# Publication: Review D: Subject scheme (00812655-DC_1)

## Topic: enumerationdef (DA00509232)

**Paragraph-level comments**

The `<enumerationdef>` element contains an enumeration definition. An enumeration definition specifies an attribute, an optional set of controlled values, and the optional element to which the attribute and controlled values pair are bound.

| Annotation | Reviewer | Status | Type | Date | Topic version |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| With natural language shortdesc, do you need the first sentence? | zlawson | updated comment | | 12/12/2021 17:23:24 | |
| I had held of implementing natural-language short descriptions because it was impossible to use natural language for so many of these elements, and I was unsure whether we wanted to have a mix of natural language and non-natural language short descriptions.<br><br>Why impossible? Other than the "has" elements, consider attributedef. It is NOT an attribute definition ...<br><br>In any case, I changed the shortdesc to read: "An enumeration definition is a binding of an attribute to a set of controlled values. The set of controlled values can be limited to a specific element or it can be empty."<br><br>Marking this comment **COMPLETE.** | keberlein | updated comment | | 14/12/2021 19:02:45 | |

An enumeration definition can accomplish the following goals:

| Annotation | Reviewer | Status | Type | Date | Topic version |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Do we need to add a statement about how these interact with the grammar files? I believe these override the grammar files, and while I think it's stated elsewhere, might be nice to have here as well, since this is the "container" element that describes all the things it does. | zlawson | updated comment | | 12/12/2021 17:26:54 | |
| They do not override the grammar files - that interaction is laid out in a topic outside of this review, which still needs a fair bit of cleanup: https://github.com/oasis-tcs/dita/blob/DITA-2.0/specification/archSpec/base/determining-effective-attribute-values.dita<br><br>I think we need to add a draft-comment here noting that this needs to be clarified here too (possibly just a cross reference). | randerson | updated comment | | 13/12/2021 20:42:45 | |
| I think this is handled with the addition of a "Processing expectations" section.<br><br>Marking this comment **COMPLETED.** | keberlein | updated comment | | 14/12/2021 01:00:53 | |

When the `<enumerationdef>` element contains only an `<attributedef>` and a `<subjectdef>` element, the set of controlled values that are bound to the attribute apply to all elements.

For example, when `<enumerationdef>` contains only `<attributedef name="value"/>`, the `@value` attribute is limited to the specified enumeration for all elements.

| Annotation | Reviewer | Status | Type | Date | Topic version |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | dstevens | updated comment | | 8/12/2021 | |

for all elements that include the @value attribute.

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| I've gotten hesitant about saying "include an attribute" but I think we should probably update this to something similar, like "for all elements that can specify the @value attribute" | randerson updated comment | 13/12/2021 20:44:16 |
| Done.<br><br>Marked as **COMPLETED.** | keberlein updated comment | 13/12/2021 22:49:50 |

When the `<enumerationdef>` element contains a `<defaultSubject>` element, the value specified by the `<defaultSubject>` element is assumed when no attribute value is explicitly set in the DITA source.

For example, given the following `<enumerationdef>` element, any draft comment in the DITA source that does not explicitly set the @audience attribute is assumed to have a value of spec-editors:

```
<enumerationdef>
    <elementdef name="draft-comment"/>
    <attributedef name="audience"/>
    <subjectdef keyref="values-audience-draft-comment"/>
    <defaultSubject keyref="spec-editors"/>
</enumerationdef>
```

| Annotation | Reviewer | Status | Type | Date | Topic version |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| When the element contains a element, the value specified by the element is assumed when no attribute value is explicitly set in the DITA source <span style="color:green">and the XML grammar does not set a default attribute value</span> . For example, given the following element, any draft comment in the DITA source that does not explicitly set the @audience attribute is assumed to have a value of spec-editors: | gjoseph | updated | change | 15/12/2021 19:03:38 | |
| Made this change. Also added a draft comment that we need to double-check that what we have in the "Usage information " section does not conflict with the final topic about "Determining effective attribute values".<br><br>Marking this comment **COMPLETED.** | keberlein | updated | comment | 11/1/2022 18:08:00 | |

When the `<enumerationdef>` element is empty, no value is valid for the attribute.

| Annotation | Reviewer | Status | Type | Date | Topic version |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| When the element is empty, no value is valid for the attribute. <span style="color:green">The result is the same as removing the attribute from the XML grammar.</span> | gjoseph | updated | change | 15/12/2021 19:06:53 | |
| I don't think we can say that. All of this stuff with subject scheme only happens in the context of an application that supports it. It's not the equivalent of validating against the grammar file. **@Robert?** | keberlein | updated | comment | 11/1/2022 18:11:10 | |
| No, we cannot make a statement that equates this to removing the attribute from the grammar. The grammar is enforced by parsers that read documents without any knowledge of DITA, so no processing rules we create can truly be the same as removing something from the grammar (unless you're dealing with an XML parser that is DITA specifc, parsing files with knowledge of the subject scheme - which isn't going to happen).<br><br>That said, looking at this now, I do not know what it means to have an empty enumerationdef. "empty" to me means &lt;enumerationdef/> but in that case we | randerson | updated | comment | 11/1/2022 23:25:31 | |

have not specified an element or an attribute name, so how can we say no value is valid for "the" attribute?

Made the following change:

When the enumerationdef element contains only an @attributedef element that does not reference a subject, no value is valid for the attribute.

For example, the following code sample specifies that no tokens are valid for the @props attribute:

&lt;enumerationdef>

&lt;attributedef name="props"/>

&lt;/enumerationdef>

Marking this comment **COMPLETED.**

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| keberlein | updated comment | 12/1/2022 04:32:40 |

- The permissible values for the `@audience` attribute on the `<draft-comment>` element are restricted to the subject values-audience-draft-comment. This means that the only allowed values are spec-editors and tc-reviewers. If no value for `@audience` is specified for a `<draft-comment>` element in the DITA source, it is assumed to be set to spec-editors.

| Annotation | Reviewer | Status | Type | Date | Topic version |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| "it is assumed to be set" is that a evasive way of putting it as "an implementation SHOULD set it to spec-editors"? By now I got it that wording should allow for enough wiggle room. But do you think this is justified here? | fwegmann | updated comment | | 12/12/2021 16:41:53 | |
| I have no idea yet what the wording should be - I agree that "it is assumed to be set" is not great. We do not want a SHOULD rule here just because this is an example, and we do not define normative rules in examples; the normative rule is actually specified in this topic, which still needs cleanup (it's in the ordered list at the end of the topic right now): https://github.com/oasis-tcs/dita/blob/DITA-2.0/specification/archSpec/base/determining-effective-attribute-values.dita

I think it makes sense to clarify in this example that because of the rules around determining effective attribute values (maybe with a link to that topic), processors treat this as if ... | randerson | updated comment | | 13/12/2021 20:49:15 | |
| @Robert, now that we have a "Processing expectations" section with a cross reference to the topic about "Determining effective attribute values," do you still want to add verbiage and a cross reference into this example in the "Usage information" section?

Marking this comment as **COMPLETED.** | keberlein | updated comment | | 13/12/2021 23:01:29 | |
| For a quick suggested wording change: "If no value ..., processors operate as if the @audience attribute is explictly set to 'spec-editoris'."

---------

Implemented. Marking this comment as **COMPLETED.** | keberlein | updated comment | | 13/12/2021 20:49:18 | |
| Add a "Processing expectations" section, and include a cross reference to the topic that Robert has called out. | keberlein | updated comment | | 13/12/2021 20:50:51 | |

# Topic: Example: How hierarchies defined in a subject scheme map affect filtering (DA00508590)

**Paragraph-level comments**

```
<subjectScheme>
    <subjectdef keys="os">
    <topicmeta>
    <navtitle>Operating systems</navtitle>
    </topicmeta>
    <subjectdef keys="linux">
    <topicmeta>
    <navtitle>Linux</navtitle>
    </topicmeta>
    <subjectdef keys="redhat">
    <topicmeta>
    <navtitle>RedHat Linux</navtitle>
    </topicmeta>
    </subjectdef>
    <subjectdef keys="suse">
    <topicmeta>
    <navtitle>SuSE Linux</navtitle>
    </topicmeta>
    </subjectdef>
    </subjectdef>
    <subjectdef keys="windows">
    <topicmeta>
    <navtitle>Windows</navtitle>
    </topicmeta>
    </subjectdef>
    <subjectdef keys="zos">
    <topicmeta>
    <navtitle>z/OS</navtitle>
    </topicmeta>
    </subjectdef>
    </subjectdef>
    <enumerationdef>
    <attributedef name="platform"/>
    <subjectdef keyref="os"/>
    </enumerationdef>
    </subjectScheme>
```

| Annotation | Reviewer | Status | Type | Date | Topic version |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| indentation not aligned properly, beginning at the contents of &lt;subjectdef keys="windows"> | fwegmann | updated comment | | 10/12/2021 20:49:13 | |
| Corrected.<br><br>Marking this comment **COMPLETED.** | keberlein | updated comment | | 13/12/2021 23:06:14 | |

```
<subjectScheme>
    <subjectdef keys="os">
    <topicmeta>
    <navtitle>Operating systems</navtitle>
    </topicmeta>
    <subjectdef keys="linux">
    <topicmeta>
    <navtitle>Linux</navtitle>
    </topicmeta>
    <subjectdef keys="redhat">
    <topicmeta>
    <navtitle>RedHat Linux</navtitle>
    </topicmeta>
    </subjectdef>
    <subjectdef keys="suse">
    <topicmeta>
    <navtitle>SuSE Linux</navtitle>
    </topicmeta>
    </subjectdef>
```

```
      </subjectdef>
      <subjectdef keys="windows">
      <topicmeta>
      <navtitle>Windows</navtitle>
      </topicmeta>
      </subjectdef>
      <subjectdef keys="zos">
      <topicmeta>
      <navtitle>z/OS</navtitle>
      </topicmeta>
      </subjectdef>
      </subjectdef>
      <enumerationdef>
      <attributedef name="platform"/>
      <subjectdef keyref="os"/>
      </enumerationdef>
      </subjectScheme>
```

| Annotation | Reviewer | Status | Type | Date | Topic version |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| There are duplicate /subjectdef elements towarrds the end. Delete the one 6 lines from the bottom of the code block. | gjoseph | updated | comment | 15/12/2021 14:53:30 | |
| No; what is in the source file is correct. Marking this comment **CLOSED.** | keberlein | updated | comment | 11/1/2022 17:55:29 | |

