

# ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 32 N 1802

Date: 2008-10-10

REPLACES: —

## ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 32

### Data Management and Interchange

Secretariat: United States of America (ANSI)  
Administered by Farance Inc. on behalf of ANSI

<b>DOCUMENT TYPE</b>	Summary of Voting/Table of Replies
<b>TITLE</b>	Summary of Voting on 32N1753 ISO/IEC FCD 20944-2 - Information technology - Metadata Registry Interoperability and Bindings (MDR-IB) Part 2: Coding bindings
<b>SOURCE</b>	SC32 Secretariat
<b>PROJECT NUMBER</b>	1.32.17.01.02.00
<b>STATUS</b>	Summary of Voting. WG2 is requested to resolve the comments. The document obtained substantial support.
<b>REFERENCES</b>	
<b>ACTION ID.</b>	ACT
<b>REQUESTED ACTION</b>	
<b>DUE DATE</b>	
<b>Number of Pages</b>	9
<b>LANGUAGE USED</b>	English
<b>DISTRIBUTION</b>	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](mailto: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

## ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 32 N1802

### Summary of Voting on Document SC 32 N 1753

**Title:** ISO/IEC FCD 20944-2 - Metadata Registry Interoperability and Bindings (MDR-IB) Part 2: Coding bindings

Project: 1.32.17.01.02.00

<b>“P” Member</b>	<b>Approval</b>	<b>Approval with Comments</b>	<b>Disapproval with Comments</b>	<b>Abstention with Comments</b>
Australia	1			
Belgium				
Brazil				
Canada			1	
China	1			
Czech Republic	1			
Egypt				
Finland				
Germany				
Japan				1
Kazakhstan				
Korea, Republic of	1			
Portugal				
Sweden				
United Kingdom			1	
United States				
<b>Total “P”</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>“O” Member</b>				
Austria				
Denmark				
France				
Italy				
Netherlands, The				
Norway				
Russian Federation				
Switzerland				
<b>Total “O”</b>				

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](mailto: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

## **COMMENTS:**

### **Canada**

No. See attached comments.

### **Japan**

Abstain. Lack of expertise.

### **United Kingdom**

No. See attached comments.

### **ISO Central Secretariat**

See attached comments.

1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
MB <sup>1</sup>	Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex (e.g. 3.1)	Paragraph/ Figure/Table/ Note (e.g. Table 1)	Type of com- ment <sup>2</sup>	Comment (justification for change) by the MB	Proposed change by the MB	Secretariat observations on each comment submitted
CA 01	All	All	Ge	Any open issues on the WG2 Issues site (Bugzilla) pertaining to this document should be resolved.	None provided with comment.	
CA 02	6.8	._type ._typeas	Te	How can a user determine what data types are supported by ._type and ._typeas in a particular implementation?	None provided with comment.	
CA 03	11.2	2nd para	Te	Just before the heading 'Rationale', is the statement "All data produced shall be well-formed XML". This appears to have been copied from clause 12.1. Clause 11.2 is about DIVP not XML.	Change XML to DIVP.	
CA 04	11.6.1	2 <sup>nd</sup> para, 2 <sup>nd</sup> bullet	Te	This clause specifies as implementation-defined: the maximum size in characters for a strictly conforming data instance, but no lower bound is imposed on the implementation.  This relates to Bugzilla issue <a href="#">273</a> .	Specify a value for the smallest permitted maximum.	
CA 05	6.3	Hierarchical naming	Ed	20944-3 talks of hierarchical navigation paths (5.4;para1) while this is never mentioned in 20944-2. The term used in 20944-2 seems to be external identifiers  (5.4.2.4; 6.3; 6.5; 6.6).  This is <a href="#">issue 301</a> in Bugzilla.	Make a clear link between external identifiers and hierarchical navigation paths. Somewhere in 20944-2 the following sentence could be added (this is just an example), in 6.6 or 6.3 or 5.4.2.4: These hierarchical naming conventions, as well as all other forms of external data identifiers that permits hierarchical navigation are also called 'hierarchical navigation paths'.	
CA 06	5.4.2.2	<b>Example</b>	Te	The example states that there are two ways to access the values of the identifiers, the first one by identifier, and the other one by index, such as 2/Z is the same as 2/2. Having two ways to access the data complicates the data access.  This is <a href="#">issue 316</a> in Bugzilla.	Use only the identifier access method, except for arrays for example, otherwise, please explain to us (outside the standard) why this method for accessing the data was chosen.	
CA 07	5.4.2.3	Example	Ed	The example in 5.4.2.3 uses the term 'soft link' which is not defined until 5.4.2.6.  This is <a href="#">issue 318</a> in Bugzilla.	Where soft link is used in 5.4.2.3, add a reference to 5.4.2.6.	
CA 08	5.4.2.5	All	Te	This sub-clause defines the term 'Hard Links', but the definition is unclear, and the term and definition do not appear in 20944-1	Use terms from 20944-1 and ensure they are clearly defined.	

