

ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 32 N1354

ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 32 N 1354

Date: 2005-09-26

REPLACES: --

<p style="text-align: center;">ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 32</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Data Management and Interchange</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Secretariat: United States of America (ANSI) Administered by Farance Inc. on behalf of ANSI</p>
--

DOCUMENT TYPE	Summary of Voting/Table of Replies
TITLE	Summary of Voting on Document SC 32 N 1330 ISO/IEC CD 24707 Information technology -- Common Logic (CL) – A Framework for a Family of Logic-Based Languages
SOURCE	SC 32 Secretary
PROJECT NUMBER	1.32.25.01.00.00
STATUS	WG 2 should take and resolve the comments [Corrections are: 1. standard number and 2. sums of ballot counts]
REFERENCES	
ACTION ID.	ACT
REQUESTED ACTION	
DUE DATE	
Number of Pages	14
LANGUAGE USED	English
DISTRIBUTION	P & L Members SC Chair WG Conveners and Secretaries

Douglas Mann, Secretary, ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 32

Farance Inc *, 360 Pelissier Lake Road, Marquette, MI 49855-9678, United States of America

Telephone: +1 906-249-9275; E-mail: MannD@battelle.org

available from the JTC 1/SC 32 WebSite <http://jtc1sc32.org/>

*Farance Inc. administers the ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 32 Secretariat on behalf of ANSI

Summary of Voting on Document SC 32 N 1330,**Title:** ISO/IEC CD 24707 Information technology -- Common Logic (CL) – A Framework for a Family of Logic-Based Languages

Project: 1.32.25.01.00.00

“P” Member	Approval	Approval with Comments	Disapproval	Abstention
Australia	X			
Belgium				
Brazil				
Canada			X	
China				
Czech Republic	X			
Egypt				
Finland				
Germany				X
Italy				X
Japan			X	
Korea, Republic of	X			
Netherlands, The				X
Portugal				
Sweden				X
United Kingdom				X
United States			X	
Total “P”	3	0	3	5
“O” Member				
Austria				
Denmark				
France				
Norway				
Russian Federation				
Switzerland				
Total “O”				

GERMANY

Lack of interest

ITALY

Lack of experts

THE NETHERLANDS

no experts available

SWEDEN

Lack of experts

UNITED KINGDOM

The UK, currently, do not have sufficient expert resources to review this document and prepare comments.

CANADA

Project: 1.32.25.01.00.00
Title: Canadian Ballot Comments on CD 24707 (SC32 N1330)
Status: Approved Canadian Ballot Comment
Date: September 22, 2005
Source: Canada

1. INTRODUCTION

Canada votes "DISAPPROVAL FOR THE REASONS GIVEN ON THE ATTACHED" on ISO/IEC CD 24707 (SC32 N1330).

2. BALLOT COMMENTS

The following are the Canadian comments on this ballot.

SEQ #	Cmnt ID	See Also	Severity	Reference	Description	Addressed By
JTC1/SC32 N1330 CD 24707						
	CAN-001		4-Minor Editorial	<i>0-Introduction</i>	In the 2 nd paragraph of the Introduction, there are two occurrences of a text string "Logicasses". Presumably this is intended to be: "Logic classes". Proposed solution Replace this string by the words "Logic classes".	
	CAN-002		3-Major Editorial	<i>3-Terms and Definitions</i>		

SEQ #	Cmnt ID	See Also	Severity	Reference	Description	Addressed By
	CAN-003		4-Minor Editorial	3.1-Definitions	The 3.1 sub-clause heading is redundant, and should be removed. Sub-clauses 3.1.1 etc should be renumbered as 3.1.	
	CAN-004		4-Minor Editorial	3.1.1	The last part of the definition (as introduced by ...) qualifies conceptual graph theory, and should not be part of the definition of conceptual graph. End this definition after 'theory', and add a definition of 'conceptual graph theory', preferable with more precision than is implied by 'introduced by'.	
	CAN-005		4-Minor Editorial	3.1.2	The Note should be a separate paragraph.	
	CAN-006		4-Minor Editorial	3.1.3	The second and third sentences should be made into a NOTE.	
	CAN-007		4-Minor Editorial	3.1.4	The second and third sentences should be made into a NOTE.	
	CAN-008		4-Minor Editorial	3.1.5	The second sentence should be made into a NOTE.	
	CAN-009		4-Minor Editorial	3.1.6	The last part of the first sentence, beginning with "originating...", with appropriate rewording, should be made into a NOTE. The second sentence should be made into a second Note.	
	CAN-010		4-Minor Editorial	3.1.8	The second sentence should be made into a NOTE.	
	CAN-011		4-Minor Editorial	3.1.11	The second sentence should be made into a NOTE.	
	CAN-012		4-Minor Editorial	3.1.12	All except the first sentence should be moved to a Note.	
	CAN-013		4-Minor Editorial	3.1.12	The first sentence should be terminated at what is currently a comma, and the rest of the definition should be moved to a Note.	
	CAN-014		1-Major Technical	3.1.x	There is no definition of 'logic-based language'.	

