

Editor's 5th Draft Resolution of Comments on SC32 N1851 CD2 11179-3

Date: 2009-11-05	Document: JTC 1/SC 32/WG 2/N1327
------------------	---

0	1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
Seq	MB¹	Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex (e.g. 3.1)	Paragraph/ Figure/Table/ Note (e.g. Table 1)	Type of com- ment²	Comment (justification for change) by the MB	Proposed change by the MB	Secretariat observations on each comment submitted

ISO/IEC JTC1/SC32/WG2 N1327

Title: Editor's WIP draft disposition of comments on-CD2 11179-3 Edition 3
Supersedes: -
Source: Ray Gates (Editor)
Status: Editor's draft disposition of comments
Action: For distribution to WG2
Date: 05 November 2009

This document is a Work in Progress. It shows the proposed resolution of ballot comment on CD2 11179-3 and records the progress in applying them to the revised text in WG2 N1326.

Another update of this document will be submit to the London WG2 meeting.

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.

Editor's 5th Draft Resolution of Comments on SC32 N1851 CD2 11179-3

Date: 2009-11-05

Document: JTC 1/SC 32/WG 2/N1327

0	1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
Seq	MB ¹	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
1.	CA 01	00 All	All	Te	All Editor's Notes should be addressed.	Some are addressed by specific comments below.	Accepted in principle. Need specific proposals.
2.	CA 02	00 All	All	Te	All open issues for this project on the WG2 Issues forum should be reviewed, and a consensus reached as to which need to be addressed in this Edition.	Specific proposals will be submitted to the ballot resolution meeting.	Accepted in principle. Need specific proposals.
3.	CA 03	00 All	All	Te	A US ballot comment on the CD1 pointed out that CD1 used a mixture of the terms: subtype, sub-type, subclass and sub-class, and called for consistent terminology. The resolution of the comment was to use 'subtype' exclusively, and 'supertype' as its counterpart. On reviewing the definitions of type and class in 19505, we believe the resolution was incorrect, and we should in fact be using 'subclass' and 'superclass'. Do not make the change blindly. Review each use of the terms to ensure it is appropriate.	Review all uses of the terms 'subtype' and 'supertype' and change to 'subclass', 'superclass' where that those terms better reflect the intended meaning.	Accepted. See also JP 07 (#66)
4.	CA 04	00 Foreword	Ed Note	Ge	Editor's Note 1 questions the status of 11179-2.	WG2 should determine the future of 11179-2. Delete Editor's note 1.	Accepted. Placeholder left to preserve numbering of Ed's notes.
5.	US 01	00 Foreword		te	EDITOR'S NOTE #1.(Action Required by FCD) For the 3rd edition of ISO/IEC 11179, it is expected that part 2 will be withdrawn, since part 3 has subsumed its content.	It is not obvious that Part 2 should be withdrawn. There is likely valid content for Part 2, so take no action at this time. This has not been substantially discussed in WG 2 and should be.	Accepted. Placeholder left to preserve numbering of Ed's notes.
6.	209 44 edit or 01	00 general		te	The use of packages and the lack of a combining feature make it impossible to know how the packages features are combined. This was straightforward in Edition 2, but there is no guidance in Edition 3 on how to put all this together.	Provide guidance on how to provide a whole metadata set.	Comments supplied to secretariat from 20944 Project Editor Accepted.

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.

0	1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
Seq	MB ¹	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
7.	JP 01	00 General		1- Major Technical	Japan NB is strongly be aware of the duplication among the ISO/IEC11179-3 Ed3 and ISO/IEC19763-3 in the term of the ontology registrations. Japan NB is not able to approve this standard unless some actual activities be initiated and confirmed in the SC32 for the reconciliation of those duplication.		Should be addressed in MDR/MFI Harmonization study period. Do not delay progression of the document in the meantime. Explicit reference to ontologies to be removed from normative text by resolution of JP 19 (#168)
8.	JP 02	00 General		1- Major Technical	Two different frameworks are introduced to 11179-3 Ed3. They should be one. One is a usual logical framework, where two worlds are: Real world---Universe of Discourse Representation (Designation, Symbol, Sign) world --- logical representation. The other is so-called meaning triangle framework from ISO 1087-1, where three worlds are: Real world --- object, subject field at 3.1 of ISO 1087-1 Concept world---- concept, concept system at 3.2 of ISO 1087-1 Representation world----definition, designation, terminology at 3.3,3.4., 3.5 of ISO 1087-1. What 11179-3 Ed3 specifies is a registry for Representation world, simply because we cannot handle Real world nor Concept world without representation, even though Concept and Concept_System are used as class names. A problem rises if ontologies such as SKOS are with in the scope of 11179-3 Ed3. Because ontologies, including the ones in RDF, OWL and Common Logic etc. are based on the usual logical framework and they do not represent Concept world of ISO 1087-1, but represent Real world.	Proposed changes: There are two choices. One is to limit the scope where ISO 1087-1 framework (i.e. a kind of meaning triangle). Then, its underlying framework is of ISO 1087-1 and ontologies that are based on the usual logical framework are out of scope. The other is to remove ISO 1087-1 from a normative reference and rename the classes such as "Concept" and "Concept_System". Then, its underlying framework is just of Representation world and is very flexible.	Not Accepted. We do not agree with the distinction that has been made. However, the resolution of JP19 (#168) removes all reference to Ontology from the description of Concept System. However, informative annexes will still illustrate that Concept_System can support at least some ontologies.
9.	CA 05	00 Introduction	Ed Notes	Ed	Editor's notes 2 and 3 are no longer required.	Delete Editor's notes 2 and 3.	Accepted. Placeholder left to preserve numbering of Ed's notes.

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.

Editor's 5th Draft Resolution of Comments on SC32 N1851 CD2 11179-3

Date: 2009-11-05

Document: JTC 1/SC 32/WG 2/N1327

0	1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
Seq	MB ¹	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
10.	US 02	00 Introduction		ge	EDITOR'S NOTE #2. (Informational) Throughout this Committee Draft, EDITOR'S NOTES make reference to 'issues' that are either addressed or not addressed by this document. Details of these issues may be found on the WG2 Issue Management website at: http://issues.metadata-stds.org . To locate a specific issue, the generic format of the URL is: http://issues.metadata-standards.org/show_bug.cgi?id=221 where the number at the end is the issue number, without leading zeroes.	OK. Informational, no action required.	Resolved by CA 05 (#9). Editor's note to be deleted.
11.	US 03	00 Introduction		ge	EDITOR'S NOTE #3. (Action required) There have been extensive changes from both the second edition of this standard, and from CD1 of the third edition. The whole document needs careful review and comment.	We are providing that in our comments on this ballot.	Resolved by CA 05 (#9). Editor's note to be deleted.
12.	CA 06	01.1	para 2	Ed	The last sentence of para 2 refers to a subclause that no longer exists because the text was moved to the Introduction.	Delete the last sentence of para 2.	Accepted. Done
13.	CA 07	01.2	para 1	Ed	`structure of the a metadata registry` is wrong.	Delete `the	Accepted Done
14.	GB 01	01.2		ed	Typo - extra word	Remove "is" in "... conceptual data model is in Clauses ..."	Accepted Done
15.	CA 08	01.3	para 1	Ed	The reference to clause 9 is incorrect.	Change the reference to clause 11.	Accepted Done
16.	CA 09	01.4	List item 1	Ed	The referenced version of UML is incorrect.	Change UML 2.0 to UML 2.1.2	Accepted Done
17.	CA 10	01.4	List item 4	Ed	The clause reference is missing.	Add: (see 8.1)	Accepted Done

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.

0	1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
Seq	MB ¹	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
18.	CA 11	02	ISO 12620	Ed	ISO 12620 is listed in the normative references, but does not appear to be referenced anywhere in the document.	Either remove this document from the normative references, or add references to it at appropriate places in the document.	Accepted. Move the reference to the bibliography. Done
19.	CA 12	02	ISO/IEC DIS 19501-2	Ed	The reference to 19501-2 is incorrect. It should be 19505-2.	Change 19501 to 19505. Also, remove the DIS as soon as the IS is published.	Accepted Done
20.	US 24	02		ed	The Clause 2 reference to UML is incorrect	It should be to <i>ISO/IEC DIS 19505-2 Information technology — OMG Unified Modeling Language (OMG UML) Version 2.1.2 — Part 2: Superstructure</i>	Accepted, but include as dated reference. Done
21.	CA 13	03.2.01	ISO/IEC DIS 19501-2	Ed	The reference to 19501-2 is incorrect. It should be 19505-2.	Change 19501 to 19505. . Also, remove the DIS as soon as the IS is published.	Accepted Done
22.	CA 14	03.2.02	ISO/IEC DIS 19501-2	Ed	The reference to 19501-2 is incorrect. It should be 19505-2.	Change 19501 to 19505. . Also, remove the DIS as soon as the IS is published.	Accepted Done
23.	CA 15	03.2.04	ISO/IEC DIS 19501-2	Ed	The reference to 19501-2 is incorrect. It should be 19505-2.	Change 19501 to 19505. . Also, remove the DIS as soon as the IS is published.	Accepted Done
24.	CA 16	03.2.05	Example needed	Te	Add a reference to an example of a composite attribute.	E.g. reference Registration.registration_state in Figure 7-1	Accepted
25.	CA 17	03.2.06	Example needed	Te	Add a reference to an example of a composite datatype.	E.g. reference Registration_Record as used by Registration.registration_state in Figure 7-1	Accepted
26.	CA 18	03.2.08	ISO/IEC DIS 19501-2	Ed	The reference to 19501-2 is incorrect. It should be 19505-2.	Change 19501 to 19505. . Also, remove the DIS as soon as the IS is published.	Accepted Done
27.	CA 19	03.2.11	ISO/IEC DIS 19501-2	Ed	The reference to 19501-2 is incorrect. It should be 19505-2.	Change 19501 to 19505. . Also, include DIS in the reference until the IS is published.	Accepted Done

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.

Editor's 5th Draft Resolution of Comments on SC32 N1851 CD2 11179-3

Date: 2009-11-05

Document: JTC 1/SC 32/WG 2/N1327

0	1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
Seq	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
28.	CA 20	03.2.12	New	Te	Add a definition of specialization, as a counterpart to generalization (3.2.8). The term specialization is used in the text.	Editor is requested to locate an appropriate definition from 19505, and adapt it if required.	Accepted. Done with some changes to the definitions of generalization and relationship to better align them.
29.	US 25	05.1.13.2.6		te	This paragraph says that reference_provider is mandatory. However, the reference_provider may not be known.	reference_provider should be made optional	Accepted Done.
30.	CA 21	03.3, 03.4	All	Ed	The separation of subclauses 3.3 and 3.4 no longer serves any purpose, now that the 3.4 contains terms and not model elements.	Combine the two subclauses, and order the terms alphabetically within the combined clause.	Accepted. Done See also US 26 (#33) & US 50 (#34)
31.	CA 22	03.3.14	Add Note	Ed	A reference should be added to Clause 3.4.40 designation (of designatable item)	Add a note referencing 3.4.40.	Accepted. Done. 3.3.14 has become 3.3.51, and 3.4.40 has become 3.3.52.

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.

0	1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
Seq	MB ¹	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
32.	GB 02	03.3.15		ed	<p>The definition of the term "entity" is dubious given its usage in the remainder of the document. It makes the reader wonder whether it is intentionally indicating an "entity instance" rather than the common usage of "entity kind" or "entity type". It also makes the reader wonder whether it intentionally excludes imaginary concepts that could never exist. In fact the term is then used with apparently different meanings.</p> <p>It is used in the definition of "attribute", where given the current definitions of entity and object it does not seem useful (e.g. "object or entity" could be replaced by "object or set of objects").</p> <p>It is used in the definition of "organization part", where it appears to have a more specific meaning.</p> <p>It is used in the definition of "text", where the term "object" could have been used.</p> <p>It is used in the commentary on the registry metamodel, where it probably means a UML class used to specify the metamodel.</p>	<p>One consistent resolution would be:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Drop the definition of entity. - Replace by "set of objects" in "attribute" - Replace by "object" in "text" - Replace by "class" in describing registry metamodel. - Be satisfied with its regular English definition for its one remaining usage in "organization part". 	<p>Accepted.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Done - Done - Done - Done

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.

