

Disposition of 32N1858 Comments on 32N1819 CD 19763-5

Date: 2010-12-27 Document: ISO/IEC JTC1/SC32/WG2 N1492

1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
MB ¹	Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex (e.g. 3.1)	Paragraph/ Figure/Table /Note (e.g. Table 1)	Type of comment ²	Comment (justification for change) by the MB	Proposed change by the MB	Secretariat observations on each comment submitted
AU01	General		ge	<p>In preparing these comments, attention was paid to the following Japanese expert comments on WD2 of Part 5</p> <p>http://metadata-standards.org/metadata-stds/Document-library/Documents-by-number/WG2-N1151-N1200/WG2-N1186-Comments-on-WD19763-5-081110.pdf</p> <p>This is referred to as Reference 1 below.</p> <p>Note was also taken of the Roles, Goals, Process, Service thinking that appears to be influencing future directions for 19763.</p> <p>http://jtc1sc32.org/doc/N1751-1800/32N1776-WG2N1124-20080527-WangJian-RGPS.ppt</p> <p>This is referred to as Reference 2 below.</p> <p>In particular, WD1 for 19763-7 for service registration suggests there will be a 19763-8 for role & goal registration.</p>		
AU02	Document cover page		ed	Says "Part 3 : Metamodel for process model registration"	Should say "Part 5"	Done. Also see CA01.
AU03	5		ed	Conformance is Clause 5 in Part 5 but it is Clause 2 in Parts 1 to 4.	Conformance in Part 5 should be Clause 2, not Clause 5.	Done.
AU04	1 (Scope)		ge	<p>Overview Point 2 on Page 2 of Japanese expert comments (see Reference 1 cited earlier) "What is the difference between a process and a service?" is noted.</p> <p>Agree with WD1 on Part 7 (Service Registration) that a process is realised by one or more services. While it is currently noted on the WG2 website that Part 7 is accepted by WG2 but not approved by SC32, it is recommended Part 5 doesn't try to cover services as part of processes. Current scope statement <i>register...process</i></p>	Preferred wording left up to authors. Might also explicitly add the clarification that processes may be implemented / realized via services, with Part 5 focusing on the registration of processes rather than services. The "handoff" between processes and services could be handled in more detail in Part 7 if it proceeds.	Made corresponding changes to the scope statement. In the scope of CD2, it is said that <i>"The metamodel specified in this part is intended to promote semantic discovery and reuse of process models within/across process model repositories. For</i>

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

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

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

1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
MB 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
				<p><i>models, including workflows, business processes, Web services, etc.</i> could be seen as ambiguous. Part 5 should not cover web services but can cover the process models, workflows and business processes that underpin them. In particular business processes that take place over the web can involve a multitude of actors (humans and software) from a multitude of organizations so they can be complex and specialized compared with business processes more closely “contained” within organizations. It might therefore be appropriate to mention this type of process which is not so “contained” (which typically, but not always, is enabled via the web) but it shouldn’t be referred to in short hand as “web services”, which are only a means of realization of such processes. Might update Introduction as well.</p>	<p>Having worked out process registration and service registration a later edition might be able to set out a more common core for “process/service” registration – eg with more about a common framework for inputs, outputs, constraints etc. There seems to be enough difference in concepts, contexts and details, however, to keep separate – but linked – at this time. One implementation of one process could consist of multiple orchestrated services, and there can be different implementations of the same process, where two or more of the different implementations might actually use some services? Some of this complexity could be worked around by forcing “atomic processes” to be very fine grained and technical but it seems much better to have processes that are atomic from a business perspective, being able to be implemented by a number of services working together?</p>	<p><i>the purpose, it provides administrative information and common semantics of process models created with a specific process modeling language, including Business Process Modeling Notation (BPMN), UML(Unified Modeling Language) Activity Diagram, and EPC(Event-driven Process Chain), etc. In that case, the metamodel can help discover function and composition of a process, and reuse its components at different levels of granularity, rather than all of them.</i></p> <p>The relationship between this part and MFI-7(metamodel for service registration) is clarified in Clause5.2 as “Process can be performed by zero to many instances of Service and Service can perform only one instance of Process”</p> <p>Also see CA07.</p>
AU05	1 (Scope)		ge	<p>Scope questions on Page 3 of Japanese expert comments (see Reference 1 cited earlier) don’t appear to have been addressed directly.</p> <p>As not all process are workflows it is assumed</p>	<p>If some of the dot points listed fall outside scope then within Clause 2 note them as explicitly excluded.</p>	<p>Especially for on-demand service selection and composition, business process is widely used to represent the execution order</p>

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.

Disposition of 32N1858 Comments on 32N1819 CD 19763-5

Date: 2010-12-27 Document: ISO/IEC JTC1/SC32/WG2 N1492

1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
MB ¹	Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex (e.g. 3.1)	Paragraph/ Figure/Table /Note (e.g. Table 1)	Type of comment ²	Comment (justification for change) by the MB	Proposed change by the MB	Secretariat observations on each comment submitted
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Process on physical things • Process by human • State-transition process • Event driven process (the event is an Input?) <p>can all be covered. However, the “practical value added” by applying Part 5 to the first two dot points may not be great.</p>		<p>within a service or orchestration of a set of services</p> <p>Process on physical things, process by human and event driven process are within the scope of MFI-5. But state transition process is beyond the scope of this part.</p> <p>In addition, The “practical value added” by applying “process on physical things” and “process by human” may not be great.</p>
AU06	4.1	Figure 2	te	<p>With goals possibly getting a “life of their own” under RGPS and Part 8 (see Reference 2 cited earlier), is it still appropriate that a process realizes only one goal? Does it mean that sometimes it may be realizing a “composite goal”?</p>		<p>Since MFI-8 focuses on Role&Goal registration, CD2 removes the definition and text of “Goal”.</p> <p>But in 5.2, the relationship between Process and Goal is addressed. Goal can be achieved by zero to many instances of Process and Process can achieve only one instance of Goal. Meanwhile, Role can involve zero to many instances of Process, and Process can be involved by one to many instances of actors playing specific Roles</p>

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

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

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

1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
MB 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
						Also see CA27, CA41 and GB14.
AU07	3.2.2, 4.1 elsewhere		te	<p>“Process” sometimes seems to be used as synonymous shorthand for “Process Model”. Is it the intention of the authors that the two are the same?</p> <p>It could be suggested (and would be “common use”?) that the two are distinct. In fact, “process” might be seen as an abstract object that can be represented in concrete terms by a process model and “realized” through a specific execution of that process (eg using specific services).</p> <p>If separation is accepted then a process can be modelled in several different ways so, in theory, the same “process” could be the subject of more than one registered process model, with each of those process models possibly, or possibly not, using the same process modelling language.</p> <p>If accepted as separate</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A process doesn’t have a modelType, a process model does • “Goal” might be expressed as the “Goal of the modelled process”, rather than the “Goal of the process model”, but the relationship shown in 4.1 still holds • Terms like “successful execution of the process model” (which appear in several places) are actually, eg, “successful execution of the modelled process”? <p>In summary the process could be seen as the (subject) object modelled by the process model.</p>	<p>If it is agreed (at least when expressed in English) there is a difference between “Process Model” and “modelled process” then refine the wording accordingly.</p> <p>For example, should 3.2.2 be “sub process model”, should the boxes in the based model be “Process Model” rather than “Process” etc.</p> <p>If for the purposes of this standard the two are seen as synonymous then this should be noted explicitly (eg as part of Clause 3).</p>	<p>In 4.1 of CD2, process is defined as system of activities, which use resources to transform inputs into outputs.</p> <p>CD2 adds a new metaclass named “<i>Process_Model</i>”, connecting “<i>Process</i>” to “<i>Process_Modeling_Language</i>”.</p> <p>Process model is defined as a specification that is the result of modelling one or more processes, adopting a specific process modelling language to describe features of a process.</p> <p><i>Process_Modeling_Language</i> specifies the modeling language that <i>Process_Model</i> uses to represent processes.</p> <p>Process can be described by zero to many <i>Process_Models</i> and one <i>Process_Model</i> can describe one and only one <i>Process</i>.</p> <p>As a sub-process of a process at upper level, an atomic process can be decomposed by another composite process at lower level. In that case, the atomic process at</p>

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

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

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

1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
MB 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
						upper level is same as the composite process in lower level. Also see CA14 & JP005.
AU08	4.1		ed	Process is constrained by Control_Constraint . <i>According the complexity of registered process models, two types of strategies are implies in Process Control Model.</i>	"implied" rather than "implies"	In CD2, we remove the metaclass Control_Constraint and its subclasses. Instead, five types of composite process are defied to play the roles that original Control_Conststaint takes. Also see CA23 & CA44.
AU09	4.1	Figure 3	te	As each process must have one, and only one, control constraint it is assumed that this often an aggregation of multiple Conditions and possibly multiple Control_Constructs. The following doesn't seem clear from the UML or text <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does an Atomic_Process only require one condition (either a Precondition or a Postcondition), are both required, or are the subtypes optional (eg there could be simply a non subtyped Condition)? While it is stated that <i>As for Atomic_Process, Condition is the only mandatory constraint</i> should it also be "taken as read" that they cannot have a Control_Construct, or is that optional? 	Provide clarification in Figure 3 and/or the associated text.	In CD1, Base Model and Process Control Model were defined to record basic structural and constraints of processes. But in CD2, there is only one metamodel by merging key metaclasses from CD1. Figure 2 of CD2 provides the metamodel for process model registration, in which " <i>Condition</i> " is removed and the relevant relations are changed accordingly. We add Event to take the place of Precondition and Postcondition in CD1. Both Atomic Process and Composite Process may have an

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.

