

**[OBIX-221] JSON Example Missing Slash in Href** Created: 18/Jul/14 Updated: 30/Jun/15 Resolved: 17/Nov/14

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	OASIS Open Building Information Exchange (oBIX) TC
<b>Component/s:</b>	ENCODINGS Specification
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	ENCODINGS WD13
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	None

<b>Type:</b>	Bug	<b>Priority:</b>	Minor
<b>Reporter:</b>	Matthias Hub	<b>Assignee:</b>	Markus Jung
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Labels:</b>	None		

**Proposal:** Add a slash to the href also in the JSON example to read "href": "/a/"

**Description**

The XML example, line 379, reads <obj href="/a/">, the JSON example, line 388, misses the last slash in the href, { "obix": "obj", "href": "/a", ...

**Comments**

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 30/Jun/15 ]

Closed with WD44 prior to reporting for CSD04

**[OBIX-219] Encodings Example for children objects** Created: 26/May/14 Updated: 30/Jun/15 Due: 25/May/14 Resolved: 02/Nov/14

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	OASIS Open Building Information Exchange (oBIX) TC
<b>Component/s:</b>	ENCODINGS Specification
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	ENCODINGS WD13
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	ENCODINGS WD13

<b>Type:</b>	Improvement	<b>Priority:</b>	Trivial
<b>Reporter:</b>	Markus Jung	<b>Assignee:</b>	Markus Jung
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Labels:</b>	None		

**Resolution:** Fixed example to use obj instead of list.

**Description**

Hello,

Encodings for OBIX: Common Encodings Version 1.0, Committee Specification Draft 02 from 19 December 2013 contains in Section 3.5 "Children" following example:

```
<list href="xyz">
  <bool val="false"/>
  <obj><int val="255"/></obj>
</list>
```

People reference this sample to demonstrate that it is valid to have in <list> children, which have nothing in common. While this is indeed a valid statement, it is also pointless, as such applications abolish the additional semantics a <list> element has over <obj>, merely the ability to specify, that the children of a <list> have something in common via the "of" facet.

For this reason I kindly ask you either to replace <list> in the above example with something different, e.g. <abstime>, or to keep <list>, but make (explicit) use of its "of" facet.

Thanks in advance for your understanding.

Dilyan Palauzov

#### Comments

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 02/Nov/14 ]

Closed w/o Resolution so re-opening

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 30/Jun/15 ]

Closed with WD44 prior to reporting for CSD04

#### [OBIX-211] Conformance Created: 20/Feb/14 Updated: 30/Jun/15 Resolved: 02/Nov/14

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Open Building Information Exchange (oBIX) TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">ENCODINGS Specification</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">ENCODINGS PR02</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	None

<b>Type:</b>	Bug	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Markus Jung</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Labels:</b>	None		
<b>Environment:</b>	Toby Considine		

<b>Proposal:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• XML encoded OBIX objects must be encoded as a well-formed XML document according to the [XML] W3C recommendation. Further, they must be a valid document adhering to the normative OBIX XML schema.</li> <li>• JSON encoded OBIX object must adhere [RFC4627].</li> <li>• EXI encoded OBIX objects must adhere to the [EXI] W3C recommendation. If schema-informed EXI is used then the normative OBIX XML schema must be used as schema to generate the EXI grammar.</li> </ul>
------------------	---

#### Description

Suggest adding call-outs to the "mother specs"  
XML must conform with a well formed document as described in RFC...  
JSON must conform with RFC4627  
Etc.

#### Comments

Comment by [Markus Jung](#) [ 21/Apr/14 ]

Fixed in WD12.

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 02/Nov/14 ]

Closed w/o Resolution so re-opening

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 30/Jun/15 ]

Closed with WD44 prior to reporting for CSD04

#### [OBIX-210] Line 464: suggest "according to" be changed to "in conformance with" Created: 20/Feb/14 Updated: 30/Jun/15 Resolved: 02/Nov/14

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Open Building Information Exchange (oBIX) TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">ENCODINGS Specification</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">ENCODINGS PR02</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">ENCODINGS WD12</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Bug	<b>Priority:</b>	Minor
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	Unassigned
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Labels:</b>	None		
<b>Environment:</b>	Toby Considine		

<b>Resolution:</b>	Rephrased.
--------------------	------------

#### Comments

Comment by <a href="#">Toby Considine</a> [ 02/Nov/14 ]
Closed w/o Resolution so re-opening
Comment by <a href="#">Toby Considine</a> [ 30/Jun/15 ]
Closed with WD44 prior to reporting for CSD04

<b>[OBIX-209] Document Consistency</b> <small>Created: 20/Feb/14 Updated: 30/Jun/15 Resolved: 02/Nov/14</small>	
<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Open Building Information Exchange (oBIX) TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">ENCODINGS Specification</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">ENCODINGS PR02</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	None

<b>Type:</b>	Improvement	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	Unassigned
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Labels:</b>	None		
<b>Environment:</b>	Toby Considine		

#### Description

Compare intro to section 3 (Binary) and to section 4 (JSON). Also, if we are going to go into the history of JSON, it is more properly routed in the LISP family of exchanges from which the literals of JavaScript are derived. We should avoid formulations that can even begin to suggest disputation of history to the reader. The intro to 5 (EXI) is the clearest and least argumentative example.
--

#### Comments

Comment by <a href="#">Markus Jung</a> [ 17/Apr/14 ]
Removed "It is derived from the object literals of JavaScript, as defined in the ECMAScript Programming Language Standard (ECMA)". Which seems to be the problematic statement. The other parts of the intro could be shortened, but just provide a neutral description of the JSON format.
Comment by <a href="#">Markus Jung</a> [ 17/Apr/14 ]
Fixed in WD12
Comment by <a href="#">Toby Considine</a> [ 02/Nov/14 ]
Closed w/o Resolution so re-opening
Comment by <a href="#">Toby Considine</a> [ 30/Jun/15 ]

Closed with WD44 prior to reporting for CSD04

**[OBIX-208] Non-Standard Formatting** Created: 20/Feb/14 Updated: 30/Jun/15 Resolved: 02/Nov/14

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Open Building Information Exchange (oBIX) TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">ENCODINGS Specification</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">ENCODINGS PR02</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	None

<b>Type:</b>	Improvement	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Markus Jung</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Labels:</b>	None		
<b>Environment:</b>	Toby Considine		

**Description**

The OASIS template defines inter-paragraph spacing. In several locations, additional paragraphs were added. This may be an artifact of format conversion. Examples are:

Line 34

Line 39

(Make sure all instances of OBIX are capitalized properly - see 109)

**Comments**

Comment by <a href="#">Markus Jung</a> [ 17/Apr/14 ]
Fixed in WD 12, only found one wrong OBIX writing within the text.
Comment by <a href="#">Toby Considine</a> [ 02/Nov/14 ]
Closed w/o Resolution so re-opening
Comment by <a href="#">Toby Considine</a> [ 30/Jun/15 ]
Closed with WD44 prior to reporting for CSD04

**[OBIX-189] Redirects (7)** Created: 20/Feb/14 Updated: 30/Jun/15 Resolved: 02/Nov/14

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Open Building Information Exchange (oBIX) TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">ENCODINGS Specification</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">ENCODINGS PR02</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">ENCODINGS WD13</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Bug	<b>Priority:</b>	Minor
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Markus Jung</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Labels:</b>	None		
<b>Environment:</b>	TAB Review		

**Description**

"The link checker at: <http://validator.w3.org/checklink>, reports seven (7) redirects in the current draft.

