

*XML Plenary Lightning Talk*

# Making the XML Stack Work with XML 1.1

Noah Mendelsohn  
IBM Research  
March 3, 2003

# Goal of this talk

- Goal of this talk: alert non XML-core WGs to need to start building an interoperable stack in an XML 1.1 world.
- Non-goals:
  - Promote or deprecate use of XML 1.1 in particular situations or recommendations
  - Debate W3C process: did right reviews happen prior to 1.1 rec?

# What's New in XML 1.1?

# Noah Buys an Island

...and designs his own letter  
used in place of “M”


English:

Noah Mendelsohn


Islandese:

Noah  endelsohn

# What Changes?

|  | Allowed in<br>XML 1.0? | Allowed in<br>XML 1.1? |
|--|------------------------|------------------------|
| <XML>  | Yes                    | Yes                    |
| <xml>  | Yes                    | Yes                    |
| <X  L> | No                     | Yes                    |

# What Changes?

|   | Allowed in<br>XML 1.0? | Allowed in<br>XML 1.1? |
|---|------------------------|------------------------|
| <code>&lt;attr="XML"&gt;</code>   | <i>Yes</i>             | <i>Yes</i>             |
| <code>&lt;attr="χμλ"&gt;</code>   | <i>Yes</i>             | <i>Yes</i>             |
| <code>&lt;attr="XL"&gt;</code> | <i>Yes</i>             | <i>Yes</i>             |
| <code>&lt;attr="&amp;#x1f"&gt;</code>   | <i>No</i>              | <i>Yes</i>             |

# Some Issues to Consider

# Schema: Declaring Elements

XML Schema

```
<xsd:element name="XL"/>
```

**Is this OK?**

**Can you declare elements with the new names?**



# Schema: Declaring Elements

XML Schema

~~<xsd:element name="XL" />~~

**Is this OK?**

**Can you declare elements with the new names?**

**No. In an element declaration, the {name} component is specified as “an NCName as defined by [ref to 1999 version of Namespaces in XML]” (from XML Schema Part 1)**

# Schema: String Type

XML Schema

```
<xsd:attribute name="at"  
  type="xsd:string">
```

```
at="Noah endelsohn"
```

**Validates.**

# Schema: String Type

XML Schema

```
<xsd:attribute name="at"  
  type="xsd:string">
```

~~at="&#x1f"~~

**Doesn't validate with xsd:string type.**

*“The **·value space·** of string is the set of finite-length sequences of characters (as defined in [XML 1.0 (Second Edition)]) that **·match·** the Char production from [XML 1.0 (Second Edition)].” (XML Schema Part 2)*

# Schema: Name Type

XML Schema

```
<xsd:attribute name="at"  
  type="xsd:name">
```

```
at="Noah endelsohn"
```

# Schema: Name Type

XML Schema

```
<xsd:attribute name="at"  
  type="xsd:name">
```

```
at="Noah  endelsohn"
```

**Doesn't validate unless we change the Schema Rec.**

*“The lexical space of Name is the set of all strings which match the Name production of [XML 1.0 (Second Edition)].” (XML Schema Part 2)*


# Query: Functions & Operators

fn:node-name (<abc>)

fn:node-name (<XL>)

# Query: Functions & Operators

`fn:node-name (<abc>)` **OK**

~~`fn:node-name (<XL>)` **Doesn't work**~~

**Doesn't work...the return type of `fn:node-name` is an `xsd:QName` which is defined as (you guessed it)...**

*“The value space of QName is the set of tuples {namespace name, local part}, where namespace name is an anyURI and local part is an NCName [i.e. per 1999 version of Namespaces in XML...NRM]” (XML Schema Part 2)*

# But there's more...

- **How do you know which Infosets allow new names/chars?**
- **application/xml (RFC 3203) needs clarification (informal discussions started)**
- **SOAP is based on RFC 3203...did not explicitly anticipate new content...affects interoperation**
- **Even old-style content may be labeled as `<?xml version="1.1"?>`.**
  - Streaming large documents complicates early generation of `<?xml version="1.x"?>`
  - Not clear whether query can easily check for new content when serializing
  - XML interop story compromised: already deployed software can't read even old-style content
- **WSDL?, RDF? Probably others?**
- **I may not have the list right, but there clearly are a lot of interrelated issues to consider.**



# Conclusion

- XML 1.1 seems to affect many Recommendations, RFC's, etc.
- We need to get busy figuring out the implications
- My opinion: we need a stack that is consistent and that preserves the nearly universal interoperability that has made XML compelling for users.