

ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 34 N 1322

DATE: 2009-11-17

ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 34
Document Description and Processing Languages
Secretariat: [Japan \(JISC\)](#)

DOC. TYPE	Meeting Report						
TITLE	XTM 2.1 Issues [WG 3]						
SOURCE	WG 3 Convenor [Mr. Patrick DURUSAU]						
PROJECT							
STATUS	Notes from the WG 3 Meeting, Leipzig, 2009-11-10, 14. This document is circulated to the SC 34 members for information.						
ACTION ID	FYI						
DUE DATE							
DISTRIBUTION	P, O and L Members of ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 34 ; ISO/IEC JTC 1 Secretariat; ISO/IEC ITTF						
ACCESS LEVEL	Open						
ISSUE NO.	105						
FILE	<table><tr><td>NAME</td><td>1322.pdf</td></tr><tr><td>SIZE (KB)</td><td></td></tr><tr><td>PAGES</td><td>21</td></tr></table>	NAME	1322.pdf	SIZE (KB)		PAGES	21
NAME	1322.pdf						
SIZE (KB)							
PAGES	21						

Secretariat ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 34 - IPSJ/ITSCJ (Information Processing Society of Japan/Information Technology Standards Commission of Japan)* Room 308-3, Kikai-Shinko-Kaikan Bldg., 3-5-8, Shiba-Koen, Minato-ku, Tokyo 105-0011 Japan *Standard Organization Accredited by JISC
Telephone: +81-3-3431-2808 ; Facsimile: +81-3-3431-2808; E-mail: kimura@itscj.ipsj.or.jp



XTM 2.1 Issues

Leipzig, November 2009

Should we make an XTM 2.1?

- Lars Heuer suggested three changes to XTM 2.0
 - he proposed that we make an XTM 2.1 version based on this
 - his three proposals fit well with the editors' opinions of the weaknesses in XTM 2.0
- However, the biggest issue to be decided is whether to make a new XTM version at all, or to stick with the one we have
- Currently we have 2 XML syntaxes for Topic Maps
 - if we do this we increase the number to 3
 - with all the interchange challenges that this entails
- Does it matter? Is it really a problem?
 - not sure

Current known software

• Tool	1.0	2.0	2.1
• CmapTools	x		
• H-Maps	x		
• Isidorus	x	x	
• Mappa	x	x	x
• Onotoa		x	
• Ontopia	x	x	x
• Perl TM	x	x	
• Ruby Topic Maps	x	x	
• TM++	x	x	
• TM4J	x		
• TMCore	x		
• ThinkGraph	x		
• Topincs	x	x	
• Wandora	x	x	
• Wordpress TM	x		
• ZTM		x	x?
• dtddoc	x		
• tinyTiM	x	x	x
• tm-converter	x	x	x



Impact of proposed changes

- 2.1 would be backwards compatible with 2.0
 - that is, every 2.0 file would also be a valid 2.1 file (*except for version number?*)
 - every 2.0 file would be imported correctly by a 2.1 reader
 - 2.1 files would not be accepted by 2.0 readers
- Five changes are proposed
 - 1460: don't require the ID attribute on topic elements
 - 1462: add subjectIdentifierRef and subjectLocatorRef
 - 1459: don't require fragments in topic references
 - 1493: change 'version' attribute value to 2.1 (from 2.0)
 - 1496: additional support for reification

<http://projects.topicmapslab.de/projects/xtm/issues>



Feedback from vendors

- On issues 1460, 1462, 1459, 1493
 - Robert Cerny: “I would welcome the changes”
 - Arnar Lundesgaard: in favour, “I'm quite certain we will support XTM 2.1 fairly quickly”
- On issue 1496
 - arrived later, so no opinions received yet

1460: don't require the 'id' attribute on <topic>

- In XTM 2.0 <topic> elements must have an 'id' attribute
 - even if they have subject identifiers or subject locators
 - this is stronger than the TMDM requirement
- The proposal is to only require an 'id' if there are no other identifiers
 - in other words, one could write simply

```
<topic>
  <subjectIdentifier>http://psi.example.org/foo</subjectIdentifier>
</topic>
```
 - the following would not be allowed

```
<topic><name><value>Foo</value></name></topic>
```
- Benefit
 - not necessary to generate IDs for topics which have other identifiers
 - easier in XSLT conversion, for example
 - this is a real issue, which does occur in real life
 - Norm Walsh complained about it, for example

Approved



1462: add subjectIdentifierRef and subjectLocatorRef

- In XTM 2.0 topics can only be referred to with <topicRef/>
- In XTM 2.1 we propose
 - <topicRef href=“...”/>
 - <subjectIndicatorRef href=“...”/>
 - <subjectLocatorRef href=“...”/>
- Benefits (of 2.0)
 - simple to understand and implement
- Downsides (of 2.0)
 - in fragments there must be a topic element for every referenced topic
 - even if the topic is just used as a type or in a scope
 - one cannot refer to a topic only by its PSI
 - causes serious problems for people using large, modular XTM files
 - one major commercial customer had to drop XTM 2.0 because of this

