

DR 09-0322 — OPC: Types

Status: Open

Subject: OPC: Types

Qualifier: Request for clarification

Submitter: Mr. Francis Cave (UK)

Contact Information: francis@franciscave.com

Submitter's Defect Number: 08-00177

Supporting Document(s): none

Date Circulated by Secretariat: 2009-10-19

Deadline for Response from Editor: 2009-12-19

IS 29500 Reference(s): Part 2

Related DR(s): none

Nature of the Defect:

[Throughout the spec]

The word "Type" is used confusingly in the spec. In §9.1.2 we are told "Content Type" "identifies the type of content that is stored in the part"; on p. 22 we are told the Type attribute "defines the role of the relationship and the format designer shall specify such a Type"; (in these two cases we are then referred to an informative annex). Later on p. 22 we are told "Relationships are represented in XML in a Relationships part.

Solution Proposed by the Submitter:

It may be there are differences between content types, relationship types, and relationship type roles within the text. These should be clarified, perhaps with new entries in the terms and definitions section.

Editor's Response:

Agree that there's benefit in additional defined terms. Update §4 Terms and Definitions to include the following term in place:

relationship type — A URI. Identifies the function of a relationship within the package, as defined in the Standard. Format designers may define new relationship types as needed.

However, we suspect that more important here is that the use of the word “type” be clarified in place in specific instances of use the document, that simple extensions to definitions may not be the best way to clarify the confusion. If there is agreement that is necessary and valuable, we would like to consider such an enhancement to the usability of the document.