

Publication: Review G: Metadata elements (00813577-DD_1)

Topic: keywords (DA00508718)

Paragraph-level comments

Key words are terms that applies to the topic or map.

Annotation	Reviewer	Status	Type	Date	Topic version
Key words are terms that apply to the topic or map.	randerson	updated	change	11/1/2022 15:04:12	
Corrected. Marking this comment as COMPLETED .	keberlein	updated	comment	11/1/2022 15:51:38	

Key words are terms that applies to the topic or map.

Annotation	Reviewer	Status	Type	Date	Topic version
Key words are terms that apply yes to the topic or map.	fwegmann	updated	change	13/1/2022 20:55:03	
Marking this comment as CLOSED . Robert already commented on this, and I fixed the typo.	keberlein	updated	comment	13/1/2022 23:55:49	

While the <keyword> element can be used inline, the <keywords> element is not an inline element. The <keywords> element only appears in the <topicmeta> or <prolog>, and it is used to specify keywords that apply to the topic.

Annotation	Reviewer	Status	Type	Date	Topic version
Should it be "...used to specify key words that apply to the topic"?					
Can we use the word "container"? The <keywords> element is a container used in the <topicmeta> or <prolog> for key words and index terms?	zlawson	new	comment	17/1/2022 02:28:53	
@Zoe, you raise two points here. I'll address the 1st point. Thanks for the correction, and I changed "keywords" to "key	keberlein	new	comment	17/1/2022 15:11:07	

words".

Topic: metadata (DA00508658)

Paragraph-level comments

A <metadata> element is a container that groups metadata such as audience and key words.

Annotation	Reviewer	Status	Type	Date	Topic version
Can anyone suggest a natural-language short description for this one that doesn't just sound like "Metadata is metadata"?	randerson	new	comment	11/1/2022 15:04:59	
Difficult. "A <metadata> element is a container for meta-information such as audience and key words" is hardly any better. Or...?	fwegmann	new	comment	13/1/2022 21:01:38	
The <metadata> container groups elements that hold information about the contents of associated topic to provide context and other data for authors and processors.					
I'm not super happy with context, but product info is context, author and audience info is context...	zlawson	new	comment	17/1/2022 02:34:47	
Metadata doesn't have a synonym, so I'm not entirely sure we can really write around it too much.					

A <metadata> element is a container that groups metadata such as audience and key words.

Annotation	Reviewer	Status	Type	Date	Topic version
The <metadata> element contains other metadata elements such as <audience> or <keywords>.	sdoherty	new	comment	15/1/2022 21:43:02	

When used in topics, metadata elements that are outside of the <metadata> element generally provide lifecycle information for the content unit, such as the author or copyright.

Annotation	Reviewer	Status	Type	Date	Topic version
This sentence seems odd to me. Are we defining something by what it isn't? Are we explaining that <metadata> doesn't necessarily contain all the metadata?	zlawson	new	comment	17/1/2022 02:38:14	

It feels like we're mixing architectural info with element info. I think this information belongs in whatever architectural topic discusses metadata.

The following code sample shows how metadata can be provided in a topic about jet packs:

Annotation	Reviewer	Status	Type	Date	Topic version
I laughed at this example, but is it slightly more frivolous than we'd like? (I'd love to keep it)					
Currently, this topic also discusses metadata elements outside of the <metadata> element...do we want to show it? (I don't think so, but I feel that's the way this topic is headed as currently written.)	zlawson	new	comment	17/1/2022 02:40:43	

Topic: vrmlist (DA00509243)

Topic-level comments

Annotation	Reviewer	Status	Type	Date	Topic version
I keep running into things that I should have suggested a change to earlier.					
<vrmlist> is very specific. You have 3 places in an IBM specific order. I have frequently run into 5 place version numbers. I have to abuse elements and attributes to get things to work. (Again, I don't really know how to specialize). I wonder if there's another way to express version information in a way that's customizable without specialization.	zlawson	new	comment	17/1/2022 03:15:54	

Paragraph-level comments

A <vrmlist> element contains one or more <vrmlist> elements that can be used for specifying the version, release, and modification information for products.

Annotation	Reviewer	Status	Type	Date	Topic version
Having trouble with a natural language short description on this one. Maybe something like:					
A version list is a container for one or more <vrmlist> elements that can be used for specifying version information.	randerson	updated	comment	11/1/2022 15:07:49	

Or maybe "A version metadata list is a grouping of one or more vrm elements that specify information about the version, release, and modification levels of a product." keberlein updated comment 11/1/2022 21:30:02

Incorporated suggestion. Marking this comment **COMPLETED.**

Also works. For some reason when I expand the comments the first time, I don't see all of them... gjoseph new comment 17/1/2022 17:42:00

I like Robert's proposal here. Just fix this:
s/sued/used/ gjoseph new comment 17/1/2022 17:41:14

Topic: vrm (DA00508945)

Topic-level comments

Annotation	Reviewer	Status	Type	Date	Topic version
When defining a version number, what value does having different attributes give us? (related to my ruminations on vrmlist)	zlawson	new	comment	17/1/2022 03:17:57	

Paragraph-level comments

A <vrm> element that can be used for specifying the version, release, and modification information for a products.