0	1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
Seq	MB ¹	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
33.	US 26	03.4		ed	It is not clear which model construct names constitute also terms which should be defined in clause 3, and which do not. Many model element names are not defined in clause 3.4.	<p>Concepts should be defined in Clause 3. Clause 3 should not define the model elements--classes, attributes, and associations, which should be defined in the clause where they are specified. Terms and definitions should be included in Clause 3 only if they are necessary for the understanding of those terms as used elsewhere in the document (see ISO/IEC Directives, Part 2, Clause 6.3.1). Clause 3.4 should be reviewed to see that each term conforms to the above.</p> <p>Prefer resolution according to US 50 (#34). Keep if US 50 not accepted.</p>	<p>The terms included in clause 3.4 are concepts which are represented in the model. The terms included are for all classes in the model, and for selected attributes and associations, where the editor felt the concepts were significant. In general, the concepts represented by attributes have not been included in clause 3.4.</p> <p>Add text explaining what is included and what is not, for merged clause 3.3/3.4.</p> <p>List here any terms we decide to remove.</p>
34.	US 50	03.4		te	Model constructs are not terms in the TC37 sense. They should be defined where they are presented in clauses 4 – 12.	<p>Remove the sub-clause. Provide definitions of model constructs where they are presented in the clauses 4 – 12.</p> <p>See also: US 26 (#33) US 27 (#39) US 28 (#40) US 29 (#42)</p>	<p>The specification of model constructs have already been moved to Clauses 5 through 10. What is left in clause 3.4 are the concepts that the model constructs implement.</p> <p>These concepts belong in clause 3, but CA 21 (#30) proposes merging clauses 3.3 and 3.4.</p> <p>Resolved by CA 21 (#30).</p>
35.	CA 23	03.4.18	definition	Te	Editor's note 4 indicates that the definition needs work	TBD	Resolved by US 04 (#36).

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.

0	1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
Seq	MB ¹	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
36.	US 04	03.4.18		te	<p>data element Data Element DE ----- EDITOR'S NOTE #4. (Action required) There has been feedback from users of 11179 that this is not a useful definition. It should be reviewed. ----- unit of data for which the definition, identification, representation and value domain are specified by means of a set of attributes</p>	<p>Remove current definition and put in the definition from ISO/IEC 2382: Part 4 - 04.07.01: data element (in organization of data) A unit of data that is considered in context to be indivisible. Example: The data element "age of a person" with values consisting of all combinations of 3 decimal digits.</p>	Accepted Done
37.	CA 24	03.4.19	definition	Te	<p>The definition of Data Element Concept is too generic. There is nothing that ties it to a data element, or otherwise distinguishes it from a simple Concept. [This is Issue 456 in Bugzilla.]</p>	TBD	<p>Same as JP 03 (#38). Revert to definition from Edition 2. Done.</p>
38.	JP 03	<i>03.4.19 data element concept</i>		2-Minor Technical	<p>The definition is substantially different from the one in Ed2. This new definition is too broad at least in the following three senses. 1) According to this definition, almost everything, including class definition, is a data element concept, which is not true. 2) A concept in ISO 1087-1 includes an individual concept (almost same as instance or individual). So, according to this definition, any specification of some individual is a data element concept, which is not true. 3) "Specification" usually means that it accompanies with some representation.</p>		<p>Revert to definition from Edition 2. Done. See also US 40 (#195)</p>
39.	US 27	03.4.2, 03.4.4, 03.4.72, 03.4.92, 03.4.93, 09.1.2		ed	<p>The terms "antisymmetric relation", "asymmetric relation", "reflexive relation", "symmetric relation" and "transitive relation" are defined in clause 3 but not used in the model; while "reflexivity", "symmetry" and "transitivity" are used in the model, but not defined in clause 3.</p>	<p>The definitions should be changed to be definitions for the terms used in clause 9. The meanings are currently all fully specified in clause 9; the definitions should be made in clause 3, and then simply used as defined there, in clause 9. Prefer resolution according to US 50 (#34). Keep if US 50 not accepted.</p>	Accepted. Done .

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.

Editor's 5th Draft Resolution of Comments on SC32 N1851 CD2 11179-3

Date: 2009-11-05

Document: JTC 1/SC 32/WG 2/N1327

0	1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
Seq	MB ¹	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
40.	US 28	03.4.28, 05.1.4		ed	The term "date and time" was not changed everywhere to "date" and "datetime".	The definition for "date and time" should be replaced with definitions for "date" and "datetime". Text in clause 5.1.4 should also be changed. Prefer resolution according to US 50 (#34). Keep if US 50 not accepted.	Accepted. Done.
41.	CA 25	03.4.40	Note	Ed	The clause reference is incomplete.	The referenced clause should be 3.3.14.	Accepted Done, though reference has now changed because clauses 3.3 and 3.4 have been combined.
42.	US 29	03.4.53, 03.4.73		ed	The terms "management" and "register" are defined in clause 3, but not used in the model.	Remove these terms from clause 3. Prefer resolution according to US 50 (#34). Keep if US 50 not accepted.	Accepted Done.
43.	CA 26	03.4.71	Ed Note	Ed	The editor's note is no longer required.	Delete Editor's Note 5.	Accepted. Placeholder left to preserve numbering of Ed's notes.
44.	US 05	03.4.71		te	EDITOR'S NOTE #5. (Action Required) Do we need to be able to distinguish different types of reference_provider? For example, one organization might maintain the document, but another might publish it or make it available.	This would seem to be beyond the scope of 11179. Take no action.	Accepted Placeholder left to preserve numbering of Ed's notes.
45.	US 30	03.4.81		te	The definition of relation is confusing and it does not meet the requirement of ISO/IEC Directives Part 2: Rules for the structure and drafting of International Standards	Proposed revised definition: sense in which concepts may be connected, via constituent roles. Example: causality is a relation with two constituent roles: cause and effect. Move definition to Clause 3.3.	Accepted change to definition. Done. Relocation resolved by CA 21 which combines clauses 3.3 & 3.4. See also US 39 (#176)
46.	JP 04	03.4.81 relation 08.1.2.4.1 Description of Relation		2- Minor Techn ical	"A <i>relation</i> is a subset of the powerset of RxUD" is not true. The powerset of RxUD is not equivalent to Cartesian product $UD \times \dots \times UD$		Resolved by US 30 (#45) New definition provided.

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.

0	1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
Seq	MB ¹	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
47.	JP 05	03.4.81 relation 08.1.2.4.1 Description of Relation		2-Minor Technical	To define relation in terms of universe of discourse is inappropriate because relation is about Concept world since Relation is subclass of Concept, but universe of discourse is about Real world.		Resolved by US 30 (#45). New definition provided.
48.	JP 06	03.4.81 relation 08.1.2.4.1 Description of Relation		2-Minor Technical	It needs to be clarified whether this relation is a relations only among general concepts or not. Posted to Bugzilla as Issue 489 .		Add text to clarify that Concepts may be general or individual, and this can depend on perspective. Add example in an Annex e.g. Dog. Reference to general and individual concepts should be restricted to Notes to avoid having to define them.
49.	CA 27	03.4.84	definition	Te	The definition uses the plural where singular would be more accurate.	Reword : 'container for extensions to identified items' as: 'container for an extension to an identified item'	Accepted Done .
50.	CA 28	03.4.89	Ed Note	Ed	The editor's note is no longer required.	Delete Editor's Note 6.	Accepted. Placeholder left to preserve numbering of Ed's notes.
51.	US 06	03.4.89		ge	EDITOR'S NOTE #6. (Information) The editor has changed the above definition, because the previous definition was defined as an association with Submission_Record, but that is defined in terms of submission, so the result was circular.	OK. Informational, no action required.	Resolved by CA 28. (#50)
52.	CA 29	03.4.91	Ed Note	Ed	The editor's note is no longer required.	Delete Editor's Note 7.	Accepted. Placeholder left to preserve numbering of Ed's notes.

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.

0	1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
Seq	MB ¹	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
53.	US 07	03.4.91		ge	EDITOR'S NOTE #7. (Information) The editor has changed the above definition, replacing registered item by metadata item for registration, because the item is not yet registered when it is submitted.	OK. Informational, no action required.	Resolved by CA 29 (#52)
54.	CA 30	03.5	All	Ed	The list of abbreviations only fills the left side of the page.	Use two columns in this section.	Accepted. Done.
55.	CA 31	03.5.04 +	New	Te	Insert after 3.5.4 an explanation of 'mece' (usage to be added by another ballot comment on clause 4.5)	mece mutually exclusive and collectively exhaustive	Accepted Done.
56.	CA 32	04.1	para 2	Te	The first sentence states that the metamodel describes the 'structure' of a Metadata Registry. The term structure is too vague.	Replace 'structure' by 'information model'.	Accepted. Done.
57.	GB 03	04.3.4 05 to 10		ge	In Clauses 5 to 10 the attributes of each class are defined three times: in the UML diagram; informally in the 'n.n.1' part of the text describing the class; and formally in the 'n.n.2' part of the text. The associations are also defined three times: in the UML diagram; informally in the 'n.n.1' for each class participating in the association; and formally in a separate part of the text. Clause 4.3.4 states that if a conflict exists between what is specified in the UML diagrams and what is specified in the text the text takes precedence. In principle this is supported but there is a potential problem in that it is unclear which text should take precedence in the event of a conflict between the informal description in the 'n.n.1' part of the text and the more formal descriptions in the 'n.n.2' and association parts of the text.	Restructure clauses 5 to 10 to avoid duplication of information thus eliminating the possibility of inconsistency.	The different representations are present to satisfy different audiences. For attributes, we should state that the formal definition takes precedence over the informal text. For the associations, the description of the association itself should take precedence over the references from the classes. Done. Clarification added in 4.3.4.
58.	CA 33	04.4	Note after para 1	Ed	In the note following para 1, the terms sub-class and super-class should not be hyphenated.	Change all instances of 'sub-class' to 'subclass' and all instances of 'super-class' to 'superclass'.	Accepted. Done.

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.

0	1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
Seq	MB ¹	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
59.	CA 34	04.5	Title	Te	Clause 4.5 is entitled 'Types of Items', but the term 'type' is not used as defined in UML. Rather, what is intended corresponds to the UML Stereotype.	Change all instances of the phrase 'Types of Items' to 'Item stereotypes'	Resolved by US 61 (#65)
60.	CA 35	04.5	Figure 4-2	Te	Further to the previous comment, <<type>> in Figure 4.2 should be <<stereotype>>	Change all instances of <<type>> in Figure 4.2 to <<stereotype>>	Resolved by US 61 (#65)
61.	CA 36	04.5	Throughout	Te	Where the text refers to 'types', rephrase to refer to 'stereotypes'.	Rephrase as appropriate in the context.	Resolved by US 61 (#65)
62.	CA 37	04.5	p 25, para 1	Te	References to 'subtypes' should be 'subclasses'. (See earlier comment on 00-All).	Change all occurrences of 'subtype' to 'subclass'.	Accepted. Done.
63.	CA 38	04.5	p 25, para 1	Ed	There is an invalid reference in the first paragraph on p.25.	The reference should be to 7.1.2.2.	Accepted. Done.
64.	CA 39	04.5	p 25, para 1	Te	In the last sentence of para 1, the reference to 'exhaustive and mutually exclusive' is usually phrased as: 'mutually exclusive and collectively exhaustive (mece)'	Replace the last sentence by: 'These subclasses are mutually exclusive and collectively exhaustive (mece), as indicated in Figure 4-2 by the notation {complete,disjoint}.'	Accepted. Done.

