

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 com- ment ²	Comment (justification for change) by the MB	Proposed change by the MB	Secretariat observations on each comment submitted
CA00	0-Ballot	-	Ge	Canada has voted 'Disapprove with Comments' on this ballot, for the reasons stated below. Canada supports the project and will change its vote to Approval on satisfactory resolution of these comments.		
CA01	0 All	All	Te	<p>Having reviewed the ISO Directives descriptions of Technical Report and Technical Specification, we believe this document would be better as a Technical Specification.</p> <p>3.1.4 Technical Specification TS document published by ISO or IEC for which there is the future possibility of agreement on an International Standard, but for which at present</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the required support for approval as an International Standard cannot be obtained, • there is doubt on whether consensus has been achieved, • the subject matter is still under technical development, or • there is another reason precluding immediate publication as an International Standard <p>Note 1 to entry: The content of a Technical Specification, including its annexes, may include requirements. Note 2 to entry: A Technical Specification is not allowed to conflict with an existing International Standard. Note 3 to entry: Competing Technical Specifications on</p>	Convert the document to a Technical Specification.	Need discussion. It will be decided in the next plenary meeting.

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

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

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

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>the same subject are permitted.</p> <p>Note 4 to entry: Prior to mid-1999, Technical Specifications were designated as Technical Reports of type 1 or 2.</p> <p>3.1.5 Technical Report TR</p> <p>document published by ISO or IEC containing collected data of a different kind from that normally published as an International Standard or Technical Specification</p> <p>Note 1 to entry: Such data may include, for example, data obtained from a survey carried out among the national bodies, data on work in other international organizations or data on the “state of the art” in relation to standards of national bodies on a particular subject.</p> <p>Note 2 to entry: Prior to mid-1999, Technical Reports were designated as Technical Reports of type 3.</p>		
CA02	0-Contents	Table of Figures	Ed	The ISO Directives call for Figures to be numbered sequentially throughout the document, and not to be prefixed by a clause or annex identifier.	Renumber the figures accordingly, so that Figure B.1 becomes Figure 3 and Figure C.1 becomes Figure 4.	Accepted
CA03	0-Contents	Table of Tables	Ed	The ISO Directives call for Tables to be numbered sequentially throughout the document, and not to be prefixed by a clause or annex identifier.	Renumber the tables accordingly, so that Table A.1 becomes Table 5.	Accepted
CA04	3 Definitions	Terms	Ed	The terms should not be capitalized in this clause unless they are always intended to be capitalized in the text.		Accepted
CA05	4.1	Figure 2	Ed	The alignment of text in the figure needs to be cleaned up.		Accepted
CA06	Annex B	Figure B.1	Ed	The alignment of text in the figure needs to be cleaned		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.

1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
MB¹	Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex (e.g. 3.1)	Paragraph/ Figure/Table /Note (e.g. Table 1)	Type of comment²	Comment (justification for change) by the MB	Proposed change by the MB	Secretariat observations on each comment submitted
				up.		
CA07	All		Te	Any other errors found before or during the Ballot Resolution meeting should be corrected if consensus can be reached on a resolution.	To be addressed at the BRM as required.	Accepted

END

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

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

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

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 com- ment ²	Comment (justification for change) by the MB	Proposed change by the MB	Secretariat observations on each comment submitted
JP 01	4.1	Figuer 2	ed	The character string in the figure is in disorder.		Same as CA05
JP 02	4.2.2	Table 1	te	The meaning of the data in the table can't be understood. For example it's unclear that " About 60 (top level: 20)" makes sense.		Accepted. This sentence was changed to "About 60"
JP 03	Annex B	Figure B.1	ed	The character string in the figure is in disorder.		Same as CA06
JP 04	Annex C	Annex C.1	ed	There is no Figure C.1 in 32N2142T-text_for_ballot- PDTR2_20943-5.pdf		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.

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	4.1	1	te	The intent of the second sentence is unclear. It may mean that someone following the guidance of the report should perform the data element mapping before value mapping, or that the mappings will be described in that order.		Accepted This means the guidance. To make it clear, it was removed.
GB 02	4.1	2	ed	The implication of the first paragraph of 4.1 is that the sub-clause will deal with both data element mapping and value mapping. However, the remainder of 4.1 is concerned only with data element mapping. The arrangement of sub-clauses levels and headings should be modified so as to better reflect the organisation of the material.		Accepted. Sub-clause was rearranged as like: 4.1 General 4.2 Data element mapping 4.3 Value mapping
GB 03	4.1	Figure 2	ed	The Figure should be redrawn so that words lie inside the boxes, and the justification and margins of the heading and content of the right-hand boxes adjusted to produce a neater and consistent appearance.		Same as CA05
GB 04	4.4.1	2	te	The second sentence is ambiguous. It can be interpreted as saying that if the domain taxonomy or ontology is known, then it will make work easier if a common DEC is constructed. An alternative interpretation is that the existence of a domain taxonomy or ontology will make it easier to construct a common DEC.		Accepted. The sentence was changed to "The existence of a domain taxonomy or ontology will make it easier to construct a common DEC."
GB 05	4.5.1	1	te	The structure of the second sentence obscures its probable intended meaning. The use of equality in discussion of data types, rather than of data is unusual in English.	Change the sentence to: When the data types are not the same, the representation of a value may be converted from one format to the other.	Accepted.
GB 06	4.5.1	2	te	Since the document is destined to be a TR rather than a Standard, this Note should be converted to main text. The information it contains is of the same nature as that in the preceding paragraph.		Accepted. The NOTE was converted to a main text