Annotation	Reviewer	Status	Type	Date	Topic version
Suggestions welcome on how to write this one using natural language. Possibly something like "Version metadata is used to track the version, release, and modification numbers for a product."	randerson	updated	comment	11/1/2022 15:11:18	
How about " Version metadata is metadata that is used to track the version, release, and modification numbers for a product"?	keberlein	updated	comment	11/1/2022 21:28:04	

Made the suggested change. Marking this comment as **COMPLETED**.

A <vrm> element that can be used for specifying the version, release, and modification information for a products.

Annotation	Reviewer	Status	Type	Date	Topic version
A element that can be used for specifying the version, release, and modification information for a product.	randerson	updated	change	11/1/2022 15:11:29	
Removed the extraneous "that". Marking this comment COMPLETED .	keberlein	updated	comment	11/1/2022 15:57:59	

Topic: copyrholder (DA00508692)

Paragraph-level comments

A copyright holder is the entity that holds the egal rights to a work that has been assigned a copyright.

Annotation	Reviewer	Status	Type	Date	Topic version
A copyright holder is the entity that holds the legal rights to a work that has been assigned a copyright.	fwegmann	updated	change	13/1/2022 20:45:16	
Fixed. Marking this comment as COMPLETED .	keberlein	updated	comment	13/1/2022 23:53:10	

Topic: created (DA00509565)

Topic-level comments

Annotation	Reviewer	Status	Type	Date	Topic version
Again, I realize this is too late, but I am thinking I would like to somehow relate this to <author> so I know who created as well as when it was created. Then I rememebered the <bookchangehistory> stuff. Why is that only associated with books? But, also, do we want to have the change history metadata included? Or should that be put into the content management system?	zlawson	new	comment	17/1/2022 01:50:17	
	keberlein	new	comment	17/1/2022	

Yes, bookmap has some specific elements for change history. Also, remember that there is also a release-management domain.

15:06:36

In general, DITA is not equipped to track granular changes in content; that needs to be left to a CMMS. The little metadata that we provide is intended to allow authors to craft an authored description of changes.

Paragraph-level comments

The creation date is the date that a document was ceated.

Annotation	Reviewer	Status	Type	Date	Topic version
The creation date is the date that a document was cr eated on.	fwegmann	updated	change	13/1/2022 20:52:39	
Fixed. Marking this comment as COMPLETED.	keberlein	updated	comment	13/1/2022 23:54:35	

The following attributes are available on this element: universal attributes , date attributes , and the attribute defined below.

Annotation	Reviewer	Status	Type	Date	Topic version
I am amused that the "date attributes" don't include @date.					
I'm mildly confused why <created> and <revised> get the date attributes. What does it mean if @expiry is different for <created> vs <revised>? Shouldn't @expiry be associated at a topic level, not a revision level? I think @golive makes sense, but it's a weird revision history/publication data mix. (But for those of us who can't afford a CMS, having the option to record that metadata in the topics is a nice poor-man's option.)	zlawson	new	comment	17/1/2022 01:58:03	
The "date attributes" are only for <created> and <revised>, do they need to be called out separately? Are they on more elements in the tech comm area? Are these the right location for these attributes?					
I have a client who has a CCMS and also uses the critdates element to pull in the created and revised dates. Customers need to know when a document was published to ensure they are referring to the correct revision. They also want to know when it was revised, because code changes are required to comply with each product release, so the publication date has	gjoseph	new	comment	17/1/2022 16:03:42	

the information that relates to the changes in this revision of the document and software. These dates are critical and very important for companies that operate in a highly regulated environment. These companies also have very sophisticated change history content models, for the same reason.

Topic: category (DA00509344)

Paragraph-level comments

A category is a class or division of people or things that have shared characteristics.

Annotation	Reviewer	Status	Type	Date	Topic version
A category is a class or division of people or things that have shared characteristics.	sdoherthy	updated	change	15/1/2022 21:34:47	
Done. Marking this comment COMPLETED .	keberlein	updated	comment	17/1/2022 14:49:39	

A category is a class or division of people or things that have shared characteristics.

