machinery Task shell and the associated Task requirements domain from the Tech Comm package.

Benefits

Address the following questions:

Who will benefit from this feature?

Readers of the specification will not be overwhelmed by extra information about a complicated document type and domain that they most likely do not need.

What is the expected benefit?

Ensuring the Technical Council provides quality content with the release of DITA 2.0.

How many people probably will make use of this feature?

Few outside of those who work in the machinery field.

How much of a positive impact is expected for the users who will make use of the feature?

Minor.

Technical requirements

Provide a detailed description of how the solution will work. Be sure to include the following details:

Adding new elements or attributes

N/A

Renaming or refactoring elements and attributes

N/A

Removing elements or attributes**Removing a topic or map specialization**

Machinery Task

Remove dita-techcomm\doctypes\dtd\machineryIndustry, including catalog.xml, machineryTask.dtd, and machineryTaskbodyConstraint.mod.

Remove dita-techcomm\doctypes\rng\machineryIndustry, including catalog.xml, machineryTask.rng, and machineryTaskbodyConstraintMod.rng.

Removing a domain entirely, or from select document types

Task requirements domain

Remove dita-techcomm\doctypes\dtd\technicalContent\dtd\taskreqDomain.ent and dita-techcomm\doctypes\dtd\technicalContent\dtd\taskreqDomain.mod.

Remove dita-techcomm\doctypes\rng\technicalContent\rng\taskreqDomain.rng.

Update any catalog.xml files that reference the Task requirements domain.

Removing an element

All of the following elements are members of the Task requirements domain that are a part of the Machinery Task shell.

- <prelreqs>
- <closereqs>
- <reqconds>
- <reqcond>
- <noconds>
- <reqcontp>
- <reqpers>
- <personnel>
- <perscat>
- <perskill>
- <esttime>

- <supeqli>
- <supequi>
- <supequip>
- <nosupeq>
- <supplies>
- <supply>
- <supplyli>
- <nosupply>
- <spare>
- <spares>
- <sparesli>
- <nospares>
- <nosafety>
- <safecond>
- <safety>

Removing an attribute

There are no specialized attributes included in the Machinery Task or Task requirements domain.

Processing impact

Any processor that provides special processing for Machinery Task and the Task requirements domain may remove the special processing.

Overall usability

Those who use the Machinery Task today will have to get the grammar files separately from the specification.

Backwards compatibility

Was this change previously announced in an earlier version of DITA?

No.

Removing a document type that was shipped in DITA 1.3?

Yes, Machinery Task.

Removing a domain that was shipped in DITA 1.3?

Yes, the Task requirements domain. This only affects the Machinery Task document type.

Removing a domain from a document type shell that was shipped in DITA 1.3?

None.

Removing or renaming an element that was shipped in DITA 1.3?

Yes, but only from the Task requirements domain.

- <prelreqs>
- <closereqs>
- <reqconds>
- <reqcond>
- <noconds>
- <reqcontp>
- <reqpers>
- <personnel>
- <perscat>
- <perskill>
- <esttime>
- <supeqli>
- <supequi>

- <supequip>
- <nosupeq>
- <supplies>
- <supply>
- <supplyli>
- <nosupply>
- <spare>
- <spares>
- <sparesli>
- <nospare>
- <nosafety>
- <safecond>
- <safety>

Removing or renaming an attribute that was shipped in DITA 1.3?

No.

Changing the meaning of an element or attribute in a way that would disallow existing usage?

No.

Changing a content model by removing something that was previously allowed, or by requiring something that was not?

Other than removing a document type, no.

Changing specialization ancestry?

No.

Removing or replacing a processing feature that was defined in DITA 1.3?

No.

Are element or attribute groups being renamed or shuffled?

No.

Migration plan

Might any existing documents need to be migrated?

Optionally, if possible, users of the Machinery Task domain should retrieve the provided grammar files from GitHub and adapt them to their DITA 2.0 implementation.

Otherwise, convert the elements to their task domain equivalents, perhaps with an @outputclass for formatting using search and replace.

