

Publication: Review L: DITA linking (00815362-DC_1)

Topic: The format attribute (DC00811007)

Paragraph-level comments

The @format attribute identifies the format of the resource that is referenced.

Annotation	Reviewer	Status	Type	Date	Topic version
Do we want to explain why this is important? I think this explains what it does, but not why.	zlawson	updated	comment	6/3/2022 23:57:20	
I don't know if we want to explain WHY an attribute is important in the short description. Certainly we need to give a sense of why @format, @href, @scope, and @type are important, especially when they work as a unit, but I don't know if we want to address the importance in the short description. @Robert?	keberlein	updated	comment	7/3/2022 16:26:05	
I'm fine with adding depth to the parent topic (DITA linking), or in the body of this topic.	zlawson	updated	comment	8/3/2022 17:31:35	
I definitely do not think it should be in the short description; we've gotten those pretty sharp and concise on all four of these as just definitions of the attribute.					
I guess I'm not clear what we would say about why it is important. It specifies the format of the resource. It's possible that your DITA toolset won't need it; it's also possible that your toolset will break without it (early versions of DITA-OT were worse about this, but that's gotten better over time, and we don't want to make the spec into a DITA-OT guide).	randerson	updated	comment	11/3/2022 03:56:00	
I agree with Robert here. Marking this comment CLOSED .	keberlein	updated	comment	11/3/2022 15:10:35	

The @format attribute identifies the format of the resource that is referenced.

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

The @format attribute identifies the format of the resource that is referenced. sdoherty updated change 15/3/2022 13:17:52

Changed to "The @format attribute identifies the format of the referenced resource rev. " keberlein updated comment 13/4/2022 13:31:40

Marking this comment **COMPLETED**.

Indicates that the target is a DITA topic or an element in a DITA topic. Unless otherwise specified, when @format is set to dita, the value for the @type attribute is treated as topic.

Annotation	Reviewer	Status	Type	Date	Topic version
So, I'm not sure how true this is, whether it's processing dependent, but is it worth talking about how links might be followed near infinitely? Is that here? Is that part of "DITA linking"?					
I'm thinking of when there are 'broken links' that are in the href that links to another topic that links to another topic that links to another topic, etc.	zlawson	updated comment		7/3/2022 00:01:11	
Does this linking pull in the title? Is that here, or else where about resolving/processing links?					
I don't think that is something that can or should be addressed in the spec. We are defining what the language means. We definitely do not go into detail about how processors might choose to work with a topic that links to a topic that links to a topic that (etc).	randerson	updated comment		11/3/2022 03:58:47	
I know that potential for infinite linking was a pain in DITA-OT, but that's definitely a DITA-OT specific processing behavior, and more recently has its own options for turning that on or off.					
Marking this comment as CLOSED .	keberlein	updated comment		11/3/2022 15:11:46	

Indicates that the target is a DITA map. References to submaps can occur at any point in a map.

Annotation	Reviewer	Status	Type	Date	Topic version
(throughout) do we want to say "target of the link"? I realize we're in a topic that's nested under "DITA Linking", but	zlawson	updated comment		7/3/2022 00:02:38	

perhaps we should be explicit?

I think "target topic" or "target map" is clear. I think "target" is clearer than "targeted", especially for non-native English speakers. gjoseph updated comment 10/3/2022 09:24:10

Agreed; the short description is clear that this is about the format of a resource that is referenced; the target is that resource. randerson updated comment 11/3/2022 04:01:13

I read through the set of topics, and I think it is good as-is. Marking this comment **CLOSED**. keberlein updated comment 11/3/2022 16:34:34

When a topic reference specifies format="ditamap", the topic reference resolves in one of the following ways:

Target of <topicref>	Resolution of <topicref>
DITA map	The hierarchy of all the topic references in the targeted map
Map branch	The hierarchy of the targeted map branch

In either case, the final result is equivalent to inserting those topic references at the current point in the map that contains the topic reference that specifies format="ditamap".