Line: 917 <http://www.oasis-open.org/> redirected to <https://www.oasis-open.org/>  
 Status: 301 -> 200 OK

Lines: 759, 825 <http://www.oasis-open.org/committees/obix/> redirected to <https://www.oasis-open.org/committees/obix/>  
 Status: 301 -> 200 OK

Line: 822 [http://www.oasis-open.org/committees/comments/index.php?wg\\_abbrev=obix](http://www.oasis-open.org/committees/comments/index.php?wg_abbrev=obix) redirected to [https://www.oasis-open.org/committees/comments/index.php?wg\\_abbrev=obix](https://www.oasis-open.org/committees/comments/index.php?wg_abbrev=obix)  
 Status: 301 -> 200 OK

Line: 922 <http://www.oasis-open.org/policies-guidelines/trademark> redirected to <https://www.oasis-open.org/policies-guidelines/trademark>  
 Status: 301 -> 200 OK

Line: 831 <http://www.oasis-open.org/committees/obix/ipr.php> redirected to <https://www.oasis-open.org/committees/obix/ipr.php>  
 Status: 301 -> 200 OK

Line: 861 <http://www.oasis-open.org/policies-guidelines/ipr> redirected to <https://www.oasis-open.org/policies-guidelines/ipr>  
 Status: 301 -> 200 OK

Line: 766 <http://www.unc.edu/> redirected to <http://unc.edu/>  
 Status: 301 -> 200 OK

"

**Comments**

Comment by <a href="#">Markus Jung</a> [ 26/May/14 ]
I see no problem with the redirects.
Comment by <a href="#">Toby Considine</a> [ 02/Nov/14 ]
Closed w/o Resolution so re-opening
Comment by <a href="#">Toby Considine</a> [ 30/Jun/15 ]
Closed with WD44 prior to reporting for CSD04

**[OBIX-153] 1.2 Normative References EXI** Created: 20/Feb/14 Updated: 30/Jun/15 Resolved: 02/Nov/14

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Open Building Information Exchange (oBIX) TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">ENCODINGS Specification</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">ENCODINGS PR02</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">ENCODINGS WD13</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Bug	<b>Priority:</b>	Minor
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Markus Jung</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Labels:</b>	None		
<b>Environment:</b>	TAB Review		

<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed reference.
--------------------	------------------

#### Description

<p>"1.2 Normative References reads in part:</p> <p>*****</p> <p>J. Schneider, T. Kamiya, Efficient XML Interchange (EXI) Format 1.0, W3C Recommendation, 10 March 2011</p> <p>*****</p> <p>The correct citation reads:</p> <p>*****</p> <p>EXI</p> <p>Efficient XML Interchange (EXI) Format 1.0 (Second Edition) , J. Schneider, T. Kamiya, D. Peintner, R. , Editors, W3C Proposed Edited Recommendation (work in progress), 22 October 2013, <a href="http://www.w3.org/TR/2013/PER-exi-20131022/">http://www.w3.org/TR/2013/PER-exi-20131022/</a> . Latest version available at <a href="http://www.w3.org/TR/exi/">http://www.w3.org/TR/exi/</a> .</p> <p>*****</p> <p>Note the updated edition.</p> <p>"</p>
--

#### Comments

Comment by <a href="#">Toby Considine</a> [ 02/Nov/14 ]
Closed w/o Resolution so re-opening
Comment by <a href="#">Toby Considine</a> [ 30/Jun/15 ]
Closed with WD44 prior to reporting for CSD04

#### [OBIX-152] 1.2 Normative References RFC4627 Created: 20/Feb/14 Updated: 30/Jun/15 Resolved: 02/Nov/14

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Open Building Information Exchange (oBIX) TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">ENCODINGS Specification</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">ENCODINGS PR02</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">ENCODINGS WD12</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Bug	<b>Priority:</b>	Minor
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	Unassigned
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Labels:</b>	None		
<b>Environment:</b>	TAB Review		

<b>Resolution:</b>	Added reference.
--------------------	------------------

#### Description

<p>"1.2 Normative References reads in part:</p> <p>*****</p> <p>Crockford, D., ""The application/json Media type for JavaScript Object Notation (JSON)"" , RFC 4627, July 2007</p> <p>*****</p> <p>Suggest adding <a href="http://www.ietf.org/rfc/rfc4627.txt">http://www.ietf.org/rfc/rfc4627.txt</a> to the citation for easy of reader reference."</p>
--

#### Comments

Comment by <a href="#">Toby Considine</a> [ 02/Nov/14 ]
---

Closed w/o Resolution so re-opening
Comment by <a href="#">Toby Considine</a> [ 30/Jun/15 ]
Closed with WD44 prior to reporting for CSD04

**[OBIX-151] 1.2 Normative References - RFC768** Created: 20/Feb/14 Updated: 30/Jun/15 Resolved: 02/Nov/14

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Open Building Information Exchange (oBIX) TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">ENCODINGS Specification</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">ENCODINGS PR02</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">ENCODINGS WD13</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Bug	<b>Priority:</b>	Minor
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Markus Jung</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Labels:</b>	None		
<b>Environment:</b>	TAB Review		

#### Description

"1.2 Normative References reads in part:  ***** Postel, J., ""User Datagram Protocol"", RFC 768, August 1980 *****  The correct citation reads:  ***** Postel, J., ""User Datagram Protocol"", STD 6, RFC 768, August 1980. <a href="http://www.ietf.org/rfc/rfc0768.txt">http://www.ietf.org/rfc/rfc0768.txt</a> *****"
--

#### Comments

Comment by <a href="#">Toby Considine</a> [ 02/Nov/14 ]
Closed w/o Resolution so re-opening
Comment by <a href="#">Toby Considine</a> [ 30/Jun/15 ]
Closed with WD44 prior to reporting for CSD04

**[OBIX-149] 1.3 Non-Normative References EXI BP** Created: 20/Feb/14 Updated: 30/Jun/15 Resolved: 02/Nov/14

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Open Building Information Exchange (oBIX) TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">ENCODINGS Specification</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">ENCODINGS PR02</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">ENCODINGS WD13</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Bug	<b>Priority:</b>	Minor
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Markus Jung</a>

<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed
<b>Labels:</b>	None
<b>Environment:</b>	TAB Review

<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed citation
--------------------	----------------

**Description**

"1.3 Non-Normative References reads in part:

\*\*\*\*\*

M. Cokus, D. Vogelheim, Efficient XML Interchange (EXI) Best Practices, W3C Working Draft, 19 December 2007

\*\*\*\*\*

The correct citation is:

\*\*\*\*\*

EXI-BEST-PRACTICES  
 Efficient XML Interchange (EXI) Best Practices , M. , D. , Editors, W3C Working Draft (work in progress), 19 December 2007,  
<http://www.w3.org/TR/2007/WD-exi-best-practices-20071219/> . Latest version available at <http://www.w3.org/TR/exi-best-practices/> .