Annotation	Reviewer	Status	Type	Date	Topic version
Why are we calling out people? "A category is a class or division of things that have shared characteristics."?	zlawson	updated	comment	17/1/2022 01:21:36	
Done. Marking this comment COMPLETED .	keberlein	updated	comment	17/1/2022 14:51:47	
Why not simplify to: "A category is a group of things that have shared characteristics." ?	gjoseph	new	comment	17/1/2022 15:39:23	

The <category> element is equivalent to both the <Coverage> element and the <Subject> element in Dublin Core.

Annotation	Reviewer	Status	Type	Date	Topic version
Same comment as the audience element regarding references to Dublin Core. I guess if we do change anything, we should make that change everywhere we currently refer to DC.	gjoseph	new	comment	17/1/2022 15:41:48	

<prolog>
<metadata>

```

<category>History</category>
<category>Non-fiction</category>
<category>Editors' choice</category>
</metadata>
</prolog>

```

Annotation	Reviewer	Status	Type	Date	Topic version
indentation of two space characters to align with other sample code and at the beginning and end of the codeblock there is an additional newline.			updated comment	12/1/2022 21:13:32	
Removed the extra line. Did not change the indentation. Marking this comment COMPLETED .	keberlein	updated comment		12/1/2022 23:18:41	

Topic: copyyear (DA00508896)

Topic-level comments

Annotation	Reviewer	Status	Type	Date	Topic version
It is probably too late to do this, but do we want to move in <copyfirst> and <copylast>? Why do only bookmaps get mult-year copyright support?	zlawson	new	comment	17/1/2022 01:43:16	

Paragraph-level comments

A copyright year is the year associated with a copyright.

Annotation	Reviewer	Status	Type	Date	Topic version
Too vague. International opyright laws focus on coyright year being the year in which an author first published a work or first submitted it to a copyright-granting agency.	sdoherly	updated comment		15/1/2022 21:38:38	
Changed to read "A copyright year is the year in which an author first published a work or submitted it to a copyright-granting agency."	keberlein	updated comment		17/1/2022 14:58:03	

Marking this comment **COMPLETED**.

Specifies the year in YYYY format

Annotation	Reviewer	Status	Type	Date	Topic version
Specifies the year in YYYY format .	sdoherly	updated	change	15/1/2022 21:39:03	
No, because the definition is a sentence fragment. Per our styleguide, we do not use a terminal period with a sentence fragment.	keberlein	updated	comment	17/1/2022 15:00:09	
Marking this comment CLOSED .					

Topic: prognum (DA00509107)

Paragraph-level comments

A program number is an order number or a product tracking code

Annotation	Reviewer	Status	Type	Date	Topic version
A program number is an order number or a product tracking code .	sdoherly	updated	change	15/1/2022 21:50:52	
Thanks; added the period. Marking this comment COMPLETED .	keberlein	updated	comment	17/1/2022 15:25:36	

A program number is an order number or a product tracking code

Annotation	Reviewer	Status	Type	Date	Topic version
Why do we specify order number? What is an order number? To me order number is associated with purchasing things, and I can't see how to track it to a "program number".	zlawson	new	comment	17/1/2022 02:56:21	
I think this point of this element is simply to be a place to store a number. It might be an order number or a program number or any other sort of number. Each implementation can interpret this as needed.	keberlein	new	comment	17/1/2022 20:49:26	

Topic: publisher (DA00509198)

Paragraph-level comments

A publisher is an entity (person, company, or organization) who makes information, literature, music, software, and other content available to the public.

Annotation	Reviewer	Status	Type	Date	Topic version
A publisher is an entity (person, company, or organization) that makes information, literature, music, software, and other content available to a reader .	sdoherly	updated	change	15/1/2022 21:52:04	
Done. Marking this comment COMPLETED .	keberlein	updated	comment	17/1/2022 15:27:22	

The following attributes are available on this element: universal attributes , link-relationship attributes , and @keyref .

Annotation	Reviewer	Status	Type	Date	Topic version
What do the link-relationship attributes do for this element?					
Why do we have @keyref here and not on other metadata elements?	zlawson	new	comment	17/1/2022 02:57:53	

Topic: series (DA00508794)

Paragraph-level comments

A series is a set of related products or programs.

Annotation	Reviewer	Status	Type	Date	Topic version
The <series> element describes a suite or collection of released A series is a set of related products or programs.	sdoherly	new	change	15/1/2022 21:55:17	
Again, whenever possible, we try to describe what something IS in the short description, rather than what one can do with the element.	keberlein	new	comment	17/1/2022 15:35:08	

The following attributes are available on this element: universal attributes .