End of
Comments

JAPAN

20 Sep, 2005



ISO

International Organization for Standardization

ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 32
Data Management and Interchange
WG 2
Metadata

Title: Japan Ballot Comments on ISO/IEC CD 24707

Status: Document to accompany ballot response

Author: Hajime Horiuchi

References:

[1] 32N1330, ISO/IEC CD 24707, Information technology — Common Logic(CL) – A Framework for a Family of Logic-Based Languages I

SEQ #	Cmnt ID	See Also	Severity	Reference	Description	Addressed By
ISO/IEC CD 24707						
001	JPN-P01-001		1-Major Technical	<i>Annex B, C (normative)</i>	Incomplete	
002	JPN-P01-002		4-Minor Editorial	<i>Title on cover page and page vi</i>	They should be same.	
003	JPN-P01-002		2-Minor Technical	<i>1 Scope last sentence at page vi</i>	The meaning of the sentence is not clear. At least, this standard prescribes the relationship between CL Expressions and Universe of Discourse as Interpretations.	
004	JPN-P01-004		4-Minor Editorial	<i>4.1 Symbol D_i</i>	“a non-empty set of individuals that an interpretation is “about”.” should be “a non-empty set of individuals that an interpretation <i>I</i> is “about”.” to be consistent with U _i .	
005	JPN-P01-005		2-Minor Technical	<i>4.1 Symbol S*</i>	Delete this symbol and its definition because this definition is not consistent with D _i * that is actually used in this standard and add the symbol D _i * and its definition i.e. D _i * a set of the elements that are a finite sequence of elements of D _i .	
006	JPN-P01-006		4-Minor Editorial	<i>4.1 Symbol U_i</i>	Add “A universe of discourse;” at the beginning of the explanation to be consistent with D _i .	
007	JPN-P01-007		4-Minor Editorial	<i>4.2 Abbreviations OWL</i>	“Ontology Markup Language for the Web” should be “Web Ontology Language”.	
008	JPN-P01-008		4-Minor Editorial	<i>5.1 Requirements</i>	Sub-clause numbers are inadequate. e.g. “1” should be “5.1.1” .	
009	JPN-P01-009		4-Minor Editorial	<i>5.1 Requirements 3. b.</i>	“logical names” should be “names” because “logical name” is not defined.	
010	JPN-P01-010		2-Minor Technical	<i>6.2 Common logicsemantics in the first line</i>	“the set D _i * x D _i ” should be “a set of special subsets of the set D _i * x D _i ”	