\*\*\*\*\*"

**Comments**

Comment by <a href="#">Toby Considine</a> [ 02/Nov/14 ]
Closed w/o Resolution so re-opening
Comment by <a href="#">Toby Considine</a> [ 30/Jun/15 ]
Closed with WD44 prior to reporting for CSD04

**[OBIX-148] 2.1 Design Philosophy** Created: 20/Feb/14 Updated: 30/Jun/15 Resolved: 02/Nov/14

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Open Building Information Exchange (oBIX) TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">ENCODINGS Specification</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">ENCODINGS PR02</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">ENCODINGS WD12</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Bug	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	Unassigned
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Labels:</b>	None		
<b>Environment:</b>	TAB Review		

<b>Resolution:</b>	I think here in the encodings it is about the fact that the XML syntax is not affected through the contracts. As the OBIX object representation wil always stick to the basic object model.
	Anyways, I think the last sentence can be avoided since it does not provide any additional benefit to the reader.

**Description**

"2.1 Design Philosophy reads in part:

\*\*\*\*\*

Higher level semantics are captured via contracts. Contracts ""tag"" an object with a type and can be applied dynamically. This is very useful for modeling systems which are dynamically configured in the field. What is important is that contracts are optionally understood by clients. Contracts do not affect the

XML syntax nor are clients required to use them for basic access to the object tree. \*\*Contracts are merely an abstraction which is layered cleanly above the object tree and its fixed XML syntax.\*\*

\*\*\*\*\*

The last sentence appears to be a direct contradiction of:

OBIX 1.1 3.5 Contracts

\*\*\*\*\*

Contracts, which are standard OBIX objects used as a template.

\*\*\*\*\*

Terminology, especially terminology central to a standard, should be used consistently across all parts of the standard."

**Comments**

Comment by <a href="#">Toby Considine</a> [ 02/Nov/14 ]
Closed w/o Resolution so re-opening
Comment by <a href="#">Toby Considine</a> [ 30/Jun/15 ]
Closed with WD44 prior to reporting for CSD04

**[OBIX-147] 2.2 XML Syntax** Created: 20/Feb/14 Updated: 30/Jun/15 Resolved: 17/Nov/14

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Open Building Information Exchange (oBIX) TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">ENCODINGS Specification</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">ENCODINGS WD13</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	None

<b>Type:</b>	Bug	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Markus Jung</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Labels:</b>	None		
<b>Environment:</b>	TAB Review		

**Description**

"2.2 XML Syntax reads in part:

\*\*\*\*\*

The OBIX XML syntax maps very closely to the abstract object model.

\*\*\*\*\*

In what way does the OBIX XML syntax not map to the abstract object model?

Closely implies not an exact match. In what way?"

**Comments**

Comment by <a href="#">Craig Gemmill</a> [ 10/Jun/14 ]
I think this comment is against 2.2 XML Syntax in the obix-encodings doc, and still appears to apply in WD13.
Comment by <a href="#">Craig Gemmill</a> [ 05/Nov/14 ]
Marked against wrong spec.
Comment by <a href="#">Toby Considine</a> [ 30/Jun/15 ]

Closed with WD44 prior to reporting for CSD04

**[OBIX-146] 2. XML Encoding - redundant** Created: 20/Feb/14 Updated: 30/Jun/15 Resolved: 17/Nov/14

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	OASIS Open Building Information Exchange (oBIX) TC
<b>Component/s:</b>	ENCODINGS Specification
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	ENCODINGS PR02
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	None

<b>Type:</b>	Bug	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	Toby Considine	<b>Assignee:</b>	Markus Jung
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Labels:</b>	None		
<b>Environment:</b>	TAB Review		

**Description**

"2 XML Encoding repeats information from <http://docs.oasis-open.org/obix/obix/v1.1/csprd02/obix-v1.1-csprd02.html>, where the XML schema is referenced.

There appears to be no particular reason for repeating information already defined elsewhere.

Delete section 2 as violation of DRY, Don't Repeat Yourself."

**Comments**

Comment by [Markus Jung](#) [ 21/Apr/14 ]

Should be discussed in next TC 04/24/2014.

I don't see so much redundancy. Some level of redundancy will remain due to the strong relation between the XML schema based definition of the OBIX object model.

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 30/Jun/15 ]

Closed with WD44 prior to reporting for CSD04

**[OBIX-145] 3.3 Value Encodings** Created: 20/Feb/14 Updated: 30/Jun/15 Resolved: 02/Nov/14

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	OASIS Open Building Information Exchange (oBIX) TC
<b>Component/s:</b>	ENCODINGS Specification
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	ENCODINGS PR02
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	ENCODINGS WD13

<b>Type:</b>	Bug	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	Toby Considine	<b>Assignee:</b>	Markus Jung
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Labels:</b>	None		
<b>Environment:</b>	TAB Review		

<b>Resolution:</b>	<p>The "may" in this case refers to a situation that can occur and is not normative in the sense that an implementation may or may not implement some feature. So I keep it lower-case.</p> <p>The rest of the sentence is rephrased: Each obj type and facet type MAY have an associated value encoding. For example, to encode the precision facet we must specify the facet code 0x40 plus the value of that facet which happens to be an integer. The object types bool, int, enum, real, str, uri, abstime, reltime, date, and time have always their value encoded (equivalent to the val attribute in XML).</p>
--------------------	--

**Description**

<p>"3.3 Value Encodings is a mixture of possible keywords, non-normative text and notes.</p> <p>It reads:</p> <p>****</p> <p>Each obj type and facet type may have an associated value encoding. For example, to encode the precision facet we must specify the facet code 0x40 plus the value of that facet which happens to be an integer. The object types bool, int, enum, real, str, uri, abstime, reltime, date, and time are always implied to have their value encoded (equivalent to the val attribute in XML).</p> <p>****</p> <p>Should the first ""may"" be ""MAY?"" A non-normative example follows. What is meant by ""always implied"" isn't clear without further explanation. Implied by what?"</p>
--

