INTRODUCTION

The Extensible Markup Language (XML) is rapidly becoming the technology of choice for information technology (IT) and Internet-based data exchange solutions. A key aspect in the development and deployment of XML is the use of namespaces. According to the World Wide Web Consortium (W3C), the purpose of XML namespaces is to “provide a simple method for qualifying element and attribute names used in Extensible Markup Language documents by associating them with namespaces identified by URI references.”\(^1\) Namespace associations allow XML implementers to use diverse XML vocabularies without fear of name collision resulting in invalid XML. To ensure consistency, organizations should decide on a namespace strategy and a naming convention when establishing organizational namespaces.

The federal government is actively engaged in developing and deploying XML. It is critical that the government establish a cohesive, coordinated namespace approach to support its various XML efforts. This namespace approach must define a standardized structure for federal namespace as well as establish a standardized naming convention for those namespaces. Without such a coordinated approach, individual government organizations will create a proliferation of disparate XML namespace structures and names resulting in chaotic management of XML components.\(^2\) Given the ever expanding proliferation of federal namespaces, it is

---

2 Following is a list of definitions of XML components (artifacts):
   - Standard markup—XML element and attribute names and tags.
   - Schema components—developer-defined entities and datatypes.
   - Schemas—mappings of logical models of business processes and the parcels of information exchanged in these processes to physical XML Schemas or document-type definitions (DTDs).
   - Stylesheet—part of the family of recommendations for defining XML document transformation and presentation.
   - Namespace associations—the associations owned by the namespace.
crucial that this strategy be put in place as quickly as possible since harmonizing
the namespace structure and names used by different government organizations
will become increasingly difficult over time.

The General Services Administration (GSA) asked LMI to recommend a strategy
and naming convention that could be used throughout the government. This
strategy is intended to be a central source of guidance to enable all trading
partners of the U.S. government to develop their XML namespaces using a
common strategy. This XML namespace strategy also will promote an organized
roll-out of the government’s ever-expanding array of XML components.

In this report we describe three options for deciding an architectural namespace
strategy—no namespace, single namespace, and multiple namespaces—and
provide recommendations on the use of each. We also explore the use of the
Uniform Resource Name (URN) and Uniform Resource Locator (URL) variants
of Uniform Resource Indicators (URIs) for a government namespace naming
convention and provide recommendations for their use. Finally, we outline the
actions necessary to implement our recommendations.

BACKGROUND

The concept of XML namespaces is defined in the W3C XML namespaces
technical specification. XML namespace features are available in the W3C XML
Schema (XSD) and in document-type definitions (DTDs). Because most new
XML development work is being done using schemas and the Draft Federal XML
Developer’s Guide recommends using XSD, our discussions focus on the use of
namespaces in XSD. To help the reader understand the concepts involved and the
reasons for our subsequent recommendations, the following subsections explain
the concepts of namespace declaration and qualification and target namespaces.

Namespace Declaration and Qualification

A namespace is declared in the root element of a Schema using a namespace
identifier. This namespace identifier must be a URI reference that conforms to the
Internet Engineering Task Force (IETF) Request For Comments (RFC) 2396,
Uniform Resource Identifiers: Generic Syntax. Schema constructs are associated
with a namespace identifier through a user-defined namespace prefix, making the

---

4 In the remainder of this document, the use the term schema (lowercase s) as a generic term
to identify the family of grammar-based XML document structure validation languages including
the more formal W3C XML Schema Technical Specification (referred to as Schema with an
uppercase S or XSD), Document Type Definition, Schematron, Regular Language Description for
XML (RELAX), and the OASIS RELAX NG.
6 T. Berners-Lee, R. Fielding, L. Masinter; Internet Engineering Task Force (IETF) RFC 2396,
constructs “namespace qualified.” In the following example, the namespace identifier is `urn:us:gov:gsa` and the namespace prefix is `gsa`:

```xml
<schema xmlns:gsa="urn:us:gov:gsa"/>
```

This means that any construct in the Schema with a namespace prefix of `gsa` belongs to the GSA namespace, as in the following example:

```xml
<element name="gsa:FederalAcquisitionRegulationIndicator" type="xsd:boolean"/>
```