Excluded, because all redhat content is excluded.

| Annotation | Reviewer | Status | Type | Date | Topic version |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Excluded, because **all redhat** content is excluded. | fwegmann | updated | change | 9/12/2021 21:39:58 | |
| Added the missing space. Marking this comment as **COMPLETED.** | keberlein | updated | comment | 10/12/2021 11:52:15 | |

If the default for @platform values is "include", this is included. If the default for @platform values is "exclude", this is excluded.

| Annotation | Reviewer | Status | Type | Date | Topic version |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Compare this description with the one in the next column; they are saying the same thing, but using completely different language to do so. Why not say things the same way? | dstevens | updated | comment | 8/12/2021 16:18:38 | |
| Good catch -- thank you! I've corrected this. Marking this comment as **COMPLETED.** | keberlein | updated | comment | 8/12/2021 21:23:53 | |

## Topic: defaultSubject (DA00508963)

**Topic-level comments**

| Annotation | Reviewer | Status | Type | Date | Topic version |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Let's assume, in the DTD or a specialization there is an attribute defined with an enumeration data type and some default value. Now a subject scheme imposes maybe different controlled values for that attribute with a different default value? How is an implementation supposed to validate a document instance? My naive understanding would be that the DTD/schema definitions have precedence. This would mean that if the | fwegmann | updated | comment | 10/12/2021 21:22:22 | |

subject scheme defines a set of controlled values none of which are in the attribute definition of the schema, then the default value of the DTD would be taken. But what is a tool like Oxygen supposed to be doing then?

Maybe I ask this, because I have (apparently) no idea what's going on behind the scenes, but then I wonder if this is worth discussing in the spec? Not necessarily here, but earlier in the usage chapter.

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| I think we should add this as a draft comment in this page, and then make sure it is covered in the section about how to determine values: https://github.com/oasis-tcs/dita/blob/DITA-2.0/specification/archSpec/base/determining-effective-attribute-values.dita<br><br>I think the answer is implied by the language today, but it's not directly addressed. The spec says that if your scheme tells you "a" and "b" are the only valid values in an attribute, then specifying "x" and "y" are both in error, and processors / applications can treat that as an error. If you set up that scheme but your grammar files only allow "x" and "y", then you've set up a scheme that means every usage of that element is automatically an error condition. | randerson | updated comment | 13/12/2021 20:57:49 |
| Added a draft comment.<br><br>Marking this comment as **COMPLETED** | keberlein | updated comment | 13/12/2021 23:11:26 |
| If the schema specifies a default value, the schema's default value is used and the subject scheme's default value is ignored. This is what's stated in the arrch spec:<br><br>The default attribute values that are specified in a subject scheme map apply only if a value is not otherwise specified in the DITA source or as a default value by the XML grammar. | gjoseph | updated comment | 15/12/2021 18:54:02 |

**Paragraph-level comments**

Do we want to make a normative statement about how processors should handle default values for attributes when they are specified by `<defaultSubject>`?

| Annotation | Reviewer | Status | Type | Date | Topic version |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Yes, I think it will help. | zlawson | updated comment | | 12/12/2021 17:10:21 | |
| Marking this comment **CLOSED**. (The work involved gets covered by other comments.) | keberlein | updated comment | | 13/12/2021 23:12:35 | |

The following attributes are available on this element: universal attributes , link-relationship attributes , `@keys` , `@keyref` , `@processing-role` , and `@toc` .

| Annotation | Reviewer | Status | Type | Date | Topic version |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| I don't play with subject scheme maps much at all, so I am highly ignorant, but my brain hurts thinking through this list of attributes.<br><br>Why would you use the link-relationship attributes on a default value?<br><br>Why is @processing-role here, but not on attributedef?<br><br>Why would this ever appear in a TOC, so why is @toc here?<br><br>If you have all the universal attributes, does that mean you can apply conditional processing on a subject scheme map? (Probably, but that really makes my brain hurt.) | zlawson | updated comment | | 12/12/2021 17:16:26 | |

Remember that the defaultSubject element is specialized from topicref, so by default, all the attributes come along. We could have -- and probably should have -- not included these attributes on defaultSubject. So, slightly bad design on the part of the TC.

But yes, one certainly can use conditional processing on elements in a subjectScheme map.

Marking this comment **CLOSED.**

| | keberlein | updated comment | 13/12/2021 21:00:36 | |

## Topic: subjectRelTable (DA00508738)

**Topic-level comments**

| Annotation | Reviewer | Status | Type | Date | Topic version |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Unless someone provides a really good reason for keeping subjectRelTable, I like the idea of moving the topics to the a repo. I really don't understand what's going on, or why you would want to do this. | zlawson | updated comment | | 12/12/2021 18:12:16 | |
| No action required, so makring this comment **CLOSED.** | keberlein | updated comment | | 13/12/2021 23:16:54 | |

**Paragraph-level comments**

The following code sample shows a subject relationship table that establishes relationships between operating systems and applications. Subjects in the first column are the operating systems, and subjects in the second column are applications.

| Annotation | Reviewer | Status | Type | Date | Topic version |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| This is more of a preference comment, but in relationship tables, I recommend to my clients to avoid multiple topics in the first cell of a rel table because it is very hard to qc what all has been associated with a single item. In this example, you can't tell as a glance what is associated with WindowsOS and that's really what you need to see. I would set ths up with row 1 being linux and row2 3 being Windows, and repeat the two items that both are related to. I realize this may not be the most efficient in terms of DITA functionality, but it is the most efficient in terms of understanding what you've done. | dstevens | updated comment | | 8/12/2021 20:37:51 | |
| @Dawn, do you have clients using subject relationship tables, or does your comment pertain to relationship tables in general? | keberlein | updated comment | | 8/12/2021 21:10:21 | |
| Relationship tables in general. I think it would apply here as well, but no, I don't have clients using subject relationship tables. | dstevens | updated comment | | 9/12/2021 13:57:58 | |
| No action required, so marking this comment **CLOSED.** | keberlein | updated comment | | 13/12/2021 23:17:31 | |

## Topic: hasRelated (DA00508710)

**Paragraph-level comments**

The `<hasRelated>` element specifies that the contained subjects have an associative relationship with the container subject.

| Annotation | Reviewer | Status | Type | Date | Topic version |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| I'm still struggling with understanding the differences between hadRelated and relatedSubjects. Here's is what the original DITA 1.2 proposal said:<br><br>&bull; **&lt;hasRelated&gt;:**A specialized &lt;topicref&gt; element that identifies an associative relationship between the container subject and each of the contained subjects. As in any DITA map, relationships applies to all parent-child pairs of descendants.<br>&bull; **&lt;relatedSubjects&gt;**A specialized &lt;topicref&gt; element that establishes associative relationships between each child subject and every other child subject (unless the association is restricted by the linking attribute of the subjects).<br><br>This does not help ... | keberlein | updated comment | 9/12/2021 16:46:59 |
| OK, after talking this over with Robert on our spec editors' call today here is the distinction, that we made:<br><br>&bull; hasRelated can be used **within** the hierarchy of a subject definition to indicate that the children subjects are related to each other.<br>&bull; related Subjects can be used **outside** of the hierarchy of the subject definitions to indicate that specific subjects are related. This is useful if the subjects that you want to indicate as related are not part of the same nodes in the hierarchical tree.<br><br>@Robert, do I have this correct?<br><br>-----<br><br>Marking this comment as **CLOSED**, as we decide to remove this element (and the "has" elements) from DITA 2.0 | keberlein | updated comment | 13/12/2021 23:23:48 |

## Example

| Annotation | Reviewer | Status | Type | Date | Topic version |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| The code sample is kind of twisted, and I don't understand the implications of the particular markup. For example:<br><br>&bull; What does specifying a key on the &lt;hasRelated&gt; element get one?<br>&bull; Also, the markup implies that linux and windows are "kinds (or maybe "types") of platforms, due to the hierarchy of the map, but why not wrap a &lt;hasKind&gt; (or &lt;hasType&gt;) element around the subject definitions for linux and windows?<br><br>If the explanatory text cannot cover these points, then I think we should swap in another example. | keberlein | updated comment | | 10/12/2021 13:05:12 | |
| Updated the introductory text to the example.<br><br>Marking this comment **COMPLETED.** | keberlein | updated comment | | 13/12/2021 23:36:07 | |

This example needs to be replaced,but I honestly do not understand the intent of the element enough to do that currently.

| Annotation | Reviewer | Status | Type | Date | Topic version |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| See my possible example, earlier -- auto may have hasrelated to mechanic and insurance. If I'm understanding the use properly. | dstevens | updated comment | | 8/12/2021 16:56:50 | |
| I reworked the introduction to the example to more clearly indicate what is happening.<br><br>Marking this comment **COMPLETED.** | keberlein | updated comment | | 13/12/2021 23:35:05 | |

```
<subjectScheme>
    <subjectdef keys="myProgram">
    <hasRelated keys="platforms">
    <subjectdef keys="linux">
    <subjectdef keys="windows"/>
    </hasRelated>
    </subjectdef>
    </subjectScheme>
```

| Annotation | Reviewer | Status | Type | Date | Topic version |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| The subjectdef element for linux is not closed.<br><br>-------------<br><br>Fixed, and marked as **COMPLETED.** | keberlein | updated | comment | 10/12/2021 12:42:55 | |