Disposition of 32N1858 Comments on 32N1819 CD 19763-5

Date: 2010-12-27 Document: ISO/IEC JTC1/SC32/WG2 N1492

1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
MB ¹	Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex (e.g. 3.1)	Paragraph/ Figure/Table /Note (e.g. Table 1)	Type of comment ²	Comment (justification for change) by the MB	Proposed change by the MB	Secretariat observations on each comment submitted
						event or a series of events. The Control_Construct has been removed. Instead, five types of composite process are defined to play the roles that original Control_Constraint takes, seeing Figure2.
AU10	4.1		te	Precondition is referred to Input from Base Model to specify the information state that should be satisfied before execution. Could such a Precondition refer to the event that triggers an atomic event driven process?		CD2 defines " Event " to record the event that a process is triggered by. It differs from Input of a process. And in CD2, " Input " and " Output " are also removed. Instead, we add three relationships named "consumes", "creates" and "manipulates" from Process to Resource . The consumed resource can be treated as input and the created ones can be treated as output.
AU11	4.1		ed	Precondition is referred to Input from Base Model to specify the information state that should be satisfied before execution Is "should" used in the sense of "must" (obligatory) or another sense?	Tighten "should" to "must"?	The resource in a specific state or in existence may initiate an event. Besides, " Precondition " and " Postcondition " are removed. Instead, we add two relationships named "produces" and "triggeredBy" from Process to Event . In this way, the produced event can be treated as
AU12	4.1		ed	Postcondition is restricted to Output to represent desirable outcomes when process is completed successfully. Is the word "desirable" required here? It is understandable that if the process does not complete successfully the specified Postcondition may not be achieved, but it is possible that the process completes "successfully" without the "desirable" postcondition outcome being achieved? Possibly one element of the definition of "success" could be whether the postcondition is achieved, in which case the word "desirable" is not	Either delete the word "desirable" or explain more clearly the concept of <i>successful completion without achieving desirable outcomes</i>	

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.

Disposition of 32N1858 Comments on 32N1819 CD 19763-5

Date: 2010-12-27

Document: ISO/IEC JTC1/SC32/WG2 N1492

1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
MB ¹	Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex (e.g. 3.1)	Paragraph/ Figure/Table /Note (e.g. Table 1)	Type of comment ²	Comment (justification for change) by the MB	Proposed change by the MB	Secretariat observations on each comment submitted
				required.		postcondition and the ones used to trigger a process can be treated as precondition.
AU13			ge	Possibly it is too late for consideration in working toward the first edition of Part 5 as an IS, but would there be value in adding an optional "Process Evolution" package along the line of the package for ontologies in Part 3 to track change over time in processes and subprocesses?		Will be considered in Ed2
AU14	4.2		ed	The current WD for Part 7 uses the heading <i>Relationship between MFI service registration and other parts in MFI</i> for the equivalent Subclause. Should that be the case here? Especially as there is some mention of ontologies, even if Figure 4 makes no explicit reference to the relationship of Part 5 with Part 3 the text could note its possible relevance? For example, it could refer to Annex B as providing an illustration.		The heading of 5.2 (original 4.2 in CD1) is changed to " <i>Relationship between MFI PMR and other parts in MFI</i> ". The relationships with part7 and part 3 are addressed in 5.2 respectively. Also see CA34&CA35.
AU15	4.3.15		te	Case 2 in Annex A is very helpful in this regard. Should the "before" and "after" attributes be referenced in 4.3.15, at least as 0..*?		In CD2, The Control_Construct has been removed. Instead, five types of composite process are defied to play the roles that original Control_Conststaint takes, seeing Figure2 and clause 5.3. All the cases are changed according to the new metamodel. Also see AU09& CA45.

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.

Disposition of 32N1858 Comments on 32N1819 CD 19763-5

Date: 2010-12-27 Document: ISO/IEC JTC1/SC32/WG2 N1492

1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
MB ¹	Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex (e.g. 3.1)	Paragraph/ Figure/Table /Note (e.g. Table 1)	Type of comment ²	Comment (justification for change) by the MB	Proposed change by the MB	Secretariat observations on each comment submitted
CA01	Title page	Title	Ed	The title specifies 'Part 3' instead of 'Part 5'	Change '3' to '5'.	Done. Also see AU02.
CA02	Introduction	All	Ed	The Introduction needs some wordsmithing to use more natural English phrasing.	To be provided after other comments on the Introduction have been resolved.	The first paragraph in CD1 has been deleted. Introduction in CD2 is rewritten, see document of the draft text of CD2 19763-5.
CA03	Introduction	Paras 1 and 3	Te	The Introduction references e-business and e-commerce, but nowhere in the document are there any references to the e-business standards developed by SC32 WG1. In particular, ISO/IEC 15944-2 specifies the Registration of e-business scenarios and their components as business objects. The scope of the present document is the registration of process models. While these may be applicable to e-business scenarios, they are also applicable in other contexts, so we should not tie this standard to e-business.	Either remove all reference e-business and e-commerce (preferred), or show how this standard relates to ISO/IEC 14662 and ISO/IEC 15944, especially part 2. Delete the first paragraph. Delete the first clause of paragraph 3, replacing it by: 'Various industrial consortia have contributed...'	
CA04	Introduction	Paras 3 & 4	Te	Clarify the message and intent of paras 3 and 4 of introduction e.g. use of the term unify.	The purpose should be to come up with a common set of semantics that will enable common understanding of the processes that have been defined using different methodologies.	
CA05	Introduction	Para 2	Te	The Introduction and scope both reference workflow, but the term is not used elsewhere in the document.	Either remove both references, or define the term and explain how this standard supports the registration of workflows.	In CD2, References to "workflow" are removed.
CA06	1. Scope	Para 1	Te	The Introduction and scope both reference workflow, but the term is not used elsewhere in the document.	Either remove both references, or define the term and explain how this standard supports the registration of workflows.	
CA07	1. Scope	Para 1	Te	At the end of the first paragraph there is a reference to	The relationship between part 5 and	The relationship between part 5 and

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.

Disposition of 32N1858 Comments on 32N1819 CD 19763-5

Date: 2010-12-27

Document: ISO/IEC JTC1/SC32/WG2 N1492

1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
MB ¹	Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex (e.g. 3.1)	Paragraph/ Figure/Table /Note (e.g. Table 1)	Type of comment ²	Comment (justification for change) by the MB	Proposed change by the MB	Secretariat observations on each comment submitted
				'Web Services', but there is also a proposal to create a separate part to register services.	the proposed new part needs to be clarified, and references to services appropriately positioned.	MFI-7(metamodel for service registration) is clarified in Clause 5.2 as "Process can be performed by zero to many instances of Service and Service can perform only one instance of Process." Also see AU04 and JP003.
CA08	1. Scope	Figure 1	Te	It is not clear what constitutes a rectangle, dotted box (sometimes labeled) or what the purpose of the arrow and direction of the arrow means.	The legend of the diagram needs to be defined.	Figure 1 in CD1 has been totally changed. Figure 1 in CD2 shows the scope of part 5. And the corresponding legend is provided.
CA09	1. Scope	Figure 1	Te	Mappings need to be applied to achieve interoperability. While Fig 1 shows the usage of mapping, there is no place where an actual mapping instance can be registered	Specify how this part relates to 19763-4 part 4 Metamodel for Model Mapping, and update Fig 1 to include reference to MFI-4.	Relation with Part4. To be discussed later.
CA10	1. Scope	Figure 1	Te	Figure 1 shows how process models (but not their definition in a registry) may reference an Ontology registry, but there is no text describing how or why this might occur. Since this part is about the process model registry, does this even need to be mentioned?	Either add an explanation of the reference to Ontology registry, or remove it from Figure 1, and remove the reference to 19763-3 from clause 2 as well.	In Fig 1 in CD2, the reference to MFI-3 is deleted. The relationship between part5 and MFI-3 is explained in Clause 5.2, which states that " <i>The attribute "annotation" of Process, Event and Resource can be declared as the URI of the registered Ontology_Atomic_Construct based on MFI Ontology Registration. It means that the concepts in an</i>