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.

0	1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
Seq	MB ¹	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
65.	US 61	04.5	Figure 4-2	te	Classes Designatable_Item, Identified_Item, Registered_Item, Administered_Item, Attached_Item, and Classifiable_Item have the "<<type>>" stereotype. Annex C.2 of the UML specification defines the "<<type>>" stereotype as: A class that specifies a domain of objects together with the operations applicable to the objects, without defining the physical implementation of those objects.... However, given that ISO/IEC 11179-3 defines a conceptual model, it would appear that every class in ISO/IEC 11179-3 specifies a domain of objects together with the operations applicable to the objects, without defining the physical implementation of those objects. Thus, it is not clear what additional constraint this stereotype places on these specific entities.	Add boilerplate text that captures the meaning of the <<type>> stereotype. [Ref. ISO/IEC DIS 19505-2:2008 UML 2.1.2 Part 2: Superstructure Annex C.1 StandardProfileL2. Consider using an interface instead of a class with the << type>> stereotype.	Agreed to add text to explain. Done. Text added in the first para. of 4.5. Defer discussion of interface, and if we agree to pursue, need detailed text on next round of balloting. See also: CA 34 (#59) CA 35 (#60) CA 36 (#61) CA 52 (#106) CA 66 (#134) CA 88 (#185) US 64 (#239) CA 126 (#250)
66.	JP 07	04.5 Types of Items in an ISO/IEC 11179 metadata registry		2-Minor Technical	It is better to use (meta)class and subclass, rather than type and subtype since class and subclass are more usual in normative reference ISO/IECDIS 19501-1, UML 2.1.2 , and no specific meaning different from class and subclass do not seem necessary.		Accepted. See also CA 03 (#3). Done.
67.	JP 08	04.5 Types of Items in an ISO/IEC 11179 metadata registry		1-Major Technical	(last paragraph) Administred_Item etc. are one of the key parts of this standard. It should not be a choice of a Registration_Authority. If Clause 6 and other parts are independent, clause 6 should be an independent standard, which is common to almost all WG2 standard. At least, the definition of data element (3.4.18) , which uses definition and identification.		Withdrawn

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.

0	1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
Seq	MB ¹	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
68.	CA 40	04.5.1	Table 4-1	Te	The intent of interpretation of Table 4-1 is unclear.	An example of how to read the table is required. The rules also need to be expressed in English.	Accepted. Done.
69.	CA 41	04.5.1	Table 4-1	Te	Some of the items listed in the left-hand column are classes, some are associations, and some are association classes.	Identify which item is of each kind.	Accepted. Changed the column to consistently list the association or association class and the associated class. Done.
70.	JP 09	<i>04.5.1 Rules for Identified_Item and its subtypes Table 4-1</i>		2-Minor Technical	The meanings of Rule 1,..., Rule 7 and one or more, none are unclear. Needs some text to explain what this table means.		Accepted. See resolution of CA-40 (#68)
71.	CA 42	04.7	last sentence	Ed	There are multiple associated datatypes.	Change 'datatype' to 'datatypes'.	Accepted. Done.
72.	CA 43	05 to 10	All	Ed	In some clauses, such as 10.1, subclause titles include the word Class or Association as appropriate, but in most these words are omitted.	The style should be consistent. Recommend using Class, Association, Association Class as appropriate for added clarity.	Accepted. Also do the same for datatypes and enumerations. Done.
73.	GB 04	05 to 10		ed	For each attribute definition both obligation and multiplicity are shown. If the multiplicity is "1" or "1..*" the obligation must be "Mandatory". If the multiplicity is "0..1" or "0..*" the obligation must be "Optional" unless there is a condition making it "Conditional" (in which case the condition is specified as part of the attribute definition). The obligation entry is, therefore, redundant, and its inclusion leads to the possibility of inconsistency in the text.	Remove all obligation entries.	Not accepted. The Obligation is seen to have value. Editor will proof read to ensure consistency. Action required.
74.	JP 10	05 to 10		4-Minor Editorial	Some are headed as XXX class such as Conceptual_Domain class at 10.1.2.2 and the others are headed as just YYY such as Cpncept at 8.1.2.1. They should be in an unified manner.		Resolved by CA 43 (#72)

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.

0	1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
Seq	MB ¹	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
75.	JP 11	05 to 10		4-Minor Editorial	Obligation (Mandatory or Optional) is not necessary because it is described by Multiplicity. It is better to remove redundancy.		Not accepted. The Obligation is seen to have value. Editor will proof read to ensure consistency. Action required.
76.	JP 12	05 to 10		3-Major Editorial	It is better to explicitly specify its direct super class at the definition of each class for easy understanding, in addition to Figure B-1, Annex B.		Accepted. Make a separate clause for direct superclass. Done.
77.	US 65	05 to 10		ed	All definitions of the following form: Conceptual_Domain is a class that represents a conceptual domain. A conceptual domain is a set of value meanings, which may either be enumerated or expressed via a description. The first sentence is redundant.	Revise such definitions to following form: Conceptual_Domain is a class that represents a set of value meanings, which is either enumerated or expressed via a description. See Clause 3.3.x Use consistent style throughout for defining classes. US will provide a list of discrepancies upon request. Also note the change of "may" to "is".	Accepted with modifications. See also JP 16 (#160) Conceptual_Domain is a class each instance of which models a conceptual domain, i.e. a set of value meanings, which may either be enumerated or expressed via a description. (see 3.x.x.) Done.
78.	US 66	05 to 10		ed	Lack of cross reference to definitions in Clause 3 for many definitions of the following form: Conceptual_Domain is a class that represents a conceptual domain. A conceptual domain is a set of value meanings, which may either be enumerated or expressed via a description	When a concept is defined in Clause 3, it should be referenced from the class definition.	Accepted. Action required.

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.

0	1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
Seq	MB ¹	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
79.	197 73 edit or 01	05.1 05.1.1 05.1.7		te	In subclause 5.1, 5.1.1, and 5.1.7, the basic types of the metamodel are described. The 19773 features of multistring and multitext should be included. Elsewhere, the multistring and multitext features should be used, where appropriate, to provide multi-lingual capability, such as textual descriptions. Note that WG2 has spent much time developing 19773 for common, reusable features to be used in several WG2 projects, and note that 19773 has completed the FCD stage, therefore the 19773 features should be referenced and used.	Use multistring and multitext, as appropriate. Use 19773 multilingual features.	Accepted in principle but needs detailed proposals on the next round of balloting. Comments supplied to secretariat from 19773 Project Editor Action required.
80.	CA 44	05.1.01	Figure 5-1	Te	The model is incomplete, since packages and classes are disconnected. E.g in Figure 5-1, Boolean, Integer, String, Date, and Datetime should have a superclass called Datatype. Other classes, such as Sign and Notation should not be dangling.	Define appropriate superclasses for all classes in the model.	Not accepted. The types shown are instances of datatypes, but not of the Datatype class. The is no reason why Sign and Notation need to be subclassed from anything else.
81.	CA 45	05.1.07.2.3	Editor's note	Te	Resolve Editor's Note #8	To be submitted to BRM.	Proposal required.
82.	US 31	05.1.1	First Paragraph	ed	It is possible to interpret the first sentence in 5.1.1 to mean that the data types specified in basic package are the data types that are to be used in 10.3.2.9 Datatype. We would like to add a sentence to make it clear that it is not the case.	Add the following sentence: Note that the datatypes that are described in this section are used in specification of the metamodel itself, and are <u>not</u> intended to be a description of datatypes to be used in section 10.3.2.9.	Accepted. Done.
83.	CA 46	05.1.11	Editor's note	Te	Resolve Editor's Note #9	To be submitted to BRM.	Resolved by US-09 (#84)
84.	US 09	05.1.11		te	EDITOR'S NOTE #9. (Action required) Do we need to reference both ITU-T E.164 and ISO/IEC 19773 module 17. What value does the reference to ISO/IEC 19773 add here?	Add text stating that ISO/IEC 19773 is referenced, but not required. Leave in the material about ITU-T E.164.	Accepted. Done.
85.	CA 47	05.1.12	Editor's note	Te	Resolve Editor's Note #10	To be submitted to BRM.	Resolved by US-10 (#86)

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.

Editor's 5th Draft Resolution of Comments on SC32 N1851 CD2 11179-3

Date: 2009-11-05

Document: JTC 1/SC 32/WG 2/N1327

0	1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
Seq	MB ¹	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
86.	US 10	05.1.12		te	EDITOR'S NOTE #10. (Action required) Should we reference UPU S42 directly in addition to or instead of ISO/IEC 19773 module 16? Why do we say 'may conform to ISO/IEC 19773' instead of 'shall conform'? What is the value of stating optional conformance?	Add text stating that ISO/IEC 19773 is referenced, but not required.	Accepted. Done.
87.	CA 48	05.1.17	Editor's note	Te	Resolve Editor's Note #11	To be submitted to BRM.	Resolved by US 11 (#88)
88.	US 11	05.1.17		te	EDITOR'S NOTE #11. (Action required) CD19773 uses the term 'multitext' with the same definition as this. We should be consistent, or explain why we are inconsistent. More detail is required to explain the structure of the set of values within <i>Text</i> . Should we reference 19773 multitext?	The text of clause 5.1.17 is not internally consistent. First it offers a definition taken from ISO/IEC 19773, then it offers a very different definition taken from ISO/IEC 2382-23. The second definition is the proper definition for <i>Text</i> ; the first should be deleted. Do not reference ISO/IEC 19773. Remove the first paragraph.	Accepted. Done.
89.	CA 49	05.1.18	Editor's note	Te	Resolve Editor's Note #12	To be submitted to BRM.	Resolved by US 14 (#94)
90.	CA 50	05.1.18	Editor's note	Te	Resolve Editor's Note #13	To be submitted to BRM.	Resolved by US 14 (#94)
91.	CA 51	05.1.18	Editor's note	Te	Resolve Editor's Note #14	To be submitted to BRM.	Resolved by US 14 (#94)
92.	US 12	05.1.18		te	EDITOR'S NOTE #12. (Action required) CD19773 uses the term 'multivalued' with the same definition as this. We should be consistent.	See US comment 14.	Resolved by US 14 (#94)
93.	US 13	05.1.18		te	EDITOR'S NOTE #13. (Action required) Since the definition below references 'multidata' does that also need to be included as a defined datatype.	See US comment 14.	Resolved by US 14 (#94)
94.	US 14	05.1.18		te	EDITOR'S NOTE #14. (Action required) 11404 and 19773 both have similar definitions for the contextualized value (Private in 11404). Do we really want to spec sets vs. individual entries? Do we want to specify some sort of default (e.g. a single character string)?	No, we do not want to spec sets vs. individual entries. The definition taken from ISO/IEC 19773 is thus inappropriate. ISO/IEC 11404 and 9075 use the term without defining it, and ISO 2382 does not define it. We do not need to define value here, either. Instead simply state that the Value datatype represents any instance of any datatype.	Accepted. Done.

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.