Annotation	Reviewer	Status	Type	Date	Topic version
Why don't we get to use @keyref?	zlawson	new	comment	17/1/2022 03:04:09	

Topic: author (DA00509606)

Topic-level comments

Annotation	Reviewer	Status	Type	Date	Topic version
indentation of two space characters to align with other sample code	fwegmann	updated	comment	12/1/2022 21:10:21	
<p>Frank, while it would be ideal to have the indentation in all code blocks standardized, I just don't think that's a priority right now. Please only comment about the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Indentation is inconsistent within a particular code block. • The code sample runs off the page in the PDF. <p>Marking this comment CLOSED.</p>	keberlein	updated	comment	12/1/2022 23:14:01	
Am I crossing the line of implementation about how you'd use this element? It's useful for keeping track of who worked on what? Would you ever use this for processing output?	zlawson	updated	comment	17/1/2022 01:05:33	
<p>Hmm ... One use case is to record the author, especially for implementations that are not using a CCMS. Stylesheets might also render the content of the author element.</p> <p>Marking this comment CLOSED.</p>	keberlein	updated	comment	17/1/2022 14:43:12	

Paragraph-level comments

An author is the entity (person, organization, or application) that created the content.

Annotation	Reviewer	Status	Type	Date	Topic version
Do we need to be specific about 'created'? Could it also be updated? Or is that getting too specific? (I guess an editor 'created' the content just as much...)	zlawson	updated	comment	17/1/2022 01:07:16	
I don't think we need to be that specific. Marking this	keberlein	updated	comment	17/1/2022 14:46:38	

comment **CLOSED**.

An author is the entity (person, organization, or application) that created the content.

Annotation	Reviewer	Status	Type	Date	Topic version
An author is the entity (person, organization, or application) that created the content , for example, a person, organization, or application.	gjoseph	updated	change	17/1/2022 15:19:02	
Incorporate the suggestion, although I changed "for example" to "such as". Marking this comment COMPLETED .	keberlein	updated	comment	17/1/2022 16:15:50	

The <author> element is equivalent to the <Creator> element in Dublin Core.

Annotation	Reviewer	Status	Type	Date	Topic version
What's the purpose of this statement? Do we expect the reader to go off and look up Dublin Core to understand how to use this element? If the usage is the same as for Dublin Core, I think we should link to the appropriate topic in the Dublin Core spec. Or we should replace this sentence with helpful usage information.	gjoseph	new	comment	17/1/2022 15:24:26	
The spec has had these statement about equivalence to Dublin Core since DITA 1.0. Perhaps TC members who were in at the very beginning could chime in?	keberlein	new	comment	17/1/2022 16:17:37	

The following attributes are available on this element: universal attributes , @keyref , and link-relationship attributes .

Annotation	Reviewer	Status	Type	Date	Topic version
I'm guessing you have @keyref so that you can have a list of authors and always make sure you spell people's names right, etc.					
If I set @keyref, can I still set the @type?	zlawson	new	comment	17/1/2022 01:03:09	
Why can I use link relationship attributes? Is that so you can get @type? Why would I want @href or anything else?					

Jane is specified as a creator of the topic, and John is specified as a contributor to the topic.

Annotation	Reviewer	Status	Type	Date	Topic version
Jane is specified as a creator of the topic and John is specified as a contributor to the topic.	sdoherly	updated	change	15/1/2022 21:34:17	
No, our styleguide calls for using a comma in sentences such as this one. Marking this comment CLOSED .	keberlein	updated	comment	17/1/2022 14:44:53	

Topic: brand (DA00509334)

Topic-level comments

Annotation	Reviewer	Status	Type	Date	Topic version
Why would I use brand? Is it just useful product information? Does it help me prep a content set for OEM?	zlawson	new	comment	17/1/2022 01:26:40	
Large companies have multiple brands each with multiple products. Some of these products share common features. I have clients that use brand to identify the brands a particular document or topic applies to. This is then used to include or suppress the topic based on the brand or brands to which the reader is entitled to see. This obviously works in Web or some other online delivery mechanism, not print or PDF.	gjoseph	new	comment	17/1/2022 15:34:47	
I cannot answer your question "Why would I use brand?" I think if you ask that question, you probably don't need this metadata element!	keberlein	new	comment	17/1/2022 20:03:07	
Gershon gave a useful example.					

Paragraph-level comments

A brand is a type of product that is manufactured by a company under a particular name.

Annotation	Reviewer	Status	Type	Date	Topic version
I realize this is the definition from some dictionary, but in my brain I think of brand more like the marketing term, or when I have to 'rebrand' something that's OEM'd.	zlawson	new	comment	17/1/2022 01:18:08	
Maybe "A brand is a name used for a family of products or the name of a product when sold by another company." ?					

The following attributes are available on this element: universal attributes .

