Subject: MEETING MINUTES -- 4 JAN 2005 -- DITA TECHNICAL COMMITTEE

- From: Don Day <dond@us.ibm.com>
- To: "DITA TC list " <dita@lists.oasis-open.org>
- Date: Mon, 10 Jan 2005 23:39:58 -0600

Courtesy France Baril,

** AGENDA **

-------------

1. Roll call

2. Review/approve minutes from 14 December

3. Specification status (look for recent updates in file area)
   - namespaces and identifiers: need agreement on namespace urls and
     conventions for extension, and public identifiers for dtds/schemas
   - naming conventions and file extensions - I'm assuming we do need to
     document what the transforms will support - please check; also,
     should we copy the specialization naming conventions here? finally,
     should the specialization rules actually care about rules for
     shell documents? they don't affect reuse, and may be the interface
     to other systems that have their own naming conventions.
   - topicref/link atts: how/where to talk about query, and why is it
     available in map but not topic?
     Also vice versa question for @translate, @xml:lang atts, which are
     available in topics but not maps
   - reconciliation of metadata elements in topics versus maps. should
     we just defer to post-1.0?
   - specifics for otherprops - how to process it (if it is really going
     to function as extension, needs to be more than just a fourth
     attribute - needs to allow groupings of values)
   - limits of specialization - review, currently point-form only for
     extension info
   - namespaces in design: to be written
   - developing processes: to be written
   - CSS fallback support: Don to get back
   - namespaces in processing: to be written
4. List issues (triage as potential post-1.0):
   - Additional bugfix issues (details to come):
9. Add tm into keyword content model to enable proper trademarking of keyword content.

10. Map and topic cannot share same keyword definition: recommend cutting the keyword element declaration from meta xml.mod and paste separate defs into map.mod (no tm) and topič.mod (with tm).

11. Elements derived from keyword must have same content models--need to revert words.cnt back to "PCDATA" for:
    msgnum, cmdname, varname
    option, parmname, apiname, kwd
    wintitle

12. Default attribute values must be declared with " delimiters
    - Should <tm> allow images or logoized content?
    - Should <keyword> be allowed to nest?

5. AOB?

** Minutes **
-------------

1. Roll call
   - We have 9 out of 19 => No quorum
   - Will make tentative decision to be accepted next week or to move to the discussion list
2. Review/approve minutes from 14 December
   - No quorum, to do next week
3. Specification status (look for recent updates in file area)
   - namespaces and identifiers: need agreement on namespace urls and conventions for extension, and public identifiers for dtds/schemas
     Do we need them? Eliot says no, we can use system id only.
     Don: since DTD has info in it, thatâ€™s providing info thatâ€™s optional and normalized. ?? Propose we have a version number in there.
     Eliot: XML stds makes them irrelevant.
     Don: some of the users on the call do use them, it makes sense to provide it for those who need it.
     Don: Put off for 2.0?
     Michael: Need agreement on what they are gonna be.
     Don: look at DocBook DTD and use OASIS enterprise name that they used? Anything that needs to be resolved will have a public identifier.
TODO: Don, will provide a list of each of the modules that have a revised pi.

Don: we agree thatâ€™s in v.1.0.

Michael: NS URI for DTD and schema arch version should it actually be something like ditaarch version. 
Erik Ennum: says would make sense.

NS URI itself: Eric proposed dita.oasis.orgâ€¦.arch1.0 Base for all ns uri will be the same 
Michael: right 
Eric: or oasisopen.org/dita/â€¦ arch1.0 
Michael: happy with dita.oasisopen.org with dita at the front. 
Eric: expectation of what follows that is version number followed by slash 1.0.org 
M: do we need /arch?

E: it depends if there are other properties then arch, like doctypes and modules. 
M: dita.oasisopen.org/1.0/ (EVERYONE AGREES ON THIS â€” Tentative decision)

URI for each of dtds and schemas:
E: to avoid collisions:
Â• Dita.oasisopen.org/1.0/mod/ 
Â• Dita.oasisopen.org/1.0/dtd/ 
M: no need for modules. Now move to 2.0 
Don: Michael take it to mailing list.

Michael: TODO: Erik please put together proposal for Ns for Michael

- naming conventions and file extensions

M: transforms are going to handle extensions. So we have naming conventions on content side to discuss.

M: Copy the naming conventions in a single place, bring spec ext in section naming conventions and file extensions? Or have them in multiple places. Will do with conref. Will see them in multiple places and them in intro doc.

M: We have naming conventions: shell files are interface and mod are reused. People might have their own naming conventions as far as what they use in their org. So maybe there is no use for us to provide naming conventions for shells and maybe contradict user conventions.

Most people who have implemented it have no issue with this.

Erik says the only thing or processing scripts care about are naming conventions for.mod files.

M: Topic type and domain modules have conventions and processing. We are documenting naming conventions for the shell. But we donâ€™t have processing, it does not increase reuse or anything, so we donâ€™t need to impose naming conventions on shell files.

M: will remove naming conventions for shell doc types. Tentative decision.
- topicref/link atts: how/where to talk about query, and why is it available in map but not topic?
Also vice versa question for @translate, @xml:lang atts, which are available in topics but not maps

    Tentative decision: Need to add them in formal update of the dtd.

- reconciliation of metadata elements in topics versus maps. should we just defer to post-1.0?
- specifics for otherprops - how to process it (if it is really going to function as extension, needs to be more than just a fourth attribute - needs to allow groupings of values)

    The section on conditional processing does not give best practices for using this att. Specific additional syntax. As C. Wong raised on the list: we donâ€™t have a std to extend attribute. But we donâ€™t have specific syntax if we add more then 1 attribute in there. Need for 1.0 or later? Put this on the list for discussion.

- limits of specialization - review, currently point-form only for extension info
- namespaces in design: to be written
- developing processes: to be written
- CSS fallback support: Don to get back
- namespaces in processing: to be written

    ** TENTATIVE DECISIONS **

    Namespace URI: dita.oasisopen.org/1.0/

    Naming conventions will be removed for shell doctypes.

    Need to add query, translate and xml:lang attributes in the formal update of the map dtd.

    ** New Actions **

    Don, will provide a list of each of the modules that have a revised pi.

    Erik please put together proposal for Ns for dtds and modules (if necessary) for Michael.

    Otherprops: The section on conditional processing does not give best practices for using this att. Specific additional syntax. As C. Wong raised on the list: we donâ€™t have a std to extend attribute. But we donâ€™t have specific syntax if we add more then 1 attribute in there. Need for 1.0 or later? Put this on the list for discussion.

    All: take a look at the limit of spec topic. Itâ€™s all new content and in need of review.
Subject: MEETING MINUTES -- 11 JAN 2005 -- DITA TECHNICAL COMMITTEE

- From: Don Day <dond@us.ibm.com>
- To: "DITA TC list " <dita@lists.oasis-open.org>
- Date: Tue, 18 Jan 2005 09:02:58 -0600

posting for France, minute taker:

** AGENDA **

1. Roll call

2. Review/approve minutes from 14 December
   and 04 January

3. Affirm tentative decisions from last week:
   - Namespace URI: dita.oasisopen.org/1.0/
   - Naming conventions will be removed for shell doctypes.
   - Need to add query, translate and xml:lang attributes in the formal
     update of the map dtd.

4. Specification status
   As of last week:
   - namespaces in design: to be written
   - developing processes: to be written
   - CSS fallback support: Don to get back
   - namespaces in processing: to be written
Related list issues:
- otherprops syntax
- URIs and versions

5. Bug lists (triage):
1. Make the body element optional in base topic as well as for task, concept, and reference
2. Make the keyref attribute CDATA instead of NMTOKEN so we can use URIs as keys
3. Retire the boolean element
4. Insert <desc> into <xref> -- for equivalence between xref and topicref
5. Choice is missing a number of elements -- should have same content model as <li>
6. Expand map DTD so meta elements are equivalent to topic meta (content elements in map should match same elements in topic: shortdesc, searchtitle, linktext)

7. Add mapref to map
8. Change the syntax for the keyword definition to parameterize the "tm" element
9. Add tm into keyword content model to enable proper trademarking of keyword content.
10. Map and topic cannot share same keyword definition: recommend cutting the keyword element declaration from meta_xml.mod and paste separate defs into map.mod (no tm) and topic.mod (with tm).
11. Elements derived from keyword must have same content models--need to revert words.cnt back to "PCDATA" for: msgnum, cmdname, varname option, parmname, apiname, kwd wintitle
12. Default attribute values must be declared with " delimiters
13. Provide more equivalence between topicref/link atts: @query, @translate, @xml:lang

If time permits--statements, at least, on these questions from users.
- Should <tm> allow images or logoized content?
- Should <keyword> be allowed to nest?
** MINUTES **
-------------

1. Roll call
- See separate attendance document. 10/19--met quorum

2. Review/approve minutes from 14 December
   and 04 January

   - Review decisions and minutes of December 14th
     Michael P motion to approve. Second: Yas.
     Accepted
   - Review minutes of Jan 4th
     Review, update: Chris Wong instead of ??? as speaker.
     - Correction: namespace should be "oasis-" in tentative decision.
     - Motion to approve: MPriestley
     Second: Eliot.

3. Affirm tentative decisions from last week:
   - Namespace URI: dita.oasis-open.org/1.0/ (with hyphen between oasis and open)
   - Discussions:
     Erik Hennum - Sent attempt to summarize on the list.
     First half about file URIs; second half is namespace.
     Paul thought 1 namespace in 1.0.
     Erik Hennum: decided to have required namespace for dita arch attr
     Optional for document types so that they would be std namespace in environ that require them
     Paul: A namespace for each doctype?
     EH: Yes but optional in 1.0. Will go on architecture att not the class att.
     EH: It would apply to the root element within the doctype. It's a namespace for the entire document. Namespace in
different doctype are diff.
     Paul: topic is a topic, it should be the same
     EH: Elements within each elements would be different
     ?? Would you still be able to reuse by conref?
     Paul: Not really.
     Paul. Do we need to do that for 1.0?
     EH Some people on the list said they absolutely needed some namespaces.
     Paul. Thought class att namespace was enough for 1.0.
     Don: can someone summarize how we moved from last week simple proposal to more complex.
     EH: Minutes did not actually recorded or reflected the fact that what was approved in Nov was namespace for the (â€¦)
doctype and not the class. If we have to reopen discussion we should. If we have people that say that dita cannot be
used with Word unless you use an actual namespace, are we ignoring our charter if we pay attention to that?
     Don: Paul I think I look at your experience with TC process and actual info and tools. Where are we missing the
namespace requirement for oasis? Would it be satisfy users to simply have a arch namespace
???: Not going to solve the word issue.
     Don. What about the reuse problem that Paul mentioned.
     Paul. Does that make sense to have element reused. Namespaces are creating a bunch of names, if I have 2 namespaces I
have 2 different names, I don't think that's what dita was trying to do, cause then you can't reuse them
     EH: Should we take interested parties off line?
     TODO : TO bring this discussion offline: Who should be lead in setting up teleconf? EH.
Others to include: Paul, Eliott, Bruce, Michael P., Eric Sirois.

Will bring this subject to next week meeting.

- Naming conventions will be removed for shell doctypes.
Motion to approve: Michael.
Second: France.

- Need to add query, translate and xml:lang attributes in the formal update of the map dtd. Accept proposal 13 (from something?? 16). Don: this is a Consistency fix.
Motion to approve: Erik Hickson
Second: Wendy Sh.

- 4. Specification status
As of last week:
- namespaces in design: to be written
- developing processes: to be written
- CSS fallback support: Don to get back
- namespaces in processing: to be written
Related list issues:
- otherprops syntax
- URIs and versions

- Don in dec we had approve 1 to 5 and 8 skip 6 and 7. this week we approved #13. Bugs 9 to 12 are late reporting. Bug fixes have been done. They are listed so they are on the table. I can back them out. But we are approving after the fact bugs that were known in June but not reported at that time. Propose acceptance on the list 9 to 12. Only 6 and 7 will be left to trade off.
- Paul what is # 12?
- Don there was an attribute in utilities the use of no key word in an attribute had a single quote and need double for some parsers. Since that change was made there's been no issues.
  -- Erick Hickson. Why not allow tm and keyword in mapâ€¦ concern with that. Maps generally allow to put stuff that you don't think is appropriate in topic.
  - ?? Adds that this is counter to direction in # 6.
  - Don: yes 6 is actually an attempt to formalize content model for shared element between maps and topics should ideally have the same content model
  - M.: Change # 10 to map and topic need to share and add tm to content model for map.
  - Don remove 10 from what we are approving and make 6 complete
  - M: I agree with # 10 and 6 seperated.
  - Don proposal accept 9 11 12. 10 remain as bug with 6 and 7.
  - Micheal: motion. Sharon (Lasgo?) Second.
  - Michael lets deal with 7 now or discuss it on the list.
  - Don: M have you had any additional stuff on 7.
  - Michael let's explain why it's there.
  - M: The immediate need was to process multiple map at one go. You end up with a lot of maps. You want to build them all at once because you want. (â€œ). It met a very specific problem. But we realize we have a non standard part. We should have a way of referencing map. So we want to get mapref in there to have a coherent architecture. In terms of ways to do that. Current proposal add mapref. Otherwise leave mapref as an odd child. If we say no to map ref, we will need a toolkit special doc on how to do it. Does affect the processing pipeline. Just a way to formalize stuff that was done informally in the past.
  - Don: What can we get out of this?
  - Eliott understands and agree that mapref is probably the best choice overall.
  - Paul: It seems to be the right technical solution. Still confuse about process of what 10.o is supposed to be
  - Don: loosing people so full count to vote is no there, so bring it up next week.
- MP: Should we take it on the list?
  - Don: yes
- MP: Also looking for feedback on what we already have.
  - Don: todo for everyone bring comments to Michael.

5. Bug lists (triage):

1. Make the body element optional in base topic as well as for task, concept, and reference
2. Make the keyref attribute CDATA instead of NM TOKEN so we can use URIs as keys
3. Retire the boolean element
4. Insert <desc> into <xref> -- for equivalence between xref and topicref
5. Choice is missing a number of elements -- should have same content model as <li>
6. Expand map DTD so meta elements are equivalent to topic meta (content elements in map should match same elements in topic: shortdesc, searchtitle, linktext)

(rationale)
http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/dita/200501/msg00026.html
(markup)
7. Add mapref to map

(issue 8 fixes a syntax error introduced by the fix for #9)
8. Change the syntax for the keyword definition to parameterize the "tm" element

http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/dita/200501/msg00004.html
(June era toolkit fixes that were not reported at the time)
9. Add tm into keyword content model to enable proper trademarking of keyword content.

10. Map and topic cannot share same keyword definition: recommend cutting the keyword element declaration from meta_xml.mod and paste separate defs into map.mod (no tm) and topic.mod (with tm).

11. Elements derived from keyword must have same content models--need to revert words.cnt back to "PCDATA" for: msgnum, cmdname, varname option, parmname, apiname, kwd wintitle

12. Default attribute values must be declared with " delimiters

13. Provide more equivalence between topicref/link atts: @query, @translate, @xml:lang
If time permits--statements, at least, on these questions from users.
- Should <tm> allow images or logoized content?

- Should <keyword> be allowed to nest?

6. AOB?

** Todos from today's meeting **
--------------------------------
EH to bring the namespace discussion offline. Others to include in discussion: Paul, Eliott, Bruce, Michael P., Eric Sirois.

Everyone bring comments to Michael on what we already have.

** Decisions from today's meeting **
------------------------------------
Approved minutes form Dec 14th and Jan 4th meetings with corrections.

Naming conventions will be removed for shell doctypes.

Need to add query, translate and xml:lang attributes in the formal update of the map dtd.

Bug resolutions: accept 9 11 12 as solutions. 10 remain as bug with 6 and 7.
Subject: MEETING MINUTES -- 18 JAN 2005 -- DITA TECHNICAL COMMITTEE

- From: "Larsen, Seraphim L" <seraphim.l.larsen@intel.com>
- To: <dita@lists.oasis-open.org>
- Date: Tue, 18 Jan 2005 10:08:34 -0700

MEETING MINUTES -- 18 Jan 2005 -- DITA TECHNICAL COMMITTEE
*** Please see Action Items and Decision Summary at the end ***

** Agenda **
-------

1. Roll call
2. Review/approve minutes from 11 January
3. List issues:
   - namespace redux
   - otherprops closure
   - DTDArchVersion value
   - related issue: public identifier DTD owner (change IBM to OASIS?)
4. Specification status
   - Spec
   - DTDs/Schemas
   - Language Ref
5. AOB?

** Minutes **
-------

1. Roll call --
   - We do have quorum; see separate email from Don Day for details.
2. Review/approve minutes from 11 January
   - Minutes approved by acclamation.
3. List issues:
   - namespace redux --
     - Needs updates to DTDs and Schemas, to be discussed offline
- otherprops closure --
  - Approved by acclamation

- DTDArchVersion value
  - Clarification: We will use DTDArchVersion (replacing DTDVersion) to track the DTD/schema version.
  - Proposal: We will use 1.0.0 for the first deliverable.
  - Approved by acclamation.

- related issue: public identifier DTD owner (change IBM to OASIS?)
  - Don to contact Mary Macrae to get the proper OASIS string to put into public identifiers.

4. Specification status
- Spec
  - Main things holding us up --
  - Namespace
  - Identifiers

  - Michael is requesting that everyone review this week by Friday, so he can provide a 1.0.0 spec draft to vote on next Tuesday. Provide comments in plain text
  - Don -- we have some outstanding issues, that cannot be resolved till we meet next week.
  - So, next week we will look at DTDs and namespace issues. Michael will provide a final 1.0 draft to the TC. We will then approve/disapprove the 1.0 draft at the subsequent meeting.

- DTDs/Schemas
  - How to validate the DTDs?
    - There are several tools for doing this
    - Don and Eric will work on this.

- Language Ref
  - Let's finish this topic on the List -- we will not be able to make a decision now.

5. AOB?

** Summary of Decisions **
--------------------------


- Proposal approved: We will use 1.0.0 for the DTDArchVersion value for the first deliverable.

** Action Required **
---------------------

021 JoAnn Hackos, Michael Priestley -- Summarize the discussion of substitution and post to the TC list. Still pending as of 7/20/04. >>>11/30/04: Action: Michael Priestley to add note to conref that people may substitute conref targets at build time

022 Don, Michael -- Put together a "self-study" tutorial/demo, as per JoAnn's comments regarding the DITA sessions. Still pending as of 7/20/04.

040 Don -- Cull the past minutes and discussion list to create an inventory of all the things we need to close on in order to create the 1.0 spec. Create a list of these items and post it in the Documents area of the website. >>> This will be ongoing.

051 055 Don Day, 9/7/04 -- Take the discussion of @scale attribute and related issues to the list (presentation mechanisms). (merge with next...)

061 Don Day, 10/05/04 -- Reply to image align and tm notes in dita-users. >>> Agenda item for 11/9/04. <<<11/30/04: image align issue is a doc mistake, corrected in the "dital32" toolkit version of Language Reference source.

062 Eric Sirois, 10/05/04 -- provide XSLT validation for specialized schemas once developed (Indi recommends Jarno to work with him)

063 All, 11/02/04, 11/09/04 -- Provide comments to Michael Priestley on the draft -- provide comments to Michael ASAP. Michael Priestley to incorporate comments into draft specification; prepare new iteration for 11/16 meeting. >>> 11/30/04 in progress

068 Nancy Harrison to send summary of DocBook table accessibility additions to TC list.

069 Don will provide a list of each of the modules that have a revised pi.

070 Erik please put together proposal for Na for dtds and modules (if necessary) for Michael.

071 Otherprops: The section on conditional processing does not give best practices for using this att. Specific additional syntax. As C. Wong raised on the list: we don't have a std to extend attribute. But we don't have specific syntax if we add more then 1 attribute in there. Need for 1.0 or later? Put this on the list for discussion.

072 All: take a look at the limit of spec topic. It's all new content and in need of review.

073 EH to bring the namespaces discussion offline. Others to include in discussion: Paul, Elliott, Bruce, Michael P., Eric Sirois. >>> In progress, as of 1/18/05.

074 Everyone bring comments to Michael on what we already have. >>> In progress, as of 1/18/05.

075 Don, 1/18/05 -- Contact Mary Macrae to get the proper OASIS string to put into public identifiers.

076 All, 1/18/05 -- Review 1.0 draft of the spec and submit comments to Michael Priestley by 1/21/05.

** Issues to be Resolved **
---------------------------

006 All -- Should DITA specialization mechanism be documented in a separate specification in order to make it easier to use in other XML applications that otherwise have no relationship to topic-based writing? >>> Ongoing. >>> 11/30/04: - add to spec issues list

009 "Best Practices" document -- Let's put this on the agenda for future discussion.

010 Relationship between DITA and other topic-based architectures (such as S1000D) -- Need to incorporate this into the "Best Practices" document.

011 All -- Revisit use of @scale on image (general treatment of graphics, ie raster vs vector assumptions, etc.). Compare/contrast with controls for the <object> element, which in HTML subsumes the <img> element. >>> 11/30/04: see Actions 051, 055 above.

<END>

Seraphim Larsen ICG Technical Publications
Technical Writer Intel Corporation
(480) 552-6504 Chandler, AZ

The content of this message is my personal opinion only.
Although I am an employee of Intel, the statements I make
here in no way represent Intel's position on the issue, nor am I authorized to speak on behalf of Intel on this matter.
Subject: MEETING MINUTES -- 25 Jan 2005 -- DITA TECHNICAL COMMITTEE

- From: "Larsen, Seraphim L" <seraphim.l.larsen@intel.com>
- To: <dita@lists.oasis-open.org>
- Date: Tue, 25 Jan 2005 10:16:25 -0700

MEETING MINUTES -- 25 Jan 2005 -- DITA TECHNICAL COMMITTEE
*** Please see Action Items and Decision Summary at the end ***

** Agenda **
-------------

1. Review/approve minutes from 18 January
   - (note Stanley Doherty attendance for 18 Jan.)
2. Disposition of remaining Action Items
3. List items:
   - Namespace recommendation from the subgroup
   - Public identifiers and catalogs
4. Specification status

** Minutes **
-------------

1. Roll call
   - We do have quorum today. See separate email from Don for attendance.
   - Special guest -- Don's kitty cat. MEOW. :)
2. Review/approve minutes from 18 January
   - Don noted that Stanley Doherty did attend 18 Jan 2005
   - Minutes approved by acclamation.
3. Disposition of remaining Action Items
   - We went through all these and closed many of them, and highlighted the ones that are gating the 1.0 release.
4. List items:
   - Namespace recommendation from the subgroup
     - Proposal -- Add a namespace to the DITA arch version
attribute, which appears on the root structural elements (topic, concept, task, and reference) in both the DTDs and schemas.
- No discussion
- Approved by acclamation.

- Public identifiers and catalogs
  - Proposal -- We will not do anything to disallow catalogs. The catalogs represent the formal documentation of the public identifiers. The catalog will be part of the specification, along with the DTDs and schemas.
  - Some questions were asked for clarification, but no changes made.
  - Approved by acclamation.

- Final resolution on mapref
  - Proposal -- Change to the language reference -- the description of the topic-ref format attribute will document ditamap as a value.
  - Approved by acclamation.

5. Specification status
- New version coming out tonight or tomorrow morning -- vote next meeting.
- Michael Priestley noted that it would be good to vote on the "whole package" -- the spec together with the DTDs and schemas. Don will ask Deborah Lapeyre to see if this will be possible.

** Summary of Decisions **
--------------------------
- Proposal -- Add a namespace to the DITA arch version attribute, which appears on the root structural elements (topic, concept, task, and reference) in both the DTDs and schemas. >>> Approved by acclamation.
- Proposal -- We will not do anything to disallow catalogs. The catalogs represent the formal documentation of the public identifiers. The catalog will be part of the specification, along with the DTDs and schemas. >>> Approved by acclamation.
- Proposal -- Change to the language reference -- the description of the topic-ref format attribute will document ditamap as a value. >>> Approved by acclamation.

** Action Required **
---------------------
NOTE: Action Items and Issues to be Resolved required for the 1.0 spec are marked with ">>>".

021 JoAnn Hackos, Michael Priestley -- Summarize the discussion of substitution and post to the TC list. Still pending as of 7/20/04. >>>11/30/04: Action: Michael Priestley to add note to conref that people may substitute conref targets at build time >>> 1/25/05 CLOSED.

022 Don, Michael -- Put together a "self-study" tutorial/demo, as per JoAnn's comments regarding the DITA sessions. Still pending as of 7/20/04.

040 Don -- Cull the past minutes and discussion list to create an inventory of all the things we need to close on in order to create the 1.0 spec. Create a list of these items and post it in the Documents area of the website. >>> 1/25/05 CLOSED.

051 055 Don Day, 9/7/04 -- Take the discussion of @scale attribute and related issues to the list (presentation mechanisms). (merge with next...) >>> 1/25/05 -- Don will update the language reference to include this discussion.

061 Don Day, 10/05/04 -- Reply to image align and tm notes in dita-users. >>> Agenda item for 11/9/04. <<11/30/04: image align issue is a doc mistake, corrected in the
"dita132" toolkit version of Language Reference source. >>>
1/25/05 CLOSED.

062 Eric Sirois, 10/05/04 -- provide XSLT validation for
specialized schemas once developed (Indi recommends Jarno to
work with him) >>> 1/25/05 -- this will be an ongoing
project; the 1.0 spec does not depend on this.

063 All, 11/02/04, 11/09/04 -- Provide comments to Michael
Priestley on the draft -- provide comments to Michael ASAP.
Michael Priestley to incorporate comments into draft
specification; prepare new iteration for 11/16 meeting. >>>
11/30/04 in progress >>> 1/25/05 -- CLOSED. Michael got
comments back and incorporated them, but cannot take any
more comments. There are a few more items to incorporate,
and then "It's done" and ready for a vote.

068 Nancy Harrison to send summary of DocBook table
accessibility additions to TC list. >>> 1/25/05 -- CLOSED.

069 Don will provide a list of each of the modules that have
a revised pi. >>> 1/25/05 -- Still open, it is in the
1/25/05 agenda.

070 Erik please put together proposal for Ns for dtds and
modules (if necessary) for Michael. >>> 1/25/05 -- This is
also in the 1/25/05 agenda.

071 Otherprops: The section on conditional processing does not
give best practices for using this att. Specific additional
syntax. As C. Wong raised on the list: we don't have a std
to extattrs attributes. But we don't have specific syntax if we
add more than 1 attribute in there. Need for 1.0 or later?
Put this on the list for discussion. >>> 1/25/05 CLOSED.

072 All: take a look at the limit of spec topic. It's all new
content and in need of review. >>> 1/25/05 CLOSED. No
time for any more comments.

073 EH to bring the namesapce discussion offline. Others to
include in discussion: Paul, Elliott, Bruce, Michael P., Eric
Sirois. >>> In progress, as of 1/18/05. >>> This is in the
1/25/05 agenda, and it's also the same as action item 070.
Duplicate CLOSED 1/25/05.

074 Everyone bring comments to Michael on what we already have.
>>> In progress, as of 1/18/05. This is a duplicate of item
076, so it should be deleted. CLOSED 1/25/05.

075 Don, 1/18/05 -- Contact Mary Macrae to get the proper OASIS
string to put into public identifiers. >>> 1/25/05 in
progress. The 1.0 draft does depend on this!

076 All, 1/18/05 -- Review 1.0 draft of the spec and submit
comments to Michael Priestley by 1/21/05. >>> In progress
as of 1/25/05. >>> CLOSED as of 1/25/05.

077 Don, 1/25/05 -- Ask Deborah Lapeyre if the DTDs and Schemas
will be ready for voting next week.

** Issues to be Resolved **
----------------------------
NOTE: Action Items and Issues to be Resolved required for the 1.0
spec are marked with ">>>".

006 All -- Should DITA specialization mechanism be documented in
a separate specification in order to make it easier to use
in other XML applications that otherwise have no
relationship to topic-based writing? >>> Ongoing. >>>
11/30/04: - add to spec issues list

009 "Best Practices" document -- Let's put this on the agenda
for future discussion.

010 Relationship between DITA and other topic-based
architectures (such as S1000D) -- Need to incorporate this
into the "Best Practices" document.
All -- Revisit use of @scale on image (general treatment of graphics, ie raster vs vector assumptions, etc.). Compare/contrast with controls for the <object> element, which in HTML subsumes the <img> element. >>> 11/30/04: see Actions 051, 055 above. CLOSED, 1/25/05.
Subject: MEETING MINUTES -- 01 Feb 2005 -- DITA TECHNICAL COMMITTEE

From: "Larsen, Seraphim L" <seraphim.l.larsen@intel.com>
To: <dita@lists.oasis-open.org>
Date: Tue, 1 Feb 2005 14:42:48 -0700

Meeting Minutes -- 01 Feb 2005 -- Dita Technical Committee

** Agenda **

1. Roll call

2. Review/approve minutes from 25 January

3. Status of remaining contingent items:
   - 051 Update Lang Ref for @scale
   - 069 List of modules that have a revised PI (covered last week?)
   - 070 Namespace names for DTDs and agendas (covered last week?)
   - 075 Contact McRae for OASIS string for PIs
   - 077 Prepare DTDs and Schemas (format)

4. Review the TC Specification process:
   - http://www.oasis-open.org/committees/process.php#standards_approval
   - Committee Draft (open period--over when we are ready)
     - signals close of a development cycle
     - 2/3s of TC voting, no more than 1/4 disapproval
     - Inform OASIS Administration
     - can be several review/ballot cycles (conformance to OASIS templates, integration of parts)
   - Public Review (1 month total time to exit)
     - initiate by majority vote of the TC
     - announce to members list, other public lists; 30 days
     - review again if substantive changes; re-approve as CD before submission to OASIS
   - Member Approval (1 month total time to exit)
     - prepare checklist, transmittal materials
     - in by 15th of the month; decision to proceed by end of month
     - in Member review for 15 days; in vote for next 15 days
     - becomes immediate standard if at least 15% pro votes, no nay votes (other qualifications)

   "Committee Specification" was part of old OASIS process--signal of readiness for use
5. Assessment: readiness for Committee Draft
   - Core Specification status
   - DTD/Schema status
   - Language Reference

6. If in consent to do so, do the first CD vote.

7. AOB?

** Minutes **

1. Roll call
   - We have 13/20 --> QUORUM

2. Review/approve minutes from 25 January
     - Minutes approved by acclamation.

3. Status of remaining contingent items:
   - 051 Update Lang Ref for @scale
     - DONE.
     - Don added a paragraph to the attribute description for @scale in the language reference.
   - 069 List of modules that have a revised PI (covered last week?)
     - CLOSED.
   - 070 Namespace names for DTDs and agendas (covered last week?)
     - Pending -- Don and Eric Sirois will apply the committee's decision to the Schemas and DTD
   - 075 Contact McRae for OASIS string for PIs
     - Pending
   - 077 Prepare DTDs and Schemas (format)
     - Lots of discussion about whether to use verbose comments within the DTDs/Schemas, or to pull it out and keep it in one place (language reference).
     - It was decided to take the discussion offline to the mailing list.
     - Action Required for Deborah Lapeyre -- Apply the consensus decision to the next round of edited DTDs

4. Review the TC Specification process:
   - http://www.oasis-open.org/committees/process.php#standards_approval
     - Discussion -- Can we have this ready for voting on next week?