0	1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
Seq	MB ¹	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
95.	19773 edit or 02	05.1.3		te	In subclause 5.1.3, the contact data does not use the 19773 contact data module. Contact data was one of the primary reasons for the creation of 19773 and a reusable set of modules.	Use the 19773 contact data module.	Comments supplied to secretariat from 19773 Project Editor Needs discussion. If accepted, review resolutions of #96-98 below.
96.	GB 05	05.1.3.2.5		te	The attribute name is incomplete and the definition is inconsistent with the multiplicity.	Amend name to "contact_phone_numbers" and amend definition to read "phone numbers for the contact".	Accept addition of number without the 's'. Done.
97.	GB 06	05.1.3.2.6		te	Incorrect multiplicity – a contact could have more than email address.	Amend multiplicity to "0..*" and amend definition to read "email addresses for the contact".	Accepted change to multiplicity, and addition of address (singular) Done.
98.	GB 07	05.1.3.2.6		te	The attribute name is incomplete.	Amend name to read "contact_email_address" or "contact_email_addresses" depending on the resolution of Error! Reference source not found.	Accepted. Use the singular. Done.
99.	GB 08	05.1.4		ed	Inconsistency – this is called "Datetime" in Figure 5.1.	Either amend the heading of this clause or Figure 5.1.	Split 5.1.4 into two separate clauses. Done.
100.	GB 09	05.1.7.2.1		te	The note specifies a code to be used. The specification of a code implies implementation and is inappropriate for a conceptual model.	Remove note.	Leave the note but qualify that this is a recommendation, not a requirement. Done.
101.	GB 10	05.1.7.2.2		te	The note specifies a code to be used. The specification of a code implies implementation and is inappropriate for a conceptual model.	Remove note.	Leave the note but qualify that this is a recommendation, not a requirement. Done.
102.	GB 11	05.1.7.2.3		te	The note specifies a code to be used. The specification of a code implies implementation and is inappropriate for a conceptual model.	Remove note.	Leave the note but qualify that this is a recommendation, not a requirement. Done.

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.

Editor's 5th Draft Resolution of Comments on SC32 N1851 CD2 11179-3

Date: 2009-11-05 Document: JTC 1/SC 32/WG 2/N1327

0	1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
Seq	MB ¹	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
103.	US 08	05.1.7.2.3 05.1.7.2		te	EDITOR'S NOTE #8. (Action required) Several of the changes proposed by Issue 240 are intended to support IETF RFC 4646 Tags for Identifying Languages. However, RFC 4646 recommends using ISO 3166-1 2-char alpha codes where available, and 3 digit numeric codes where no 2-char alpha code exists. 11179-3 edition 2 specified the use of 3 digit numeric codes, with extensions if necessary. In RFC 4646, extensions are supported either through the use of 2-char alpha codes reserved for private use by 3166-1, or by separate extension and private use identifiers. We need to decide which approach to use in edition 3. An application needing 2 char alpha codes, could translate from the 3 digit numeric code.	We need an alternative mechanism to specify language identification. We don't want to require RFC 4646 for all implementations, but want to have a mechanism to specify alternates. Add an additional optional qualifier that would specify the encoding of language identification Add in the text that RFC 4646 is preferred, but not required.	Leave the notes in each clause but qualify that each is a recommendation, not a requirement. Done.
104.	GB 12	05.1.7.2.4		te	The note specifies a code to be used. The specification of a code implies implementation and is inappropriate for a conceptual model.	Remove note.	Leave the note but qualify that this is a recommendation, not a requirement. Done.
105.	GB 13	05.1.7.2.5		te	Note 1 specifies a code to be used. The specification of a code implies implementation and is inappropriate for a conceptual model.	Remove note.	Leave the note but qualify that this is a recommendation, not a requirement. Done.
106.	CA 52	06.1.1	Figure 6-1	Te	Further to related comments on clause 4.5, <<type>> should be <<stereotype>>	Change <<type>> to <<stereotype>> in Identified_Item in Figure 6-1.	Resolved by US 61 (#65)
107.	CA 53	06.1.2.2.1	Editor's note	Te	Resolve Editor's Note #15	To be submitted to BRM.	Proposal required.

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.

0	1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
Seq	MB ¹	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
108.	US 15	06.1.2.2.1		te	EDITOR'S NOTE #15. '(Action required) How is full_expansion derived? Should Namespace be required to have exactly one identifier within its own scope that would be used as the prefix in the full expansion? If so, why is full_expansion optional? Should we add full_prefix as an attribute of Namespace?'	The answer is more general than your question. We anticipate registering namespaces which conform to a variety of independent standards. We want a model which is aligned with XML namespaces, UML namespaces and ZING (Z39.50) namespaces. The possible changes listed in the note do not align. If we are accommodating registration of namespaces not under the control of the Registrar, then we cannot enforce the suggested constraints. Thus, take no action.	Add a 'namespace_scheme_reference' attribute to Namespace that allows the type of namespace to be specified, and add text that specifies that the derivation of the full expansion is dependent on the type of namespace. Action required.
109.	19773 editor 03	06.1.2.4		te	In subclause 6.1.2.4, the "slot" feature has already been developed in 19773 under IKV (identifier-kind-value) tuples.	Use 19773 IKV tuples for this feature.	Comments supplied to secretariat from 19773 Project Editor Needs discussion Slot was chosen for compatibility with ebXML.
110.	GB 14	06.1.2.4		te	6.1.2.4.2.2 specifies that the data type of "slot_value" is string, yet 6.1.2.4.2.3 ("slot_type") is used to specify the data type of the slot. There appears to be some contradiction here.	[None proposed]	Add explanation. Action required.
111.	CA 54	06.2.1	Editor's note	Te	Resolve Editor's Note #16	To be submitted to BRM.	Resolved by US 16 (#114)
112.	CA 55	06.2.1	Editor's note	Te	Resolve Editor's Note #17	To be submitted to BRM.	See US 17 (#115)
113.	CA 56	06.2.1	Editor's note	Te	Resolve Editor's Note #18	To be submitted to BRM.	Resolved by US 18 (#116)

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.

0	1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
Seq	MB ¹	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
114.	US 16	06.2.1		te	EDITOR'S NOTE #16. (Action required) The <i>term_definition_pairing</i> association uses the role 'heading' instead of 'term', because 'term' is used by the <i>assertion_term</i> association. Should we rename <i>term_definition_pairing</i> to <i>designation_definition_pairing</i>	Agreed that we should change it to avoid using the word "term". Suggest that it be renamed to <i>designation_definition_pairing</i> or to <i>definition_heading</i> , at the editor's discretion.	Accepted. Action required. Delete Editor's note. Placeholder left to preserve numbering. See also US 23 (#132), CA 64 (#131)
115.	US 17	06.2.1		te	EDITOR'S NOTE #17. (Action required) It has been suggested that <i>term_definition_pairing</i> may be dependent on <i>Context</i> . For example, different terms may be used for the same definition in different contexts, or different definitions may be applied to the same term in different contexts. The Editor suggests making <i>Term_Definition_Pairing</i> a class associated with exactly one <i>Designation</i> and one <i>Definition</i> , and associating it with zero or more <i>Contexts</i> . Designations and Definitions may be associated zero or more <i>Term_Definition_Pairings</i> . We could specify a constraint that a <i>Context</i> shall be specified if a <i>Designation</i> or <i>Definition</i> is associated with more than one <i>Term_Definition_Pairing</i> , but it might be better to leave this to the discretion of a <i>Registration_Authority</i> .	Change the multiplicity between <i>designation</i> and <i>definition</i> for <i>term_definition_pairing</i> association from 0..1 to 0..* on both ends. Add text to explain the meaning of pairing. Make no other change.	Not accepted. Resolve the Editor's note by adding text explaining that if there is a requirement to pair a term with different definitions in different contexts, then this requires separate <i>Designatable_Items</i> . Action required.
116.	US 18	06.2.2.3.1		te	EDITOR'S NOTE #18. (Action required) Is there a better location for the table below? Is it useful?	Insert an overview subclause to clause 6, briefly explaining the division of the package into two regions, and including the table and its explanatory text.	Accepted Action required.
117.	GB 15	06.2.2.3.2.2		te	What is the condition that makes a "designation_language" applicable? If the condition cannot be specified in terms of the values of recorded for other model constructs should the obligation not be Optional instead of Conditional?	[None proposed]	Editor requests text to express the condition more clearly, e.g. in terms of other aspects of the model. If not received, this will be changed to optional. Action required.

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.

0	1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
Seq	MB ¹	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
118.	CA 57	06.2.2.4.1	Editor's note	Te	Resolve Editor's Note #19	To be submitted to BRM.	See US 19 (#119)
119.	US 19	06.2.2.4.1		te	EDITOR'S NOTE #19. (Action required) The datatype of <i>definition_text</i> has been changed from <i>String</i> to <i>Text</i> by Issue 18 . Since the <i>Text</i> datatype inherently supports multiple languages, do we still need the explicit <i>definition_language</i> attribute here? Or should we revert to <i>String</i> ?	Datatype text has no language inherent in it. Make no change here.	Accepted. Delete Editor's note. Placeholder left to preserve numbering.
120.	CA 58	06.2.2.4.2.2	Condition	Ed	reference the named attribute, not just the class.	Change the reference 7.1.2.9 to 7.1.2.9.2.7.	Accepted. Done.
121.	CA 59	06.2.2.4.2.3	Condition	Ed	The condition has been copied from the previous attribute. It does not belong here.	Delete the condition.	Accepted. Done.
122.	CA 60	06.2.2.6	All	Te	The rewrite of this clause to reflect the changes to the model is incomplete.	Complete the rewrite of the clause, especially changing any occurrence of <i>Designation_Space</i> to <i>Namespace</i> , and <i>designation_space_membership</i> to <i>designation_namespace</i> .	Accepted. Done.
123.	CA 61	06.2.2.7.1	Editor's note	Te	Resolve Editor's Note #20	To be submitted to BRM.	Resolved by US 20 (#124)

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.

0	1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
Seq	MB ¹	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
124.	US 20	06.2.2.7.1		te	<p>EDITOR'S NOTE #20. (Action required) Although <i>Designations</i> can be associated with both Naming_Conventions and Contexts, there is currently no way to specify that a particular Naming_Convention applies to a Designation in a particular Context. If one were to associate Naming_Convention to a Context, this could imply one of two things depending on the cardinality of the association.</p> <p>(1) A Context can have many Naming_Conventions Question: How would one know if a particular name came from a particular naming convention?</p> <p>(2) A Context can have only one Naming_Convention This then requires that ALL names in this Context have this Naming_Convention. This then implies that:</p> <p>1. ALL names in ALL languages use this Naming_Convention (i.e. French, English, Korean, etc.)</p> <p>2. ALL names in a language use this Naming_Convention (i.e. preferred term and non-preferred terms [synonyms]) Question: Doesn't this seem to be overly restrictive and unrealistic?</p>	<p>There is no need to bring "context" into the discussion. A designation either conforms to a Naming_Convention or not. No action required.</p>	<p>Accepted</p> <p>Placeholder left to preserve numbering.</p>
125.	CA 62	06.2.3.1.2.1	Editor's note	Te	Resolve Editor's Note #21	To be submitted to BRM.	Resolved by US 21 (#126)
126.	US 21	06.2.3.1.2.1		te	<p>EDITOR'S NOTE #21. (Action required) Should we add the class word 'rating' to the attribute name?</p>	<p>No, do not add the class word "rating" to the attribute name. Remove the words "rating of" from the definition. Rationale: The word rating is misleading.</p>	<p>Accepted. Change done.</p> <p>Delete Editor's note.</p> <p>Placeholder left to preserve numbering.</p>
127.	CA 63	06.2.3.2.2.1	Editor's note	Te	Resolve Editor's Note #22	To be submitted to BRM.	Resolved by US 22 (#128)

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.