Annotation	Reviewer	Status	Type	Date	Topic version
Why can't I use @keyref to a specific list of brands?	zlawson	new	comment	17/1/2022 01:08:15	

```
<prodinfo>
  <prodname>MyMedDevice</prodname>
  <vrmlist>
    <vrm version="1"/>
  </vrmlist>

  <brand>ExampleCo</brand>
</prodinfo>
```

Annotation	Reviewer	Status	Type	Date	Topic version
indentation of two space characters to align with other sample code	fwegmann	updated	comment	12/1/2022 21:12:13	
Marking this comment CLOSED .	keberlein	updated	comment	12/1/2022 23:16:08	

Topic: featnum (DA00509479)

Paragraph-level comments

A feature number is the number that is associated with a product feature.

Annotation	Reviewer	Status	Type	Date	Topic version
I'm actually somewhat questioning <featnum> being associated with <prodinfo>, A feature might be associated with multiple products. I can also see multiple features being associated with a single product. Can I have multiple <featnum> in a <prodinfo>?					
Can multiple products be associated with <prodinfo>?	zlawson	updated	comment	17/1/2022 02:13:50	
This question actually belongs down in <prodinfo> so I'll repeat it there, but I'd like to understand better all the various 'specific bits' associated with <prodinfo> and why we have all of them.					

Do we want to simply cross reference the example in the <prodinfo> topic? This question probably applies to all the other elements that can only be used as children of <prodinfo>.

Annotation	Reviewer	Status	Type	Date	Topic version
I would like to see more relationships with prodinfo, so yes please. (I have a related comment somewhere, I think on component)	zlawson	updated	comment	17/1/2022 02:03:43	
I agree we should rather just xref the prodinfo example.	gjoseph	updated	comment	17/1/2022 16:12:08	
All the product-information elements now simply have a cross reference to the prodinfo topic. Marking this comment COMPLETED .	keberlein	updated	comment	17/1/2022 20:45:56	

Topic: prodname (DA00509443)

Topic-level comments

Annotation	Reviewer	Status	Type	Date	Topic version
I don't think there is, but should there be a relationship with @product? Should there be an @name that relates to @product?	zlawson	updated	comment	17/1/2022 02:53:53	
No. Marking this comment as CLOSED .	keberlein	updated	comment	17/1/2022 15:24:02	

Paragraph-level comments

A product name is the name that a business, company or enterprise chooses to give a product.

Annotation	Reviewer	Status	Type	Date	Topic version
Oxford comma?	zlawson	updated	comment	17/1/2022 02:53:09	
Yes. Thanks for catching this! Corrected, and marking this comment as COMPLETED .	keberlein	updated	comment	17/1/2022 15:23:12	

Topic: revised (DA00508788)

Paragraph-level comments

Revision information is used to maintain tracking dates that are important in a development cycle, such as the date of the last modification, the original availability date, and the expiration date.

Annotation	Reviewer	Status	Type	Date	Topic version
<p>I'm not sure 'original availability' is entirely accurate. I think it's referring to the @golive attribute, but my first thought was "when was this topic first published" and wouldn't that be more associated with the <created> element? do we need to be more specific about when did the revised content go live? or is it safer to just drop that tidbit? Why don't we mention these attributes in teh <created> shortdesc?</p> <p>Is it worth mentioning here or in <critdates> that we can have multiple <revised>?</p> <p>@Zoe, you raise two points here, and I'm going to respond to the second one.</p> <p>We do not list content model information in the element-reference topics. Our expectation is that implementors who need to know that there can be multiple revised elements will get that information from inspecting the grammar files. DITA authors who do not have the ability to understand the grammar files can use an authoring tool and see whether multiple revised elements can be present.</p>	zlawson	new	comment	17/1/2022 03:03:30	
	keberlein	new	comment	17/1/2022 15:34:04	

Topic: component (DA00509307)

Topic-level comments

Annotation	Reviewer	Status	Type	Date	Topic version
<p>I'm wondering if we want to further subdivide the prolog elements, combining all the things that are in <proinfo>. I feel that there's some definition/meaning lost because we're not including that distinction. I realize that's...implicit when you're inserting the elements, but with an alphabetical list of <metadata> information, we're losing something important.</p>	zlawson	new	comment	17/1/2022 01:33:48	
<p>The elements basically fall into the following groups:</p> <p>Elements that are contained directly in prolog (and one might describe these as lifecycle-management information):</p>	keberlein	updated	comment	17/1/2022 16:46:30	

- copyright (and child elements copyrholder and copyryear)
- critdates
- metadata
- permissions
- source

Elements that are contained in metadata (and these might largely be described as descriptive metadata):

- audience
- author
- category
- keywords
- othermeta
- prodinfo
- publisher

Product-information elements, which are contained in prodinfo:

- brand
- component
- featnum
- platform
- prodname
- prognum
- vrmlist (and child element vrm)

Paragraph-level comments

A component is a part or element of a larger whole, such as a machine, software application, or vehicle.