## Topic: Subject scheme maps (DA00508533)

**Paragraph-level comments**

*Controlled values* are tokens that can be used as values for attributes. For example, the `@audience` attribute can take a value that identifies the users that are associated with a particular product. Typical values for a medical-equipment product line might include "therapist", "oncologist", "physicist", and "radiologist". In a subject scheme map, an information architect can define a list of these values for the `@audience` attribute. Controlled values can be used to classify content for filtering and flagging at build time.

| Annotation | Reviewer | Status | Type | Date | Topic version |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| This may be my misinterpretation, but this definition doesn't explain that the intention of controlled values is to limit options. We're explaining what we're doing but not why we'd want to. maybe add something about Authoring tools might use this list to limit the values authors can use, avoiding mispellings and invalid values for your processing.? | zlawson | updated | comment | 12/12/2021 18:19:34 | |
| **@Robert,** I'll work this comment.<br><br>----<br><br>I've added the following sentence: "An authoring tool can then provide a pick list for values for the attribute and generate a warning if an author attempts to specify a value that is not one of the controlled values."<br><br>Marking this comment **COMPLETED**. | keberlein | updated | comment | 12/1/2022 16:09:42 | |

Key references to controlled values are resolved to a key definition using the same precedence rules as apply to any other key. However, once a key is resolved to a controlled value, that key reference does not typically result in links or generated text.

| Annotation | Reviewer | Status | Type | Date | Topic version |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| FWIW -- I do not understand what the second sentence means. | sdoherty | updated | comment | 12/12/2021 13:35:48 | |
| Quite simply, that key references resolved within a subjectScheme map do NOT generate variable text or produce links. Within the context of a subjectScheme map, the key references provide bindings or associations with subjects. | keberlein | updated | comment | 13/12/2021 20:06:03 | |
| I think the root of this problem / this misunderstanding is the poor design choice of using the same keys/keyref attribute for Subject Schemes as we do for normal linking / variable text. We had an item in the 2.0 queue to completely redesign that, but never had anyone with the time / energy to work on it (it would have been a big change). | randerson | updated | comment | 13/12/2021 21:15:29 | |

The problem here is that we have to explain "These don't work like normal keys, and you shouldn't use them in links and expect them to resolve as text or links" -- in a way that is clear, accurate, and short enough that it actually gets read. So, I think we need some work on this paragraph.

|  |  |  |  |
|---|---|---|---|
| Added a draft comment to the source.<br><br>Marking this comment as **COMPLETED.** | keberlein | updated comment | 14/12/2021 17:31:30 |
| My understanding is that keyref behavior to a subject scheme object is not resolved the usual way. Usually a keyrref results in a standard topicref behavior or substitution of the key value defined by the keydef element. In this case, at processing time, the value of the atttribute value defined by the subject scheme's subjectdef element takes effect, presumably to drive some rendering-time behavior similar to profiling or some other custom behavior that's traditionally driven from attribute values. | gjoseph | updated comment | 15/12/2021 10:53:12 |
| Marking this comment **CLOSED**. | keberlein | updated comment | 12/1/2022 04:17:35 |

## Topic: subjectHeadMeta (DA00509268)

**Topic-level comments**

| Annotation | Reviewer | Status | Type | Date | Topic version |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Somewhere in this topic need to reiterate that the content in the subjectHeadMeta is an optional display-only thing? | zlawson | updated comment |  | 12/12/2021 18:13:13 |  |
| Added the following to the short description: "for use if the subject scheme is displayed."<br><br>Marking this comment **COMPLETED.** | keberlein | updated comment |  | 14/12/2021 18:02:35 |  |

**Paragraph-level comments**

The `<subjectHeadMeta>` element enables a navigation title and short description to be associated with a subject heading.

| Annotation | Reviewer | Status | Type | Date | Topic version |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Dumb question that probably doesn't have an answer.<br><br>Why did we specialize subjectHeadMeta, but just use topicmeta for &lt;subjectdef>?<br><br>Do we need this specialization?<br><br>Would it make more sense to have a subjectMeta that could be used for subjectHeadMeta and in subjectdef? | zlawson | updated comment |  | 12/12/2021 18:22:42 |  |
| The content model of subjectHeadMeta was explicitly limited to navtitle/shortdesc -- thus the specialization. The subjectdef element can in theory reference real live content, and use all of the metadata associated with any content, while the subject heading is really just a heading.<br><br>That's the background anyway - I can't say for certain that it's better than just using topicmeta... | randerson | updated comment |  | 13/12/2021 21:23:53 |  |
|  | keberlein | updated comment |  | 14/12/2021 |  |

## Example

In the following code sample, the `<subjectHeadMeta>` element contains a `@navtitle` element that provides a label for the group of subjects:

```
<subjectScheme toc="yes" search="no">
  <!-- ... -->
  <subjectHead>
  <subjectHeadMeta>
  <navtitle>Server setup</navtitle>
  </subjectHeadMeta>
  <subjectdef href="planningTaskType.dita"/>
  <subjectdef href="installingTaskType.dita"/>
  <subjectdef href="webServerApp.dita"/>
  <subjectdef href="databaseApp.dita"/>
  </subjectHead>
  <!-- ... -->
</subjectScheme>
```

| Annotation | Reviewer | Status | Type | Date | Topic version |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| I think the example should include a shortdesc as well for the subjectHead. Per my earlier comment, I think this example is supposed to be providing documentation for a subject scheme, so I would think there should be a description of the overall grouping as part of the documentation. | dstevens | new | comment | 8/12/2021 20:31:39 | |
| I don't understand this example at all, and think it should be entirely redone. Subject head is meant to basically provide a heading within a set of subjects, which is not itself a valid thing you can select -- but it could be used to optimize editing. A better example might be a heading of "Operating systems" that then defines keys for win/mac/linux -- so "operating systems" can't be selected, but it can improve navigation for the subjects that can. | randerson | new | comment | 13/12/2021 21:22:39 | |
| **@Robert,** I've updated the example, which now is in the subjectHead topic. Do the changes work for you? | keberlein | new | comment | 14/12/2021 18:09:09 | |

## Example

| Annotation | Reviewer | Status | Type | Date | Topic version |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| This is the same code sample used in the subjectHead topic. I suggest removing it from this topic, and just cross-referencing to the example in the subjectHead topic.<br><br>----<br><br>Done.<br><br>Marking this comment **COMPLETED**. | keberlein | updated | comment | 9/12/2021 13:53:39 | |

## Topic: Binding controlled values to an attribute (DA00509076)

**Paragraph-level comments**

The `<enumerationdef>` element binds the set of controlled values to an attribute. Valid attribute values are those that are defined in the set of controlled values. Invalid attribute values are those that are not defined in the set of controlled values. An enumeration can specify an empty

`<subjectdef>` element, in which case, no value is valid for the attribute. An enumeration can also specify an optional default value by using the `<defaultSubject>` element.

| Annotation | Reviewer | Status | Type | Date | Topic version |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| The element binds the set of controlled values to an attribute. Valid attribute values are those that are defined in the set of controlled values. Invalid attribute values are those that are not defined in the set of controlled values. If ~~A~~ an enumeration ~~can~~ specif~~y~~ ies an empty element, no attribute value can be assigned to the attribute ~~in which case, no value is valid for the attribute~~. An enumeration can also specify an optional default value by using the element. | gjoseph | updated | change | 15/12/2021 12:06:07 | |
| Changed to read "If an enumeration specifies an empty element, no value is valid for the attribute."  Marking this comment **COMPLETED.** | keberlein | updated | comment | 11/1/2022 18:20:31 | |

When the above subject scheme map is used, the only valid values for the `@audience` attribute are "therapist", "oncologist", "physicist", and "radiologist". Note that "users" is not a valid value for the `@audience` attribute; it merely identifies the parent or container subject.

| Annotation | Reviewer | Status | Type | Date | Topic version |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| When the above subject scheme map is used, the only valid values for the @audience attribute are "therapist", "oncologist", "physicist", and "radiologist". Note that "users" is not a valid value for the @audience attribute ~~;~~ , it merely identifies the parent or container subject. | gjoseph | updated | change | 15/12/2021 12:09:12 | |
| Done, more or less as yu suggested. Marking this comment **COMPLETED.** | keberlein | updated | comment | 11/1/2022 18:24:32 | |

The following code sample declares that there are no valid values for the `@outputclass` attribute.

| Annotation | Reviewer | Status | Type | Date | Topic version |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| I suggest we either add to this sentence that this is done by defining an empty subjectdef element, or by making the empty subjectdef element in the code samble bold so it stands out. My preference is the latter. Although we say this explicitly in the main body of this topic above, the reader may forget this sentence by the time they read this example.  I wonder if we should make it clearer that the result of doing this means that users cannot set any value for the attribute. I'm not sure all readers will deduce this fact from the current text. | gjoseph | updated | comment | 15/12/2021 12:15:41 | |
| Added bold highlighting, also added the following sentence: "Authors will not be able to specify the @outputclass attribute on an element."  Marking this comment **COMPLETED.** | keberlein | updated | comment | 11/1/2022 18:28:36 | |

## Topic: Example: Extending a subject scheme upwards (DC00810971)

**Paragraph-level comments**

The following subject scheme map creates a "Software" category that includes operating systems as well as applications. The subject scheme map that defines the operation system subjects is pulled in by reference, while the application subjects are defined directly in the subject scheme map below:

| Annotation | Reviewer | Status | Type | Date | Topic |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|

| | | | | version |
|---|---|---|---|---|

| second line should be 'subject scheme map that defines the operating system subjects' | nharrison | updated comment | 11/12/2021 23:13:02 | |
| Fixed.  Marking this comment **COMPLETED.** | keberlein | updated comment | 13/12/2021 20:02:04 | |