Editor's 5th Draft Resolution of Comments on SC32 N1851 CD2 11179-3

Date: 2009-11-05

Document: JTC 1/SC 32/WG 2/N1327

0	1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
Seq	MB ¹	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
128.	US 22	06.2.3.2.2.1		te	EDITOR'S NOTE #22. (Action required) Should we add the class word 'rating' to the attribute name?	No, do not add the class word "rating" to the attribute name. Remove the words "rating of" from the definition. Rationale: The word rating is misleading.	Accepted Change done. Delete Editor's note. Placeholder left to preserve numbering.
129.	US 32	06.2.4.2		ed	Subclause 6.2.4.2 states" A <i>Definition</i> is used for exactly one <i>Designatable_item</i> . Definitions may not be not be reused across multiple <i>Designatable_Items</i> ". This must be explained so that it is comprehensible to qualified persons who have not participated in the standard preparation.	Add one or two sentences of explanation. Definitions cannot be reused, explain why not.	Accepted Action required. Added as Issue 495.
130.	US 33	06.2.4.3		ed	Subclause 6.2.4.3 states" A <i>Designations</i> may not be not be reused across multiple <i>Designatable_Items</i> ". This must be explained so that it is comprehensible to qualified persons who have not participated in the standard preparation.	Add one or two sentences of explanation. Designations cannot be reused, explain why not.	Accepted Action required. Added as Issue 495.
131.	CA 64	06.2.4.6	Editor's note	Te	Resolve Editor's Note #23	To be submitted to BRM.	Resolved by US 16 (#114)
132.	US 23	06.2.4.6		te	EDITOR'S NOTE #23. (Action required) The following paragraph needs work. Can we use Designation instead of Heading?	Designation is already the name of both a class and another role in the model. A distinct name for the role is desirable. Make no change.	Resolved by US 16 (#114) Delete Editor's note. Placeholder left to preserve numbering.
133.	CA 65	07.1.1	Figures	Ed	Consolidate the Figures 7-1, 7-2, 7-3 into one	Place the Registration_Record and the Registry_Specification classes at the bottom of Figure 7-1, and delete figures 7-2 and 7-3.	Accepted Done.
134.	CA 66	07.1.1	Figure 7-1	Te	Further to related comments on clause 4.5, <<type>> should be <<stereotype>>	Change <<type>> to <<stereotype>> in Registered_Item, Administered_Item and Attached_Item in Figure 7-1.	Resolved by US 61 (#65)

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.

Editor's 5th Draft Resolution of Comments on SC32 N1851 CD2 11179-3

Date: 2009-11-05

Document: JTC 1/SC 32/WG 2/N1327

0	1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
Seq	MB ¹	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
135.	CA 67	07.1.1	Editor's note	Te	Resolve Editor's Note #24. In the Registration class, attribute registration_state uses Registration_Record as its data type. Another ballot comment on Binary_Relation identifies potential difficulties with using the same name for more than one construct in the metamodel, such as attribute and datatype.	The resolution of this Editor's note should be consistent with the resolution of the comment on Binary_Relation.	Discuss in conjunction with CA 91 (#189). See also GB 16 (#140) Rename Registration_Record to Registration_State. Done.
136.	US 34	07.1.1	Figure 7-3	te	Figure 7-3 shows Registry_Specification with a required (must be present) attribute registry_web_address. Therefore a strictly conforming or a conforming registry implementation cannot exist if there is not a url for the registry. If it is not on the web the registry cannot be conformant.	Make registry_web_address optional.	Accepted. Done.
137.	US 35	07.1.1	Figure 7-3	ed	Since Reference_Document is fully expanded in figure 5-1 and Clause 5, it does not require expansion in figure 7-1.	Edit as noted.	Accepted. Done.
138.	CA 68	07.1.2.2.1	Editor's note	Te	Resolve Editor's Note #25	To be submitted to BRM.	Proposal required.
139.	CA 69	07.1.2.2.1	1 st bullet item	Ed	In the first bullet item below Editor's Note 25, in the third line, identifier is misspelt.	Change identier to identifier.	Accepted. Done.

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.

0	1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
Seq	MB ¹	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
140.	GB 16	07.1.2.5 and Figure 7.1		te	Abbreviations (other than those in common use such as "uri") have generally not been used in attribute names in accordance with good conceptual data model practice yet "Registration_Authority" has an attribute named "ra_identifier".	Rename this attribute to "registration_authority_identifier".	Discuss in conjunction with CA 91 (#189). See also CA 67 (#135) Check the standard from which this comes first, but otherwise accepted. Done.
141.	CA 70	07.1.2.6.2	Editor's note	Te	Resolve Editor's Note #26	To be submitted to BRM.	Proposal required.
142.	GB 17	07.1.2.7 and Figure 7.1		te	There is an inconsistency in the naming of the attributes of "Stewardship_Record". "steward" is of data type "Organization" and "stewardship_contact" is of data type "Contact".	Rename "steward" to "stewardship_organization".	Accepted. Done.
143.	GB 18	07.1.2.7 and Figure 7.1		te	There is an inconsistency in the naming of the attributes of "Submission_Record". "submitter" is of data type "Organization" and "submission_contact" is of data type "Contact".	Rename "submitter" to "submission_organization".	Accepted. Done.

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.

0	1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
Seq	MB ¹	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
144.	20944 edit or 01	07.1.2.9		te	<p>Clause 7 and subclause 7.1.2.9 specify global descriptive data that applies to a registry as a whole. To date, 11179 has not had any so-called registry-wide data. This is a compatibility question for 20944 access because it is unclear how to navigate to the data.</p> <p>Furthermore, by using global values, it becomes impossible to aggregate, cache, and federate metadata because there is no mechanism for combining incompatible global data when caching/aggregating multiple registries. Likewise, federation becomes difficult because global parameters only apply to the present registry and none of the subordinate registries.</p> <p>Finally, the notion of registry-global data means that the focus in Edition 3 has shifted from a specification of descriptive data (which could be stored in a registry, or stored as standalone metadata) to specification of descriptive data that MUST exist in a registry (i.e., standalone metadata is no longer possible). This is a significant change in understanding 11179 metadata standards.</p>	<p>Remove global features.</p> <p>Refactor problem to use grouping feature (e.g., group lists, similar to topic maps).</p>	<p>Comments supplied to secretariat from 20944 Project Editor</p> <p>Editor's response:</p> <p>Registry_specification was added to resolve a previous ballot comment. Removing it is not appropriate. We should specifically address any issues. E.g:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - add text that if there is no registry, it is not required. If there are multiple registries, there should be one Registry_Specification per registry. - Add an optional association from Registration to Registry_Specification to indicate which registry the registration is in. This addresses the navigation issue. Registry_Specification should also be a top level access point when 20944 adds support for edition 3. - Alternate proposal is for 20944 to address the Registry_Specification when it opens the registry. - Concern expressed that extending the model to support multiple registries may have other implications.

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.

Editor's 5th Draft Resolution of Comments on SC32 N1851 CD2 11179-3

Date: 2009-11-05

Document: JTC 1/SC 32/WG 2/N1327

0	1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
Seq	MB ¹	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
145.	CA 71	07.1.2.9.1	2 nd para	Ed	There is a missing reference at the end of the 2 nd para.	The reference should be to 7.1.2.9.2	Accepted. Done.
146.	GB 19	07.1.2.9.1		ed	Typo - "... and specified more formally in 0."	Amend to read "... and specified more formally in 7.1.2.9.2."	Accepted. Done.
147.	CA 72	07.1.3.2	All	Te	The rewrite of the text based on previous ballot comments does not adequately differentiate between 'organization' as a concept, and 'Organization' as a class in the metamodel.	Rewrite to clearly distinguish the use of the concept from the use of the class.	Accepted Action required.
148.	CA 73	07.1.3.3	All	Te	The rewrite of the text based on previous ballot comments does not adequately differentiate between 'reference document' as a concept, and 'Reference_Document' as a class in the metamodel.	Rewrite to clearly distinguish the use of the concept from the use of the class.	Accepted Action required.
149.	CA 74	07.1.4.1	All	Te	This sub-clause is called 'Namespace', but it does not describe Namespace.	Briefly describe Namespace, and then cross-reference 6.1.2.3 for more details.	Accepted Action required.
150.	CA 75	07.1.5.1.1	Editor's note	Te	Resolve Editor's Note #27	To be submitted to BRM.	Proposal required.
151.	CA 76	07.1.5.2.2	Editor's note	Te	Resolve Editor's Note #28	To be submitted to BRM.	Proposal required.
152.	CA 77	07.1.6.1	para 2	Ed	The association name 'attachment' should not be capitalized, even if it is at the beginning of the sentence.	Change 'Attachment' to 'attachment'.	Accepted. Done.
153.	US 51	07.1.6.2	Entire sub-clause	te	Identifying a Namespace for the registry cannot be mandatory, and it is questionably useful at all. Only users who wish to take advantage of Namespaces would ever consider doing this. It is easy to imagine an application that does not use Namespaces. The existence of the relationship means Clause 7 is not independent of the others. The need to specify a Namespace for a registry is questionable. In Clause 6, a Designation does not need to be a member of a Namespace, so why does an RA_Identifier need to be?	Much more explanation is needed. If a compelling rationale cannot be made for this being mandatory, then it should be optional.	Make Namespace optional. Done.

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.

0	1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
Seq	MB ¹	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
154.	JP 13	08 Concept Package		1-Major Technical	Since Concept_System and Concept are introduced, it should adopt the framework of ISO 1087-1. But, the structure of Concept Package is very different from the one of ISO 1087-1. It should be similar. In addition to 3.2 Concepts of ISO 1098-1, 3.3 Definitions, 3.4 Designation and 3.5 Terminology are also important parts of ISO 1087-1. The structures of them should also be introduced into 11179-3 Ed3.		Withdrawn
155.	GB 20	08.1.1	Figure 8.1	ed	The "concept_system_importation" association has an extra 'corner'.	Update figure.	Accepted Done.
156.	US 36	08.1.1	Figure 8-1	te	Figure 8-1 shows the associations "concept_system_importation" and "concept_system_reference" as each having one-way navigability. Navigation in the other direction would make an implementation a unable to be a strictly conforming registry.	Add text to explain that navigation one way is required for conformance, but navigability in both directions is allowed.	Accepted Action required. See also US 37 (#165)
157.	JP 14	08.1.1 Overview (of Concept System Region) Figure 8.1		2-Minor Technical	Intuitively, Relation and Link are understood as disjoint. Then, an ontology in RDF and OWL-full cannot be handled because a Relation may be a Link at the same time. Note: Concept has no problem because a concept in ISO 1087-1 may be a general concept (concept ,class) or individual concept (individual, instance).		The comment shows a misunderstanding of Link. A Relation is a set of tuples. A Link is one of those tuples. No change required.
158.	CA 78	08.1.2.1	para 1	Ed	An indefinite article is missing in the first sentence.	insert 'a' before 'unit of knowledge'	Accepted. Done.

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.

0	1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
Seq	MB ¹	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
159.	JP 15	08.1.2.1 <i>Concept</i>		2- Minor Techn ical	Concept needs to have an association, preferably an aggregation with Characteristic because Concept is a class which represents a concept, which is created by a unique combination of characteristic, according to ISO 1087-1.		Needs discussion. It has been suggested that the class named Characteristic should really be Characteristic Type, in which case the proposed association would not apply.
160.	JP 16	08.1.2.1 <i>Concept and most of others</i>		4- Minor Editorial	"Concept is a class which represents a concept" should be " Concept is a class whose instance represents a concept." to be more clear and precise.		Accepted with modifications. Use: 'each instance of which models', instead of 'whose instance represents'. Done See also US-65 (#77) Apply to the description of all other classes as well. Done
161.	US 52	08.1.2.2	Para 1	te	The term "domain of discourse" is used here, and it is not defined or used anywhere else. What is it? If "domain of discourse" and "universe of discourse" mean the same thing, then a "concept system" is a "context" (see 6.2.2.5). If they are the same thing, then they need to be specified that way. On the other hand, there are many uses of "context" in which a "concept system" is not implied, and vice-versa. They are not the same thing.	Remove the (2 nd) sentence with the term in it. The TC 37 definition of "concept system" is in the 1 st sentence. The 2 nd sentence is unnecessarily confusing. Neither 8.1.2.2 nor 6.2.2.5 should be using the term "universe of discourse" or "domain of discourse". If Clause 3.4.17 remains, the the definition needs to change to avoid reference to "Universe of Discourse". Consider the description of Context in light of its use in 11179 and consider specifically referencing the description of context in 19773.	Agree to delete 2 nd sentence in 8.1.2.2.1. Done. In 3.4.17, replace 'Universe of Discourse' by 'Circumstances'. Done. Reword 6.2.2.5 to conform to agreed rewording of clauses relating to Classes modelling concepts. Done. Replaced 'is a universe of discourse' by 'represents circumstances'.