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

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

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

1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
MB 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
						<i>ontology can be used to annotate a process, the resource participating in a process, or the event initiated by a resource.</i> Also see US03.
CA11	2 Normative references	19763-3	Te	Why does the reference to 19763-3 specify edition 1, while the references to 19763-1 and 19763-2 do not specify an edition.	Either consistently reference a specific edition or not, or explain the inconsistency. The proper way to reference a specific edition is by dated reference.	Accepted. CD2 uses a dated reference to 19763-3, seeing Clause 3.
CA12	2 Normative references	Missing reference	Te	Mappings need to be applied to achieve interoperability. While Fig 1 shows the usage of mapping, there is no place where an actual mapping instance can be registered	Add a normative reference to 19763-4 part 4 Metamodel for Model Mapping	Relation with Part4. To be discussed later.
CA13	3 Definitions	Missing terms	Te	The classes shown in Figures 2, 3 and 4 are specified in clause 4 and defined in terms of the metamodel. However, the concepts that these classes represent need to be defined in clause 3, in the same way that CD2 11179-3 now defines the concepts behind the classes in its metamodel.	Add terms and definitions for all the concepts represented by the metamodel. Terms which need to be defined include, but are not necessarily limited to: artifact (proposed elsewhere to be renamed 'resource'), atomic process, composite process, process, process modeling language, input, output, goal (proposed elsewhere to be renamed 'purpose'), constraint, artifact constraint (proposed elsewhere to be renamed 'resource constraint', control constraint, control construct, condition, precondition, postcondition, anyorder, split, choice, join, sequence.	In CD2, Clause 4.1 provides definitions of the following terms: <i>process, process model, process modelling language, and sub-process, composite process, atomic process, resource, event and condition process.</i> Also see US09.

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.

Disposition of 32N1858 Comments on 32N1819 CD 19763-5

Date: 2010-12-27

Document: ISO/IEC JTC1/SC32/WG2 N1492

1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
MB ¹	Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex (e.g. 3.1)	Paragraph/ Figure/Table /Note (e.g. Table 1)	Type of comment ²	Comment (justification for change) by the MB	Proposed change by the MB	Secretariat observations on each comment submitted
CA14	3.2.1	Process model	Te	The definition does not clearly state what a process model is. Defining it as the result of process modelling is not useful. (Also, process modelling is not defined.)	Suggestion: Model of a process, showing what the process does, and possibly how it is done.	Accepted. In 4.1 of CD2, process is defined as a system of activities, which use resources to transform inputs into outputs CD2 adds a new metaclass named "Process_Model", connecting "Process" to "Process_Modeling_Language". Process model is defined as a specification that is the result of modelling one or more processes, adopting a specific process modelling language to describe features of a process. <i>Process_Modeling_Language</i> specifies the modeling language that <i>Process_Model</i> uses to represent processes. Process can be described by several Process_Models(at least one) and one Process_Model can describe one Process. Also see AU07 & JP005.
CA15	3.2.2	Sub-process	Te	The definition is unclear. It refers to a composite process model. The terms 'process' and 'process model' seem to be used interchangeably. The semantics of each term needs to be clarified.	Suggestion: component process of a composite process.	Accepted. In CD2, 4.1.6 defines composite process as " <i>process that consists of</i>

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.

Disposition of 32N1858 Comments on 32N1819 CD 19763-5

Date: 2010-12-27 Document: ISO/IEC JTC1/SC32/WG2 N1492

1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
MB ¹	Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex (e.g. 3.1)	Paragraph/ Figure/Table /Note (e.g. Table 1)	Type of comment ²	Comment (justification for change) by the MB	Proposed change by the MB	Secretariat observations on each comment submitted
					Note: a sub-process may be an atomic process, or a composite process.	<i>other processes.</i> "
CA16	3.3.5	PSL	Ed	PSL is defined by ISO 18629, but this is not mentioned.	Add a reference to ISO 18629 as a note to this definition.	Done.
CA17	4	All	Te	The presentation of the description of the model should be made consistent with that of 19763-2 and other parts of 19763, including the use of figures that show the attributes of each class, and consistent textual description. Note also that WG2 requested that the representation in 11179-3 Edition 3 be changed (see SC32 N1851a), and that 19763 and 11179 use a consistent representation.	Review the representations used in FCD3 19763-2 and CD2 11179-3, and determine what format to use for this part.	Accepted. CD2 follows the representation which is similar to that used in FCD3 19763-2. Also see GB25.
CA18	4	All	Te	Do we need to model the state of process execution?	None provided.	How to model the state of process execution is not taken into account in CD2. Also see CA33 & GB20 & GB22.
CA19	4	All figures	Te	It is hard to understand the associations. Are they unidirectional, or bidirectional? If uni-directional, in which direction?	Clarify the associations.	In Fig. 2 and Fig.3 of CD2, for one-way association, arrows are added to specify the direction. And for bidirectional association, arrows are not shown. Also see US01.
CA20	4.1	Clause heading	Te	Registration is a procedure. This clause does not describe the registration procedure, so the term 'registration' does not belong in the clause heading. Also, the clause describes both the metamodel for process models, and the metamodel for process control	Rename clause 4.1 to one of: MFI metamodel for process models or:	Accepted. Rename Clause 5.1 to "Overview of MFI PMR" "MFI PMR" is used throughout the

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.

Disposition of 32N1858 Comments on 32N1819 CD 19763-5

Date: 2010-12-27 Document: ISO/IEC JTC1/SC32/WG2 N1492

1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
MB ¹	Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex (e.g. 3.1)	Paragraph/ Figure/Table /Note (e.g. Table 1)	Type of comment ²	Comment (justification for change) by the MB	Proposed change by the MB	Secretariat observations on each comment submitted
				models. These would be better split into separate clauses. Now that 19763-2 uses the term 'package', perhaps that term could be used here.	MFI package for process models or: MFI Process Model package Also use the chosen phrase in place of 'base model' throughout the document.	document. Also see US04.
CA21	4.1	Para 1	Ed	With the split of clause 4.1 into two parts, the last sentence of para 1 is out of place. The first sentence of para 2 repeats what is relevant for this first split clause. A later paragraph repeats the rest.	Delete the last sentence of para 1: "In MFI Process registration..."	Done. 5.1 is rewritten according to the new metamodel.
CA22	4.1	Figure 2	Te	The term registration does not belong in the figure title, for the same reason it does not belong in the clause title. 'Base model' is not a good term. It is not clear what is meant by 'Base'. Now that 19763-2 uses the term 'package', perhaps that term could be used here.	Rename the figure to one of: MFI metamodel for process models or: MFI package for process models or: MFI Process Model package Throughout the document, amend any reference to Base model accordingly.	Accepted. In CD1, Base Model and Process Control Model were defined to record basic structural and constraints of processes. But in CD2, there is only one metamodel by merging key metaclasses from CD1. Figure 2 in CD2 is renamed as " <i>The metamodel for process model registration</i> ".
CA23	4.1	Figure 2	Te	The term 'Artifact' has connotations of something that is man-made. A more general term would be 'Resource'	Replace the class 'Artifact' by 'Resource' in Figure 2, and make corresponding changes throughout the document.	Accepted. "Artifact/artefact" is replaced by "Resource" throughout the document. The term "Resource" is defined in Clause 4 in CD2.

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.

Disposition of 32N1858 Comments on 32N1819 CD 19763-5

Date: 2010-12-27

Document: ISO/IEC JTC1/SC32/WG2 N1492

1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
MB ¹	Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex (e.g. 3.1)	Paragraph/ Figure/Table /Note (e.g. Table 1)	Type of comment ²	Comment (justification for change) by the MB	Proposed change by the MB	Secretariat observations on each comment submitted
						Also see CA42 and CA43.
CA24	4.1	Figure 2	Te	Figure 2 does not actually include a Process Model as a class. Assuming we want to register more than one Process Model in a registry, we need to be able to specify which Processes belong to which model.	Add a Process Model as a class, showing how it includes one or more processes.	Accepted. <i>"Process_Model"</i> is defined to designate a specification that is the result of modeling zero or one process, adopting a specific process modeling language to describe features of a process. See Figure 2 in CD2. Process Model describes only one process which is atomic or composite. If the process described by the model is composite, it is needed to register the construct type within it and the involved sub-processes, which may be further decomposed at lower level. In this way, we can know which process belongs to which process model. Also see AU07
CA25	4.1	Figure 2	Te	Process_Modelling_Language is currently associated with a Process. Is that what we want? Once we add the Process_Model class, would it be better to associate Process_Modelling_language with the Process Model (implying that the whole model is specified in the same lanaguage), or do we want to retain the existing association, implying that different processes in one process model may be specified in different languages.	Decide which association is more useful, and make any required changes. Include a note about the implications of the decision taken.	CD2 adds a new metaclass named <i>"Process_Model"</i> , connecting <i>"Process"</i> to <i>"Process_Modeling_Language"</i> . <i>Process_Model</i> is a specification that is the result of modeling zero or one process, adopting a specific process

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.