## Topic: Extending subject schemes (DA00509323)

**Paragraph-level comments**

The `<schemeref>` element provides a reference to another subject scheme map. Typically, the referenced subject-scheme map defines a base set of controlled values that are extended by the current subject-scheme map. The values in the referenced subject-scheme map are merged with the values in the current subject-scheme map; the result is equivalent to specifying all of the values in a single subject scheme map.

| Annotation | Reviewer | Status | Type | Date | Topic version |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Editorial -- need to be consistent about hyphenation for "subject scheme". Sometimes it is hyphenated when used as a modifier, sometimes it is not. | sdoherty | updated comment | | 12/12/2021 13:36:57 | |
| Good point. From my recently refreshed knowledge regarding the use of hyphens in compound words, I would argue here that it should always be written without hyphen: it is not a compound adjective such as "implementation-specific rule" that usually takes a hyphen if used as modifier. Here we have two nouns forming a compound that, IMHO, falls into the same category as "user guide" or "living room". Intuitively I'd talk of a "subject scheme map", being a map containing a subject scheme. Native speakers, step forward;) | fwegmann | updated comment | | 12/12/2021 16:05:16 | |
| The phrase "subject-scheme" is hyphenated in this paragraph because it is used in long noun strings:<br><br>• Referenced subject-scheme map<br>• Referencing subject-scheme map<br><br>Without the hypen, it is less clear exactly what the adjectives "referenced" and "referencing" modify.<br><br>Marking this comment **CLOSED.** | keberlein | updated comment | | 14/12/2021 00:12:34 | |

The `<schemeref>` element provides a reference to another subject scheme map. Typically, the referenced subject-scheme map defines a base set of controlled values that are extended by the current subject-scheme map. The values in the referenced subject-scheme map are merged with the values in the current subject-scheme map; the result is equivalent to specifying all of the values in a single subject scheme map.

| Annotation | Reviewer | Status | Type | Date | Topic version |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| The element provides a reference to another subject scheme map. Typically, the referenced subject-scheme map defines a base set of controlled values that are extended by the current subject-scheme map. The values in the referenced subject-scheme map are merged with the values in the current subject-scheme map ~~;~~ . ~~t~~ The result is equivalent to specifying all of the values in a single subject scheme map. | gjoseph | updated | change | 15/12/2021 14:23:12 | |
| Dome. Marking this comment as **COMPLETED.** | keberlein | updated | comment | 11/1/2022 18:30:10 | |

**Draft comment:** Kristen J Eberlein 05 December 2021

I think we need to make a normative statement about this for DITA 2.0. I realize that doing so would require developing detailed content about processing subject scheme maps, since they have different processing expectations than DITA maps in general. Also, see the following draft comment (from the 1.3 time frame), which had been commented out of this topic.

| Annotation | Reviewer | Status | Type | Date | Topic version |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| I wonder if anyone is actually extending the subject scheme this way to create an uber ontology or taxonomy. I doubt it's used much, if at all, which may make it worthwhile considering removal of the schemeref element from our content model... I'd expect this type of activity to be done using ontology tools. | gjoseph | updated | comment | 15/12/2021 14:27:43 | |
| @Gershon, I doubt anyone is doing this. I am not aware of any processors that support schemeref. **@Robert,** should we consider removing this behavior (the transclusion and merging) rather than defining the expected processing? | keberlein | updated | comment | 11/1/2022 18:32:36 | |
| I'm not aware of processors that do this. I think we should keep the element, it's logical / intuitive that you might want to pull in controlled values from several schemes, but I'd be OK removing that language about "equivalent to specifying all values in a single subject scheme map" <br><br> I think we should run that by the TC before removing though - it's a defined behavior, and we should check if others know of its use. | randerson | updated | comment | 11/1/2022 23:11:20 | |
| Marking this as **REFERRED**. We'll have it on the agenda for the TC meeting on 18 January 2022. | keberlein | updated | comment | 12/1/2022 04:23:28 | |

## Topic: relatedSubjects (DA00509552)

**Topic-level comments**

| Annotation | Reviewer | Status | Type | Date | Topic version |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| The &lt;relatedSubjects> element seems to have a different content model than the other "has" elements. It does not permit &lt;subjectHead; why? <br><br> Was this intentional, or an error in the original content model released with DITA 1.2> | keberlein | updated | comment | 10/12/2021 13:11:45 | |
| Intentional, based on a reading of the original DITA 1.2 proposal. <br><br> If the purpose of the relatedSubjects element is strictly to be an element that can contain subjects -- and specifies that all contained subjects have (essentially) a family relationship, then there is NO need for a subjectHead element (which was intended to to provide a label that would be displayed for faceted browsing. <br><br> Marking this comment as **CLOSED.** | keberlein | updated | comment | 13/12/2021 21:25:12 | |

**Paragraph-level comments**

How is this element different from `<hasRelated>`?

| Annotation | Reviewer | Status | Type | Date | Topic version |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| in my understanding &lt;hasRelated> establishes a relationship within a classification, while relatedsubjects estabishes a relationship between classifications or categories. | dstevens | updated | comment | 8/12/2021 18:58:52 | |
| | keberlein | updated | comment | 9/12/2021 | |

| Annotation | Reviewer | Status | Type | Date |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| @Dawn, is your understanding based on these elements, or RDF? And what do you mean by a classification? Is it a subject scheme or a subject? | | | | 12:53:26 |
| I mean subjects. So using my hasrelated example, autos has hasRelated to Mechanics and Insurance, within its subject of auto. But related subjects to autos might be Henry Ford or Assembly Line or Motorcycles. These later items don't have a direct relationship. Autos don't "have" motorcycles, they are related to them. But autos do "have" mechanics or insurance. | dstevens | updated comment | | 9/12/2021 13:54:59 |
| No changes required. Marking this comment **CLOSED.** | keberlein | updated comment | | 14/12/2021 00:14:47 |

# Example

| Annotation | Reviewer | Status | Type | Date | Topic version |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| The subjectdef element for linux needs to be closed. Fixed.<br><br>Marking as **COMPLETE.** | keberlein | updated | comment | 10/12/2021 14:06:54 | |

The following code sample specifies that the Linux, the Apache Web Server, and the MySQL Database subjects are related:

| Annotation | Reviewer | Status | Type | Date | Topic version |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| If my understanding is correct, the better example from other examples we are using in other elements would be to say that the subject Cities is related to the subject Places. | dstevens | updated comment | | 8/12/2021 19:00:56 | |
| @Dawn, why would that be a better example? This example shows that a hasRelated element can contain subjectdef elements, and that the contained subjects are related in some unspeciifed way.<br><br>I don't really see the utility of this, except as a minimal framework for some sort of faceted browsing. | keberlein | updated comment | | 9/12/2021 12:59:17 | |
| I think you can close this. I think I didn't pay enough attention to this example and was thinkig that all the listed subjectdefs were things that had been part of the same subject in the past -- linux, redhat, etc. -- which they obviously aren't. Sorry. | dstevens | updated comment | | 9/12/2021 13:42:42 | |
| Marking this comment **CLOSED.** | keberlein | updated comment | | 9/12/2021 13:46:07 | |

# Topic: subjectRelHeader (DA00509505)

**Paragraph-level comments**

Each cell in the header row identifies a subject topic that defines a role. When specializing the `<subjectRelTable>` element, you can accomplish the same purpose by specializing the cells within the rows to enforce the roles.

| Annotation | Reviewer | Status | Type | Date | Topic version |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| I think this whole explanation is confusing.<br><br>• Can we eliminate the word "topic" -- Each cell in the header row identifies a subject (or category or classification) that applies to all of the &lt;subjectRole> elements contained in the corresponding column. | dstevens | updated comment | | 8/12/2021 20:43:06 | |

- For the second sentence, I have no idea what we are talking about. is is saying that you might specialize subjectRole to specifically correspond to a particular classification of values -- so that subjectRole in the first column, for example, could only include keyrefs that were part of the column's referenced content -- kind of like an enumeration that specifies which values are allowed in a specific column? Whether that is indeed what is being said, or something else entirely, could we be a little less obuse?

Also, looking at the example rendered table confuses me more because it *looks* like we are saying the entire scheme associated with operating system is related to the entire scheme associated with application. So should this somewhere indicate that althourgh you are using a keyref, no association is established in the subjectrelheader? That may be obvious, but it doesn't really look that way.

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| I find this content confusing, also. The design of subjectRelTable, which does not strictly mirror that of relatable, is largely to blame, I think. | keberlein | updated comment | 9/12/2021 13:10:14 |
| For the first sentence - yes, I think we should change or remove the word "topic". I think we should delete the second sentence entirely. The idea behind it was that people would be specializing &lt;subjectRelTable> to create even more specialized types of subject relationships. We're struggling to determine if people even use the base element, so I do not think we should talk about specializing it in the usage information. | randerson | updated comment | 13/12/2021 21:30:05 |
| Implemented the changes that Robert suggested. Marking this comment **COMPLETED.** | keberlein | updated comment | 14/12/2021 00:17:39 |
| I suggest deleting the second sentence. It's irrelevant here. Perhaps it could be moved to the arch spec, but even there I don't see much value in explaining how a user would specialize subjectRelTable futher. | gjoseph | updated comment | 16/12/2021 10:41:26 |
| Marking this comment **CLOSED,** as the TC decide to remove subject rel table. | keberlein | updated comment | 11/1/2022 19:02:44 |

Do we need such an example?

| Annotation | Reviewer | Status | Type | Date | Topic version |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| What would be a more complex example? What is the use case for such complexity? I wouldn't think we would need it, unless an easy use case comes to mind. | dstevens | updated comment | | 8/12/2021 20:51:42 | |
| A reason for a more complex example is that the subjectRelHeader shown in the subjectRelTable topic does not clearly show what can be done with this element. | keberlein | updated comment | | 9/12/2021 13:12:22 | |