Annotation	Reviewer	Status	Type	Date	Topic version
I couldn't follow the logic of this sentence. Probably me, but it seems circular.	sdoherty	updated	comment	15/3/2022 13:19:01	
This was hard to word. @Robert, maybe we should ask the TC for help with this? Marking this comment as ACCEPTED .	keberlein	updated	comment	13/4/2022 13:57:15	
Sent e-mail to TC on 19 April 2022.	keberlein	updated	comment	19/4/2022 12:36:03	

When a topic reference targets an entire DITA map and the referenced map contains a relationship table, there are special processing implications. Because relationship tables are only valid as direct children of the DITA map, referenced relationship tables are treated as children of the referencing map.

Annotation	Reviewer	Status	Type	Date	Topic version
Does this mean that the pseudo child retables are ignored? If that's what we want the spec to say, then let's just say it and we	gjoseph	updated	comment	10/3/2022 09:28:11	

don't need a new topic for this behavior. Say it here with an example, or add it to the relevant reltable topic.

No, this is definitely not what it means - the reltable elements are not ignored, they are treated as if they were children of the referencing map. As the draft-comment says. we need an example of this behavior to make it clear.

randerson updated comment 11/3/2022 04:03:33

Marking **CLOSED**

Note:

If a <topicref> element that references a map contains child <topicref> elements, the processing behavior regarding the child <topicref> elements is undefined.

Annotation	Reviewer	Status	Type	Date	Topic version
"undefined". I wonder if we should state that the child topicref elements <i>should</i> be ignored. This way we can clarify the spec in a way that does not break anyone doing custom "undefined" behaviors, while at the same time making it clear that these child topicrefs are bad practice.	gjoseph	updated	comment	10/3/2022 09:32:09	
Do we know what the DITA-OT does with these child topicref elements? Just curious...					
I hesitate to even say what DITA-OT does, because we should not be defining the spec around what it does. But I think the answer is - usually they are ignored, and sometimes things break. The behavior is undefined there as well.					
I think I'd rather leave it as explicitly undefined, which does leave room for defining it later in the unlikely event we want to define something. Saying that processors should ignore them defines a behavior that we cannot change later.	randerson	updated	comment	11/3/2022 04:05:49	

Marking **CLOSED**

- If the @format attribute is specified on a containing element within the map or within the related-links section of the a topic, the value cascades from the closest containing element.

Annotation	Reviewer	Status	Type	Date	Topic version
If the @format attribute is specified on a containing element within the map or within the related-links section of the a topic, the value cascades from the closest containing element.	gjoseph	updated	change	10/3/2022 09:34:36	

Fixed

randerson updated comment 11/3/2022
04:11:05

Marking **COMPLETED**

For processors that support Lightweight DITA, the following table summarizes values for the @format attribute:

Annotation	Reviewer	Status	Type	Date	Topic version
I guess I'm confused why this is in the DITA spec. Doesn't LWDITA have its own spec? As far as I know so far, none of these terms are meaningful within the context of this spec -- h dita, m dita, x dita.	dstevens	updated	comment	15/3/2022 15:34:47	
There was a lot of discussion around this in Feb/March 2019 (and no, I don't have that date memorized, I had to search through our email archive). We agreed to list those in here as an alternative to much more invasive changes originally requested for collaboration with Lightweight DITA. Some of that discussion came here, where there was an action item to add the first update related to this LwDITA content: https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/dita/201903/msg00014.html	randerson	updated	comment	15/3/2022 15:47:08	
In a perfect world where the DITA base, DITA TC, and Lightweight DITA spec were all coming out together, I think it would be easier to explain, but it's not looking like timing will work that way. For processors that do not (or do not yet) support Lightweight DITA, this table will really have as much weight as the pdf, html, and txt examples.					
Marking this comment CLOSED .	keberlein	updated	comment	13/4/2022 13:34:51	

Topic: The href attribute (DC00810956)

Paragraph-level comments

The @href attribute specifies the URI of the resource that is addressed. It can used to reference another DITA topic or map, an element inside a DITA topic or map, or a non-DITA resource.

Annotation	Reviewer	Status	Type	Date	Topic version
The @href attribute specifies the URI of the resource that is addressed. The referenced resource can be It can used to reference another DITA topic or map, an element inside a DITA topic or map, or a non-DITA resource.	gjoseph	updated	change	10/3/2022 09:40:29	

Done. Marking comment as **COMPLETED**.

keberlein updated comment 10/3/2022
15:16:47

The value of the @href can optionally contain a fragment identifier.