5. Assessment: readiness for Committee Draft
   - No time -- will continue here next meeting

6. If in consent to do so, do the first CD vote.
   - No time -- will continue here next meeting

7. AOB?
   - No time for this

** Summary of Decisions **

--------------------------
- None

** Action Required **

---------------------
*** NOTE: Action Items and Issues to be Resolved required for the 1.0 spec are marked with ">>>".

022 Don, Michael -- Put together a "self-study" tutorial/demo, as per JoAnn's comments regarding the DITA sessions. Still pending as of 7/20/04.

051 055 Don Day, 9/7/04 -- Take the discussion of @scale attribute and related issues to the list (presentation mechanisms). (merge with next...) >>> 1/25/05 -- Don will update the language reference to include this discussion.
062 Eric Sirois, 10/05/04 -- provide XSLT validation for
specialized schemas once developed (Indi recommends Jarno
to work with him) >>> 1/25/05 -- this will be an ongoing
project; the 1.0 spec does not depend on this.

>>> 069 Don will provide a list of each of the modules that have
a revised pi. >>> 1/25/05 -- Still open, it is in the
1/25/05 agenda. >>> 2/1/05 -- CLOSED.

>>> 070 Erik please put together proposal for No for dtds and
modules (if necessary) for Michael. >>> 1/25/05 -- This is
also in the 1/25/05 agenda. >>> 2/1/05 -- Don added
a paragraph to the attribute description for @scale in the
language reference.

>>> 075 Don, 1/18/05 -- Contact Mary Macrae to get the proper OASIS
string to put into public identifiers. >>> 1/25/05 in
progress. The 1.0 draft does depend on this! >>> 2/1/05
-- Still pending.

>>> 077 Don, 1/25/05 -- Ask Deborah Lapeyre if the DTDs and Schemas
will be ready for voting next week.

NEW 078 Deborah Lapeyre, 2/1/05 -- Take discussion of DTD comments
to the list, and apply the consensus decision to the next
round of edited DTDs.

079 (placeholder for next)

** Issues to be Resolved **
---------------------------
*** NOTE: Action Items and Issues to be Resolved required for the
1.0 spec are marked with ">>>".

>>> 006 All -- Should DITA specialization mechanism be documented in
a separate specification in order to make it easier to use
in other XML applications that otherwise have no
relationship to topic-based writing? >>> Ongoing. >>>
11/30/04: - add to spec issues list

009 "Best Practices" document -- Let's put this on the agenda
for future discussion.

010 Relationship between DITA and other topic-based
architectures (such as S1000D) -- Need to incorporate this
into the "Best Practices" document.

012 (placeholder for next)
Subject: MEETING MINUTES -- 08 Feb 2005 -- DITA TECHNICAL COMMITTEE

- From: "Larsen, Seraphim L" <seraphim.l.larsen@intel.com>
- To: <dita@lists.oasis-open.org>
- Date: Tue, 8 Feb 2005 18:05:19 -0700

MEETING MINUTES -- 08 Feb 2005 -- DITA TECHNICAL COMMITTEE
*** Please see Action Items and Decision Summary at the end ***

** Agenda **
---
1. Roll call
2. Review/approve minutes from 01 February
3. Assessment: readiness for Committee Draft
   - Core Specification status
   - DTD/Schema status
   - Language Reference
4. If in consent to do so, do the first CD vote.
5. If in consent to do so, approve the CD for public review.
6. AOB?

** Minutes **
---
1. Roll call
   - 12/19 -> QUORUM
2. Review/approve minutes from 01 February
   - Minutes approved by acclamation
3. Assessment: readiness for Committee Draft (CD)
   - Core Specification status
   - DTD/Schema status
   - Language Reference
   - There were several questions / contingent issues --
     - Can we vote on these drafts in the form they are currently in? Is this the final form? Are there formatting issues that need to be fixed?
     - There are some comments in certain places that don't seem appropriate. We will vote on the drafts
- Will there be a .chm version of the files?

4. If in consent to do so, do the first CD vote.
- VOTE RESULTS -- We have approval by 13 of 19 -- unanimous. WE HAVE A COMMITTEE DRAFT! However, note the contingencies listed above.

5. If in consent to do so, approve the CD for public review.
- We plan to provide the following versions --
  - HTML Web
  - HTML Help
  - PDF
- It was moved and seconded to approve for public review, with the source corrections as requested.
- VOTE RESULTS -- We have approval by 13 of 19 -- unanimous, with the source corrections as requested.

6. AOB?
- How do we manage incoming comments resulting from the public review?
  - Someone needs to figure out how the public can submit comments. AR for Don to ask Mary Macrae about all these things.
  - It would be best if every input we get must receive a response and be tracked. Thus we need a single focal point for receiving comments.
  - Recommendation -- All comments to be forwarded to the TC Comments list, and also to be CC'd to Michael Priestley.

- Let's take a vacation next week. :)  
  - Any questions/issues, use the TC list.

** Summary of Decisions **
--------------------------
- We approved the committee draft (CD).
- We approved the CD for public review.
- We will take a vacation and not meet on 2/15.

** Action Required **
---------------------
*** NOTE: Action Items and Issues to be Resolved required for the 1.0 spec are marked with ">>>".  

022 Don, Michael -- Put together a "self-study" tutorial/demo, as per JoAnn's comments regarding the DITA sessions. Still pending as of 7/20/04.

062 Eric Sirois, 10/05/04 -- provide XSLT validation for specialized schemas once developed (Indi recommends Jarno to work with him) >>> 1/25/05 -- this will be an ongoing project; the 1.0 spec does not depend on this.

>>> 070 Erik please put together proposal for Ns for dtds and modules (if necessary) for Michael. >>> 1/25/05 -- This is also in the 1/25/05 agenda. >>> 2/1/05 -- Don added a paragraph to the attribute description for @scale in the language reference. >>> 2/8/05 -- CLOSED.

>>> 075 Don, 1/18/05 -- Contact Mary Macrae to get the proper OASIS string to put into public identifiers. >>> 1/25/05 in progress. The 1.0 draft does depend on this! >>> 2/1/05 -- Still pending. >>> 2/8/05 -- CLOSED.

>>> 077 Don, 1/25/05 -- Ask Deborah Lapeyre if the DTDs and Schemas will be ready for voting next week. >>> 2/8/05 -- CLOSED.

078 Deborah Lapeyre, 2/1/05 -- Take discussion of DTD comments to the list, and apply the consensus decision to the next round of edited DTDs. >>> 2/8/05 -- CLOSED.

>>> 079 Don Day, 2/8/05 -- Ask Mary Macrae about several issues --
  - How can the public submit comments on the CD? Can we get a mailing list set up? etc.
  - What are the constraints for the final format of the
CD?

>>> 080 All, 2/8/05 -- Remove comments from the CD.

>>> 081 All, 2/8/05 -- Will there be a .chm version of the CD files?

082 placeholder for next

** Issues to be Resolved **
---------------------------
*** NOTE: Action Items and Issues to be Resolved required for the 1.0 spec are marked with ">>>".

006 All -- Should DITA specialization mechanism be documented in a separate specification in order to make it easier to use in other XML applications that otherwise have no relationship to topic-based writing? >>> Ongoing. >>> 11/30/04: - add to spec issues list >>> CLOSED 2/8/05

009 "Best Practices" document -- Let's put this on the agenda for future discussion.

010 Relationship between DITA and other topic-based architectures (such as S1000D) -- Need to incorporate this into the "Best Practices" document.

>>> 012 All, 2/8/05 -- Decide how to manage incoming comments resulting from the Public Review of the Committee Draft.

013 placeholder for next

<END>
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Subject: Minutes March 8, 2005 regular meeting

- From: Don Day <dond@us.ibm.com>
- To: "DITA TC list " <dita@lists.oasis-open.org>
- Date: Mon, 14 Mar 2005 14:16:25 -0600

Major discussion points and decisions.

AGENDA:
0. Minute-taker volunteer
   Bruce Esrig
1. Roll call (introduce new prospectives)
2. Review/approve minutes from 8 February
   [link]
   Approved by consensus.
3. Review comments thus far:
   (Note new Language spec version with context links)
   - Language reference (audience: architectural and tool implementers).
   - Attribute list for specialized elements. Redundant. Will provide links in HTML/PDF.
   - Example for a whole tree of elements. Redundant. Will provide links in HTML/PDF.
   - Examples. Present source before output.
   - Attribute definition. Sometimes redundant. When common, link to the common definition, even if the dtd/schema files don't have a special name for the common definition.
   - Ancestry map. Will try to generate per element from class attribute default values for now.
   - Fragments. Maps and topics are stored separately. Conref enables incorporation of the contents of an element from within another context (map or topic).

Architecture specification.
- Get comments to Michael in the next day or two. Fresh readers welcome.
4. File naming recommendation for DTD/Schemas
   File name changes not required by OASIS.
   Will rename to eliminate underscores.
   Concrete proposal will be created on the list.
5. 1.1 requirements
Define a process
(need volunteer to find mentions of "post 1.0" deferred items in minutes)
(rank by priority and difficulty) solid things for 1.1; medium effort
design
work candidates for 1.2; big items for 2.0
Mary McRae: how to move committee draft into member review.
Need TC meeting on 3/15, responses to comments, 3 attestations of use, IPR
policy.
Posted 1st of the month, ballots open on the 16th of the month.
TC looks at any no votes and decides whether to return to committee draft.


7. AOB?
Invitation to dinner at CIDM Content Management Strategies conference
Tuesday evening 12 April 2004.
To be followed by open Q&A.

Next:
- Michael Priestly will update drafts, take inputs.
- Next Tuesday, we'll have a draft as finished as can be for reviews as of
  that date.
Subject: Minutes March 15, 2005 regular meeting

- From: Don Day <dond@us.ibm.com>
- To: "DITA TC list " <dita@lists.oasis-open.org>
- Date: Tue, 15 Mar 2005 18:50:55 -0600

AGENDA:

0. Minute-taker volunteer
   Wendy Shepperd

1. Roll call
   --14 present out of 20 members
   Members: Bruce Esrig, Chris Kravogel, Christopher Wong, Dave Schell,
   Eliot Kimber, Indi Liepa, Michael Priestley, Paul Grosso, Paul Antonov, Rob
   Frankland, Robin Cover, Stanley Doherty, Wendy Shepperd, France Baril.
   Chair: Don Day
   Observers: David Brainard, John Hunt, Nancy Harrison
   Prospective: Dana Spradley, JoAnn Hackos, Kevin Schaum (now new member),
   Paul Prescod

2. Review/approve minutes from 8 March
   -- [The Chair missed this item; to do next week.]

3a. Keyword Discussion
   -- getting close. Lots of good discussion on the message board.
   Summary from Michael(editor)
   -- Keyword in DITA is allowed in the <keywords> element leads to conclusion
   that <keywords> in prologue is a list of keywords available elsewhere.
   <Keyword> as a general element is actually general, but <keywords> in the
   prologue is very specific. There was lots of discussion on the TC list
   about this difference.

   There were 2 Proposals, one from Bruce Esrig and one from Michael Priestly
   and Paul Prescott.

   Michael reviewed his proposal: (from Michael's email sent on March 15):
   For comparison/voting, here's what's in the draft of the spec I'm about to
   upload:

   <keyword> represents a word or phrase with special significance in a
   particular domain. In the general case, <keyword> elements typically do not
   have any special semantics and processing associated with them, but can
   still be useful for organizing content for reuse or special processing.
   <keyword> specializations are more meaningful and are therefore preferable.
   <keyword> in the <keywords> element distinguishes a word or phrase that
   describes the content of a topic (a topic description keyword). Topic
   description keywords are typically used for searching, retrieval and
Specialized elements derived from `<keyword>` may also have extended processing, such as different formatting or automatic indexing. If the `keyref` attribute is used, or some other method of key-based lookup based on the value of the element itself, then the keyword can be turned into a hyperlink on output (not currently supported).

When DITA topics are output to XHTML, any `<keyword>` elements in the `<keywords>` element are placed in the Web page metadata.

DISCUSSION:

-- compare difference b/w Bruce's and Michael's definitions. Discussed 2 differences.
--Bruce supports the wording that Michael proposed
--Paul supports the wording that Michael proposed

TC has general consensus. There are no objections voiced from the committee.

Michael's proposed definition is accepted.

3b. Attestations

Last week, Don asked for attestations: a simple one-sentence: We've tested the 1.0 DITA DTDs, and we assert that we are applying these in the scope of the latest IPR policy.

Don received two replies. He asked the TC if any other people can provide an attestation. He asked Indi Liepa if she would be interested. She does not have a response at this time, but she will take a look. He also asked Wendy Shepperd from BMC. Wendy responded that BMC is still in the pilot/prototype stage of implementation.

Robin Cover clarified that a member just needs to provide a certification declaring that their entity represented is successfully using the DITA 1.0 specification consistent with the OASIS IPR policy. Robin clarified where to find the latest IPR. There is a new TC process document underway, but for attestations, we will use the current definition.

ACTION: Robin Cover provide an update to the list clarifying the requirements of an attestation.

ACTION: Don will provide an updated URL for the IPR policy link. Completed. Wendy will check with her team and get back with Don. Paul Grosso offered to provide an attestation. Paul Antanoff offered to provide an attestation.

4. Review latest output; remaining comments/dispositions

Michael made most suggested changes to the spec accept for the following 2 usability change requests:

-- Did not include (reiterate the attribute list of every element when it's the same as the attribute that it is specialized from). For example, `<wintitle>` has the same attributes as `<keyword>`. It would be nice not to repeat the attribute list. Michaels was not able to get these changes in, so, in the current spec, each element has a complete attribute list.
-- In the example tagging for elements, sometimes the current element being discussed in the example is bold and sometimes it isn't. Michael wasn't able to fix all of these, so there is still some inconsistency.

Michael asserts that he made all technical changes and most usability changes except the ones noted above.

ACTION: Michael, upload the specification draft.

The TC members present at the meeting downloaded the latest zip. Michael explained that the spec includes 2 PDF files, a set of DTDs (in a zip file), and a set of schemas (in a zip file).

Paul Grosso asked whether the spec will be provided in HTML format.

Don asked if we can have a single format that is the formal submission, and provide alternate formats that are not the "formal" spec. The committee is voting on the PDF version today.
Robin agreed that a linkable HTML is more usable, but the TC will probably not require more than a PDF. Paul said we discussed as a TC months ago that we would provide non-proprietary formats such as HTML. He would prefer that we have a web-friendly format available, such as HTML.

ACTION: Michael, provide the HTML format as part of the spec.

5. Vote to accept revised materials as a ready-to-transmit Committee Draft.

2 options: Put forth a committee draft two. Today, we are looking at committee draft one that includes all comments and suggestions. Now, we can approve this version as committee draft two. Then, we can submit the spec to OASIS for acceptance.

Question from Bruce about the copyrights: OASIS 2005 and previous IBM copyrights. Michael said that the spec must keep a copyright history. So, the OASIS 2005 copyright supersedes the previous IBM copyrights, but he previous IBM copyrights are preserved based on content submitted in previous years.

Roll call ballot vote:
1. Do we accept the zip file as provided by Michael Priestly with the current updates that we accept the content as what we support as committee draft 2?

Total count: unanimous approval from the 14 members present and the chair (14 of 20 Members, pass by just over 2/3s Members)

ACTION: Need to submit the committee draft 2 to the OASIS committee for approval. The submission will produce the HTML version of the documentation.

6. Vote to transmit the CD to OASIS.
The next vote is to submit the current spec to OASIS for standardization.

Roll call ballot vote:
Total count: unanimous approval from the 14 members present and the chair (14 of 20 Members, pass by simple majority)

7. AOB?

DECISIONS MADE:
-- Keywords issue: Michael's proposed definition is accepted.

ACTIONS:
-- Need to submit the committee draft 2 to the OASIS administration for approval.

-- Robin Cover provide an update to the list clarifying the requirements of an attestation. Completed.

-- Don will provide an updated URL for the IPR policy link. Completed.
Wendy will check with her team and get back with Don. Paul Grosso offered to provide an attestation. Paul Antonov offered to provide an attestation. All Completed.

-- Michael, upload the specification draft. Completed.

-- Michael, provide the HTML format as part of the spec. (to be done after the submission)

Regards,

Don Day <dond@us.ibm.com>
Chair, OASIS DITA Technical Committee
IBM Lead DITA Architect
11501 Burnet Rd., MS 9037D018, Austin TX 78758
Ph. 512-838-8550   (T/L 678-8550)

"Where is the wisdom we have lost in knowledge? Where is the knowledge we have lost in information?"
Minutes March 22nd, 2005 regular meeting (thanks to Chris Wong!)

0. Minute-taker volunteer
Chris Wong was volunteered

1. Roll call
Members: France Baril, Stanley Doherty, Rob Frankland, Paul Grosso, Eliot Kimber, Chris Kravogel, Indi Liepa, Dave Schell, Kevin Shaum, Wendy Shepperd, Sharon Veach, Chris Wong, Don Day (13/23: quorum met; 16 needed for 2/3rds majority on polls)
Prospective: Paul Prescott, Dana Spradley (both now Voting Members at end of call), Kirsten Nothstine (1 of 3)
Observers: Mary McRae, David Brainard, Erik Hennum, Nancy Harrison, Eric Sirois

Mary McRae pointed out that because the last meeting was held half a day before the public review period ended, the vote to approve the second DITA 1.0 committee draft for member review was technically nonbinding. This meeting lacked the 2/3 quorum needed to re-approve the draft.

2. Review/approve minutes
March 8 minutes approval: Wendy Shepperd motioned, Sharon Veach seconded.
March 15 minutes approval: France Baril motioned, David Schell seconded.

3. Assessment:
- Any change of duties at this time?

Michael Priestley will remain as editor.
Seraphim Larsen will remain as minute taker. Paul Prescott volunteered to be the alternate minute taker.

Eliot Kimber will remain as parliamentarian.
France Baril volunteered to be the secretary.

- Note OASIS cleaning of rosters as new IPR policy adoption nears

Membership rosters will need to be updated for the new OASIS IPR transition, to better reflect members' obligations and restrictions under the new policy. The TC's transition to the new IPR will not take place until at least 50% of members have signed the new Membership Agreement, and the TC votes to transition. The TC will have 2 years to...
make the transition. Member companies' voting representatives will need to be briefed on the new IPR policy.

4. Requirements gathering:

Don Day: requirements are mostly already written in some form in the past. The task is to determine the appropriate scope and backwards compatibility of the releases. DITA 2.0 will be the first opportunity to introduce incompatible design changes. Pre 2.0 versions such as 1.1 will have bug fixes and forward-compatible design changes.

Members had no objections to Don's starting point for discussion.

Paul G. would like us to keep all requirements, including those that we decide to leave out of 1.1.

We need a recorder who would collect requirements and comments for TC review. Chris Kravogel had volunteered for the role before, and confirmed his willingness to take on the job. We can now regard this duty as formally assigned to him.

Paul Frankland requested that the requirements be made available for public review.

Schedule:
- first version of 1.1 requirements for TC review by next week
- public review by April 5th
- requirements complete by April 19th.

Process and schedule approved by consensus.

Chris Kravogel requested that external input (such as the dita-users Yahoo group) be emailed to him within a week by interested TC members.

[post-meeting follow-up from Chris K:
As suggested on the TC meeting, may I ask to add the following e-mail address to the minutes for direct postings for post 1.0 issues:
dita@seicodyne.com
Any hint or requirement sent is welcome.]

Don Day: the public announcement of the 1.1 requirements document can recommend using the TC website comments field to submit feedback.

5. Conference reminders and AOB

JoAnn Hackos reminded members to RSVP on the Annapolis conference dinner.

Since we lacked quorum, we will use a web-based ballot (Kavi). There will be 2 ballots:

1. To approve the committee draft (requires 2/3 vote)
2. To submit the committee draft to OASIS (requires simple majority vote).

[post-meeting follow-up: these ballots have been sent out; please vote as soon as possible!]

Regards,
--
Don Day <dond@us.ibm.com>
Chair, OASIS DITA Technical Committee
IBM Lead DITA Architect
11501 Burnet Rd., MS 9037D018, Austin TX 78758
Ph. 512-838-8550   (T/L 678-8550)
"Where is the wisdom we have lost in knowledge? Where is the knowledge we have lost in information?"
--T.S. Eliot

---

Follow-Ups:
- Re: [dita] Minutes March 22, 2005 regular meeting
  - From: Don Day <dond@us.ibm.com>
Subject: MEETING MINUTES -- 29 Mar 2005 -- DITA TECHNICAL COMMITTEE

- From: "Larsen, Seraphim L" <seraphim.l.larsen@intel.com>
- To: <dita@lists.oasis-open.org>
- Date: Tue, 29 Mar 2005 10:11:13 -0700

MEETING MINUTES -- 29 Mar 2005 -- DITA TECHNICAL COMMITTEE
*** Please see Action Items and Decision Summary at the end ***

** Agenda **
-------------
1. Roll call
2. Review/approve minutes from 22 March:
   - (note: on scope definition for pre 2.0 activities, would we not have meant "backwards-compatible design changes" rather than "forward-compatible?")
3. Requirements gathering:
   - Brainstorm: Input from our respective contacts
   - Input from the past minutes
4. AOB

** Minutes **
-------------
1. Roll call
   - We do have a quorum.
2. Review/approve minutes from 22 March:
   - CHANGES --
   - Instead of using the email address provided by Chris Kravogel for providing DITA comments. Instead of that, we should use the DITA Comments interface.
   - (note: on scope definition for pre 2.0 activities, would we not have meant "backwards-compatible design changes" rather than "forward-compatible?")
   - DITA 1.0 is a stable release, but we will be making changes in 2.0 that will not be backward compatible and will require transformation.
   - But the correction to the minutes pertains to pre-2.0 work. So yes, we should change it to "backwards-compatible". We want to make sure 1.x is backwards-compatible with the current DITA user base.
   - Minutes, as appended above, approved by acclamation.
3. New TC Role -- DTD and Schema Maintainer
- Michael Priestley suggested that we add this new role.
- Michael proposes that Robert Anderson be the DTD and
  Schema Maintainer. However, Robert is neither a Member
  nor an Observer. So, how do we do that?
  - Perhaps Michael (as Editor) could have the formal
    role, and delegate as needed?
  - Proposal -- Michael Priestley to be given the
    role of Editor and DTD/Schema Maintainer, as the
    single point of contact for these roles.
  - Proposal accepted by acclamation.
- Also, we need to ask JoAnn if she wants to continue
  in her role as co-editor with Michael Priestley.

4. Requirements gathering:
- Brainstorm: Input from our respective contacts
  - See Eliot's email --
  - Input from the past minutes
  - See Chris Kravogel's list at
  - Comments: The "Keyword" issue (item 1 on Chris'
    email) should be expanded to (a) Semantics and (b) Nesting.
  - Chris should also add the rest of Michael's issues
    to the list of issues, which Michael emailed to the
    TC List.
  - What criteria do we use?
  - Don read a list of possible "triage" criteria,
    which he asked everyone to think about. We'll
    revisit this next week to come up with a final
    list.

5. AOB

** Summary of Decisions **
--------------------------
- Michael Priestley to be given the role of Editor and
  DTD/Schema Maintainer, as the single point of contact for
  these tasks.

** Action Required **
---------------------
022 Don, Michael -- Put together a "self-study" tutorial/demo,
  as per JoAnn's comments regarding the DITA sessions. Still
  pending as of 7/20/04.

062 Eric Sirois, 10/05/04 -- provide XSLT validation for
  specialized schemas once developed (Indi recommends Jarno to
  work with him) >>> 1/25/05 -- this will be an ongoing
  project; the 1.0 spec does not depend on this.

079 Don Day, 2/8/05 -- Ask Mary Macrae about several issues --
  - How can the public submit comments on the CD? Can we
    get a mailing list set up? etc.
  - What are the constraints for the final format of the
    CD?

080 All, 2/8/05 -- Remove comments from the CD.

081 All, 2/8/05 -- Will there be a .chm version of the CD files?

082 All, 3/8/05 -- Submit comments to Michael Priestley on the
  Architecture Specification.

085 Michael Priestley, 3/15/05 -- provide the HTML format as
  part of the spec (to be done after the submission).

086 Who?, 3/15/05 -- Need to submit the committee draft 2 to the
  OASIS administration for approval.

087 3/29/05 -- Ask JoAnn Hackos if she wants to continue
  in her role as co-editor with Michael Priestley.
Chris Kravogel, 3/29/05 -- Expand "Keyword" issue (on the Issues List) to (A) Semantics and (B) Nesting.

Chris Kravogel, 3/29/05 -- Add the rest of Michael's issues to the Issues List (which Michael sent by email to the TC List).

** Issues to be Resolved **
---------------------------

006 All -- Should DITA specialization mechanism be documented in a separate specification in order to make it easier to use in other XML applications that otherwise have no relationship to topic-based writing? >>> Ongoing. >>> 11/30/04: - add to spec issues list >>> CLOSED 2/8/05

009 "Best Practices" document -- Let's put this on the agenda for future discussion.

010 Relationship between DITA and other topic-based architectures (such as S1000D) -- Need to incorporate this into the "Best Practices" document.

012 All, 2/8/05 -- Decide how to manage incoming comments resulting from the Public Review of the Committee Draft.

013 Need volunteer to find mentions of "post 1.0" deferred items -- need to rank by priority and difficulty) solid things for 1.1; medium effort design work candidates for 1.2; big items for 2.0 in minutes (3/8/05).

014 (3/29/05) Need list of possible "triage" criteria for deciding how to prioritize new requirements. Don read a list of possible criteria at the 3/29/05 meeting. To be discussed and resolved at the next meeting.

015 (placeholder for next)
Subject: Minutes April 5, 2005 regular meeting

- From: Don Day <dond@us.ibm.com>
- To: "DITA TC list " <dita@lists.oasis-open.org>
- Date: Tue, 19 Apr 2005 00:57:38 -0500

Posted for Paul Prescod, minute taker for the meeting:

MEETING MINUTES -- 05 Apr 2005 -- DITA TECHNICAL COMMITTEE
*** Please see Action Items and Decision Summary at the end ***

Agenda:
1. Roll call
3. Review of "post 1.0" requirements gathering for public review.
4. More on "OASIS Website" thread?
5. More on "Marketing/Press relations" thread?
6. AOB

MINUTES
1. Roll call

Members: Robin Cover, Stanley Doherty, Bruce Esrig, Yas Etessam, Rob Frankland, Paul Grosso, JoAnn Hackos, Eliot Kimber, Indi Liepa, Paul Prescod, Michael Priestley, Kevin Shaum, Dana Spradley, Sharon Veach, Chris Wong, France Baril, Don Day (Chair)

Observers and visitors: Erik Hennum, Eric Sirois, Kirstine Nothstine (Member at end of this meeting)

We have quorum--17/26.

   * Items 88 and 89 are done by the chair.
   * No corrections on minutes
   * Minutes accepted as read: Proposed: Michael Priestley,
     Seconded
     Sharon Veach

3. Review of "post 1.0" requirements gathering for public review.
Anyone have trouble getting to this link? No problems reported.

We would like to get the issues document out for public review today.

Triage rules are in the document:
  * some are done
  * some are way too impactful
  * some are not backwards compatible

Bruce Esrig: *suggest new criteria: anything that cannot wait for 2.0 but is not backwards compatible may need to be done now*

Priestley: Design #6 is done (about otherprops syntax)

Design #13 done? (about CALS/Docbook coordination)

Day feels that there hasn’t been enough coordination and design consideration to be confident.

#11 (collection-type attributes) is listed as potentially done.

Day et Al. investigating: yes, it is done.

#12 class attribute syntax

Priestley: What does #12 class attribute syntax mean?

Grosso: as he recalls, issue was that class attribute syntax is finicky -- needs to end in space.

Priestley: class attribute is not part of the user's domain. Is that good enough?

Grosso is not happy with the usability issue but accepts the technical reasons

Consensus is to revisit in 2.0

Don proposes: Issues #1 and #2 (keyword handling) are clearly in scope

Priestley does not understand Design #4 -- need to get more info

Design #5 ANSI Warning Labels -- consensus to attack issue

Design #7 Reconciliation of metadata -- consensus that this is should be handled

Design #8 trademark allowing images -- consensus to tackle

Design #9 prototitle attribute -- consensus to tackle

Design #10 row-level metadata -- consensus to tackle as general consistency issue

Design #13 (CALS liason) -- move from design section to TC process

Design #14 -- About referring to sets of elements. Can look at for 1.1

New issue -- concref a substep into the content of the steps. France will give more detail.

Design #15 -- new domains
  -- Day could this wait?
  -- Eric: could a community do this?
  -- Day: let's treat this as a TC process issue

Design #16 -- glossary entries
  -- need a complete and well-vetted requirements
  -- there is a proposal on the DeveloperWorks issue
  -- Consensus is to keep for 1.1

Design #17 -- W3C standard addressing: two issues
  -- standards for addressing
  -- Xinclude has a mechanism for splitting addresses
  -- wait for 2.0 because of compatibility issues

Design #18 -- Namespace role names
  -- could not implement in 1.1 if we make the namespace required
  -- could implement it if we make it optional
  -- let's discuss it more in 1.1 context

Design #19 -- Clarify MIME versus format=
  -- disconnect between DITA and W3C practice
  -- proposal as a documentation issue

Design #20 -- Issues of use context for links
  -- maybe be partially implemented in 1.0
  -- should be considered further in 1.1
* Design #21 -- conref improvements from deep dive
  -- for example generalization on the fly
  -- keep for 1.1
  -- itemize for next version of link
* Design #22 -- move text attributes into elements for translation and reuse
  -- Keeper
* Design #23 -- add outputclass to linkinfo and linktext
  -- consistency issue
  -- should be considered for 1.1
* Design #24 -- move format and scope into related attributes
  -- remove note about backwards incompatibility
  -- basically a maintainability issue
  -- 1.1 change
* Design #25 -- consider making @role (and other enumerated atts) un-enumerated
  -- related to #5 and #18
  -- therefore keep
* Design #26 -- Rework of spec hierarchy
  -- Priestley proposes to wait
  -- Kimber concurs that it will take too long to work it out
  -- therefore wait for 2.0
* Design #27 -- Intro of new task type
  -- e.g. from Nokia
  -- Handle in 1.1
* Design #28
  -- Indexing
  -- Indextermref

Will pick up here next week.

4. More on "OASIS Website" thread?
   No time to address.

5. More on "Marketing/Press relations" thread?
   No time to address.

6. AOB
   None.

Decisions:

All decisions were made by consensus and are recorded in the discussion of 1.1.