Task requirement elements	Suggested original element
<prelreqs>	<prereq > with <outputclass> set to prelreqs
<closereqs>	<postreq > with <outputclass> set to closereqs
<reqconds>	 with <outputclass> set to reqconds
<reqcond>	 with <outputclass> set to reqcond
<noconds>	 with <outputclass> set to noconds
<reqcontp>	 with <outputclass> set to reqcontp
<reqpers>	 with <outputclass> set to reqpers
<personnel>	 with <outputclass> set to personnel
<perscat>	 with <outputclass> set to perscat

Task requirement elements	Suggested original element
<perskill>	 with <outputclass> set to perskill
<esttime>	 with <outputclass> set to esttime
<supeqli>	 with <outputclass> set to supeqli
<supequi>	 with <outputclass> set to supequi
<supequip>	<p > with <outputclass> set to supequip
<nosupeq>	<data > with <outputclass> set to nosupeq
<supplies>	<p > with <outputclass> set to supplies
<supply>	 with <outputclass> set to supply
<supplyli>	 with <outputclass> set to supplyli
<nosupply>	<data > with <outputclass> set to nosupply
<spare>	 with <outputclass> set to spare
<spares>	<p > with <outputclass> set to spares
<sparesli>	 with <outputclass> set to sparesli
<nospares>	<data > with <outputclass> set to nospares
<nosafety>	 with <outputclass> set to nosafety
<safecond>	 with <outputclass> set to safecond
<safety>	 with <outputclass> set to safety

You also need to search for the Machinery Task document type declaration:

```
<!DOCTYPE task PUBLIC "-//OASIS//DTD DITA Machinery Task//EN" "machineryTask.dtd">
```

and replace it with the task document type declaration:

```
<!DOCTYPE task PUBLIC "-//OASIS//DTD DITA Task//EN" "task.dtd">
```

Might any existing processors or implementations need to change their expectations?

Vendors may remove support for the Machinery Task type and the Task requirements domain.

Might any existing specialization or constraint modules need to be migrated?

No.

If no migration need is anticipated, why not?

N/A

Costs

Outline the impact (time and effort) of the feature on the following groups.

Maintainers of the grammar files

Remove the grammar files.

Editors of the DITA specification

The removal of the document type and domain must be mentioned in the list of changes and migration information.

Remove the following topics from the base specification:

- archSpec\base\example-contraints-correct-machinery-task-constraint.dita

Remove the following topics from the Tech Comm specification:

- archSpec\technicalContent\dita-machinerytask-topic.dita

I cannot find the source for the following in the current specifications:

- langRef/containers/mitask-d.html
- langRef/technicalContent/prelreqs.html
- langRef/technicalContent/closereqs.html
- langRef/technicalContent/reqconds.html
- langRef/technicalContent/reqcond.html
- langRef/technicalContent/noconds.html
- langRef/technicalContent/reqcontp.html
- langRef/technicalContent/reppers.html
- langRef/technicalContent/personnel.html
- langRef/technicalContent/perscat.html
- langRef/technicalContent/perskill.html
- langRef/technicalContent/esttime.html
- langRef/technicalContent/supeqli.html
- langRef/technicalContent/supequi.html
- langRef/technicalContent/supequip.html
- langRef/technicalContent/nosupeq.html
- langRef/technicalContent/supplies.html
- langRef/technicalContent/supply.html
- langRef/technicalContent/supplyli.html
- langRef/technicalContent/nosupply.html
- langRef/technicalContent/spare.html
- langRef/technicalContent/spares.html
- langRef/technicalContent/sparesli.html
- langRef/technicalContent/nospares.html
- langRef/technicalContent/nosafety.html
- langRef/technicalContent/safecond.html
- langRef/technicalContent/safety.html

Vendors of tools

Vendors must remove support for the Machinery Task document type and the Task requirements domain.

DITA community-at-large

- Will this feature add to the perception that DITA is becoming too complex? No.
- Will it be simple for end users to understand? Yes.
- If the feature breaks backwards compatibility, how many documents are likely to be affected, and what is the cost of migration? Not many, only those using the Machinery Task document type and the Task Requirements domain.

Producing migration instructions or tools

- How extensive will migration instructions be, if it is integrated into an overall 1.3 # 2.0 migration publication or white paper? Additions to the search and replace recommendations.
- Will this require an independent white paper or other publication to provide migration details? No.

- Do migration tools need to be created before this change can be made? No. If so, how complex will those tools be to create and to use?

Examples

N/A