# Topic: schemeref (DA00508610)

**Topic-level comments**

| Annotation | Reviewer | Status | Type | Date | Topic version |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| You could refer to the existing example discussed in the general examples section using schemeref. I would add an example here only if you can demonstrate a capability of schemeref not shown previously. | fwegmann | updated comment | | 12/12/2021 16:54:52 | |
| Removed the draft comment. Marking this comment **CLOSED.** | keberlein | updated comment | 11/1/2022 18:38:37 | | | |

**Paragraph-level comments**

The values specified in the subject scheme maps are merged; the result is equivalent to specifying all of the values in a single map.

| Annotation | Reviewer | Status | Type | Date | Topic version |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| The values specified in the subject scheme maps are merged . ; t The result is equivalent to specifying all of the values in a single map. | gjoseph | updated | change | 16/12/2021 09:54:43 | |
| Done. marking this comment **COMPLETED.** | keberlein | updated | comment | 11/1/2022 18:36:32 | |

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

| Annotation | Reviewer | Status | Type | Date | Topic version |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Should this also get @processing-role? Possibly with a default value? Also @toc = no as default? | zlawson | updated | comment | 12/12/2021 17:31:10 | |
| **@Robert?** I don't want to hog all the "fun" here ... | keberlein | updated | comment | 11/1/2022 18:39:21 | |
| At this point I don't think so. It is only available inside of subject schemes, and only meant to reference other subject schemes; I think whatever role you've assigned to the root subject scheme (almost certainly "resource-only") should carry through. Similarly, I think it's safe to use the root TOC setting here. Marking **CLOSED** - it wouldn't hurt to add them but I don't think there is a compelling reason to do so, absent a push at the TC. | randerson | updated | comment | 11/1/2022 23:28:15 | |

Would it be good to have a separate example for this element?

| Annotation | Reviewer | Status | Type | Date | Topic version |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| I think an example here would be helpful to the reader, but only if it's complete. Since we have the example in the arch spec (if I remember correctly), perhaps a link to the arch spec topic with the example will suffice. | gjoseph | updated | comment | 16/12/2021 10:00:13 | |
| Marking this comment **CLOSED,** as I have removed the draft comment. | keberlein | updated | comment | 11/1/2022 18:40:02 | |

# Topic: hasNarrower (DA00508596)

**Paragraph-level comments**

The container subject is more general than the subjects contained within the `<hasNarrower>`element. The way in which the contained subjects represent a narrower relationship is not specified.

| Annotation | Reviewer | Status | Type | Date | Topic version |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| add space between &lt;hasNarrower> and element. | dstevens | updated | comment | 8/12/2021 16:52:18 | |
| Done. | keberlein | updated | comment | 8/12/2021 21:15:00 | |

| Annotation | | Reviewer | Status | Type | Date | Topic version |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Marking this comment as **COMPLETED.** | | | | | | |

## Example

| Annotation | Reviewer | Status | Type | Date | Topic version |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Isn't the "planting-rose" subject narrower than "horticulture," simply by virtue of the fact that "planting-roses" is a child of "horticulture"?<br><br>---<br><br>According to the DITA 1.2 proposal for this stuff (https://www.oasis-open.org/apps/org/workgroup/dita/download.php/26359/IssueControlledValues12031.html) the &lt;hasNarrower> element " makes the default hierarchical relationship explicit."<br><br>I wonder if Erik Hennum anticipated that some viewing applications would not understand the hierarchy of the map, and so would need markup like &lt;hasNarrower> ...<br><br>----<br><br>No changes required. Marking this comment **CLOSED.** | keberlein | updated comment | | 10/12/2021 12:19:07 | |

## Topic: subjectRel (DA00508992)

**Paragraph-level comments**

The associations between different cells in the same row are evaluated in the same way as those in a `<relrow>`.

| Annotation | Reviewer | Status | Type | Date | Topic version |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| should there be a crossref here? | dstevens | updated comment | | 8/12/2021 20:32:20 | |
| No. Anyone needing to look at the relrow topic can access it through using the "DITA elements, A to Z" topic.<br><br>Marking this comment as **CLOSED.** | keberlein | updated comment | | 8/12/2021 21:17:30 | |

## Topic: Processing controlled attribute values (DA00508848)

**Paragraph-level comments**

- Processors *SHOULD* validate that the values of attributes that are bound to controlled values contain only valid values from those sets. (The list of controlled values is not validated by basic XML parsers.) If the controlled values are part of a named key scope, the scope name is ignored for the purpose of validating the controlled values.

| Annotation | Reviewer | Status | Type | Date | Topic version |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Processors SHOULD validate that the values of attributes that are bound to controlled values contain only valid values from those sets. ( This requirement is needed because T tbasic XML parsers do not validate the list of controlled values is not validated by basic XML parsers. ) If the controlled values are part of a named key scope, the scope name is ignored for the purpose of validating the controlled values. | gjoseph | updated change | | 15/12/2021 14:19:17 | |
| Done. Marking this comment **COMPLETED.** | keberlein | updated comment | | 11/1/2022 18:42:54 | |

# Topic: subjectdef (DA00508958)

**Topic-level comments**

| Annotation | Reviewer | Status | Type | Date | Topic version |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| I think I'm not seeing the distinction between the code samples. The example is the same; but the introduction is slightly different. I would suggest a more robust example with multiple first level subject defs and nested ones. | dstevens | updated comment | | 8/12/2021 19:04:26 | |
| Mistake in the DITA source! Apologies.<br><br>Marking this comment **CLOSED.** | keberlein | updated comment | | 9/12/2021 14:14:52 | |

**Paragraph-level comments**

The `<subjectdef>` element can use a `<navtitle>` element to supply a label for the subject. The `@href` attribute on `<subjectdef>` can be used to reference a topic that captures the consensus definition for the subject.

| Annotation | Reviewer | Status | Type | Date | Topic version |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| What is "consensus definition"? I *thnk* I figured it out, but will our average reader know what this means? | gjoseph | updated comment | | 16/12/2021 10:02:15 | |
| Changed to read "provides more information about a subject and how authors use it when classifying content." Yeah, the wording was very Erik Hennum!<br><br>Marking this comment **COMPLETED.** | keberlein | updated comment | | 11/1/2022 18:48:28 | |

The following attributes are available on this element: universal attributes , link-relationship attributes , `@keys` , `@keyref` , `@processing-role` , `@toc` , `@collection-type` , and `@linking` .

| Annotation | Reviewer | Status | Type | Date | Topic version |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| What the heck would @collection-type or @linking do? Ditto the link-relationship attributes. | zlawson | updated comment | | 12/12/2021 17:35:17 | |
| **@Robert?** Sharing the fun here ... | keberlein | updated comment | | 11/1/2022 18:44:47 | |
| They would just inherit the common processing used elsewhere - provided you're trying to publish the scheme, which is possible but not the most common case. Early on, I saw examples of subject schemes where each "subject" was a DITA topic, so publishing the scheme could be used to publish your taxonomy, in which case you'd want all of the normal processing associated with those attributes.<br><br>Marking **CLOSED** - there is no driving reason to remove these, and if used, they'd pick up normal processing behaviors. | randerson | updated comment | | 11/1/2022 23:30:22 | |

## Example

| Annotation | Reviewer | Status | Type | Date | Topic version |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Obviously a mistake in the DITA source; the example is dupicated. I've | keberlein | updated comment | 9/12/2021 14:07:33 | | |

corrected this.

----

Marked as **COMPLETED.**

Do we need a 2nd example that focuses on subjects for a simple taxonomy?

| Annotation | Reviewer | Status | Type | Date | Topic version |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Yes, or at least a related link to the architecture example. (Taxonomies are a blind spot for me. I keep trying to understand how/why to use one and I've never had an implementation that needed one, so I never entirely grok them.)<br><br>I'm also a bit meh on the description that the example shows values for @product...because we don't have the enumerationdef that does the actual connecting. I would explicitly state that because if I randomly came to this topic and it doesn't point to enumerationdef, I wouldn't realize that I needed it. I'd think I could just use a key name that included "values-&lt;attributeName>" and magic would happen. | zlawson | updated | comment | 12/12/2021 17:39:36 | |
| The enumerationdef element has some \*extended\* examples of how to do this - that might be a good link target.<br><br>I do think this example needs updating - it shows 3 key definitions, but does not actually associate them with product. Options I see are:<br><br>1. We refer to enumerationdef for all examples of this - it what this one is showing<br>2. We state that this example is showing how to define hierarchical subjects, but then refer to enumerationdef for how it's used for that case<br>3. We add an example of enumerationdef here -- "here is how you define the subjects, here is how you use them"<br>4. We just state that this is defining hierarchical subjects and don't mention the product attribute<br><br>I think I favor 2, but any of those would resolve this example -- @Kris? | randerson | updated | comment | 11/1/2022 23:51:06 | |
| **@Robert**, I'll take this one on; I'll work on it today.<br><br>----<br><br>1. I revised the intro to the "Example of defining a set of ontrolled values". Because the example is about *defining* controlled values, I did not add any information about binding the enumeration to an attribute. We simply cannot make every example contain all the information that a end user would need in order to use an element ...<br>2. I added another example: "Example of defining a simple taxonomy". The taxomony is for "hobbies", and it contains "fibre-arts" and "wood-working" subjects.<br><br>Marking this comment **COMPLETED.** | keberlein | updated | comment | 12/1/2022 16:13:32 | |

## Topic: subjectRole (DA00508656)

**Paragraph-level comments**

A subject-relationship table cell does not imply a relationship between topics or resources that are referenced in the same cell, unless the `@collection-type` attribute set on the cell indicates that they are related.

| Annotation | Reviewer | Status | Type | Date | Topic version |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | gjoseph | updated | comment | 16/12/2021 | |