**Comments**

Comment by <a href="#">Toby Considine</a> [ 02/Nov/14 ]
Closed w/o Resolution so re-opening
Comment by <a href="#">Toby Considine</a> [ 30/Jun/15 ]
Closed with WD44 prior to reporting for CSD04

**[OBIX-144] 3.3.2 Int Encodings Unknown abbreviations** Created: 20/Feb/14 Updated: 30/Jun/15 Resolved: 17/Nov/14

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Open Building Information Exchange (oBIX) TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">ENCODINGS Specification</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">ENCODINGS WD13</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	None

<b>Type:</b>	Bug	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Markus Jung</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Labels:</b>	None		
<b>Environment:</b>	TAB Review		

**Description**

<p>"3.3.2 Int Encodings and 3.3.3 Real Encodings have charts with unknown sigla for encodings:</p> <p>3.3.2</p> <p>u1</p> <p>u2</p> <p>s4</p> <p>s8</p>
---

3.3.3  
f4  
f8

Wikipedia says that s8 has 20 possible uses, none of which are ""Signed 64-bit integer value."" <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/S8>

Wikipedia says that f8 has 15 possible uses, none of which are ""64-bit IEEE floating point value"" <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/F8>

The IEEE names for f4 an f8, respectively are: binary32 and binary64. I suspect s4 and s8 are decimal32 and decimal64, respectively."

#### Comments

Comment by [Craig Gemmill](#) [ 10/Jun/14 ]

I think this is against obix-encodings doc.

Comment by [Craig Gemmill](#) [ 05/Nov/14 ]

Marked against wrong spec.

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 30/Jun/15 ]

Closed with WD44 prior to reporting for CSD04

#### [OBIX-143] 3.3.4 Str Encodings Created: 20/Feb/14 Updated: 30/Jun/15 Resolved: 02/Nov/14

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Open Building Information Exchange (oBIX) TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">ENCODINGS Specification</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">ENCODINGS PR02</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	None

<b>Type:</b>	Bug	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Markus Jung</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Labels:</b>	None		
<b>Environment:</b>	TAB Review		

#### Description

"3.3.4 Str Encodings

Table 3.5 Str Encodings confuses string encoding with value types.

The first entry references (without citation) one assumes the XML Schema datatypes documents for UTF8. Which is a recognized string \*encoding.\*

The second entry uses a heretofore unknown type of encoding called ""prev."" The description says: ""u2 index of previously defined string.""

u2 appears in 3.3.8 prior to year, 3.3.2 Int Encodings for Unsigned 16-bit integer value, which along with the explanation implies u2 is a unsigned 16-bit integer value for an index.

However that may be, an index is not a string encoding but value. Which is ok so long as values and string encodings are not confused.

A better way to state the allowed values would be UTF8 strings or index values that refer to UTF8 strings. There you can define the index value."

#### Comments

Comment by [Markus Jung](#) [ 21/Apr/14 ]

Should be discussed in next TC 04/24/2014.

I don't see the problem here. Maybe because the UTF-8 encoding is only defined for str value types and not for the other string usages, like for attributes?

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 02/Nov/14 ]

Closed w/o Resolution so re-opening

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 30/Jun/15 ]

Closed with WD44 prior to reporting for CSD04

#### [OBIX-142] 3.3.7 Time Encodings Created: 20/Feb/14 Updated: 30/Jun/15 Resolved: 02/Nov/14

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Open Building Information Exchange (oBIX) TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">ENCODINGS Specification</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">ENCODINGS PR02</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	None

<b>Type:</b>	Bug	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	Unassigned
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Labels:</b>	None		
<b>Environment:</b>	TAB Review		

**Resolution:** Rephrased it to: The time encoding works similar to reltime using a number of seconds or nanoseconds for the current time of the day. The provided number SHOULD NOT exceed a time representing 24:00:00.

#### Description

"3.3.7 Time Encodings

reads in part:

\*\*\*\*\*

0 sec unsigned 32-bit number of seconds since midnight

1 ns unsigned 64-bit number of nanoseconds since midnight

\*\*\*\*\*

Does not define midnight sufficiently for interchange of values. A 32-bit number can express unsigned 0 through 4,294,967,295. The maximum number of seconds in a day, leaving aside some leap year adjustments, is 864,000. The behavior of a conforming application that sends or receives more than 864,000 is undefined. The same argument applies to nanoseconds.

"

#### Comments

Comment by [Markus Jung](#) [ 21/Apr/14 ]

Fixed in WD12.

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 02/Nov/14 ]

Closed w/o Resolution so re-opening

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 30/Jun/15 ]

Closed with WD44 prior to reporting for CSD04

<b>[OBIX-141] 6 Conformance</b> <small>Created: 20/Feb/14 Updated: 30/Jun/15 Resolved: 17/Nov/14</small>	
<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Open Building Information Exchange (oBIX) TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">ENCODINGS Specification</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">ENCODINGS PR02</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	None

<b>Type:</b>	Bug	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Markus Jung</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Labels:</b>	None		
<b>Environment:</b>	TAB Review		

### Description

"6 Conformance presently reads:

\*\*\*\*\*

An implementation is compliant with this specification if it implements all MUST or REQUIRED level requirements. An implementation MUST specify its supported encodings.

\*\*\*\*\*

First, this conformance clause does not conform to 8(a) of the TC Process which reads in part:

\*\*\*\*\*

listing a set of numbered conformance clauses, to which any implementation of the specification must adhere in order to claim conformance to the specification (or any optional portion thereof).

\*\*\*\*\*

There are three different representations, XML, JSON and EXI.

At a minimum, there should be three separate conformance clauses, one for each representation, that lists the conformance requirements for each, including the interaction where optional choices have been made by the two parties to a communication."

### Comments

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 30/Jun/15 ]

Closed with WD44 prior to reporting for CSD04

<b>[OBIX-140] Encoding - Overloading terminology</b> <small>Created: 20/Feb/14 Updated: 30/Jun/15 Resolved: 02/Nov/14</small>	
<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Open Building Information Exchange (oBIX) TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">ENCODINGS Specification</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">ENCODINGS PR02</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	None

<b>Type:</b>	Bug	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Markus Jung</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Labels:</b>	None		
<b>Environment:</b>	TAB Review		

### Description

"The term ""encoding"" is applied to XML, JSON, EXI but also to Bool (?) 3.3.1, Int 3.3.2, Real 3.3.3, Str 3.3.4, 3.3.5 Abstime, etc. not to mention in the conformance clause: ""An implementation MUST specify its supported encodings.""

XML ""encoding"" normally refers to the use of XML syntax. A string ""encoding,"" at least in Unicode conformant documents, refers to a Unicode defined byte sequence that represents characters. The various other uses of ""encoding"" in this document appear to be data types but it isn't possible to say for sure.

