

ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 32 N 1754

Date: 2008-05-27

REPLACES: _____

<p>ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 32</p> <p>Data Management and Interchange</p> <p>Secretariat: United States of America (ANSI) Administered by Farance Inc. on behalf of ANSI</p>
--

DOCUMENT TYPE	Disposition of Comments
TITLE	Disposition of comments in 32N1623 Summary of Voting on CD3 20944-2 - Information technology - Metadata Registry Interoperability and Bindings (MDR-IB) Part 2: Coding bindings
SOURCE	WG2 - Frank Farance - Project Editor
PROJECT NUMBER	1.32.17.01.02.00
STATUS	Disposition of comments in 32N1623 (comments on CD3 20944-2 ballot 32N1570). This accompanies FCD 20944-2 sent to NBs for 4 month letter ballot
REFERENCES	
ACTION ID.	FYI
REQUESTED ACTION	
DUE DATE	
Number of Pages	6
LANGUAGE USED	English
DISTRIBUTION	P & L Members SC Chair WG Conveners and Secretaries

Dr. Timothy Schoechle, Secretary, ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 32
Farance Inc *, 3066 Sixth Street, Boulder, CO, United States of America
Telephone: +1 303-443-5490; E-mail: Timothy@Schoechle.org
available from the JTC 1/SC 32 WebSite <http://www.jtc1sc32.org/>
*Farance Inc. administers the ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 32 Secretariat on behalf of ANSI

Approved Canadian Comments on SC32 N1570 CD3 20944-2

Template for comments and secretariat observations

Date: 2007-06-27

Document: ISO/IEC CD3 20944-2

1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
MB ¹	Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex (e.g. 3.1)	Paragraph/ Figure/Table /Note (e.g. Table 1)	Type of com- ment 2	Comment (justification for change) by the MB	Proposed change by the MB	Secretariat observations on each comment submitted
CA 01	6.8	all	te	<p>The reserved keyword properties in section 6.8 of 20944-2 CD3 need further explanation and examples. <code>._typeas</code>: has a brief example, and <code>._value</code>: is described in 6.7, but the rest have nothing.</p> <p><code>._prop</code>:</p> <p>What other properties might the data object have? Does this keyword return just the names of available properties, or there values as well. Can properties have other than a single value?</p> <p><code>._type / ._typeas</code>:</p> <p>Is the list of valid types implementation-defined?</p> <p><code>._label</code> :</p> <p>Is this the name of the object, or something else? What if an object has multiple names?</p> <p>[This comment is Bugzilla issue 278.]</p>	<p>Provide sample syntax for each keyword, with examples of data that might be returned for each keyword from different types of data object.</p>	<p>Will provide explanation.</p>

ISO

International Organization for Standardization



**ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 32
Data Management and Interchange
WG 2
Metadata**

Title: Japan Ballot Comments on ISO/IEC CD3 20944-2

Status: Document to accompany ballot response

Author: Hajime Horiuchi

References:

[1] 32N1570, ISO/IEC CD 20944-2, Information technology — Metadata Registries Interoperability and Bindings(MDR-IB): - Part 2: Coding bindings

SEQ #	Cmnt ID	See Also	Severity	Reference	Description	Addressed By
ISO/IEC 2nd CD 19763-1						
001	JPN-P01-001		General	General	This project consolidation and its CD ballot resolution are grounded on only the WG2 resolutions at Huntsville, which have not yet authorized by the SC32 level resolution. So, this consolidated project is not yet initiated and cannot go to the CD stage. So, this CD ballot is void. See 6.2.2.1 and Item 3, 12.5.7, ISO/IEC JTC1 N8105 ISO/IEC JTC 1 Directives, 5th Edition, Version 1.0	Addressed at 2007-07 BRM.
002	JPN-P01-002		General	General	32N1570B-ballot for CD3 24944-2 says "Date of circulation: 2007-04-20, Closing date: 2007-07-15". However, 9.4.1, ISO/IEC JTC1 N8105 ISO/IEC JTC 1 Directives, 5th Edition, Version 1.0 says "In the case of CDs/PDAMs/PDISPs/PDTRs, this date should be no less than three months from the date of notification of issue." So, the closing date shall be after 2007-07-20.	Addressed at 2007-07 BRM.

End of Paper

2	(3)	4	5		(6)	(7)
Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex (e.g. 3.1)	Paragraph/ Figure/Table /Note (e.g. Table 1)	Type of comment ²	Comment (justification for change) by the MB		Proposed change by the MB	Secretariat observations on each comment submitted
GB	General		ge/te	It is not clear what the term 'coding bindings' means		See Introduction for explanation.
GB	General		ed	Many terms (for example "data object" in Clause 5.3.1.1) are enclosed in quotes, without any explanation as to the significance of the quotes. Either the quotes should be removed or their significance explained.		This is a normal convention for introducing a new concept and its term..
GB	5.3		te	'Data Structuring Model'. This term is not understood.		See subclause 5.1 for an explanation.
GB	5.3.1.1		ed	English: ... an "data object" a "data object" ...	Will make change as requested.
GB	5.3.1.1		ed	'Data objects are structured data characterized by following.' This sentence is not understood.		Don't understand problem
GB	5.4.2.6		te	'Soft links are implicitly "chased" (automatically "dereferenced").' What is the significance of using both "chased" and "dereferenced" here? Would it not be more appropriate to just use "dereferenced"?		The current wording helps explain the concept.
GB	5.4.2.7		te	'References must be explicitly "chased" (or "dereferenced").' What is the significance of using both "chased" and "dereferenced" here? Would it not be more appropriate to just use "dereferenced"?		See above.
GB	10		ed	This is a placeholder that should be removed.		It is needed as a placeholder
GB	11.2		ed	ISO 11404 is referenced in this clause, yet is not included in the normative references clause (Clause 2).		Will make change as requested.

1 MB = Member body (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by **)

2 Type of comment: ge = general te = technical ed = editorial

NOTE Columns 1, 2, 4, 5 are compulsory.

US Comments on CD3 Text For: ISO/IEC 20944, Information technology — Metadata Registries Interoperability and Bindings (MDR-IB) — Part 2: Coding bindings	Date: 2007-06-13	Document: xxx
--	------------------	---------------

0	1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
#	NB ¹	Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex	Paragraph/ Figure/ Table / Note #	Comment type ²	Comment (justification for change) by the NB	Proposed change by the NB	Proposed Disposition of Comments
0001	US	general		te	The 20944 parts 2, 3, and 4 should describe the minimum expected limits that are supported across all implementations. For example, when storing an 11179 attribute via 20944, what size should be accepted on all implementations: 1KB, 1MB, 1GB, or somewhere in between?		Currently, there is no consensus on agree-upon minimum limits.

1 NB = National body (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the Secretariat editing unit are identified by **)

2 Type of comment: ge = general te = technical ed = editorial NOTE Columns 1, 2, 4, 5 are compulsory. ISO electronic balloting commenting template (enhanced 2002-08)