What you get if you copy-and-paste comments from Content Fusion

Eliot Kimber Jun 9, 21:21

Why is this key definition--I think this applies to any topicref that does not specify @"href" and does not have any link text.

Kristen James Eberlein01:42

Because that's what we approved at the stage two level. And we would want @"subjectrefs to have meaning if it is applied to a <topicgroup> elements -- that use case eliminates the wording that you suggest. FYI, this wording was explicitly discussed at the TC meeting on 29 March; you were present and agreed to it. I do know that we don't always catch everything at first ... Check out the minutes to the TC meetings referenced in the "Tracking information" section. Do you want to reopen the stage two proposal so that we can modify the "Proposed solution"? I've had to reopen several stage 2 proposals that I championed for this sort of thing: * #36: Remove deprecated items * #316: Diagnostics element * This proposal * Probably more Maybe we should allow the stage three proposals to state "This is what was approved at stage two, and here is a revised version for stage three.

Gershon Joseph Jun 6, 08:05

The end tag for the preceding optional element should not be marked in bold, since it's not new. It's part of the current, existing spec code.

Kristen James Eberlein Jun 6, 09:37

I've corrected this in the DITA source. Thanks for noticing this.

Kristen James Eberlein Jun 6, 09:45

~~langRef/base/subjectCell.dita~~

Gershon Joseph Jun 6, 08:06

This file is listed twice.

Kristen James Eberlein Jun 6, 09:42

Good catch. I checked this list against the topics in the spec, and also noticed that it did not include topicSubjectTable.

Kristen James Eberlein Jun 6, 09:44

langref/base/topicSubjectTable

Kristen James Eberlein Jun 5, 06:03

Should be "Specifies one or more keys that are defined by subject definitions in a subject scheme map." I think we want to avoid introducing new terminology such as "subject keys".

Robert D Anderson Jun 6, 16:38

Yes, it should

Eliot Kimber Jun 9, 22:02

I agree. Actually, now that I read this again, I think "that are defined in a subject scheme map" is too strong because it implies a requirement if they are not (either because the key is defined by not in a subject scheme map or because the key is not defined in any map). I think "expect to be defined in subject scheme maps". "in a subject scheme map" could be read as expecting all the referenced keys to be in a single map.

Kristen James Eberlein03:32

Hmm ... We could change the wording to one of the following in order to eliminate your concern that we are implying that the subject definitions must be in a single subject scheme map: * "Specifies one or more keys that are defined by subject definitions in subject scheme maps" * Specifies one or more keys that are defined by subject definitions in one or more subject scheme maps" And, of course, we can state (do we really need to do so?) that a @"subjectrefs attribute that references a key NOT defined by a subject definition in a subject scheme map is meaningless." I don't think we need to be concerned about the meaning of a @"subjectrefs" attribute referencing a key that is not defined. Surely that is covered by standard rules around key resolution and processing.

Robert D Anderson Jun 6, 16:34

Yes, that sounds like the right group

Eliot Kimber Jun 9, 21:44

Change to: When specified on a topic reference, associates the referenced resource with subjects defined in subject scheme maps. This is more active, removes the limitation to topics, and reflects the potential for multiple values on @"subjectrefs"

Kristen James Eberlein03:37

Good thinking. I've changed the sentence to read as follows, which reflects a slight editorial change from your suggestion: "When specified on a topic reference, the @"subjectrefs" attribute associates the referenced resource with subjects that are defined in subject scheme maps."

Eliot Kimber Jun 9, 21:42

c/topic/resource/ I don't see a reason to limit the association scope, especially since we are not defining any processing implications for the association.

Kristen James Eberlein03:41

This is handled by your previous comment; no changes to the source are required.

Eliot Kimber Jun 9, 21:47

I don't think this statement is necessary because either it's not true (if we're not defining any processing expectations we can't say what is and isn't meaningful) or because it's trivially obvious. But in either case it has no actionable effect relative to our processing expectations (because there aren't any). If this statement is still necessary it should refer to topic references, not key definitions, since being a key definition has no bearing on the use or non-use of @"subjectrefs--unspecialized" topicrefs can specify @"subjectref" and not reference any resource.

Kristen James Eberlein03:48

Thinking about this ... 1. Perhaps we need to back track from our original stated position of not introducing "any processing expectations for @"subjectrefs in the DITA 2.0 time frame." Maybe we need to introduce a limited set of processing expectations, maybe we need to introduce a full set of processing expectations. Note: Changes about the wording that I quoted require reopening the stage two proposal. 2. We explicitly called out key definitions, since TC members had concerns around that. We do not want to state that @"subjectrefs" does not have a meaning when it is specified on a topic reference that does not specify a resource, since that would rule out the useful use case of specifying @"subjectrefs" on the <topicgroup> element. (That might be something that we want to show explicitly in an example ...)