If in the enumeration of various values ""encoding"" was meant to be data type, then use ""data type"" and not encoding.

BTW, this specification does not specify or reference another document that specifies how ""An implementation MUST specify its supported encodings.""

Lacking any means to declare an encoding and no meaningful definition of encoding, it is difficult to see how any application could conform to this specification."

### Comments

Comment by [Markus Jung](#) [ 26/May/14 ]

The encoding specifies how the information is expressed in some format. Since there are multiple available formats there is some kind of overloading of this term. Regarding the conformance section a separate issue [OBIX-144](#) deals with this issue.

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 02/Nov/14 ]

Closed w/o Resolution so re-opening

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 30/Jun/15 ]

Closed with WD44 prior to reporting for CSD04

### [OBIX-139] 5.2 Non-schema-informed EXI Created: 20/Feb/14 Updated: 30/Jun/15 Resolved: 17/Nov/14

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Open Building Information Exchange (oBIX) TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">ENCODINGS Specification</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">ENCODINGS PR02</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	None

<b>Type:</b>	Bug	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Markus Jung</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Labels:</b>	None		
<b>Environment:</b>	TAB Review		

### Description

"5.2 Non-schema-informed EXI presently reads:

\*\*\*\*\*

EXI can be used without any schema information about the XML infoset that shall be encoded. This has the advantage that no schema information is required at the decoders' site, but comes with the disadvantage of being less efficient and providing only a limited compression for small payloads.

\*\*\*\*\*

I am not certain what could have been meant by ""can be used"" followed by ""that shall be encoded."" Nor does ""no schema information is required at the decoder's site"" follow from either not including or including the encoded XML infoset. Even more confusing is the last clause, which implies not sending information is ""less efficient and providing only a limited compression for small payloads.""

## Comments

Comment by [Markus Jung](#) [ 21/Apr/14 ]

Should be discussed in next TC 04/24/2014.

This section is kind of informative. EXI provides a schema-informed and non-schema informed mode. For the schema informed mode the encoder and decoder need to have the schema document and the encoding is most efficient. The non-schema informed mode does not put any specific requirement on the decoder but is less efficient. Should the OBIX EXI encoding allow both types or request a certain type?

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 30/Jun/15 ]

Closed with WD44 prior to reporting for CSD04

#### [OBIX-138] 5.2 Schema-informed EXI Created: 20/Feb/14 Updated: 30/Jun/15 Resolved: 02/Nov/14

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Open Building Information Exchange (oBIX) TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">ENCODINGS Specification</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">ENCODINGS PR02</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">ENCODINGS WD12</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Bug	<b>Priority:</b>	Minor
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	Unassigned
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Labels:</b>	None		
<b>Environment:</b>	TAB Review		

<b>Resolution:</b>	Reformatted.
--------------------	--------------

## Description

"5.2 Schema-Informed EXI reads in part:

\*\*\*\*\*

the EXI best practices [EXI BP] or the guidelines in [EXI MR] need to be followed.

\*\*\*\*\*

Referencing references is normally styled with bold [ ] and bold text within."

## Comments

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 02/Nov/14 ]

Closed w/o Resolution so re-opening

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 30/Jun/15 ]

Closed with WD44 prior to reporting for CSD04

#### [OBIX-137] 4.1.4 Other types and facets: above, below, following Created: 20/Feb/14 Updated: 30/Jun/15 Resolved: 17/Nov/14

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Open Building Information Exchange (oBIX) TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">ENCODINGS Specification</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">ENCODINGS PR02</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	None

<b>Type:</b>	Bug	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Markus Jung</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Labels:</b>	None		
<b>Environment:</b>	TAB Review		

#### Description

"4.1.4 Other types and facets reads in part:

""Facets are mapped to name/value pairs as described by the rules above.""

4.2 XML Namespace reads in part:

""as shown in the examples below:""

4 JSON encoding - reads in part:

""The following grammar is used to represent OBIX objects:""

above occurs 3 times, below 2 times and following 22 times, not to mention similar terms being used.

The problem this presents is that every reader of this specification, which hopefully will number in the thousands if not hundreds of thousands, will have the same experience with uncertainty, every time they read this specification.

It is a simple enough matter to say: Facets are mapped to name/value pairs as described by the rules defined in Section \*\*\*.

Which removes the ambiguity but also in this case, discloses that there are \*no rules for mapping facets in JSON.\* (4.1.4)

The next mention ""upwards"" of facets comes in 3.5 Children, which is in the OBIX Binary section. Is that the source of rules for facets in JSON?"

#### Comments

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 30/Jun/15 ]

Closed with WD44 prior to reporting for CSD04

#### [OBIX-136] Examples are unnumbered Created: 20/Feb/14 Updated: 30/Jun/15 Resolved: 17/Nov/14

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Open Building Information Exchange (oBIX) TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">ENCODINGS Specification</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">ENCODINGS PR02</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	None

<b>Type:</b>	Bug	<b>Priority:</b>	Minor
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Markus Jung</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Labels:</b>	None		
<b>Environment:</b>	TAB Review		

#### Description

"There are numerous examples in the specification, none of which are numbered. They share the same background and presentation as the grammar

defined at 4 JSON encoding.

Numbering the examples will help distinguish the examples from normative text and make it possible to reference specific examples, as opposed to following, above, below, etc."

#### Comments

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 30/Jun/15 ]

Closed with WD44 prior to reporting for CSD04

#### [OBIX-135] Section headers inconsistent Created: 20/Feb/14 Updated: 30/Jun/15 Resolved: 02/Nov/14

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Open Building Information Exchange (oBIX) TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">ENCODINGS Specification</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">ENCODINGS PR02</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">ENCODINGS WD12</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Bug	<b>Priority:</b>	Minor
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	Unassigned
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Labels:</b>	None		
<b>Environment:</b>	TAB Review		

**Resolution:** Now consistent writing of headers.

#### Description

"Section headers are inconsistently formatted:

3.3.1 Bool Encodings

3.3.2 Int Encodings

compare:

4.1.1 Bool encoding

4.1.2 Int encoding

If you prefer the APA style, follow: <http://blog.apastyle.org/apastyle/headings/>

Or MLA:

\*\*\*\*\*

Heading Caps. Each word in a title is capitalized, except for articles (a, an, the), prepositions (against, between, in, of, to), conjunctions (and, but, for, nor, or, so, yet), and the infinitive to. This form of capitalization is used for headings and subheadings in many styles, and traditionally in newspapers where the term originated.

\*\*\*\*\*

In any case, be consistent.

BTW, there is no reason to abbreviate Boolean or Integer or Str in this specification. Particularly in light of longer section titles written out in full. Spell out words in section titles."

