

Editors 1st Draft Resolution of Comments on SC32 N2148 PDTR 20943-6

Date: 2012-06-07

Document: SC32/WG2 N1659

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	Disposition of comments
CA00	0-Ballot	-	Ge	Canada has voted 'Disapprove with Comments' on this ballot, for the reasons stated below. Canada supports the project but believes there are sufficient technical issues that need to be resolved to require second PDTR ballot.	The revised draft should be issued as second PDTR (or PDTS - see next comment).	-
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</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Note 2 to entry: A Technical Specification is not allowed to conflict with an existing International Standard.</p>	Convert the document to a Technical Specification.	Rejected.

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.

Editors 1st Draft Resolution of Comments on SC32 N2148 PDTR 20943-6

Date: 2012-06-07

Document: SC32/WG2 N1659

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	Disposition of comments
				<p>Note 3 to entry: Competing Technical Specifications on 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	New	Ed	The document contains Figures and Tables, but these are not listed with the table of contents.	A Table of Figures and a Table of Tables should be added following the Table on Contents.	Accepted. Done. RESOLVED ☺
CA03	2 Normative references	11179-3	Ed	The reference to 11179-3 specifies the year as 2010, but the third edition won't be published until 2012, and the second edition was published in 2003.	Change the date to 2012.	Accepted. Done. RESOLVED ☺
CA04	3.2 Terms from 11179-3	References	Ed	The references to 11179-3 as the source of the definitions specify the year 2011, but the third edition won't be published until 2012.	Change the date to 2012.	Accepted. Done. RESOLVED ☺
CA05	4.2	1 st sentence	Ed	The sentence begins 'Figure 2 is the procedure...', but the procedure is more than the Figure.	Reword as: 'Figure 2 shows the procedure...'	Accepted. Done. RESOLVED ☺

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.

Editors 1st Draft Resolution of Comments on SC32 N2148 PDTR 20943-6

Date: 2012-06-07

Document: SC32/WG2 N1659

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	Disposition of comments
CA06	4.2	1 st sentence	Ed	The second part of the sentence reads: 'and it mainly has three processes.' It is unclear what is meant by 'mainly has'. Also, since the first part of the sentence starts 'Figure 2...', the 'it' in the second part seems to refer to the Figure, not the procedure.	Reword as: 'which has three main processes.'	Accepted. Done. RESOLVED ☺
CA07	4.2.2	2 nd sentence	Te	We do not understand what the second sentence means. "The Concepts region and the Data description region are defined as class and property respectively.	None provided.	Accepted. Done. The sentence means that the Concepts region and the Data description region are related with defining classes and properties. However, the sentence is not clear, and also it's not proper to describe that relation in this subclause. Most of all the relationship between them is defined and described in the subclause 4.3. <Solution> The sentence is removed. RESOLVED ☺
CA08	4.2.2.2	3 rd sentence	Te	We do not understand what the third sentence means. "After this sub-process, the process could be moved in process-2.1 in order to define classes of the generic ontology.	None provided.	Accepted. Done. This sentence means Process-2 can be iterated to define classes and their properties. The sentence is not clear and it is not meaningful.

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.

Editors 1st Draft Resolution of Comments on SC32 N2148 PDTR 20943-6

Date: 2012-06-07

Document: SC32/WG2 N1659

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	Disposition of comments
						<Solution> Delete the sentence. RESOLVED ☺
CA09	4.3	All	Te	It is unclear whether the two mapping approaches are intended to be alternative or complementary approaches.	The relationship between the two mapping approach needs to be more fully explained.	Accepted. Done. They are complementary. <Solution> Added an additional and clear description in 4.3.1 RESOLVED ☺
CA10	4.3.2	All	Te	We do not understand why Conceptual Domains and Data Element Concepts would be mapped to a Class, nor how a Data Element Concept can be mapped to both a class and a property.	This mapping approach needs to be more fully explained.	Accepted. Done. <Solution> Add a mapping example to Annex A.(See Table 6) RESOLVED ☺
CA11	Annex A	All	Te	The example in Annex A does not show the 11179-3 structures from which the data is being mapped.	Show the missing structures.	Accepted. Done. <Solution> 1. Modify Figure A.1 (current no. is Figure 5) and Figure 3; current no. is Figure 2) 2. An example in Annex A is

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.