Regards,
--
Don Day <dond@us.ibm.com>
Chair, OASIS DITA Technical Committee
IBM Lead DITA Architect
11501 Burnet Rd., MS 9037D018, Austin TX 78758
Ph. 512-838-8550   (T/L 678-8550)

"Where is the wisdom we have lost in knowledge?
Where is the knowledge we have lost in information?"
   --T.S. Eliot
Subject: MEETING MINUTES -- 19 Apr 2005 -- DITA TECHNICAL COMMITTEE

- From: "Larsen, Seraphim L" <seraphim.l.larsen@intel.com>
- To: <dita@lists.oasis-open.org>
- Date: Tue, 19 Apr 2005 09:12:09 -0700

MEETING MINUTES -- 19 Apr 2005 -- DITA TECHNICAL COMMITTEE

*** Please see Action Items and Decision Summary at the end ***

** Agenda **
--------------
Main things for today:
- TC administrivia
- Resume review of "post 1.0" requirements for public review.

1. Roll call

2. Review/approve minutes from 5 April (no meeting 12 April):

3. Discuss different meeting day/time for next phase

4. CD in ballot for your organization's primary representative:

3. Resume review of "post 1.0" requirements for public review.

6. More on "OASIS Website" thread?

7. More on "Marketing/Press relations" thread?

8. AOB

** Minutes **
--------------
Main things for today:
- Resume review of "post 1.0" requirements for public review.

1. Roll call
   - We do have quorum!

2. Review/approve minutes from 5 April (no meeting 12 April):
   - Minutes approved by acclamation.

3. Discuss different meeting day/time for next phase
   - Decision: No change
4. CD in ballot for your organization's primary representative:

- Find the rep for your group in the list of voting members referenced in the URL above. It's important to get that person to register a vote for DITA.
- See this link --


- If you follow the ballot link, it will show you what votes have been cast so far. The link is copied here for convenience --


5. Resume review of "post 1.0" requirements for public review.

- URL:


- Continuing with number 29
- Issue 29 -- Extensible metadata attributes
  - Identical to item 47
  - Full solution is probably a 2.0 issue, since it may cause backwards-compatibility issues
  - But can we do something for 1.1?
    - Priestley -- yes we need to do something
    - Day -- shall we make a recommendation on how to create values?
    - Priestley -- no, that's already in the 1.0 spec. There is a real need to add new attributes. That doesn't mean we should add the ability to add *any* metadata, because that would go outside of scope.
    - No disagreement -- we'll keep for 1.1.
- Issue 30 -- Formal "component" or "fragment" element specially designed as source content for CONREF.
  - I couldn't capture the discussion.
  - This is more a best-practice issue for content reuse. As such, yes we can include it in the scope for 1.1.
  - So, we'll keep it with a new name -- Best practice for content reuse.
- Issue 31 -- Side-by-side implementation of xml:id?
  - I couldn't capture the discussion.
  - Let's keep it on the list for 1.1 and keep discussing it.
- Issue 32 -- Should <refsyn> be moved to a domain, e.g. Programming or Software?
  - Erik Hennum -- Extensible addition of values with a semantic but particular processing instructions associated with it.
    - For example, metadata values
    - Or hybrid data-and-discourse documents, such as an insurance claim form
    - Priestley -- You sometimes want to keep the data there in the document, but hide it from the human-readable output.
    - Day -- 1.1 scope item? Or too ambitious and move to 2.0?
    - Priestley -- Shouldn't take much to implement. Will appear everywhere "keyword" exists. It's optional everywhere, so it will not have any backward-compatibility issues.
    - Day -- No other discussion, so we'll keep this for the 1.1 spec. Need more explanation though.
- Issue 33 -- DATA element
  - Erik Hennum -- Extensible addition of values with a semantic but particular processing instructions associated with it.
    - For example, metadata values
    - Or hybrid data-and-discourse documents, such as an insurance claim form
  - Priestley -- You sometimes want to keep the data there in the document, but hide it from the human-readable output.
  - Day -- 1.1 scope item? Or too ambitious and move to 2.0?
  - Priestley -- Shouldn't take much to implement. Will appear everywhere "keyword" exists. It's optional everywhere, so it will not have any backward-compatibility issues.
  - Day -- No other discussion, so we'll keep this for the 1.1 spec. Need more explanation though.
- Issue 34 -- Support for foreign content vocabularies such as MathML and SVG
  - Hennum -- This element gives us the ability to have inline objects. It's not appropriate, for example, to specialize <unknown> to include text-based content. The idea is to be able to
ignore the <unknown> element and use replacement text instead.
- Day -- Any reasons to exclude from 1.1?
- No reasons, so we'll keep for 1.1.
- Issue 35 -- Extensible metadata by expressing data in map structures
  - Seems to be in scope for 1.1, so we'll keep it for 1.1.
- Issue 36 -- Reconciling topic <link> and map <topicref> elements
  - Hennum -- This can create problems for specialization because you have to specialize for both sides.
  - Priestley -- Concerned that it might take a lot to support the transforms for this
  - Day -- Is it too much for 1.1?
  - Priestley -- Not sure
  - Day -- Move to post-1.1?
  - Hennum -- Creates specialization issues, but can live with it.
  - Keep for 1.1, but identify it as high-risk, maybe drop later -- possibly high risk, high cost (for the transform)
- Issue 37 -- bookmap / bkinfo revision
  - Keep for 1.1
- Issue 38 -- Policy-based style mechanism
  - Day -- probably too much to do this and 37 both in the 1.1 spec
  - Keep for 1.1
- Issue 39 -- Integration of domain elements with structural elements of the topic
  - Hennum -- No impact to existing content
  - Related to issue 46
  - Keep for 1.1 -- let's at least look at it for 1.1
  - We'll continue next week with Issue 40.
  - We need to finish this list by the end of the month!

6. More on "OASIS Website" thread?
   - Not covered -- no time

7. More on "Marketing/Press relations" thread?
   - Not covered -- no time

8. AOB
   - Not covered -- no time

** Summary of Decisions **
--------------------------
- Decided to keep the meeting at the same weekly timeslot.
- Decided on the 1.1 issues list -- Issues 29-39 -- see details in minutes, above.

** Action Required **
---------------------
022 Don, Michael -- Put together a "self-study" tutorial/demo, as per JoAnn's comments regarding the DITA sessions. Still pending as of 7/20/04.

062 Eric Sirois, 10/05/04 -- provide XSLT validation for specialized schemas once developed (Indi recommends Jarno to work with him) >>> 1/25/05 -- this will be an ongoing project; the 1.0 spec does not depend on this.

079 Don Day, 2/8/05 -- Ask Mary Macrae about several issues --
  - How can the public submit comments on the CD? Can we get a mailing list set up? etc.
  - What are the constraints for the final format of the CD?

080 All, 2/8/05 -- Remove comments from the CD.

081 All, 2/8/05 -- Will there be a .chm version of the CD files?

082 All, 3/8/05 -- Submit comments to Michael Priestley on the Architecture Specification.

085 Michael Priestley, 3/15/05 -- provide the HTML format as
part of the spec (to be done after the submission).

086 Who?, 3/15/05 -- Need to submit the committee draft 2 to the OASIS administration for approval.

087 3/29/05 -- Ask JoAnn Hackos if she wants to continue in her role as co-Editor with Michael Priestley.

088 Chris Kravogel, 3/29/05 -- Expand "Keyword" issue (on the Issues List) to (A) Semantics and (B) Nesting. CLOSED 4/5/05.

089 Chris Kravogel, 3/29/05 -- Add the rest of Michael's issues to the Issues List (which Michael sent by email to the TC List). CLOSED 4/5/05.

090 (placeholder)

** Issues to be Resolved **
---------------------------

009 "Best Practices" document -- Let's put this on the agenda for future discussion.

010 Relationship between DITA and other topic-based architectures (such as S1000D) -- Need to incorporate this into the "Best Practices" document.

012 All, 2/8/05 -- Decide how to manage incoming comments resulting from the Public Review of the Committee Draft.

013 Need volunteer to find mentions of "post 1.0" deferred items -- need to rank by priority and difficulty) solid things for 1.1; medium effort design work candidates for 1.2; big items for 2.0 in minutes (3/8/05).

014 (3/29/05) Need list of possible "triage" criteria for deciding how to prioritize new requirements. Don read a list of possible criteria at the 3/29/05 meeting. To be discussed and resolved at the next meeting.

015 (placeholder for next)

(END)
** Subject: MEETING MINUTES -- 26 Apr 2005

- From: "Paul Prescod" <paul.prescod@blastradius.com>
- To: <dita@lists.oasis-open.org>
- Date: Tue, 3 May 2005 01:00:06 -0700

---

** Agenda **
AGENDA:

1. Roll call
3. Finish review of "post 1.0" requirements for public review (start with item 40).
4. More on "OASIS Website" thread?
5. More on "Marketing/Press relations" thread?
6. AOB

** Minutes **
----------------
Main things for today:
- Finish review of "post 1.0" requirements for public review.

1. Roll call
   - We do have quorum!
2. Review/approve minutes from 19 April:
   - Minutes approved by acclamation.
3. Discuss different meeting day/time for next phase
   - Decision: No change
4. Resume review of "post 1.0" requirements for public review.
5. Resume review of "post 1.0" requirements for public review.

40: Keyref architecture: attempt for DITA 1.1.
41: shortdesc: sometimes the first paragraph is too complex forHoverhelp.
42: related to 41
  * Michael has a proposal and would like to address for DITA
1.1
43: semantic linking
  * semantic phrase level markup as hyperlinks
  * rename to implicit linking
  * thinks that the design is already done
  * creates incentive to use semantic tagging
  * independent of Eliot's issue of managing addressing
44: modularization of specification
  * optional versus required parts of the specifications
  * Treat this as a process question for now.
45: issues of context
  * potentially a best practice rather than a design
issue?
    * let's deal with it as a documentation issue until
proven otherwise
46: an exclusion facility would be helpful
  * related to issue 39 "Integration of domain elements
with structural elements of the topic"
  * also issues of "replacement" domains that replace
structure elements
  * may need to leave aside backwards-incompatible parts
of the problem
47: duplicate to issue 29
  * remove from list
48: related to bookmap
  * remove from list
New issue: Imagemap is in utilities domain: should it stay
there?
  * probably not a 1.1 issue because (garbled)
Process issues:
  * module registry and module standardization process
    * to be addressed soon -- Action for Don Day
  * language review of existing constructs for well-formed
definition and formal completeness
    * want to standardize application of features to
elements
      * Action for Bruce E: come up with a couple of
examples for an upcoming meeting
    * administrative choice of IPR mode:
      * when to do this
        * we have two years to do so -- defer
      * Review of recursiveness in DITA DTDs in specific cases
        * explanation of why recursive elements are
allowed
      * spec update for 1.1
    * Change history and annotations support in DITA:
      * Call this a design issue and add it to the
keepers for design list
Three more issues raised lately:
1. indextermref
2. substeps also used as steps elsewhere
3. structured sections
  * these will be added to the list by acclamation
Proposal:
  * two week review period
    * will allow people to add to the list
    * publish to "DITA Users" mailing list
    * accepted by acclamation

** Summary of Decisions **
----------------------------------
- Decided on process for external review
- Decided on the 1.1 issues list -- Issues 40 through end-- see
details
  in minutes, above.

** Action Required **
----------------------
022 Don, Michael -- Put together a "self-study" tutorial/demo,
as per JoAnn's comments regarding the DITA sessions. Still
pending as of 7/20/04.

062 Eric Sirois, 10/05/04 -- provide XSLT validation for
specialized schemas once developed (Indi recommends Jarno to work with him) >>> 1/25/05 -- this will be an ongoing project; the 1.0 spec does not depend on this.

079 Don Day, 2/8/05 -- Ask Mary Macrae about several issues --
- How can the public submit comments on the CD? Can we get a mailing list set up? etc.
- What are the constraints for the final format of the CD?

080 All, 2/8/05 -- Remove comments from the CD.

081 All, 2/8/05 -- Will there be a .chm version of the CD files?

082 All, 3/8/05 -- Submit comments to Michael Priestley on the Architecture Specification.

085 Michael Priestley, 3/15/05 -- provide the HTML format as part of the spec (to be done after the submission).

086 Who?, 3/15/05 -- Need to submit the committee draft 2 to the OASIS administration for approval.

087 3/29/05 -- Ask JoAnn Hackos if she wants to continue in her role as co-Editor with Michael Priestley.

090 4/26/05 -- Bruce Esrig to come up with examples of formal completeness issues
  *e.g. features applied to some elements but not all

091 (placeholder)

** Issues to be Resolved **
---------------------------
009 "Best Practices" document -- Let's put this on the agenda for future discussion.

010 Relationship between DITA and other topic-based architectures (such as S1000D) -- Need to incorporate this into the "Best Practices" document.

012 All, 2/8/05 -- Decide how to manage incoming comments resulting from the Public Review of the Committee Draft.

013 Need volunteer to find mentions of "post 1.0" deferred items -- need to rank by priority and difficulty) solid things for 1.1; medium effort design work candidates for 1.2; big items for 2.0 in minutes (3/8/05).

014 (3/29/05) Need list of possible "triage" criteria for deciding how to prioritize new requirements. Don read a list of possible criteria at the 3/29/05 meeting. To be discussed and resolved at the next meeting.

015 (4/26/05) Module registry and module standardization process

<END>
Subject: MEETING MINUTES -- 03 May 2005 -- DITA TECHNICAL COMMITTEE

- **From:** "Larsen, Seraphim L" <seraphim.l.larsen@intel.com>
- **To:** "DITA TC list " <dita@lists.oasis-open.org>
- **Date:** Tue, 3 May 2005 09:01:30 -0700

---

**Meeting Minutes -- 03 May 2005 -- DITA Technical Committee**

**Agenda**

- Vote on DITA 1.0 Spec Ballot --
  - Jamie Clark advised Don Day that because our TC is still grandfathered under the previous OASIS process document, we do not need to have the Special Majority Vote to resolve the negative votes. If we have a quick meeting today with quorum attendance, we can still resolve to accept the passage of DITA as a Spec by simple majority.

  - Here is the question on which we are voting --

    Do you approve accepting the specification as submitted and as passed by OASIS member ballot by the required margin?

**Minutes**

- We *do* have quorum (12 of 24).
  - Don Day has a list of attendees and will post to the list.

  - Again, here is the question on which we are voting --

    Do you approve accepting the specification as submitted and as passed by OASIS member ballot by the required margin?

  - The vote:
    - The vote was unanimously in favor (12 of 12), with no abstentions or opposed.
    - We have a spec!

- Additional business --
  - JoAnn Hackos raised the idea of creating an interoperability document where CMS vendors can include information about how their products conform to DITA.
  - Some vendors claim to have a better method than DITA maps, for handling reuse (for example), and thus do not want to conform to the DITA spec. This creates
interoperability issues with other companies who are using DITA but a different CMS.
- JoAnn will submit what they've written so far, and see what the TC thinks about it.
- Perhaps we should do a questionnaire to give to the CMS vendors, and post the results.
- The main issue is that we can get interoperability in the end. CMS vendors can handle things "under the hood" any way they like, as long as content conforming to DITA can be extracted somehow.

** Summary of Decisions **
-------------------------------
- We voted unanimously to approve the 1.0 specification.

** Action Required **
---------------------
022 Don, Michael -- Put together a "self-study" tutorial/demo, as per JoAnn's comments regarding the DITA sessions. Still pending as of 7/20/04.

062 Eric Sirois, 10/05/04 -- provide XSLT validation for specialized schemas once developed (Indi recommends Jarno to work with him) >>> 1/25/05 -- this will be an ongoing project; the 1.0 spec does not depend on this.

079 Don Day, 2/8/05 -- Ask Mary Macrae about several issues --
- How can the public submit comments on the CD? Can we get a mailing list set up? etc.
- What are the constraints for the final format of the CD?

080 All, 2/8/05 -- Remove comments from the CD.

081 All, 2/8/05 -- Will there be a .chm version of the CD files?

082 All, 3/8/05 -- Submit comments to Michael Priestley on the Architecture Specification.

085 Michael Priestley, 3/15/05 -- provide the HTML format as part of the spec (to be done after the submission).

086 Who?, 3/15/05 -- Need to submit the committee draft 2 to the OASIS administration for approval.

087 3/29/05 -- Ask JoAnn Hackos if she wants to continue in her role as co-Editor with Michael Priestley.

088 Chris Kravogel, 3/29/05 -- Expand "Keyword" issue (on the Issues List) to (A) Semantics and (B) Nesting. CLOSED 4/5/05.

089 Chris Kravogel, 3/29/05 -- Add the rest of Michael's issues to the Issues List (which Michael sent by email to the TC List). CLOSED 4/5/05.

090 Bruce Esrig, 4/26/05 -- Come up with examples of formal completeness issues -- e.g. features supplied to some elements but not all.

091 JoAnn Hackos, 5/3/05 -- CMS interoperability document / questionnaire <<< post to TC list.

092 (placeholder)

** Issues to be Resolved **
-----------------------------
009 "Best Practices" document -- Let's put this on the agenda for future discussion.

010 Relationship between DITA and other topic-based architectures (such as S1000D) -- Need to incorporate this into the "Best Practices" document.

012 All, 2/8/05 -- Decide how to manage incoming comments resulting from the Public Review of the Committee Draft.

013 Need volunteer to find mentions of "post 1.0" deferred items
-- need to rank by priority and difficulty) solid things for 1.1; medium effort design work candidates for 1.2; big items for 2.0 in minutes (3/8/05).

014 (3/29/05) Need list of possible "triage" criteria for deciding how to prioritize new requirements. Don read a list of possible criteria at the 3/29/05 meeting. To be discussed and resolved at the next meeting.

015 (4/26/05) Module registry and module standardization process.

016 (placeholder for next)

<END>
** Agenda **

- Vote on DITA 1.0 Spec Ballot --
  - Jamie Clark advised Don Day that because our TC is still grandfathered under the previous OASIS process document, we do not need to have the Special Majority Vote to resolve the negative votes. If we have a quick meeting today with quorum attendance, we can still resolve to accept the passage of DITA as a Spec by simple majority.

  - Here is the question on which we are voting --

    Do you approve accepting the specification as submitted and as passed by OASIS member ballot by the required margin?

** Minutes **

- We *do* have quorum (12 of 24).
  - Don Day has a list of attendees and will post to the list.

- Again, here is the question on which we are voting --

    Do you approve accepting the specification as submitted and as passed by OASIS member ballot by the required margin?

- The Vote:
  - The vote was unanimously in favor (12 of 12), with no abstentions or opposed.
  - We have a spec!

- Additional business --
  - JoAnn Hackos raised the idea of creating an interoperability document where CMS vendors can include information about how their products conform to DITA.
  - Some vendors claim to have a better method than DITA maps, for handling reuse (for example), and thus do not want to conform to the DITA spec. This creates interoperability issues with other companies who are using DITA but a different CMS.
  - JoAnn will submit what they've written so far, and see what the TC thinks about it.
  - Perhaps we should do a questionnaire to give to the CMS vendors, and post the results.
  - The main issue is that we can get interoperability in the end. CMS vendors can handle things "under the
hood" any way they like, as long as content conforming to DITA can be extracted somehow.

** Summary of Decisions **
--------------------------
- We voted unanimously to approve the 1.0 specification.

** Action Required **
---------------------
022 Don, Michael -- Put together a "self-study" tutorial/demo, as per JoAnn's comments regarding the DITA sessions. Still pending as of 7/20/04.

062 Eric Sirois, 10/05/04 -- provide XSLT validation for specialized schemas once developed (Indi recommends Jarno to work with him) >>> 1/25/05 -- this will be an ongoing project; the 1.0 spec does not depend on this.

079 Don Day, 2/8/05 -- Ask Mary Macrae about several issues --
- How can the public submit comments on the CD? Can we get a mailing list set up? etc.
- What are the constraints for the final format of the CD?

080 All, 2/8/05 -- Remove comments from the CD.

081 All, 2/8/05 -- Will there be a .chm version of the CD files?

082 All, 3/8/05 -- Submit comments to Michael Priestley on the Architecture Specification.

085 Michael Priestley, 3/15/05 -- provide the HTML format as part of the spec (to be done after the submission).

086 Who?, 3/15/05 -- Need to submit the committee draft 2 to the OASIS administration for approval.

087 3/29/05 -- Ask JoAnn Hackos if she wants to continue in her role as co-Editor with Michael Priestley.

088 Chris Kravogel, 3/29/05 -- Expand "Keyword" issue (on the Issues List) to (A) Semantics and (B) Nesting. CLOSED 4/5/05.

089 Chris Kravogel, 3/29/05 -- Add the rest of Michael's issues to the Issues List (which Michael sent by email to the TC List). CLOSED 4/5/05.

090 Bruce Esrig, 4/26/05 -- Come up with examples of formal completeness issues -- e.g. features applied to some elements but not all.
JoAnn Hackos, 5/3/05 -- CMS interoperability document / questionnaire <<< post to TC list.

(placeholder)

** Issues to be Resolved **
---------------------------
009 "Best Practices" document -- Let's put this on the agenda for future discussion.

010 Relationship between DITA and other topic-based architectures (such as S1000D) -- Need to incorporate this into the "Best Practices" document.

012 All, 2/8/05 -- Decide how to manage incoming comments resulting from the Public Review of the Committee Draft.

013 Need volunteer to find mentions of "post 1.0" deferred items -- need to rank by priority and difficulty) solid things for 1.1; medium effort design work candidates for 1.2; big items for 2.0 in minutes (3/8/05).

014 (3/29/05) Need list of possible "triage" criteria for deciding how to prioritize new requirements. Don read a list of possible criteria at the 3/29/05 meeting. To be discussed and resolved at the next meeting.

015 (4/26/05) Module registry and module standardization process.

(placeholder for next)

<END>
Subject: MEETING MINUTES -- 17 May 2005 -- DITA TECHNICAL COMMITTEE

** Agenda **
-------------
1. Roll call
2. Review/approve minutes:
   - 26 April:
   - 03 May:
3. Discuss Robert Anderson's review of DITA 1.0 DTDs
4. Wrapup of the DITA 1.1 Requirements list (public inform):
5. Discuss how to sort out the top issues and what process to use to work them.
6. More on "OASIS Website" thread?
7. More on "Marketing/Press relations" thread?
8. AOB

** Minutes **
-------------
1. Roll call -
   - We have 15/25 => QUORUM
2. Review/approve minutes:
   - 26 April:
     - Minutes approved by acclamation.
   - 03 May:
     - Chris Wong -- Any follow-up on the negative votes?
     - Michael Priestley -- Should we contact those two parties?
- Don Day -- Action Item to contact those two parties who cast a No-vote
- Minutes approved by acclamation.

3. Discuss Robert Anderson's review of DITA 1.0 DTDs
   - Catalogs are incorrect -- need slight updating to point to the correct file. This is the most important issue.
   - Public ID in the map files should be in upper-case
   - Class attribute for title element was declared twice (though declared the same way both times)
   - Many issues/inconsistencies in the comments -- not really important
   - Mary McGuire (sp?) -- Not unusual for standards to discover that there are some issues the day after they're issued. We can put out a fix update -- this is not at all unusual. This is not a "1.1" revision -- just a minor correction.
   - Don -- What about schemas?
   - Robert -- Hasn't done any parsing tests here.
   - Scott Tsao -- Question about OpenToolkit README for schema implementation.
      - Some discussion and clarification ensued -- couldn't capture all of it.
      - Scott -- Will there be a change to the statement in the README? It's important.
      - Don -- It's not a TC issue, but yes, Don will make a note of it and clarify the README.
      - Scott -- We need to make it as simple as possible for people without having to understand all the underlying code.
   - Michael Priestley -- Let's vote on this.
   - Chris Wong -- Let's NOT vote now; let's take some time to review the changes to the DTDs.
   - Action for all -- Review Robert's review of the DTDs.
   - Michael Priestley -- Let's make Robert Anderson the official maintainer of the DTDs, since he's a TC member now.
     - Robert Anderson was appointed the "Official Maintainer of the DTDs and Schemas". Approved by acclamation.

4. Wrapup of the DITA 1.1 Requirements list (public inform):
   - Don -- Let's not put this out for public comment -- we already have enough comments/requirements. Let's put it out as "this is what we are planning to do", not soliciting comments but simply informing.
   - Michael -- It's OK to solicit comments. But we'll just vote on them to decide whether to implement the suggestions. If there are some outlandish suggestions, we can just reject them. It's our "due diligence requirement" -- there are DITA users who are not represented on the TC.
   - Sharon -- Agrees with Michael.
   - Action for Don -- We'll submit this for public review through the TC site, and announce on DITA-Users -- two-week review period (review commenting period to be closed EOD 6/6/05). Don will publish ONLY the requirements document -- will NOT publish the "normal TC process" document (bug fixes, process questions, documentation issues).
     - Bruce -- Some of the requirements doc is not described fully; and the source column is probably something we don't want to publish (where the idea originated).
     - Don -- Agrees. We also should omit the prioritization column.
     - Michael -- It would still be interesting to know what the public thinks about the priorities.
     - Don -- Let's also ask people to indicate which items are important to them.
     - Seraphim -- Ask instead for people to choose their "top 5" -- helps to focus the prioritization a little better.
     - Don -- Does anyone have time to provide more description for each item?
     - Don -- Maybe everyone could look through the requirements list and post full descriptions to the TC list. New action item for everyone.

5. Discuss how to sort out the top issues and what process to
use to work them.
- Don -- Public review will indicate people's Top 5.
  - Some items are no-brainers -- Bug Fixes, for example.
  - Book Map issue -- Important to get quality print. The Book Map is important for many people as a reference implementation for getting high-quality print.
  - Are there other issues that seem to be obviously important?
  - Language proposals have been good -- data element, for example.
  - Let's move this discussion to the list, since we're out of time.

6. More on "OASIS Website" thread?
- Not covered.

7. More on "Marketing/Press relations" thread?
- Not covered.

8. AOB
- Don -- Let's appoint JoAnn Hackos to be Co-Editor of the 1.1 Specification (together with Michael).
  - Approved by acclamation.

** Summary of Decisions **
--------------------------
- Robert Anderson was appointed the "Official Maintainer of the DTDs and Schemas". Approved by acclamation.

- JoAnn Hackos was appointed Co-Editor of the 1.1 Specification (together with Michael Priestley). Approved by acclamation.

** Action Required **
---------------------
022 Don, Michael -- Put together a "self-study" tutorial/demo, as per JoAnn's comments regarding the DITA sessions. Still pending as of 7/20/04.

062 Eric Sirois, 10/05/04 -- provide XSLT validation for specialized schemas once developed (Indi recommends Jarno to work with him) >> 1/25/05 -- this will be an ongoing project; the 1.0 spec does not depend on this.

079 Don Day, 2/8/05 -- Ask Mary Macrae about several issues --
  - How can the public submit comments on the CD? Can we get a mailing list set up? etc.
  - What are the constraints for the final format of the CD?

080 All, 2/8/05 -- Remove comments from the CD.

081 All, 2/8/05 -- Will there be a .chm version of the CD files?

082 All, 3/8/05 -- Submit comments to Michael Priestley on the Architecture Specification.

085 Michael Priestley, 3/15/05 -- provide the HTML format as part of the spec (to be done after the submission).

086 Who?, 3/15/05 -- Need to submit the committee draft 2 to the OASIS administration for approval.

087 3/29/05 -- Ask JoAnn Hackos if she wants to continue in her role as co-Editor with Michael Priestley.

090 Bruce Esrig, 4/26/05 -- Come up with examples of formal completeness issues -- e.g. features applied to some elements but not all.

091 JoAnn Hackos, 5/3/05 -- CMS interoperability document / questionnaire <<< post to TC list.

092 Don Day, 5/17/05 -- Contact the two parties who cast a No-vote against approving the 1.0 DITA specification, to find out why they voted that way.

093 All, 5/17/05 -- Review Robert Anderson's review of the DTDs --
All, 5/17/05 -- Due by 5/20 -- Look through the requirements list and post full descriptions to the TC list. Don will then roll them into the doc he is posting for public review. Don will target 5/23 as his posting date.

Don Day, 5/17/05 -- Due by 5/23 -- Submit the 1.1 Requirements List for public review with a cover letter and solicit comments/additional ideas, and also ask for which items are most important (choose top 5). Review to be closed by start of meeting 6/7/05.

(placeholder)

** Issues to be Resolved **
---------------------------
009 "Best Practices" document -- Let's put this on the agenda for future discussion.

010 Relationship between DITA and other topic-based architectures (such as S1000D) -- Need to incorporate this into the "Best Practices" document.

012 All, 2/8/05 -- Decide how to manage incoming comments resulting from the Public Review of the Committee Draft.

013 Need volunteer to find mentions of "post 1.0" deferred items -- need to rank by priority and difficulty) solid things for 1.1; medium effort design work candidates for 1.2; big items for 2.0 in minutes (3/8/05).

014 (3/29/05) Need list of possible "triage" criteria for deciding how to prioritize new requirements. Don read a list of possible criteria at the 3/29/05 meeting. To be discussed and resolved at the next meeting.

015 (4/26/05) Module registry and module standardization process.

016 (placeholder for next)

<END>

Seraphim Larsen CIG Operations / TPPE
Senior Technical Writer Intel Corporation
(480) 552-6504 Chandler, AZ

In theory, there is no difference between theory and practice. But in practice, there is. - Jan L. A. van de Snepscheut

The content of this message is my personal opinion only. Although I am an employee of Intel, the statements I make here in no way represent Intel's position on the issue, nor am I authorized to speak on behalf of Intel on this matter.
Subject: MEETING MINUTES -- 14 June 2005 -- DITA TECHNICAL COMMITTEE

** Agenda **
---
1. Roll call

2. Review/approve minutes from our last meeting, 17 May:

3. Review and assess the public list comments on 1.1 requirements (+=TC member):

4. Assign leads/owners for researched proposals.

5. Formalize an action on Robert's DTD corrections list:

6. OASIS invitation to participate on OASIS Adoption Forum
Program Committee

7. Certification for tool vendors who want to support DITA: discuss whether and how to do this (ie, for CM, translation, editors, tools in general)

8. AOB

** Minutes **
-------------
1. Roll call
   - We have quorum

2. Review/approve minutes from our last meeting, 17 May:
   - Minutes approved by acclamation.

3. Review and assess the public list comments on 1.1 requirements (+=TC member):
   - Summary:
     - How to prioritize the items?
       - Don/JoAnn -- Let's do the easiest ones first
         ("low-hanging fruit")
       - Michael -- On the other hand, a case can be made for doing the hardest ones first, and working in the other ones on the side.
       - Seraphim -- Break it down into "must have" and "nice-to-have"
     - Proposal for next 2 weeks --
       - Submit request for TC members to go back to their organizations and then submit prioritizations through the comments form (max of 5) (due by 6/21)
       - Before meeting, tally the inputs and add to the tally already in the document -- and re-sort the document
       - At meeting on 6/21 -- We'll have a new set of prioritizations. We still won't know exactly what's in 1.1, and what will wait till after 1.1. Basically we'll need to continue with today's agenda
       - How do we split the list (1.1 vs. post-1.1)?
       - Another approach -- Let's set a target date for release; and whatever gets finished by then, gets finished. Everything else, gets rolled into 1.2 or later.
         - Paul Grosso -- You always have a target deadline, and as you approach you evaluate whether you need to flex a bit to roll in some important features.
         - Seraphim -- Break it down to "must have" and "nice-to-have". This will help us determine schedule -- let's base schedule on the "must have". Also -- Items on which many others depend, should be must-haves.
         - Chris Wong -- Perhaps some items can be
developed outside the TC, and when they're more developed we can roll them into the spec.
- Don -- Need to identify dependencies.
- Proposal -- Complete the ranking, identify must-haves, determine target date based on that, and schedule everything else based on that.
- Proposal -- Let's still continue with assignments NOW.
- JoAnn -- As a non-technical person, a use-case would be helpful to understand "what we're doing and why we're doing it" (in regard to each issue proposal to be rolled into 1.1).
- Bruce Esrig -- How to address each proposal -- Bruce has a list of questions/considerations to use to assess each item on the list for the 1.1 spec.
  - Scope --
    - Michael broke it down into "Major" vs. "Trivial", where "Trivial" means "could be done in less than a day" -- often minor bug fixes. For "Trivial" items, we already see clearly what needs to be done. "Major" means we need to figure out how to do it.
- Don -- Let's call it "Mechanical" vs. "Design".
- Use Case -- what and why
- Technical requirement -- ???
- Costs and benefits --
  - What is the time and effort required, both for the TC and for the assigned implementer.
  - What is the benefit we expect to get? How many people would probably make use of it? (everyone/many/few)
  - How much of a positive impact would that make for those users? (significant/minor)
- Don -- Don will find a place to track all this, and allow people to sign up / volunteer.