Annotation	Reviewer	Status	Type	Date	Topic version
A component is a part or element of a larger whole, such as a machine, software application, or vehicle.	gjoseph	updated	change	17/1/2022 15:46:05	
Done. Marking this comment as COMPLETED .	keberlein	updated	comment	17/1/2022 16:19:38	

Topic: othermeta (DA00509473)

Topic-level comments

Annotation	Reviewer	Status	Type	Date	Topic version
Do we want to expand that this element enables you to define	zlawson	new	comment	17/1/2022 02:45:30	

additional metadata without specializing?

That's what I was thinking when I reworked the shortdesc... gjoseph new comment 17/1/2022 16:58:19

Paragraph-level comments

Other metadata is metadata that specifies properties by using name and content pairs.

Annotation	Reviewer	Status	Type	Date	Topic version
Other metadata is used to mark up metadata that is not included in the DITA content model, by specifying ies properties by using name and value content pairs.	gjoseph	new	change	17/1/2022 16:49:01	

Should we simply remove the "Processing expectations" section? I don't think it is necessary.

Annotation	Reviewer	Status	Type	Date	Topic version
Agree, it does not seem necessary	randerson	updated	comment	11/1/2022 15:06:04	
Removed the draft comment and section. Marking this comment as COMPLETED .	keberlein	updated	comment	11/1/2022 17:18:16	
+2 this offers absolutely no value to the reader.	gjoseph	new	comment	17/1/2022 16:49:49	

Indicates whether the @content attribute is translated. Allowable values are yes, no, and -dita-use-conref-target.

Annotation	Reviewer	Status	Type	Date	Topic version
Hmm this attribute makes me cringe... We really should not have any translatable content in attributes. Perhaps this would have been better if we had a value element instead of the oddly named content attribute? One could argue this is a bug fix and not a new feature, as part of our work to remove any remaining attributes that contain translatable content...	gjoseph	new	comment	17/1/2022 16:53:17	

The following code sample shows that the metadata ThreadWidthSystem has a value of metric :

Annotation	Reviewer	Status	Type	Date	Topic version
	sdoherty	updated	change	15/1/2022	

The following code sample shows that the metadata ThreadWidthSystem has a value of "metric ":

21:44:34

Thanks for catching this. I've made the correction. Marking this comment **COMPLETED**.

keberlein updated comment 17/1/2022 15:14:07

Topic: prodinfo (DA00508717)

Topic-level comments

Annotation	Reviewer	Status	Type	Date	Topic version
<p>As I was reviewing all the specific metadata bits, <prodinfo> has several extremely specific metadata bits: <brand>, <component>, <featnum>, <prognum>, and <series>. These offer flexibility, but also can be very confusing. How is a <prognum> different than a <series>? Is a <brand> different than a <series>? What's the difference between a <component> and a <featnum>?</p>	zlawson	new	comment	17/1/2022 02:19:57	
<p>These terms have specific and different meanings in different companies. Do we want these defined? Or simplified and easy to specialize?</p> <p>And the "we're done, maybe for DITA 2.1" answer is fine.</p>					
<p>These elements are in DITA because they were part of the initial IBM design. Does anyone use them? I don't know. Most of the implementation that I have set up for companies use specialized elements.</p>	keberlein	new	comment	17/1/2022 15:22:26	
<p>I think companies should feel free to interpret these elements with whatever semantic slant that makes sense to them.</p>					
<p>This works for me. In fact, I've often "redefined" one or more of the IBM terms to work with a client's vocabulary when they wanted OOTB DITA.</p>	gjoseph	new	comment	17/1/2022 17:26:05	
<p>If you want to remove attributes, we do it now or not until DITA 3.0... Large organizations like IBM, Oracle, and Cisco have all these things defined as part of their product vocabulary. Smaller organizations tend to use a subset that work for them. Do you think we need to say so?</p>	gjoseph	new	comment	17/1/2022 17:24:47	

Paragraph-level comments

Product information is pivotal information about a product. It might include the product name or number, brand name, associated components, and more.

Annotation	Reviewer	Status	Type	Date	Topic version
What do we mean by "pivotal" information? I suggest we delete the word "pivotal" because most readers won't know what it really means. Maybe replace with something like: Product information is detailed information about a product, for example the product name, version number, and the associated brand name.	gjoseph	new	comment	17/1/2022 17:21:44	

Topic: source (DA00508556)

Paragraph-level comments

The <source> element contains a description of the resource. Alternatively, the @href or @keyref attributes can be used to reference a description of the resource.