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.

0	1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
Seq	MB ¹	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
162.	JP 17	08.1.2.2 <i>Concept_System</i>		1- Major Technical	When we see "MaritalStatus" example at F.2.2 SKOS Example Thesaurus, MaritalStatus in SKOS/Turtle is an instance of Concept_System. Then, MaritalStatus in SKOS/RDF-XML also can be instances of Concept_System, although they are semantically equivalent. Concept_System should be independent of representation (notation), since a concept system is fairly conceptual and independent of representation. One of the characteristics of ISO 1087-1 is to distinguish "Concepts" (ISO 1087-1 3.2) and "Designations" (ISO 1087-1 3.4). If 11179-3 Ed3 adopt the framework of ISO 1087-1, 11179-3 Ed3 should also distinguish "Concepts" and "Designation". Concept_System of 11179-3 Ed3 is about "Designations" because it is dependent on representation, although a concept system of ISO 1087-1 is about "Concepts".		Needs discussion
163.	CA 79	08.1.2.2.1	para 1	Ed	There are two periods at the end of the 2 nd sentence.	Remove one of the periods.	Accepted. However, the resolution of JP 18 (#167) deletes the sentence.
164.	CA 80	08.1.2.2.1	para 3	Ed	'ontology' is not a defined term, so should not be italicized.	Remove the italics, unless another ballot comment adds a definition.	Accepted. However, the resolution of JP 19 (#168) deletes the sentence.
165.	US 37	08.1.2.2.1 08.1.3.3 08.1.3.4		te	What is the difference between & concept_system_reference & concept_system_importation?	Provide better specification	Explanation to be added. Action required. See also US 36 (#156)
166.	US 38	08.1.2.2.1	8.1.2.2.1 Description of Concept_System	te	"Partonomy" is jargon.	We suggest to replace "partonomy" by "meronymy", the scientific term used in linguistics.	Accepted, but with spelling amended to meronymy . Done. [Note however that scientific terms are jargon by definition]

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.

0	1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
Seq	MB ¹	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
167.	JP 18	08.1.2.2.1 <i>Description of Concept_System</i>		2-Minor Technical	"It is used to describe a domain (universe?)of discourse" should be deleted because intuitively what is used to describe a domain of discourse is terminology and not a concept system even though the meaning of "describe" is vague .		Accepted. Done . See US 52 (#161).
168.	JP 19	08.1.2.2.1 <i>Description of Concept_System</i>		2-Minor Technical	An ontology is not a concept system. A concept system is fairly conceptual, but an ontology is a specification (a representation). A representation of a concept system can be an ontology, but an ontology itself is not a concept system.		Delete 1 st sentence of para 3. Done . Also, everywhere, a Class models a concept, instead of represents. Done .
169.	JP 20	08.1.2.3.1 <i>Description of Assertion</i>		3-Major Editorial	"Assertion shall participate in the following associations:" should be "An assertion shall participate in the following associations:" to be consistent with others such as "A Concept may" at 8.1.2.1 (Pronoun "A" is necessary because the sentence prescribes its multiplicity.)		Accepted.. Done .
170.	CA 81	08.1.2.4.1	Editor's note	Te	Resolve Editor's Note #29	To be submitted to BRM.	Proposal required .
171.	CA 82	08.1.2.4.1	1 st bullet item	Ed	relation_roleset s/b relation_role_set	Make the correction.	Accepted. Done .
172.	CA 83	08.1.2.4.1	1 st bullet item	Ed	The missing xref should be fixed.	The xref should be to 8.1.3.8.	Accepted. Done .
173.	JP 21	08.1.2.5 <i>Relation_Role</i> 08.1.4.1 <i>Link_End</i>		2-Minor Technical	For an ontology described in a language that does not have role explicitly such as KIF, how Relation_Role and Link_End are specified.		Add some explanatory text. Action required .
174.	CA 84	08.1.2.5.1	1 st bullet item	Ed	The missing xref should be fixed.	The xref should be to 8.1.3.8.	Accepted. Done .
175.	CA 85	08.1.2.6	Link	Te	The usage of Link and associated Link_Ends is unclear.	Additional explanation and examples are needed.	Accepted Action required .

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.

0	1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
Seq	MB ¹	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
176.	US 39	08.1.2.6		te	The way that the CD2 metamodel represents Relations and Links may leads to confusion and extreme complexity with regard to level pairs.	Explain in the text that a relation as a set of tuples, a link is one of the tuples, Thus a link is an element of the set. The type instance paradigm is not applicable. See also 3.4.81	Accepted. Action required. See also US 30 (#45)
177.	JP 22	08.1.2.6 Link		2-Minor Technical	The meaning of Concept at " <i>Link_End</i> (8.1.4.1) with two or more <i>Concepts</i> (8.1.2.1) " is unclear. It needs to clearly specify whether this means individual concept or general concept. So, Ed3 is better to introduce <i>Individual_Concept</i> and <i>General_Concept</i> , in addition to just <i>Concept</i> .		Distinction between General and Individual Concept may depend on perspective. Tentatively not accepted.
178.	JP 24	08.1.2.6 Link		2-Minor Technical	It is better to allow a Link with only one <i>Link_End</i> (even not reflective) to support a <i>rdf:type C</i> or <i>C(a)</i> since Relation of arity 1 (i.e. general concept) is allowed.		Not Accepted A Unary Relation is just a Concept. Add some text to this effect. Action required.
179.	JP 23	08.1.2.6 Link-end		2-Minor Technical	Link-end may possibly be with only one Concept if the link is reflexive.		Add text to explain that a reflexive relation must be specified using Assertion rather than Link. Check wording with Kevin. Action required.
180.	GB 21	08.1.2.6, 08.1.3.7		te	Inconsistency. 8.1.2.6 says that Link <u>may</u> participate in "relation_membership". 8.1.3.7 implies that Link <u>shall</u> participate in "relation_membership".	[None proposed]	8.1.2.6 is wrong. Change 'may' to 'shall', and restructure the text accordingly. Action required.
181.	US 53	08.1.3.2	Last para	te	This paragraph is difficult to understand. The terms "committed to" and "uniform ontological commitment" are not defined, and sound like terms of art for a particular user community. Since 11179 is supposed to be useful to a wide variety of users, the use of these terms is a source of confusion.	Rewrite the paragraph so that it can be understood by someone outside of the ontological community.	Accepted Action required.

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.

0	1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
Seq	MB ¹	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
182.	CA 86	08.1.3.4	1 st para	Ed	The missing xrefs should be fixed.	The xref to Concepts s/b to 8.1.2.1. The xref to Assertion s/b to 8.1.2.3.	Accepted Done .
183.	JP 25	08.2 <i>Classification metamodel region</i>		1- Major Technical	This is very different from ISO/IEC 11179-2 :2005 (Ed2). Does this supersede ISO/IEC 11179-2 :2005 (Ed2)?		Yes. WG2 needs to discuss the future of 11179-2 at the London interim meeting. No action here.
184.	CA 87	08.2.1	Editor's note	Te	Resolve Editor's Note #30	To be submitted to BRM.	Proposal required.
185.	CA 88	08.2.1	Figure 8-2	Te	Further to related comments on clause 4.5, <<type>> should be <<stereotype>>	Change <<type>> to <<stereotype>> in Classifiable_Item in Figure 8-2.	Discuss in conjunction with US 61 (#65)
186.	JP 26	08.2.2.1 <i>Classifiable_Item</i>		2- Minor Technical	The meaning of Classifiable_Item is unclear partly because "classes" here are unclear. This may correspond to object at 3.1.1 of ISO 1087-1. If 11179 Part3 Ed3 adopts the framework of ISO 1087-1, this should be Object, whose description is "Object is a class whose instance represents an object at 3.1.1 of ISO 1087-1."		The use of the word 'classes' is wrong' It should be 'metadata items'. Done. Also added xref to 4.5.
187.	CA 88	08.2.2.3	para 1	Ed	In the third line, 'to' is missing after 'respect'	Make the correction.	Accepted. Done .
188.	CA 90	08.2.4.2	para 1	Ed	The xref should not be in parentheses when it is directly referenced in the sentence.	Remove the parentheses from around the xref.	Accepted. Done .
189.	CA 91	09.1.1	Figure 9-1	Ed	In the Binary_Relation class, the names of the attribute are the same as the names of the datatypes assigned to the attributes, except for capitalization. It is possible that this could cause implementation problems in some systems that might not support case sensitivity, and also do not allow multiple objects, even of different types to have the same name.	Choose different names for the attributes and the datatypes. Discuss possible names at the BRM.	Not accepted. See also CA 67 (#135) See also GB 16 (#140)
190.	CA 92	10	Editor's note	Te	Resolve Editor's Note #31	To be submitted to BRM.	Proposal required.

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.

0	1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
Seq	MB ¹	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
191.	US 54	10	Figure 10-1	te	A DEC may be associated with many CDs. For instance, the characteristic <i>marital status</i> may correspond to the sets of properties {single, married} or {single, married, separated, divorced, widowed}. These sets of properties are CDs.	Change the cardinality to 0..*. The optional part of this corresponds to the idea that a characteristic (a determinable) might exist independently of its properties (determinants). for a CD the value meanings are distinct.	Needs discussion. This would be a major change from Edition 2. If the set of properties is different, these are different DEC's. Recommend not to accept.
192.	CA 93	10.1.1	Editor's note	Te	Resolve Editor's Note #32	To be submitted to BRM.	Proposal required.
193.	CA 94	10.1.1	Editor's note	Te	Resolve Editor's Note #33	To be submitted to BRM.	Proposal required.
194.	CA 95	10.1.1	Editor's note	Te	Resolve Editor's Note #34	To be submitted to BRM.	Proposal required.
195.	US 40	10.1.2.5		te	The text states that a data_element_concept is an abstraction of one or more data elements, in contradiction to the figure and the clause for data element.	The text should be modified so that it does not imply that a data_element_concept cannot exist without being associated with at least one data element.	Resolved by JP 03 (#38). Revert to definition from edition 2. Done.
196.	US 55	10.1.4.1	3 rd para	te	The wording is supposed to be formal, but the dual usage of terms (meaning and domain) is confusing and incomplete, and therefore not formal.	Remove the paragraph, as it does not add clarification to the sub-clause.	Accepted. Done.
197.	US 58	10.1.4.1	3 rd para	te	The wording is supposed to be formal, but the dual usage of terms (meaning and domain) is confusing and incomplete.	Remove the paragraph, as it does not add clarification to the sub-clause.	Same as US 55 (#196)
198.	US 56	10.2	Figure 10.2	te	"Object class" and "characteristic" should be mandatory elements of a DEC.	Make relations from OC to DEC and Ch to DEC mandatory and make appropriate changes to sub-clauses 10.2l.3.1 and 10.3.2.3.	Needs discussion. These were deliberately made optional in Edition 2, because not every user wants to have to specify them. Recommend not accept.

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.

