

# RIXML Standards Suite v3.0 Enumeration List Review Project

## Enumeration review:

### Components, episodes, and related products/interactions

---

#### Context:

If you have not already done so, please review the [overview](#) of the RIXML v3.0 Enumeration List Review Project.

To understand the context for the enumeration lists being reviewed in this document, please read the following sections of the *Draft Release Notes and Data Dictionary* document:

- Overview (pages 7-10)
- Making connections (pages 62-64)
- Describing components and individual resources (page 65-68)

These documents are available on the RIXML website. Note that the page numbers referenced above are based on the draft version dated December 18, 2024; minor changes may occur in updated versions.

#### Enumerations to review / review priority:

Enumeration list	Review importance
<b>Related products and interactions</b>	
ProductRelationshipTypeEnum	MEDIUM
InteractionRelationshipTypeEnum	MEDIUM
<b>Connecting episodes in a series</b>	
PeriodicityEnum	LOW
QuarterEnum	LOW
WeekOfYearEnum	LOW
<b>Components and individual resources</b>	
ComponentTypeEnum	HIGH

Details about how and where the above enumerations are used, along with specific questions for your consideration, appear below.

## Details about each list:

### Category 1: related products and related interactions

<b>List:</b>	<b>ProductRelationshipTypeEnum</b>	<b>Review importance: MEDIUM</b>
<b>Where used:</b>	RelatedProduct.relationshipType	<b>Full documentation details:</b> <b>Tag description</b> page 64 <b>Enumeration list</b> page 91
<b>Summary:</b>		<b>Enumeration values:</b> BasedOn PartOf References Replaces Requires TranslationOf RelatedTo Model IndustryReport InitiationReport
<b>Notes:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Also used in Interactions, but that list does not include Model, IndustryReport, InitiationReport.</li> <li>Model, IndustryReport, and Initiation Report were removed in the Interactions standard because they do not describe the relationship; rather, they describe what type of content the related file is (a model, industry report, or initiation report). This seems like the right approach; using the “RelatedTo” value in this field, and using tagging elsewhere in the standard (form, action, focus, etc.) to define what each report’s purpose is.</li> </ul>	
<b>Questions:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Any objections to removing Model, IndustryReport, and InitiationReport for the reasons stated above?</li> </ul>	

<b>List:</b>	<b>InteractionRelationshipTypeEnum</b>	<b>Review importance: MEDIUM</b>
<b>Where used:</b>	RelatedProduct.relationshipType	<b>Full documentation details:</b> In Interactions Standard, not Research Standard
<b>Summary:</b>		<b>Enumeration values:</b> ParentEvent SubEvent AnnualEvent
<b>Notes:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This list is used in the Interactions Standard to indicate the type of relationship exists between two interactions tagged as being related.</li> <li>The <i>AnnualEvent</i> option is designed to connect the records for annual conferences, etc.; it is similar to the new “Series Inventory” standard we are introducing in v3.0 to connect research items in a series.</li> </ul>	
<b>Questions:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Does this list capture all necessary types of relationships between interactions?</li> </ul>	

### Related question:

While the Interactions Standard contains a tag set that allows publishers to indicate that one or more research reports are related to the interaction, the Research Standard has no mechanism for indicating that an interaction is related to the research report. Should it?

## Category 2: connecting the episodes in a series

<b>List:</b>	<b>PeriodicityEnum</b>	<b>Review importance: LOW</b>
<b>Where used:</b>	Series.Periodicity	<b>Full documentation details:</b> <b>Tag description</b> page 63 <b>Enumeration list</b> page 94
<b>Summary:</b> This indicates how frequently a series is produced.		<b>Enumeration values:</b> Hourly IntraDay Daily Weekly EveryTwoWeeks Monthly Quarterly SemiAnnually Annually Irregularly
<b>Notes:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>This tag will not have a PublisherDefined option.</li></ul>		
<b>Questions:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Are there any other recommended values?</li></ul>		

While we have used XML standard units when possible (utilizing gYear, gYearMonth, gMonth), there were some options we wanted to provide that did not have XML standard options. These include quarter and week-of-the-year.

<b>List:</b>	<b>QuarterEnum</b>	<b>Review importance: LOW</b>
<b>Where used:</b>	Episode.quarter episodeAttributeGroup.quarter	<b>Full documentation details:</b> <b>Tag description</b> page 62, 83 <b>Enumeration list</b> page 101
<b>Summary:</b>		<b>Enumeration values:</b> Q1 Q2 Q3 Q4
<b>Notes:</b>	•	
<b>Questions:</b>	•	

<b>List:</b>	<b>WeekOfYearEnum</b>	<b>Review importance: LOW</b>
<b>Where used:</b>	Episode.week episodeAttributeGroup.week	<b>Full documentation details:</b> <b>Tag description</b> Pages 63, 84 <b>Enumeration list</b> Pages 101-102
<b>Summary:</b>		<b>Enumeration values:</b> W1 W2 W3 W4 .... W50 W51 W52 <b>(full list includes all 52 weeks)</b>
<b>Notes:</b>	•	
<b>Questions:</b>	• Are there any objections?	

### Category 3: components and individual resources

<b>List:</b>	<b>ComponentTypeEnum</b>	<b>Review importance: HIGH</b>
<b>Where used:</b>	Component.componentType	<b>Full documentation details:</b> <b>Tag description</b> page 65 <b>Enumeration list</b> page 87
<b>Summary:</b> A publisher must also indicate the type of component an item is. This is a new tag, so we would like firms to consider the types of componentization they may wish to provide and determine whether any items are missing from this list:		<b>Enumeration values:</b> Text Section Chapter Chart Table Audio Video Photograph Image Interactive Other
<b>Notes:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Components within a research item can be given a title and/or an intended audience type; see the relevant enumeration list review sections for more information.</li></ul>		
<b>Questions:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>We compiled this list based on input gathered in the development phase regarding the types of components member firms anticipated tagging. What other values would your firm find helpful?</li></ul>		