Annotation	Reviewer	Status	Type	Date	Topic version
Description of resource or the actual resource?	zlawson	updated	comment	17/1/2022 03:05:39	
Description of the resource. Marking this comment CLOSED .	keberlein	updated	comment	17/1/2022 15:36:30	

It is undefined what it means when the <source> element has both content and an attribute-based reference to another resource. It is up to the implementation to determine the processing for this situation.

Annotation	Reviewer	Status	Type	Date	Topic version
I'm confused why we describe something as undefined. Are we obliquely offering a suggestion?	zlawson	updated	comment	17/1/2022 03:06:58	
Is this another situation where @keyref behavior is different?					
There is no defined behavior for what processors should do if the source element contains both content and an attribute-based reference to another resource.	keberlein	updated	comment	17/1/2022 15:41:21	
We call it out here because we explicitly state in the shortdesc that the description of the source can go in either places.					
Marking this comment CLOSED .					

The following code sample shows that the content is based on information from the *XML Exchange Table Model Document Type Definition* :

Annotation	Reviewer	Status	Type	Date	Topic version
Should the example be to the Dublin reference?	zlawson	new	comment	17/1/2022 03:07:34	
No. The code sample is what might be in metadata for a topic that outlines the key aspects of the OSIS Exchange Table Model. Why would you think we'd want to focus on something in the Dublin core?	keberlein	new	comment	17/1/2022 15:43:39	

Topic: audience (DA00509548)

Topic-level comments

Annotation	Reviewer	Status	Type	Date	Topic version
I'm most familiar with the @audience attribute for ditaval filtering purposes. Do these attributes enable you to use this element more like something I'd think would be associated with subject scheme?	zlawson	updated	comment	17/1/2022 00:34:41	
Dumb question - does this element allow text? Am I supposed to do <audience>user</audience> or <audience name="user"/>?					
OK, answering your two questions: <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. No, there is no intersection between the audience element and the @audience attribute.2. No, the audience element does not permit CDATA. You need to use attributes to specify any information.	keberlein	updated	comment	17/1/2022 23:20:50	
I've never used this element or seen it used.					
Marking this comment CLOSED .					

Paragraph-level comments

Indicates the level of experience that the audience is assumed to possess. Different audiences might have different experience levels with respect to the same topic. For example, a topic might require general knowledge from a programmer but expert knowledge from a user.

Annotation	Reviewer	Status	Type	Date	Topic version
I think I need a bit of expansion on the use case.					
I could use this element to define some flagging/color scheme/formatting in my output. I could 'automagically' collect all topics that are audience[@name=user], and if @experiencelevel is "expert" I'd have an icon on the page.	zlawson	new	comment	17/1/2022 00:39:18	

Specifies the high-level task that the audience for the content is trying to accomplish. Different audiences might read the same topic in terms of different high-level tasks. For example, a systems administrator might read the topic while administering an application, while a programmer might read the same topic while customizing the application.

Annotation	Reviewer	Status	Type	Date	Topic version
While reading the 2nd sentence, it started to sound a little bit awkward. What about: a systems administrator might read the topic when administering an application, while a programmer might read the same topic when customizing the application. Also, isn't "system administrator" the usual term?	fwegmann	updated	comment	12/1/2022 21:00:18	
Done, and good catch in regard to system administrator. Marking this comment COMPLETED .	keberlein	updated	comment	12/1/2022 23:21:20	

Specifies a name for the audience, which can be used in the @audience attribute.

Annotation	Reviewer	Status	Type	Date	Topic version
I was going to ask how this element related to the audience attribute.					
With 'can', I'm going to guess it could relate to the attribute, but it doesn't have to.					
What does it do? If I have the <audience> element in a topic with @name set to an @audience that is filtered to exclude, will this topic be excluded?	zlawson	new	comment	17/1/2022 00:32:40	
If it doesn't, what is the purpose of this attribute?					
I think this is a residue of early plans for what would be done in future releases of DITA. I am not aware of any way that you can use the @name attribute here, certainly not without some very customized and implementation-specific processing.	keberlein	new	comment	17/1/2022 23:23:45	

Is it worth removing the attribute? I kind of doubt it, but would be open to persuasion.

Specifies the type of audience for whom the content is intended. Note that this differs from the @type attribute on many other DITA elements.

