

ISO/IEC FCD2 19763 -4

Metamodel for model mapping
Comment and Resolution

(worksheet for discussion)

Masaharu Obayashi

SC32/WG2

2009.11.17

MFI-4 FCD2

- Text:
 - 32N1846
- Summary Voting:
 - 32N1908
- Disposition of Comment
 - WG2Nxxxx this worksheet (see Note of PPT)
 - WG2Nxxxx document (to be merged)

Summary

(main issues and change proposal)

- Introduction
 - replace the reference on E-business by broader target
- 1. Scope
- 2. Normative reference
- 3. Conformance
 - Conformance : Extension/strictly
- 4. Term Definition
 - missing references of some term definition
- 5. core model
 - Using typeCode is not appropriate , enumeration type is better?
 - The description of Cardinality and optional/mandatory is inconsistent.
- Annex

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

CA01		Defer progression of 19763-4 to FDIS until 19763-2 reaches FDIS.	D	
CA17-20		The first sentence “The Metamodel-Model Rule is constraints...” is not good English, and the intended meaning is not clear. The following sentence beginning “The Metamodel-Model Rule provides constraints...” does make sense.	A	
JP 01		Not proper font (like Tahoma) happens to be appeared in the FCD text (doc text). They should be changed to be proper font (such as Arial) Also, formatting such as section number is in disorder.		
UK03		“This part of ISO/IEC 19763 prescribes ...” The use of “prescribes” does not fit well within the context. Do you mean “describes”?	A,R	
UK09		This refers to the ModelDomainProfile and ModelComponentSet metaclasses defined in 19763-2. Since it is still unclear what the role of these classes is in 19763-2, it is equally unclear what the LevelPairRule metaclass in this part is doing. Clarification is required.	D	
UK14		The use of these tables is unclear. Provide further explanation of the use of these tables.	A,R	
UK16		This refers to a “Metamodel-Model Rule” and “Model-Value Rule”, implying that mapping is between levels. But in the presentation “Understanding MFI?” presented at the WG2 meeting in Sydney in May 2008 (now at WG2 N1286) the implication was that mapping is between ‘models’ at the same level, specifically at the M1 and the M2 level. During the discussion following the presentation this ‘mapping at a single level’ interpretation of the requirement was accepted. Clarification is needed as to what exactly is being mapped.	D	