



Errata to SyncML Device Information DTD Specification

Specification version: 1.0

Specification date: 2000-12-07



SyncML Initiative

The following companies are Sponsors of the SyncML initiative:

Ericsson
IBM
Lotus
Matsushita Communications Industrial Co., Ltd.
Motorola
Nokia
Palm, Inc.
Psion
Starfish Software



Copyright Notice

Copyright (c) **Ericsson, IBM, Lotus, Matsushita Communication Industrial Co., LTD, Motorola, Nokia, Palm, Inc., Psion, Starfish Software** (2001).

All Rights Reserved.

Implementation of all or part of any Specification may require licenses under third party intellectual property rights, including without limitation, patent rights (such a third party may or may not be a Supporter). The Sponsors of the Specification are not responsible and shall not be held responsible in any manner for identifying or failing to identify any or all such third party intellectual property rights.

THIS DOCUMENT AND THE INFORMATION CONTAINED HEREIN ARE PROVIDED ON AN "AS IS" BASIS WITHOUT WARRANTY OF ANY KIND AND ERICSSON, IBM, LOTUS, MATSUSHITA COMMUNICATION INDUSTRIAL CO. LTD, MOTOROLA, NOKIA, PALM INC., PSION, STARFISH SOFTWARE AND ALL OTHER SYNCML SPONSORS DISCLAIM ALL WARRANTIES, EXPRESS OR IMPLIED, INCLUDING BUT NOT LIMITED TO ANY WARRANTY THAT THE USE OF THE INFORMATION HEREIN WILL NOT INFRINGE ANY RIGHTS OR ANY IMPLIED WARRANTIES OF MERCHANTABILITY OR FITNESS FOR A PARTICULAR PURPOSE. IN NO EVENT SHALL ERICSSON, IBM, LOTUS, MATSUSHITA COMMUNICATION INDUSTRIAL CO., LTD, MOTOROLA, NOKIA, PALM INC., PSION, STARFISH SOFTWARE OR ANY OTHER SYNCML SPONSOR BE LIABLE TO ANY PARTY FOR ANY LOSS OF PROFITS, LOSS OF BUSINESS, LOSS OF USE OF DATA, INTERRUPTION OF BUSINESS, OR FOR DIRECT, INDIRECT, SPECIAL OR EXEMPLARY, INCIDENTAL, PUNITIVE OR CONSEQUENTIAL DAMAGES OF ANY KIND IN CONNECTION WITH THIS DOCUMENT OR THE INFORMATION CONTAINED HEREIN, EVEN IF ADVISED OF THE POSSIBILITY OF SUCH LOSS OR DAMAGE.

The above notice and this paragraph must be included on all copies of this document that are made.



- 1 Formatting Conventions 5**
 - 1.1 Errata Type Classifications 5
- 2 WBXML code page incorrectly defined..... 6**
 - 2.1 Problem..... 6
 - 2.2 Solution..... 6
 - 2.2.1 Other specifications/erratas affected..... 6
- 3 SCR of DSMem element not appropriate 6**
 - 3.1 Problem..... 6
 - 3.2 Solution..... 6
 - 3.2.1 Other specifications/erratas affected..... 6
- 4 Content model of SharedMem in DTD incorrect 6**
 - 4.1 Problem..... 6
 - 4.2 Solution..... 6
 - 4.2.1 Other specifications/erratas affected..... 7
- 5 DevID element mistyped in some examples..... 7**
 - 5.1 Problem..... 7
 - 5.2 Solution..... 7
 - 5.2.1 Other specifications/erratas affected..... 7
- 6 SCR of ParamName element not appropriate..... 7**
 - 6.1 Problem..... 7
 - 6.2 Solution..... 7
 - 6.2.1 Other specifications/erratas affected..... 7
- 7 CTCap ambiguity 7**
 - 7.1 Problem..... 7
 - 7.2 Solution..... 8
 - 7.2.1 Other specifications/erratas affected..... 8
- 8 References 8**



1 Formatting Conventions

The key words "MUST", "MUST NOT", "REQUIRED", "SHALL", "SHALL NOT", "SHOULD", "SHOULD NOT", "RECOMMENDED", "NOT RECOMMENDED", "MAY" and "OPTIONAL" in this document are to be interpreted as described in [RFC 2119].

