

Review of Artifact Identification Requirements WD14, dated June 22, 2005.

Requested format of comments: Please refer to line numbers and/or section numbers in the Acrobat file being reviewed. A statement of the problem, together with proposed replacement text, would be most useful to the TAB.

The TAB would appreciate your answers to the following, along with other comments and suggestions.

Thank you for your interest and attention.

1. Should **Part** be added to the current naming scheme? Or added to required metadata? **Part** could be used by (e.g.) web services security and SAML. Our inclination is to not include **Part**. Are there examples of a specification divided into several pieces that would suggest using **Part** in the naming scheme? The working definition, after line 254, was:

**Part**

The name of a sub-part of a TC's **Product** when a single product bearing a single **ArtifactType** is composed of multiple separable components, as with a "core" specification and its "profiles".

A value for **Part** MUST be included [in an **ArtifactIdentifier**] if the referenced **Product** is composed of multiple separable components. Otherwise **Part** MAY be included or omitted. The named **Parts** of a single **Product** must be unique within that **Product**.

2. Should it be permitted to append an arbitrary, in-the-character-set (per lines 365-375) string to **Revision**? At present only "diff" followed by two digits is permitted. This would be inserted among lines 294-298. See also Appendix B.
3. Should hyphen be permitted in a **DescriptiveName**?
4. It might  be more natural to reverse the order of stage and **artifactType**. Should it be reversed? If it were, an OASIS Standard set of artifacts would lexically sort together, rather than (say) all specifications in a cached directory. See line 379. Note that the review package for an OASIS Standard will be a ZIP archive if there is more than one artifact included, so the package provides this sorting benefit.
5. We have taken the position that only specifications and other prose artifacts must use the structured artifact names. Should the formal name for e.g. schemas be required to be in the structured style with an additional descriptive name not in the structured style being permitted?
6. Are the requirements for **ArtifactIdentifier** confusing with respect to file names?
7. This document specifies a set of Required Metadata for OASIS artifacts to be available in the document and/or associated metadata, and also as a basis for exposing selected metadata in the Artifact Identifier. Comments would be appreciated on the following plan for XHTML metadata in the next Working Draft, and would be inserted into section 5.5.2 and 5.5.3 (lines 431-443):

Use the style of "Expressing Dublin Core in HTML/XHTML meta and link elements," Dublin Core Metadata Initiative Recommendation, November 30, 2003, <http://dublincore.org/documents/dcq-html/>. The intent is to follow the style, but not to make normative reference to the Recommendation There will be one meta element per name-value pair. We may need to define an OASIS metadata namespace to use as a prefix for the metadata names.

The compatibility for versions of HTML before XHTML 1.0 would parallel that for the DCMI Recommendation.

8. Comments on the URN details, and placement of the “test” namespace would be appreciated. (lines 465-533). Section 6.2 needs clarification; suggestions appreciated.
9. Comments on the persistent URL section would be appreciated (lines 534-592)
10. There are some examples in Appendix C; should section 8 be deleted or contain detailed examples? Which TC(s) work product would provide challenging examples?
11. Should additional artifact types be included in the list in lines 255-268? CSS stylesheets? Best Practices? Should any types be eliminated?
12. Is the grammar in Appendix B useful? Is it correct? Should the grammar in Appendix B be normative?