DR 19-0005 — DML Diagrams: Context-dependent content models not clearly documented

Status: Open

Subject: DML Diagrams: Context-dependent content models not clearly documented

Qualifier: Editorial defect

Submitter: Francis Cave Organization: (BSI)

Contact Information: <francis@franciscave.com>

Submitter’s Defect Number: 20190111-5

Supporting Document(s): none

Date Circulated by Secretariat:

Deadline for Response from Editor:

IS 29500 Reference(s): Part 1 §21.4.4.1, §21.4.4.2, §21.4.4.6, §21.4.4.10, §21.4.4.11, §21.4.5.1, §21.4.5.2, §21.4.5.3, §21.4.5.11

Related DR(s): none

Nature of the Defect:

Many elements share the same name but have different content models in different contexts. In most cases the context is clear in the documentation, but in the cases referred to here, the context could usefully be clarified.

Solution Proposed by the Submitter:

In the case of §21.4.4.1, §21.4.4.2, §21.4.5.1 and §21.4.5.2, the use of distinct content types CT\_CTCategory, CT\_CTCategories, CT\_SDCategory and CT\_SDCategories seems pointless and potentially confusing for implementers, since these are identical to CT\_Category and CT\_Categories used for the same elements cat and catLst in other contexts (see §21.4.2.4 and §21.4.2.5 respectively). I suggest modifying the schema to drop CT\_CTCategory, CT\_CTCategories, CT\_SDCategory and CT\_SDCategories. The prose will only need modifying if the cross-references to the complex types in the schema are retained.

In the case of §21.4.4.6 and §21.4.5.3, the use of distinct content type CT\_CTDescription and CT\_SDDescription seems pointless and potentially confusing for implementers, since these are both identical to CT\_Description used for the same element in other contexts (see §21.4.2.11). I suggest modifying the schema to drop CT\_CTDescription and CT\_SDDescription. The prose will only need modifying if the cross-references to the complex types in the schema are retained.

In the case of §21.4.4.11 and §21.4.5.1, the use of distinct content type CT\_CTName and CT\_SDName seems pointless and potentially confusing for implementers, since these are both identical to CT\_Name used for the same element in other contexts (see §21.4.2.30). I suggest modifying the schema to drop CT\_CTName and CT\_SDName. The prose will only need modifying if the cross-references to the complex types in the schema are retained.

In the case of §21.4.4.10, to avoid confusion with §21.4.5.10 change the heading as follows:

21.4.4.10 styleLbl (Color Transform Style Label).

Schema Change(s) Needed:

Yes/No

**Editor’s Response:**

None

Changes to Part 1: N Part 2: N Part 3: N Part 4: N