10:49:48

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| We wanted to redesign subjectScheme for DITA 2.0, but no one had the bandwidth to do it. And I am probably the person on the TC with the deepest knowledge of subjectScheme. Anyhow, marking this comment **CLOSED,** since the TC decide today to remove subject rel table from DITA 2.0. | keberlein | updated comment | 11/1/2022 18:51:56 |

When used within the `<subjectRelHeader>`, the `<subjectRole>` element defines the type of subject or the relationship provided by the column.

| Annotation | Reviewer | Status | Type | Date | Topic version |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Maybe this addresses my earlier comment on subjectrelheader. maybe add an explicit sentence here tht says no relationship is defined in the subjectRelheader? | dstevens | updated comment | | 8/12/2021 20:53:31 | |
| I'm just not sure that's true, given the wacky design of subjectRelHeader! It does not mirror reltable. <br><br> ---- <br><br> Marking this comment **CLOSED**, since the TC decide today to remove subject rel table from DITA 2.0. | keberlein | updated comment | | 14/12/2021 17:57:34 | |

## Topic: Example: Extending a subject scheme (DA00509241)

**Paragraph-level comments**

```
<subjectScheme>
  <subjectdef keys="os">
  <topicmeta>
  <navtitle>Operating systems</navtitle>
  </topicmeta>
  <subjectdef keys="linux">
  <topicmeta>
  <navtitle>Linux</navtitle>
  </topicmeta>
  <subjectdef keys="redhat">
  <topicmeta>
  <navtitle>RedHat Linux</navtitle>
  </topicmeta>
  </subjectdef>
  <subjectdef keys="suse">
  <topicmeta>
  <navtitle>SuSE Linux</navtitle>
  </topicmeta>
  </subjectdef>
  </subjectdef>
  <subjectdef keys="windows">
  <topicmeta>
  <navtitle>Windows</navtitle>
  </topicmeta>
  </subjectdef>
  <subjectdef keys="zos">
  <topicmeta>
  <navtitle>z/OS</navtitle>
  </topicmeta>
```

```
        </subjectdef>
        </subjectdef>
        <enumerationdef>
        <attributedef name="platform"/>
        <subjectdef keyref="os"/>
        </enumerationdef>
        </subjectScheme>
```

| Annotation | Reviewer | Status | Type | Date | Topic version |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Delete the &lt;/subjectdef> 6 lines from the bottom of the code block. It's a duplicate that lacks a start tag. | gjoseph | updated | comment | 15/12/2021 15:02:11 | |
| No, the code sample is correct as it stand. I double-checked it.<br><br>Marking this comment **CLOSED.** | keberlein | updated | comment | 11/1/2022 18:56:54 | |

The following subject scheme map extends the enumeration defined in baseOS.ditamap. It adds macos as a child of the existing os subject; it also adds special versions of Windows as children of the existing windows subject:

| Annotation | Reviewer | Status | Type | Date | Topic version |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| The following subject scheme map extends the enumeration defined in baseOS.ditamap. It adds macos as a child of the existing os subject ;  and it also adds special versions of Windows as children of the existing windows subject: | gjoseph | updated | change | 15/12/2021 15:03:39 | |
| Done. Marking this comment **COMPLETED.** | keberlein | updated | comment | 11/1/2022 18:55:09 | |

```
        <subjectScheme>
            <schemeref href="baseOS.ditamap"/>
            <subjectdef keyref="os">
            <subjectdef keys="macos"/>
            <subjectdef keyref="windows">
            <subjectdef keys="win10"/>
            <subjectdef keys="win11"/>
            </subjectdef>
            </subjectdef>
            </subjectScheme>
```

| Annotation | Reviewer | Status | Type | Date | Topic version |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Speaking of indentation. While the conkeyreffed "basic-subjectScheme" basically uses an indentation of 4 space characters, the two examples in this topic use two. A consistent indentation would be nice. And if I were asked, I'd always pledge for 2 space characters. | fwegmann | updated | comment | 10/12/2021 20:54:24 | |
| Corrected the indentation in these examples.<br><br>Since a majority of existing code blocks use an indentation of four space, we need to stick with that. Handling the indentation is manual, finicky work. Changing it just is not a priority.<br><br>Marking this comment **COMPLETED.** | keberlein | updated | comment | 14/12/2021 00:03:34 | |

```
        <subjectScheme>
            <subjectdef keys="os">
            <subjectdef keys="linux">
            <subjectdef keys="redhat"/>
            <subjectdef keys="suse"/>
```

```
        </subjectdef>
        <subjectdef keys="macos">
        <subjectdef keys="windows">
        <subjectdef keys="win10"/>
        <subjectdef keys="win11"/>
        </subjectdef>
        <subjectdef keys="zos"/>
        </subjectdef>
        <enumerationdef>
        <attributedef name="platform"/>
        <subjectdef keyref="os"/>
        </enumerationdef>
        </subjectScheme>
```

| Annotation | Reviewer | Status | Type | Date | Topic version |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| &lt;subjectdef keys="macos"/> | fwegmann | updated | change | 10/12/2021 20:55:11 | |
| Fixed.<br><br>Marking this comment **COMPLETED.** | keberlein | updated | comment | 14/12/2021 00:09:25 | |

```
    <subjectScheme>
        <subjectdef keys="os">
        <subjectdef keys="linux">
        <subjectdef keys="redhat"/>
        <subjectdef keys="suse"/>
        </subjectdef>
        <subjectdef keys="macos">
        <subjectdef keys="windows">
        <subjectdef keys="win10"/>
        <subjectdef keys="win11"/>
        </subjectdef>
        <subjectdef keys="zos"/>
        </subjectdef>
        <enumerationdef>
        <attributedef name="platform"/>
        <subjectdef keyref="os"/>
        </enumerationdef>
        </subjectScheme>
```

| Annotation | Reviewer | Status | Type | Date | Topic version |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Clarifying Frank's comment: The subjectdef element that defines macos is missing an end tag. It should be: &lt;subjectdef keys="macos" /> | gjoseph | updated | comment | 15/12/2021 15:06:39 | |
| Already handled. Marking this comment **CLOSED.** | keberlein | updated | comment | 11/1/2022 18:55:48 | |

## Topic: Scaling a list of controlled values to define a taxonomy (DA00513584)

**Topic-level comments**

| Annotation | Reviewer | Status | Type | Date | Topic version |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| In every example related to "has" elements, except hasRelated (which has a note to replace the example), the "has" element is shown as a child of subjectScheme -- applying therefore to all of the subjects nested within it. But is also valid to be a child of &lt;subjectdef>. If we keep these elements, I think we need to have some examples that show the has elements as part of the subjectdef. Showing that within the same overall subjectdef heirarchy the has relationship could vary or in fact, the values within a single subject def could have different relationships. For example, a subjectdef of automobile, | dstevens | updated | comment | 8/12/2021 16:51:43 | |

might have kind -- sedan, miniman, suv, but also part -- tire, hood, engine, and also related -- mechanic, insurance, etc.

| Annotation | Reviewer | Status | Type | Date |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| That's a good point. I think the examples were developed back in the DITA 1.2 time frame to just be very stripped down.<br><br>Since it seems very clear that we are heading to removing these elements from DITA 2.0, I'm marking this comment **CLOSED.** | keberlein | updated | comment | 14/12/2021 17:49:30 |

**Paragraph-level comments**

Beyond the core elements and the attribute binding elements, sophisticated taxonomies can take advantage of some optional elements. These optional elements make it possible to specify more precise relationships among subjects. The `<hasNarrower>`, `<hasPart>`, `<hasKind>`, `<hasInstance>`, and `<hasRelated>` elements specify the kind of relationship in a hierarchy between a container subject and its contained subjects.

| Annotation | Reviewer | Status | Type | Date | Topic version |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Beyond the core elements and the **attribute -binding** elements, sophisticated taxonomies can take advantage of some optional elements. These optional elements make it possible to specify more precise relationships among subjects. The , , , , and elements specify the kind of relationship in a hierarchy between a container subject and its contained subjects. | fwegmann | updated | change | 9/12/2021 21:03:08 | |
| Made the change.<br><br>Marking this comment **COMPLETED.** | keberlein | updated | comment | 10/12/2021 11:48:29 | |

```
<subjectScheme>
  <hasInstance>
  <subjectdef keys="city">
  <subjectdef keys="la"/>
  <subjectdef keys="nyc"/>
  <subjectdef keys="san-francisco"/>
  </subjectdef>
  <subjectdef keys="state">
  <subjectdef keys="ca"/>
  <subjectdef keys="ny"/>
  </subjectdef>
  </hasInstance>
  <hasPart>
  <subjectdef keys="place">
  <subjectdef keyref="ca">
  <subjectdef keyref="la"/>
  <subjectdef keyref="sf"/>
  </subjectdef>
  <subjectdef keyref="ny">
  <subjectdef keyref="nyc"/>
  </subjectdef>
  </subjectdef>
  </hasPart>
</subjectScheme>
```

| Annotation | Reviewer | Status | Type | Date | Topic version |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| This is a keyref to "sf" but the key defined is "san-francisco" earlier in the file. I don't think this will work. | dstevens | updated | comment | 8/12/2021 19:35:16 | |
| Good catch - need to update this one. | randerson | updated | comment | 8/12/2021 19:59:52 | |
| Corrected. | keberlein | updated | comment | 9/12/2021 13:21:17 | |

```
<subjectScheme>
    <hasInstance>
    <subjectdef keys="city">
    <subjectdef keys="la"/>
    <subjectdef keys="nyc"/>
    <subjectdef keys="san-francisco"/>
    </subjectdef>
    <subjectdef keys="state">
    <subjectdef keys="ca"/>
    <subjectdef keys="ny"/>
    </subjectdef>
    </hasInstance>
    <hasPart>
    <subjectdef keys="place">
    <subjectdef keyref="ca">
    <subjectdef keyref="la"/>
    <subjectdef keyref="sf"/>
    </subjectdef>
    <subjectdef keyref="ny">
    <subjectdef keyref="nyc"/>
    </subjectdef>
    </subjectdef>
    </hasPart>
    </subjectScheme>
```

| Annotation | Reviewer | Status | Type | Date | Topic version |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| To make this more international friendly, if you're keeping the la, nyc, and sf, can you add navtitle descriptions that spell out the city (and maybe state) names? <br><br> I realize it clutters up the example, but may help with clarity for folks not as familiar with US geography. | zlawson | updated | comment | 12/12/2021 16:16:57 | |
| I spelled things out more in the values for @keys, for example, "los-angeles" rather than "la." <br><br> Marking this comment **COMPLETED.** | keberlein | updated | comment | 14/12/2021 00:22:15 | |