Eliot Kimber Jun 9, 22:01

Per my mail to the list, this topic currently says nothing about what processors or required, allowed, or encouraged to do with the keys specified on @"subjectrefs". Without that it's ambiguous as to whether treating them as normal key references is or isn't required and what the processor behavior should or may be when a subject keyref cannot be resolved. While we don't want to specify processing expectations with respect to what it *means* to have a subject associated with a topicref I think we have to specify what the key resolution expectations and requirements are since address processing is independent of the meaning applied to a resolved subject reference. If we say that the value of @"subjectrefs" is zero or more key names then I think we are obligated to say what the key resolution requirements are. Given that, I think there should be a processing expectations section something like: Processing Expectations Processors MAY attempt to resolve the key names in @"subjectref" using the same key resolution rules as for @"keyref". Processors MAY report unresolvable subject references as warnings or errors. Beyond the option of attempting to resolve key references in @"subjectrefs", there are no processing expectations for either the values of @"subjectrefs" or any subjects addressed by @"subjectrefs".

Kristen James Eberlein03:56

If we are going to make a normative statement about our expectations for @"subjectrefs" and key resolution, then MAY is too weak. That effectively would make it impossible to specify ANY additional processing expectations for @"subjectrefs" in future 2.x releases.

Eliot Kimber Jun 9, 21:48

using

Eliot Kimber Jun 9, 21:48

on

Eliot Kimber Jun 9, 21:49

I corrected "applying/to" to "using/on" to avoid any implication that subjectrefs might point to or otherwise indirectly apply to a topicref (other than through normal cascading).

Kristen James Eberlein03:58

I'm not sure about the wording tweaks you are suggesting here. Robert and I would have to look at existing patterns that are in use in the draft DITA 2.0 spec.

Eliot Kimber Jun 9, 22:48

I just realized in the course of putting together the examples below that <subjectScheme> and <subjectdef> do not allow the @"keyscope" attribute. I think that's a bug and we should allow it in 2.0 so that a subjectScheme map that is intended to be used as a normal submap can choose to always be in a scope. Likewise, any subjectdef should be able to establish a key scope for itself and its subjects.

Kristen James Eberlein04:05

This was an explicit decision made in the DITA 1.3 time frame. Robert Anderson and Chris Nitchie felt strongly about this, and I deferred to their concerns. (I had previously run into difficulties with using subject scheme to define controlled values that would have been eliminated if I could have used key scopes ...) Nonetheless, <subjectScheme> and <subjectdef> do not allow @"keyscope", and so this proposal cannot include examples of markup that would allow @"keyscope" in such places. We cannot treat the fact that <subjectScheme> and <subjectdef> do not allow the @"keyscope" attribute as a bug, since that was an explicit decision on part of the TC. Allowing @"keyscope" on these elements would require a new DITA 2.0 proposal. Send an e-mail to the TC if that is something that you want to champion.

Eliot Kimber Jun 9, 22:45

Additional examples with key scopes: A subject scheme map may be included in a map as either a normal sub map or as a peer root map and associated with a key scope on the map reference. A subject scheme map included as a sub map with a key scope: <map> <title>User assistance for the Acme Widget</title> <!-- ... --> <mapref keyscope="subjects" href="subjectschemes/subject-scheme-01.ditamap"/> <topicref keyref="install-overview" subjectrefs="subjects.installing"> <topicref keyref="install-linux"/> <topicref keyref="install-macosx"/> <topicref keyref="install-windows"/> <topicref keyref="install-troubleshooting" subjectrefs="subjects.troubleshooting"/> </topicref> <!-- ... --> </map> The keys defined in referenced subject scheme map are included in the referencing map's key space. References to the subject keys must be scope qualified (i.e., "subjects.installing"). Putting the subject scheme keys in a key scope ensures that the keys defined in the subject scheme do not conflict with any keys defined elsewhere in the referencing map (although the referencing map could still override any keys defined in the subject scheme map). The subject scheme map can also be referenced as a peer-scope root map in a key scope: <map> <title>User assistance for the Acme Widget</title> <!-- ... --> <mapref keyscope="subjects" scope="peer" href="subjectschemes/subject-scheme-01.ditamap"/> <topicref keyref="install-overview" subjectrefs="subjects.installing"> <topicref keyref="install-linux"/> <topicref keyref="install-macosx"/> <topicref keyref="install-windows"/> <topicref keyref="install-troubleshooting" subjectrefs="subjects.troubleshooting"/> </topicref> <!-- ... --> </map> As a peer map, the keys defined in the subject scheme map are not included in the referencing map's key space but may be resolved using normal cross-deliverable key reference resolution. Processors that support cross-deliverable linking may also choose to resolve references from @"subjectrefs" to keys in peer subject scheme maps, for example to report keys specified on @"subjectrefs" that cannot be found in the peer subject scheme map.

Robert D Anderson Jun 6, 16:35

Typo, extra greater-than symbol

Kristen James Eberlein Jun 6, 17:42

I've made that change in the proposal AND the source files for the branch.