Namespaces allow constructs with the same name but from different markup vocabularies to be used in the same Schema with no adverse effects. In the following example, two `State` elements are used in the same Schema, but they are associated with two different namespaces. One element represents a U.S. state abbreviation (AK, AL, AR) in the EPA’s namespace, while the other represents the state of water quality (acidic, basic, high turbidity) in a specific state’s environmental department namespace:

```xml
<?xml version="1.0" encoding="UTF-8"?>
<xsd:schema xmlns:xsd="http://www.w3.org/2001/XMLSchema"
  xmlns:epa="urn:us:gov:epa"
  xmlns:vadeq="urn:us:gov:va:state:environmental">
  <xsd:element name="epa:State" type="epa:StatePostalCodeType"/>
  <xsd:element name="vadeq:State" type="vadeq:WaterQualityIndicatorType"/>
</xsd:schema>
```

If the `State` elements described above were not in separate namespaces, an XML processor would generate an error. This condition is known as “name collision.”

Namespace declaration and qualification have the following advantages:

- Namespaces associate schema constructs with a conceptual space.
- Namespace qualification of schema constructs identifies the namespace where the constructs belong.
- Namespaces allow use of constructs with the same name but from different markup vocabularies in the same schema with no adverse effects.

---

7 This is for example only, and it does not represent current U.S. government environmental namespaces.
Namespace declaration and qualification have the following disadvantage:

- Namespace qualification of schema constructs can increase verbosity.

In the following example, the instance has no namespace qualification:

```xml
<AgencyName>GSA</AgencyName>
<AgencyID>9986</AgencyID>
<ContactPartyID>222345897</ContactPartyID>
<OrderedQuantity>100</OrderedQuantity>
<OrderedQuantityAmount>399</OrderedQuantityAmount>
```

In this example, the instance has namespace qualification:

```xml
<gsa:AgencyName>GSA</gsa:AgencyName>
<gsa:AgencyID>9986</gsa:AgencyID>
<gsa:ContactPartyID>222345897</gsa:ContactPartyID>
<gsa:OrderedQuantity>100</gsa:OrderedQuantity>
<gsa:OrderedQuantityAmount>399</gsa:OrderedQuantityAmount>
```

In summary, although namespace qualification of Schema constructs can increase verbosity as shown in the example, the ability to easily identify the namespace where a construct belongs (visually or automatically) is valuable. Use of namespaces will be valuable for the U.S. government because it allows constructs developed in different areas to be associated with their own unique conceptual space.

**Target Namespaces**

The declaration of a target namespace in a Schema indicates that the Schema is acting as a “collector” of constructs declared in it. While a Schema may have more than one declared namespace, only one namespace can be designated as the target namespace. It is not required that a target namespace be declared in a Schema.

A target namespace is declared using the namespace identifier of the selected namespace. In this example, the `urn:us:gov:gsa` namespace is declared as the target namespace:

```xml
<?xml version="1.0" encoding="UTF-8"?>
<xsd:schema xmlns:xsd="http://www.w3.org/2001/XMLSchema"
xmlns:gsa="urn:us:gov:gsa"
targetNamespace="urn:us:gov:gsa">
```
This means that any element, attribute, or data type declared in the Schema belongs to the Schema’s target namespace.

The advantage of a target namespace is that a declaration of a target namespace in a Schema indicates that the Schema is acting as a “collector” of constructs declared within it. The disadvantage of a target namespace is that other users of a Schema so declared will need to reference the declared target namespace.

In summary, target namespaces are valuable because they allow a set of Schema constructs to be collected into a single conceptual space. This allows the constructs to be identified as a single set of constructs.

**ARCHITECTURAL NAMESPACE STRATEGY**

An organization can choose to have no target namespace; one target namespace (referred to as a single namespace configuration) that is used for all Schemas within the organization, or multiple target namespaces (referred to as a multiple namespace configuration). We outline the advantages and disadvantages of each option in the following subsections and we offer guidance or a recommendation with a justification on each option.

No Namespace

A Schema does not need to declare a target namespace. When a namespace is not declared, it is referred to as the “no namespace” option.

*No Namespace Option*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advantages and disadvantages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Advantages:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Disadvantages:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Guidance or recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Government organization schemas SHOULD use namespaces.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Justification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Namespaces provide a method of tying XML components to a particular scope. Having no namespaces causes confusion and increases the time required to discern the origin of XML constructs because no identifier is provided.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Single Namespace Configuration

Under a single namespace concept, all XML components reference the same namespace, regardless of department Agency, or initiative focus. The implication of having a single namespace for the federal government is that all elements and attributes need to be unique.

Single Namespace Option

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advantages and disadvantages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Advantages:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disadvantages:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Guidance or recommendation

The U.S. government SHOULD NOT use a single-namespace configuration. Individual government organizations MAY use a single-namespace configuration.

