TMDM

Last changes

Status

- **Last vote**
  - Yes, without comments: Canada, Italy, Korea, Netherlands
  - Yes, with comments: Norway, UK, US
  - No, unless comments accepted: Japan (email not received by secretariat)
  - TMDM therefore now approved as FCD

- **Quality of comments received was high**
  - most of the received comments deal with wordsmithing, and so will not be covered in this meeting
  - many will be rejected for technical reasons already discussed in meetings; these will therefore not be covered in the meeting either

- **Comments from Robert Barta[1] are also included**

- **This means that this is the last chance to make non-trivial changes**

- **After this, TMDM will be pretty much cast in stone...**

[1] http://isotopicmaps.org/pipermail/sc34wg3/2005-April/002609.html

General: URI vs IRI

- **Japan**
  - "URI should be changed to IRI because an IRI is a sequence of characters from the Universal Character Set (Unicode/ISO 10646) and allows to use non-Latin scripts in it."

Clause 3.14-3.16: published subject *

- **UK**
  - "Why are these defined? Surely 13250-2 only needs to be concerned with subject identifiers and subject indicators, published or not."

Clause 4.4: Datatypes

- **US**
  - "Doesn't defining string and using the W3C definition give us two definitions of string? BTW, the XML infoset defines 'null' (...) so wouldn't it be cleaner to simply add 'null' to the list and avoid defining string/null, etc.?"

- **Norway**
  - "It should be stated explicitly that the datatype URIs are considered to be PSIs for the respective datatypes, not just 'identifiers'."

- **UK**
  - "[datatype] property. Value should be described as a string identifier."

Clause 5.1: Source locators

- **"The UK would like the editors to review whether clause 5.1, Source locators, should be an integral part of the data model."**

Clause 5.2: The topic map item

- **Barta**
  - "Base locator: I would assume - from the name - that it is an absolute URI which allows all relative URIs in the map to be made absolute.
  Why is it there in the model and what reason could there be that this is NOT done at deserialisation (or construction) time?
  The only reason can be that the base locator is modified in a TM instance changing all relative URIs in there. I cannot see any use case for this.
  It can be NULL. So what does that mean for relative URIs? Is such a map meaningful?"

- **Norway**
  - "The semantics of the base locator property need to be defined more precisely."

Clauses 5.4, 5.6, 5.7, and 5.8

- **Barta**
    - "In a couple of places the TMDM allows to have NULL as value, even if there were a choice for a reasonable default. So, for instance, if an occurrence does not have a type, it is an 'OCCURRENCE' or if a topic is not an instance of something, then lets make it a 'THING' or 'TOPIC'.
    Everyone who defines a mapping from TMDM into something else needs a base ontology for the TMDMish things (Lars needs it for his Q, I need it for \Tau). It is probably not good if we all use different ones.
    If that is done clever, we could reuse it for TMQL as well."

- **Norway**
    - "The [type] property should be required to have a value. Define PSIs for use when deserializing untyped topic names from XTM."

Clause 5.5: Variant items

- **UK**
  - "[datatype] property. Value should be described as a string identifier."

- **Barta**
  - "The datatype is a string. And then it is a locator one sentence later. I guess it is not a topic for a good reason?"

Clause 7: Published subjects

- **Norway**
  - "The domain topicmaps.org should not be used for PSIs since it is not controlled by SC34. Use PSIs whose form is http://psi.topicmaps.com/iso13250/foo."

Clause 7.4: Variant name scopes

- **Norway**
  - "The display name PSI should be removed. It no longer serves any purpose now that the topic naming constraint has been removed."

Clause 7.5: Topic characteristic types

- **Norway**
  - "The unique-characteristic PSI should be removed from TMDM since it belongs more appropriately in TMCL."

Clause 7.6: Topic map constructs

- **UK**
  - "Explain why the identified for topic map constructs are there, or else remove them."

- **Norway**
  - "The purpose served by the PSIs defined in this section should be made clear, or else they should be removed from the standard. If retained, they should be defined more carefully."

- **Norway**
  - "Each term in the glossary should have a PSI."