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.

1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
MB <sup>1</sup>	Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex (e.g. 3.1)	Paragraph/ Figure/Table/ Note (e.g. Table 1)	Type of comment <sup>2</sup>	Comment (justification for change) by the MB	Proposed change by the MB	Secretariat observations on each comment submitted
				<p>which is supposed to list the vocabulary used in all parts.</p> <p>In particular, the relationship between the first sentence and the second is not immediately apparent. Further down in 5.4.2.7, Reference is defined as an identifier (but see separate ballot comment on that definition), which helps provide a link between the use of identifier in the first sentence, and reference in the second, but this needs to be made more clear. Further, a hard link is stated to be a first class reference, while a reference is stated to be a second class name. So a hard link is a first class second class name. What does all this mean? The term 'first class reference' is not defined.</p>		
CA 09	5.4.2.6	All	Te	<p>This sub-clause defines the term 'Soft Links', but the definition is unclear, and the term and definition do not appear in 20944-1 which is supposed to list the vocabulary used in all parts.</p> <p>In particular, the relationship between the first sentence and the second is not immediately apparent.</p>	Use terms from 20944-1 and ensure they are clearly defined.	
CA 10	5.4.2.7	All	Te	<p><b>This sub-clause defines the term 'Reference', but reference is already defined in 20944-1 3.21.11.7 with a different definition, which is itself inadequate and the subject of a ballot comment on 20944-1 and 19773. The term 'second class name' is not defined.</b></p> <p>[This relates to issue <a href="#">319</a> in Bugzilla.]</p>	Use the term reference as defined in 20944-1, as amended by related ballot comments.	
CA 11	6.6	Examples	Te	<p>Several examples are given in the documentation, but the example regarding UNIX filesystems designation is not given.</p> <p>[This is <a href="#">issue 320</a> in Bugzilla.]</p>	For completeness sake's, add the UNIX filesystems designation as an additional example in this section.	
CA 12	6.6	Examples	Te	<p>The path separation seems to be wrong, as _ and - characters are not path separators in C and MIME respectively. Therefore the example seems to be wrong, or is badly explained since the - and _ simply disappear in the path decomposition.</p> <p>[This is <a href="#">issue 321</a> in Bugzilla.]</p>	<p>Replace the external identifiers by the following, or explain in more detail while there is no 1 to 1 character equivalence in the decomposed version:</p> <pre> AbcDef/GhiJkl/MnoPqrStu/123/456 # MIME abcdef.ghijkl.mnopgrstu[123][456] # C language AbcDef\GhiJkl\MnoPqrStu\123\456 # Windows Registry                     </pre>	

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.

1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
MB <sup>1</sup>	Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex (e.g. 3.1)	Paragraph/ Figure/Table/ Note (e.g. Table 1)	Type of com- ment <sup>2</sup>	Comment (justification for change) by the MB	Proposed change by the MB	Secretariat observations on each comment submitted
					((abcdef) (ghijkl) (mnopqrstu) 123 456) # LISP	
CA 13	6.6	Examples	Ed	The last word of the path decomposition is (which is wrong): path segment #5: word #1: 56 [This is <a href="#">issue 324</a> in Bugzilla.]	It should be replaced by: path segment #5: word #1: 456	
CA 14	6.8	._typeas	Te	The ._typeas example states a conversion to an int type, as in "zipcode/._typeas/int". int is not specified in ISO/IEC 11404. [This is <a href="#">issue 323</a> in Bugzilla.]	Replace by: "zipcode/._typeas/integer" to be consistent with ISO/IEC 11404.	
CA 15	6.8	._type	Te	The ._type should return a datatype. Currently the possible, allowed or valid datatypes returned are not defined. [This is <a href="#">issue 325</a> in Bugzilla.]	Either indicate the allowed basic datatypes, if they are defined (are they based on ISO/IEC 11404?), or if they implementation specific, clarify this by adding a note regarding this.	
CA 16	4, 11, 12	All	Te	The explanation of the intended use of this part provides no clear idea of why anyone would want to use these facilities. [This is <a href="#">issue 326</a> in Bugzilla.]	Provide more concrete examples of where these facilities would be useful. In particular, where might one want to use DVP; why would anyone use 20944-2 XML instead of, say, XML Schema?	

