Comments for ISO/IEC PDTR 20943-5

Comments on PDTR Text For: ISO/IEC PDTR 20943-5	Date: 2012-04-05	Document: **SC32/N2190**

0	1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
#	NB[1]	Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex	Paragraph/ Figure/Table/ Note #	Com- ment[2] type	Comment (justification for change) by the NB	Proposed change by the NB	Secretariat Comments
01	US	1.1		Ed	Background doesn't belong in the Scope section. Put that in the Introduction.	Move section to the Introduction.	
02	US	1.2		Ed	Purpose and Scope are not sufficiently different to merit a different section.	Move sentence to end of Scope section.	
03	US	1.3		Ed	As stated in US-02 (SC32 N 2191), the Scope needed some rewording. We feel the instruction given then was not clear. The additional detail about the steps of the SMMP is not what we meant. We meant to go into a little more detail about what semantic mapping is, not how to do it in this case. Scope sections are general in nature.	Beginning with the 2nd sentence to the end of this sub-clause, remove the original text (not what was moved there in US-02). At end of 1st sentence, remove "data elements", and replace with "registries through achieving metadata registry content consistency. A procedure based on the structure of ISO/IEC 11179 MDR is described."	
04	US	1.3		Ed	The statement in SC32 N 2191 US-02 that Conceptual Domain is out of scope of the TR leaves us perplexed. Take the following example: OC = person P = marital status CD = {single, married} And OC = person P = marital status CD = {single, married, separated, widowed, divorced} The current proposal would map these descriptions together because they agree on the DEC (i.e., OC + P). What would the purpose of such a final result be? Data described in these 2 ways are not interoperable. To make the data	Add CD mapping, including comparisons of VM's, to the Scope. US comments 21-32 below address the problem of mapping CD's.	

Comments for ISO/IEC PDTR 20943-5

Comments on PDTR Text For: ISO/IEC PDTR 20943-5		Date: 2012-04-05	Document: **SC32/N2190**

0	1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
#	**NB**[1]	**Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex**	**Paragraph/ Figure/Table/ Note #**	**Com- ment[2] type**	**Comment (justification for change) by the NB**	**Proposed change by the NB**	**Secretariat Comments**
					interoperable, the VM's in each of the CD's have to be mapped, too.		
05	US	2		Te	TR 20943-1 is referenced in sub-clause 4.4. It is essential for understanding the point in the paragraph.	Add TR 20943-1 as a normative reference.	
06	US	3.1.3		Ed	Definition has a typo.	Remove the words "to the".	
07	US	3.1.6		Te	Definition text is imprecise.	Replace "appearances" with "designations" and add reference to ISO 1087-1.	
08	US	4		Te	Clause 4 addresses semantic mapping procedure for DEC (data element concepts) rather than data elements.	Add "for Data Element Concepts" to title.	
09	US	4.1	3rd paragraph	Ed	Improve readability.	End 1st sentence agfter "metadata element sets", then replace "including" with "This includes four". Then, replace "namely" with a colon ":".	
10	US	4.2	Titles throughout	Te	Reduce number of sub-clauses.	Remove 4.2 heading and title. Promote 4.2.1 to 4.2. Promote 4.2.1.1 to 4.2.1. Promote 4.2.1.2 to 4.2.2. Promote 4.2.2 to 4.3. Promote 4.2.2.1 to 4.3.1. Promote 4.2.2.2 to 4.3.2 Promote 4.2.3 to 4.4 Promote 4.2.3.1 to 4.4.1 Promote 4.2.3.2 to 4.2	
11	US	4.2	Titles	Te	Value domains are not part of data element concepts. Plus, the semantic part of a value domain is the conceptual domain.	Promote and rename sub-clause 4.3 to "Semantic metadata mapping procedure for conceptual domains".	

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 **)**   **page 2 of 5**

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 for ISO/IEC PDTR 20943-5

Comments on PDTR Text For: ISO/IEC PDTR 20943-5		Date: 2012-04-05	Document: **SC32/N2190**

