

ISO/IEC FCD3 19763 -2

MFI-2 core model
Comment and Resolution
(worksheet for discussion)

Masaharu Obayashi
SC32/WG2
2009.11.17

MFI-2 FCD3

- Text:
 - 32N1848
- Summary Voting:
 - 32N1909
- Disposition of Comment
 - WG2Nxxxx this worksheet (see Note of PPT)
 - WG2Nxxxx document (to be merged)

Summary

(main issues and change proposal)

- Introduction
 - Remove the reference on E-business
 - Suggestion by Finland
- 1. Scope
 - Not aligned with Part-1
- 2. Normative reference
- 3. Conformance
 - Annex A and B is informative or normative?
 - Conformance : Extension/strictly
- 4. Term Definition
 - move the definition of Model xxx (metamodel) to the section 5.
 - missing references of some term definition
- 5. core model
 - About the description of traditional 4 layer model MOF
 - rationale is needed for changed Model Package
 - The relationship with part-3 is unclear.
 - ORM model suggested from Canada
 - ModelByMOF and ModelInstances are not good names
 - Using typeCode is not appropriate , enumeration type is better?
 - The description of Cardinality and optional/mandatory is inconsistent.
 - UML is bloats (by Finland comment)
- Annex
 - Delete Annex D

Legend

id	clause	Summary of comment	status	note
			A	Accept the change proposal
			K	Keep the FCD3 description
			R	will prepare the refined modification
			P	change proposal prepared
			D	Need to be discussed
			C	Closed
			H	Harmonization needed

General, Introduction , 1. Scope

CA01		Remove the reference on E-business	A,D	GB05
CA03	scope	not aligned with 19763-1 Clause 5.1	A,H, D	
CA04	scope	is to be utilized by all parts of 19763	H,D	CA52, JP02, GB09, GB10
FI01	Intro.	Introduction as such may not be understood by a person that has no knowledge of (information) systems interoperability.	P	
FI02	Intro.	It is very unclear in the introduction if this standard has any importance. Is there a reason why I should read this standard?	A,P, D	
GB01	Gene.	The names of the metaclasses and the descriptions of them make it very difficult to understand the role or purpose of each metaclass within the overall metamodel.	D	
GB05		The potential use of MFI goes far beyond e-business and e-commerce and the broader application should be recognised.	A,D	CA01
CN01		In the first paragraph, the first sentence uses the phrase "core metamodel", but the third sentence says "core model", according to the last paragraph of the introduction section, only core model and metamodel should be used interchangeably.	A	

2. Conformance, 3. Normative Ref.

CA05		shall conform to Annex A and B, but informative	A,D	FI03
CA07		We do not understand why the wording for Strictly Conforming and Conforming needs to be different for row b and row c.	P,D	
CA08		“content conformance” should be described as part of the model	A,P	JP01
CA11		In row 1, the difference between Level 1 and Level 2 is that Level 2 allows for both Annex A and extensions. is the exclusion of Annex A from Level 1 deliberate.	A	CN02
FI03		Clause “satisfy the requirements of 5.2, 5.3, 5.4, 5.5, Annex A, and B” It should be decided if Annex A and B are mandatory or informative.	A,D	CA05
JP01		Both of them should address constraints as conformance conditions in addition to attributes and references. Otherwise, an implementation that does not hold the constraints specified can claim conformance.	K,D A	CN02 CA08
CN02		Can an implementation both conform level to 1 and 2?	A	CA11

4. Term Definition

CA22		a term 'metamodelling language' which is undefined.	A,P	
CA37		Metamodel classes should be defined in clause 5.	A	
GB02		"form of aggregation that ..." – "aggregation" is not defined.	A,P	
GB04		In both the clauses the note says "One of three obligation statuses ..." yet only two obligation statuses (mandatory and optional) are defined and used.	A	
CN03	4.2.16 composition	We find that the phrases are a little bit hard to understand.	K	
CN04	4.2.21 datatype	In datatype definition, why says that whose operations do not have side effects	K	

5 . Specification-1

CA39		The rationale for the changes to the packages from FCD2 to FCD3	A,R	
CA40		The description should provide an explanation of the class	A,R	
CA41		an ORM view of part of the model	D	
CA42		Insert a new heading before the paragraph.	A,R	
CA43		Annexes C through G provide additional explanatory text	A,R	
CA44		The reference to e-business is inappropriate	A	CA01
CA45		The new figure as given is a rehash of already existing figures and as such, is not acceptable unless it is an exact duplication of the original MOF or IRDS 4 level architecture	R,D	
CA48		The 3 rd sentence states: A metamodel is an “abstract language” for describing different kinds of data, that is a language without a concrete syntax and notation. Delete the 3 rd sentence.	R,D	
CA49		The 2nd sentence has problems similar to those of the 3rd sentence of item 3.Delete the 2nd sentence.	R,D	
CA52		It is the job of MFI part 1 to describe the whole family of standards.	H,A	CA04 ,JP02, GB09, GB10

5 . Specification-2

CA 53		Concept of a metaclass has been introduced in the caption. The earliest instance of this term in the text occurs only under Figure 4.	A,R	
CA 54		The usage and interpretations of the package connectors like <<use>> and <<reference>> is unclear	A,R	
CA 56		a normative clause which refers to an Informative Annex. LevelPair is shown as one of the packages in MFI Core so needs to be Normative.	A	
CA 57		The rationale used in determining the allocation of metaclasses to packages is not clear.	A,R	
CA 59		This clause refers to the relationship between MFI part 2 and part 3 but there is no such relationship.	H,A	
CA 60		5.2.1 states: A ModelByMOF <u>shall have</u> a PackagedObject using UML, but in Figure 4, the association is shown as optional.	A,R	
CA 61		Rename ModelByMOF to ModelObject.	A,D	GB13, CN16
CA 62		attribute MOFVersion is shown as string[1..1], with Use Optional,	K,D	GB11
CA 63		PackagedObject[0..1] is shown with Use Mandatory	K,D	GB11