The subject scheme map can also define relationships between subjects that are not hierarchical. For instance, cities sometimes have "sister city" relationships. An information architect could add a `<subjectRelTable>` element to define these associative relationships, with a row for each sister-city pair and the two cities in different columns in the row.

| Annotation | Reviewer | Status | Type | Date | Topic version |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Seems like there should be a reference to subject relationship tables here. Actually, I feel lie the idea of a subject relationshpi table needs its own topic to explain why and how. This appears to be the only mention of the concept, hidden in this topic. | dstevens | updated | comment | 8/12/2021 16:31:59 | |
| A new architectural topic that focuses on subject relationship tables ... It probably would be useful, assuming that we do not remove subject relationship table. But I think before we spending time developing such a topic, we'll need an architectural topic about relationship tables in general. Then the subject relationship table topic could focus on where the subjectRelTable deviates from the reltable design. <br><br> Marking this comment as **DEFERRED.** | keberlein | updated | comment | 9/12/2021 13:31:56 | |
| Do we really need to keep subjectRelTable? Seems way too esoteric when we have such good taxonomy and ontology development and management tools out there. I don't think the CCMS should use DITA to manage complex ontologies. | gjoseph | updated | comment | 15/12/2021 14:46:18 | |

| | Marking this comment as **CLOSED**, since we decided at the TC meeting today to remove subject rel tables from DITA 2.0. | keberlein | updated comment | 12/1/2022 04:37:21 |
|---|---|---|---|---|

## Topic: attributedef (DA00509352)

**Paragraph-level comments**

The following attributes are available on this element: ID and conref attributes , `@status` , `@base` , `@outputclass` , and `@class` .

| Annotation | Reviewer | Status | Type | Date | Topic version |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Humble request - can we get a walk-through of how the attribute topics are organized? I'm not 100% sure I follow what's going on all the time. And maybe discuss formatting of these attribute sections?<br><br>I feel like this attributes section isn't quite right. I'm not sure if it's just a formatting thing (not using a dl here), or if something isn't correct. We're stating that @translate has a default value of no, but it's not listed as an included attribute. | zlawson | updated comment | 12/12/2021 17:09:43 | |
| The attribute list here is wrong, it is missing translate / name (both should have been listed): https://github.com/oasis-tcs/dita/blob/DITA-2.0/doctypes/dtd/subjectScheme/subjectScheme.mod#L622-L626 | randerson | updated comment | 13/12/2021 21:37:30 | |
| **@Robert,** assigning this to you to complete the work. | keberlein | updated comment | 11/1/2022 18:58:36 | |
| Fixed the attribute list; marking CLOSED | randerson | updated comment | 14/1/2022 21:50:35 | |

## Topic: elementdef (DA00508838)

**Paragraph-level comments**

The following attributes are available on this element: ID and conref attributes , `@status` , `@base` , `@outputclass` , `@translate` , `@class` , and `@name` .

| Annotation | Reviewer | Status | Type | Date | Topic version |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Similar comment to attributedef and defaultSubject attribute questions.<br><br>Here's we list @name and @translate, we didn't in attributedef.<br><br>My brain is hurting with the idea of adding conrefs to these. Possibly needs an example up in the arch section? | zlawson | updated comment | 12/12/2021 17:21:56 | |
| The attributedef list was incorrect, and was missing those two. As for using conrefs ... those are near-universal, basically allowed anywhere that id is allowed. In cases like that, removing them tends to make maintenance a bit harder (and result in random dissonance of "why isn't this here" when someone tries it) than just including them. | randerson | updated comment | 13/12/2021 21:40:46 | |
| **@Robert,** assigning this one to complte the work. | keberlein | updated comment | 11/1/2022 18:59:42 | |
| Closing this one:<br><br>• The current list is correct (the referenced one on attributedef was the error)<br>• I don't want to remove conref - while it's unlikely to be used, removing select universal attributes from just a few elements makes them not universal, increases | randerson | updated comment | 11/1/2022 23:17:24 | |

maintenance cost, and leads to things getting missed. We've had cases in the past where some "exception" elements missed new universal attributes because they had to be defined with duplicate definitions.
  - I also don't want an example of using conref, here or in the arch spec - as you note, it hurts the brain to imagine doing it, and I can't see a reason to include examples for such extreme edge-cases.

Marking **CLOSED**

## Topic: Defining controlled values for attributes (DA00508553)

**Paragraph-level comments**

- A `<navtitle>` (or a `<titlealt>` element with a `@title-role` of `navigation`) can provide a more readable name for the controlled value.

| Annotation | Reviewer | Status | Type | Date | Topic version |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Why don't we remove the alternative titlealt element here? I'm all for simplification. If the navtitle element works the same way, let's kill the titlealt with convoluted @title-role value to mean the same as a navtitle element... | gjoseph | updated | comment | 15/12/2021 10:55:17 | |
| The navtitle element is a specialized titlealt that defaults the title-role attribute to "navigation". It's a case where we've added the convenience element &lt;navtitle> but it's in an optional domain, so might not be present; implementations need to be aware that this behavior is associated with that token on the base element, not specifically with the element.<br><br>Marking **Closed** | randerson | updated | comment | 11/1/2022 23:04:26 | |

- Authoring tools *MAY* support accessing and displaying the content of the subject definition resource in order to provide users with a detailed explanation of the subject.

| Annotation | Reviewer | Status | Type | Date | Topic version |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| In the corresponding DITA source file archSpec/base/controlled-values-for-attributes.dita the part after "MAY" is wrapped by a ph element for apparently no particular reason. | fwegmann | updated | comment | 7/12/2021 20:39:09 | |
| Yes -- This happens if we have removed @rev attributes. For DITA 2.0, we plan to run some scripting to remove such ph elements, but we have not done that with previous DITA releases.<br><br>Marking this comment **CLOSED**. | keberlein | updated | comment | 7/12/2021 20:51:43 | |

- Authoring tools *MAY* support accessing and displaying the content of the subject definition resource in order to provide users with a detailed explanation of the subject.

| Annotation | Reviewer | Status | Type | Date | Topic version |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Need a space between MAY and support | dstevens | updated | comment | 8/12/2021 16:00:25 | |
| @Dawn, that's a DITAweb formatting glitch.<br><br>Marking this comment **CLOSED.** | keberlein | updated | comment | 8/12/2021 19:43:43 | |

## Topic: Classification maps (DA00509433)

**Topic-level comments**

| Annotation | Reviewer | Status | Type | Date | Topic version |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| People really don't get classification maps, and three sentences don't adequately describe why or how you would do this. For example, (I think), to associate some metadata that doesn't have a DITA metadata tag with certain topics in the map. using an example from some clients -- creating a subject scheme map that defines grade levels, and then associating topics in a map with the relevant grades. A curriculum map for junior high might include topics for 6, 7 or 8th grades, which would be specified in a classification map.<br><br>At a minimum there should be examples. | dstevens | updated comment | | 8/12/2021 16:15:11 | |
| This topic was added for DITA 1.3. For DITA 1.2, there was no architectural information what so ever about classification maps. This sort of stuff is why we got rigorous with the proposal process for new versions of DITA.<br><br>I have to wonder whether we should consider removing the classification domain (and this the classification map) from DITA 2.0. I don't know if anyone except Zoomin is using it (and they use it behind the scenese.). It's pretty impossible for authors to use ... Authors at IBM revolted whole scale at an early implementation that used this markup.<br><br>My only concern about removing it is that it at least reflects an attempt to associate subjects defined in subject scheme with topics referenced by topicref. | keberlein | updated comment | | 8/12/2021 21:30:22 | |
| Marking this comment **CLOSED**, as we are moving forward with removing the classification map and domain. | keberlein | updated comment | | 11/1/2022 17:42:53 | |

**Paragraph-level comments**

# Topic: Example: Defining values for deliveryTarget (DA00509063)

**Topic-level comments**

| Annotation | Reviewer | Status | Type | Date | Topic version |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| I wonder if it might also be useful to point out another use of this. If the two departments share no information (that is, content will never include online tags in the print based department), then this file could be set up without enumeration, and then each department would have its own subject scheme with an enumerationdef that points only to their type of output. Since the title is just about defining values for deliveryTarget, both uses apply and provide further examples on a difficult subject. | dstevens | updated comment | | 8/12/2021 16:28:02 | |
| @**Dawn**, I'm not completely clear whether the following is the use case that you are thinking of. Or maybe something completely different?<br><br>• There is a subject scheme map (foo.ditamap) that defines controlled values that apply to both departments. However, it does not include any enumerations/bindings.<br>• Each departments builds their own subject scheme that includes an enumeration/binding. (Does it contain only an enumeration/binding?)<br>• The subjectScheme map for each departments references foo.ditamap using the schemeref element.<br>• The deliverables for each department reference the department-level subjectScheme map.<br><br>My concern about the above scenario is that I don't know if it would work. Because the spec never specified any clear rules for how implementations should process | keberlein | updated comment | | 14/12/2021 18:23:02 | |

schemeref, I don't think that any processors ever implemented support for it. Last time I looked (post DITA 1.2, pre DITA 1.3), schemeref did not work with DITA-OT.