Disposition of 32N1858 Comments on 32N1819 CD 19763-5

Date: 2010-12-27 Document: ISO/IEC JTC1/SC32/WG2 N1492

1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
MB ¹	Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex (e.g. 3.1)	Paragraph/ Figure/Table /Note (e.g. Table 1)	Type of comment ²	Comment (justification for change) by the MB	Proposed change by the MB	Secretariat observations on each comment submitted
						<p>modeling language to describe features of a process. It shows what the process does and how it is done.</p> <p><i>Process_Modeling_Language</i> specifies the modeling language that <i>Process_Model</i> uses to represent processes.</p> <p>Notice that different processes in one process model should be specified by one language.</p> <p>Also see US05 and US06.</p>
CA26	4.1	Para 2	Te	Rephrase the first sentence to reflect the change in name of the model.	<p>Replace: 'As Figure 2 suggests, Base Model is...'</p> <p>By: The Process Model package is...'</p>	<p>Accepted.</p> <p>Clause 5.1 is rewritten to reflect the change in the revised metamodel,</p>
CA27	4.1	Para 2	Te	<p>The usage of the term 'Goal' is more commonly associated with high-level business objectives. It is suggested that the English language usage refer to 'purpose' of the process, i.e. more commonly understood as the objective of the process is to realize a purpose.</p> <p>Note that ISO 18269-1 uses the following definition of Process taken from ISO 15331-1:</p> <p>process structured set of activities involving various enterprise entities, that is designed and organised for a given purpose</p>	<p>Replace the text 'Goal states the purpose that should be achieved by fulfilling the process model...' with 'Purpose states the objective that should be achieved by fulfilling the process ...'</p>	<p>Since MFI-8 focuses on Role&Goal registration, CD2 of 19763-5 removes the definition and text of "Goal".</p> <p>The relationship between Process and Goal is addressed in 5.2.</p> <p>Also see CA41, AU06 and GB14.</p>
CA28	4.1	Para 2	Te	The last sentence beginning 'One referent instance...' is irrelevant. Even within a single process model we can expect that the output of one process is an input to	Delete the sentence.	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.

Disposition of 32N1858 Comments on 32N1819 CD 19763-5

Date: 2010-12-27 Document: ISO/IEC JTC1/SC32/WG2 N1492

1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
MB ¹	Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex (e.g. 3.1)	Paragraph/ Figure/Table /Note (e.g. Table 1)	Type of comment ²	Comment (justification for change) by the MB	Proposed change by the MB	Secretariat observations on each comment submitted
				another process.		
CA29	4.1	Figure 3	Ed	Insert a new clause heading in front of Figure 3. This should become 4.2 and subsequent clauses be renumbered.	New heading, one of: MFI Metamodel for process control models or: MFI package for process control models or: MFI Process Control Model package	In CD1, Base Model and Process Control Model were defined to record basic structural and constraints of processes. But in CD2, there is only one metamodel.
CA30	4.1	Figure 3	Te	The term 'registration' does not belong in the figure title, for the same reason it does not belong in the clause title.	Rename the figure to one of: MFI Metamodel for process control models or: MFI package for process control models or: MFI Process Control Model package	So it is not necessary to insert a new clause, seeing the draft text of CD2 of 19763-5.
CA31	4.1	Figure 3	Te	The second paragraph below Figure 3 states: In general, Artifact_Constraint is used to record a relationship between Artifacts yet Figure shows Artifact_Constraint associated with a single Artifact.	Either Artifact_Constraint should be associated with one or more Artifacts (i.e. change the multiplicity at Artifact to 1..*), Or Artifact_Constraint should be associated with a relationship between Artifacts. Or both.	The "Artifact_Constraint" is removed in CD2. But the role it plays in CD1 is addressed by the attribute "annotation" of Resource. Also see GB18.

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.

Disposition of 32N1858 Comments on 32N1819 CD 19763-5

Date: 2010-12-27 Document: ISO/IEC JTC1/SC32/WG2 N1492

1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
MB ¹	Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex (e.g. 3.1)	Paragraph/ Figure/Table /Note (e.g. Table 1)	Type of comment ²	Comment (justification for change) by the MB	Proposed change by the MB	Secretariat observations on each comment submitted
CA32	4.1	Figure 3	Te	We question some of the cardinalities.	The model needs to be validated.	The metamodel is revised and the validation work is underway.
CA33	4.1	Last para	Te	The last paragraph of 4.1 refers to Information State, but this is not defined, nor is it specified where it resides.	None provided.	In 5.1 of CD2, the whole text is rewritten according to the changes of the metamodel. There is no information state in CD2. In CD2, the state of process or resource is not taken into account. Also see CA18 & GB20 & GB22.
CA34	4.2	Clause heading	Te	Clause 4.2 should be renamed, consistent with the renaming of clause 4.1. Figure 4 shows the relationship between MFI Core and some metaclasses in the Process Model package. Registration is a procedure which is not discussed in the clause, so the term does not belong in the clause title.	Suggestion: Relationship between MFI Core and MFI Process Model	Both the heading of Clause 5.2 and caption of Figure 3 are changed to “Relationship between MFI PMR and other parts of MFI”, followed with the detailed explanation on the relationships between MFI Process and MFI Ontology registration& MFI-7 & MFI-8 is addressed. The relationship between MFI-5 and MFI-2&4 will be confirmed after discussion on the relationship between RGPS and MFI-2&4. Also see AU14
CA35	4.2	Figure 4	Te	The Figure caption should be changed consistent with the change made to the clause heading.	See comment on change to clause 4.2 heading.	
CA36	4.2	Figure 4	Te	In Sydney, it was stated that MFI-2 Core can only handle UML model components, but Fig 4 shows a Process as being sub-typed from ModelComponent of Part 2. Which is correct? Note: FCD3 19763-2 clause 4.2 defines UML [ISO/IEC	None provided.	Relation with Part 2. Need more discussion.

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.

Disposition of 32N1858 Comments on 32N1819 CD 19763-5

Date: 2010-12-27

Document: ISO/IEC JTC1/SC32/WG2 N1492

1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
MB ¹	Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex (e.g. 3.1)	Paragraph/ Figure/Table /Note (e.g. Table 1)	Type of comment ²	Comment (justification for change) by the MB	Proposed change by the MB	Secretariat observations on each comment submitted
				19501:2005] and MOF [ISO/IEC 19502:2005] terms, used in specifying the MFI model.		
CA37	4.2	All	Te	Figure 4 shows only Artifact, Process and Process_Modelling_Language being sub-typed from classes in MFI Core. (1) Why is Artifact sub-typed from ModelClassifier instead of ModelComponent ? (2) Why are not all other metaclasses sub-typed from ModelComponent as well? ModelComponent is an Administered Item, allowing administrative information to be specified.	None provided.	Relation with Part 2. Need more discussion.
CA38	4.2	All	Te	Despite the use of 'Registration' in the name of this part of 19763, the registration process is not described.	Explain how the relationship with MFI Code supports the registration process.	Relation with Part 2. Need more discussion.
CA39	4.2	All	Te	We should allow users who want to register process models, but who do not need the complexity of MFI Core, to subtype the 19763-5 metaclasses directly from Administered_Item.	Provide an alternate registration package based directly on 11179-3. Add a reference to 11179-3 to support this. [Note: Using 11179-3 Edition 3 the subtyping should be from Registered_Item, allowing the user to choose when to use an Administered_Item versus an Attached_Item.]	In CD2, all the metaclasses will inherit Administered_Item from MDR. See 5.3 and Annex B in CD2. Also see JP004 and GB10.
CA40	4.3	All	Te	The clause heading 'MFI Process Registration' does not describe the content of the clause, which provides the description of the classes illustrated in clause 4.1.	Either move the description closer to the figures in clause 4.1 (split into two clauses by other comments), or split this clause into two to mirror the split of clause 4.1, and use clause heading that mirror those other clauses.	"MFI PMR" is used throughout the document.
CA41	4.3.1	Goal	Te	The usage of the term 'Goal' is more commonly	Rename the class 'Goal' to	Since MFI-8 focuses on Role&Goal

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.

Disposition of 32N1858 Comments on 32N1819 CD 19763-5

Date: 2010-12-27 Document: ISO/IEC JTC1/SC32/WG2 N1492

1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
MB ¹	Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex (e.g. 3.1)	Paragraph/ Figure/Table /Note (e.g. Table 1)	Type of comment ²	Comment (justification for change) by the MB	Proposed change by the MB	Secretariat observations on each comment submitted
				<p>associated with high-level business objectives. It is suggested that the English language usage refers to 'purpose' or 'objective' of the process, i.e. more commonly understood as the objective of the process is to realize a purpose.</p> <p>Note that ISO 18269-1 uses the following definition of Process taken from ISO 15331-1:</p> <p>process structured set of activities involving various enterprise entities, that is designed and organised for a given purpose</p> <p>'addressing' would be better as 'documenting'.</p> <p>It is not obvious that the purpose is necessarily 'common'.</p> <p>It is the process that is intended to achieve the objective, not the process model.</p>	<p>'Purpose'.</p> <p>Change the description from:</p> <p>Goal is a metaclass addressing the common purpose that a process model should achieve.</p> <p>To:</p> <p>Purpose is a metaclass documenting what the process should achieve.</p>	<p>registration, CD2 of 19763-5 removes the definition and text of "Goal".</p> <p>But in 5.2, the relationship between Process and Goal is addressed.</p> <p>Also see CA27, AU06 and GB14.</p>
CA42	4.3.8	clause heading	Te	The term 'Artifact' has connotations of something that is man-made. A more generic term would be 'Resource'	Rename the clause to 'Resource'	Accepted.
CA43	4.3.8	Definition	Te	The term 'Artifact' has connotations of something that is man-made. A more generic term would be 'Resource'	<p>Reword the definition as:</p> <p>'Resource is a metaclass designating a resource that participates as one or more Inputs and/or Outputs in the process model'</p> <p>Note the use of 'resource' within the definition of the Resource metaclass is acceptable because the metaclass represent the concept resource. In clause 3, the definition of the concept 'resource' should not refer to itself.</p>	<p>"Artifact/artefact" is replaced by "Resource" throughout the document.</p> <p>The term "Resource" is defined in Clause 4 in CD2.</p> <p>Also see CA23.</p>

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.