5 . Specification-3

CA64		"A MOF compliant model should be recommended"? The meaning of this statement is unclear?	D	
CA69		The name 'has as upper' is not meaningful	D	CN19
CA70		ModelInstances is not a good name.	D	
FI04		Figure 7 should be presented earlier.	A	
FI05		Figures 1 and 7 are missing one alternative: In the level M0 there can be data in a database. In the level M1 there can be the database structure. In the level M2 there can be the database modelling language. In the level M3 there can be meta-modelling language. Consider adding database reality in figures 1 and 7. Actually, majority of the interoperable systems will be database systems.	A, D	
FI06		XMI has several versions. Which version of XMI is referred to?	A,R	
FI07		UML is a bloat.	K	
JP02		The description on other parts of MFI should be deleted. It is out of the scope of MFI Part2, but is a matter of MFI Part1.	H,A	CA52
JP03		There are several unclear data types such as URI of attribute "original" at 5.3.2 ModelSpecification, typeCode of attribute "model type" at 5.2.2 Model Classifier and typeCode of attribute "conceptualization" at 5.4.2 ModelInstances.	A,R	
JP04		These sub clauses should be deleted since MFI Part2 should not prescribe	H, A	CA52

5 . Specification-4

GB05	The potential use of MFI goes far beyond e-business and e-commerce and the broader application should be recognised.	D	CA01
GB09	The list of parts of 19763 is incomplete.	H,D	CA04,CA5 2,JP02
GB10	The statement that MFI Part 3 utilizes MFI Part 2 extensions will be incorrect if the current draft MFI Part 3 becomes accepted as a standard.	H,D	CA04,CA5 2,JP02
GB11	This says that for each attribute description the datatype and multiplicity are to be given with the attribute name and then under the use heading a statement as to whether the attribute is mandatory or optional. The statement of both the multiplicity and the obligation (under use) provides the potential for inconsistency, and there are many instances in succeeding clauses where there is such inconsistency.	K,D	CA62,CA6 3
GB12	The models are shown both diagrammatically and in text. It is unclear which takes precedence if the diagrams and the text are inconsistent.	D	
GB13	The description of ModelByMOF does no more than state where this metaclass fits within the model.	A	CA61, CN16
GB15	The datatype is shown as string. Should this not be an enumeration type? The values are fixed and known.		GB18
GB18	All of this indicates that the use of “typeCode” is inappropriate and an enumeration type would be more appropriate.		GB15

5 . Specification-5

GB22		The description does not appear to be describing what is indicated by the attribute name. It is, therefore, unclear what this attribute is supposed to indicate.	A,R	
CN05		The paper says that: "Any other metamodels described either using MOF or not using MOF can be placed independently within the MOF architecture."	A,R	
CN09		In figure2, there are lines with description says <<use>> and <<reference>>	A,R	
CN16		ModelByMOF has a mandatory attribute isMOFcompliant, so it can also no be a model by MOF. Then the name ModelByMOF may cause misunderstanding.	A	CA61, GB13
CN17		A ModelClassifier is identifying model construct and typed model as a construct.	A,R	
CN18		The paper says that ModelClassifiers as a model construct and refers ModelSelections as construct .What is a model construct and what is a construct? In the previous defination of names, there is only an item that called modeling construct. Is it the same with this one ?	A,R	

5 . Specification-6

CN19		Between the component ModelDomainProfile and ModelComponent the description says "Has as upper", but should aggregation be "has as lower"?	D	CA69
CN20		In figure6, there has been 2 binding constraint2. This may cause misunderstanding.	A,R	
CN21		In figure6, What's the difference between solid and dashed arrow ?	A,R	
CN22		In figure 6,Why says that ModelInstances is grouped by ModelComponentSet ?	A,R	
CN23		In figure6, What is the relationship between ModelSelection and ModelInstances?	A,R	
CN24		In figure 7, What's the conceptualization type between Metamodel and Modeling facility? And what about Modeling construct and Modeling facility? The figure seems missing these 2 notation.	A,R	
CN26		The paper says "A ModelSelection relates a ModelSign to a ModelInstances." What's the relation between ModelSeletion and ModelSign, and what does modelSign actually do ?	A,R	

Annex . A,B,C,D,E,F

CA71	A	Annex A is shown as Informative, but it is referenced from the Conformance clause, so needs to be Normative.	A	CA05 ,FI03,
CA72	B	Annex B is shown as Informative, but it is referenced from the Conformance clause, so needs to be Normative.	A	CA05 ,FI03
CA77	C	The class ModelClassifier does not match that used in Figure 4 on p.34. attachment type and classifier name are missing.	D	
CA78	C	Why are only some of the classes in Figure C.1 described?	A,R	
CA94	D	Annex D is shown as Informative, but it is shown as part of the MFI Core package in Figure 2, so needs to be Normative.	P, D	
JP08	A	It is not clear whether sign (DI-1) of ModelSign shall be the same as the value of attributes "sign" of ModelSign.	A,R	
JP09	A	DI-1 (concept id of ModelConcept) is NOT "specified by" DI-2 (domain name of ModelDomainProfile) since it can be an arbitrary string.	A	
JP10	5, A	In Figure 3 and Figure8, ModelAssociation is a subclass of AdministeredItem, however, the description in 5.5.1, also, in A.2 Identifier rule for Administered Items, is not mentioned.	A	