END

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.

## Template for comments and secretariat observations

Date: 10 September 2008

Document: ISO/IEC FCD 20944-2

1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
MB <sup>1</sup>	Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex (e.g. 3.1)	Paragraph/ Figure/Table/ Note (e.g. Table 1)	Type of com- ment <sup>2</sup>	Comment (justification for change) by the MB	Proposed change by the MB	Secretariat observations on each comment submitted
GB01	5.3.1.1		ed	'Data objects are structured data characterized by following.' This sentence is <i>still</i> not understood; it appears to be incomplete.		
GB02	10		ed	It is still not clear why this placeholder needs to be retained.		
GB03	11		ed	The abbreviation DIVP is not formally defined in this Part or in Part 1. Similar problems exist for some other abbreviations.	Formally define all abbreviations in Part 1.	

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.

# Template for comments and secretariat observations

Date: 2008-09-26

Document: **ISO/IEC 20944-2**

1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
MB <sup>1</sup>	Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex (e.g. 3.1)	Paragraph/ Figure/Table/ Note (e.g. Table 1)	Type of com- ment <sup>2</sup>	Comment (justification for change) by the MB	Proposed change by the MB	Secretariat observations on each comment submitted
**	General		ed	The document incorrectly references itself.	The document shall reference itself throughout (except in the fixed introductory paragraphs to Clauses 2 and 3) as "this part of ISO/IEC 20944.  Other parts shall be referenced as "ISO/IEC 20944-n".  The series as a whole shall be referenced as "ISO/IEC 20944".	
**	3		ed	Introductory paragraph not drafted in accordance with the ISO/IEC Directives Part 2.  Footnote 3 is unclear and gives no useful information.	Replace first sentence with: "For the purposes of this document, the terms and definitions given in ISO/IEC 20944-1 apply."  Delete footnote 3.	
**	Footnote 2		ed	This type of information is not given in International Standards	Delete footnote.	
	General		ed	Document incorrectly uses the phrase "this Clause" throughout.	Re-draft document so that the term "clause" begins with a lower case "c", unless it is used to refer to a clause elsewhere in the document, in which case it shall be spelled with a capital "C" and followed by the clause number in question.	
**	General		ed	Document incorrectly uses the term "subclause" throughout.	In accordance with ISO/IEC Directives Part 2, 6.6.7.3.1, it is unnecessary to precede a reference to a subclause with both the term "subclause" and the subclause reference number.  Remove the term subclause throughout document, leaving only the reference number of the subclause.  For example: "See ISO 8601, 3.8, 3.18, 3.26, and 4.1."	
**	General		ed	Inconsistent note presentation	Present all notes in Arial 9pt, NOTE in caps without following colon.	

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.

## Template for comments and secretariat observations

Date: 2008-09-26

Document: **ISO/IEC 20944-2**

1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
<b>MB<sup>1</sup></b>	<b>Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex</b> (e.g. 3.1)	<b>Paragraph/ Figure/Table/ Note</b> (e.g. Table 1)	<b>Type of com- ment<sup>2</sup></b>	<b>Comment (justification for change) by the MB</b>	<b>Proposed change by the MB</b>	<b>Secretariat observations</b> on each comment submitted
**	General		ed	Documents referenced informatively in the text should be listed in a bibliography at the end of the document.	Add a bibliography listing such documents, e.g. ISO 8601, ISO/IEC 9899, ISO/IEC 11179, ISO/IEC 10646...	
**	9.3.3, Note		ed	Incorrect reference to Annex A.	There is no Annex A in this part of ISO/IEC 20944. Remove reference to Annex A or specify to which document Annex A belongs.	

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.