Justification

A single namespace is ideal for ensuring maximum interoperability; however, because of the size, scope and requirements of the U.S. government, having a single namespace is not practical for the volume of metadata anticipated. Individual government organizations may choose to have a single namespace to promote the highest level of interoperability, depending on the size of the organization and its requirements.

a “Front-end” means organizations need to harmonize data or make various data constructs conform to each other when XML Schemas are created rather than waiting until harmonizing data is required to accommodate back-end needs as often happens after XML Schemas have been created.

Multiple Namespace Configuration

The multiple namespace configuration allows an infinite number of namespaces. For the federal government, the configuration should be one namespace for federal enterprise level XML components and one base namespace for each department and agency. For departments and agencies, the configuration should be at the option of the organization to create its own namespace strategy for multiple namespaces as a subset of its base namespace. If a government organization opts not to create a base namespace, it may use the federal enterprise namespace. In addition to enterprise level XML components, the federal enterprise namespace could hold shared XML constructs that other schemas could reference. The moderation of shared XML components is crucial to the success of such a strategy. Each government organization needs to modify existing shared XML components to harmonize them across all government organizations before placing them into the federal enterprise namespace. Each government organization would control the content of its own namespace.
Multiple Namespace Option

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advantages and disadvantages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Advantages:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Disadvantages:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Guidance or recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The U.S. government SHOULD use multiple namespaces. Government organizations SHOULD adopt the strategy of referencing the shared federal enterprise namespace and define its own namespace architecture strategy.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Multiple Namespace Option (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Justification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Creating a “shared” namespace for housing commonly used XML constructs mitigates the risk of lowering interoperability. The shared namespace may also be used by organizations that do not want to maintain their own namespace.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allowing namespaces for individual government organizations increases flexibility and initially reduces development cost and time. The additional complexity of multiple namespaces is minimal compared to the additional flexibility provided by the solution.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In the long run, as documents are passed between more systems, additional mapping and translation of the same element in multiple namespaces will need to be harmonized. If the naming conventions prescribed by the Draft Federal XML Developer’s Guide are used, creating semantically unique names in different agencies should not be overly burdensome.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Having a namespace for each organization will create a complex XML namespace architecture, but this is necessary to develop a robust network of U.S. government schemas.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NAMING CONVENTIONS

Technical Options

A namespace declaration requires a uniform resource identifier (URI). As defined in RFC 2396, a URI is a “compact string of characters for identifying an abstract or physical resource.” A URI scheme can be “a locator, a name, or both.” A URI locator scheme is in the form of a uniform resource locator (URL) and a URI name scheme is of the form of a uniform resource name (URN). URLs generally define a location, but are not required to be a resolvable Internet or World Wide Web address. URNs are required to provide a globally unique and persistent reference even if the URL subset of the URI scheme ceases to exist.

---

URLs are generally recognized in the public at large as hypertext transfer protocol (http) Internet addresses; however, this is not correct. In fact, a URL is really a dated colloquialism that refers to one of a number of URI locator scheme types to include\textsuperscript{10,11}

- HTTP
- file transfer protocol (FTP)
- gopher
- mailto
- news
- telnet.

For the purposes of this paper, we focus on URI HTTP schemes when discussing URI locator schemes, and use the generally accepted notation of URL to represent such schemes. An HTTP URL is of the form:\textsuperscript{12}

$$\text{http\_URL} = \text{http:\/\slash\slash host [\text{"":} port] [abs\_path[ \text{"?"} query ]]\backslashn}$$

The host component is commonly referred to as the domain component. Management of URLs within the federal government—that is, maintenance of unique identifiers that constitute the host or domain component of a URL—is institutionalized in the federal government and the subordinate states and municipalities. The domain (host) component is managed by several agencies. Currently, GSA is responsible for managing the \text{dot-gov} domain, the Department of Commerce manages the \text{dot-us} domain, and the Department of Defense manages the \text{dot-mil} domain.\textsuperscript{13} Domains are segmented into a hierarchy of levels—such as first (or top), second, third. Each domain level has its own unique management requirements as defined at \url{http://www.nic.mil/faq.html}.


\textsuperscript{12} T. Berners-Lee et al.; Internet Engineering Task Force (IETF) RFC 2616; \textit{Hypertext Transfer Protocol –HTTP/1.1}; Internet Society, June 1999.