#### Comments

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 02/Nov/14 ]

Closed w/o Resolution so re-opening

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 30/Jun/15 ]

Closed with WD44 prior to reporting for CSD04

**[OBIX-130] 1.2 Normative References OBIX Encodings** Created: 20/Feb/14 Updated: 30/Jun/15 Resolved: 17/Nov/14

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Open Building Information Exchange (oBIX) TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">ENCODINGS Specification</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">ENCODINGS WD13</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	None

<b>Type:</b>	Bug	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Markus Jung</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Labels:</b>	None		
<b>Environment:</b>	TAB Review		

**Description**

"1.2 Normative References reads in part:

\*\*\*\*\*

OBIX Encodings Encodings for OBIX: Common Encodings Version 1.0.  
See link in ""Related work"" section on cover page.

\*\*\*\*\*

2.2.1 Content Negotiation reads in part:

\*\*\*\*\*

OBIX resources MUST be encoded using MIME types defined by the corresponding encodings as defined by the OBIX Encodings specification.

\*\*\*\*\*

The lack of a specific reference to same part of OBIX Encodings masks a more fatal error: OBIX Encodings defines a MIME type for JSON and EXI only. It does not define a MIME type for XML.

"

**Comments**

Comment by [Craig Gemmill](#) [ 10/Jun/14 ]

I think this is in obix-encodings.

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 30/Jun/15 ]

Closed with WD44 prior to reporting for CSD04

**[OBIX-110] Hanging paragraphs (9)** Created: 20/Feb/14 Updated: 30/Jun/15 Resolved: 02/Nov/14

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Open Building Information Exchange (oBIX) TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">ENCODINGS Specification</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">ENCODINGS PR02</a>

<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	OBIX 1.1 WD33		
<b>Type:</b>	Bug	<b>Priority:</b>	Minor
<b>Reporter:</b>	Toby Considine	<b>Assignee:</b>	Craig Gemmill
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Labels:</b>	None		
<b>Environment:</b>	TAB Review		

**Description**

"There are several hanging paragraphs, that is where a header occurs followed immediately by content. Which means if I cite ""3.3 Value Encodings"", do I mean all of section 3.3 or do I just mean the text that immediately follows that heading?

How do I distinguish between a citation of 3.3 that includes.

""The object types bool, int, enum, real, str, uri, abstime, reltime, date, and time are always implied to have their value encoded (equivalent to the val attribute in XML)."" + 3.3.1 Bool Encodings which says nothing about implied value types and when I mean to cite 3.3 simply to reference implied value types?

This is one of nine hanging paragraphs in this draft."

**Comments**

Comment by <a href="#">Markus Jung</a> [ 21/Apr/14 ]
Problem is not clear to me.
Comment by <a href="#">Toby Considine</a> [ 02/Nov/14 ]
This issue has been considered resolved based on TC discussions for soem time.
Comment by <a href="#">Toby Considine</a> [ 30/Jun/15 ]
Closed with WD44 prior to reporting for CSD04

**[OBIX-91] COnformance clause for Encodings is inadequate** Created: 20/Feb/14 Updated: 30/Jun/15 Resolved: 02/Nov/14

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	OASIS Open Building Information Exchange (oBIX) TC
<b>Component/s:</b>	ENCODINGS Specification
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	ENCODINGS PR02
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	None

<b>Type:</b>	Improvement	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	Toby Considine	<b>Assignee:</b>	Markus Jung
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Labels:</b>	None		
<b>Environment:</b>	TAB Review		

<b>Resolution:</b>	Duplicate issue -> see <a href="#">OBIX-141</a>
--------------------	---

**Description**

"Encoding" is a specification on its own. As such it must have a detailed Conformance Clause.

That will not do:

"An implementation is compliant with this specification if it implements all MUST or REQUIRED level requirements. An implementation MUST specify its supported encodings"

1. What constitutes an "implementation" is everyone's guess: we see in this document "client and server implementation.", "EXI implementation", "reference implementation", etc. I don't know what kind of entity is supposed to conform. The closest I see is something called an "Encoder" and maybe a decoder too. That seems to suggest there are at least two types of implementations to take care of.
2. Not clear how to "specify its supported encodings". A reference to the normative text that says how to do that is needed.
3. Because there are different types of encodings with their own requirements, it may be good to distinguish different conformance profiles (for JSON, EXI...), combinations of which can of course be claimed. Right now, ""if it implements all MUST or REQUIRED level requirements"" seems to imply that all encodings must be supported...

### Comments

Comment by [Markus Jung](#) [ 21/Apr/14 ]

Should be discussed in next TC 04/24/2014.

There will be device classes like gateways that implement all protocol bindings and encodings. But for a constrained 6LoWPAN device it will be either or. Such a device will only provide on protocol binding and one encoding e.g. CoAP with XML, or CoAP with EXI.

But I don't see the requirement to specify it in encodings sections. Such a device class conformance would better fit in the overall core spec, that can reference the bindings and the encodings together.

Comment by [Markus Jung](#) [ 26/May/14 ]

This issue is similar to [OBIX-144](#), will clause this issue now.

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 02/Nov/14 ]

Closed w/o Resolution so re-opening

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 02/Nov/14 ]

[OBIX-144](#), will clause this issue now.

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 30/Jun/15 ]

Closed with WD44 prior to reporting for CSD04

### [OBIX-90] mix of SHALL and MUST keywords Created: 20/Feb/14 Updated: 30/Jun/15 Resolved: 02/Nov/14

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Open Building Information Exchange (oBIX) TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">ENCODINGS Specification</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">ENCODINGS PR02</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">ENCODINGS WD12</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Improvement	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	Unassigned
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Labels:</b>	None		
<b>Environment:</b>	TAB Review		

**Resolution:** It is more an recommendation. Therefore changed wording to SHOULD.

### Description

In 5.3, we see use of SHALL keyword, while all other mandatory reqs use MUST. It is better to settle for just one and here MUST, as the preferred keyword for RFC2119 . REQUIRED is still necessary in some cases because serving different grammatical context, but thats not the case of {MUST, SHALL} that are really redundant.

### Comments

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 02/Nov/14 ]

Closed w/o Resolution so re-opening

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 30/Jun/15 ]

Closed with WD44 prior to reporting for CSD04

**[OBIX-78] Editorial Issue, Line 106, 101, and elsewhere. OBIX vs oBIX** Created: 15/Dec/13 Updated: 30/Jun/15 Resolved: 02/Nov/14

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Open Building Information Exchange (oBIX) TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">ENCODINGS Specification</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">ENCODINGS WD09</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">ENCODINGS WD12</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Bug	<b>Priority:</b>	Minor
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Chris Bogen</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	Unassigned
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Labels:</b>	None		
<b>Environment:</b>	Chris Bogen		

**Proposal:** Change all occurrences of "oBIX" to "OBIX"

**Resolution:** Fixed.

#### Description

The term "oBIX" appears throughout the document (see lines 106 and 101) and in the core document it is "OBIX." If I recall correctly, we are dropping the lower case "o" and using "OBIX" hereafter.