Disposition of 32N1858 Comments on 32N1819 CD 19763-5

Date: 2010-12-27

Document: ISO/IEC JTC1/SC32/WG2 N1492

1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
MB ¹	Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex (e.g. 3.1)	Paragraph/ Figure/Table /Note (e.g. Table 1)	Type of comment ²	Comment (justification for change) by the MB	Proposed change by the MB	Secretariat observations on each comment submitted
CA44	4.3.9	Definition	Te	The definition of the Constraint metaclass references 'control constraint' and 'semantic constraint'. Control constraint is shown in Figure 3, but Semantic constraint is not. Is this synonymous with 'Artifact Constraint'?	Define the concepts 'control constraint' and 'semantic constraint' in clause 3. Clarify what is a 'semantic constraint' versus an 'artifact constraint'	The metaclass "Constraint" is removed in CD2. Also see AU08 & CA23.
CA45	4.3.15	Attributes	Te	The "attributes" that have been included are insufficient. For example, if process A "splits" into process B and C, then one has to be able to identify both Process B and C based on some precondition. Similarly the "join" process needs to be identify by a process ID and the precondition for the join established.	None provided.	In CD2, The Control_Construct has been removed. Instead, five types of composite process are defied to play the roles that original Control_Conststaint takes, seeing Figure2 and clause 5.3. Cases are all changed as well Also see AU09,CA45, AU15 &JP020.
CA46	All	All	Te	We propose validating Part 5 using a candidate Process Model from IDEF0 (same as used in validating 19763-2 in Sydney Metadata Forum) to validate the registration using IDEF0 modelling paradigm of a process model.	To be provided to the BRM in Jeju.	Not finish yet because the metamodel changes a lot. Need to discuss with Canada.
CA47	All	All	Te	We propose validating Part 5 using Clause 5.1 Business Requirements View and 5.2 Business Choreography View of UMM Meta model to map into Part 5, and to conduct gap analysis as to what metadata should be registered.	To be provided to the BRM in Jeju.	
CA48	All	All	Te	We propose validating Part 5 using the Transfrontier Movement of Waste model to validate another registration using UMM modeling paradigm of process model	To be provided to the BRM in Jeju.	
CA49	All	All	Te	We continue to review the document and may have additional comments to submit to the ballot resolution meeting.	To be submitted to the BRM in Jeju.	

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.

ISO/IEC JTC1/SC32/WG2 N1492

SEQ #	Cmnt ID	See Also	Severity	Reference	Description	Addressed By
001	JPN-P01-001		1-Major Technical	<i>General</i>	<p>MF1 Part5 should be able to register process models that are described in a state-transition and event-driven language, including Petri net, Hoar CSP model, UML sequence diagram and UML state machine diagram.</p> <p>Because they are practically used in industries and usually equivalent with a finite-state machine, and therefore, also with a Turing machine.</p> <p>It should be demonstrated if the current specification of CD 19763-5 can handle these process models.</p>	<p>As a member of RGPS world, this part has to support on-demand service selection and composition. So the introduction section of this part says that it will support registration of business process that is used to represent the execution order within a service or orchestration of a set of services.</p> <p>For this purpose, event-driven process is taken into account in this part.</p> <p>Since state transition process mainly focuses on the state change of a single object, not the activity or process, the state-driven process is not considered in CD2.</p>
002	JPN-P01-002		1-Major Technical	<i>General</i>	<p>It is not clear that MF1 Part5 presuppose existence of a process model registry that can register process models fully</p> <p>If we looking at Figure 1, it seems yes because there is "Process model repository".</p> <p>But, it we look at the specifications of each metaclass at 4.3, there is no mechanism to link to a proper element in a process model repository.</p>	<p>MF1-5 assumes the process model to be registered has been created and stored in a specific process model repository. As the scope of CD2 states, <i>"The metamodel specified in this part is intended to promote semantic discovery and reuse of process models within/across process model repositories. For the purpose, it provides administrative information and common semantics of process models created with a specific process modeling language, including Business Process Modeling Notation (BPMN), UML(Unified Modeling Language) Activity Diagram, and EPC(Event-driven Process Chain), etc. In that case, the metamodel can help discover function and composition of a process, and reuse its components at different levels of granularity, rather than all of them."</i></p>

ISO/IEC JTC1/SC32/WG2 N1492

SEQ #	Cmnt ID	See Also	Severity	Reference	Description	Addressed By
003	JPN-P01-003		1-Major Technical	<i>General</i>	<p>The scope of MFI Part5 needs to be re-investigated and clarified. Especially, it is necessary to avoid unnecessary duplication with and segregation from MFI Part7.</p> <p>From the point of MFI Part7, MFI Part5 is indispensable to MFI part7 to make semantic search of Web services possible.</p> <p>Except the objectives from MFI Part7, MFI Part5 seems to have no specific objectives.</p> <p>So, it is one possibility that MFI Par5 and Part7 will be merged into one part.</p>	<p>The scope of CD2 is rewritten.</p> <p>In RGPS world, processes to be registered are at business level. They can represent the execution order within a service or the orchestration of a set of services.</p> <p>The relationship between part 5 and part 7 is provided in 5.2. That is, "<i>Process can be performed by zero to many instances of Service and Service can perform only one instance of Process.</i>"</p> <p>Also see AU04 and CA07.</p>
004	JPN-P01-004		1-Major Technical	<i>General</i>	"Process" and its subclasses are only subclasses of Administered Item. This is strange because Administered Item has a key role in MFI. At least, Constraint should also be a subclass of Administered Item.	In CD2, all the metaclasses will inherit Administered_Item from MDR. See 5.3 in CD2.
005	JPN-P01-005		2-Minor Technical	<i>3.2.1 process model</i>	The definition makes little sense since process model is defined in terms of process modeling. What is process modeling?.	<p>Accepted.</p> <p>How to model a process is out of the scope of this part.</p> <p>In CD2, 4.1.2 defines process model as "<i>specification that is the result of modelling zero or one processes, adopting a specific process modelling language to describe features of a process.</i>"</p>
006	JPN-P01-006		4-Minor Editorial	<i>3.3.3 MFI-3</i>	MFI-3 should be MFI Ontology registration to be consistent with ISO/IEC 19763-3: 2007.	<p>Accepted.</p> <p>See 4.2 in CD2.</p>
007	JPN-P01-007		4-Minor Editorial	<i>3.3.4 OWL-s</i>	OWL-"s" should be OWL-"S".	In CD2, OWL-S is removed from the list of process modelling language because it is mainly designed for service description.

ISO/IEC JTC1/SC32/WG2 N1492

SEQ #	Cmnt ID	See Also	Severity	Reference	Description	Addressed By
008	JPN-P01-008		2-Minor Technical	<i>4.3.2 Process</i>	Need a constraints that specifies bindings between Input/Output of a process and that of its parent process.	<p>We use Resource instead of Input/output. We think that the constraint specifying bindings between resources and process can be replaced by the "creates", "resumes" and "manipulates" relationships from Process and Resource.</p> <p>The bindings between resources of a process and that of its parent process are not necessary in part 5. Because in CD2, a composite process is restricted by a construct type, which specifies the execution order that its sub-processes should follow. That is, the sub-processes will execute when the corresponding event occurs or the resource to be consumed is ready. It doesn't care whether its relations with that of the parent process.</p> <p>Also see GB15.</p>
009	JPN-P01-009		2-Minor Technical	<i>4.3.2 Process</i>	<p>It is not clear what happens when a process have a input that does not satisfy its precondition.</p> <p>Is it out of the scope of MFI Part5?</p>	In CD2, the precondition of a process is treated as the state that the consumed resource stays in. If a process has an input that does not satisfy its precondition, it means that the resource to be consumed is not in the specified state.
010	JPN-P01-010		2-Minor Technical	<i>4.3.2 Process</i>	Since Process is a subclass of ModelComponent of MFI Part2, it needs to be clarified how the mandatory attribute "component type" of ModelComponent is specified in Process.	<p>Relation with Part 2.</p> <p>Need more discussion.</p>