Annotation	Reviewer	Status	Type	Date	Topic version
Why do we have an @type? What does this add to the element? Why is @type different than @name? Why would I use one over the other?	zlawson	new	comment	17/1/2022 00:46:07	
I also wonder about the purpose of this attribute? We say it's not like the type attribute on other elements, but we don't say how it's different or its intended usage here.					
The job attribute confuses me to. If it's the task the audience is doing, then why was it named "job" and not "task"? could it also be the role the audience playing? The same audience may play more than one role in the organization. Not sure if role would be assigned using type or job...	gjoseph	new	comment	17/1/2022 15:04:31	

```
<prolog>  
  <metadata>  
    <audience type="programmer" experiencelevel="expert"/>  
  </metadata>  
</prolog>
```

Annotation	Reviewer	Status	Type	Date	Topic version
indentation of two space characters to align with the rest of the examples	fwegmann	updated	comment	12/1/2022 21:06:14	
Marking this comment CLOSED .	keberlein	updated	comment	12/1/2022 23:15:22	

Topic: critdates (DA00509404)

Topic-level comments

Annotation	Reviewer	Status	Type	Date	Topic version
Again, late to the party, but part of me wonders if there should be a <review> element, and if @expiry should actually be an	zlawson	new	comment	17/1/2022 02:02:53	

element here.

Do we need a use case? It's kinda obvious, and I'm probably dabbling into user guide stuff again, but why would I use this instead of a CMS, or is that the point?

Paragraph-level comments

```
<prolog>
  <critdates>
    <created date="2020-06-12"/>
    <revised modified="2021-03-03" golive="2020-02-03" expiry="9999-09-09"/>
  </critdates>
</prolog>
```

Annotation	Reviewer	Status	Type	Date	Topic version
I suggest removing expiry or give it a more realistic value, say "2024-03-02, which is 3 years after the last revision. I had a client once with a 3 year retention policy on publications, based on the date on which the publication was last published.	gjoseph	new	comment	17/1/2022 16:09:20	

Topic: permissions (DA00509086)

Topic-level comments

Annotation	Reviewer	Status	Type	Date	Topic version
Is the intent behind this that a processor could somehow associate this with a role or something?					
Is this meant for processors to do something nifty with the publication to show/hide content? Do we need to express this has nothing to do with authoring the content?	zlawson	new	comment	17/1/2022 02:49:55	
I wonder if this needs a processing expectations. I think this is an element that only works if you have something nifty setup in your publishing.					
I think this is a simple alternative to control the entitlement on the content consumption platform. If you have a sophisticated delivery platform, they use a combination of metadata including audience and usually use subject scheme to drive the filtering and entitlement. This offers a very basic, if not lame alternative for teams that don't have a complex delivery platform. We may want to say something	gjoseph	new	comment	17/1/2022 17:05:01	

to this effect in a Processing Expectations section. I'll be happy to take an action to knock up a first draft. I've come down with a head cold and am trying to complete my review before the due date/time, so I don't have the head to invent any sensible content right now :(

@Zoe, @Gershon -- We do not have "Rendering expectations" or "Processing expectations" sections for ANY of these metadata elements. There is no way that we could specify such expectations. What companies and implementations do with metadata (with the exception of filtering and flagging attributes) is solely up to them.

keberlein updated comment 17/1/2022 19:56:22

Also, please remember that "Processing expectations" is about things that processors should do in a standard way, so as to ensure interoperability.

Paragraph-level comments

Topic: platform (DA00509401)

Topic-level comments

Annotation	Reviewer	Status	Type	Date	Topic version
How does this relate to @platform and ditavals?					
Why does <audience> have @name that relates to the attribute, but this element doesn't?	zlawson	new	comment	17/1/2022 02:51:25	
Answers to your two questions: 1. No connections to @platform and filterng using a DITAVAL. Yes, I think folks who designed DITA 1.0 (which is where all these metadata elements came in) thought that someday, some one would create some some of connections between the product element and the @product attribute. But that never happened. 2. Why does the audience element have a @name attribute and the product element does not? Dunno, again part of the initial DITA 1.0 design.	keberlein	new	comment	17/1/2022 15:19:46	

Paragraph-level comments

Topic: copyright (DA00509378)

Paragraph-level comments

Indicates the legal status of the copyright holder. Note that this differs from the @type attribute on many other DITA elements.

Annotation	Reviewer	Status	Type	Date	Topic version
Why not call it @status?	sdoherly	new	comment	15/1/2022 21:36:54	
Because it's been call @type since DITA 1.0. @Stan, are you suggesting that we rename this attribute for DITA 2.0, or is your comment just an off-the-cuff observation?	keberlein	new	comment	17/1/2022 14:54:49	

Indicates the legal status of the copyright holder. Note that this differs from the @type attribute on many other DITA elements.

Annotation	Reviewer	Status	Type	Date	Topic version
Since I don't know a lot about copyright, what is the legal status? Whether or not it's registered? Does it depend on country of use?					
I think at some point in the review process, I would like to see all the @type attribute descriptions collected for a review pass, so we can be sure they're parallel and make sense.	zlawson	new	comment	17/1/2022 01:39:23	
Do we need this attribute? do people use it? Would it be better as a child element?					