Editor's 5th Draft Resolution of Comments on SC32 N1851 CD2 11179-3

Date: 2009-11-05

Document: JTC 1/SC 32/WG 2/N1327

0	1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
Seq	MB ¹	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
199.	US 59	10.2	Figure 10.2	te	"Object class" and "characteristic" should be mandatory elements of a DEC.	Make relations from OC to DEC and Ch to DEC mandatory and make appropriate changes to sub-clauses 10.2l.3.1 and 10.3.2.3.	Same as US 56 (#199)
200.	CA 96	10.2.2.2	Editor's note	Te	Resolve Editor's Note #35	To be submitted to BRM.	Proposal required.
201.	JP 27	10.2.2.2 <i>Characteristic</i>		2-Minor Techn ical	A characteristic is not necessarily a concept, according to ISO 1087-1. "Characteristics are used for describing concepts."		Not accepted. The fact that Characteristics are used to describe Concepts, does not prevent them also being Concepts.
202.	JP 28	10.2.2.2 <i>Characteristic</i>		2-Minor Techn ical	According to ISO 1087-1, characteristic is abstraction of a property of an object or of a set of objects. But, 10.2.2.2 says it is common to all of the members of a given object class, which is not true.		Delete the sentence.
203.	US 41	10.2.2.4		ed	Subclause 10.2.2.4 is mislabelled. Subclause is labelled "Concept_Domain". It should be "Conceptual_Domain"	Change as indicated.	Accepted. Done.
204.	JP 29	10.2.2.4 <i>Concept_Dom ain</i>		4-Minor Editori al	Concept_Domain should be Conceptual_Domain.		Same as US 41 (#203)
205.	CA 97	10.2.3.1	All	Te	Modifications to this sub-clause in response to a CD1 ballot comment are still pending. Also, the sub-clause should be rewritten in the revised style used for the description of associations.	Rewrite the sub-clause in accordance with the resolution of CD1 ballot US S16 (seq #249), and in the revised style to be consistent with the rest of the document.	Accepted Help required.
206.	US 42	10.2.3.1 10.2.3.3	Figure 10-2	ed	Figure 10-2 does not match the text of Subclauses 10.2.3.1 and 10.2.3.3 for the roles on the associations.	Revise text to match the figure.	Accepted Help required.
207.	CA 98	10.2.3.2	All	Ed	This sub-clause should be rewritten in the revised style used for the description of associations.	Rewrite the sub-clause in the revised style to be consistent with the rest of the document.	Accepted Help required.

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.

Editor's 5th Draft Resolution of Comments on SC32 N1851 CD2 11179-3

Date: 2009-11-05

Document: JTC 1/SC 32/WG 2/N1327

0	1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
Seq	MB ¹	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
208.	CA 99	10.2.3.3	All	Te	Modifications to this sub-clause in response to a CD1 ballot comment are still pending. Also, the sub-clause should be rewritten in the revised style used for the description of associations.	Rewrite the sub-clause in accordance with the resolution of CD1 ballot US S17 (seq #250), and in the revised style to be consistent with the rest of the document.	Accepted Help required.
209.	US 57	10.2.3.3	1 st para	te	A value meaning is a concept, but the text does not indicate this.	Change the text to reflect this fact.	Accepted Help required.
210.	CA 100	10.3.2.1.1	Last para	Ed	There is a xref missing at the end of the last sentence. Also, the word `Section` is not needed.	Replace `Section` by `10.4.2.2.`	Accepted. Done.
211.	US 60	10.3.2.3.1	1 st para	te	A value meaning is a concept, but the text does not indicate this.	Change the text to reflect this fact.	This is already stated in the last sentence of the paragraph. No action required.
212.	CA 101	10.3.2.7	New	Te	The resolution of CD1 ballot comment US m-1140 (#256) has not yet been implemented.	Implement the resolution of the ballot comment, by adding an example based on ISO 3166-3.	Accepted. To be done.
213.	US 43	10.3.2.9		ge	There is confusion about the relationship between ISO 21090 and the data types specified in 10.3.2.9. There are unfounded statements about that assert that 11179 is incapable of dealing with the 21090 data types	Add text in Clause 10.3.2.9: There are many areas that have standardized datatypes. This part of 11179 is intended to accommodate datatypes from data type schemes specified in external standards. It is also intended to accommodate other non-standard datatype schemes. Possible standardized datatype schemes include ISO/IEC 11404 (General Purpose Datatypes), ISO/IEC 9075 (SQL dataype), XML Schema datatypes, C programming language datatypes, etc.	Accepted. Action required.
214.	CA 102	10.3.2.9.1	Editor's note	Te	Resolve Editor's Note #36	To be submitted to BRM.	Proposal required.
215.	CA 103	10.3.3.1	All	Ed	This sub-clause should be rewritten in the revised style used for the description of associations.	Rewrite the sub-clause in the revised style to be consistent with the rest of the document.	Accepted. Action required.

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.

Editor's 5th Draft Resolution of Comments on SC32 N1851 CD2 11179-3

Date: 2009-11-05

Document: JTC 1/SC 32/WG 2/N1327

0	1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
Seq	MB ¹	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
216.	CA 104	10.3.3.2	All	Te	Modifications to this sub-clause in response to a CD1 ballot comment are still pending. Also, the sub-clause should be rewritten in the revised style used for the description of associations.	Rewrite the sub-clause in accordance with the resolution of CD1 ballot US S18 (seq #257), and in the revised style to be consistent with the rest of the document.	Accepted. Action required.
217.	CA 105	10.3.3.3	Editor's note	Te	Resolve Editor's Note #37	To be submitted to BRM.	Proposal required.
218.	CA 106	10.3.3.3	All	Te	Modifications to this sub-clause in response to a CD1 ballot comment are still pending. Also, the sub-clause should be rewritten in the revised style used for the description of associations.	Rewrite the sub-clause in accordance with the resolution of CD1 ballot US S18 (seq #257), and in the revised style to be consistent with the rest of the document.	Accepted. Action required.
219.	CA 107	10.3.3.4	All	Te	Modifications to this sub-clause in response to a CD1 ballot comment are still pending. Also, the sub-clause should be rewritten in the revised style used for the description of associations.	Rewrite the sub-clause in accordance with the resolution of CD1 ballot US S19 (seq #258), and in the revised style to be consistent with the rest of the document.	Accepted. Action required.
220.	CA 108	10.3.3.5	All	Te	Modifications to this sub-clause in response to a CD1 ballot comment are still pending. Also, the sub-clause should be rewritten in the revised style used for the description of associations.	Rewrite the sub-clause in accordance with the resolution of CD1 ballot US S20 (seq #259), and in the revised style to be consistent with the rest of the document.	Accepted. Action required.
221.	CA 109	10.3.4.2	Editor's note	Te	Resolve Editor's Note #38	To be submitted to BRM.	Proposal required.
222.	CA 110	10.3.4.2	Editor's note	Te	Resolve Editor's Note #39	To be submitted to BRM.	Proposal required.
223.	CA 111	10.4.1	Editor's note	Te	Resolve Editor's Note #40	To be submitted to BRM.	Proposal required.
224.	CA 112	10.4.2.1	Editor's note	Te	Resolve Editor's Note #41	To be submitted to BRM.	Proposal required.
225.	CA 113	10.5.2.5.1	New	Te	Modifications to this sub-clause in response to CD1 ballot comment US m1210 (seq #266) are still pending.	Implement the resolution of the ballot comment, by adding an example	Accepted. Action required.
226.	CA 114	10.5.2.6	New	Te	Modifications to this sub-clause in response to CD1 ballot comment KR 02 (seq #267) are still pending.	Implement the resolution of the ballot comment, by adding an example	Accepted. Action required.

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.

Editor's 5th Draft Resolution of Comments on SC32 N1851 CD2 11179-3

Date: 2009-11-05

Document: JTC 1/SC 32/WG 2/N1327

0	1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
Seq	MB ¹	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
227.	CA 115	10.5.2.6	Editor's note	Te	Resolve Editor's Note #42	To be submitted to BRM.	Proposal required.
228.	CA 116	10.5.3.1	Editor's note	Te	Resolve Editor's Note #43	To be submitted to BRM.	Proposal required.
229.	GB 22	10.6	Figure 10.6	ed	Inconsistency – in this Figure “*” instead of the “0..*” used in other Figures.	Change all instances of “*” to “0..*.”.	Accepted. Done.
230.	US 44	10.6	Figure 10-6	ed	Figure 10-6 shows the use of Date_Time	Change Date_Time to Datetime	Accepted. Done.
231.	US 45	10.6	Figure 10-6	ed	The presentation of the multiplicity is not consistent with the rest of the figures.	The presentation of the multiplicity should be consistent with the rest of the figures.	Accepted. Done.
232.	CA 117	11	Editor's note	Te	Resolve Editor's Note #44, also CD1 ballot comments CA-89 (seq #303) & US m1430 (seq #304)	To be done by Editor for FCD.	Accepted. Action required.
233.	GB 23	11		ge	The status of clause 11 (edition 2 style basic attributes) is not clear. It is known to be inconsistent with the metamodel of the earlier clauses. The conformance clause suggests that it is an alternative, but the editor's note indicates that it may be made consistent. Given that 11179-3 is a conceptual model anyway, clause 11 should be dropped if its contents have now been completely covered by the metamodel. If there is a desire for some implementations to support only this limited set of attributes, an expanded conformance clause could describe the corresponding profile.	Move and convert clause 11 into an expanded conformance clause describing an edition 2 style profile.	The purpose of this clause is to describe basic attributes for uses that do not involve a registry, in the style of Edition 1. The current clause is based on the Edition 2 model. It will be revised to reflect the Edition 3 model. The conformance clause needs to be modified to allow conformance to the Basic Attributes alone by a non-registry applications.
234.	US 46	11		te	The material in Clause 11 was introduced to make the basic attributes from Edition 1 into a subset of Edition 2. The notion of Basic attributes is no longer needed.	Use Clause 11 to expand Annex D with appropriate editing and make Annex D normative.	Not accepted. The basic attributes are used by non-registry applications. Resolved by GB 23 (#233)
235.	CA 118	11.1	Editor's note	Te	Resolve Editor's Note #45	To be done by Editor for FCD.	Accepted. Action required.

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.

Editor's 5th Draft Resolution of Comments on SC32 N1851 CD2 11179-3

Date: 2009-11-05

Document: JTC 1/SC 32/WG 2/N1327

0	1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
Seq	MB ¹	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
236.	CA 119	11.2.1	Editor's note	Te	Resolve Editor's Note #46	To be done by Editor for FCD.	Accepted. Action required.
237.	CA 120	11.2.4	Note 1	Ed	There is a missing xref in Note 1.	The xref s/b 8.2.	Accepted. Action required.
238.	CA 121	11.4	Editor's note	Te	Resolve Editor's Note #47	To be done by Editor for FCD.	Accepted. Action required.
239.	US 64	12		te	It is not clear how to map between a UML model element and an implementation. What affect does the <<type>> stereotype or interface declaration have? The text in 12.1 is not adequate.	Expand Clause 12.1 and add informative annex with implementation guidance.	Accepted in principle. Explanatory text does not belong in clause 12. Normative text should be in clause 4. Informative text can be in the new Annex. Clause 12 should be clear as to conformance requirements. Action required.
240.	GB 24	12 and general		te	The approach to conformance and profiles has left some of the metamodel rather short of semantics. Aspects of use of certain important abstract classes (such as Classifiable) are left unspecified other than in conformance profiles. Some fundamental relationships are defined only in 12.4.2 and not in the metamodel, which until that point leaves the reader wondering how the class hierarchies were related.	Avoid defining completely new semantics in conformance section – define semantics in metamodel and then explain different conformance profiles.	Accepted. Action required.
241.	US 62	12.2		ed	The paragraphs between 12.2 and 12.2.1 are “hanging paragraphs,” which should be avoided (ISO/IEC Directives, Part 2, Edition 5, Clause 5.2.4).	Insert level 3 heading right after 12.2 heading and call it “12.2.1 General”.	Accepted. Action required.
242.	US 63	12.2 and throughout	Last paragraph	ed	“A strictly conforming implementation may be limited in usefulness but is maximally interoperable with respect to this part of ISO/IEC 11179. A conforming implementation may be more useful, but may be less interoperable with respect to this part of ISO/IEC 11179.” The word “may” should only be used to grant permission (ISO/IEC Directives, Part 2, Edition 5, Annex H).	Change “may” to “might”. Whole document needs to be checked for correct use of “may”.	Accepted. Action required.