ISO/IEC JTC1/SC32/WG2 N1492

SEQ #	Cmnt ID	See Also	Severity	Reference	Description	Addressed By
011	JPN-P01-011		2-Minor Technical	4.3.3 Process _Modelling _Language	Since Process_Modelling_Language is a subclass of ModelSpecification of MFI Part2, it needs to be clarified how the mandatory attribute such as "format" of ModelSpecification is specified in Process _Modelling _Language.	Relation with Part 2. Need more discussion.
012	JPN-P01-012		2-Minor Technical	4.3.4 Atomic_Process	The meaning "one-step execution" is unclear. More practical definition such as "process that does not have sub-process" would be better.	In Clause 4 of CD2, Atomic_Process is defined as "a process that does not have a sub-process at the same level of granularity".
013	JPN-P01-013		2-Minor Technical	4.3.8 Artifact	Since Artifact is a subclass of ModelClassifier of MFI Part2, it needs to be clarified how the mandatory attribute "model type" of ModelClassifier is specified in Artifact.	Relation with Part 2. Need more discussion.
014	JPN-P01-014		2-Minor Technical	4.3.10 Artifact _Constraint	The constraints of artifacts as input are stated as Preconditions and the constraints of artifacts as output is stated as Postconditions. Artifact_Constraint do not seem necessary, in addition to Precondition and Postcondition.	"Artifact_Constraint" is removed in CD2. Precondition and Postcondition are also removed. Instead, Event is added in CD2 to play the role that precondition and postcondition take. The events triggering a process can be treated as the precondition and those produced by a process can be regarded as the postcondition. The association class "triggeredBy" from Process to Event means that a process may be triggered by a series of events which is linked by the connector specified by the attribute "triggeredByType" of "triggeredBy". Similarly, the association class "produces" from Process to Event means that a process may produces a series of events, linked by the connector specified by the attribute "produceType" of "produces".

ISO/IEC JTC1/SC32/WG2 N1492

SEQ #	Cmnt ID	See Also	Severity	Reference	Description	Addressed By
						Both Atomic and Composite Process may have the two kinds of events. Also see AU10-AU13.
015	JPN-P01-015		2-Minor Technical	4.3.12 <i>Condition</i>	"conditional state" should be "information space" since this CD 19763-5 cannot handle the notion "state".	The metaclass "Condition", "Precondition" and "Postcondition" are removed in CD2.
016	JPN-P01-016		2-Minor Technical	4.3.13 <i>Precondition</i>	"information space and state" should be "information space" since Precondition is only used for constraints of input, which does not seem to have states.	Precondition and Postcondition are also removed. Instead, Event is added in CD2 to play the role that precondition and postcondition take. The events triggering a process can be treated as the precondition and those produced by a process can be regarded as the postcondition.
017	JPN-P01-017		2-Minor Technical	4.3.13 <i>Precondition</i>	It needs to be clarified how a precondition can be specified? Is it out of the scope of MFI Part5?	The association class "triggeredBy" from Process to Event means that a process may be triggered by a series of events which is linked by the connector specified by the attribute "triggeredByType" of "triggeredBy".
018	JPN-P01-018		2-Minor Technical	4.3.14 <i>Postondition</i>	"information space and state" should be "information space" since Postcondition is only used for constraints of output, which does not seem to have states.	Similarly, the association class "produces" from Process to Event means that a process may produces a series of events, linked by the connector specified by the attribute "produceType" of "produces".
019	JPN-P01-019		2-Minor Technical	4.3.14 <i>Postondition</i>	It needs to be clarified how a postcondistion can be specified? Is it out of the scope of MFI Part5?	Both Atomic and Composite Process may have the two kinds of events.

ISO/IEC JTC1/SC32/WG2 N1492

SEQ #	Cmnt ID	See Also	Severity	Reference	Description	Addressed By
020	JPN-P01-020		2-Minor Technical	<p><i>4.3.16 AnyOrder</i></p> <p><i>4.3.17 Choice</i></p> <p><i>4.3.18 Join</i></p> <p><i>4.3.19 Sequence</i></p> <p><i>4.3.20 Split</i></p>	Needs proper attributes as demonstrated in Annex A.	<p>The Control_Construct is removed. Instead, five types of composite process are defied to play the roles that original Control_Conststaint takes, seeing Figure2 and clause 5.3.</p> <p>Also see GB21.</p>
021	JPN-P01-021		1-Major Technical	<p><i>Annex A</i></p> <p><i>Example</i></p>	Need an example that uses all the mataclasses of MFI Part5. Otherwise, it is not clear whether the mataclasses of this CD are necessary and sufficient. Especially, an example needs to demonstrate how Artifact_Constraint, Precondition and Postcondition are specified.	<p>Done.</p> <p>See Annex A in CD2.</p>
022	JPN-P01-022		1-Major Technical	<p><i>Annex A</i></p> <p><i>Example</i></p>	Need more examples that are described in langauges other than OWL-S. Otherwise, it is not clear whether the mataclasses of this CD are necessary and sufficient for process modeles expressed in other major languages.	
023	JPN-P01-023		3-Major Editorial	<i>Annex C</i>	W3C Member Submission is just a member submission and not an W3C official specifications. The description should refer	<p>Accepted.</p> <p>But in CD2, OWL-S is removed from the list of process modelling language because it is mainly designed for service description.</p>

ISO/IEC JTC1/SC32/WG2 N1492

SEQ #	Cmnt ID	See Also	Severity	Reference	Description	Addressed By
				<i>OWL-S</i>	to DAML page at http://www.daml.org/services/owl-s/1.1/ .	

End of Paper

Disposition of 32N1858 Comments on 32N1819 CD 19763-5

Date: 2010-12-27

Document: **ISO/IEC JTC1/SC32/WG2 N1492**

1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
MB ¹	Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex (e.g. 3.1)	Paragraph/ Figure/Table /Note (e.g. Table 1)	Type of comment ²	Comment (justification for change) by the MB	Proposed change by the MB	Secretariat observations on each comment submitted
GB 01	General		ed	There are a number of areas where the English could be improved. For example, the use of "the" before "EB(E-Business)" at the beginning of the first sentence of the Introduction is not normal usage.		Accepted. See the documents of CD2.
GB 02	General		ed	Artefact/artifact is spelt inconsistently.	Use "artefact" consistently.	Done. "Artefact" and "artifact" have been changed to "Resource" throughout the document. See 5.3.12.
GB 03	Contents		ed	Although definitions and abbreviations may be numbered in the same way as subclauses, the ISO/IEC Directives make it clear that they should not be treated as such, and so should not be included in the table of Contents.	Remove subclauses of 3.2 and 3.3 from Contents.	In CD2, terms and definitions are provided in 4.1 and abbreviated terms are provided in 4.2. To keep consistency with others parts of MFI, CD2 removes the subclause of 4.2(original 3.3) from the content and keeps the subclause of 4.1(original 3.2).
GB 04	Introduction		ed	The use of time-based qualifiers such as "Today", "became" and "increasingly" has unwanted implications. How relevant are the comments when the standard is five years old?	Remove all time-based qualifiers.	Done. See the Introduction clause in CD2.

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.

Disposition of 32N1858 Comments on 32N1819 CD 19763-5

Date: 2010-12-27 Document: ISO/IEC JTC1/SC32/WG2 N1492

1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
MB ¹	Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex (e.g. 3.1)	Paragraph/ Figure/Table /Note (e.g. Table 1)	Type of comment ²	Comment (justification for change) by the MB	Proposed change by the MB	Secretariat observations on each comment submitted
GB 05	1		ed	It is not clear which bits of the Scope clause refer to 19763 as a whole and which bits refer to part 5. It is similarly unclear whether Figure 1 illustrates only part 5, in which case the figure should be expanded to show the relationship to other parts, or whether it is such an expanded figure, in which case those elements that illustrate part 5 should be clearly identified.	Rewrite to make clear the relationship of Part 5 to the rest of 19763.	The scope is rewritten in CD2. The relationship between part 5 and the other parts of MFI is moved to 5.2.
GB 06	1		ed	The Scope clause refers to several other specifications, using abbreviations such as PSL, OWL-S and MFI-3, but does not locally explain the meanings of those abbreviations. The references to PSL and OWL are not so significant, since that have been identified in the (non-normative) introduction and are expanded in clause 3. However, the use of MFI-3 to refer to part 3 of 19763 is less satisfactory. The full reference to ISO/IEC 19763-3 should be used, the reference to the first edition omitted (unless the intention is to pick up something that was defined in that version of that standard and omitted from later versions) and "Specified" or "defined" should be used rather than the weaker "proposed". (But also see comment GB08 below).	Abbreviations used before Clause 3.3 should have their meanings explained.	Accepted. In CD2, the abbreviations used before Clause 4.2(Clause 3.3 in CD1) have been explained in the scope. "MFI Ontology Registration" is used as the abbreviation of 19763-3:2007 throughout the document, seeing 4.2 in CD2. Also see GB08.
GB 07	3.3.1		ed	The abbreviated term is inconsistent with the full name of the standard.	Amend abbreviated term to read "MFI Process Model registration" throughout.	Done. Amend the abbreviated term to read "MFI PMR" throughout.
GB 08	3.3.3		ed	The abbreviated term is inconsistent with the terms defined in other clauses.	Amend abbreviated term to read "MFI Ontology registration" throughout.	Done. "MFI Ontology Registration" is used as the abbreviation of 19763-3:2007 throughout the document, seeing 4.2 in CD2. Also see GB06.