#### Comments

Comment by [Craig Gemmill](#) [ 16/Dec/13 ]

Over to you Markus, I think this was miscategorized...

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 02/Nov/14 ]

Closed w/o Resolution so re-opening

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 30/Jun/15 ]

Closed with WD44 prior to reporting for CSD04

**[OBIX-56] Editorial: Tables and Figures need to be identified, have separate tables of... in the front matter** Created: 12/Sep/13 Updated: 30/Jun/15

Resolved: 16/Dec/13

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Open Building Information Exchange (oBIX) TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">ENCODINGS Specification</a> , <a href="#">OBIX 1.1 Specification</a> , <a href="#">REST Specification</a> , <a href="#">SOAP Specification</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">oBIX 1.1 PR01</a> , <a href="#">SOAP PR01</a> , <a href="#">ENCODINGS PR01</a> , <a href="#">REST PR01</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	None

<b>Type:</b>	Bug	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">William Cox (Inactive)</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Markus Jung</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		

<b>Labels:</b>	None
<b>Environment:</b>	William Cox
<b>Resolution:</b>	Number the tables and figures. Create a table of figures and table of tables (!) after the Table of Contents for each specification.

#### Description

See e.g. OBIX 1.1 PR01, starting at lines 270, 1522, 1890. Tables should have a numbered caption via insert caption; figures likewise. Suggest sequential numbering through the document.

#### Comments

Comment by <a href="#">Craig Gemmill</a> [ 27/Sep/13 ]
For the 1.1 spec, this is a duplicate of <a href="#">OBIX-34</a> . So I'll work the 1.1 core spec there.
Noted that reporter here suggests sequential numbering. In <a href="#">OBIX-34</a> , the suggestion is (per other recent specs) <chapter>-<number> for both Figures and Tables. Plan is to go with the latter approach for consistency.
Comment by <a href="#">Markus Jung</a> [ 02/Oct/13 ]
Fixed for ENCODINGS in OBIX-Encodings-v1.0-wd07.
Comment by <a href="#">Craig Gemmill</a> [ 16/Oct/13 ]
Fixed for core spec in WD16.
Comment by <a href="#">Markus Jung</a> [ 07/Nov/13 ]
In the SOAP binding document are no figures and no tables.
Comment by <a href="#">Markus Jung</a> [ 07/Nov/13 ]
Table of Tables added to the Encodings document WD 08.
Comment by <a href="#">Toby Considine</a> [ 30/Jun/15 ]
Closed with WD44 prior to reporting for CSD04

#### [OBIX-50] Localization - Move XML encoding rules from Core to Common Encodings Created: 09/Sep/13 Updated: 30/Jun/15 Resolved: 16/Dec/13

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Open Building Information Exchange (oBIX) TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">ENCODINGS Specification</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">oBIX 1.1 PR01</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">REST WD08</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Improvement	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Craig Gemmill</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Labels:</b>	None		
<b>Environment:</b>	Toby Considine		

#### Description

Localization rules in REST specification In Core 1.1, Section 8.4 (992-997) appears to be XML encoding rules. If they are meant to be general model rules, please re-write. If they are XML-specific rules, suggest moving to XML section of Common Encodings.

#### Comments

Comment by <a href="#">Markus Jung</a> [ 16/Dec/13 ]
The localization is now handled by the core specification, bindings (e.g. like the HTTP REST binding) might provide further details on how to deal with localization.

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 30/Jun/15 ]

Closed with WD44 prior to reporting for CSD04

**[OBIX-49] XML Headers - Move XML encoding rules from Core to Common Encodings** Created: 09/Sep/13 Updated: 30/Jun/15 Resolved: 10/Jun/14

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Open Building Information Exchange (oBIX) TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">ENCODINGS Specification</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">oBIX 1.1 PR01</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">OBIX 1.1 WD27</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Bug	<b>Priority:</b>	Minor
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Labels:</b>	None		
<b>Environment:</b>	Toby Considine		

#### Description

In Core 1.1, Section 8.4 (992-997) appears to be XML encoding rules. If they are meant to be general model rules, please re-write. If they are XML-specific rules, suggest moving to XML section of Common Encodings

#### Comments

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 12/Sep/13 ]

For meeting of 9/12

[8:39] Chris Bogen: Craig: Second paragraph of 8.4...may be specific to xml, but client consuming object would want to make sure they have same information regardless of encoding...maybe terminology should be changed, so maybe change title of 8.4 from xml to something else

[8:40] Chris Bogen: Toby: So extents must be used regardless of encodings/bindings, so e.g. "bindings that conform with specs must identify how to represent/do this"

[8:41] Chris Bogen: William: recording the back and forth on particular issues is important

Comment by [Craig Gemmill](#) [ 12/Sep/13 ]

I think there are some changes required for the core 1.1 spec, but I would like to retain the intent of the spec language rather than moving into the XML encodings doc. The general intent of 8.4 (for example, similar observations may be made for the preceding section) is that when encoding an object that implements a contract (in ANY encoding, not just XML), you must encode the full extent of the object. The reason for this is that a client consuming an object from a server would expect to have the entire object, regardless of what encoding was used to retrieve the object.

Comment by [Craig Gemmill](#) [ 10/Jun/14 ]

This looks fixed in WD27 (actually probably much earlier). The relevant clause now is 9.3.1 in WD27.

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 30/Jun/15 ]

Closed with WD44 prior to reporting for CSD04

**[OBIX-48] Encodings: Simple Editorial comments** Created: 09/Sep/13 Updated: 30/Jun/15 Resolved: 16/Dec/13

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Open Building Information Exchange (oBIX) TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">ENCODINGS Specification</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">oBIX 1.1 PR01</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	None

<b>Type:</b>	Improvement	<b>Priority:</b>	Trivial
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Markus Jung</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Labels:</b>	None		
<b>Environment:</b>	Toby Considine		

#### Description

Line 16: Fix formatting of RFC647 format

Line 61-64: Update namespace to meet rules stated on oBIX 1.1, and allow for other namespaces as appropriate (i.e., for the 2015 version)

Line 61-64: Prefix rules invalidate \*all\* of the examples in 1.1.

78-81 See previous comment

Line 88: Add normative reference to UDP to the references.

Line 108 Change Full Fidelity to Full Fidelity

Line 462: "Eliminate sentence beginning "Even worse..."

#### Comments

Comment by [Markus Jung](#) [ 02/Oct/13 ]

Fixed in OBIX-Encodings-v1.0-wd07.doc.