Annotation	Reviewer	Status	Type	Date	Topic version
The value of the @href attribute can optionally contain a fragment identifier.	gjoseph	updated	change	10/3/2022 09:41:40	
Done. Marking comment as COMPLETED .	keberlein	updated	comment	10/3/2022 15:18:57	

When an @href attribute references a DITA resource using a value for the @href attribute that consists of a URI with a fragment identifier, the portion after the hash must be a DITA local identifier. A DITA local identifier takes the following forms:

Annotation	Reviewer	Status	Type	Date	Topic version
When an @href attribute references a DITA resource using a n @href value for the @href attribute that consists of a URI with a fragment identifier, the portion after the hash must be a DITA local identifier. A DITA local identifier takes the following forms:	gjoseph	updated	change	10/3/2022 09:47:59	
Done. Marking this comment COMPLETED .	keberlein	updated	comment	10/3/2022 15:20:52	

- *elementID* is the value of the @id attribute of the element within a DITA topic.

Annotation	Reviewer	Status	Type	Date	Topic version
Should this also have the (non-topic) phrase?	zlawson	updated	comment	7/3/2022 00:16:52	
Probably makes sense - @Kris any concerns with adding that?	randerson	updated	comment	11/3/2022 04:18:55	
Done. Marking this comment as COMPLETED .	keberlein	updated	comment	11/3/2022 15:22:41	

A non-topic element inside a DITA topic

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

shouldn't this require the file name as well, if it's in a file other than the referencing topic (unless it's in a CCMS)?

nharrison updated comment 14/3/2022 22:39:52

Wow, yeah. And it appeared this way in DITA 1.3 and probably earlier. Added "file.dita#".

keberlein updated comment 13/4/2022 14:02:16

Marking this comment **COMPLETED**.

Topic: The type attribute (DC00811055)

Paragraph-level comments

On linking elements, the @type attribute describes the target of a reference. It is also used on several other elements for varying purposes.

Annotation	Reviewer	Status	Type	Date	Topic version
On linking elements, the @type attribute describes the target of a reference. The @type attribute It is also used on several non-linking other elements for other varying purposes.	gjoseph	updated	change	10/3/2022 10:04:17	
Done. Marking this comment as COMPLETED .	keberlein	updated	comment	10/3/2022 15:34:50	

This topic describes how to interpret the @type attribute when it is used on linking elements. Usage information for the @type attribute on other elements, such as <note> or <copyright>, is described in the element reference topics for those elements.

Annotation	Reviewer	Status	Type	Date	Topic version
This topic describes how to interpret the @type attribute when it is used on linking elements. Usage information for the @type attribute on other elements, such as or , is described in the element reference topics for those elements.	gjoseph	updated	change	10/3/2022 10:06:35	
No, because we are committed to using the "syntactic that" to ease translation and understanding by ESL speakers.	keberlein	updated	comment	10/3/2022 15:38:19	
Marking this comment as CLOSED .					

Only the <xref> element can link to content below the topic level. The other linking elements only can target topics.

Annotation	Reviewer	Status	Type	Date	Topic version
Only the element can link to content below the topic level. The other linking elements can only link to can target topics.	gjoseph	updated	change	10/3/2022 10:10:05	
Done. Marking this comment as COMPLETED .	keberlein	updated	comment	10/3/2022 15:39:56	

Only the <xref> element can link to content below the topic level. The other linking elements only can target topics.

Annotation	Reviewer	Status	Type	Date	Topic version
We refer to "target topics" as a noun in other spec topics, so I changed the text here for consistency and clarity for non-native English speakers.	gjoseph	updated	comment	10/3/2022 10:11:38	
No change to source required, so making comment as CLOSED .	keberlein	updated	comment	10/3/2022 15:41:43	

Only the <xref> element can link to content below the topic level. The other linking elements only can target topics.

