

SML Transition Request

<Include> for both SML and SML IF specs

1. Document title, URIs, [estimated publication date](#)
2. The document Abstract and Status sections, either by reference (e.g., the URI to the document) or direct inclusion.

Record of the decision to request the transition

<Include> the link to the meeting minutes with the group's RESOLUTION to request the transition.

Report of important changes to the document

There have been no substantial changes to the two specifications since the second LC published on 12th September 2008. Minor changes were made to the specifications to resolve the following bugs

<<Add: explain what changes were made. >>

4633	Use of short namespace
5492	xs:schema line too long
5680	Fix errors in schematron variable substitution support text and example

Evidence that the document satisfies group's requirements

The requirements listed in the scope section of the charter have been met.

- Have the requirements changed since the previous transition? Are any requirements previously satisfied no longer satisfied? Are any requirements previously unsatisfied now satisfied?

Evidence that dependencies with other groups met (or not)

The SML WG charter requires the WG to coordinate its efforts with the XML Schema WG and the XML Query WG. Both WGs reviewed the first LC specifications and submitted comments.

All comments submitted by these two WGs were resolved satisfactorily. We requested these 2 WGs to review the 2nd LC.

<Include> list of bugs opened based on comments from XSD 1.1 and XQuery

- Does this specification have any normative references to W3C specifications that are not yet Proposed Recommendations? **Note:** In general, documents do not advance to Recommendation with normative references to W3C specifications that are not yet Recommendations.
 - **NO – we don't have any such references**
- Have other Groups confirmed that dependencies have been satisfied? For example, does the issues list show that these groups are satisfied as a result of their review of the document? Are there dependencies that have not been satisfied?
 - **I believe the answer is yes – need to find the appropriate emails**

Evidence that the document has received wide review (e.g., as shown in an issues list)

- Was there wide review by groups with dependencies?
 - Yes, the specs were reviewed by the XML Schema WG and XML Query WG
 - Query WG bugs: 5598 to 5600
- Any review from other organizations?
 - Yes- review from Sun and EMC
 - <http://lists.w3.org/Archives/Public/public-sml/2008Sep/0019.html>
 - <http://lists.w3.org/Archives/Public/public-sml/2008Sep/0015.html>

List of bugs

Reviewer Satisfied

[5518](#) Why are rules allowed on both element declaration and type definitions

[5525](#) Confusing section names

[5527](#) Why is NCName optional?

[5530](#) Use consistent form for MIT URI

[5513](#) Why does SML define sml:ref instead of using XLink

[5519](#) Relationship between SML model validity and XSD validity assessment needs to be precisely defined

[5520](#) Why is document defined as a character sequence?

[5522](#) The term "containing element" is not clear

[5523](#) Discuss the behavior of GET on URI

[5524](#) Rename section 4.4.1.1

[5526](#) What does "nested to any depth" mean?

[5528](#) xs:import for SML namespace is unnecessary

[5529](#) Clarify Appendix C

[5541](#) Why is schema-less identification of reference elements important?

[5542](#) How are SML URIs absolutized

[5543](#) SML URI seems overconstrained

[5544](#) Why does SML require that the target of SMLURI be an XML element?

[5545](#) Reconcile SML URIs with RFC3986

[5546](#) Reconcile SML-IF with RFC 2557

Reviewer Not Satisfied

[5562](#) SML should define an XHTML href Reference Scheme

Evidence that issues have been formally addressed

Reviewer satisfied and not satisfied breakdown.

Verify that bugzilla has the record of reviewer satisfaction

- Include a link to an issues list that indicates that the Group has been responsive to reviewers who have raised issues since the previous transition. The Director's expectations are that, as a document advances, the Working Group will keep an increasingly precise record of how it has formally addressed each issue.
- For changes in the issues list since the previous transition:
 - Highlight issues where the Group has declined to make a change, with rationale. See also [Clarification: tables summarizing review](#) Tim Berners-Lee (Tue, Feb 15 2000).
 - Highlight issues where the Group has not satisfied a reviewer and has either not yet responded to the reviewer, or the reviewer has not yet acknowledged the Group's decision.
 - Show, without highlighting:
 - Issues where the Working Group has accepted a proposed change.
 - Issues where the Working Group has clarified the specification to the satisfaction of the reviewer.

Objections

No formal objections.

- Have there been any objections since the previous transition?
- For each objection, is there a record of the decision, the objection, and attempts to satisfy the reviewer?

Implementation information

- Are there any implementation requirements beyond the defaults of the Process Document? For instance, is the expectation to show two complete implementations (e.g., there are two software instances, each of which conforms) or to show that each feature is implemented twice in *some* piece of software?
 - Two implementations of each required feature
 - At least one implementation of each optional features
- What are the Group's plans for showing implementation of optional features? In general, the Director expects mandatory features and optional features that affect interoperability to be handled similarly. Optional features that are truly optional (i.e., that do not affect interoperability) may require less implementability testing.
 - Optional features list
 - SML
 - SML: sml:locid
 - EXT: Later versions of XML
 - EXT: Later versions of XML Schema
 - EXT: Later versions of XPath
 - LIC: Schematron processor Query bindings other than XSLT for validators

- SML: Model processors not also model validators may not be schema-aware
 - SML: Multiple reference schemes recognized in the same SML reference
 - Allowed
 - What happens outside of validation context
 - SML: Support for non-XSD defined shorthand pointers (bare names), i.e. those defined as IDs in DTDs
 - LIC: Which SML constraints are visible/enforced in sub-trees whose root is laxly assessed
 - SML-IF
 - SML: Locator
 - SML: Schema bindings
 - SML: Base URIs – both optional for consumers, but at least one required if any relative references used in the instance
 - EXT: Later versions of XML
 - EXT: Later versions of XML Schema
 - SML: When both forms of base URI markup are used, optional for a consumer to check the consistency of the forms used (i.e. check that each absolutized URI is the same under all schemes used).
 - LIC: Schema import: not required to fetch external components; re-statement of XML Schema processor latitude.
 - LIC: Schema include & redefine: not required to fetch external components; re-statement of XML Schema processor latitude.
 - Distinguish between
 - SML: those for which SML/SML-IF defines the behavior,
 - EXT: versus extensibility/loose-coupling provisions defined by SML/SML-IF,
 - LIC: versus license granted by other specifications and preserved via restatement for SML/SML-IF processors (latter e.g. XSD, URI processing).
- Is there a preliminary implementation report? The implementation report should be a detailed matrix showing which software implements each feature of the specification.
 - Yes, COSMOS and IBM
- What are expectations about additional software that is expected to implement the specification during CR?
 - None expected
- What is the minimal duration of the CR period? Estimate of how long it will take before requesting PR?
 - Statutory minimum?? MSM informs us the minimum is zero.
- Are there any [features at risk](#)?
 - No
- Does the WG have additional implementation experience that will help demonstrate interoperability (e.g., has there been an interoperability day or workshop? Is one planned?}?
 - There was an interoperability day prior to Submission.

- No additional ones are planned.
- Are there tests or test suites available that will allow the WG to demonstrate/evaluate that features have been implemented? If not, what metrics will the WG use? If there are special conditions for this specification related to evaluation of implementations, what are they? Are test suites planned at any time? If there are tests or test suites available, are there links between the tests and the features of the specification they purport to test?
 - Yes, test suites exist
 - ? Mapping

Patent disclosures

- Has anything changed on the patent disclosure page since the previous transition? Have there been any incomplete or problematic disclosures?
 - No disclosures have been made impacting the specification.
- If the group is not using [IPP](#): Does the disclosure page conform to the patent policy requirements?
 - Hope so.