1.1 Errata Type Classifications

The errata types are classified according to the following scheme:

CLARIFICATION: Textual enhancement that provides a clearer explanation of a specification item without changing any behavior.

CORRECTION: A modification that obsoletes some items in the current published specification.

PROBLEM: A known problem for which an erratum has yet to be proposed.



2 WBXML code page incorrectly defined

2.1 Problem

The specification defines that the WBXML code page of the DevInf is 0x01 (The following WBXML token codes represent element types (i.e., tags) form code page x01 (one), DevInf DTD.).

2.2 Solution

Chapter 7: clarify that the WBXML code page of the DevInf is 0x00.

2.2.1 Other specifications/erratas affected

None.

3 SCR of DSMem element not appropriate

3.1 Problem

The specification defines that the client and server must be able to send and receive the DSMem, respectively. However, this is not appropriate from the interoperability point of view because the dynamic memory elements were moved into the MetInf spec.

3.2 Solution

Chapter 8: the SCR of the DSMem element should look like:

| Element Type | Support of Synchronization Server | | Support of Synchronization Client | |
|--------------|-----------------------------------|-----------|-----------------------------------|-----------|
| | Sending | Receiving | Sending | Receiving |
| DSMem | MAY | SHOULD | SHOULD | MAY |

3.2.1 Other specifications/erratas affected

None.

4 Content model of SharedMem in DTD incorrect

4.1 Problem

The specification defines incorrectly in the DTD definition that the content type of the SharedMem is PCDATA.

4.2 Solution

Chapter 6: change the DTD definition in the chapter to define that the content type of the SharedMem is EMPTY:

```
<!ELEMENT SharedMem EMPTY>
```



4.2.1 Other specifications/erratas affected

N/A

5 DevID element mistyped in some examples

5.1 Problem

The DevID element is mistyped in some examples in the specification (DevId instead of DevID).

5.2 Solution

The correct format of the DevID element is 'DevID'. This needs to be corrected in all the examples, the DevID element is mistyped.

5.2.1 Other specifications/erratas affected

None.

6 SCR of ParamName element not appropriate

6.1 Problem

The specification defines that the client and server must be able to send the and receive ParamName, respectively. However, this is not appropriate from the interoperability point of view if the client supports all possible parameters of the supported content type properties.

6.2 Solution

Chapter 5.19: clarify that for a client it sending the ParamName element is optional if the client supports all the parameters of all the supported properties (e.g. for property TEL, parameters WORK, VOICE, HOME etc. are all supported).

Chapter 8: the SCR of the ParamName element should look like:

| Element Type | Support of Synchronization Server | | Support of Synchronization Client | |
|--------------|-----------------------------------|-----------|-----------------------------------|-----------|
| | Sending | Receiving | Sending | Receiving |
| ParamName | SHOULD | MUST | SHOULD | SHOULD |

6.2.1 Other specifications/erratas affected

None.

7 CTCap ambiguity

7.1 Problem

There is an ambiguity in the <CTCap> part of th DTD. Due todifferent interpretations it is possible to have <ParamName> or <PropName> elements with or without empty (ValEnum+ | (DataType, Size?)) data.



7.2 Solution

Changing the <CTCap> element definition will solve this ambiguity. The second '?' within the original (ValEnum+ | (DataType, Size?))? choice should be moved after the second closing ')' flagging the whole choice as optional.

The new element would look like this:

```
<!ELEMENT CTCap ((CTType, (PropName, (ValEnum+ | (DataType,  
Size?))?),DisplayName?, (ParamName, (ValEnum+ | (DataType,  
Size?))?),DisplayName?)*+)+ >
```

7.2.1 Other specifications/erratas affected

None.

8 References

[[RFC 2119](#)] Key words for use in RFCs to Indicate Requirement Levels, [IETF](#).