Annotation	Reviewer	Status	Type	Date	Topic version
Only the <xref> element can link to content below the topic level. The other linking elements only can target topics. I'd leave the <xref> in; I find the alternative less clear.	nharrison	updated	comment	14/3/2022 22:49:31	
No changes required. Omitting the name of the element is a DITAweb glitch. Marking this comment as CLOSED .	keberlein	updated	comment	15/3/2022 01:04:44	

The following table lists values for the @type attribute that are commonly used on <xref> elements:

Annotation	Reviewer	Status	Type	Date	Topic version
in addition to this list, my clients commonly xref <step> elements. should we add that to this table?	dstevens	updated	comment	15/3/2022 15:48:49	
I don't think so - the step element is part of the tech content package that isn't yet available, so it probably should not be called out as a common type value in the base spec.	randerson	updated	comment	15/3/2022 15:51:49	

Marking this comment **CLOSED**.

keberlein updated comment 13/4/2022
13:36:38

Element targeted

Annotation	Reviewer	Status	Type	Date	Topic version
Target e Element targeted	gjoseph	updated	change	10/3/2022 10:12:51	
Done. Marking this comment COMPLETED .	keberlein	updated	comment	10/3/2022 15:42:34	

-dita-use-conref-target is also a valid value for the @type attribute. See for more information.

Annotation	Reviewer	Status	Type	Date	Topic version
Ironically, this statement appears to be missing the xref -- see ?? for more information.	dstevens	updated	comment	15/3/2022 15:49:24	
That's due to the DITAWeb presentation - the linked topic that explains "dita-use-conref-target" is not part of the review, so ditaweb has an empty cross-reference there.	randerson	updated	comment	15/3/2022 15:52:37	
Marking CLOSED					

Topic: DITA linking (DA00508818)

Topic-level comments

Annotation	Reviewer	Status	Type	Date	Topic version
Do we want to list any examples of linking elements? Is it necessary?	zlawson	updated	comment	6/3/2022 23:55:22	
By linking elements, we mean ANY element that can specify the @href attribute. I do realize that does not match what most DITA authors will think of as "linking elements."	keberlein	updated	comment	7/3/2022 16:23:34	
Do we state somewhere that linking element = anything with @href?	zlawson	updated	comment	8/3/2022 17:30:05	

I know I was halfway through the section before I remembered that could include images. Just now, I realized that could be to code samples (I forget which elements let you do that...)

It might be worth defining what we mean by "linking", it seems sorta obvious, but there are lots of devils in the details. A conref or a key is a link, in some ways of thinking. Are those included here?

I don't think we need to list all the elements, but a smattering of examples probably couldn't hurt.

I know I'm too close to these topics, but I would have thought from the short description that a linking element was any element with those four attributes. Do we need to state that explicitly -- linking elements all use these four attributes, and any element with these four attributes is a linking element?

randerson updated comment 11/3/2022 03:51:11

I think stating that explicitly would not hurt. I also think that this would be a good comment to bring to the TC -- not because we need TC help in resolving it, but for general education and clarification. I suspect that many DITA users (and maybe some TC members) would hear the phrase "linking elements" and think "xref and link, oh, maybe topicref ..." rather than the whole array of elements on which the @href attribute can be specified. Folks should also be aware of the push to ensure that all such elements also carry @format, @scope, and @type.

keberlein updated comment 11/3/2022 15:19:04

Marking this comment as **REFERRED**.

Paragraph-level comments

DITA supports many different linking elements, but they all use the same set of attributes: @format, @href, @scope, and @type. These four attributes act as a unit.

Annotation	Reviewer	Status	Type	Date	Topic version
DITA supports many different linking elements, but they all use the same set of attributes: @format, @href, @scope, and @type. These four attributes act as a set .	sdoherty	updated	change	15/3/2022 13:17:40	
Leaving the wording as-is. Marking the comment as CLOSED .	keberlein	updated	comment	13/4/2022 13:38:25	

Topic: The scope attribute (DC00810962)

Paragraph-level comments

- The resource is part of the current set of content, but it might not accessible at build time.
- The resource should be treated as a root map for the purpose of creating map-to-map key references (peer maps).