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.

Editor's 5th Draft Resolution of Comments on SC32 N1851 CD2 11179-3

Date: 2009-11-05

Document: JTC 1/SC 32/WG 2/N1327

0	1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
Seq	MB ¹	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
243.	CA 122	12.4	All	Te	Bugzilla issue 473 proposes that information on conformance to Edition 1 and Edition 2 be moved to an informative Annex.	Move the descriptions as suggested.	Accepted. Action required. (Same as JP 30 (#245))
244.	US 47	12.4		ed	Subclause 12.4 needs references to clause name and clause number whenever one or the other is referenced.	Reference clause name and number as indicated.	Accepted. Action required.
245.	JP 30	12.4.1 Table 12-1 – Comparison for Conformance Levels across Editions of ISO/IEC 11179-3		3-Major Editorial	Since Edition 3 supersedes Edition 1 and 2, all the specifications should be about Edition 3 only. At least, this table should go to an informative annex such as Annex D or E.		Accepted. Action required. (Same as CA 122 (#243))
246.	CA 123	99 Annex A	Title	Te	This annex lists not just terms from clause 3, but also Designations from other clauses.	Append 'and Designations' to the title.	Accepted. Done
247.	CA 124	99 Annex A	Table heading	Te	This annex lists not just terms from clause 3, but also Designations from other clauses.	Change the heading of the first table column to: Term / Designation.	Accepted. Done. (See also US 48 (#249))
248.	CA 125	99 Annex A	New	Te	This annex lists not just terms from clause 3, but also Designations from other clauses.	Add a new paragraph at the front of the Annex as follows: "In the table below, if the definition comes from a clause 3.n.n, then the item being defined is a general term. If the definition comes from clause 5.n.n.n through 10.n.n.n.n, then the item being defined is a construct within the metamodel.	Accepted. Action required.
249.	US 48	99 Annex A		ed	The items in column 1 of the table are not all terms and in column 2 are not all pointers to "definitions".	Either change the headings and description of the table, or use different columns for model element names than for terms.	Resolved by CA 124 (#247)
250.	CA 126	99 Annex B	Figure B-1	Te	Further to comments on clause 4.5, <<type>> in Figure B-1 should be <<stereotype>>	Change all instances of <<type>> in Figure B-1 to <<stereotype>>	Resolved by US 61 (#65)

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.

0	1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
Seq	MB ¹	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
251.	JP 32	99 Annex B (normative) Consolidated Class Hierarchy		2-Minor Technical	It is not clear whether this diagram shows subclass hierarchy or subtype hierarchy. Its notation is exactly same as Figure 4.2 – Types of items.		It is a class hierarchy.
252.	JP 31	99 Annex B Figure B.1- Consolidated Class Hierarchy		1-Major Technical	The hierarchy of Concept needs to be examined and clarified. Are they mece or not? How each subclass is different. For example, what is a difference between (unary?) Relation and (Enumerated_?)Conceptual_Domain? What is a difference between Object_Class and (unary?) Relation? Is there a Concept that is not a Value_Meaning? What is the notion of gender? Is it a (unary) Relation or a Enumerated_Conceptual_Domain? What is the notion of male? Is it a (unary) Relation or a Value_Meaning? The difference needs to be clearly stated at the description of the classes. Why aren't Assertion, Link nor Link_End a Concept?	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Introduce General Concept and Individual Concept as subclass of Concept 2) Assertion and Link should treated as a Concept 3) Remove Characteristics from Concept. 4) Do we still need still need Object_Class? 	<p>Not accepted.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) On other comments we have decided that the distinction depends on perspective, and we should not add the distinction at this time. 2) Need greater rationale before this is accepted. 3) We have examples where Characteristic is a kind of Concept. 4) Yes, we need Object Class in clause 10. <p>Consider whether what we call Characteristic should be Characteristic type.</p>
253.	CA 127	99 Annex C	Editor's note	Te	Editor's Note #48 calls on the US NB to provide updates to this Annex to align it with the normative metamodel.	Remove Annex C unless complete updates are provided in time for FCD.	No updates have been provided. Delete the Annex.
254.	JP 33	99 Annex C C.8 Item Rules Table		2-Minor Technical	The meanings of Rule 1,..., Rule4 and one or more, one, no are unclear. Needs some text to explain what this table means.		Resolved by CA 128 (#255)
255.	CA 128	99 Annex C.8	Item rules	Ed	The table in C.8 was the original table provided by US ballot comment that became Table 4-1 in clause 4.5. The table is not needed in this Annex.	Delete clause C.8, even if the rest of the Annex is retained.	Accepted. Action required.

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.

Editor's 5th Draft Resolution of Comments on SC32 N1851 CD2 11179-3

Date: 2009-11-05

Document: JTC 1/SC 32/WG 2/N1327

0	1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
Seq	MB ¹	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
256.	CA 129	99 Annex D	Editor's note	Te	Resolve Editor's Note #50	To be done by Editor for FCD.	Accepted. Action required.
257.	CA 130	99 Annex D	Editor's note	Te	Resolve Editor's Note #51. CD1 ballot comments seq #315 through #364 also relate to this note.	To be done by Editor for FCD.	Accepted. Action required.
258.	CA 131	99 Annex D.1.1	Editor's note	Te	Resolve Editor's Note #52	To be done by Editor for FCD.	Accepted. Action required.
259.	CA 132	99 Annex D.2.6.2	Editor's note	Te	Resolve Editor's Note #53	To be done by Editor for FCD.	Accepted. Action required.
260.	US 49	99 Annex F		ed	Annex F does not use the same terms as the normative clauses	"Container" should be replaced with "source". A more complete explanation should be given for the structure of the tables. Make sure that all other terms are consistent with the normative clauses.	Accepted. Action required.
261.	CA 133	99 Annex F.2.2	Turtle	Te	Add reference to where information about Turtle can be found.	To be done by Editor for FCD.	Accepted. Action required.
262.	CA 134	99 Annex F.2.2	All	Te	It is unclear from the example exactly what would be contained within the MDR, and what would need to be added by a translator generating Turtle notation. For example, the items listed under 'Concept' should probably not be prefixed 'ms:' in the MDR, rather this prefix should be added by a Turtle generator.	Remove Turtle syntax from MDR content. Add explanatory text about what should be included in MDR content, and what should not.	Accepted. Action required. Example to be clarified. See also JP 35 (#264)
263.	JP 34	99 Annex F.2.2 SKOS Example Thesaurus and general		2-Minor Technical	For example, it is not clear whether, for example, 11179 Part3 Ed3 registry stores and manages this marital status thesaurus, or, this marital status thesaurus exists outside of 11179 Part3 Ed3 registry, and 11179 Part3 Ed3 registry only stores and manages some kind of metadata (or administered_ information) and a small part of structure (or semantics) of this marital status thesaurus.		Add a constraint to Assertion that if a formula is specified, all the Concept Systems that use it must specify the same notation. Action required. Consider whether to add a notation to Assertion (not yet agreed).

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.

0	1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
Seq	MB ¹	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
264.	JP 35	99 Annex F.2.3 Example Value Domain References Table F-7 <Enumerated_Conceptual_Domain>		2-Minor Technical	This is an example of Enumerated_Value_Domain because ms:Single etc. are values. At least, they should be "notion designated (or denoted or represented) by ms:Single" etc.		Discuss in conjunction with CA 134 (#262) The example needs to be clarified. Action required. This is a Conceptual Domain and the values shown are the representation of the Value Meanings of the domain.
265.	OA SIS	05.1.3 05.1.5		Te	Person <=> Contact model mismatches	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Suggest aligning with regrep with a common Party class that Organization and Person extend ○ Add address, phone etc. to Party ○ Take away title from Person and instead make it an attribute of association with an organization (titles or roles are in the context of a relationship with some organization) 	Needs discussion by WG2.
266.	OA SIS	05.1.14		Te	Registration_Authority_Identifier	Why have separate attribute for registration_authority_identifier. Better to represent registration_authority via an Organization and use orgs identifier	11179-6 requires the use of ISO/IEC 6523 identifiers for registration authorities, but we don't want to require this for all organizations.
267.	OA SIS	06.1.2.2	Scoped Identifier	Te	Suggest simplifying identifier scheme. Consider providing an example that maps to a URN naming scheme		Opportunity for the future. Needs a detailed proposal. No changes at this time.
268.	OA SIS	06.2		Te	Designation and Definition region: This clause is very difficult to follow. It is not clear what a Designatable_Item is. Suggests providing examples and clearer definition * designation_sign attribute is particularly not clear		Examples to be considered. Proposals should be submitted as FCD ballot comments.

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.

0	1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
Seq	MB ¹	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
269.	OA SIS	07.1		Te	Registration metamodel region: Consider aligning this section with ISO 19135		Proposals should be submitted as FCD ballot comments.
270.	OA SIS	08.1.2.1		Te	Concept System section is difficult to understand. Suggest clarifying text and adding examples		Examples to be considered. Proposals should be submitted as FCD ballot comments.
271.	OA SIS	8.2.2		Te	Classes in the Classification region :Good alignment in Classification region		No action required.
272.	OA SIS	00 All		Ge	RegRep and 11179 have a very different model for handling language specific content. Perhaps this is an area where we can collaborate to achieve better alignment		Opportunity for future alignment. No action at this time.
273.	OA SIS	00 All		Ge	Does the spec have something analogous to ebXML RegRep RegistryPackage? If not, consider adding it as we have found it very useful.		Editor to review RegRep RegistryPackage and compare it to MDR Registration package. However, defer changes to FCD ballot comment,
274.	OA SIS	00 All		Ge	We were unable to find a place in the spec where Association support and Association metamodel was described. Consider defining a clearer Association metamodel		Editor to review RegRep support for Association. We have Relation in Concept System in Edition 3, and Concept_Relationship in the Data Element Concept region in Edition 2, but may need Association in Data Description region. However, defer changes to FCD ballot comment,
275.	OA SIS	00 All		Ge	We were unable to find a concept equivalent to Repository or RepositoryItem as defined in RegRep. Is this intentionally out of scope? If so, please clarify in 1. Scope section.		Add clarifying text in scope section 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.

Editor's 5th Draft Resolution of Comments on SC32 N1851 CD2 11179-3

Date: 2009-11-05	Document: JTC 1/SC 32/WG 2/N1327
------------------	---

0	1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
Seq	MB ¹	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
276.	OA SIS	00 All		Ge	Examine spec for forward references and minimize whenever possible. An example is that of Designatable_Item		Editor to review text. However, WG2 has previously decided that a logical sequence is more important than strictly avoiding forward references. In some cases, references are in both directions and cannot be avoided.
277.	OA SIS	00 All		Ge	Consider adding a reference to OASIS ebXML RegRep 3.0 specifications in Bibliography section		Accepted. Done.
278.	111 79-3 Edit or	05 to 10		Te	Multiplicity is used in the text, but not defined.	Add a definition of multiplicity as contained in 19763-2, along with that for cardinality which is referenced from multiplicity.	Accepted. Action required.

Key to shading: **Yellow = Issue that requires discussion to determine resolution**
Green = Issue that has been discussed and resolved at Jeju meeting.
 No shading = Proposed Resolution from Editor

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.