TMDM

Final tweaks before FDIS

What is this?

- **These slides are working slides for the ISO SC34 WG3 meeting in Montréal, Canada 2005-07-28 to -31**
- **Each slide presents one issue that has been discussed and settled by the committee**
  - the following slide, titled “Resolution” will in each case give the conclusion reached by the meeting

Status

- Reached FCD before Amsterdam
- New interim draft produced 2005-07-13 for review before this meeting
- After final issues settled at this meeting we will prepare FDIS draft
- Once the FDIS passes ballot TMDM is finished

Principle: Inferred information

- **Anne Cregan**
  - must implementations “create extra instances of associations on the fly to capture inferred type-instance and supertype-subtype associations”?
- **TMDM specifies clearly that additional relationships can be inferred from associations in the topic map**
  - the question is: must implementations actually create these in the data set?

Resolution

- **The additional associations would be redundant**
  - this is poor practice, and can lead to problems managing the data
  - will also increase the size of the topic map
- **However, we can't forbid this**
- **Add a NOTE to this effect**

Principle: Topic characteristics

- **This is based on feedback from multiple sources, including N0655**
- **The definition of scope says**
  - "context within which a topic characteristic is valid"
  - topic characteristics: topic names, occurrences, and association roles
  - yet scope applies to associations (not roles), and variant names in the model
- **So, what is it scope really applies to?**
  - topic names, occurrences, and association roles?
  - statements? (may need some prose added to work)
  - topic map constructs? (that would include topic maps and topics)
- **Do we really need the term "topic characteristic", and if so, what does it mean?**

Resolution

- **Define scope as applying to statements**
- **Make it clear that topic names, variants, occurrences, and associations are statements**
- **Remove the term “topic characteristic”, because it's not needed**
  - the PSI will also be removed

Clause 3: “Topic Maps” vs “topic map”

- **The 2005-07-13 draft for the first time distinguishes between**
  - “Topic Maps”: the general technology
  - “topic map”: a data set conformant to ISO 13250-2
- **Should “Topic Maps” be introduced as a defined term in the glossary?**
  - this would also give it a PSI in clause 7.5
- **Downside is that it gives awkward constructions like**
  - “There are many Topic Maps syntaxes...”
- **If yes, what is the definition?**

Resolution

- **We define “Topic Maps” as the technology in general**
  - the definition appears in the glossary, and there is a PSI for it
- **“Topic Maps” is a proper noun, therefore it is singular, so “Topic Map” is incorrect**
  - put in a NOTE to this effect

Clause 4.3: The status of locators

- **In TMDM locators are now strings**
- **However, many properties take locators or sets of them as their values**
  - these properties are now described as having strings, where the strings are locators
  - this doesn't really seem acceptable
- **Proposed solutions**
  - define a new fundamental type for locators

Resolution

- **We define “locator” as a new fundamental type**
  - the definition remains the same
- **All properties that take locator values are updated to say so**

Clause 5.3.2: Subject indicators

- **Discussion with readers has made it clear that not all of them are aware that subject indicators are not *required* to exist**
- **Of course, creating good indicators is best practice, but from the TMDM's point of view, everything works fine without them**
- **Should a note be added to make this clear?**

Resolution

- **Add prose making it clear that implementations are not required to dereference subject identifier IRIs, and so it is not an error for a subject identifier not to have a corresponding indicator**
- **Make it clear that best practice *is* to have an indicator**

Clause 7: PSIs defined by TMDM

- **UK national body**
  - "If this standard is to define new subject identifiers for concepts which already have subject identifiers under the http://www.topicmaps.org/ namespace, the editors should specify the mapping between the http://www.topicmaps.org/ namespace and the http://psi.topicmaps.com/ namespace."
- **Questions**
  - should we do it?
  - if so, where should we do it?
  - and how?

Resolution

- **Yes, we must make the relationship clear**
- **We put the explanation in the definition of each PSI that has a relationship to an XTM 1.0 PSI**
- **The relationships are:**
  - type-instance: subtype of XTM 1.0 PSI
  - supertype-subtype: also subtype
  - sort name: also subtype
  - association: subtype
  - occurrence: subtype
  - ...

Clause 7.2: Prominence of type-instance

- **It has been felt by several readers that the type-instance PSIs are not sufficiently prominent in clause 7.2**
  - in Amsterdam it was discussed to move them into clause 5.3 and to add illustrating instance diagrams
  - in the 2005-07-13 draft only a note pointing forward from 5.3 has been added
- **Do we consider the note sufficient?**
  - Gabriel Hopmans: “if inferred information is added to the data set, then no”
- **Do we want to add instance diagrams to illustrate this?**
- **Some additional information can be found in**
  - http://isotopicmaps.org/pipermail/sc34wg3/2005-July/002759.html

Resolution

- **We consider the NOTE sufficent**
- **Don't want to add instance diagrams, because**
  - they will be quite large, and not necessarily very readable,
  - the prose already provides the necessary information, and
  - if we later define a graphical notation, that should have been used instead

Old clause 7.5: Topic characteristic types

- **Norway**
  - "The unique-characteristic PSI should be removed from TMDM since it belongs more appropriately in TMCL."
- **Status**
  - accepted by the working group meeting in Amsterdam
  - editors instructed to invite comments from Steve Newcomb to verify that he also accepts this
  - the outcome of email discussion about this was that we wanted to bring this up in Montréal again to ensure that everyone is satisfied with the decision
- **Resolution**
  - Steve Newcomb not present; issue deferred

New clause 7.5: PSIs for glossary terms

- **Feedback on this would be welcome**
- **Should it be a clause, or an annex?**
- **Resolution**
  - members encouraged to review

New clause 7.5: tm:unconstrained-scope

- **What is the validity of a topic characteristic that has this PSI as its scope?**

Resolution

- **Add usage making it clear that this should not be used as a scoping topic**

New issue: Figures 5 and 6

- **These have different visual orientation**
- **Figure 5 should be made consistent with figure 6**
  - rationale: 4 and 6 are already consistent

XTM

One last issue

Principle: “XML syntax” or “XTM syntax”?

- **Japanese national body**
  - “The title of this document is 'XML Syntax' while the term 'XTM Syntax' is used in the content of this document. Those terms should be unified.”

Resolution

- **Change title of part 3 to “Interchange Syntax”**
- **Rationale**
  - all other titles describe function of part
  - “XML Syntax” is vague, and appears to conflict with “XTM Syntax”
  - “XTM Syntax” is confusing as a name, and does not describe function
  - “Interchange Syntax” seems the most consistent, and avoids the apparent conflict
- **Formalities**
  - Jim says this is within SC34's jurisdiction
  - editors to ask secretary to handle the formalities of the title change

Clause 5.8: Empty variant names

- **What is the TMDM representation of:**
  - <variant><parameters>...</parameters></variant>
- **That is, a <variant> element with no <variantName> child?**
  - the 2005-07-20 XTM draft says no variant item should be created in this case

Resolution

- **No item is created**
- **Nested <variant> elements may appear, and may create variant items**
  - the variant items will inherit the scope of the empty parent <variant>