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 07	4.5.2	5	te	The meaning of the last phrase of the paragraph headed "Conversion" is unclear. It is possible that a significant word has been omitted.		Accepted. It was changed to "If two or more values in one value domain can be represented by a broader value in the other value domain, these values are converted to the broader value."
GB 08	4.5.3	3	te	The meaning of the phrase "in an appropriate order" is unclear in this context.		Accepted This was changed "to have the same order."
GB 09	Annex A		ed	It is unclear whether a Normative Annex is appropriate in a TR. It may be better to move the material to be a clause in the main body of the document.		Accepted. It was moved to main body.
GB 10	Annex A	1	te	The meaning of the first sentence is unclear.		Accepted. the sentence was changed to "... can be derived from the factoring which is ..."
GB 11	Annex A	3	ed	The style of the sentence is unusual in a standard.	Change the sentence to: "The steps in factoring a description are:"	Accepted.
GB 12	Annex A	7	ed	It is generally regarded as better style, and more easily read, if small numbers, up to about 12, occurring in text are presented as words rather than digits.	Change "are 4 possibilities" to "are four possibilities", and similarly in the four numbered points below – but leave the label numbers as digits.	Accepted.
GB 13	Annex B	Figure B1	ed	The figure must be re-drawn so that the text does not overlap or lie outside its associated box boundaries, and so that text elements do not lie on top of each other.		Same as CA06
GB 14	Annex C	1	te	The sentence refers to a Figure C1 which does not appear.		Same as JP04

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)
MB¹	Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex (e.g. 3.1)	Paragraph/ Figure/Table /Note (e.g. Table 1)	Type of com- ment²	Comment (justification for change) by the MB	Proposed change by the MB	Secretariat observations on each comment submitted
GB 15	Annex C	2	ed	The second sentence refers to text items coloured red, although all the relevant text is monochrome. Either some other way to identify the text elements must be found, or the explanation of which the reference is part deleted.		Accepted. "the features in red" was changed to "the features expressed in italic type"

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)
#	NB ¹	Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex	Paragraph/ Figure/Table / Note #	Comment type ²	Comment (justification for change) by the NB	Proposed change by the NB	Secretariat observations on each comment submitted
1	US	1.1		te	Synonymy, the situation where data elements may mean the same thing though they have different names, is but one of many problems in comparing semantics.	Use a much more general statement to open, such as “Data Elements and their constructs differ in many ways, yet for the purposes of data and semantic interoperability, those differences must be bridged or harmonized.”	Partially accepted. “Data Elements and their constructs differ in ...” was changed to “Metadata differs in ...”.
2	US	1		te	In general, the Scope statement is not clear. In particular, the term semantic metadata mapping needs to be described better. The real issue it seems is one of mapping and harmonizing concepts. The collection of data elements and constructs to map is much less so.	Expand the mapping to include constructs, i.e., DEC, CD, VM, VD, etc. They can be mapped as well. Be more specific about the process of mapping. What is intended (bridging differences) and how are you going to do it (compare across concepts). Finding the data elements to compare is not always much of a problem. Combining data sets, for instance, just requires the mapping be done, the data elements are already known.	Partially accepted. The mapping of DEC, VM, VD is discussed, and CD is out of the scope of this TR. The scope is mapping DE to DE. We reviewed scope text to make this clear.
3	US	2		te	Add normative reference to ISO 704:2000 and ISO 1087-1:2000	These will give you the framework to talk about concepts, harmonization, and the relationships that might exist between pairs of data elements being compared.	Accepted.
4	US			ge	Our emphasis on comparing pairs of data elements seems counter-intuitive. The draft already talks about mapping many sets of data elements, say from standards. Even so, some kind of pair-wise comparison (even if it can be done automatically) is required. For each data element in some set, even if the data elements from one set are mapped to one core set, must be compared to something.		Accepted, no action required.
5	US	4.4		te	Significantly expand the description in this section. Much more needs to be said about how to	Use Annex A from ISO TR 25100 as a guide. There the focus is on the core	Accepted. Seek input from US on possible contents to

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

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)*

Comments on PDTR Text For: ISO/IEC PDTR 20943-5 Information technology — Achieving metadata registry content consistency – Part 5: Semantic metadata mapping procedure (SMMP)		Date: 2011-10-11	Document: SC32/N2142
--	--	------------------	-----------------------------

0	1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
#	NB ¹	Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex	Paragraph/ Figure/Table / Note #	Comment type ²	Comment (justification for change) by the NB	Proposed change by the NB	Secretariat observations on each comment submitted
					harmonize.	components from the transportation industry. Use ISO 704 and ISO 1087-1 to translate the core components and lexical (from, where, to, with) analyses to the more general terminological framework of concepts and relations.	expand this section. If some possible contents are suggested during ballot, we'll discuss about that in the next BRM.
6	US	Annex C		te	Nomatively referencing Annex C in normative Annex A means Annex C should be normative.	Change Annex C from informative to normative.	Accepted, if GB09 is resolved.
7	US	Annex C		te	Expand.	See attached document for proposed update.	Accepted.

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

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)*