Annotation	Reviewer	Status	Type	Date	Topic version
I am ignorant, so I'm unclear what "map-to-map key references (peer maps)' are. This might make sense when we do reviews for the keys, but I couldn't really find anything in the spec that stood out to me.	zlawson	updated	comment	7/3/2022 00:21:59	
It's the cross-book linking feature, which is really not defined beyond "use peer key maps" -- because the actual implementation is entirely dependent on how source info and deliverables are used. DITA 1.3 topic is here: https://docs.oasis-open.org/dita/dita/v1.3/errata02/os/complete/part3-all-inclusive/archSpec/base/links-between-maps.html#links-between-maps	randerson	updated	comment	11/3/2022 04:16:47	
We'll need to circle back on this one after we review the relevant content about cross-book linking. Marking this comment ACCEPTED .	keberlein	updated	comment	13/4/2022 13:49:16	

- The resource is part of the current set of content, but it might not accessible at build time.
- The resource should be treated as a root map for the purpose of creating map-to-map key references (peer maps).

Annotation	Reviewer	Status	Type	Date	Topic version
The resource is part of the current set of content, but it might not be accessible at build time. The resource should be treated as a root map for the purpose of creating map-to-map key references (peer maps).	gjoseph	updated	change	10/3/2022 09:53:51	
Done. Marking this comment COMPLETED .	keberlein	updated	comment	10/3/2022 15:33:13	

- The resource is part of the current set of content, but it might not accessible at build time.
- The resource should be treated as a root map for the purpose of creating map-to-map key references (peer maps).

Annotation	Reviewer	Status	Type	Date	Topic version
[ignore]	nharrison	updated	comment	14/3/2022 22:41:45	
Ignoring (and marking CLOSED)	randerson	updated	comment	15/3/2022 15:49:43	

Indicates that the resource is not part of the current information set.

Annotation	Reviewer	Status	Type	Date	Topic version
Indicates that the resource is not part of the current information set of content .	gjoseph	updated	change	10/3/2022 09:55:15	
Done. Marking this comment as COMPLETED .	keberlein	updated	comment	10/3/2022 15:25:08	

Indicates that the resource is not part of the current information set.

Annotation	Reviewer	Status	Type	Date	Topic version
We use "set of content" several time above, so this "information set" should also be "set of content" for consistency.	gjoseph	updated	comment	10/3/2022 09:56:00	
No change needed to the source, so marking this comment as CLOSED .	keberlein	updated	comment	10/3/2022 15:28:10	

See for more information on -dita-use-conref-target

Annotation	Reviewer	Status	Type	Date	Topic version
Missing actual cross reference here?	dstevens	updated	comment	15/3/2022 15:49:59	
Yes, because we did not have a key definition in the map. I've corrected that.	keberlein	updated	comment	13/4/2022 13:40:15	
Marking this comment COMPLETED .					

- If no value is specified but the attribute is specified on a containing element within a map or within the related-links section, the value cascades from the closest containing element.

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

If ~~no value is specified but~~ the @scope attribute is specified on a containing element within a map or within a ~~the~~ related-links section, the value cascades from the closest containing element.

gjoseph updated change 10/3/2022 09:57:55

As noted on the next comment, this is a widely used conref'ed phrase, so either we need to avoid reuse in this case, or make a different edit.

randerson updated comment 11/3/2022 04:19:36

I "flattened" the conref, and made the suggested change. Marking this comment **COMPLETED**.

keberlein updated comment 11/3/2022 16:53:12

- If no value is specified but the attribute is specified on a containing element within a map or within the related-links section, the value cascades from the closest containing element.

Annotation	Reviewer	Status	Type	Date	Topic version
We've already stated in the stem sentence for this list that no value is specified, so we don't need to repeat it here.	gjoseph	updated	comment	10/3/2022 09:59:15	
I agree with the comment, but this is a reused sentence that is used in several contexts - some of which do not have that lead-in. So probably need a different edit to avoid the repeat.	randerson	updated	comment	11/3/2022 04:14:30	
Marking this comment CLOSED , as no additional changes to the source are required.	keberlein	updated	comment	11/3/2022 16:54:58	

Processors can consider additional URI schemes as external by default. Processors *MUST* always consider relative URIs as local by default.

Annotation	Reviewer	Status	Type	Date	Topic version
This normative statement should be reworded so that it is clear that it is about the @scope attribute. As currently written, if it is viewed in the appendix, no one would know that it concerned the @scope attribute.	keberlein	updated	comment	4/3/2022 23:18:32	
Added "For the @scope attribute" to the beginning of the normative statement.	keberlein	updated	comment	11/3/2022 16:45:38	
Marking this comment COMPLETED .					

