

=====
Minutes of the OASIS DITA TC
Tuesday, 15 May 2018
Recorded by Nancy Harrison

7. Proposal for a safety domain in DITA 2.0

- <https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/dita/201805/msg00007.html> (Jang Graat, 08 May 2018)
 - <https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/dita/201805/msg00008.html> (Eberlein, 08 May 2018)
 - <https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/dita/201805/msg00009.html> (Jang Graat, 08 May 2018)
 - <https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/dita/201805/msg00015.html> (Nitchie, 09 May 2018)
 - <https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/dita/201805/msg00019.html> (Sirois, 10 May 2018)
 - <https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/dita/201805/msg00020.html> (Amber Swope, 10 May 2018)
 - <https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/dita/201805/msg00021.html> (Eberlein, 10 May 2018)
 - <https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/dita/201805/msg00022.html> (Jang Graat, 10 May 2018)
 - <https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/dita/201805/msg00023.html> (Eberlein, 10 May 2018)
 - <https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/dita/201805/msg00025.html> (Amber Swope, 10 May 2018)
- Kris; there was a lot of discussion on this proposal; we need to wade thru his proposal and see what parts are really needed. Are there things that hazardstatement doesn't provide? I'd like to hear from folks who have clients using this domain,
- Dawn; my clients have largely been able to make it work, and comply with whatever ANSI standards they need to work with; one of them needed to make an adjustment because they needed multiple symbols associated with a statement, but that was doable.
- Chris; I'm not an expert on the ANSI standards he references. His primary complaint is that it doesn't enforce compliance with any of the standards, but I don't find that compelling. You can make them work with those standards, and it's useful to have structures in a generic base vocabulary that allow for different kinds of hazard statements. I don't see a really strong reason to make a change.
- Scott; we used hazardstatement at Schneider Electric, and we didn't have any issues with it mapping to ANSI.
- Kris; I'd second that; my clients use it and it works fine. The question is 'what is it intended for?' We always expected that companies would need to customize it to meet their particular needs. I don't see a real need for a redesign.
- Dawn; my only issue is to put in different list types in the 'how to avoid' section. Our clients use that that section, and only simplelists are allowed there, not any other kinds.
- Kris; that's a good point; I'd support loosening the content model to support other lists.

=====
Minutes of the OASIS DITA TC meeting
Tuesday, 5 June 2018
Recorded by Maria Essig

6. Hazard Statement

Jang: There were e-mails passed concerning the hazard statement while I was traveling on business. Apparently, no one saw any reason to change anything. But I believe it needs to be redone – I disagree that there is no problem with it. It is supposed to be compliant with the ANSI standard, but is not. The discussion is far from over and I wonder how it will move forward.

Nancy: You should discuss this with Kris.

Jang: People have no problem with it, but it is not compliant with ANSI standards.

Bob Thomas: It doesn't limit you from generating ANSI compliant hazard statements, but allows a compliance model that lets you work with a looser content model.

Jang: But it is not possible to leave the hazard symbol outside of the message panel now, which is defined by ANSI as necessary for grouped hazard statements. Type attribute allows note, fastpath – which are specifically against the ANSI hazard statement standards, which only has 4 levels of hazard statements.

Nancy: Do you specialize?

Jang: You can't have separate hazard statements unless you don't use hazard symbols. According to ANSI, you don't have to repeat the symbol if grouping statements. But the hazard symbol belongs to the message panel.

Nancy: Are there any other comments? It's too bad Kris and Dawn are not on this call because they are the ones who didn't think changes in hazard statement were advisable.

Robert: I agree we need a different construction for messagepanel to cleanly support ANSI content.

Jang: We could add multiple images as a child of messagepanel, but that won't work because messagepanel is specialized from the element. I can investigate what can be done to rework the hazardstatement domain to make it more workable for ANSI-compliant content, without compromising legacy content that uses the current version. I will also contact Dawn and Amber, both of whom have clients using the current domain, to provide a single proposal, especially since Dawn is already the owner of a proposal relating to this domain for 2.0. (One possibility is replacing the with <div> as the base for the messagepanel element.)

=====
Minutes of the OASIS DITA TC
Tuesday, 4 December 2018
Recorded by Nancy Harrison

- Dawn ; wrt hazard statement (#164); we had put that on hold. Is that still going to happen? Jang had proposed something much more complex than my requirements, which were just to add some elements to 'howtoavoid'.
- Robert; I don't think Jang will make progress on that.
- Kris; I agree w/Robert. could we fix the worst parts just by changing/adding some elements?
- Robert; we should also change messagepanel from '?' to '*' (1 to >1). I think Jang had totally convinced me of just some of what he wanted, but what he was suggesting was logical and straightforward. otoh, I don't think he was changing 'howtoavoid', so your work on that wouldn't interfere. I can help, but probably it won't happen this month.
- Dawn; I can work on something and pass it by you when you have time.