Approved

Alternative syntax for topic references

- Instead of
 - `<topicRef href="..."/>`
 - `<subjectIdentifierRef href="..."/>`
 - `<subjectLocatorRef href="..."/>`
- we could have
 - `<topicRef href="..."/>` (and perhaps `<topicRef iid="..."/>`)
 - `<topicRef sid="..."/>`
 - `<topicRef slo="..."/>`

Rejected



Observation

- It would be cleaner if <topicRef> were named <itemIdentifierRef>
 - because of the logic behind the other new element names
 - however, we are not *currently* proposing this, to preserve backwards compatibility
 - should backwards compatibility be lost...

1496: Reference to reifier

- XTM 2.0 supports only the -reifier- attribute, which contains an IDREF
 - this is unlike the other topic references in the syntax
 - suggested solution is to add <reifier> child element, which contains a <*Ref>

```
<association>
  <reifier>
    <subjectIdentifierRef href="http://psi.bouvet.net/lmgs-employment"/>
  </reifier>
  [...]
</association>
```
- The -reifier- attribute may or may not be kept
 - removing it will break backwards compatibility

Approved

The reifier attribute: keep if we preserve
backwards compatibility

1459: don't require fragments in topicrefs

- In XTM 2.0 every <topicRef> URI must contain a fragment
 - <topicRef href="http://example.org/xtm/foo"/> is illegal
 - <topicRef href="http://example.org/xtm/foo#bar"/> is legal
 - <topicRef href="foo"/> is illegal (and a common error)
 - <topicRef href="#foo"/> is legal
- Benefits (of 2.0)
 - makes some common errors easy to catch
 - difficult to imagine a case where a non-fragment URI is correct
- Downsides (of 2.0)
 - it's an odd restriction to have
 - there's no guarantee that it won't ever be useful to have a URI without a fragment

Approved

Processing of URIs

- We load from <http://example.org/xtm/foo> an XTM file containing
 - `<topicRef href="foo"/>`
 - what is the resulting item identifier?
 - answer: <http://example.org/xtm/foo>
 - `<topicRef href="bar"/>`
 - what is the resulting item identifier?
 - answer: <http://example.org/xtm/bar>

This is just a clarification.



1493: change 'version' attribute value to 2.1

- In XTM 2.0 files, the version attribute must be exactly “2.0”
- What should the rule be in 2.1?
 1. It must be “2.1” if 2.1 features are used, otherwise it can be either 2.1 or 2.0
 2. It must be “2.1”. 2.0 files are described in the previous version of the spec.
 3. It must be “2.0”. We don’t change the number.
- Cases to consider
 - tool supporting 2.1 and 2.0 gets a 2.0 file
 - tool supporting only 2.0 gets a 2.1 file
 - tool supporting only 2.1 gets a 2.0 file

We choose option #1



The RELAX-NG schema

- What should the official 2.1 schema do with XTM 2.0?
 - only specify schema for 2.1 syntax
 - perhaps allow version number to be 2.0 or 2.1
 - or merge schemas so that if
 - -version- == 2.1, require 2.1 syntax,
 - -version- == 2.0, require 2.0 syntax

We merge the schemas

New issue: attribute to reference a topic

- XTM 2.0 syntax
 - `<role>`
 - `<type><topicRef href="#bar"/></type>`
 - `<topicRef href="#foo"/>`
 - `</role>`
- Proposed new syntax (with new attributes for subject-id/locator)
 - `<role playerii="#foo" typeii="#bar"/>`
 - `<role playersi="http://psi.example.org/foo" typeii="#bar"/>`
- This is really a proposal for a new XTM 3.0

Rejected for 2.1



New issue: annex describing 2.0/2.1 diffs

- The editors shall write an annex briefly describing the differences

Approved



1611: Media type for XTM

- We agree there should be a media type for XTM
 - ISO apply for a media type
 - however, we think that IANA requires that the media type appear in the spec before it will approve an RFC with the media type
- Therefore we will write an XTM 2.1 draft with an annex
 - the annex recommends the media types for XTM 1.0, 2.0, and 2.1
- The editors are requested to apply for media types
 - and to work out exactly what the requirements are

Approved



So what are the media types?

- Alternatives
 - application/topicmaps+xml
 - application/xtm+xml
 - application/xtm(10|20|21)+xml
 - application/tm+xml
- What about CTM?
 - text/ctm ?

We will discuss this on the mailing list



Recommended file extensions?

- We recommend the .xtn file extension for all versions

Approved



Recommendation for CTM

- We recommend that CTM
 - specify a media type,
 - start the process to register a media type, and
 - recommend a file extension