4. Assign leads/owners for researched proposals.
- 45 - Chris Wong
- Other issues -- let's take volunteers on the TC List

5. Formalize an action on Robert's DTD corrections list:
- Didn't get to this.

6. OASIS invitation to participate on OASIS Adoption Forum Program Committee
- Didn't get to this.

7. Certification for tool vendors who want to support DITA: discuss whether and how to do this (ie, for CM, translation, editors, tools in general)
- Didn't get to this.

8. AOB
- Didn't get to this.

** Summary of Decisions **
--------------------------
- TC Members should go back to their organizations and then submit prioritizations through the comments form (max of 5) (due by 6/21)

** Action Required **
---------------------
022 Don, Michael -- Put together a "self-study" tutorial/demo, as per JoAnn's comments regarding the DITA sessions. Still pending as of 7/20/04.

062 Eric Sirois, 10/05/04 -- provide XSLT validation for specialized schemas once developed (Indi recommends Jarno to work with him) >>> 1/25/05 -- this will be an ongoing project; the 1.0 spec does not depend on this.

079 Don Day, 2/8/05 -- Ask Mary Macrae about several issues --
- How can the public submit comments on the CD? Can we get a mailing list set up? etc.
- What are the constraints for the final format of the CD?

080 All, 2/8/05 -- Remove comments from the CD.

081 All, 2/8/05 -- Will there be a .chm version of the CD files?

082 All, 3/8/05 -- Submit comments to Michael Priestley on the Architecture Specification.

085 Michael Priestley, 3/15/05 -- provide the HTML format as part of the spec (to be done after the submission).

086 Who?, 3/15/05 -- Need to submit the committee draft 2 to the OASIS administration for approval.

087 3/29/05 -- Ask JoAnn Hackos if she wants to continue in her role as co-Editor with Michael Priestley.

090 Bruce Esrig, 4/26/05 -- Come up with examples of formal completeness issues -- e.g. features applied to some elements but not all.

091 JoAnn Hackos, 5/3/05 -- CMS interoperability document / questionnaire <<< post to TC list.

092 Don Day, 5/17/05 -- Contact the two parties who cast a No-vote against approving the 1.0 DITA specification, to find out why they voted that way. <<< STILL PENDING as of 6/14/05.

093 All, 5/17/05 -- Review Robert Anderson's review of the DTDs --

094 All, 5/17/05 -- Due by 5/20 -- Look through the requirements list and post full descriptions to the TC list. Don will then roll them into the doc he is posting for public review. Don will target 5/23 as his posting date.

095 Don Day, 5/17/05 -- Due by 5/23 -- Submit the 1.1 Requirements List for public review with a cover letter and solicit comments/additional ideas, and also ask for which items are most important (choose top 5). Review to be closed by start of meeting 6/7/05. <<< CLOSED 6/14/05.

096 All, 6/14/05 -- TC Members should go back to their organizations and then submit prioritizations through the comments form (max of 5) (***due by 6/20***)

097 Seraphim, 6/14/05 -- For 6/21 meeting, incorporate the new tallies for 1.1 requirements, and generate a newly sorted list.

098 All, 6/14/05 -- At 6/21 meeting, break down the 1.1 requirements list into "must haves" and "nice-to-haves". Estimate time requirements for each "must have" -- development time and TC discussion/decision time. Build schedule based on that. We also need to determine (for each item) Scope, Use Case, Technical Requirements, and Cost/Benefit.

099 All, 6/14/05 -- By 6/20, indicate which issues you want to volunteer for -- post to the TC list.

100 (placeholder)

** Issues to be Resolved **

009 "Best Practices" document -- Let's put this on the agenda for future discussion.

010 Relationship between DITA and other topic-based architectures (such as S1000D) -- Need to incorporate this into the "Best Practices" document.

012 All, 2/8/05 -- Decide how to manage incoming comments resulting from the Public Review of the Committee Draft.
013 Need volunteer to find mentions of "post 1.0" deferred items -- need to rank by priority and difficulty) solid things for 1.1; medium effort design work candidates for 1.2; big items for 2.0 in minutes (3/8/05).

014 (3/29/05) Need list of possible "triage" criteria for deciding how to prioritize new requirements. Don read a list of possible criteria at the 3/29/05 meeting. To be discussed and resolved at the next meeting.

015 (4/26/05) Module registry and module standardization process.

016 (placeholder for next)

<END>

Seraphim Larsen                   CIG Operations / TPPE
Senior Technical Writer           Intel Corporation
(480) 552-6504                    Chandler, AZ

The content of this message is my personal opinion only. Although I am an employee of Intel, the statements I make here in no way represent Intel's position on the issue, nor am I authorized to speak on behalf of Intel on this matter.
Subject: MEETING MINUTES -- 21 June 2005 -- DITA TECHNICAL COMMITTEE

- From: "Larsen, Seraphim L" <seraphim.l.larsen@intel.com>
- To: <dita@lists.oasis-open.org>
- Date: Tue, 21 Jun 2005 10:56:33 -0700

MEETING MINUTES -- 21 June 2005 -- DITA TECHNICAL COMMITTEE
*** Please see Action Items and Decision Summary at the end ***

DITA Technical Committee website:
- Public:
  http://www.oasis-open.org/committees/tc_home.php?wg_abbrev=dita
- Members only: http://www.oasis-open.org/apps/org/workgroup/dita/

These minutes are also available at

** Minutes **
---------------

Today's Goal: Complete assignments list

8:00-8:05 Roll Call
- 14 of 24 voting members => QUORUM
- See website for attendance details


- There were at least two Observers whose attendance was not recorded because I couldn't get their names. If you were one of them, please email Seraphim.

8:05-8:10 Review/approve minutes from 14 June

- Chris Wong says he did *not* say the following.
  Not sure who did say it. (Under "Proposal for next 2 weeks") --
- Chris Wong -- Perhaps some items can be developed outside the TC, and when they're more developed we can roll them into the spec.
- Minutes approved by acclamation.

8:05-8:50 Assignments
- We went through the list of 1.1 requirements and took volunteers for each item.
- Note: Only *members* can take on assignments.
  If observers or others want to contribute,
Today's Goal: Complete assignments list

8:00-8:05  Roll Call
- 14 of 24 voting members => QUORUM
- See website for attendance details
- There were at least two Observers whose attendance was not recorded because I couldn't get their names. If you were one of them, please email Seraphim.

8:05-8:10  Review/approve minutes from 14 June
- Chris Wong says he did *not* say the following. Not sure who did say it. (Under "Proposal for next 2 weeks") --
  - Chris Wong -- Perhaps some items can be developed outside the TC, and when they're more developed we can roll them into the spec.
- Minutes approved by acclamation.

8:05-8:50  Assignments
- We went through the list of 1.1 requirements and took volunteers for each item.
  - Note: Only *members* can take on assignments.
    If observers or others want to contribute, they need to become a member (as per Mary McRae's email).
- Clarification from Michael Priestley --
  - They do not have to be *voting* members
  - There are "members" and "voting members". The attendance requirements to be a "voting member" are stricter than to be a "member". (There are *no* attendance requirements to be a member.)
  - See email from Mary McRae for further clarification --
- Thus, if someone wants to volunteer for an assignment, we'll put them on the list for now, and try to figure out how to get them into regular membership as soon as possible.
  - According to Mary McRae, if you want to be
a member, you can -- just let Don, France, or Seraphim know, and we can change your status.

- New assignments list --
  - We completed assignments (though some items had no volunteers).
  - New assignments list to be located here -- http://www.oasis-open.org/apps/org/workgroup/dita/download.php/13091/DITA-TC-1dot1PublicRequirementsWithEffort.htm
  - Seraphim has Action Item to fill in the names

- If you volunteered for an assignment:
  - Fill out the definition template for your assignment:
    - Template located here:
      http://www.oasis-open.org/apps/org/workgroup/dita/download.php/13184/IssueNumberXX%28template%29.zip
    - Name your completed templates like this:
      IssueNumberXX.dita
    - Post your completed templates to the Drafts area of the DITA TC:
    - The writeup *must* include a time estimate.

- Next meeting:
  - For each assignment that has been written up, we will take a vote to decide whether or not to proceed.
    - If the assignment is approved, we will put it into the schedule.
    - We will also determine if the item is a "must have" or a "nice to have", based on the number of tallies received for that item.
    - We'll build an overall schedule based on this approach. We'll use the "must have"/"nice to have" to prioritize, if needed.

8:50-8:55 Announcements, opens
  - Please send your tallies of additional "top five" requirements to the TC List by EOD 24 June 2005.

** Summary of Decisions **
--------------------------
- No formal decisions.

** Action Required **
022 Don, Michael -- Put together a "self-study" tutorial/demo, as per JoAnn's comments regarding the DITA sessions. Still pending as of 7/20/04.

062 Eric Sirois, 10/05/04 -- provide XSLT validation for specialized schemas once developed (Indi recommends Jarno to work with him) >>> 1/25/05 -- this will be an ongoing project; the 1.0 spec does not depend on this.

079 Don Day, 2/8/05 -- Ask Mary Macrae about several issues --
- How can the public submit comments on the CD? Can we get a mailing list set up? etc.
- What are the constraints for the final format of the CD?

080 All, 2/8/05 -- Remove comments from the CD.

081 All, 2/8/05 -- Will there be a .chm version of the CD files?

082 All, 3/8/05 -- Submit comments to Michael Priestley on the Architecture Specification.

085 Michael Priestley, 3/15/05 -- provide the HTML format as part of the spec (to be done after the submission).

086 Who?, 3/15/05 -- Need to submit the committee draft 2 to the OASIS administration for approval.

087 3/29/05 -- Ask JoAnn Hackos if she wants to continue in her role as co-Editor with Michael Priestley.

090 Bruce Esrig, 4/26/05 -- Come up with examples of formal completeness issues -- e.g. features applied to some elements but not all.

091 JoAnn Hackos, 5/3/05 -- CMS interoperability document / questionnaire <<< post to TC list.

092 Don Day, 5/17/05 -- Contact the two parties who cast a No-vote against approving the 1.0 DITA specification, to find out why they voted that way. <<< STILL PENDING as of 6/14/05.


096 All, 6/14/05 -- TC Members should go back to their organizations and then submit prioritizations through the comments form (max of 5) (**due by 6/24**)

097 Seraphim, 6/14/05 -- For 6/21 meeting, incorporate the new tallies for 1.1 requirements, and generate a newly sorted list. >>> 6/21/05 -- not done yet.
098 All, 6/14/05 -- At 6/21 meeting, break down the 1.1 requirements list into "must haves" and "nice-to-haves". Estimate time requirements for each "must have" -- development time and TC discussion/decision time. Build schedule based on that. We also need to determine (for each item) Scope, Use Case, Technical Requirements, and Cost/Benefit. CLOSED, 6/21/05. We're taking a slightly different approach, detailed above.

099 All, 6/14/05 -- By 6/20, indicate which issues you want to volunteer for -- post to the TC list. CLOSED, 6/21/05.

100 All non-members, 6/21 -- If you want to be a "Member" (with no attendance requirements), send an email to Don, France, or Seraphim, and we will change your status. You *must* be a "Member" or "Voting Member" if you want to participate in the 1.1 changes.

101 All assignment volunteers, 6/21 -- Complete the writeups of your 1.1 assignments, and submit to the Drafts area of the Documents section of the Members Website of the TC. Use the template located here --
http://www.oasis-open.org/apps/org/workgroup/dita/download.php/13184/IssueNumberXX%28template%29.zip

102 Seraphim, 6/21 -- Fill in the volunteers' names on the Assignments List --

103 (placeholder)

** Issues to be Resolved **

009 "Best Practices" document -- Let's put this on the agenda for future discussion.

010 Relationship between DITA and other topic-based architectures (such as S1000D) -- Need to incorporate this into the "Best Practices" document.

012 All, 2/8/05 -- Decide how to manage incoming comments resulting from the Public Review of the Committee Draft.

013 Need volunteer to find mentions of "post 1.0" deferred items -- need to rank by priority and difficulty) solid things for 1.1; medium effort design work candidates for 1.2; big items for 2.0 in minutes (3/8/05).

014 (3/29/05) Need list of possible "triage" criteria for deciding how to prioritize new requirements. Don read a list of possible criteria at the 3/29/05 meeting. To be
discussed and resolved at the next meeting.

015 (4/26/05) Module registry and module standardization process.

016 (6/14/05) Formalize an action on Robert's DTD corrections list:

017 (6/14/05) OASIS invitation to participate on OASIS Adoption Forum Program Committee

018 (6/14/05) Certification for tool vendors who want to support DITA: discuss whether and how to do this (ie, for CM, translation, editors, tools in general) 016

019 (placeholder for next)

<END>
8:05-8:10 Review/approve minutes from previous meeting
   - Minutes approved by acclamation.

8:10-8:50 Business of the day
   - review the Members/Observers changes for participation
     - done
   - discuss response to et.gov registry invitation
     - Action for Don -- Contact Owen Ambur to clarify the
       statements about assumption of ownership on the
       http://et.gov site.
     - Proposal: To respond to invitations of this kind as they
       come in.
     - Decision: Don will respond to such invitations,
       submitting details to the TC List for review before
       a decision is made.
   - discuss grouping and staging of issues for candidate releases
     (scope and compatibility question)
     - Paul Grosso -- Do we have any kind of errata process at
       OASIS?
       - Is there a pointer to an errata document?
       - How do we point people to errata?
       - Action for Don: Contact Mary McRae to clarify this,
         and ask if we can add an errata link.
     - DocBook experience -- They have a whole bug-tracking
       system on Sourceforge.
   - Back to the discussion on staging this material --
     - Don -- There is one bug that Robert noted
       (misreferenced topicAttr.mod file in the catalog -- if
       you're using a catalog file, the processor will stop
       with an error).
     - Don -- It could be a critical issue for some users;
       needs to be fixed as soon as possible.
       - Highest priority -- Implement the recommended DTD
         bug fixes
       - So, what are the actual work items for 1.1, and
         how do we stage in sequence?
     - Don -- The question at hand is this: How do we
determine whether an item is appropriate for the 1.1 release, rather than a future major release? Some items might be too "intrusive" and should be moved to 2.0.

- Don -- The implicit agreement is that if something introduces backwards-incompatibility, then it should wait for 2.0. If it's backwards-compatible with 1.0, then it's in scope for 1.1. Examples of backwards-incompatibility:
  - We can add new elements, but we can't delete elements.
  - We can add attributes, but we can't change existing values for attributes, or remove existing attributes.
  - We can't change fixed orders.
  - We can't make an optional element to be required.
  - In general, tightening of content models in the base is incompatible (e.g., removing an element; changing the order of elements in a required sequence)

- This summary seems to answer the question about what scope of items are appropriate for 1.1, and which should be deferred to 2.0.

- Should we incorporate this list into some kind of Design Guidelines document for people to consider as we develop 1.1?

- Action for Robert Anderson: Start a Design Guidelines list to be posted to the Documents area. Ask Michael Priestley to look at it and update with the information he posted to the list earlier (considerations on whether your 1.1 proposal has implications for the DITA architecture overall).

- Action for Paul Prescod: It would also be good to include discussion of authoring considerations for new elements. Paul is willing to prepare a draft.

- prepared issues: #9
  - Paul Prescod -- Let's do the discussion of these things by email, and use the meeting simply for final discussion and the vote.

- Don -- We should do the review itself on the list, at least 3-4 days before the meetings.

- Paul -- Let's just bring it to the meeting when we're ready for a vote or for decision at a milestone in the process?

** Summary of Decisions **
-----------------------------
- Decision: Don will respond to invitations, (such as the one we got from Owen Ambur of http://et.gov), submitting
details to the TC List for review before a decision is made.

** Action Required **
---------------------
022 Don, Michael -- Put together a "self-study" tutorial/demo, as per JoAnn's comments regarding the DITA sessions. Still pending as of 7/20/04.

062 Eric Sirois, 10/05/04 -- provide XSLT validation for specialized schemas once developed (Indi recommends Jarno to work with him) >>> 1/25/05 -- this will be an ongoing project; the 1.0 spec does not depend on this.

079 Don Day, 2/8/05 -- Ask Mary Macrae about several issues --
- How can the public submit comments on the CD? Can we get a mailing list set up? etc.
- What are the constraints for the final format of the CD?

080 All, 2/8/05 -- Remove comments from the CD.

081 All, 2/8/05 -- Will there be a .chm version of the CD files?

082 All, 3/8/05 -- Submit comments to Michael Priestley on the Architecture Specification.

085 Michael Priestley, 3/15/05 -- provide the HTML format as part of the spec (to be done after the submission).

086 Who?, 3/15/05 -- Need to submit the committee draft 2 to the OASIS administration for approval.

087 3/29/05 -- Ask JoAnn Hackos if she wants to continue in her role as co-Editor with Michael Priestley.

090 Bruce Esrig, 4/26/05 -- Come up with examples of formal completeness issues -- e.g. features applied to some elements but not all.

091 JoAnn Hackos, 5/3/05 -- CMS interoperability document / questionnaire <<< post to TC list.

092 Don Day, 5/17/05 -- Contact the two parties who cast a No-vote against approving the 1.0 DITA specification, to find out why they voted that way. <<< STILL PENDING as of 6/14/05.


096 All, 6/14/05 -- TC Members should go back to their
organizations and then submit prioritizations through the comments form (max of 5) (**due by 6/24**)

097 Seraphim, 6/14/05 -- For 6/21 meeting, incorporate the new tallies for 1.1 requirements, and generate a newly sorted list. >>> 6/21/05 -- not done yet.

100 All non-members, 6/21 -- If you want to be a "Member" (with no attendance requirements), send an email to Don, France, or Seraphim, and we will change your status. You *must* be a "Member" or "Voting Member" if you want to participate in the 1.1 changes. <<< CLOSED 7/12/05

101 All assignment volunteers, 6/21 -- Complete the writeups of your 1.1 assignments, and submit to the Drafts area of the Documents section of the Members Website of the TC. Use the template located here -- http://www.oasis-open.org/apps/org/workgroup/dita/download.php/13184/IssueNumberXX%28template%29.zip

102 Seraphim, 6/21 -- Fill in the volunteers' names on the Assignments List -- http://www.oasis-open.org/apps/org/workgroup/dita/download.php/13091/DITA-TC-1dot1PublicRequirementsWithEffort.htm <<< CLOSED 7/12/05

Subsequent action items are on the web site at http://www.oasis-open.org/apps/org/workgroup/dita/members/action_items.php

** Issues to be Resolved **
-----------------------------

009 "Best Practices" document -- Let's put this on the agenda for future discussion.

010 Relationship between DITA and other topic-based architectures (such as S1000D) -- Need to incorporate this into the "Best Practices" document.

012 All, 2/8/05 -- Decide how to manage incoming comments resulting from the Public Review of the Committee Draft.

013 Need volunteer to find mentions of "post 1.0" deferred items -- need to rank by priority and difficulty) solid things for 1.1; medium effort design work candidates for 1.2; big items for 2.0 in minutes (3/8/05).

014 (3/29/05) Need list of possible "triage" criteria for deciding how to prioritize new requirements. Don read a list of possible criteria at the 3/29/05 meeting. To be discussed and resolved at the next meeting.

015 (4/26/05) Module registry and module standardization
016 (6/14/05) Formalize an action on Robert's DTD corrections list:

017 (6/14/05) OASIS invitation to participate on OASIS Adoption Forum Program Committee

018 (6/14/05) Certification for tool vendors who want to support DITA: discuss whether and how to do this (ie, for CM, translation, editors, tools in general) 016

019 (placeholder for next)

<END>
** Minutes **

----------

- Roll call
  - 17 of 24 >> QUORUM
  - See website for detailed attendance record.

- Review/approve minutes from previous meeting
  - Minutes approved by acclamation, with no comments

- Business of the day
  - review new Action Item forms, dispose of issues (see last minutes)
    - Completed -- any pending action items will be posted to the TC action item tool.
  - scope and compatibility--review Robert's posting, Notes on Backwards Compatibility for DITA 1.1
    - Did not get to this.

- Resume prepared issues: #9
  - Did not get to this.

- Announcements/Opens
  - JoAnn Hackos -- DITA conference in Europe
    - Looking for speakers!
  - Chris Kravogel -- Also will be DITA presentations at a conference near Frankfurt.
  - These two conferences are happening near each other, at about the same time -- so you can do both of these.
  - Contact JoAnn or Chris for more information!

** Summary of Decisions **

--------------------------

- None

** Action Required **

---------------------

022 Don, Michael -- Put together a "self-study" tutorial/demo, as per JoAnn's comments regarding the DITA sessions. Still
pending as of 7/20/04. >>> CLOSED 7/19/05

062 Eric Sirois, 10/05/04 -- provide XSLT validation for specialized schemas once developed (Indi recommends Jarno to work with him) >>> 1/25/05 -- this will be an ongoing project; the 1.0 spec does not depend on this. >>> CLOSED 7/19/05

079 Don Day, 2/8/05 -- Ask Mary Macrae about several issues --
- How can the public submit comments on the CD? Can we get a mailing list set up? etc.
- What are the constraints for the final format of the CD?
- CLOSED 7/19/05

080 All, 2/8/05 -- Remove comments from the CD. >>> CLOSED 7/19/05

081 All, 2/8/05 -- Will there be a .chm version of the CD files?
>>> CLOSED 7/19/05

082 All, 3/8/05 -- Submit comments to Michael Priestley on the Architecture Specification. >>> CLOSED 7/19/05

085 Michael Priestley, 3/15/05 -- provide the HTML format as part of the spec (to be done after the submission). >>> CLOSED 7/19/05

086 Who?, 3/15/05 -- Need to submit the committee draft 2 to the OASIS administration for approval. >>> CLOSED 7/19/05

087 3/29/05 -- Ask JoAnn Hackos if she wants to continue in her role as co-Editor with Michael Priestley. >>> CLOSED 7/19/05. Yes JoAnn will continue.

090 Bruce Esrig, 4/26/05 -- Come up with examples of formal completeness issues -- e.g., features supplied to some elements but not all. >>> CLOSED 7/19/05.

091 JoAnn Hackos, 5/3/05 -- CMS (and other tools, such as editing tools) interoperability document / questionnaire <<< post to TC list.
- 7/19/05:
  - A draft has been circulated to some TC members. Need to post to the list for general comments.
  - JoAnn is looking into establishing a subcommittee for DITA interoperability
  - We'll keep this action open
  - JoAnn will clarify to the TC at a future meeting (by 8/16/05)
  - JoAnn -- Maybe we should come up with a list of tools. All, please send emails to JoAnn with suggestions.
- Michael Priestley -- Maybe post an informal request for feedback (to the DITA TC list) and setting up a teleconference to go through the document, before posting to the TC?
- JoAnn and Don to work out the details offline.

092 Don Day, 5/17/05 -- Contact the two parties who cast a No-vote against approving the 1.0 DITA specification, to find out why they voted that way. <<< STILL PENDING as of 6/14/05. <<< STILL OPEN as of 7/19/05

093 All, 5/17/05 -- Review Robert Anderson's review of the DTDs --
- This needs to go onto the Agenda for future meeting discussion.
- Thus: OPEN as of 7/19/05

096 All, 6/14/05 -- TC Members should go back to their organizations and then submit prioritizations through the comments form (max of 5) (**due by 6/24**)
>>> CLOSED as of 7/19/05

097 Seraphim, 6/14/05 -- For 6/21 meeting, incorporate the new tallies for 1.1 requirements, and generate a newly sorted list. >>> 6/21/05 -- not done yet.
>>> CLOSED as of 7/19/05

101 All assignment volunteers, 6/21 -- Complete the writeups of your 1.1 assignments, and submit to the Drafts area of the Documents section of the Members Website of the TC. Use the template located here --
http://www.oasis-open.org/apps/org/workgroup/dita/download.php/13184/IssueNumberXX%28template%29.zip
>>> STILL OPEN as of 7/19/05. Do we need to set up a schedule for this?

Subsequent action items are on the web site at http://www.oasis-open.org/apps/org/workgroup/dita/members/action_items.php

** Issues to be Resolved **
-----------------------------

009 "Best Practices" document -- Let's put this on the agenda for future discussion.
- 7/19/05 --
  - Don -- Do we as a TC need to own a "Best Practices" document?
  - Michael -- It's still a pretty shallow pool of companies who are implementing DITA. IBM and Nokia could probably come up with something.
  - Indi -- Confers with Michael -- We need a broader user base to really come up with "Best Practices"
Michael -- We might think there's a "right" way to do something, but that doesn't necessarily make it a "best practice" that has emerged from multiple sources and has some weight behind it.

JoAnn -- At CIDM, we've been looking at the process maturity model -- and something wouldn't be recommended as a "Best Practice" till it's attained a certain level of maturity. So she agrees -- it's probably premature.

Michael -- Perhaps we should put together a "tips and tricks", "recommendations and ideas" document, to help people get started.

So, let's keep this open, and redefine it as an agenda item for future discussion.

The action is to initiate the activity.

010 Relationship between DITA and other topic-based architectures (such as S1000D) -- Need to incorporate this into the "Best Practices" document.
- 7/19/05 -- Merge this with Issue #009.

012 All, 2/8/05 -- Decide how to manage incoming comments resulting from the Public Review of the Committee Draft.
>>> CLOSED 7/19/05.

013 Need volunteer to find mentions of "post 1.0" deferred items -- need to rank by priority and difficulty) solid things for 1.1; medium effort design work candidates for 1.2; big items for 2.0 in minutes (3/8/05). >>> CLOSED 7/19/05, completed by Chris Kravogel.

014 (3/29/05) Need list of possible "triage" criteria for deciding how to prioritize new requirements. Don read a list of possible criteria at the 3/29/05 meeting. To be discussed and resolved at the next meeting. >>> CLOSED 7/19/05

015 (4/26/05) Module registry and module standardization process.
- 7/19/05 --
  - Don -- This might be a 1.1 agenda item
  - Bruce -- There are different ways we could approach this.
  - Don -- Do we need this for committee business?
  - Bruce -- Yes, the committee should decide what a module registry should be and whether it's in our scope to work on it.
  - We'll assign this as an action item for Don, to put this on the agenda for discussion (after Bruce completes the document).
  - We also need a document describing this. Bruce will own this. Due date 12/30/05.

016 (6/14/05) Formalize an action on Robert's DTD corrections
list:
- Duplicate -- copy URLs into Action Item 93
- Otherwise this is CLOSED 7/19/05.

017 (6/14/05) OASIS invitation to participate on OASIS Adoption Forum Program Committee
   - 7/19/05 -- CLOSED, Indi is taking care of this.

018 (6/14/05) Certification for tool vendors who want to support DITA: discuss whether and how to do this (ie, for CM, translation, editors, tools in general). Duplicate (Action Item 91), CLOSED 7/19/05.
MEETING MINUTES -- 26 July 2005 -- DITA TECHNICAL COMMITTEE
(Minutes taken by France Baril, <France.Baril@ixiasoft.com>)

DITA Technical Committee website:
- Members only: http://www.oasis-open.org/apps/org/workgroup/dita/

- Summary
  - No quorum for the first half of the meeting so we discussed item #9 from the 1.1 requirements list.
  - We had quorum for the second half where we approved minutes and accepted the notes for backward compatibility as an official TC document.

- Sharon Veach's comments on Spec updates
  - Sharon commented on spec update document that Robert Anderson put out.

- Wording updates
  - Included summary of changes since it was posted
  - Don: should we have a must fix items in list
  - Robert: OK will update

- Discussions on issue # 9 - data element
  - Erik H: the main issue is: When we have a nested property do we need to indicate implicite subject of that property; idref notion.
  - Paul: no sense to have metadata and not know what container it applies to
  - Erik: Issue more of property being about container but also about something higher up the chain. For ex, a phone number about an org, is contained by the org but it’s also the phone number of the book owner if it is the number of the organization that is also the book owner.
  - Paul: you say that relationship are so complicated that they are hard to id. But I am more against that, need to know explicetly what that metadata is about. You gotta have relationship between the metadata element.

If a section that has embedded element where I track downloads, it’s there for some reason, its has nothing to do with the person reading,
it’s just convenient to have it here. It’s not metadata more than a body is a metadata to a topic.

- Erik: it’s a property, but not in the metadata sense

- ???, Maybe problem regarding sense of what metadata is.

- Erik: Gray line between data and metadata. Some app use it for different purposes. For example: Audience may be used as filter or may be displayed.

- Bruce: Paul is asking more formality about what the relationships are between metadata and the data. These could be different, some data is referring to other data like related info, in xref. The reason this is hard to capture is that when you are establishing rel, you need 2 places to say it. So we are cut with: do we wish to be formally explicit and how do we use the structure available to express what we want to say

- Erik: is there a case where we have data that is not about its container. In the bookrights example, I see no challenge to that rule.

- Bruce: I don’t think we have an example right now

- Erik: should we try to come back with more examples to see if we have something where the subject is not the container. Do we have a clear case for the requirement?

- Paul: I thought so.

- Erik: it’s always attached to something

- Paul: Data is an element

- Erik: it’s always a property of it’s container

- Paul: Will have to think about it. Though we had exemples with metadata about something different then its parent.

- Bruce: Question: If we have org container and org has 2 orgs with different characterization. So element inside of suborg1 and each one would have its own data, there is no way that we would know that these are containment inside org.
- Erik: Data about suborgs would be about the suborg and then climbing back up the tree.