Obviously, this also relates to my statements that we need to explicity cover processing expectations for schemeref and how @keyref is resolved in the context of a subject scheme map.

If I am misunderstanding what you were suggesting, please let me know!

----

Sent e-mail to Dawn on 12 January 2022. Also am marking this comment as **REFERRED,** since we need to have TC discussion about the schemeref element, the way that the spec in 1.2 and 1.3 discussed it usages and implicit expectations for processors, and what we want the DITA 2.0 spec to lay out.

**Paragraph-level comments**

# Topic: Subject scheme elements (DA00509305)

**Topic-level comments**

| Annotation | Reviewer | Status | Type | Date | Topic version |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| aren't we missing the classification map elements. The review includes the topic on classification maps --topicsubject, subjectref, etc, so I expected to see those elements. are they part of a later review? Is there more content on the use of classification maps associated with those? | dstevens | updated comment | | 8/12/2021 20:18:21 | |
| The classification elements are defined in the classification domain; they are not defined as part of a structural specialization (like subjectScheme). These elements will be included in a later review.<br><br>Yes, subject definitions and classification maps are intrinsically related. No, the spec does not contain any additional content about classification.<br><br>Marking this comment **CLOSED.** | keberlein | updated comment | | 8/12/2021 21:32:21 | |

**Paragraph-level comments**

# Topic: subjectScheme (DA00509562)

**Topic-level comments**

| Annotation | Reviewer | Status | Type | Date | Topic version |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| It's a nice almost complete example. Should you go ahead and add the subjectRelTable as well to it? | dstevens | updated comment | | 8/12/2021 20:55:58 | |
| Holding off on doing that, since I suspect that we will be removing the subject relationship table from DITA 2.0.<br><br>----<br><br>Marking this comment **CLOSED**, as we have removed subject rel table from DITA 2.0. | keberlein | updated comment | | 14/12/2021 18:54:43 | |

**Paragraph-level comments**

Specifies a location within another map document where this map will be anchored. Resolution of the map is deferred until the final step in the delivery of any rendered content. For example, `anchorref="map1.ditamap#a1"` allows the map with `@anchorref` to be pulled into the location of the anchor point "a1" inside map1.ditamap when map1.ditamap is rendered for delivery.

| Annotation | Reviewer | Status | Type | Date | Topic version |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| I suppose this comment tacks on to the recent discussions of anchor. I don't understand the use case for anchorref within a subject scheme map. | dstevens | updated | comment | 8/12/2021 20:55:02 | |
| I don't see a use case, either -- but @anchorref is here because subjectScheme is specialized from map, which has @anchorref.<br><br>Marking this comment **CLOSED.** | keberlein | updated | comment | 9/12/2021 13:33:41 | |
| I think it was a design flaw -- that attribute exists for map, so it needed an explicit decision to \*not\* have it on subject scheme when we specialized. The way things are heading now I kind of expect it will be removed from both going forward. | randerson | updated | comment | 13/12/2021 21:46:21 | |

```
<subjectScheme>
    <!-- Pull in a scheme that defines unix OS values -->
    <schemeref href="unixOS.ditamap"/>
    <!-- Define new OS values that are merged with those in the unixOS scheme -->
    <subjectdef keys="operating-systems">
    <subjectdef keys="linux"/>
    <subjectdef keys="windows"/>
    <subjectdef keys="zOS"/>
    </subjectdef>
    <!-- Define application values -->
    <subjectdef keys="applications">
    <subjectdef keys="apache-server" href="subject/apache.dita"/>
    <subjectdef keys="my-sql"      href="subject/sql.dita"/>
    </subjectdef>

    <!-- Define an enumeration of the platform attribute, equal to
    each value in the OS subject. This makes the following values
    valid for the platform attribute: linux, windows, zOS -->
    <enumerationdef>
    <attributedef name="platform"/>
    <subjectdef keyref="os"/>
    </enumerationdef>
    <!-- Define an enumeration of the otherprops attribute, equal to
    each value in the application subjects.
    This makes the following values valid for the otherprops attribute:
    apache-server, my-sql -->
    <enumerationdef>
    <attributedef name="otherprops"/>
    <subjectdef keyref="applications"/>
    </enumerationdef>
    </subjectScheme>
```

| Annotation | Reviewer | Status | Type | Date | Topic version |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| I see two errors in the example code.<br><br>1. &amp;lt;subjectdef keyref=" **os**"/> should be &amp;lt;subjectdef keyref=" **operating-systems**"/><br><br>2. The comment above this enumerationdef element should include "and the UNIX operating systems defined in the target of the schemeref element". | gjoseph | updated | comment | 16/12/2021 11:49:58 | |
| Corrected the value of @keyref, and edited the comment. | keberlein | updated | comment | 11/1/2022 19:13:47 | |

Marking this comment **COMPLETED.**

# Topic: subjectHead (DA00509203)

**Paragraph-level comments**

For this element, the following considerations apply:

- The `@collection-type` attribute has an expected processing default value of unordered, although this value is not defaulted in the grammar files. This element limits the available values for `@collection-type` to unordered, sequence, and -dita-use-conref-target.
- The `@linking` attribute has a default value of normal, and no other values are valid.

| Annotation | Reviewer | Status | Type | Date | Topic version |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| I guess I don't understand the use case for either of these attributes in a subject scheme map. | dstevens | updated | comment | 8/12/2021 19:06:22 | |
| I think it's to address the rare case of wanting to print out or otherwise render your scheme -- this tells you whether to render it as an ordered list of subject, vs unordered. I doubt that is common but I think it's the genesis of this. (Also note that what this really means, practically speaking, is -- we kept the collection-type attribute here but removed the value of "family" as an option.) | randerson | updated | comment | 13/12/2021 21:50:12 | |
| No change required. Marking this comment **CLOSED.** | keberlein | updated | comment | 13/12/2021 23:55:02 | |

In the following code sample, the `<subjectHead>` element groups together several subjects and a label:

| Annotation | Reviewer | Status | Type | Date | Topic version |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| I don't fully understand this example. I think the example is creating documentation for a subject scheme. The heading Server Setup has four "consensus" definitions nested underneath it, so authors presumably would understand when to use each term. But the key itself isn't part of this example, so is it assumed that the referenced document would include that information? Is there any reason you wouldn't do this all in one file -- that is, add the keys to the subjectdefs here so it not only defines the subject scheme, but documents it at the same time? | dstevens | updated | comment | 8/12/2021 20:25:34 | |
| Check out the shortdesc for subjectHead; it states that this element "provides a heading for a group of subjects, **for use if the subject scheme is displayed.**" (Emphasis added.) In the example, I think the intent was to define a few subjects (each with a DITA topic that explains the subject), and use subjectHead to provide a label ("Server setup") which rendered as some part of a facted browsing experience. So, the purpose of the subjectScheme is NOT to define subjects, but to generate some resources for the browsing experience. Note that toc is set to "yes" on the root element (to override the subjectScheme defaults). @Dawn, does this make sense? FYI, this is not an example I created; it's an Erik Hennum original. This is what I really dislike about subjectScheme. It's overloaded and tries to do TOO MANY things. I think you were approaching the code sample is the "Example" section assuming that it a subjectScheme intended to create an enumeration? | keberlein | updated | comment | 9/12/2021 13:42:23 | |
| I agree with Dawn on the point that the only reason for subjectHead seems to be to | fwegmann | new | comment | 12/12/2021 17:16:56 | |

provide a documentation for an existing (part of a) subject scheme. Remember the short description of subject scheme maps: "Subject scheme maps can be used to define controlled values and subject definitions. The controlled values can be bound to attributes, as well as element and attribute pairs. The subject definitions can contain metadata and provide links to more detailed information; they can be used to classify content and provide semantics that can be used in taxonomies and ontologies".

There's nothing about a meta usage of providing documentation about the subjects defined in a subject scheme map. Looks to me as if subjectHeads with that intention are violating the orthogonality principle (no side effects, each action changes just one thing without affecting others).

I could think of subjectHead as a container for textual (short) description of what is being defined in the subject scheme map, but I cannot understand why this is a specialization of topicref, with all the implications.

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| I just want to add my +1 to the general "huh?"<br><br>Is the idea that you might have a fancy Oxygen Plugin that helps you pick metadata values to be used in your Zoomin portal that might show the subjectHead in a popup or tree structure somewhere? | zlawson new | comment | 12/12/2021 18:04:11 |
| > Is the idea that you might have a fancy Oxygen Plugin that helps you pick metadata values to be used in your Zoomin portal that might show the subjectHead in a popup or tree structure somewhere?<br><br>Yes, I think that sums it up, believe it or not... | randerson new | comment | 13/12/2021 21:51:46 |
| I've updated the code sample, as well as the introductory paragraph. **@Robert**, do you think this adequately handles the issues that reviewers have raised? | keberlein | updated comment | 14/12/2021 00:00:38 |

# Topic: Subject scheme maps and their usage (DA00509355)

**Topic-level comments**

| Annotation | Reviewer | Status | Type | Date | Topic version |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| FYI -- The generated index retains the old one-word term (subjectScheme) versus the more recent two-word term (subject scheme). | sdoherty | updated comment | | 12/12/2021 13:41:08 | |
| Good catch; I've changed this.<br><br>Marking this comment as **COMPLETED**. | keberlein | updated comment | | 14/12/2021 17:23:11 | |

**Paragraph-level comments**

# Topic: hasInstance (DA00508595)

**Topic-level comments**

| Annotation | Reviewer | Status | Type | Date | Topic version |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Since I am agreeing with the idea that we don't need all this hasSomething stuff, I'm not really reviewing those elements. I think they're doing something supercomplicated that no one really understands anymore. | zlawson | updated comment | | 12/12/2021 18:06:21 | |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| No work required. Marking this comment **CLOSED.** | keberlein  updated comment | 14/12/2021 00:25:34 |

**Paragraph-level comments**