Editors 1st Draft Resolution of Comments on SC32 N2148 PDTR 20943-6

Date: 2012-06-07

Document: SC32/WG2 N1659

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	Disposition of comments
						added. RESOLVED ☺
CA12	Annex A	All	Te	The example in Table A.2 only maps the Object Class and Property, while the mapping in 4.3.2 also includes Conceptual Domain and Data Element Concept.	Either include Conceptual Domain and Data Element Concept in the example, or exclude them from the mapping.	Accepted. Done. <Solution> Add a mapping example to Annex A. RESOLVED ☺
CA13	Annex A	New	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 A.1 becomes Figure 5.	Accepted. Done. RESOLVED ☺
CA14	Annex A	New	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 1 and Table A.2 becomes Table 2	Accepted. Done. RESOLVED ☺
CA15	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.	-
DE01	4.2.1		te	It should be possible to construct an ontology from several concept systems.		Not accepted. This part supports to construct an ontology from several concept systems. See Figure 2.

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.

Editors 1st Draft Resolution of Comments on SC32 N2148 PDTR 20943-6

Date: 2012-06-07

Document: SC32/WG2 N1659

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	Disposition of comments
						Closed.
DE02	4.3.1		te	The use of the word "concept" in chapter 4.3.1 is confusing, because link and link_end are not concepts in ISO 11179. Therefore, the phrase "In the concept region, there are five concepts used fir mapping model" does not correspond with the concept hierarchy in ISO 11179.	One should clearly distinguish the class "concept" and its subsumptions in ISO 11179 and the word "concept" used herein in a broader sense.	Accepted. Done. <Solution> 1. The mapping model is modified, and thus the statement is changed. 2. To avoid the confusion, "concept" is substituted with "class" used in the 11179 metamodel. RESOLVED ☺
DE03	4.3.1		te	The distinction between concepts, relation and relation_role in 4.3.1 is arbitrary, because relation and relation_role are concepts in ISO 11179 as well. So, if I build up an ontology of relations, relations of ISO 11179 become classes.		Accepted. Done. The mapping in Figure 3 is not correct. Only several of all concepts can be mapped to the ontology class. In case of Relation and Relation_Role, their function is the same with the relationship between ontology classes. Therefore, both are subclasses of Concept in 11179, but they cannot be mapped to ontology class. <Solution>

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.

Editors 1st Draft Resolution of Comments on SC32 N2148 PDTR 20943-6

Date: 2012-06-07

Document: SC32/WG2 N1659

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	Disposition of comments
						Add additional description. RESOLVED ☺
DE04	Annex A		te	"relation" should be replaced by "relation_role". For example, the relation between Person and Student is "hierarchy" with the relation_roles "is_a" and "reverse_is_a".	Replace "relation" by "relation_role".	Accepted. Done. <Solution> Replaced. RESOLVED ☺
JP01	1	4th Paragraph	ed	There are no definitions of an abbreviation of "EDF", "EDF-S", "OWL" and "KIF".	Add these words to list of abbreviated terms.	Accepted. Done. <Solution> New Subclause "3.5 Abbreviated terms" is added and the previous title of Clause 3 is changed as "Terms, definitions, and abbreviated terms". RESOLVED ☺
JP02	2	3rd Paragraph	te	Terminologies of ISO/IEC 11179-3:2010 are being quoted in Clause 3, but there is ISO/IEC 11179-3:2011 in Normative reference.	Change "11179-3:2010" to "11179-3:2012".	Accepted. Done. <Solution> CA03 RESOLVED ☺
JP03	2		te	Terminology of ISO/IEC 19103 and ISO/IEC 19763 is	Add a normative reference to 19103-3 and 19763-	Accepted. Done.

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

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

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

Editors 1st Draft Resolution of Comments on SC32 N2148 PDTR 20943-6

Date: 2012-06-07

Document: SC32/WG2 N1659

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	Disposition of comments
				being quoted in Clause 3, but those standards aren't written by Normative reference.	3.	<Solution> Added. RESOLVED ☺
JP04	3	all	te	There are no definitions of the terminology from which I emerge by this document.		Withdrawn.
JP05	3	all	ed	It's the structure made "Sub-Clause" every standard of the quotation destination of terminology, but does it match Directive?		Accepted. Done. <Solution> "Sub-Clause" is changed to "Subclause". RESOLVED ☺
JP06	4.3.2	1st Paragraph	te	Isn't the first "Figure 3" a slip of "Figure 4"?		Accepted. Done. <Solution> "Figure 3" is corrected as "Figure 4" (See 4.4.3). RESOLVED ☺
US01	general		ge	It is unclear what problem 20943-6 is solving. The example in Annex A does not motivate an understanding of the nature of the problem. The document seems to have little to do with "generating ontologies".	Modify text to clarify intent.	Accepted. Done. <Solution> Annex A is modified. RESOLVED ☺.