- Bruce: in org we might have info and in addition suborgs which may occur a couple of times, although the reason for including suborgs is to describe structure.

- Erik: Info is about sub and there to include info about the org.

- Don: Agreement to carry this in email by Paul and Erik. Would Erik agree that the committee decide while not there in the next 2 weeks.

- Erik: yes if no questions are left unanswered.

- At this point in the meeting, we reached a quorum.

- Minutes from 7/19/05 approved:
  - Bruce proposes to accept, Indi seconds
  - Minutes are approved.

- Scope and compatibility--review Robert's posting,
  Notes on Backwards Compatibility for DITA 1.1

  - Robert received no comments on this document.

  - Paul: please summarize that the goal is to be backward compatible with data not necessarily with applications.

  - Don: what is our action as a tc with respect to this? Should we consider this is a completed document. Any objection as to accepting this as a guide to the TC with the update.

  - No objections, so it’s closed, we move on.

- Agenda items not covered:
  - #11 create elements for translateable attributes

  - #12 universality of univ-atts

  - #20 extensible metadata attributes

  - #40 keyref architecture
Roll call
- 12/23 => We do have quorum!

Review/approve minutes from previous meeting
- Minutes approved by acclamation.

General issue: CamelCase for attributes?
- The main "problem" is that CamelCase hasn't been used before, so it would introduce confusion.
- Don -- Is there an issue here? "Will it rock the world if we suddenly introduce CamelCase in attribute names?"
- Michael Priestley - It's an issue of consistency.
- Michael -- It doesn't make a huge difference, but we should still have recommendations for going forward. Not a strong opinion either way, except perhaps CamelCase might be the safest approach since you avoid using special characters.
- Paul Grosso -- It is really confusing to have many different ways of doing this. He thinks CamelCase would be confusing and would seem odd.
- Sharon Veach -- Is the idea that CamelCase and Hyphenation and simple concatenation would all exist side-by-side?
- Paul Prescod -- For 1.1, let's stick with what we have. For 2.0, let's make a decision on the best approach, and stick with it.
- Michael -- There are currently no uses of CamelCase. Erik Hennum is the "chief advocate" of CamelCase, and he's not here. So maybe we should defer the discussion till he gets back.
- Dana Spradley -- He was one of the original advocates of CamelCase, but now agrees with Paul Grosso that it would be confusing.
- Michael -- Let's not make a decision today -- Let's wait till Erik Hennum can contribute to the discussion.
- We'll revisit this issue when Erik Hennum is present.

Resume prepared issues:
We'll revisit this issue when Erik Hennum is present.

#20 extensible metadata attributes (Owner Michael Priestley)
- Michael explained the proposal.
- Discussion followed.
- Don -- Let's open a new discussion post on the list, to continue this discussion.
- No consensus/decision yet.

#11 create elements for translateable attributes
- Not addressed -- no time.

#12 universality of univ-atts
- Not addressed -- no time.

#40 keyref architecture
- Not addressed -- no time.

Proposal -- Change the template to add a place for "owner and interested parties" (breaking out these two items separately), and a place for "proposed solution".
- Approved by acclamation.

Announcements/Opens
- Not addressed -- no time.
MEETING MINUTES -- 09 August 2005 -- DITA TECHNICAL COMMITTEE
(Minutes taken by Alan Houser <arh@groupwellesley.com>)

DITA Technical Committee website:
- Members only: http://www.oasis-open.org/apps/org/workgroup/dita/

- Roll call
  - 62% -- we have a quorum

- Review/approve minutes from previous meeting
  - Minutes approved by acclamation.

Old business:
General issue: CamelCase for attributes?
- Waiting for Eric Hennum's return to resume the discussion (next week).

Item 20 -- Extensible metadata attributes.
- Deferred in Michael Priestley's absence.

New business:

I. Accessibility and localization

- Don initiated discussion on an email message (referenced above) from CEN/ISSS regarding a planned workshop on document processing for accessibility. The group seeks a liason contact with the DITA TC.

Alan Houser volunteered, without objection.
Action Item: Don will respond to the email.

Further discussion:
- Don -- How is DITA certifying to best practices in accessibility and localization? Does DocBook have a similar liason?
  - Joanne Hackos: SDI will provide seamless DITA integration with their localization tools. Speaker from SDI will present at DITA Europe conference. Don -- can this speaker present to the TC? Joanne will follow up.
- Bruce Esrig: Will check our strategy for translating SGML. What issues come up?
- Don: (Action Item) Don will send note to list on each of two issues (access & local). Will make decision on liason activity at appropriate time.

-------

Prepared Issues:
I. Proposal for general attribute addition.

- Paul Prescod -- Originally interpreted item #20 (above) as the ability to add any kind of attribute to specialized elements in DITA. Was surprised to learn that it is only metadata/profiling attribute. Any attribute that does not fit model is not generalizable.

DITA should support arbitrary attributes. Important for migration legacy to DITA -- may need to capture legacy metadata. Should be done at 1.1 or 2.0.

Allow any attributes to be extensible. Problems relate to generalization and respecialization. Must be lossless. Must find a way to tunnel arbitrary attributes to other attributes. Syntactic issues, difficult to implement in XSLT, and impossible to deal with in CSS.

Should this be dealt with sooner or later?

- Don: Chris Wong raises issue -- whether scope creep jeopardizes schedule/feasibility for adoption. Requests that discussion continue on list.

- Don: What is the usability of the proposed feature? Writers are loath to work with attributes unless they are really, rally motivated to do so. Is this motivated by good design principals rather then whether writers will really use this.

- Chris Kravogel: When we convert legacy DTDs to dita, there are two approaches:
  Convert attributes to attributes, or
  Convert attributes to data elements, perhaps in an alternate location that might be more convenient.

- Paul: Where can data element occur?

- Chris Wong: How necessary is it to maintain attributes as attributes?

- Don: Data element is intended to hold real data.
  <required-cleanup> element is there for theings that don't fit nicely. Perhaps editor requires writer to disambiguate content.

Paul Prescod -- wheter attributes are really necessary. What element is appropriate for info that really is metadata?

Don: Proposal to convert attribute value to text content.
More general question -- 1. general migration of attributes.
2. supporting architected attributes in a general way. Want them to be created and used by authors. Extension mechanisms are intended to support ongoing design in your DTD.
Have we really considered usability aspect of general attribute declaration mechanism. If we create it, will writers use it? Is it not just a good idea, but something that will add value.

Paul: Usability is handled by the tools. DITA already has hundreds of attributes.

Dana Spradley -- Using data elements would be much less usable than attributes. E.g., we can hide attributes. Can't hide elements. People thinking of migrating to dita -- one limitation is inability to find a place to put attributes they require.

Don: Do customers require that attributes be retained when migrating legacy content?

Chris Wong: Yes -- e.g., attributes that represent FrameMaker conditions. Haven't seen requests for general-purpose attributes.

Don: Usability issue -- when an attribute has value of CDATA or NTOKEN. Often a tools issue when the value of the attribute must be precisely stated. E.g., when you're providing a repeatable conditional processing value, or taxonomy of terms preferred for use within your organization. When writers compose their own terms for a data attribute, the taxonomy grows, or there are missed opportunities for processing.

Paul: Most tools have hooks for overriding assignment of attributes.

Don: Where do we go next week?

Joanne: Can we have somebody make statement about categories of these attributes? Parameters of the attributes we're trying to define? Processing/filtering, keyword/taxonomic metadata w/controlled vocabulary? Link to taxonomic engine? Could we partition the discussion to determine what is settled and what is not settled? Also legacy attributes? Attributes used for search?

Paul: Do we want to attack them on a per-attribute type basis or treat them more generally?

Joanne: If we don't clearly state the requirements of what people might want to do, we might miss something.

Don: Even if we create a general attribute declaration mechanism, this does not create an architected way to treat those attributes. e.g. intent-based design, people would need to design their own processing.
Categorize to recommend standard implementations of attributes in those categories.

Bruce Esrig: Want to hook into specialized processing for attributes that are not acted on by the core kit.
Don: perhaps support fallback processing.

Joanne: Can somebody make post?

Paul: I can post. Note that the scope of XML attributes is unlimited. However, there are more and less common patterns that we could document.

Joanne: Specify areas, give people guidance in each area.

Paul Prescod: ACTION ITEM -- post summary of categories for legacy attributes.

Don: This also creates vendor opportunity for fulfillment.

--------

II. Create elements for attributes with translatable text. (item 11)

Don: Example of problem -- "navtitle" attribute often contains info appropriate for <title> itself. However, attribute values cannot contain markup. They are accessible through a different interface. They complicated translation when an attribute value is translatable content. (Normally only in element content is translated). Can't use conref on attribute.

Don: Owner (Michael Priestley) isn't present, there has been little/no discussion on list. We aren't currently defining an implementation; we're simply approving the owner to continue with the scope of work.

Joanne: Does this present legacy issues?
Don: Yes. Content models will change.

Don: We're not finishing these, we're giving approval to weigh them for business value and put them on the 1.1 agenda.

Approved by acclamation.
I. General issue: CamelCase for attributes?

Don Day invites Erik Hennum to briefly describe the arguments for standardizing on a camel case naming convention for attribute names.

Erik --
With DITA, as with any extensible system, there is a risk of developing large quantity of names. Need to manage names and make sure names are intelligible.

Other systems, particularly object-oriented programming languages, have seen value in self-documenting names. These names may be somewhat verbose, but can tell what the object is about by looking at a name.

Camel case makes clear where the word boundaries are.

The TC should consider naming issues as new elements are brought into system. How do we make those names legible? For example, with single-case, compound names, how do we handle the case where the last letter of a word and the first letter of the following word are the same?

Don -- What about the issue of renaming of legacy attributes?

Erik -- clearly we do not want to change existing names.

Paul Prescod -- if we don’t change existing names, we will have inconsistent names for some time. If we propose to change legacy names at 2.0, we would have to go through cost/benefit analysis. Benefits must outweigh the cost for migrating legacy documents.

Erik -- If we stick to our existing convention, as we increase the names, we’re going to have increasingly cryptic names. E.g., the name “properties” is taken. Any new properties-related attribute would be a compound name.

Bruce Esrig -- consider namespace convention. Module dash.

Rob Frankland -- Camel case is easier than hyphen.

Robin Cover -- Will convey a set of references for several NDRs (Naming and Design Rules) documents being used and/or
drafted by 6 or 7 organizations and government agencies.  
Already logged as Action Item:  

Paul -- Authors would need to remember whether an attribute is camel case or not.

Alan Houser -- Most tools present lists of attributes, and don’t require that authors remember attribute names.

Don -- Would this (camel case) possibly influence processing architectures? Would this encourage processing based on camel case features?

Paul -- Would processes depend on Camel Case to identify word breaks?

Don -- Do we start this at 1.1, or wait for 2.0.

Erik -- Are we presenting a problem by doing it now?

Paul -- I propose separate issue: do we revamp naming convention now or later?

Erik -- Concurs.

Rob -- Is this strictly a human issue or a parser issue?

Don -- Do folded case conventions make sense in non-English DTDs? E.g. many asian languages don’t have the concept of “case”. Is there an implicit assumption that we’re using a mixed case language?

Bruce -- Word boundaries are always a problem in asian languages.

Don -- Question to Paul Prescod: Have you seen customers rewrite DTDs to a non-english language?

Paul’s response -- We encourage people to use the authoring tool’s user interface to present different names to authors. This doesn’t break processing.

Erik -- any convention for names that’s specific to a language does not present a problem for other languages.

Don -- spinning off a separate numbered issue. Will add issue, make Erik owner (ACTION ITEM).

Paul -- DITA is not currently consistent with respect to use of dashes, capitalization. “Document-oriented” DTDs don’t tend to use camel case as much as data-oriented. This is probably an artifact of our case-insensitive SGML legacy.
II. Review/approve minutes from previous meeting

Seraphim Larsen joins -- we have quorum.
Don will ask Mary McRae for clarification on quorum rules (ACTION ITEM).

August 9 Minutes:
http://www.oasis-open.org/apps/org/workgroup/dita/download.php/13980/DITA.8.9.05.txt

Don -- Comment on minutes: There is value in DITA being certifiably compliant for governments and other organizations.

Minutes approved.
--------

Prepared Issues

III. Discussion: Extensible metadata attributes (Feature #20).
Don -- General attribute addition is also related to this.
See Paul Prescod's summary at
Discussion deferred in Michael Priestley’s absence.

-----

IV. Discussion: Consider making most universal attributes completely universal (Feature #12).

Robert Anderson -- These attributes should be used on any element. There are items today that you can’t filter for various reasons.

Don -- So this is a completeness issue.

Robert -- For example, conref is something that you can’t filter today.

Paul Prescod -- With respect to conref: this would cause difficulties for many CMS products. Would need to do full conref processing before they can extract metadata elements.
With respect to filtering -- what does it mean to filter a metadata thing? Since metadata is typically used for searching and content management.

Robert -- You can designate that in a particular situation, some metadata will apply. Currently these are available on many elements already.

Paul -- This should be cleaned up -- should be some policy. But it would be interoperability issue. Most CMS do not resolve conref before processing metadata attributes.

Don -- we could write application notes for different vendors. Indicate potential issues wrt capabilities that are already out there. We’re not opening a pandora’s box, just making it bigger. If somebody is going to implement this, they do so in an interoperable way.
Paul -- That works for conref, but what about filtering attributes? Let’s enumerate the issues and get feedback from CMS vendors.

Don -- Do we know enough to approve continuing this issue? Can we attach a contingent issue to add info for CMS vendors.

Paul -- I would be enthusiastic about approving “cleaning up” the current status. Why do some elements provide a conref attribute and others don’t?

Robert -- Historically, a lot of elements did not have id and conref. They were added selectively as requested (before IBM handed off DITA to OASIS).

Don -- Let’s defer this for Michael’s input.

Paul -- (ACTION ITEM for Michael Priestly) Can Michael comment on:
1. Use cases that he can recall.
2. Thoughts about CMS implications.
   This is somewhat unprecedented in markup. It feels innovative to put filtering attributes on metadata. What does it mean from semantic point of view?

Robert -- filtering and conref are available on keyword element. (OASIS version).
Proposed changes includes list of all attributes that must be added.

--------

V. Discussion: Don Day mentions Hedley Finger’s comments on extending conditional attributes.
Follow-up comment by Erik Hennum:

Don -- People working on extensible metadata attributes needs to take this into consideration. Michael Priestly is owner.

--------

Deferred until next week:
Item 40, keyref architecture.
Item 9, data element
I. Roll Call -- We have a quorum

Review minutes
http://www.oasis-open.org/apps/org/workgroup/dita/download.php/13980/DITA.8.9.05.txt

Don Day -- Received clarification from Mary McRae for quorum rules. Quorum is 51% (more than half).

The record should note the following corrections to the 9-August-2005 TC minutes:

The following remark should have been attributed to Bruce Esrig:
When we convert legacy DTDs to dita, there are two approaches:
Convert attributes to attributes, or convert attributes to data elements, perhaps in an alternate location that might be more convenient.

Erik Hennum’s name was mis-spelled in at least one instance.

Reference to issue number 9 should have referenced Erik’s latest version:

16-August-2005 Minutes approved.

II. Quick review of open action items

III. Discussion: Three related items:
- #20 extensible metadata attributes
- #12 universality of univ-atts
- related: extending conditional atts--Hedley Finger proposal

Discussion: Item 20
Michael Priestley -- One of the basic issues is “what it meant” by extensible metadata attributes? Narrow sense in architectural spec. “Is this a general way for people to add any kind of new attribute, or is a specific way to add new processing attributes only?” I think others have hit the limits of our set of conditional attributes.

Don Day -- Is there any question that the scope of
extensibility is anything other than metadata attributes.

MP -- what do we mean by metadata attributes?

Don -- what the architecture knows how to process in a regular way?

MP -- Do we limit or extend?

Paul Prescod -- Most crucial issue is handling of filter attributes. Propose separate issue for more general attributes. Caveat -- If extensibility for general attributes is accepted, we should accommodate both.

MP -- Conditional process attrs is “low-hanging fruit”. Can come up with working design without opening a Pandora’s box.

Erik Hennum -- Is everybody going to regard the same attrs at metadata or not? Any attr that takes a token can be used for cond processing.

PP -- Shouldn’t it be part of the language.

MP -- If we want to allow specialized processing, generalized stream must include non-token identifiers. Even though syntax must be token.

PP -- Should be tokenized or not.

MP -- Take same syntax that “props” attr takes, and apply to cond processing attrs. How do you define that set? Architecture Spec defines which cond attrs are defined for cond proc in the toolkit. One could argue that “importance” can support cond proc. “importance” currently has a different syntax. Would have to change behavior to make it work.

Don -- Design intent was to provide spectrum of values that processors could know or process. We allow variant behaviors if we allow specialization there.

Erik -- As we allow extensibility, are we really allowing a mechanism that allows any attribute that conforms to that value notation to support conditional processing?

MP -- For example, inheritance from “props” determines whether a processor treats it that way. Existing set of DITA attrs would not be arbitrarily assignable to conditional processing. Would add new ones by speciallizing/inheriting from one of this set.

Erik -- I’m hearing -- any pseudo-token-ized attribute is available for conditional processing. If user needs to add values for any other purpose that’s acceptable.
MP -- Current proposal is only for conditional processing attrs. For cond proc attr, it’s not the tokenization that determines its role for conditional processing, it’s whether it inherits from otherprops.

Erik -- Under the proposal, only tokenized attrs would be generalizable.

MP -- The DTD does not explicitly say they’re tokens.

Erik -- This expectation is not enforced by syntax.

MP -- If I say this new attr specializes from props, I’m guaranteeing certain syntactic behaviors.

PP -- It’s not that filter attrs are generalizable,

MP -- By enhancement to processing engine, you could filter based on this attr. Is this listed as a specialization of “props” in domain attr? Otherwise it’s a user error to try filter on it.

Don -- Not tokenized values, but enumerated values in DTD. France Beril brought up a point -- is there any reason for enumerated attrs to be CDATA?

MP -- Not relevant to cond processing.

Don -- I’m sensing that we have a general agreement. Have all stakeholders commented?

Proposal raised to approve Feature #20 for further action.

Bruce -- Can we clarify the name of the feature to something involving cond attrs?

MP -- extended conditional processing attributes?

Bruce -- do we need to mention specialization as a way to extend?

MP -- not sure...specializable conditional processing attributes? “Adding new conditional processing attributes”. (from the users’ perspective)

Item 20 formally approved.

Don -- An aside: we need to consider the possibility of halting 1.1 items and deferring features to 1.2, given current number of open items and our rate of progress.

------
Discussion: Item 12 -- Universality of universal apps.
Robert Anderson -- There is some opposition to adding id and conref to metadata elements.

Don -- RA and MP need to have that conversation before continuing.

MP -- We were conservative when we first added these. We’re currently “feature-creeping” back to universal. I’m now surpised to see elements that _don’t_ support these. We should change the onus from “justify having these”, to “justify not having these”.

I can imagine cases where somebody might have different sets of keywords, different sets of copyright data. There might be a concrete requirement on keyword conrefing for controlled vocabularies. Same capabilities you have in content but applies to metadata.

PP -- There are two different issues. conref and filtering attrs are quite different. Issue with filtering attrs is that semantics. When you think of metadata elements not as publishing attrs but searching in CMS. How would a CMS index an “audience” element with “audience” attribute? Does it filter based on who is making the search? If we state that these attrs only apply to publishing process, that would be clear. If we don’t make a statement, CMS vendors will implement this in different ways or conspire to ignore the attr.

MP -- I’m not sure I buy the premise that CMS is the basic use case.

PP -- Search in general, not CMS.

MP -- Will these attrs be used for searching source, or at publish time?

MP -- May not be a clean line. May be a muddy line. e.g. “product” metadata. If you’re shipping info for a particular product, the “product” metadata is useless. On the other hand, if you’re publishing to Web site that includes multiple products, the metadata is useful again. When metadata is useful depends on how and when you’re delivering it. All will be useful at authoring time. Some will be useful at delivery time.

PP -- Maybe state that these attrs are always applicable to publishing process. When applied to metadata attrs, goal is to drive publishing process which will generate searchable metadata. Have seen customers want to use in other parts of the process (internal use).
MP -- There’s a clear use case for “keywords” element in prolog. Used for search and indexing.

Robert -- audience attr does have audience attr.

PP -- Cust asks what it means? If you’re using metadata on output instead of source and want it to vary based on the publishing process, that attr might be meaningful.

MP -- might have audience element that provides complete description of user type. Also slap audience attr on the elemnt. When pub for different audience, you can filter out that audience definition from prologue.

Robert -- We need to define what these means when not used in publishing context. Also, implementation issue w/conref in metadata attr values. Seemed optimistic to me that CMS will apply conref before they extract metadata attrs. May introduce divergence between what the spec allows and what is practiced in field.

MP -- scenario -- controlled set of conref defns, conref’ed. If CMS is not part of picture, this is very reasonable. If CMS is part of picture, may express it as embedded data.

MP -- It seems like such a clear requirement to manage metadata sets. Even if CMS does something different but DITA compatible, I’d still want to be able use conref to manage them. I shouldn’t need to pay for a CMS to get centrally managed product definitions, for example.

Don -- Can we put this on the 1.1 plate?

Robert -- TC needs to be familiar with use cases before putting on 1.1. plate.

MP -- Need to update use cases in feature discussion.

(Action item)

Tabled until next week.
I. Roll Call -- We have a quorum

Review/approve minutes from previous meeting
http://www.oasis-open.org/apps/org/workgroup/dita/download.php/14234/minutes.8.23.05.txt

Minutes approved.

---

II. Discussion

- CamelCaseRedux

Erik Hennum summarizes roll-up in:

DITA has no naming convention

Consistent naming convention would make DITA easier to use.

Extension will increase need for more names and self-documented names (e.g. infrequently used)

(citing Robin Cover) There is some adoption of camel case among XML vocabs -- e.g. TEI. TEI article cites advantages of camel case over hyphenated names.

(citing Paul Prescod) Namespaces can affect what we decide about camel case. Aliasing of element names in authoring tools can also affect camel case. e.g. Author-visible name may be camel case, but “official” name not.

Don Day -- Original DITA design was to use HTML names where reasonable.

Bruce Esrig -- Another item to consider -- Should element names be treated in a unified way?

Don -- Some people have used data modeling tools for progressive concatenation of element names. Interesting thought, but can lead to longer element names.

Bruce Esrig -- Consider value constructed from module name. You
would want to be able to distinguish DITA element name from other parts of the name.

Don -- This won’t affect 1.1. Name changes, if they happen, would be at 2.0. Recommendation would be to use UC init character for element names, LC for attribute names.

Erik Hennum -- TEI uses LC for element and attribute names.

PP -- Using init UC for element names is violently at odds w/what we’ve done. Cost for usability would be quite high. Every new element starts w/UC. Very inconsistent.

Don -- Should we defer this whole consideration for 2.0?

Erik -- Does that mean we have no convention until 2.0? E.g., if we introduce a new compound name, is there no convention for that name?

Alan Houser -- Where does init UC for element names come from?

Robin Cover -- I’m not sure it’s accurate to attribute this to an OASIS guideline. Exists in some naming guidelines documents, But not necessarily an OASIS guideline.

Paul Prescod -- An argument for doing this now instead of 2.0 -- the more names we introduce w/ the old convention, the more we need to change. If we change at 2.0, every dita document and specialization will need to be re-vamped. Cost of revamping elements in 1.1 timeframe would be minor (as percentage of whole).

Erik -- What is current “convention”?

PP -- No capital letters.

Erik -- If we have a convention, it’s problematic to have things that violate that convention. If we don’t have a convention, what’s the loss?

Don -- Cost of migrating 2.0 users may effect whether this is a good idea

Erik -- Why should we adopt a convention prohibiting camel case in the absence of other conventions?

PP -- In absence of conventions, introducing caps will make situation worse. People will notice that divergence more than how we sometimes use dashes and sometimes don’t.

Having two ways of doing it is better than having three ways.
Don -- Is there a need for a proposal to sharpen up consistency?

PP -- In 1.1 timeframe, we should use a particular convention. 2.0 timeframe, consider revamping the whole vocabulary. Can’t say whether this would be worthwhile.

Don -- Perhaps not a critical thing to decide at this point. Appropriate for later decision? Can we defer until acceptance of 1.1 proposal?

PP -- Don’t know whether we will have additional insights later, or will we just be re-hashing the discussion.

Erik -- PP proposes that for 1.1 future, compound names will be spelled out in all LC with no hyphen.

Don -- Let’s move discussion to email list and come up w/modified proposal for 1.1 naming conventions for next week.

-------------------

Prepared issues

- #12 universality of univ-atts

Deferred one week awaiting use cases from Robert Anderson.

--------

- #9 Add a element for representing machine-processable values within DITA topics and maps

Erik -- This should be designed more fully before the committee can vote on it.

- is the committee willing to approve completing the design?

- what holes does the committee see in the design?

Erik requests feedback to email list.

Bruce Esrig -- Any relationships with other issues? e.g. Need to record structured info for other purposes?

Don -- Does this effect design, or just that context of data element meets those requirements.

Bruce -- e.g. conditionalizatoin attrs. Then possible to design special structures used for conditionalization. Do we want to design the data structure to do conditionalization?
Paul Prescod -- How would a user use the intersection of those two things?

Bruce -- Put value in conditional parameter. Assumed to be a global unique value. If the person wants to draw those names from a (product hierarchy), they may need to come up with some structures. Those structures may be similar to those in the data element.

PP -- Might this be system-wide metadata?

Bruce -- Problem comes if lower-level names are not unique. e.g. “switch” and 17 product names have “switch”.

Erik -- Existing prodinfo element is example of that.

Bruce -- This may not specifically apply under the data proposal. Perhaps it should proceed around the profiling proposal.

Don -- Does this inform on the design of the data element, or is it a best practice?

Bruce -- Could inform design if requires nesting (?)

Don -- In general, I think we want to keep the feature of cond processing separate from the design points of the elements in dita. Bruce, please correspond w/ Erik re: use cases on email list (plus any other feedback on design). A complex, real-world example would be nice to have in the spec.

PP -- Bruce -- can you send email to list highlighting these issues?

Approved for 1.1

-----------

- #40 keyref architecture

Michael Priestley -- Existing proposal -- use existing keyref attr and design the syntax for it. Allow same syntax to occur in href. New architecture -- Define keys attr in topicRef. Map can use keys attr to re-mount a key value. Map can assign key to a particular topic.

For different processing contexts you can slap in a different map and resolve to a different topic. Provides flexibility for resolving dangling references.
(MP mentioned Paul Prescod’s concern) -- Implementing this in an editor. Editor would need map values to resolve at authoring time?

PP -- My concerns don’t argue against design of actual feature.

Don -- Functional capability of keyref is not there yet. We need definition of how to do that -- e.g. connect citations to their bibliographic sources.

Approved for 1.1
MEETING MINUTES -- 06 September 2005 -- DITA TECHNICAL COMMITTEE
(Minutes taken by Seraphim Larsen <seraphim.l.larsen@intel.com>)

DITA Technical Committee website:
- Members only: http://www.oasis-open.org/apps/org/workgroup/dita/

- Roll call
  - We do have quorum for today

- Announcement from OASIS
  - Jane Harnad -- Event Manager for OASIS
    - Wants to make everyone aware of OASIS Adoption Forum
    - Date: 17 October 2005
    - Location: London, UK
    - Link for event is on OASIS Home Page:
    - UDDI and eGov will be at the meeting
    - 1-day program
    - Keynote from senior analyst at Ovum talking about Open Source, Open Standards, and so on
    - DITA presentation on the program (Indi Liepa, Ian Larner)
    - Focus on eGov, eHealth, eCommerce
    - Any questions, please contact Jane Harnad or Carol Geyer
      - contact info at http://www.oasis-open.org/who/staff.php

- Indi Liepa and Ian Larner volunteered to present at this Forum.
  - But what is the procedure for making sure the presentation meets with the TC's approval?
  - Indi and Ian will work on this, and will post a URL to the TC list for the TC to review. *ACTION*
  - Indi welcomes all advice and comments

- Review/approve minutes from previous meeting
  - http://www.oasis-open.org/apps/org/workgroup/dita/download.php/14294/minutes.8.30.05.txt
  - Minutes approved by acclamation.

- New discussion:
  - Catalogs: embedding version numbers
    - There was extensive discussion, not all of it captured here. If there are any significant omissions, please post to the TC List.
  - Chris Wong -- The proposal as it stands seems OK; the peripheral issues can be resolved separately.
  - Don -- Looks like we need to identify "best practice" for current version of the spec, and for 1.1., maybe we should update the spec with a best practice on the use of XML schema with the catalog.
  - Don -- Doesn't seem to be disagreement here -- just looks
like we need to distill this down into a design principle
that we can include in 1.1.
- Eliot -- Sounds appropriate
- Don -- Any volunteers to write up the issues and the
analysis of what we discussed here?
- Eliot -- Will take that Action Item, and will send to Paul
to review and also post to the list. *ACTION*

- Old business:
  - CamelCaseRedux (moving toward a modified 1.1 proposal)
    - Don's comments on the IBMIDDoc conventions:
    - Bruce's cautions about what not to change:
    - We will move this discussion to next week -- need more
discussion on the list

- Resume prepared issues in queue:
  - #12 universality of univ-atts

  - NOTE: Scribe may have mixed up Bruce Esrig and Robert
  Anderson in a few places in the following discussion!

- Robert Anderson - Some use cases:
  - (1) Translate xling can be set to indicate whether or
    not something should be translated.
  - (2) Users expect filtering atts to be available on
every element
  - (3) Adding ID and Conref atts to make reuse possible
    in more locations. Also possible to reuse info such
    as copyright without having to rewrite it for every
element.

- Bruce Esrig - So, would att data be available at map level
  and roll down to topic level?
- Don -- That's partially available now, but not for every
element
- Bruce -- Which elements have that?
- Robert -- Should be in documentation, but not sure if it's
  all there
- Bruce -- Useful thing to mention this under metadata in
  the documentation
- Don - Robert's got the list of elements that would use the
  att
- Robert - In the list of elementsatts, the only one he
  omitted was for table entries, because CALS style tables
  might have issues for editors and processing
- Michael Priestley - Another place to disallow filtering is
  on titles, since it is a required part of the topic
- Robert -- Can we use conref in the title?
- Michael -- Yes, or you can use multiple phrases.
  Originally it was also required for body, but since body
is an optional part of topic now, it is not required.
- Don -- Should a design consideration like this be tied in with the content model?
- Robert -- Removing them would violate backwards-compatible goal.
- Don -- Any discussion?
- Michael -- FWIW, the alternative is to allow the filtering attributes, but just accept the fact that processing can fail if people use them incorrectly. Michael thinks it's better to forbid use.
- Michael -- But if people are using the atts for flagging, perhaps it's acceptable. But seems strange to flag "body" with an att, while the topic itself is unflagged.
- Michael -- Is anyone arguing *against* the proposal?
- Robert -- Need to have a full and completed design before it's accepted or not.
- Don -- Robert should take it away and do one more pass on it.
- Michael -- Sounds OK.
- Michael -- Formally moves that Robert update the document based on this discussion.
- Seraphim -- seconds.
- Approved by acclamation. *ACTION* for Robert Anderson, due for next week.