Except the following comments which need further discussions:

Line 61-64: Update namespace to meet rules stated on oBIX 1.1, and allow for other namespaces as appropriate (i.e., for the 2015 version)

Line 61-64: Prefix rules invalidate \*all\* of the examples in 1.1.

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 30/Jun/15 ]

Closed with WD44 prior to reporting for CSD04

**[OBIX-7] Fix the JSON examples, especially the quotes and comma after "tag" in the second and third line** Created: 24/Aug/13 Updated: 30/Jun/15

Resolved: 13/Dec/13

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Open Building Information Exchange (oBIX) TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">ENCODINGS Specification</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">ENCODINGS PR01</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">ENCODINGS WD08</a>

<b>Type:</b>	Bug	<b>Priority:</b>	Major
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Markus Jung</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Labels:</b>	None		
<b>Environment:</b>	Matthias Hub		

**Description**

```

from:

{"tag":"obj", "href":"/a/", "nodes":[
{"tag","obj", "name":"b", "href":"b"}, "nodes":[
{"tag","obj", "name", "c"}, {"tag","ref", "name", "d", "href":"d"}, ]
}}

to:

{
  "tag" : "obj",
  "href" : "/a/",
  "nodes" : [ {
    "tag" : "obj",
    "name" : "b",
    "href" : "b",
    "nodes" : [ {
      "tag" : "obj",
      "name" : "c"
    }, {
      "tag" : "ref",
      "name" : "d",
      "href" : "d"
    } ]
  } ]
}

```

**Comments**

Comment by <a href="#">Markus Jung</a> [ 05/Sep/13 ]
I agree, I will change it.
Comment by <a href="#">Toby Considine</a> [ 12/Sep/13 ]
This is a nice comment and I am glad that Markus is working on it
Comment by <a href="#">Markus Jung</a> [ 02/Oct/13 ]
Fixed in OBIX-Encodings-v1.0-wd07.doc
Comment by <a href="#">Matthias Hub</a> [ 02/Oct/13 ]
Thanks Markus for the change, it looks already much better now in wd07! Sorry for being pedantic, but the quotes should be the default quotes like " and not the ones currently in the PDF (the validation of a copy and paste of the JSON part into <a href="http://jsonlint.org/">http://jsonlint.org/</a> will fail with an error). I found that this is not only in that example but overall, also for XML. If you need a separate issue to track I can create that.
Comment by <a href="#">Markus Jung</a> [ 10/Oct/13 ]
Full ack. Will be fixed in the next WD. I don't think we need a separate issue for that.
Comment by <a href="#">Markus Jung</a> [ 07/Nov/13 ]
Quotes fixed in WD 08
Comment by <a href="#">Toby Considine</a> [ 30/Jun/15 ]
Closed with WD44 prior to reporting for CSD04

<b>[OBIX-6] Call the tag element "type" instead of "tag" - as it seems to be more like a type than a tag (although "type" already used in edge cases)</b> Created: 24/Aug/13 Updated: 30/Jun/15 Resolved: 16/Dec/13	
<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	OASIS Open Building Information Exchange (oBIX) TC
<b>Component/s:</b>	ENCODINGS Specification

<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	ENCODINGS WD07
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	None

<b>Type:</b>	Bug	<b>Priority:</b>	Minor
<b>Reporter:</b>	Toby Considine	<b>Assignee:</b>	Markus Jung
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Labels:</b>	None		
<b>Environment:</b>	Matthias Hub		

<b>Proposal:</b>	Fix as per comments
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed as per comments

#### Comments

Comment by <a href="#">Markus Jung</a> [ 05/Sep/13 ]
The naming was initially taken from the XML to JSON conversion, where XML elements are represented. Therefore the key name is "tag", but we could change it to an obix specific name.
Comment by <a href="#">Markus Jung</a> [ 02/Oct/13 ]
I think "obix" would be a good name identifier. This leads to something like "obix":"obj", or "obix":"bool" which increases the readability. Fixed in oBIX-Encodings-v1.0-wd07.
Comment by <a href="#">Matthias Hub</a> [ 10/Oct/13 ]
That sounds good to me, thanks!
Comment by <a href="#">Toby Considine</a> [ 30/Jun/15 ]
Closed with WD44 prior to reporting for CSD04

#### [OBIX-5] Call the structural element "items" instead of "nodes" because of the semantic meaning of the term "node" / "nodes" in HTML context (where JSON is usually used) Created: 24/Aug/13 Updated: 30/Jun/15 Resolved: 16/Dec/13

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	OASIS Open Building Information Exchange (oBIX) TC
<b>Component/s:</b>	ENCODINGS Specification
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	ENCODINGS PR01
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	ENCODINGS WD07

<b>Type:</b>	Bug	<b>Priority:</b>	Minor
<b>Reporter:</b>	Toby Considine	<b>Assignee:</b>	Markus Jung
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Labels:</b>	None		
<b>Environment:</b>	Matthias Hub		

<b>Proposal:</b>	Fix as per comments
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed as per comments

#### Comments

Comment by <a href="#">Markus Jung</a> [ 05/Sep/13 ]
Rewording is fine for me.
Comment by <a href="#">Markus Jung</a> [ 02/Oct/13 ]
Maybe "children" is more appropriate --> Fixed in OBIX-Encodings-v1.0-wd07.
Comment by <a href="#">Matthias Hub</a> [ 10/Oct/13 ]
That sounds okay to me - at least from the current point of view :- ) thanks!

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 30/Jun/15 ]

Closed with WD44 prior to reporting for CSD04

**[OBIX-3] Consider DFDL issues in JSON Encoding** Created: 15/Aug/13 Updated: 30/Jun/15 Resolved: 13/Dec/13

<b>Status:</b>	Closed
<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">OASIS Open Building Information Exchange (oBIX) TC</a>
<b>Component/s:</b>	<a href="#">ENCODINGS Specification</a>
<b>Affects Version/s:</b>	<a href="#">ENCODINGS PR01</a>
<b>Fix Version/s:</b>	None

<b>Type:</b>	Improvement	<b>Priority:</b>	Minor
<b>Reporter:</b>	<a href="#">Toby Considine</a>	<b>Assignee:</b>	<a href="#">Markus Jung</a>
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Labels:</b>	None		
<b>Environment:</b>	Toby Considine		

<b>Proposal:</b>	Close without action
------------------	----------------------

**Description**

DFDL (data format description language) is an OpenGrid approach to getting non-XML data formats (such as JSON) into an XML format. DFDL

<http://www.ogf.org/dfdl/>

Review JSON representations to see if they are compatible with DFDL translation into the formal schema.

**Comments**

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 13/Dec/13 ]

There is no real interest in this task.

Comment by [Toby Considine](#) [ 30/Jun/15 ]

Closed with WD44 prior to reporting for CSD04