**URN Option**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advantages and disadvantages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Advantages:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disadvantages:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Guidance or recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Government organization schemas SHOULD use URNs for namespaces.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Justification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>URNs are designed as persistent names, a requirement for a schema namespace. The short-term disadvantage of needing to register the namespace identifier is outweighed by the long-term advantage of a registered persistent name. URL domain names are already managed by the GSA domain registration. URNs can take advantage of this service as discussed later in this document. In addition, although not a requirement, URNs can be registered in a global namespace identifier directory, providing the same opportunity as a URL to be resolvable and store information pertinent to the schema.(^c) In addition, the schemaLocation attribute may be used to provide information on where the Schema resides, rather than trying to use a namespace to identify a storage location.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---


\(^b\) RFCs are managed by the Internet Engineering Task Force, and they are the equivalent of International Organization for Standardization (ISO) standards.

\(^c\) Mechanisms for URN resolution and use in Internet applications are proposed in RFC 3401 and RFC 3405. See IETF RFC 3406 Uniform Resource Names (URN) Namespace Definition Mechanisms, October 2002.
### URL Option

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advantages and disadvantages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Advantages:** | Additional information regarding a schema may be stored at the URL.  
The dot-gov URLs have an established registry to ensure uniqueness. |
| **Disadvantages:** | A URL may cause confusion because people expect the URL to be resolvable, when in fact this is not required. |

#### Guidance or recommendation

Government organization schemas MAY use URLs for namespaces. When using URLs, the corresponding URN syntax MUST also be registered.

#### Justification

URLs are designed as location identifiers rather than persistent names. URLs lead to great confusion regarding XML namespaces because people assume an XML namespace in the form of a URL will be resolvable. While URNs are preferred, some organizations may find using URLs beneficial because they have already created a number of Schemas using a URL, they have other systems dependant on the URL namespace, or other reasons. In addition, URL domain names are already managed by the GSA domain registration.

---

### Recommended Naming Convention

A naming convention and a source of management is required for namespaces. As stated previously, GSA manages the dot-gov top-level domains for URLs.\(^\text{14}\)

Government organizations as defined at [http://www.nic.gov/](http://www.nic.gov/) are qualified to pursue a dot-gov registration. Qualified government organizations may register for second- and third-level domains. XML namespaces should use the registered domains of government organizations in the dot-gov domain to create unique namespace URIs, whether they use a URN or URL syntax. When a URL is registered at [http://www.nic.gov/](http://www.nic.gov/), it must be reserved in both the URL and URN syntax for use as a namespace for the registering organization. This methodology will ensure no duplication of namespaces, and the current registration structure will act as a centralized point of unique namespace management. The recommended naming conventions for URN and URL syntaxes follow.

URN NAMING CONVENTION

Our proposed structure follows the structure defined by the IETF Network Working Group in RFC 2141. That structure contains the uniform resource identifier consisting of “urn,” the namespace identifier (NID), and namespace-specific string (NSS). Following is an example:

```
urn:us:gov:gsa
```

We propose the NID be represented by the string “US”. We propose the NSS conform to the second- and/or third-level domain as registered with the GSA Government Domain Registration and Services. Further hierarchical segmenting of the URN would be at the government organization’s discretion. A prudent measure for organizations choosing to use the recommendations in this paper is to manage the further hierarchical segmenting of URNs in their organizations to ensure uniqueness and avoid chaos; however, additional management of namespaces at an organization level is not required to adopt the proposed recommendation in this paper.

Following are some notional examples of how the naming convention would be applied to different government organizations using a URN:

- **United States Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA)**—USEPA has registered epa.gov. Following our recommendation, the URN would be `urn:us:gov:epa`.

- **General Services Administration**—GSA has registered gsa.gov. Following our recommendation, the URN would be `urn:us:gov:gsa`.

- **The Office of the U.S. Courts**—The Office of the U.S. Courts has registered uscourts.gov. Following our recommendation, the URN would be `urn:us:gov:uscourts`.

---

16 GSA manages registrations at the Network Information Site (NIC) located at http://www.nic.gov.
17 See http://www.nic.gov/whois_search_results2.html.
The U.S. District Court for Eastern District of Pennsylvania—The U.S. District Court for Eastern District of Pennsylvania has a URL of http://www.paed.uscourts.gov/. Although the “paed” extension of the URL is not registered with GSA NIC, it is the registered domain owner’s right to further extend the URN, therefore, a further delineation of uscourts.gov enables the Eastern District of Pennsylvania to have its own URN, urn:us:gov:uscourts:paed.