- (Robert's use-case scenarios, above)

  - #37 Reconcile the topic and map elements
    - Erik -- Do we go forward with this, for 1.1?
    - Don -- Everyone please take a look at this particular item. *ACTION* for all, due for next week.
    - Michael -- Not sure this should go into 1.1. Will require reworking of entire linking architecture.
    - Don -- Michael and Erik, please update the "Costs" area to reflect that. *ACTION* due for next week.

  - New proposals from Members:
    - Extensibility of DITA through new attributes
      - http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/dita/200508/msg00069.html and following
      - NOT ADDRESSED -- NO TIME

    - Styling Options for Conditional Text
      - http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/dita/200508/msg00066.html and following
      - NOT ADDRESSED -- NO TIME

    - Recognizing DITA Documents
      - http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/dita/200508/msg00067.html and following
      - NOT ADDRESSED -- NO TIME
- Announcements/Opens
  - NOT ADDRESSED -- NO TIME

<end>
MEETING MINUTES -- 13 September 2005 -- DITA TECHNICAL COMMITTEE
(Minutes taken by Seraphim Larsen <seraphim.l.larsen@intel.com>)

DITA Technical Committee website:
- Members only: http://www.oasis-open.org/apps/org/workgroup/dita/

- Roll call
  - We have 14 of 23 => QUORUM

- Review/approve minutes from previous meeting
  - Minutes approved by acclamation.

- Actions:
  - #23: embedding version numbers
    - Eliot -- One of the main concerns here, is that if we rename things for the 2.0 release, it may require significant rework for users at that point.
    - See links above for more details on recommendations.
    - Don -- Is the title appropriate?
      - No disagreement
    - Don -- How should we wrap this up?
      - Don -- Moves that Eliot wrap up the document and post to the drafts section of the website, with a sample XML catalog attached.
      - No objections, approved by acclamation >>> update Action Item #23 for Eliot. ***ACTION***
    - Paul Prescod -- Suggested that the version-independent identifiers needed to explicitly reflect the DITA version 1.x application.
    - Eliot -- After some discussion, Eliot agreed that this was appropriate.
    - Paul -- also suggested that there needed to be a third form of version-independent identifier that was also not specific to any version of the DITA application.

- Review other action status
  - Don -- Everyone, please review your open action items and record your progress there / close as needed!

- Old business:
  - naming convention (conclusion of camelCase discussion)
    - Erik's summary:
    - Paul Grosso comment:
- Discussion:
  - Erik -- Are we sure that DITA 2.0 will be a clean enough break from 1.x, that we can go ahead and establish a new standard at that point?
  - Paul -- There is still a concern to users who have legacy data.
  - Don -- Concurs. We've been making assumptions that we can make broad architectural and naming changes at that point in time. If that's the case, then we might want to postpone that date as long as we can. This will cause a lot of churn for our users. We need to focus on what is really necessary for 2.0. Will there be a cost-benefit for users to move to 2.0?
  - Erik -- In other words, if we are going break something, we need to make sure there's a good reason for it.
  - Don -- Yes, let's not rattle our users if we don't need to.
  - Paul -- Concerned about delaying the change. Longer delays can be painful. Less likely that anyone will listen when we try to make the change. Only reason not to move to 2.0 ASAP, is that we are trying to get momentum behind DITA and get 1.x issues resolved as tightly as possible. But advise that we avoid delaying.
  - Erik -- Java 1.1 might be a good example.
  - Rob Frankland -- Need to be attuned to the issues. Need to be very sensitive to people who are not adopting DITA because 1.x has enough problems that they can't use it.
  - Michael -- If we're talking about backwards-incompatible changes that would actually increase the user base because it fixes people's problems. But the driver for all these changes is user value.
  - Rob -- Concurs.
  - Erik -- Getting back to naming convention issue...
  - Chris Wong? Paul Prescod? -- What about using underbars instead of hyphens?
  - Don -- Was discussed before. Underbars get lost in links (because of underlining).
  - Don -- Recap... Any other comments about Erik's specific statements?
  - Robert Anderson -- Users at IBM -- If we change existing elements to camelcase, etc., it will upset a lot of users -- what's the benefit?
  - Erik -- We won't change any existing names. If for some reason, we were breaking backward-compatibility that renaming would be possible, would the committee want to use camelCase for compounds?
  - Michael -- Is this also a recommendation for specializers?
  - Erik -- Yes, it would be a recommended consistent
convention.
- Don -- Does this suggest a separate document for specializers?
- Erik -- No, let's just keep one document. The document already addressed the issues for specializers.
- Don -- So, can we close on this document today? Anything else to bring forward? Do we need to make any amendments?
- Erik -- Need formal approval on whether to use hyphens in compounds that are base DITA (and one other thing).
- Don -- Probably can't decide this today.
- Out of time, so we need to defer this.

- revision of approved issue #12
  - NO TIME, NOT ADDRESSED

- Resume prepared issues in queue:

  - #37 Reconcile the topic and map elements
    - NO TIME, NOT ADDRESSED

  - #9 element for properties and embeddeddata (Issue9.html) modified
    - NO TIME, NOT ADDRESSED

- New proposals from Members:
  - Extensibility of DITA through new attributes
    - http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/dita/200508/msg00069.html and following
    - NO TIME, NOT ADDRESSED

  - Styling Options for Conditional Text
    - http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/dita/200508/msg00066.html and following
    - NO TIME, NOT ADDRESSED

  - Recognizing DITA Documents
    - http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/dita/200508/msg00067.html and following
    - NO TIME, NOT ADDRESSED

- Announcements/Opens
  - NO TIME, NOT ADDRESSED
MEETING MINUTES -- 20 September 2005 -- DITA TECHNICAL COMMITTEE
(Minutes taken by Bruce Esrig <esrig@lucent.com>)

DITA Technical Committee website:
- Members only: http://www.oasis-open.org/apps/org/workgroup/dita/

Agenda:
8:00-8:05 Roll call

8:05-8:10 Review/approve minutes from previous meeting
- Approved by acclamation.

Actions:
- #23: embedding version numbers
  - Closed last week. Eliot Kimber has an outstanding action to post a summary.

Old business:

- naming convention (conclusion of camelCase discussion)
  - Summary of proposal (E Hennum):
    - Existing names stay as they are
    - Future names all lower case for now
    - Use hyphens as separators between words in new names

  - Comments on proposal (E Hennum, Paul Prescod):
    - Specializers may use another convention (such as camelCase)
    - Currently, DITA can’t move to camelCase because it would be a major change
    - In the future, DITA may move to camelCase in order to be consistent with industry practices as summarized by Robin Cover

  - Proposal on naming convention accepted by acclamation.

- revision of approved issue #12
  - Note typo: mopGroup.mod should be mapGroup.mod.
  - Proposal to accept issue #12 for design work in DITA 1.1 accepted by acclamation.

- Resume prepared issues in queue:
  - #37 Reconcile the topic and map elements
    - R Anderson: There is significant work involved to implement this in the DITA open toolkit.
- Is the difficulty of implementing this in the DITA open toolkit a gating factor?
  - E Hennum: The DITA open toolkit is a basis for many implementations.
  - P Prescod: Need to check whether the difficulty is inherent, or specific to the DITA open toolkit.
  - P Grosso: The W3C has an implementation phase that is used to determine the value of a proposal.
  - R Frankland: Want to avoid proliferation of user-designed features
  - E Hennum: clear benefit of being able to share maps and topics
  - P Prescod: simplifies DITA, it is often hard to make a business case for an individual usability enhancement, but they may be worthwhile
  - E Hennum: if doing map specializations, hard to provide same pattern of specializations in maps and topics without implementing them twice.
  - B Esrig: why not create it as a feature separate from a release
  - D Day: would anyone develop it
  - P Grosso: yes, if customers request it, but the customers would be cautioned that it’s not in the standard yet
  - B Esrig: … to serve as a placeholder help vendors avoid taking independent directions
  - P Prescod: would it reduce the number of elements in DITA
  - E Hennum: first we would have a transitional period … deprecate the link element
    - additional benefits: developers see the same structure, specializers only have to do it once
  - P Prescod: reducing the number of elements is beneficial
    - provide two ways as early as possible to reduce the amount of content using the old mechanism
    - if it will happen at all, it should happen early
  - P Prescod: developers will never get ahead of the TC in matters of usability
  - R Anderson: to determine amount of effort required, we’d need to know when to release DITA 1.1
  - D Day: note that the toolkit does not implement all features of DITA 1.0
    - for example, keyref
    - so there can be motion to move the standard, however the tools might lag
  - Yas Ettasam: Cheaper solution: vendors allow users to copy references. The tools do the transforms themselves.
  - E Hennum / Yas Ettasam: Wouldn’t work for the hierarchy and parent-child relationships.
  - YE: Proposal is about enabling relationships at the topic level that are currently possible at the map level, so structuring would be possible below the map
level, which changes the story a lot.
- EH: The existing link and linkpool elements already have this capability. Want a standalone representation of all the relationships, possibly an intermediate step in processing.
- YE: Proposal is not to change the markup. Though vendors are not bound to implement the workaround.
- EH: Willing to put it on a back burner. Still in the queue of things that we might take up.
- D Day: On the post-DITA 1.1 agenda.

A brief discussion of an item that C Kravogel has in the queue with N Harrison.
- N Harrison has been collecting feedback and a report should be ready in two weeks.

End of meeting, rest of agenda appears below, for consideration at the next meeting.

#9 element for properties and embeddeddata (Issue9.html) modified
http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/dita/200509/msg00023.html and preceding

New proposals from Members:
- Extensibility of DITA through new attributes
http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/dita/200508/msg00069.html and following

- Styling Options for Conditional Text
http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/dita/200508/msg00066.html and following

- Recognizing DITA Documents
http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/dita/200508/msg00067.html and following

8:50-8:55 Announcements/Opens
8:55 Adjourn
Meeting Minutes -- 27 September 2005 -- DITA Technical Committee
(Minutes taken by Bruce Esrig <esrig@lucent.com>)

DITA Technical Committee website:
- Members only: http://www.oasis-open.org/apps/org/workgroup/dita/

Agenda:
8:00-8:05 Roll call
No quorum.

8:05-8:10 Review minutes from previous meeting

Actions:
- request to close those that are possible to close

Old business:
- #9 see and see also

New business:
- Question about which items will enter the release
  
  - Don Day will work with Seraphim Larsen to update the list of features "DITA 1.1 published requirements with effort" to indicate which items have been included / have not been included / remain to be considered / remain to be proposed / have low priority.

  - Paul Prescod proposes that a requirements deadline be established. Don Day suggests end of October.

  - Query re training (Bruce Esrig): How does DITA support the encoding of training materials in DITA XML markup?
    - Indi Liepa: Interested in training materials for servicing phones.
    - Paul Prescod: BlastRadius also interested.
    - C. Kravogel: Interest in training materials.

  - What is the support for multimedia objects?
    - E Hennum: The DITA <object> element allows references to external multimedia elements. Also, the <unknown> element allows the addition of inline vocabularies for multimedia objects that have XML representations, such as SVG.

    - P Prescod: prefer diversity, let market figure it out
    - E Hennum: We have a type hierarchy. Identify a standard class for each purpose.
- Paul Prescod: Don't bring it into the spec. Training might not belong in the base. Instead it could be introduced by a community of interest. By contrast, <bookmap> belongs in the base. Need a process to facilitate specialization in another body.

- E Hennum:
  - (1) No single body can comprehend all problem domains, so this is an opportunity to take advantage of the extensibility of the DITA architecture. Pluggability makes sense.
  - (2) Do we want to recognize particular specializations? Even if we allow a community to develop a specialization, would we have a mechanism for "recognizing" a specialization? Alternatively, would we "let a thousand flowers bloom" and let people vote with their feet, adopting certain specializations or abandoning them. Ultimately, we have no control over specializations because the architecture is designed to permit them. So the most we could do is endorse one or not.

- D Day:
- Rhetorical question: What is special about books? Why do they belong in the base?
- Answer: Because books involve distinctive processing (of an aggregate object) as opposed to HTML Help, Java Help, and Compiled help, for which topics can be processed individually. The processing of books involves additional issues.

- C Wong: conflict could result from having competing specializations

- E Hennum: need a public space where solutions could be registered

- B Esrig: related to question of a module registry (existing action item)

- D Day: Paul, whose field should the thousand flowers bloom in?

- P Prescod: support a registration process only, not a reconciliation process

- D Day:
  - can create experimental specializations
  - a registry could be available, but specializations are not required to register
  - a plug-in architecture would enable anyone who provides a specialization can drop in style sheets, XML catalogs, any other needed ingredients ... to toolkit ... allow those who use the toolkit to adopt a specialization as a plug-in
- P Prescod:
  - on training, we need someone to take the lead
  - they should assemble the community of people who is interested
  - they can find a forum ... a different OASIS TC or sub-TC perhaps

- John Hunt, IBM (joined the call to address the topic!):
  - Explore some specializations
  - A keen interest in joining others with a similar interest
  - Invite others to look at articles .. listed in Cover Pages
  - or Google DITA learning
  - Send high ratings (!) to Developer Works, then join forum (to be determined) and provide feedback
  - Plan to coordinate activities further
  - TC members should send e-mail to john_hunt@us.ibm.com

- P Prescod:
  - TC should not police other people's processes
  - could say that starting with a proposal is better than starting with a blank slate

- D Day:
  - how to build community
  - message from Carol Geyer re DITA forums in xml.org
  - what would OASIS be willing to host? Design work?

- R Cover
  - oasisopen.org is the location for formal TC activity
  - subscription groups can be created in a controlled manner to support the activities of a specialized group of TC members and others
  - OASIS is eager to support what the community would require

- D Day
  - intellectual property issue
  - anything on oasisopen.org is "submitted" under OASIS TC intellectual property (IP) rules
  - need to verify? xml.org would not have this limitation

- R Cover
  - volunteer TC members could serve as a board in administering the Web site

- D Day
  - Will talk about IP questions from TC and forum facilities
with Carol Geyer later in the week
- The Wiki would be a place to post announcements
- Announcement: Info from J Hackos on the DITA Europe conference. Nov 2nd and 3rd in Frankfurt, Germany.
  http://www.infomanagementcenter.com/DITAeurope/

- C Kravogel
  - Announcement: TEKOM annual meeting in Wiesbaden, Germany

New proposals from Members:
- Extensibility of DITA through new attributes

<end>
DITA TC Meeting minutes

Date: Tuesday, 04 October 2005
Time: 08:00am - 09:00am PT

8:05-8:10 Review/approve minutes from previous meetings

Minutes accepted by acclamation.

3-minute issues:

1. How and when to close 1.1 scope

   - Paul Prescod suggested using email.

   - Don Day explained that realistically, we will not get through the entire issues list. He proposed -- as at the last meeting -- that all proposals should be submitted by the end of the month. He then asked if anything significant was on the way.

   - JoAnn Hackos mentioned that the bookmark proposal is important. She then asked about FO output, but Don Day explained that FO output is an issue for the DITA Open Toolkit, not the DITA standard.

   - Paul Prescod brought up "meta-issues": clarity, separation of concerns etc.

   - Don Day requested that issues not yet discussed be nominated at the next meeting, to be accepted by the end of the month. Paul Prescod proposed the motion, Alan Hauser seconded. It was accepted by acclamation.

2. How and when to update bugs (candidate release DTDs?)

   - These are the "bug fix" issues that were found in the DITA 1.0 standard, covering DTD bugs, comment issues and catalog problems.

   - Don Day asked if the list considered the update to be urgent. His own opinion is in the affirmative: people on dita-users and the TC mailing lists have hit these bugs. The bug fixes can be issued as a candidate release. He wanted to know the members' preference on the extent of the release: should only the bug fixes be issued, or should there be a full cleanup that includes the comments. Chris Wong and Paul Prescod favored the latter.

   - Robert Anderson pointed out that catalogs are currently only in the DTD archive. Schemas never had corresponding catalog files: the need for one for the schemas was realized during the discussion on embedding version
numbers. He asked how catalogs should be introduced: should a separate one be included in the schemas archive or should there be a single set of catalogs for both? Paul Prescod felt that catalogs should definitely be included in the schemas archive, but was indifferent on whether there should be one or two sets. Paul Grosso favored separate catalogs.

- Eliot Kimber mentioned that his 1.1 work on embedding version number currently uses separate catalogs for DTDs and schemas, with a separate catalog that pulls the two together. This comment brought up the issue of how to reconcile or coordinate the candidate release with Eliot's work for DITA 1.1. Should the catalog changes be deferred to 1.1? Paul Prescod wanted the 1.1 work to be separate. Robert Anderson pointed out that the catalogs in their current 1.0 state are broken.

- Paul Prescod suggested that the candidate release be limited to fixes (including catalog fixes), with release notes documenting the fixes. Design issues -- specifically Eliot's work -- should be deferred to 1.1. The candidate release will not include catalogs for the schemas. Robert Anderson moved to accept the proposal, with Chris Wong seconding. It was accepted by acclamation.

3. Indexing issues (clear up issues for proposal writers)

- It was obvious that the indexterm issue did not have much agreement. Paul Prescod pointed out that the proposal (issue #45) combined a few proposals, not all of which are as heavily contested. He suggested that it be divided into separate proposals. Robert Frankland strongly agreed. Chris Wong agreed to slice up the proposal. Rob Frankland moved to accept the proposal to divide, JoAnn Hackos seconded. It was accepted by acclamation.

4. Related links content model (issue brought up by Robert Anderson)

- This is the proposal to relax the related-links content model so it can be empty. Right now, it must have at least one of link, linkpool or linklist, which is inconvenient for IBM's internal specialization work. Robert Anderson explained the issue. Don Day asked if this was a compatible change, to which Robert replied in the affirmative. This was a relaxation of the model, not a further restriction. Don Day clarified that this would go into 1.1. Paul Prescod moved to accept the proposal, and Yas Etessam seconded. It was accepted by acclamation.

5. keyref positioning wrt data element (Esrig question)

- Bruce Esrig had asked on the list if there was
a dependency between the keyref and the data element proposals. Don Day raised this question at the meeting, to which Bruce replied in the negative.

- Resume prepared issues in queue:
  - Close on #9 element for properties and embedded data (Issue9.html) modified

- Don Day pointed out that the data element proposal had dependencies: the bookmap/bookinfo proposal needed this enhancement so it can move all metadata into the bookmap element (eliminating the need for a separate bkinfo file). He asked if there were remaining issues on the proposal. Erik Hennum pointed out that the issues of the type ID attribute and content models (where <data> goes) may still be open. Don Day asked if there were any implementation issues. Erik replied that it is possible to write a generic data harvesting code for the element. Otherwise, the responsibility is really with the specializers to handle application-dependent elements that only they know about.

  - Eric Hennum moved to accept the proposal, Paul Prescod seconded. This proposal was accepted by acclamation.

8:50-8:55 Announcements/Opens

- JoAnn Hackos mentioned that she was looking for proposals from the TC for the upcoming Content Management Strategies conference. She will post details to the list.
MEETING MINUTES -- 11 October 2005 -- DITA TECHNICAL COMMITTEE
(Minutes taken by Seraphim Larsen <seraphim.l.larsen@intel.com>)

DITA Technical Committee website:
- Members only: http://www.oasis-open.org/apps/org/workgroup/dita/

- Roll call
  - We do have quorum today.

- Review/approve minutes from previous meetings
  - One item incorrectly attributed to Bruce Esrig; not sure to whom to attribute.
  - Seraphim moved to accept the minutes as read; Alan Houser seconded; approved by acclamation

- Actions (see http://www.oasis-open.org/apps/org/workgroup/dita/members/action_items.php)
  - Not covered

- News: Mailing list for DITA Focus Area Editorial Board
  - Don drew attention to the following posting:

- Write-in: Make sure we capture any items that have not been discussed -- no more new items to be accepted after the end of the month
  - Action (Yas Ettessam): Go through all the sign-up lists and minutes, and capture all the items that have been approved since June. What is left over that hasn't been fully discussed?
    - Yas Ettessam volunteered to do that.

- Don -- Is anyone working on anything else that still needs to be discussed/approved by the committee that will be ready by the end of the month?
  - Chris Kravogel --
    - #4 xNAL
    - #5 ANSI warning labels
    - #8 Allow <tm> to contain images or logoized content

- Indi Liepa -- Working on item #19 (more general task type), but stuck because of lack of time. Do hope to finish by end of month.

- Eric Sirois -- Item #35 (unknown element). Trying to get all the people together so we can put the final proposal together.

- Michael Priestley -- Plan to finish the following by end of month:
- Resume prepared issues in queue:
  - #45 Add "See", "See Also" indexing elements (original proposal--now replaced by the next 3)

- Issue #45: Add See, See Also indexing elements
  - Eliot Kimber -- "See" is used when you have redirection to another entry in the index; if you have a "See", then you don't have anything else under that entry. "See also" does allow you to have other items under that entry.
  - Chris Wong -- Agrees.
  - Eliot -- But it doesn't seem that the content model is actually structured that way.
  - Bruce Esrig -- It may be necessary to be weak in that way. The existing content model doesn't specify that you can't break up the text mix with subordinate index entry info. In order to do that, you'd have to enclose the text in a new element. (Such as Michael's suggestion: <indextext>)
  - Eliot -- We're constrained by the current index term content model -- we don't have the option of defining new element types that have a more conventional content model (primary, secondary, tertiary) (such as in DocBook).
  - Don Day -- But by explicitly marking the hierarchy, you lose the ability to insert an index into another index.
  - Bruce -- You can make the tag names level-independent (as DITA already does).
  - Eliot -- How is that different from using primary/secondary/tertiary?
  - Bruce -- You can grab one of the lower pieces and use it again somewhere else. (The scenario Don is proposing.)
    - For example, one item might appear under two headings:
      <indexterm>Fish</indexterm> <indexterm id="Carp">Carp</indexterm>
      </indexterm> ... later ... <indexterm>Long thin things that swim</indexterm>
      conref="filename.xml#Carp"</indexterm> </indexterm>
    - Note: A better example would show the level changing too. Also, it would be better to have both instances get the indexentry for Carp from a separate file.
  - Eliot -- But I can't imagine anyone actually doing that.
  - Don -- Someone might want to conref to an index term, from another index term.
  - Eliot -- Why would that be better than just retyping the word "carp"?
  - Michael Priestley -- Seems to recall some fairly common situations where (for example) you'd have an API name, and you'd have that item under its own entry, and also under a generic index list that included all APIs.
  - ?? - But would you do that with conref?
  - Paul Prescod -- Is anyone actually proposing that? (using conref)
- Michael Priestley -- What's the cost-benefit analysis for the user?

- Eliot -- You have a wrapper that wraps around the primary, secondary, and tertiary entries.

- Chris Wong -- We need to stay backwards-compatible; we can't restrict index-term further.

- Don -- The proper thing to do for 1.1 is to update the spec and define standard behavior for tools in respect to index-terms and for titles in sections--known loose structure at the base level.

- Michael --

- Paul Prescod -- The user is putting things where they are not allowed -- exactly Eliot's comment.

- Eliot -- The desire from the data-modelling viewpoint is that with "See" you don't have any levels in the content model.

- Paul -- We are already down the path of defining these constraints.

- Eliot -- Is that really where we are at?

- Bruce -- There's a content model where all sub-elements are optional. You have rules, but the language doesn't offer a convenient way of restricting it within the tool.

- Robert Anderson -- Question: somebody said use "See" when there are no other subentries; use "See also" when there *are* other entries. What happens when another topic defines a sub-entry?

- Eliot -- Error condition.

- Bruce -- You can't ensure the global semantics because you are defining everything locally; the only way to check it is for the user to generate the index and see the erroneous result.

- Chris Wong -- But the two mean different things when output in the index. Sometimes you do mean "see also" and not "see", even if there are no other entries.

- Michael -- Robert has a legitimate use-case. When you have a topic that gets reused in another collection of topics.

- Bruce -- If both "See" and "See Also" occur, then establish a rule that "See Also" is preferred?

- Robert -- A topic can be used in one context where it is "see", and then reused in another collection where there are other sub-entries. Users should not have to change <see> to <see-also> for the new context.

- Michael -- You define just one term, "See", and it changes to "See" or "See Also" depending on the context. It's an override. Even if "See" is specified in the source, when any other content occurs (typically in another instance), the "See" gets converted to a "See also" for output purposes, and the other content is preserved in the result.

- Chris Wong -- So it's a processing effect. The markup stays the same. If a "see" has to be downgraded to a "see also", it suggests an error in the content.

- Robert -- So - if a <see> ends up with other sub-entries,
it changes to "See also" in the index output. The entry is still processed as a <see>, that is, the primary term does not get a page number where the <see> is defined.

- Don -- Where do we go from here? Take it to the list? We need Erik Hennum's participation here anyway.
- Bruce -- We've had some dispersion on the list; we need to discuss this in conversation. People are naming criteria whether to do or not do certain things. It needs to be discussed in order to decide as a group which criteria to accept.
- Don -- So, we need Erik on the phone.
- Paul -- Can we have interim calls focused on this topic?
- Don -- Design issues should be worked out on the design teams. Recommends that Chris sets up a workgroup call to converge on these design points. The TC responsibility is simply to approve or disapprove.
- Chris Wong -- Will take action to set up a conference call to discuss this issue.
- That's all, out of time!

- Issue #45a: Add sort order indexing elements
  - No time, not addressed

- Issue #45b: Add page range indexing elements
  - No time, not addressed

- Issue #47 Structured Sections
  - No time, not addressed

- Issue 34: Constraints - restriction without specialization
  (was replacement domains)
  - No time, not addressed

- Issue 32: Domain and topic integration
  - No time, not addressed

- New proposals (unnumbered) from members:
  - Extensibility of DITA through new attributes
      and following
    - No time, not addressed

- Styling Options for Conditional Text
    and following
- Recognizing DITA Documents
    and following
  - No time, not addressed

- Start of documenting DITA design principles (Paul Prescod)
  - No time, not addressed

8:50-8:55 Announcements/Opens
  - No time, not addressed

<end>
Roll call
- We do have quorum

Review/approve minutes from previous meetings
- Minutes approved by acclamation.

Review for other recently completed actions
- *** Special thanks to Yas Etessam for completing Action Item 28!
- Reviewed and closed several action items -- see URL above for details.

New Schema bugs--erroneous content model for taskGrp.xsd, others
- Robert Anderson summarized the bugs listed at the URL -- they are pretty much just copy-paste errors.
- Don thought we should let everyone know that these bugs are here, even though we had decided (2 weeks ago) to approve the new schema.
- Bruce Esrig motions to accept the bug list as presented, do not retract our former approval of the schema.
- Michael Priestley seconds.
- Approved by acclamation: Accept the bug list as presented, do not retract our former approval of the schema.

1.1 issue tracking document: DITA-TC-1dot1Items_Tracking.html
- We need to distinguish between "Approved for Work" and "Approved for Design" :
  - "Proposal Approved" -- The proposal has been approved; go ahead and work on this; when you're done, we'll review it again and see if we can approve the final results ("Design Approved").
  - "Design Approved" -- The final design has been approved; it's been approved for inclusion in the spec -- it is now part of the spec.

Features list
- Definition of Status Phases:
  - In Progress:
    - Author(s) still working on proposal
  - Submitted:
    - Proposal has been submitted to TC for consideration; needs TC decision (vote) in order to proceed.
- Proposal Approved:
TC has approved the proposal; authors working to complete the design

Design Approved:
- Final design of the proposal has been approved.

Postponed:
- Proposal has been postponed to post-1.1.

Proposal Approved:
- #20 Extensible metadata attributes
- #11 Create elements for text attributes with translatable text
- #40 Keyref architecture
- #23 Embed version numbers into catalogs

Design Approved:
- #9 New DATA element
- #12 Make universal attributes completely universal
  - Seraphim proposed to move this to the "Design Approved" category
  - Michael Priestley seconded
  - Approved by acclamation

In progress:
- #38 Bookmap
- #4 Use subset of OASIS xNAL standard for addresses
- #5 Add ANSI warning labels as addition to element
- #17 Conref improvements
- #19 Introduce new, more general task type
- #14 Specialize glossary entry and definition elements
- #41/42 Allow expanding/contracting the shortdesc model
- #6 Make @role (and other enumerated attributes) unenumerated
- #8 Allow to contain images or logoized content
- #35 Support foreign content vocabularies such as MathML and SVG
- #43 Semantic (implicit) linking
- #45b Add page range indexing elements

Submitted:
- #45: Add See, See Also indexing elements
  - Chris -- The main issue was coming from the IBM side; there could be a conflict. IBM's concern was that in a high reuse environment a "see" directive could conflict with other indexterms in a map's collection of topics: the deprecated term in the "see" could itself be the term of another indexterm. The solution is to degrade a "see" in such cases into a "see also". Additionally, see/see also indexterms could be entered in a map's topicmeta element, out of any content context. Such indexterms can only generate see/see also entries and never generate page references. This allows see/see also entries to be managed entirely at the map level if so desired, eliminating topic dependency and improving reuse.
- Don -- Does the workgroup have consensus on these documents? Does the workgroup have any concerns?
- Eliot -- Except for the range issue, we were happy with the decision we made, as of yesterday

- #45a: Add sort order indexing elements
  - Chris -- One concern was that the ability to specify a sort order for each indexterm could result in inconsistent sort orders for the same term where a uniform sort order is desirable. The solution is to allow the specification of a term's default sort order by placing an indexterm with a sort order directive in a map's topicmeta element. An indexterm there would not generate a page reference.
  - Don -- Any discussion on these proposals?
  - Cannot discuss, because of phone interference (very entertaining!) -- Postpone to next week.

- #47 Structured Sections

- #34: Constraints - restriction without specialization (was replacement domains)

- #32: Domain and topic integration

- Postponed to Post 1.1:
  - #37 Reconciling topic and elements

  - Post 1.1: everything else

- Spec and process issues (from Yas's notes, other comments):
  - Update DITA 1.0 DTD/Schema specification (bug fixes and comment edits)

- Naming convention

- OASIS artifact naming guidelines (to follow where applicable)

- Relax the related links content model so it can be empty (more of a fix issue)
- Documenting DITA design principles (not approved yet)

- Details in the DITA spec--Priestley ("There are some cases...
  where the spec needs to be updated")
  - behavior of conref with attributes on the referencing element
  - why a content fragment has to be addressed within a topic

- Styling options for conditional text

- Recognizing DITA documents

- New worked proposals (unnumbered) from members:
  - Extensibility of DITA through new attributes
    and following

- Styling Options for Conditional Text
  and following

- Recognizing DITA Documents
  and following

- Start of documenting DITA design principles (Paul Prescod)

<end>
MEETING MINUTES -- 25 October 2005 -- DITA TECHNICAL COMMITTEE
(Minutes taken by Seraphim Larsen <seraphim.l.larsen@intel.com>)

DITA Technical Committee website:
- Members only: http://www.oasis-open.org/apps/org/workgroup/dita/

- Roll call
  - We do have quorum today

- Review/approve minutes from previous meeting
  - Alan Houser moves to accept the minutes as read
  - JoAnn Hackos seconds
  - Approved by acclamation

- New issues:
  - Syntax Diagram content model bug (decision needed on how to fix)
    - Don summarized the issue
    - Paul Prescod - Fixing the bug would imply changing the content model -- this is a design decision that should not be made lightly.
    - Bruce Esrig -- Better to fix sooner than later.
  - PROPOSAL: Paul Prescod moves to loosen the content model for the fig element (by adding xref and fn) to allow specializations in general, and the syntax diagram specialization in particular.
    - Robert Anderson motions to accept the proposal
    - Michael Priestley seconds
    - Approved by acclamation
    - ACTION ITEM for Robert Anderson to address this issue.