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.

Editors 1st Draft Resolution of Comments on SC32 N2148 PDTR 20943-6

Date: 2012-06-07

Document: SC32/WG2 N1659

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	Disposition of comments
US02	introduction	Paragraph 1	te	The first paragraph should be removed because the "semantic web" is a vague concept and the statement "In other words, an ontology is a formal and exact representation of information by concepts and relations between the concepts" is not a true statement, i.e., many ontologies are idealized *inexact* representations.	Remove.	Accepted. Done. Accepted. Done. <Solution> Removed. RESOLVED ☺
US03	3.4.1		te	The definition of "ontology", taken from 19763-3, is problematic "specification of concrete or abstract things, and the relationships among them, in a prescribed domain of knowledge". First, it seems that the use of "specification" is consistent with ISO/IEC Guide 2, which defines "technical specification" as "document that prescribes technical requirements to be fulfilled by a product, process or service", i.e., a specification is a kind of normative document. If the ISO/IEC Guide 2 sense of "specification" isn't the right one, then "specification" should be defined to make the definition of "ontology" clear. Second, given the example in the document, it seems that an "ontology" is merely a concept system (as defined by ISO 1087-1). If it is not intended for "ontology" to be a "concept system", then the definition should make it clear.	Correct the definition.	Rejected. <Solution> Leave the previous definition RESOLVED ☺ Through the discussion, we decided to reject this comment and keep the previous definition.
US04	3.5.1		te	The definition of "mapping model" is "a model for mapping between concepts of 11179-3 and concepts (classes) of generic ontology", yet the notion of a "generic ontology" is undefined. What makes a "generic ontology" different from an "ontology"? This distinction should be clarified in this definition, or "generic ontology" should be defined.	Add definition of generic ontology.	Accepted. Done. <Solution> The term "generic ontology" is replaced with "FGO_Ontology model". RESOLVED ☺
US05	3.5.1		te	It is unclear why new definitions need to be included in this	Explain.	Accepted. Done.

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

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

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

Editors 1st Draft Resolution of Comments on SC32 N2148 PDTR 20943-6

Date: 2012-06-07

Document: SC32/WG2 N1659

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	Disposition of comments
				document if the purpose of 20943-6 is intended to merely explain *existing* things, but not *specify* new things. It is difficult to review the new definitions when there is no context of (intended) specification, i.e., the document is a technical report.		<Solution> Explanation of “mapping model” is the only new definition and it is not defined by ISO nor SC7 and therefore it’s necessary to include in the definition. RESOLVED ☺
US06	4.3		ed	The discussion of mapping seems to confuse the objects of discourse (concepts, relations) and the relations among them (which are also called concepts and relations). This is not to suggest that one introduce language such as "meta-concept" and "meta-relation". For example, if P contains several concepts and relations, and Q contains several concepts and relations, then the mapping from P to Q will involve "relations" (as 20943-6 calls them) and there will be common features of P and Q (albeit not only concepts) that are called "concepts".	Modify text to clarify meaning.	Accepted. Done. <Solution> The prefix “FGO_” is used to avoid the confusion. RESOLVED ☺
US07	4.3		te	The note after the definition of "ontology" says "This part of ISO/IEC 20943 considers that an ontology consists of three components (class, property, and relation) used for describing most ontologies regardless of ontology description languages", yet it seems to preclude ontologies that are not framed in the class-property-relation paradigm. The limitation should be made clearer, and a rationale should be provided for this limitation.	Provide rationale for using only the class-property-relation model, or provide a more general description.	Accepted. Done. RESOLVED ☺
US08	4.3.2		te	In "mapping property" it is unclear why the notion of a "property defined in a data description region" only maps into a "generic ontology property". Given that all properties are concepts, too, couldn't some of them map into a "generic ontology class"?	Clarify.	Accepted. Done. <Solution> The reason why “Property” cannot be “Ontology class” is

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.

Editors 1st Draft Resolution of Comments on SC32 N2148 PDTR 20943-6

Date: 2012-06-07

Document: **SC32/WG2 N1659**

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	Disposition of comments
						given. (See Subclause 4.3.3.) RESOLVED ☺
US09	Annex A		ed	It is unclear in the diagram what portions are the "generic ontology", what portions are the "mapping", and what the "domain" and "range" are of the mapping.	Make the diagram easier to read and interpret.	Accepted. Done. <Solution> The diagram is modified and a detailed example is given. RESOLVED ☺

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.