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

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

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

1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
MB 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
GB 09	4.1, 4.2	Figures 2, 3 and 4	te	The diagram notation is not defined. It appears to be using the UML package and class diagram notation, but which version is being used?	Specify the notation being used.	Done. See abbreviation term of UML in 4.2.
GB 10	4.1, 4.2	Figures 2, 3 and 4	te	"Goal", "Input", "Output" and "Constraint" (and subclasses as appropriate) are subclasses of "Administered Item" by inheritance through the MFI Core. This appears to be incorrect.		In CD2, all the metaclasses will inherit Administered_Item from MDR. See 5.3 & Annex B in CD2. Also see CA39 and JP004.
GB 11	4.1	Figure 2	te	Some multiplicities are shown as "*" whereas elsewhere both "0..*" and "1..*" are used. It is unclear whether "*" represents "0..*" or "1..*".	Replace "*" with "0..*" or "1..*" as appropriate.	Done All the "*" in CD1 is replaced by "0..*" or "1..*" in CD2.
GB 12	4.1	Figure 2	ed	In this figure and Figures 3 and 4 attributes of the classes are not shown except for a single attribute of "Process".	Remove attribute.	In CD2, All attributes of metaclasses are added in Figure 2.
GB 13	4.1	Figures 2	te	The model shows that each process must have one or more inputs, with each input being a reference to an artefact. Not all process modelling notations mandate the concept of an input, but a common consideration when modelling processes is to recognise and record the event that triggers the process and these concepts are not included in the model. The event will often be an external event (such as 'customer places order') but internal events, which may be time based (such as 'time to pay staff') or conditional (such as 'stock level falls below reorder level'), may also be recognised and recorded.	Relax the mandatory nature of the need to record an input for a process and add in the ability to record events that trigger processes.	Accepted. In Figure 2 of CD2, 1) Process can create, consume or manipulate zero to many resources. 2) Process can be triggered by or produce zero to many Events, which has 3 types: internal_conditional, internal_time_based and external.

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.

Disposition of 32N1858 Comments on 32N1819 CD 19763-5

Date: 2010-12-27 Document: ISO/IEC JTC1/SC32/WG2 N1492

1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
MB ¹	Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex (e.g. 3.1)	Paragraph/ Figure/Table /Note (e.g. Table 1)	Type of comment ²	Comment (justification for change) by the MB	Proposed change by the MB	Secretariat observations on each comment submitted
GB 14	4.1	Figures 2	te	The model shows that each process must have one or more outputs, with each output being a reference to an artefact, and additionally each process must also have one and only one goal. Not all process modelling notations mandate the concepts of outputs and goals.	Relax the mandatory nature of the need to record both an output and a goal for a process.	Accepted. In Figure 2 of CD2, 1) Process can create, consume or manipulate zero to many resources. 2) Since MFI-8 focuses on Role&Goal registration, CD2 of 19763-5 removes the definition and text of "Goal". But in 5.2, the relationship between Process and Goal is addressed. Also see CA27, CA41 & Au06.
GB 15	4.1	Figures 2 and 3	te	Some process modelling notations (such as IDEF-0) have concepts which record inputs to a process that are outputs of other processes that act as constraints and/or mechanisms on the process. These concepts are not included in the model.	Include the 'constraint' and 'mechanism' concepts as additional optional inputs to a process.	In CD2, a composite process is restricted by a construct type, which specifies the execution order that its sub-processes should follow. That is, the sub-processes will execute when the corresponding event occurs or the resource to be consumed is ready. So we think it may be not necessary to define the concept as additional optional inputs to a process. Also see JP008.

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.

Disposition of 32N1858 Comments on 32N1819 CD 19763-5

Date: 2010-12-27

Document: **ISO/IEC JTC1/SC32/WG2 N1492**

1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
MB ¹	Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex (e.g. 3.1)	Paragraph/ Figure/Table /Note (e.g. Table 1)	Type of comment ²	Comment (justification for change) by the MB	Proposed change by the MB	Secretariat observations on each comment submitted
GB 16	4.1	Figures 2 and 3	te	Some process modelling notations include the concept of a processor of a processor (usually shown in swim lanes). This concept is not included in the model.	Include the 'processor' concept.	The attribute "hasRole" of process can describe the processor.
GB 17	4.1	Figures 2 and 3	te	Some process modelling notations (such as Data Flow Diagrams) include the concept of a datastore (which may be a paper-file, a whole database, a table in a database, or a column in a table). This concept is not included in the model.	Include the 'datastore' concept.	Need discussion with UK. We think that the resource to be manipulated can play the role that "datastore" does.

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.

Disposition of 32N1858 Comments on 32N1819 CD 19763-5

Date: 2010-12-27

Document: ISO/IEC JTC1/SC32/WG2 N1492

1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
MB ¹	Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex (e.g. 3.1)	Paragraph/ Figure/Table /Note (e.g. Table 1)	Type of comment ²	Comment (justification for change) by the MB	Proposed change by the MB	Secretariat observations on each comment submitted
GB 18	4.1	Figure 3	te	The model shows that each artefact must be constrained by one or more artefact constraints and that each process must be constrained by one or more control constraints. The names of "Artefact Constraint" and "Control Constraint" are inconsistent.	Rename "Control Constraint" as "Project Constraint".	Both "Artifact_Constraint" and "Control_Constraint" are removed from CD2. CD2 defines "Event" to record the event that a process is triggered by or it produces. And in CD2, "Input" and "Output" are also removed. Instead, three associations named "consumes", "creates" and "manipulates" from Process to Resource are defined. The constraints between resources are specified by the process they participate in. Similarly, constraints among processes is implied in the definitions of five subclasses of Composite_Process in CD2. Also see CA31 & JP001

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

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

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

1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
MB 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
GB 19	4.1	Figure 3	te	The model shows that each process must be constrained by one or more control/process constraints, with each control/process constraint being an aggregation of one or more conditions (where each condition is either a precondition or a post condition) and zero, one or more control constructs. When initially documenting a process a precondition and/or a post condition may not be identified, but the model requires that at least one condition is recorded.	Relax the mandatory nature of the need to record a constraint for a process.	Accepted. In CD2, precondition and postcondition are removed. But a metaclass "Event" is added to register precondition and postcondition of a process. That is, the events triggering a process can be treated as the precondition of a process, and the ones produced by a process will be regarded as the postcondition of a process. Also see JP001.
GB 20	4.1	Figure 3	te	The model shows that each process must be constrained by one or more control/process constraints, with each control/process constraint being an aggregation of one or more conditions (where each condition is either a precondition or a post condition) and zero, one or more control constructs. Some process modelling notations also recognise the concept of an exit condition - a condition that will cause the process to stop executing prematurely. This concept is not included in the model.	Include the 'exit condition' concept.	How to register the state of a process is not taken into account in CD2. Also see CA18 & GB22.

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.

Disposition of 32N1858 Comments on 32N1819 CD 19763-5

Date: 2010-12-27

Document: ISO/IEC JTC1/SC32/WG2 N1492

1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
MB ¹	Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex (e.g. 3.1)	Paragraph/ Figure/Table /Note (e.g. Table 1)	Type of comment ²	Comment (justification for change) by the MB	Proposed change by the MB	Secretariat observations on each comment submitted
GB 21	4.1	Figure 3	te	The model shows that each process must be constrained by one or more control/process constraints, with each control/process constraint being an aggregation of one or more conditions and zero, one or more control constructs and with each control/process constraint must be for one and only one process. Control construct has subclasses of sequence, join, choice, split and anyOrder. These control constructs are not constraints on an individual process, but are descriptions of a dependency between two or more processes. The model cannot reflect this complexity.	Remodel this whole area to introduce the dependency concept and then to describe the dependency. The choice construct needs to record the guard conditions for the choice options.	Accepted. The Control_Construct has been removed. In CD2, a composite process is restricted by an attribute constructType, which implies the execution order that its sub-processes should follow. See clause 5.3.8-5.3.17 Also see JP020.
GB 22	4.1	Figure 3	te	Some process modelling notations also include the concept of a pause between processes. Indeed, some notations even include different classes of pause. The model does not include these concepts.	Add the pause concept to the model.	How to model the state of process execution does not consider in CD2. Also see CA18 & GB20.
GB 23	4.1		te	Within the descriptive text there are many implied constraints that are not formally specified in Clause 4.3.	Include the formal specification of all constraints in Clause 4.3.	In CD2, there is no formal specification of constraints.
GB 24	4.2	Figure 4	ed	The name of the "ModelSpecification" class should be italicised.		Need discussion with Part2.
GB 25	4.3		ed	The layout of the class specifications differs from that used in other parts of this standard.	Adopt a common layout for class specifications across all parts of the 19763 standard.	Accepted. Follow the representation used in FCD3 19763-2. Also see CA17.

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.