- Item to add to spec-in-process issues (Don to add to future agenda) --
  - Content model consistency, to make sure that the same base for specialization for all elements that are the same kinds of elements (Erik Hennum)

- Issues tracking:
  - Features list
  - Definition of Status Phases:
    - Design Approved: Final design of the proposal has been approved.
    - Proposal Approved: TC has approved the proposal; authors working to complete the design
    - Submitted: Proposal has been submitted to TC for consideration; needs TC decision (vote) in order to proceed.
    - In Progress: Author(s) still working on proposal
    - Postponed: Proposal has been postponed to post-1.1.
- Design Approved:
  - # 9 New DATA element
  - #12 Make universal attributes completely universal

- Proposal Approved:
  - #20 Extensible metadata attributes
  - #11 Create elements for text attributes with translatable text
  - #40 Keyref architecture
  - #23 Embed version numbers into catalogs

- Submitted:
  - #45: Add See, See Also indexing elements
    - PROPOSAL: Chris Wong moves to add this proposal to the Proposal Approved List for the 1.1 spec
      - Bruce Esrig seconds
      - No objections, approved by acclamation

  - #45a: Add sort order indexing elements
    - Discussion -- There will need to be some discussion of the details before this moves to Design Approved
    - PROPOSAL: Bruce Esrig moves to add this proposal to the Proposal Approved List for the 1.1 spec
      - Chris Wong seconds
      - No objections, approved by acclamation

  - #45b: Add page range indexing elements
    - There was some discussion, summarizing what has already been discussed on the list.
    - PROPOSAL: Chris Wong moves to add this proposal to the Proposal Approved List for the 1.1 spec
      - Michael Priestley seconds
      - No objections, approved by acclamation

  - #47 Structured Sections
    - Yas Etessam summarized the proposal.
    - Discussion ensued, was moved to the list -- needs to be consistent #34.

  - #34: Constraints - restriction without specialization (was replacement domains)
    - See comment on #47 above

  - #32: Domain and topic integration
    - No time, not addressed
- #8: Allow tm to contain images or logo content
  - No time, not addressed

- #38: Bookmap / bkinfo revision
  - No time, not addressed

- In progress:
  - # 4 Use subset of OASIS xNAL standard for addresses
  - # 5 Add ANSI warning labels as addition to element
  - #17 Conref improvements
  - #19 Introduce new, more general task type
  - #14 Specialize glossary entry and definition elements
  - #41/42 Allow expanding/contracting the shortdesc model
  - # 6 Make @role (and other enumerated attributes) unenumerated
  - #35 Support foreign content vocabularies such as MathML and SVG
  - #43 Semantic (implicit) linking
  - #45b Add page range indexing elements

- Postponed to Post 1.1:
  - #37 Reconciling topic and elements

- Post 1.1: everything else

- Spec and process issues (from Yas's notes, other comments):
  - Update DITA 1.0 DTD/Schema specification (bug fixes and comment edits)
      among others
    - No time, not addressed

- Naming convention
    (approved 2005-09-30)
  - No time, not addressed

- OASIS artifact naming guidelines (to follow where applicable)
  - No time, not addressed

- Relax the related links content model so it can be empty (more of a fix issue)
    (proposal)
    (approved for 1.1 timing)
  - No time, not addressed

- Documenting DITA design principles (not approved yet)
  - No time, not addressed
- Details in the DITA spec--Priestley ("There are some cases...
where the spec needs to be updated")
  - behavior of conref with attributes on the referencing element
  - why a content fragment has to be addressed within a topic
  - No time, not addressed

- Styling options for conditional text
  - Recognizing DITA documents
  - No time, not addressed

- New worked proposals (unnumbered) from members:
  - Extensibility of DITA through new attributes
    - http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/dita/200508/msg00069.html and following
    - No time, not addressed

- Styling Options for Conditional Text
  - http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/dita/200508/msg00066.html and following
  - No time, not addressed

- Recognizing DITA Documents
  - http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/dita/200508/msg00067.html and following
  - No time, not addressed

- Start of documenting DITA design principles (Paul Prescod)
  - No time, not addressed

- Module Registry proposal (Bruce Esrig)
  - No time, not addressed

- Announcements/Opens
  - No time, not addressed

<end>
MEETING MINUTES -- 01 November 2005 -- DITA TECHNICAL COMMITTEE

(Minutes taken by Seraphim Larsen <seraphim.l.larsen@intel.com>)

DITA Technical Committee website:
- Members only: http://www.oasis-open.org/apps/org/workgroup/dita/

- Roll call
  - We do have quorum today

- Review/approve minutes from previous meeting
  - Michael Priestley moves to accept the minutes as read
    - Alan Houser seconds
    - No objections
    - PROPOSAL APPROVED by acclamation

- New issues:
  - Clarification of 1.1 close of input (need vote)
  - Don makes the following motion:
    - Don Day, DITA TC Chair, proposes that all proposals listed in the categories "Design Approved", "Design Submitted", "Proposal Approved", "Proposal Submitted", and "In Progress" are to be considered active proposals for inclusion in the 1.1 spec, whether or not they have been submitted to the TC yet as a formal writeup. No additional proposals are to be considered for 1.1.

  - Don Day further proposes that writeups for all proposals in the "In Progress" stage (yet to enter the "Proposal Submitted" and subsequent "Proposal Approved" stages) must be presented to the TC by Monday November 14, 2005 (three meetings from now); otherwise, the proposal will be dropped from consideration for the 1.1 spec.
    >>> In other words, the proposal writeups (concept/outline) for all proposals must be submitted by this date.

  - Don Day further proposes that the design writeups for all proposals in the "Proposal Approved" stage must be submitted to the TC by Monday, December 5, 2005 for the "Design Submitted" milestone; otherwise, the proposal will be dropped from consideration for the 1.1 spec.
    >>> In other words, the detailed design writeups for all proposals must be submitted by this date.
    There will still be opportunity to discuss, debate, and revise the details of the design (both on the List and at the TC meeting, as needed).
- Seraphim Larsen moves that we accept the three-part proposal as written above.
  - Michael Priestley seconds
  - No objections
  - PROPOSAL APPROVED by acclamation

- Bruce Esrig -- We should come up with a template or list of requirements that defines exactly what must go into the design proposal. ACTION ITEM for Don Day.

- Michael Priestley moves to accept Erik Hennum's proposal to add the "Chunking" issue to the "In Progress" list (expansion of the "chunk" attribute).
  - JoAnn Hackos seconds
  - No objections
  - PROPOSAL APPROVED by acclamation

- Issues tracking:
  - Features list
  - Definition of Status Phases:
    - In Progress: Author(s) still working on proposal
    - Proposal Submitted: Proposal concept/outline has been submitted to TC for consideration; needs TC decision (vote) in order to proceed. DEADLINE: All proposals must be in this phase by 14 Nov 2005, or will be dropped from the 1.1 spec.
    - Proposal Approved: TC has approved the proposal; authors working to complete the design
    - Design Submitted: Working detailed design has been submitted to TC for consideration (discussion, debate, and possible revision). DEADLINE: All proposals must be in this phase by 05 Dec 2005, or will be dropped from the 1.1 spec.
    - Design Approved: Final design of the proposal has been approved.
    - Postponed: Proposal has been postponed to post-1.1.

- Design Approved:
  - #9 New DATA element
  - #12 Make universal attributes completely universal

- Design Submitted:
  - None currently in this phase

- Proposal Approved:
  - #20 Extensible metadata attributes
  - #11 Create elements for text attributes with translatable text
  - #40 Keyref architecture
  - #23 Embed version numbers into catalogs
  - #45 Add See, See Also indexing elements
  - #45a Add sort order indexing elements
  - #45b Add page range indexing elements
- Proposal Submitted:
  - #34: Constraints - restriction without specialization (was replacement domains)
    - Erik Hennum moves to accept this proposal and move it into the "Proposal Approved" phase
      - Bruce Esrig seconds
      - No objections
      - PROPOSAL APPROVED by acclamation

- All the following items will be addressed at next week's TC meeting -- we ran out of time today.

  - #32: Domain and topic integration
  - #8: Allow tm to contain images or logo content
  - #38: Bookmark / bkinfo revision
  - #5 Add ANSI warning labels as addition to element
  - #19 Introduce new, more general task type
  - #4 Use subset of OASIS xNAL standard for addresses
  - #6 Make @role (and other enumerated attributes) unenumerated
  - #17a Conref - improved specialization support
  - #17b Conref - with delta (applying changes)
  - #17c Conref - referencing a range of elements
  - #17d Conref and conditional processing - preserve without resolving
  - #17e Conref - push instead of pull
  - #42 shortdesc flexibility (includes #41)
  - #43 Semantic (implicit) linking
  - #35 Support foreign content vocabularies such as MathML and SVG

- In progress:
  - #14 Specialize glossary entry and definition elements

- Postponed to Post 1.1:
  - #37 Reconciling topic and elements
  - #47 Structured Sections (by request--converging thoughts with #34)

- Post 1.1: everything else

- Spec and process issues (from Yas's notes, other comments):
- Update DITA 1.0 DTD/Schema specification (bug fixes and comment edits)
    among others

- Naming convention
    (approved 2005-09-30)

- OASIS artifact naming guidelines (to follow where applicable)

- Relax the related links content model so it can be empty (more of a fix issue)
    (proposal)
    (approved for 1.1 timing)

- Documenting DITA design principles (not approved yet)

- Details in the DITA spec--Priestley ("There are some cases... where the spec needs to be updated")
  - behavior of conref with attributes on the referencing element
  - why a content fragment has to be addressed within a topic

- Styling options for conditional text
- Recognizing DITA documents

- New worked proposals (unnumbered) from members:
  - Extensibility of DITA through new attributes
    and following

- Styling Options for Conditional Text
    and following

- Recognizing DITA Documents
    and following

- Start of documenting DITA design principles (Paul Prescod)

- Module Registry proposal (Bruce Esrig)
MEETING MINUTES -- 08 November 2005 -- DITA TECHNICAL COMMITTEE
(Minutes taken by Bruce Esrig <esrig@lucent.com>)

DITA Technical Committee website:
  - Public:
    http://www.oasis-open.org/committees/tc_home.php?wg_abbrev=dita
  - Members only: http://www.oasis-open.org/apps/org/workgroup/dita/

- Roll call
  - We do not have quorum today

Summarize minutes from previous meeting:
http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/dita/200511/msg00004.html

- Remaining proposal write-ups submitted by Nov 14th
- All design-level writeups must be in by Dec 5th

New issues:
Discuss how to resolve various section proposals (from email discussions)

- Add keyword nesting to list of issues (Michael Priestley, Robert Anderson
to write up).
  Use case: a fancy application of conref. Product name needs to change
  consistently.
  Want compound strings. Prod name for Platform (two separate conrefs).
  Need a keyword entity because of contexts that it can appear in.
  Nested (specialized) keyword turns out to be a convenient means.

- Schedule for 1.1

  Proposal:
    o Six meetings on design by end of February. (Note: W3C uses
      "candidate recommendation" upon completion of design. The end of February
      would be a time when vendors could begin to implement, test, and offer
      feedback.)
    o Two rounds of draft writing to integrate design and perform updates.
    o Target submission of draft specification for public review at
    o Expect completion of approval process by September 2006.

- Staging DTD updates (DITA 1.0.1)

  Could be a Committee Draft or non-normative errata. (Mary McRae,
  communication to Don Day). The Technical Committee has already approved the
  release of the fixes.

One more bug fix in the DITA toolkit: public ID for tables should state
"DITA Exchange Table Model" according to tblDecl.mod, but uses of the ID
(e.g. in catalog-dita.txt) wrongly say "DITA CALS Tables". Risk is to those
who created a catalog using the old name.

Better for users if the bug fix is released. Will be uploaded, will get TC
approval next week to announce that the bug fix is available.
- What to include in a design template (Don Day will post by Monday):
  Formal description of feature covering language and architectural
  impacts that can be pasted into the specifications.
  Reference behavior for implementers to match. May include fragments of
  pseudocode or process description.

** END OF DISCUSSION FOR TODAY'S LIMITED SCOPE **

Issues tracking:
- Features list
- Definition of Status Phases:
  - In Progress: Author(s) still working on proposal
  - Submitted: Proposal has been submitted to TC for consideration;
    needs TC decision (vote) in order to proceed.
  - Proposal Approved: TC has approved the proposal; authors working to
    complete the design
  - Design Approved: Final design of the proposal has been approved.
  - Postponed: Proposal has been postponed to post-1.1.

- Design Approved:
  - # 9 New DATA element
  - #12 Make universal attributes completely universal

- Proposal Approved:
  - #20 Extensible metadata attributes
  - #11 Create elements for text attributes with translatable text
  - #40 Keyref architecture
  - #23 Embed version numbers into catalogs
  - #45 Add See, See Also indexing elements
  - #45a Add sort order indexing elements
  - #45b Add page range indexing elements
  - #34: Constraints - restriction without specialization

- Submitted:
  - #47 Structured Sections
    http://www.oasis-open.org/apps/org/workgroup/dita/download.php/14824/IssueNumber47.html
  - #32: Domain and topic integration
  - #8: Allow tm to contain images or logo content
    http://www.oasis-open.org/apps/org/workgroup/dita/download.php/15055/IssueNumber08_.htm
  - #38: Bookmap / bkinfo revision
  - #5 Add ANSI warning labels as addition to element
  - #19 Introduce new, more general task type
  - # 4 Use subset of OASIS xNAL standard for addresses
- #6 Make @role (and other enumerated attributes) unenumerated
  http://www.oasis-open.org/apps/org/workgroup/dita/download.php/15115/IssueNumber06.html

- #17a Conref - improved specialization support

- #17b Conref - with delta (applying changes)

- #17c Conref - referencing a range of elements

- #17d Conref and conditional processing - preserve without resolving

- #17e Conref - push instead of pull
  http://www.oasis-open.org/apps/org/workgroup/dita/download.php/15120/IssueNumber17e.html

- #42 shortdesc flexibility (includes #41)
  http://www.oasis-open.org/apps/org/workgroup/dita/download.php/15121/IssueNumber42.html

- #43 Semantic (implicit) linking

- #35 Support foreign content vocabularies such as MathML and SVG

- In progress:
  - #14 Specialize glossary entry and definition elements

- Postponed to Post 1.1:
  - #37 Reconciling topic and elements

- Post 1.1: everything else

Spec and process issues (from Yas's notes, other comments):
Update DITA 1.0 DTD/Schema specification (bug fixes and comment edits)
http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/dita/200507/msg00058.html among others

Naming convention

OASIS artifact naming guidelines (to follow where applicable)

Relax the related links content model so it can be empty (more of a fix issue)
(approved for 1.1 timing)
Documenting DITA design principles (not approved yet)

Details in the DITA spec--Priestley ("There are some cases... where the spec needs to be updated")
- behavior of conref with attributes on the referencing element
- why a content fragment has to be addressed within a topic

Styling options for conditional text
Recognizing DITA documents

New worked proposals (unnumbered) from members:
Extensibility of DITA through new attributes
http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/dita/200508/msg00069.html and following

Styling Options for Conditional Text
http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/dita/200508/msg00066.html and following

Recognizing DITA Documents
http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/dita/200508/msg00067.html and following

Start of documenting DITA design principles (Paul Prescod)

Module Registry proposal (Bruce Esrig)

<end>
MEETING MINUTES -- 15 November 2005 -- DITA TECHNICAL COMMITTEE
(Minutes taken by Seraphim Larsen <seraphim.l.larsen@intel.com>)

DITA Technical Committee website:
- Members only: http://www.oasis-open.org/apps/org/workgroup/dita/

- Roll call => We have quorum today!

- Review/approve minutes from previous meetings:
    - Don Day moves to accept the minutes as read, Sharon Veach
      seconds, no objections, APPROVED BY ACCLAMATION.
    - Don Day moves to accept the minutes as read, Sharon Veach
      seconds, no objections, APPROVED BY ACCLAMATION.

- New issues:
  - Spec comment tracking options
    - beta bugzilla mechanism
    - ws-rx TC tracking log method
    - OASIS Wiki for TCs ("All TC Wikis are open to the world;
      posting is only allowed by TC members. So the Wiki would
      allow someone on the TC to enter the issue and post
      progress/resolution for the world to see but the outside
      world wouldn't be able to actually log the issue.")
  - *** Need to select and follow a method for 1.1:
    - Bruce -- Is there someone who can edit the comments
      and put them into place? If yes, the Wiki would be
      a wonderful thing. It would have a natural
      organization to thing.
      - A comment would point to the spec, or the spec
        would point to the comment. But it seems like
        there is already a place where the comments are
        collected, but
    - Erik -- One idea is to maintain the next version of
      the spec as a Wiki document, and allow people to
      comment on it. But we need to make it clear that this
      "version" of the spec would not be authoritative.
    - Don -- The main issue is that we need to agree on the
      overall method. Any more pros/cons?
    - Michael Priestly -- What do we do with comments after
      they are incorporated?
    - Erik -- We can use the Wiki history mechanism to track
      this kind of thing. The Wikipedia has a good model
      that we can copy. It seems like that would be very
      appropriate.
    - Robin -- The Wiki that would be offered is (NNN?),
      which doesn't have as much support as some of the
      others, but it does track up to 15 versions. But
      there's no round-trip between the Wiki format and
      standard HTML. Thus you have to reconcile yourself to
      a copy-and-paste process (or write your own Perl
scripts). Thus: Investigate it, but beware of the limitations.

- Don -- PROPOSAL: We will go with the Wiki approach, and Seraphim will take on the administrative task of adding comments to the Wiki. We will make it clear that the draft in the Wiki is not the authoritative draft of the 1.1 spec, but is an unofficial draft in progress. ACTION for Seraphim would be to investigate this, and contact Robin Cover to get help with other Wikis and other guidance.
  - Don Day moves to accept this proposal, Bruce Esrig seconds, no objections, APPROVED BY ACCLAMATION.

- Revised section nesting and new keyword nesting proposals added (see below)
  - Don -- We mainly need to decide whether to allow this in, since we're at the deadline.
  - Michael Priestley -- Let's make an exception for this item, rather than extending the deadline.
  - PROPOSAL -- Grant an extension to Paul Prescod to have till next week to put this proposal in the proper template.
    - Don moves, Michael seconds, no objections, APPROVED BY ACCLAMATION.

- PROPOSAL -- Give Michael Priestley and Robert Anderson an extension till next week to provide the proposal on "keyword nesting" in the proper template.
  - Don moves, Yas Etessam seconds, no objections, APPROVED BY ACCLAMATION.

- 1.1 schedule proposed (completion of approval by Sept 2006)
  - PROPOSAL:
    - Six meetings on design by end of February. (Note: W3C uses "candidate recommendation" upon completion of design. The end of February would be a time when vendors could begin to implement, test, and offer feedback.)
    - Two rounds of draft writing to integrate design and perform updates.
    - Target submission of draft specification for public review at beginning of June 2006.
    - Expect completion of approval process by September 2006.

  - Don moves to accept this schedule proposal, Michael Priestley seconds, no objections, APPROVED BY ACCLAMATION.

- Staging of DTD updates -- Decide whether to approve as a Committee Draft or as a non-normative errata

  - PROPOSAL: To approve as a committee draft (revision 1.0.1) the upload of the revised DTDs and schemas with
release notes, conforming to the latest changes that
Robert Anderson has proposed.
- Don moves to accept this proposal, Bruce Esrig
seconds, no objections, APPROVED BY ACCLAMATION.

- New template for 1.1 (review ideas still out)
  - Not covered

- Clarification of chunk attribute (see below)
  - Not covered

- FYI -- Spec final formats reposted
  - Now includes DITA source. This is the formal DITA 1.0 spec.
  - The only real difference is the presence of the OASIS
    copyright language.

- Issues tracking:
  - Features list
  - Definition of Status Phases:
    - In Progress: Author(s) still working on proposal
    - Submitted: Proposal has been submitted to TC for
      consideration; needs TC decision (vote) in order to
      proceed.
    - Proposal Approved: TC has approved the proposal; authors
      working to complete the design
    - Design Approved: Final design of the proposal has been
      approved.
    - Postponed: Proposal has been postponed to post-1.1.

- Design Approved:
  - # 9 New DATA element
  - #12 Make universal attributes completely universal

- Proposal Approved:
  - #20 Extensible metadata attributes
  - #11 Create elements for text attributes with translatable text
  - #40 Keyref architecture
  - #23 Embed version numbers into catalogs
  - #45 Add See, See Also indexing elements
  - #45a Add sort order indexing elements
  - #45b Add page range indexing elements
  - #34: Constraints - restriction without specialization

- Submitted:
  - DISCUSSION:
    - Don -- Note that even if we haven't approved these items,
      please go ahead and work on your design versions of these
docs.
    - Michael -- Have all these items been submitted as
documented proposals?
    - Don -- Yes.
    - Don -- Can we approve all the numbered proposals without
review?
  - Michael -- Confused by that idea.
  - Don -- We are taking time to formally review each of
    these proposals. Can we just submit them all, and
    approve that each of them moves into the design phase?
  - Michael -- Concerned about that, because we need to
    give direction to the design. Better to review
    earlier than later.

- #38: Bookmap / bkinfo revision
  - DISCUSSION:
    - Don -- Highest-rated item on our list. We need to make
      a decision here so we can move on -- there's a lot of work
      to do here.
    - Don -- Are we headed in the right direction?
    - Michael -- Are we replicated metadata that already has
      a home somewhere else?
    - Don -- If it's part of the *book* metadata, then it has
      value, so that people harvesting the metadata don't have
      to look for it in two places.
    - Michael -- bookmeta is a specialization of topicmeta,
      right?
    - Don -- Yes.
    - Michael -- Do we now have a publisher metadata element?
    - No time to continue discussion
    - ACTION for Don, Michael, Erik Hennum -- Continue the
      discussion on the list.

- #32: Domain and topic integration
- #8: Allow tm to contain images or logo content
  http://www.oasis-open.org/apps/org/workgroup/dita/download.php/15055/IssueNumber08_.htm
- #5 Add ANSI warning labels as addition to element
- #19 Introduce new, more general task type
- # 4 Use subset of OASIS xNAL standard for addresses
- # 6 Make @role (and other enumerated attributes) unenumerated
  http://www.oasis-open.org/apps/org/workgroup/dita/download.php/15115/IssueNumber06.html
- #17a Conref - improved specialization support
- #17b Conref - with delta (applying changes)
- #17c Conref - referencing a range of elements
- #17d Conref and conditional processing - preserve without resolving
- #17e Conref - push instead of pull
  http://www.oasis-open.org/apps/org/workgroup/dita/download.php/15120/IssueNumber17e.html
- #42 shortdesc flexibility (includes #41)
  http://www.oasis-open.org/apps/org/workgroup/dita/download.php/15121/IssueNumber42.html
- #43 Semantic (implicit) linking
- #35 Support foreign content vocabularies such as MathML and SVG
- #14 Specialize glossary entry and definition elements

- In progress:
  - #47 Structured Sections (replaced by "Nested sections proposed compromise")
  - keyword nesting

- Postponed to Post 1.1:
  - #37 Reconciling topic and elements

- Post 1.1: everything else

- Spec and process issues (from Yas's notes, other comments):
  - Update DITA 1.0 DTD/Schema specification (bug fixes and comment edits)

- Naming convention
    (approved 2005-09-30)

- OASIS artifact naming guidelines (to follow where applicable)

- Relax the related links content model so it can be empty (more of a fix issue)
    (proposal)
    (approved for 1.1 timing)

- Documenting DITA design principles (not approved yet)

- Details in the DITA spec--Priestley ("There are some cases... where the spec needs to be updated")
  - behavior of conref with attributes on the referencing element
  - why a content fragment has to be addressed within a topic

- Styling options for conditional text
  - Recognizing DITA documents

- New worked proposals (unnumbered) from members:
  - Extensibility of DITA through new attributes
- http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/dita/200508/msg00069.html and following

- Styling Options for Conditional Text
  - http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/dita/200508/msg00066.html and following

- Recognizing DITA Documents
  - http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/dita/200508/msg00067.html and following

- Start of documenting DITA design principles (Paul Prescod)

- Module Registry proposal (Bruce Esrig)

- Clarification of Chunk attribute (Erik Hennum)

- Announcements/Opens
  - Don -- Skip next week?
    - Several people will not be available
    - Thus we will cancel next week's meeting (11/22).

<end>
DITA Technical Committee website:
- Members only: http://www.oasis-open.org/apps/org/workgroup/dita/

- Roll call
  - We do have quorum

- Review/approve minutes from previous meeting:
  - Don moves to accept minutes as read, Sharon seconds, no objections, approved by acclamation.

- New issues:
  - New template for 1.1 (review ideas still out)
    - We'll skip this for now, nothing to discuss
  - *** Action for Don, Bruce Esrig: To have a proposed template for next week
  - Clarification of chunk attribute (see below)
    - Erik Hennum posted an update, not keyed into any particular numbered issue.
    - Don thinks it is editorial commentary that can be added to the spec itself. Erik's not here to discuss anyway.
    - But should we take this off the numbered list of issues?
    - Do we need to have any discussion on this today?
    - JoAnn -- Which item is it?
    - Don -- The last item on the list of the unnumbered proposals -- http://www.oasis-open.org/apps/org/workgroup/dita/download.php/15374/Chunk.html

- Issues tracking:
  - Features list
  - Definition of Status Phases:
    - In Progress: Author(s) still working on proposal
    - Submitted: Proposal has been submitted to TC for consideration; needs TC decision (vote) in order to proceed.
    - Proposal Approved: TC has approved the proposal; authors working to complete the design
    - Design Approved: Final design of the proposal has been approved.
    - Postponed: Proposal has been postponed to post-1.1.

- Design Approved:
  - #9 New DATA element
  - #12 Make universal attributes completely universal

- Proposal Approved:
  - #20 Extensible metadata attributes
- #11 Create elements for text attributes with translatable text
- #40 Keyref architecture
- #23 Embed version numbers into catalogs
- #45 Add See, See Also indexing elements
- #45a Add sort order indexing elements
- #45b Add page range indexing elements
- #34: Constraints - restriction without specialization

- Submitted:
- #38: Bookmap / bkinfo revision
  http://www.oasis-open.org/committees/download.php/15056/IssueNumber38.htm

- DISCUSSION copied here from TC Meeting 15 Nov 2005:
  - Don -- Highest-rated item on our list. We need to make a decision here so we can move on -- there's a lot of work to do here.
  - Don -- Are we headed in the right direction?
  - Michael -- Are we replicated metadata that already has a home somewhere else?
  - Don -- If it's part of the *book* metadata, then it has value, so that people harvesting the metadata don't have to look for it in two places.
  - Michael -- bookmeta is a specialization of topicmeta, right?
  - Don -- Yes.
  - Michael -- Do we now have a publisher metadata element?
  - No time to continue discussion
  - ACTION for Don, Michael, Erik Hennum -- Continue the discussion on the list.

- Discussion continuing today --
  - Don -- If there is an existing metadata element in the design but it's not adequate.
  - Bruce -- Is there a good summary of the bookmap proposal? Can it be reposted? Many of the details of the proposal are referred out to the DITA Open Toolkit. Bruce hasn't been able to chase back to the details. Also, there are references to a newsgroup?
  - Don -- That newsgroup later became the DITA Users Group (Yahoo groups), but those references are lost links now.
  - Action for Don -- Get the linked material from Erik Hennum and post it somewhere to make it available.
  - Bruce -- Also, if we drop bookmap attributes now we'll introduce backwards incompatibility.
  - Don -- We can't remove the attributes in an architected way. Thus the proposal is to eschew their use and point users to do their metadata to the book element. Whenever we have legacy-migration issues, perhaps there should be (as part of the design document) a discussion about migration.
  - Bruce -- This is a case of something outside the spec, but commonly used as though it's part of the spec. So we would not be obligated to do this, but it would be
a service.
- Don -- In terms of moving forward to getting this to
design, let's say that the design document will
discuss several migration scenarios for existing
content. Does that sound OK?
- Bruce -- Yes
- Don -- The TC itself is not responsible for developing
tools, but we'll ask tool vendors to help support
migration. The Design Document can suggest some best
practices for the implementers to do that.
- Don -- What cases of existing content do we need to
consider to see what kinds of migration issues there
will be for users and vendors?
- Chris Kravogel -- We are using bookmap with clients.
- JoAnn -- No concerns right now, but it's a significant
change nonetheless. People are more interested in
having a "better bookmap", to avoid having to do so
much customization.
- Jen Linton -- Let's put a note out on the DITA Users
list to capture people's requirements.
- *** Action for Don -- post that on the DITA Users
List, asking who is using DITA map and what their
migration requirements will be. Capture that as an
addendum for the proposal, so we have additional
context for making a decision.
- Paul Prescod -- Are we really just adding additional
book capabilities to DITA?
- Don -- This is more about the formal ... (couldn't
catch all this!)
- Paul -- Perhaps we should call it "Add book-level
processing to DITA based upon revised bookmap demo" --
new title for the proposal.
- Doesn't want to force a large-scale rewriting, but
we might want to write the proposal from this
point of view -- for example, giving more
references to what the existing bookmap is, to
provide context for people to understand what we
are voting on.
- Chris Kravogel -- We have used the bookmap pretty much
unchanged, except for bookinfo metadata. THere is
a reason why he is on the bookmap team -- to really
follow what is happening there, so they can be ready
to make necessary changes for their customers.
- Don -- It's good to have you there, to capture your
experience with using bookmap with customers.
- Don -- Any other discussion?
- Paul -- Just one more thought -- The scope of the
work, and the scope of the 1.1 spec, is going to be
quite substantial. Does this really need to go into
base DITA? Maybe it doesn't necessarily need to be
part of the base spec with the topics.
- Don -- Has also wondered about this. How do we
differentiate between the core spec, and useful
hierarchical additions to that core? "Blessed"
buildout from that core?
- Maybe that's not a decision for today -- can we state it in terms of general principles?

- Paul -- Some DTDs and schemas will be industry-specific, that we wouldn't want to put into the core.