The Department of Defense—DoD has dod.gov registered; consequently, the available XML URN is urn:us:gov:dod. DoD would have the option to further delineate this URN to accommodate its individual agencies:

- urn:us:gov:dod:don
- urn:us:gov:dod:don:nvy
- urn:us:gov:dod:don:usmc
- urn:us:gov:dod:doa

DoD would be responsible for managing the delineation of the namespace past the second-level registered domain, as would other agencies that want to further extend their URNs.

In some cases, government (and potentially non-government) organizations could use this same structure for non dot-gov registered domains. This would be the case for a community of interest such as the environment community made up of states and a federal agency, the domain called the Environmental Information Exchange Network (Exchange Network). The Exchange Network has registered the domain exchangenetwork.net; the appropriate URN would be urn:us:net:exchangenetwork. Similarly, the justice community of interest is planning to register global.gov; the URN would be urn:us:gov:global. The DoD may choose to use urn:us:mil:dod instead of urn:us:gov:dod, although this choice is not recommended.
URN Based on a Registered Domain Name

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advantages and disadvantages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Advantages:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Disadvantages:</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Guidance or recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Government organization schemas SHOULD follow the urn:us: “registered domain” structure. Other organizations MAY consider similar adoption.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Justification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This structure is based on a lesson learned. RFC 1480, published in June 1993, proposed a comprehensive, yet fairly complex hierarchy for government organizations. The hierarchy was never adopted. In a market-driven system where the best recommendations become de facto standards, the complex hierarchical system failed. The above mechanism is based on registered domain names where the naming convention is part of Proposed Rule 41 CFR Part 102-173.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

URL Naming Convention

If an organization decides to use a URL, the domain portion of the URL at the second and third levels should match what has been registered at http://www.nic.gov/.

Use of additional domain levels for additional hierarchical segmenting of the URL would be at the discretion of the government organization. A prudent measure for organizations that choose to use the recommendations in this paper is to manage the further hierarchical segmenting of URLs in their organizations to ensure uniqueness and avoid chaos; however, additional management of namespaces at an organizational level is not required to adopt the proposed recommendation in this paper.

The following gives notional examples of how the naming convention would be applied to different government organizations using a URL:

- **United States Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA)**—USEPA has registered epa.gov. The URL namespace would be http://www.epa.gov.

- **General Services Administration**—GSA has registered gsa.gov. The URL namespace would be http://www.gsa.gov.
## URL Based on a Registered Domain Name

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advantages and disadvantages</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Advantages</td>
<td>Using this structure ensures uniqueness through the use of the domain registry. The domain registry is already established and stable. Government organizations are free to create their URLs through the use of the domain registry process. Government organizations are free to create as many delineated URLs from their registered URL as necessary to fulfill their individual requirements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disadvantages</td>
<td>The recommended federal approach is to use a URN, which is in line with current trends in open standards bodies.(^a)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Guidance or recommendation

Government organizations deciding not to use the preferred URN solution, MAY use URLs. If a URL is used, its second and third levels MUST be registered with the GSA NIC and a corresponding URN expression MUST also be registered.

### Justification

Following a standard naming convention allows organizations to implement registered URLs as namespaces with the assurance that they are using a unique namespace that after it is registered, is reserved for an organization’s use.

\(^a\) For example, the Organization for the Advancement of Structured Information Standards (OASIS) Universal Business Language (UBL) Technical Committee has opted to use a URN.

## Next Steps

If our recommended federal namespace strategy and government-wide naming convention is accepted, GSA should take the following actions:

- Work with the appropriate office in the Department of Commerce to request a formal namespace and seek a review by the Internet Engineering Task Force (IETF) in accordance with IETF RFC 3406, *Best Current Practice Uniform Resource Names (URN) Namespace Definition Mechanism for the “US” NID.*

- As lead for the developing federal XML registry, define requirements for the federal registry based on a decision to recommend URNs for XML namespaces.

- As the authority for the dot-gov domain, investigate the ability to automatically reserve the corresponding URN for an organization that has registered a dot-gov URL and subsequently automatically register the URN with the federal registry.
In its capacity of operating the Office of Electronic Government, promulgate this paper on xml.gov as a recommended best practice and take other necessary actions to ensure government-wide distribution.

As a member of the federal CIO XML Working Group, recommend the XML Working Group incorporate this strategy and naming convention in the next version of the *Federal XML Developers Guide* and write this strategy in the form of official policy.