Disposition of 32N1858 Comments on 32N1819 CD 19763-5

Date: 2010-12-27

Document: ISO/IEC JTC1/SC32/WG2 N1492

1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
MB ¹	Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex (e.g. 3.1)	Paragraph/ Figure/Table /Note (e.g. Table 1)	Type of comment ²	Comment (justification for change) by the MB	Proposed change by the MB	Secretariat observations on each comment submitted
GB 26	4.3		te	Not all references are shown in the class specifications, for example Goal (Clause 4.3.1) should include a specification of a reference to the Process class..	Add the missing reference specifications.	Accepted. CD2 adds references specifications to the classes in clause 5.2. See 5.2 of CD2.
GB 27	4.3.2		te	In the description of the "URI" and "name" attributes the term "process model" is used, whereas "process" would be more appropriate.	Delete "model" in both cases.	Accepted. The description of "name" attributes is used in process. See 5.3.1 of CD2. 1. name: String [1..1] -Use: Mandatory -Description: Name of a process. The description of the "URI" attribute is used in Process_Model, seeing 5.3.2.
GB 28	4.3.2		te	Some process modelling notations allocate a number to a process as well as a name. An optional "number" attribute will be need to cope with this.	Add an optional "number" attribute.	Accepted. See 5.3.1 in CD2. An associate class named "modelReferenceNumber" is defined between Process and Process_Model.
GB 29	4.3.2		te	In the description of the "type" attribute the valid values are given as "0" and "1". "C" and "A" would be more meaningful valid values. This may require a change of datatype from Boolean to String.	Amend the valid values.	Accepted. See 5.3.1 in CD2.

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.

Disposition of 32N1858 Comments on 32N1819 CD 19763-5

Date: 2010-12-27

Document: ISO/IEC JTC1/SC32/WG2 N1492

1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
MB ¹	Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex (e.g. 3.1)	Paragraph/ Figure/Table /Note (e.g. Table 1)	Type of comment ²	Comment (justification for change) by the MB	Proposed change by the MB	Secretariat observations on each comment submitted
GB 30	4.3.2		te	In the description of the "hasInput" and "hasOutput" references the input and output are described as 'messages'. But the Input and Output classes in turn reference the Artefact class, and not all artefacts will be messages.	Reword to remove the word 'message'.	Accepted. In CD2, "input" and "output" are removed. Resource and its relations with Process can be used to record inputs and outputs of a process. That is, input is represented by the consumed resource and output is addressed by the created resources. Also see GB15 & JP008
GB 31	4.3.3	Constraints	ed	Typo - "name" is miss spelt as "name!"	Correct	Accepted.
GB 32	4.3.6, 4.3.7		te	See comment above re 'messages'.	Reword to remove the word 'message'.	Accepted.
GB 33	4.3.11		te	The "constrainedBy" reference is named from the wrong end. This reference constrains a process.	Rename.	The metaclass "Control_Constraint" is removed in CD2. See Figure 2 in CD2.
GB 34	Annexes A and B	Figures 5, 6, 7 and 8	ed	These figures are inappropriately numbered - see clauses 5.2.6 and 6.6.5.3 of Part 2 of the ISO/IEC Directives, "Rules for the structure and drafting of international standards".	Renumber as Figures A-1, A-2, A-3 and B-1 respectively.	Accepted.
GB 35	Annex C	Table 1	te	This list should also include Data Flow Diagrams, IDEF-0 and Rummler-Brache style Swim Lane Diagrams.	Add additional entries.	Accepted. We add Data Flow Diagram and IDEF0 in Annex C.

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
1	US	Throughout	Figures	te	On the figures, it is hard to tell which end is the direction of the reference	Show direction arrowheads on the associations.	In Fig. 2 and Fig.3 of CD2, for one-way association, arrows are added to specify the direction. And for bidirectional association, arrows are not needed. Also see CA19.
2	US	Clause 4.1	Figure 2	te	It is not clear what the scope is for the class "Artifact"	Clarify whether same instance of Artifact can be referred to by any processes in the registry.	"Artifact/artefact" is replaced by "Resource" throughout the document. The term "Resource" is defined in Clause 4 in CD2. Also see CA42 and CA43. Resource and its relations with Process can be used to record inputs and outputs of a process. That is, input is represented by the consumed resource and output is addressed by the created resources. Also see GB15 & JP008 & GB30
3	US	Clause 1 and 4	Figure 1	te	Figure 1 shows there is some kind of reference into the Ontology Registry. The document does not explain what is this doing. What is the purpose? Clause 4 does not explain how those references are made.	Provide explanation in Clause 1. In Clause 4 call out the part(s) of the model that are intended to reference into Ontology Registry.	In Fig 1 of CD2, the reference to MFI-3 is deleted. The relation between part5 and other parts are shown in Figure 3. The relationship between part5 and part 3 is explained in Clause 5.2, which states that " <i>The attribute "annotation" of Process, Event and Resource can be</i>

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
							<p><i>declared as the URI of the registered Ontology_Atomic_Construct based on MFI Ontology Registration. It means that the concepts in an ontology can be used to annotate a process, the resource participating in a process, or the event initiated by a resource.</i></p> <p>Also see CA10.</p>
4	US			te	The heading for Clause 4 and Caption for Figure 2 are misleading.	<p>Figure 2 title should be "Base model of MFI process metamodel".</p> <p>Clause 4 heading should be "Structure of MFI process registration metamodel".</p>	<p>Accepted.</p> <p>4.2 defines "MFI PMR" as the abbreviated terms of ISO/IEC 19763-5. This term is used throughout the document.</p> <p>The heading for Clause 5 is changed to "Structure of MFI PMR".</p> <p>The caption of Figure 2 is changed to "The metamodel for process model registration".</p>
5	US	Throughout	Figure 2 & 4	te	Figure 4 shows how to register a process, but this Part is process model registration. It is not clear whether the intent is to register a process or a process model. This has an impact on the meaning of the association between Process and Process_Modelling_Language in Figure 2.	If the intent is to separate process from process model, then it needs to be explained. If the class named process is meant to be process model, then the class needs to be renamed.	<p>CD2 adds a new metaclass named "Process_Model", connecting "Process" to "Process_Modeling_Language".</p> <p>That is, Process_Model is the result of modeling one process with a specified modelling</p>
6	US	Clause 4.3.2 and throughout	Figure 2 & 4	te	If you have a process, then you could have multiple languages associated, but if a process	Clarify the intent.	

¹ NB = US

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

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
					model, it makes sense to have one.		language. Process_Modeling_Language specifies the modeling language that Process_Model uses to represent processes. Also see CA25.
7	US	Clause 4.1	Figure 2	te	On the aggregation relation (consists of) between Process and Composite_Process, it says a process can be part of one and only one composite. It appears to us that a process does not have to be part of a composite and a process can be part of many composites.	Change the cardinality to 0..many	In CD2, the aggregation relation (consists of) between Process and Composite_Process was removed. In CD2, the five subclasses of Composite_Process and the "sameAs" relation of Process can be used to record the parent-child relation of processes. See figure 2 and clause 5.3 , Annex A of CD2,
8	US		Figure 3	te	There are not definitions in clause 3 for terms including: process, goal, input, output, artifact, artifact constraint, control constraint, and condition.	Provide definitions for these and other terms.	In CD2, Clause 4.1 provides definitions of the following terms: <i>process, process model, process modelling language, sub-process, atomic process, composite process, resource, event</i> and <i>condition process</i> . Also see CA13.
9	US	Clause 4	Figure 3	te	How are multiple Contol_Constructs to be combined into a single Control_Constraint?	Clarify in Clause 4.	The Control_Construct in CD1 has been removed. Instead, five subclasses of Composite_Process are defined to play the similar

1 NB = US

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
							roles it takes, seeing Figure2. The composite process has an attribute “construct_type”, which can be used to restrict the execution order of the corresponding sub-processes.
10	US		Figure 3	te	We note that cardinality on the aggregation under Control_Constraint is 1, we hope that the definitions clarify why that is so.	Depending on definition, may need to change cardinality.	“Control_Constraint” is removed from CD2. Constraints between sub-processes of a composite process are recorded by an attribute “construct_type”, which is used to restrict the execution order of sub processes. One composite process is allowed to have only one kind of control construct. But its sub-processes can be further decomposed at lower level. In this way, we could record the whole organization of sub-processes. See figure 2 and clause 5.3 of CD2.
11	US	Annex C		te	The references for the process modelling languages listed in Annex C are incomplete.	Create a bibliography and put in full references for each listed modelling language into the bibliography. Use the most recent reference possible.	Accepted. Create a bibliography and put some references for the listed modelling languages. The rest is referred to clause 3 in CD2.
12	US	Clause 4.3.3 and Annex A	Figure 7	te	Specification of the model type in the Process_Model_Language class needs to be more specific.	Refine the Process_Modeling_Language in Clause 4.3.3 to include	Accepted.

¹ NB = US

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

Disposition of 32N1858 Comments on 32N1819 CD 19763-5

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
						the attribute "version" of the process modelling language.	See 5.3.3 of CD2.

1 NB = US

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