- Don -- Acknowledging the concern, but not identifying a decision or a specific direction.
  - Let's add an item to the non-numbered section of the things we need to discuss, to resolve this question. Action for Don ***.

- Conclusion: Action for Don to do a rewrite of the bookmap discussion so we can make a decision next week.

- #32: Domain and topic integration
  - Skipped since Erik Hennum isn't here.

- #8: Allow tm to contain images or logo content
  http://www.oasis-open.org/committees/download.php/15055/IssueNumber08_.htm
  - Owned by Chris Kravogel.
  - Don -- Within IBM, we do a word-scan of the content of the document, to compare words to known trademark lists. The scanning tool identifies them and marks only the first of multiple occurrences. It's completely dependent on the existence of discoverable text. This particular tool would not be able to scan against the existence of a graphic tm element. Thus, part of the proposal needs to look at how others might be processing these things.
  - Bruce -- The standard way of doing this, is to indicate the text together with the graphic. This would allow you to identify the trademarks contained in the document.
  - Don -- How do we implement the binding between the graphic and the text element? Typos, etc.
  - Paul Prescod? -- IBM is "IBM" as text, and "IBM" as graphical logo. This is at the heart of the matter.
  - Chris -- That's an issue for the reviewer to check.
  - Don -- This is one case where the design and processing impinge on the authoring. Can we associate the *graphic* to the tm list, so that the *tool* binds the image to the processing, rather than making the author do that?
  - Bruce -- He was envisioning that this would be done by preprocessing tools.
  - Chris -- We could have both possibilities, depending on what kinds of rules the company / author decide on.
  - Bruce -- The text strings could be post-processed depending on whether the users set things up that way.
  - Paul Prescod -- Did IBM add this element primarily to get the output effect of generating TM characters? Or is there more to it than that?
  - Don -- It generates a properly trademarked character. It can also be inserted manually, or be done by a tool. This also ensures that the terms are correct.
- Paul -- If the real goal is the element is to generate an appropriate trademark symbol, associated with some text, then it seems that the simplest proposal is to add the image to the content model for the trademark. But if there are use cases where we need to generate summary lists (etc.), we might need to address that issue too.
- Seraphim -- Easy to envision a use case where you need to summarize all the trademarks that occur and put them on a "legal disclaimer" page (for example).
- Don -- Also, there will be users who don't have an automated system like that, and need to do everything manually.
- Rob Frankland -- There are cases where a customer's trademark is not text, but is some kind of graphic.
- Don -- But even those graphics are often encoded as UNICODE code points.
- Paul -- And there are use cases where there are both graphical and textual trademarks.
- Don -- Perhaps we need a few more use cases. We don't have a clear picture of exactly what we're thinking of doing with this.
- Action for Chris -- to discuss this with Robert Anderson at IBM to look at IBM's use case.
- Action for all -- Send trademark use cases directly to Chris Kravogel <christian.kravogel@seicodyne.ch>
- Don suggests also for Chris to consider this form: <image href=""><tm attr...>IBM</tm><alt>IBM Logo</alt></image>
  This has the advantage of not creating any new markup, of not introducing image within keyword (which is what image within tm would imply), and of ensuring that tm can occur anywhere that you would want to place a logo anyway (that is, anyplace in which image is already allowed). There is little difference in terms of processing for output, and it retains the advantage of string searching for text of interest for policy-enforcing tools, and works fine for direct authoring.

- Additional commentary from Bruce Esrig, following the meeting --
  - The basic proposal seems to be to allow graphics to appear in output as a result of trademark markup.
  - We are unresolved about why this is helpful, and if it is helpful, what features to support.
  - To respect the rights of copyright holders, the first occurrence of a trademark should be marked.
  - Some authoring environments might seek to automate this marking. In such environments, the markup would be added through some sort of processing, either to clean up the source in order to make sure it is ready for production, or to automatically add trademark indications during processing. The same processing could extract the names of the trademark owners for an auto-generated list.
  - The USPTO (US Patent and Trademark Office) has a field
that can hold equivalent text for a graphic. This permits a blue graphic that looks a little like "IBM" to be associated with the text "IBM". Automatic processing could ... report a reference based on the alternate text or based on another text string ("IBM" or "the IBM logo") and credit the owner ("is the property of..."). However, we might ask whether a generic statement would be sufficient. A generic statement is sometimes used to cover the use of trademarks ("... their respective owners").

- A graphic would usually contain the appropriate trademark symbol (in the US, this is a circle-R if either a trademark or service mark is registered). Therefore adding the trademark symbol may not be suitable. The trademark markup would simply serve to flag a use of a particular graphic which is a trademarked symbol.

- Note another complication. If a trademark is used WITHIN a large graphic, would it be necessary to have non-printing markup to declare the trademark? Or is there metadata for a graphic that could be used for this?

- Additional commentary from Don Day, following the meeting --
- I think there is a true semantic distinction between trademark text (the discoverable thing that takes the (TM) or (R) superscript qualifier) and a logo, which is not ordinarily used in discourse (as with "XML" in "DITA is an application of (Embedded image moved to file: pic22036.jpg)") (FYI, there is a graphic [XML] at the end of that sentence). Legal experts might be even quicker to point out the distinction between the two. The graphic might be an output expression of a full trademarked string, but anyone searching a document for trademark infringement will be doing the string analysis anyway. Even in the output, the text of the tm should go into the @alt="XML logo" attribute for the image.

- (And the fact that IBM uses logos such as [eServer] in discourse all over the Web informs me that there are cases for such usage--I'm just trying to find the best practice for separating source from output concerns.)

- #5 Add ANSI warning labels as addition to element http://www.oasis-open.org/committees/download.php/15057/IssueNumber5-haz.htm
- #19 Introduce new, more general task type http://www.oasis-open.org/committees/download.php/15058/IssueNumber19-task.htm
- # 4 Use subset of OASIS xNAL standard for addresses http://www.oasis-open.org/committees/download.php/15112/IssueNumber4.htm
- # 6 Make @role (and other enumerated attributes) unenumerated http://www.oasis-open.org/committees/download.php/15115/IssueNumber06.html
- #17a Conref - improved specialization support http://www.oasis-open.org/committees/download.php/15116/IssueNumber17a.html
- #17b Conref - with delta (applying changes)
- #17c Conref - referencing a range of elements
http://www.oasis-open.org/committees/download.php/15118/IssueNumber17c.html
- #17d Conref and conditional processing - preserve without resolving
http://www.oasis-open.org/committees/download.php/15119/IssueNumber17d.html
- #17e Conref - push instead of pull
http://www.oasis-open.org/committees/download.php/15120/IssueNumber17e.html
- #42 shortdesc flexibility (includes #41)
http://www.oasis-open.org/committees/download.php/15121/IssueNumber42.html
- #43 Semantic (implicit) linking
http://www.oasis-open.org/committees/download.php/15122/IssueNumber43.html
- #35 Support foreign content vocabularies such as MathML and SVG
http://www.oasis-open.org/committees/download.php/15123/IssueNumber35.html
- #14 Specialize glossary entry and definition elements
- #2 Keywords in keywords
http://www.oasis-open.org/committees/download.php/15522/IssueNumber02.html
- #00 Nested Sections Solution Proposal

- In progress:
  - #47 Structured Sections (replaced by "Nested sections proposed compromise")

- Postponed to Post 1.1:
  - #37 Reconciling topic and elements

- Post 1.1: everything else

- Spec and process issues (from Yas's notes, other comments):
  - Update DITA 1.0 DTD/Schema specification (bug fixes and comment edits)

Naming convention

OASIS artifact naming guidelines (to follow where applicable)

Relax the related links content model so it can be empty (more of a fix issue)

Documenting DITA design principles (not approved yet)
Details in the DITA spec--Priestley ("There are some cases... where the spec needs to be updated")
- behavior of conref with attributes on the referencing element
- why a content fragment has to be addressed within a topic

Styling options for conditional text
Recognizing DITA documents

New worked proposals (unnumbered) from members:
Extensibility of DITA through new attributes
http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/dita/200508/msg00069.html and following

Styling Options for Conditional Text
http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/dita/200508/msg00066.html and following

Recognizing DITA Documents
http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/dita/200508/msg00067.html and following

Start of documenting DITA design principles (Paul Prescod)

Module Registry proposal (Bruce Esrig)

Clarification of Chunk attribute (Erik Hennum)

<end>
MEETING MINUTES -- 06 December 2005 -- DITA TECHNICAL COMMITTEE
(Minutes taken by Seraphim Larsen <seraphim.l.larsen@intel.com>)

DITA Technical Committee website:
- Members only: http://www.oasis-open.org/apps/org/workgroup/dita/

- Roll call
  - We do have quorum

- Review/approve minutes from previous meeting:
  - Minutes approved by acclamation.

New/housecleaning:
- OASIS Interoperability Symposium (Raleigh May 2006) / F2F?
  - OASIS Symposium in San Francisco, May 9-12,
    http://www.oasis-open.org/events/symposium_2006/
  - STC Conference, May 7-10, Las Vegas,
    http://www.stc.org/53rdConf/
- JoAnn's CMS conference -- April 3-5 in San Francisco
  - http://www.cm-strategies.com/
    - Chris Kravogel, Chris Wong, Paul Prescod, Bruce Esrig
      would be going to this one
    - Seraphim might be going too
  - Might be best to plan on a TC session at this conference
- *** ACTION for JoAnn, let Carol Guyer know that this
  meeting is happening and we want it to be OASIS-sanctioned
- *** ACTION for JoAnn to plan for a Q&A session like we had
  last time
- Raleigh Conference (Kay Ethier -- DITA 2006), March 23-25 --
  she's requested of Carol Guyer that they consider having a F2F
  for that conference too. Dave Schell, Michael Priestley, Paul
  Prescod will be there.
  - Should we ask Kay Ethier to set up a DITA F2F meeting at
    this conference?
- *** ACTION for Don to contact the organizers of these
  conferences to help set up F2F meetings, but they will not
  necessarily be official DITA TC meetings, just informal
  gatherings.

- Papers?
  - DocBook -- Anyone interested in working on a call to
    coordinate with DocBook group on writing a paper?
    - *** ACTION for Erik Hennum to coordinate with Nancy
       Harrison to make the call to the DocBook folks

- RobertA suggests moving "Relax the related links content model so
  it can be empty" to the approved items.
  - No objections, so Don will go ahead and implement (*** ACTION).

- It appears that #7 "reconcile metadata elements in topics versus
maps" (related to #12 "make univ-atts universal") did not get identified specifically during the call for 1.1-scoped items.
- Michael Priestley is concerned that we lose track of proposals that are postponed.
- *** ACTION for Don Day for next week's agenda, to prepare and distribute a list of "fell off the list" items, to make sure Michael's concern is addressed. We will go through that list next week. This will clean up our agenda and make clear what our actions need to be for the list.

Actions/status from last week:
- New template for 1.1
  - Eric Sirois: There is no proposal yet; he and Bruce are working on it. Need to finish by next week so we can discuss it.

- Clarification of chunk attribute? (depending on status from last week)
  - Don -- We discussed whether it's more of a case of editorial commentary, rather than a full proposal. What is Erik Hennum's opinion?
  - Erik -- It's sort of in the middle, since it's addressing an obscure spot. Need the opinion of the TC to make sure it's correct.
  - Don -- Since it's already in the numbered proposals, we'll hit this when we go through the list next week.

Issues tracking:
- Features list
- Definition of Status Phases:
  - In Progress: Author(s) still working on proposal
  - Submitted: Proposal has been submitted to TC for consideration; needs TC decision (vote) in order to proceed.
  - Proposal Approved: TC has approved the proposal; authors working to complete the design
  - Design Approved: Final design of the proposal has been approved.
  - Postponed: Proposal has been postponed to post-1.1.

- Design Approved:
  - # 9 New DATA element
  - #12 Make universal attributes completely universal

- Proposal Approved:
  - #20 Extensible metadata attributes
  - #11 Create elements for text attributes with translatable text
  - #40 Keyref architecture
  - #23 Embed version numbers into catalogs
  - #45 Add See, See Also indexing elements
  - #45a Add sort order indexing elements
  - #45b Add page range indexing elements
  - #34 Constraints - restriction without specialization
- Submitted:
  - #38: Add book-level processing to DITA based upon revised bookmap demo

  - Don - Don did the following rewrites, which are included in
    the proposal at the URL above:
    - Revised the title
    - Rewrote the introduction
    - Made some minor updates regarding TM and XML
    - Started gathering some input from DITA Users group and
      included in appendix

  - Don -- Does anyone see any issues?

  - Paul Prescod -- It looks like Don added the right stuff, looks
    good, addressed Paul's concerns. A person can read it through
    and understand the whole context.

  - Don -- As the owner of the proposal, he'd like to offer it for
    approval. Moves to accept the proposal.
    - Sharon Veach seconds.
    - No objections, this proposal #38 is approved and status
      must be updated to "Proposal Approved". *** ACTION for
        Don to move it to that list.

- #8: Allow tm to contain images or logo content (postpone this
  for 2 weeks, per Kravogel)
  http://www.oasis-open.org/committees/download.php/15055/IssueNumber08_.htm

- #32: Domain and topic integration

  - Erik -- A topic specialization cannot have a dependency on
    a domain, and vice-versa. THis causes some unfortunate design
    constraints. For example: We'd like to be able to share
    markup on class/method/parameter across information types, but
    cannot do that because of this constraint. The proposal is to
    come up with a way to mix-and-match domain and topic
    specializations so they can freely use new vocabulary in any
    context where it makes sense.

  - Don proposes that we accept this proposal as submitted (we
    need to see more material for a full design approval), with
    the contingent items as discussed. This gives the go-ahead to
    complete the design work.
    - Rob Frankland seconds.
    - No objections.
    - Approved >> *** ACTION for Don to move to Proposal
      Approved list.

- #5 Add ANSI warning labels as addition to element
  http://www.oasis-open.org/committees/download.php/15057/IssueNumber5-haz.htm

  - Defer to 12/20, since Chris Kravogel will be out 12/13

- #19 Introduce new, more general task type
  http://www.oasis-open.org/committees/download.php/15058/IssueNumber19-task.htm
- #4 Use subset of OASIS xNAL standard for addresses

  - Defer to 12/20, since Chris Kravogel will be out 12/13

- #6 Make @role (and other enumerated attributes) unenumerated
  http://www.oasis-open.org/committees/download.php/15115/IssueNumber06.html
- #17a Conref - improved specialization support
  http://www.oasis-open.org/committees/download.php/15116/IssueNumber17a.html
- #17b Conref - with delta (applying changes)
- #17c Conref - referencing a range of elements
  http://www.oasis-open.org/committees/download.php/15118/IssueNumber17c.html
- #17d Conref and conditional processing - preserve without resolving
  http://www.oasis-open.org/committees/download.php/15119/IssueNumber17d.html
- #17e Conref - push instead of pull
  http://www.oasis-open.org/committees/download.php/15120/IssueNumber17e.html
- #42 shortdesc flexibility (includes #41)
  http://www.oasis-open.org/committees/download.php/15121/IssueNumber42.html
- #43 Semantic (implicit) linking
  http://www.oasis-open.org/committees/download.php/15122/IssueNumber43.html
- #35 Support foreign content vocabularies such as MathML and SVG
  http://www.oasis-open.org/committees/download.php/15123/IssueNumber35.html
- #14 Specialize glossary entry and definition elements
- #2 Keywords in keywords
  http://www.oasis-open.org/committees/download.php/15522/IssueNumber02.html
- #00 Nested Sections Solution Proposal

- In progress:
- #47 Structured Sections (replaced by "Nested sections proposed compromise")

- Postponed to Post 1.1:
- #37 Reconciling topic and elements

- Post 1.1: everything else

Spec and process issues (from Yas's notes, other comments):
Update DITA 1.0 DTD/Schema specification (bug fixes and comment edits)
http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/dita/200507/msg00058.html among others

Naming convention
OASIS artifact naming guidelines (to follow where applicable)

Relax the related links content model so it can be empty (more of a fix issue)
(approved for 1.1 timing)

Documenting DITA design principles (not approved yet)

Details in the DITA spec--Priestley ("There are some cases...
where the spec needs to be updated")
- behavior of conref with attributes on the referencing element
- why a content fragment has to be addressed within a topic

Styling options for conditional text
Recognizing DITA documents

New worked proposals (unnumbered) from members:
Extensibility of DITA through new attributes
http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/dita/200508/msg00069.html and following

Styling Options for Conditional Text
http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/dita/200508/msg00066.html and following

Recognizing DITA Documents
http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/dita/200508/msg00067.html and following

Start of documenting DITA design principles (Paul Prescod)

Module Registry proposal (Bruce Esrig)

Clarification of Chunk attribute (Erik Hennum)

Criteria for making distinction between general and industry-specific
DTDs/schemas (future agenda discussion)

8:50-8:55 Announcements/Opens

8:55 Adjourn

<end>
MEETING MINUTES -- 13 December 2005 -- DITA TECHNICAL COMMITTEE
(Minutes taken by Seraphim Larsen <seraphim.l.larsen@intel.com>)

DITA Technical Committee website:
- Members only: http://www.oasis-open.org/apps/org/workgroup/dita/

Roll call
- We have quorum!

Review/approve minutes from previous meeting:
(Dec 6)
- Given that Seraphim will remove the dialogue on Item #38, Don Day moves that we accept the minutes as read.
  - Sharon Veach seconds
  - No objections
  - Minutes approved by acclamation

New/housecleaning:
- Translation focus, upcoming activities:
  - Don -- We don't have any certification regarding DITA's translation-supporting characteristics
  - For 12/20 meeting, we've lined up Andrzej Zydron to spend some time discussing this. Dec 20 15 min with Andrzej Zydron on xml:tm and translation best practices
  - For 1/17 meeting, Yves Savourel will present something on translation best practices. Jan 17 presentation, discussion/review with Yves Savourel (W3C ITS)
  - Don --
    - These presentations will take place within the DITA TC meeting
    - It's also OK to invite other people from member companies to attend as observers to see these presentations
    - Bruce -- Is there a limit of the number of people who can join the call?
    - Don -- Yes, about 70 lines, so, if you have 20 people from your company or something like that, maybe you can set up a bridge, or let Don know ahead of time
    - ACTION *** for Don to send meeting information to the TC list, with a summary of who these people are, and dial-in information for the meetings

Actions/status from last week:
- New template for 1.1
  - Draft has been completed and posted to the TC doc repository
    http://www.oasis-open.org/apps/org/workgroup/dita/download.php/15905/design-numXX.zip

Review "left off the list" and unnumbered proposals for 1.1 scope:

The items left behind by not being explicitly designated for the 1.1 cutoff include:
  - Procedure -- Go through each one, get consensus, and do
one final vote at the end.

#7 reconcile metadata elements in topics versus maps
- Michael Priestley (MP) -- let's keep it in 1.1 (he then tried to make the case why we should do that)
- Don -- OK, consensus is to keep this in 1.1A
- KEEP in 1.1

#13 Create containers for steps and other elements
- Don -- this one is done. This is already an architected solution in one of the other proposals.
- DROP from 1.1, already covered in other proposals

#46 Allow substeps to be used as steps elsewhere
- Michael -- Point to #19 as our workaround for this, taking it off the list for 1.1 for now. #19 makes it possible to do this in the future, possibly also in combination with some stuff in #17.
- Don -- Thus, this one is off the list for 1.1.
- Paul Prescod -- Need to make a distinction between items we are dropping because (1) We are solving them in other ways, (2) We are not solving them at all, (3) We are deferring solution to the future.
- Don -- Again, this one is closed because it is solved via one of the other proposals already in the works.
- DROP from 1.1, already covered in other proposals

#1 Keyword (semantic role of keyword)
- Don -- Based on Paul Prescod's analysis, we will defer this one to post 1.1.
- DROP from 1.1, deferred to post 1.1

#16 Extend link syntax to allow indicating context of a target
- Elliot -- This is important because the reuse mechanism in DITA is fundamentally broken, but doubts that we can fix it in 1.1, probably need to fix in 2.0, since.
- Paul Prescod -- If you conref something twice, and then you xref that element by ID, to which output do you generate a link?
- Michael -- If you have two topics with the same ID, the implemented behavior is to take the first one.
- Elliot -- He considers that this is fundamentally broken.
- Michael -- At least, we're in agreement that should be addressed post 1.1. Disagreement about whether there's really a problem.
- Paul -- The implementation Michael mentioned is not in the specification -- it's just in the reference toolkit. We need to document what the current behavior is expected to be, and *that* issue needs to be captured in 1.1.

- DROP #16 from 1.1, deferred to post 1.1, with possibility
for "best practices" to address some of the issues.

- But add *** NEW PROPOSAL for 1.1 -- Update spec to reflect current behavior of items cross-referenced more than once in the current implemented behavior that you see in the Toolkit reference implementation. Michael will own this new proposal, with Paul and Elliot as stakeholders.

#36 Extensible metadata by expressing data in map structures
- Erik -- This one is already handled by #9.
- Don -- Agreed.
- DROP #36 from 1.1, already covered in other proposals

#39 Policy based style
- Don -- Not possible in 1.1 scope.
- DROP #39 from 1.1, deferred to post 1.1

#41 Allow expanding the shortdesc model (related to #42, which IS on the list)
- DROP #41, already covered in other proposals (#42)

#48 Support change history and annotations in prolog
- Erik -- We need to expand on the critical date elements that are already in the prolog.
- Don -- We need to make sure it extends to map as well as topic
- DROP #48 from 1.1, deferred to post 1.1

#10 Navtitle as element (subsumed into #11)
- DROP #10 from 1.1, already covered in other proposals

#15 Allow role names to be namespaced
- Elliot -- Two different specializations can use the same role name with different semantics
- Don -- This is probably a 2.0-level issue?
- Elliot -- OK with him to defer to 2.0.
- Erik -- General acknowledgement that DITA would benefit significantly from this.
- Don -- Can it be scoped to 1.1?
- Erik -- No one has come up with a plausible and straightforward method to solve this.
- Don -- We're out of time, need to defer discussion on this one.

#18 move @format and @scope into rel-atts
- No time to finish discussion.

#31 Side-by-side implementation of DITA ids and xml:id
- No time to finish discussion.

#33 Move <refsyn> to a domain (depends on #32, which was accepted)
- No time to finish discussion.

#44 Keep indextermref (or redefine its function)
- No time to finish discussion.

#49 Better separation of XSL-FO names from XSLT logic (looks like Toolkit req)
- No time to finish discussion.

- Don -- We'll finish the discussion next time, and take our vote then. ACTION *** for Don to put this on the agenda.

Unnumbered contributions that arrived SINCE the original list was gathered and weighted:

Spec and process issues (from Yas's notes, other comments):
Update DITA 1.0 DTD/Schema specification (bug fixes and comment edits)
http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/dita/200507/msg00058.html among others

OASIS artifact naming guidelines (to follow where applicable)

Documenting DITA design principles (not approved yet)

Details in the DITA spec--Priestley ("There are some cases... where the spec needs to be updated")
- behavior of conref with attributes on the referencing element
- why a content fragment has to be addressed within a topic

Styling options for conditional text

Recognizing DITA documents

New worked proposals (unnumbered) from members:

Extensibility of DITA through new attributes
http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/dita/200508/msg00069.html and following

Styling Options for Conditional Text
http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/dita/200508/msg00066.html and following

Recognizing DITA Documents
http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/dita/200508/msg00067.html and following

Start of documenting DITA design principles (Paul Prescod)

Module Registry proposal (Bruce Esrig)
Clarification of Chunk attribute (Erik Hennum)

Criteria for making distinction between general and industry-specific
DTDs/schemas (future agenda discussion)

This section tracks changes as decisions/approvals are made.

Issues tracking:
- Features list
- Definition of Status Phases:
  - In Progress: Author(s) still working on proposal
  - Submitted: Proposal has been submitted to TC for consideration;
    needs TC decision (vote) in order to proceed.
  - Proposal Approved: TC has approved the proposal; authors working to
    complete the design
  - Design Approved: Final design of the proposal has been approved.
  - Postponed: Proposal has been postponed to post-1.1.

- Design Approved:
  - # 9 New DATA element
  - #12 Make universal attributes completely universal

- Proposal Approved:
  - #20 Extensible metadata attributes
  - #11 Create elements for text attributes with translatable text
  - #40 Keyref architecture
  - #23 Embed version numbers into catalogs
  - #45 Add See, See Also indexing elements
  - #45a Add sort order indexing elements
  - #45b Add page range indexing elements
  - #34: Constraints - restriction without specialization
    - Naming convention
    - Relax the related links content model so it can be empty (more of a fix issue)
    (approved for 1.1 timing)
  - #38: Add book-level processing to DITA based upon revised bookmap demo
  - #32: Domain and topic integration

- Submitted:
  (defer to 12/20)
  - #8: Allow tm to contain images or logo content (postpone this for 2 weeks, per Kravogel)
    http://www.oasis-open.org/committees/download.php/15055/IssueNumber08_.htm
- #5 Add ANSI warning labels as addition to element
  http://www.oasis-open.org/committees/download.php/15057/IssueNumber5-haz.htm
- # 4 Use subset of OASIS xNAL standard for addresses

(resume here for 12/13)
- #19 Introduce new, more general task type
  http://www.oasis-open.org/committees/download.php/15058/IssueNumber19-task.htm
- # 6 Make @role (and other enumerated attributes) unenumerated
  http://www.oasis-open.org/committees/download.php/15115/IssueNumber06.html
- #17a Conref - improved specialization support
  http://www.oasis-open.org/committees/download.php/15116/IssueNumber17a.html
- #17b Conref - with delta (applying changes)
- #17c Conref - referencing a range of elements
  http://www.oasis-open.org/committees/download.php/15118/IssueNumber17c.html
- #17d Conref and conditional processing - preserve without resolving
  http://www.oasis-open.org/committees/download.php/15119/IssueNumber17d.html
- #17e Conref - push instead of pull
  http://www.oasis-open.org/committees/download.php/15120/IssueNumber17e.html
- #42 shortdesc flexibility (includes #41)
  http://www.oasis-open.org/committees/download.php/15121/IssueNumber42.html
- #43 Semantic (implicit) linking
  http://www.oasis-open.org/committees/download.php/15122/IssueNumber43.html
- #35 Support foreign content vocabularies such as MathML and SVG
  http://www.oasis-open.org/committees/download.php/15123/IssueNumber35.html
- #14 Specialize glossary entry and definition elements
- #2 Keywords in keywords
  http://www.oasis-open.org/committees/download.php/15522/IssueNumber02.html
- #00 Nested Sections Solution Proposal

- In progress:
- #47 Structured Sections (replaced by "Nested sections proposed compromise")

- Postponed to Post 1.1:
- #37 Reconciling topic and elements

- Post 1.1: everything else
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<end>
DITA Technical Committee website:
- Members only: http://www.oasis-open.org/apps/org/workgroup/dita/

- Roll call
  - We do have quorum (14/21)
  - There were several attendees from various companies who
    attended to hear Andrzej Zydron's presentation on DITA and
    translation, including:
      - Vladimir Leonov, Lucent Technologies
      - James C. Hall, Lucent Technologies
      - Michael Kuperstein, Intel Corp

- Review/approve minutes from previous meeting:
  - Don moves to accept the minutes as read, JoAnn Hackos seconds,
    approved by acclamation

- Special topic:
  - Andrzej Zydron on DITA and translation
    - Three presentations:
      - Compatibility of DITA Design Principles Regarding
        Localization
      - DITA Best Practices
      - DITA and XML
    - Don -- Does anyone want to take on the list of inline elements
      presented in the Compatibility presentation?
      - Chris Wong volunteered to take a look at that.  *** ACTION
      - Some discussion of inline elements ensued.

- Next meeting will be January 3rd -- Andrzej may continue
  presentation at that meeting.
  - If you have questions for Andrzej, please post them to the
    list.

- No time for anything else!  The following material was not
  covered.

- Review "left off the list" and unnumbered proposals for 1.1 scope:

--------------------------
This section tracks changes as decisions/approvals are made.

Issues tracking:
- Features list
- Definition of Status Phases:
  - In Progress: Author(s) still working on proposal
  - Submitted: Proposal has been submitted to TC for consideration; needs TC decision (vote) in order to proceed.
  - Proposal Approved: TC has approved the proposal; authors working to complete the design
  - Design Approved: Final design of the proposal has been approved.
  - Postponed: Proposal has been postponed to post-1.1.

- Design Approved:
  - # 9 New DATA element
  - #12 Make universal attributes completely universal

- Proposal Approved:
  - #20 Extensible metadata attributes
  - #11 Create elements for text attributes with translatable text
  - #40 Keyref architecture
  - #23 Embed version numbers into catalogs
  - #45 Add See, See Also indexing elements
  - #45a Add sort order indexing elements
  - #45b Add page range indexing elements
  - #34: Constraints - restriction without specialization
    - Naming convention
    - Relax the related links content model so it can be empty (more of a fix issue)
  - #38: Add book-level processing to DITA based upon revised bookmap demo
  - #32: Domain and topic integration

-------------------------------------

- Submitted:
  (defer to 12/20)
  - #8: Allow tm to contain images or logo content (postpone this for 2 weeks, per Kravogel)
    http://www.oasis-open.org/committees/download.php/15055/IssueNumber08_.htm
  - #5 Add ANSI warning labels as addition to element
    http://www.oasis-open.org/committees/download.php/15057/IssueNumber5-haz.htm
  - #4 Use subset of OASIS xNAL standard for addresses

(resume here for 12/13)
- #19 Introduce new, more general task type
  http://www.oasis-open.org/committees/download.php/15058/IssueNumber19-task.htm
- #6 Make @role (and other enumerated attributes) unenumerated
  http://www.oasis-open.org/committees/download.php/15115/IssueNumber06.html
- #17a Conref - improved specialization support
  http://www.oasis-open.org/committees/download.php/15116/IssueNumber17a.html
- #17b Conref - with delta (applying changes)
- #17c Conref - referencing a range of elements
  http://www.oasis-open.org/committees/download.php/15118/IssueNumber17c.html
- #17d Conref and conditional processing - preserve without resolving
  http://www.oasis-open.org/committees/download.php/15119/IssueNumber17d.html
- #17e Conref - push instead of pull
  http://www.oasis-open.org/committees/download.php/15120/IssueNumber17e.html
- #42 shortdesc flexibility (includes #41)
  http://www.oasis-open.org/committees/download.php/15121/IssueNumber42.html
- #43 Semantic (implicit) linking
  http://www.oasis-open.org/committees/download.php/15122/IssueNumber43.html
- #35 Support foreign content vocabularies such as MathML and SVG
  http://www.oasis-open.org/committees/download.php/15123/IssueNumber35.html
- #14 Specialize glossary entry and definition elements
- #2 Keywords in keywords
  http://www.oasis-open.org/committees/download.php/15522/IssueNumber02.html
- #00 Nested Sections Solution Proposal

- In progress:
  - #47 Structured Sections (replaced by "Nested sections proposed compromise")

- Postponed to Post 1.1:
  - #37 Reconciling topic and elements

- Post 1.1: everything else
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