0	1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
#	NB[1]	Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex	Paragraph/ Figure/Table/ Note #	Com-ment[2] type	Comment (justification for change) by the NB	Proposed change by the NB	Secretariat Comments
12	US	4.2.1.2	2nd paragraph	Ed	The word "may" here is confusing and awkward. Are you recommending that the element set or target object not be chosen, or are you saying that in no circumstances is it to be chosen?	Replace "may" with the appropriate word, either should or must.	
13	US	4.2.2.1	1st sentence	Ed	Wording is a little awkward.	Replace "involved in" with "associated with". Replace "sub-grouped data elements" with "sub-group the data element concepts".	
14	US	4.2.2.1	3rd paragraph	Te	It is not clear how one determines if a data element concept is relatively less important.	Add some detail to explain how one goes about this. Provide criteria for this process.	
15	US	4	Throughout	Te	Reference to data elements is now wrong, based on the previous US comments.	Replace all instances of "data element" with "data element concept".	
16	US	4.2.2.2		Te	The term "primary data element" (concept) is unclear.	Explain how one determines the primary data element concepts. Is the choice arbitrary? If so, say so. Provide criteria for this process.	
17	US	4.2.2.2	Last sentence	Te	"Less important" is not clear.	Explain how one determines more or less importance. Provide criteria for this process.	
18	US	4.2.3.1	Last sentence	Ed	The TR is about semantic mapping, not standardization.	Remove the sentence.	
19	US	4.2.3.2	Last sentence, 2nd paragraph	Te	This is not clear.	Provide an example of how this works.	
20	US	4.2.3.2	Table 3	Te	The procedure and section deal only with data element concepts. It is not clear how representational issues, such as "number" in "ebookEditionNumber", arise.	Either explain how this is related or remove.	
21	US	4.3	Titles	Te	Titles and numbering of sub-clauses need to	Promote 4.3 to 5 and rename "Semantic	

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 **)   **page 3 of 5**

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 for ISO/IEC PDTR 20943-5

Comments on PDTR Text For: ISO/IEC PDTR 20943-5		Date: 2012-04-05	Document: **SC32/N2190**

0	1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
#	**NB**	**Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex**	**Paragraph/ Figure/Table/ Note #**	**Com-ment type**	**Comment (justification for change) by the NB**	**Proposed change by the NB**	**Secretariat Comments**
			throughout		change.	metadata mapping procedure for conceptual domains" Promote 4.3.1 to 5.1 Promote 4.3.2 to 5.2 Promote 4.3.3 to 5.3 Promote 4.3.4 to 5.4	
22	US	4.3.1	1st paragraph	Te	This is not really correct. The set of value meanings – the conceptual domain – has meaning itself. These semantics have an impact on the value meanings underneath. For instance, in a CD called marital status, the meaning of single changes whether you have value meanings {single, married} or {single, married, widowed, divorced}. Also, reference to datatype is not useful, since 11179 does not make much use of datatype.	Recommend rewriting this section to reflect the new emphasis on conceptual domains. Finding hierarchical and associational differences between similar value meanings across conceptual domains seems to be the method to apply.	
23	US	4.3.2 and 4.3.3	Entire sub-clauses	Te	These mix issues associated with the designations in value domains and the value meanings in conceptual domains.	Separate value meaning considerations (conceptual domains) from designation (value) considerations in value domains. Separating meaning (concepts) from representation (designations) is an important distinction this TR should emphasize.	
24	US	4.3.2	Generalization	Te	This ignores part-whole relationships.	Take the idea from ISO 1087-1 and refer to both generic/specific and part/whole as super- and sub-ordination. Refer to ISO 1087-1 and ISO 704.	
25	US	4.3.3	Composition / Decomposition	Te	When does one combine or separate values?	Rules for how and why this is done should be explained. The purpose for this is not really clear.	

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 **)   **page 4 of 5**
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 for ISO/IEC PDTR 20943-5

Comments on PDTR Text For: ISO/IEC PDTR 20943-5	Date: 2012-04-05	Document: **SC32/N2190**

0	1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
#	NB	Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex	Paragraph/ Figure/Table/ Note #	Com-ment type	Comment (justification for change) by the NB	Proposed change by the NB	Secretariat Comments
26	US	4.4		Ed	Create new clause.	Number this as Clause 6.	
27	US	4.4	4th paragraph	Te	See US-24. The possibility of part / whole relationships might affect factors as well.	Change generalization and specialization to super- and sub-ordination. Refer to ISO 1087-1 and ISO 704.	
28	US	4.4	9th and 10th paragraph – Lexical and Syntactic Differences	Te	Names are not the only place where differences can show up. Representing male and female as m/f or 0/1 are differences that need to be mapped.	What kind are they? They are either lexical or syntactical, maybe both sometimes. They need to be accounted for in the TR, as they are one of the main drivers for the inclusion of value and conceptual domains in 11179.	
29	US	4.4	7th paragraph	Ed	Spelling error.	Change "whole sail" to "wholesale".	
30	US	4.4	3rd paragraph	Ed	The clause "the attributes shown below are identified" in the last sentence doesn't seem to refer to any figure.	Either reinstate the figure or change to text to read "the various parts of this description can be placed as data in identified attributes."	
31	US	B.1	1st paragraph / last sentence	Ed	Wording is awkward.	Replace "how one factors a" with "how the factoring of a".	
32	US	B.2	3rd paragraph / last sentence	Ed	"state" in 11404 is a datatype family, not an actual datatype.	Add "family" after "datatype" in the parenthetical phrase.	
33	US	general		ge	The title of the TR, Semantic Metadata Mapping Procedure, sounds redundant. The words semantic and metadata often refer to the same thing.	Change the title to Semantic Mapping Procedure	

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 **)   **page 5 of 5**
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)*