SEQ #	Cmnt ID	See Also	Severity	Reference	Description	Addressed By
				<i>on page 17</i>		
011	JPN-P01-011		4-Minor Editorial	<i>6.2 Common logicsemantics Table 1 E6</i>	"term sequence" should be "argument sequence" to be consistent with 6.1.1.11.	
012	JPN-P01-012		4-Minor Editorial	<i>6.2 Common logicsemantics Table 1 E7</i>	"term sequence" should be "argument sequence" to be consistent with 6.1.1.9.	
013	JPN-P01-013		2-Minor Technical	<i>6.2 Common logicsemantics Table 1 E18</i>	The function ext needs to be defined.	
014	JPN-P01-014		4-Minor Editorial	<i>6.5 Summary of CLIF in the first line on page 17</i>	"Common Logic core syntax" should be "Common Logic Interchange Format" to be consistent with the title of Annex A.	
015	JPN-P01-015		2-Minor Technical	<i>A.2.3 Expression syntax termseq on page 30</i>	"seqvar?" should be "[seqvar]" because "?" is undefined and termseq may not have a sequence variable.	
016	JPN-P01-016		4-Minor Editorial	<i>A.3 CLIF Semantics Table on page 30</i>	Need a table designation and title.	
017	JPN-P01-017		2-Minor Technical	<i>A.3 CLIF Semantics Table on page 30</i>	"boolsent" should also have E12 Biconditional as its semantics.	
018	JPN-P01-018		1-Major Technical	<i>B.3 CGIF Syntax</i>	BNF in Annex B does not conform to ISO/IEC 14977. For example, the defining-symbol is "::=" rather than "=" and there is no terminator-symbol.	
019	JPN-P01-019		4-Minor Editorial	<i>C.2 XCL Syntax on page 47</i>	"coreSyntax" is better to be "commonLogicInterchangeFormat".	

End of Paper

UNITED STATES

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
US-1	5		<i>ge</i>	Rationale is generally not included in a standard; belongs in a TR or other external document	Significantly reduce content in clause 5; e.g., remove most of 2 nd para. p. 16. Consider planning for a TR split for 24707.	
US-2	all		<i>ge</i>	Normative text should be clearly identifiable to eliminate ambiguity or possible confusion in conformance evaluations. Parsing each paragraph to separate out the conformance relevant sentences is tedious and error prone.	If statements are intended only to indicate “good practices” , recommend they be clustered in a separate section (paragraph, chapter, etc.). Ensure that usage of “should” and “shall” conform to ISO guidelines. Ensure that “should” refers to recommendations, not requirements.	
US-3	5.2.1, para 2, last sentence.		<i>ge</i>	It is not explicitly stated whether CGIF is a CL dialect.	State so explicitly.	
US-4	6		<i>ge</i>	UML is not in harmony with the text	Bring UML diagrams into agreement with rest of the clause, making clear that in case of any ambiguity, the text carries the normative weight.	
US-5	All		<i>ge</i>	Need more examples, especially in the CLIF annex	Add additional examples where appropriate. In particular, consider having an example for each distinct linguistic formation.	
US-6	All		<i>ge</i>	There is still some confusion as to whether KIF means CLIF or not	Make sure references to KIF really mean historically KIF, not CLIF (e.g., p16)	
US-7	Annex A, B, and C		<i>ge</i>	Terminology seems based on CLIF.	Terminology of each annex should flow from the abstract CL syntax and semantics (i.e., not CLIF)	
US-8	All		<i>te</i>	Not clear that unique name assumption does not hold	Make clear that names are not unique; e.g., interpretation of two names might be the same individual.	
US-9	3		<i>te</i>	“type” not defined	Define “type”	
US-10	3.1.2		<i>te</i>	Note on glossary entry could be interpreted to mean that CLIF is semantically equivalent to	Remove the note. “based on KIF” in first sentence (and in 3.1.6) is sufficient.	

				KIF.	Could add reference to section 5.2.1.	
US-11	4.1		<i>te</i>	Some definitions require editing, some alternatives have been proposed Non-denoting name is misleading.	<p>“Universe/universe of discourse”; need to distinguish it from “Domain/domain of discourse”</p> <p>Domain - set over which quantifiers range,</p> <p>Universe= set of all denotations of all names in the dialect, including relation and function names. Different dialects assume different relationships between these.</p> <p>Change nondenoting name to non-quantifiable name - name whose interpretation is not in D.</p> <p>Denoting name - a name whose interpretation is in D. Remove 3.1.10 and other terms not used</p> <p>3.1.12 should reference W3C spec and not elaborate very much; add discussion at URI noting IRI's potential role</p>	
US-12	5.1 (1) , p5, 2 nd and 3 rd sentences		<i>te</i>	Suggested corrective example.	Remove “should” from both sentences, thereby making the first sentence an assertion about CL, the second an assertion about what constitutes a “conventional first-order syntax”.	
US-13	5.2.1, para 2		<i>te</i>	CLIF is asserted to be “more similar to conventional machine-oriented logics.” What appears to be meant is more similar to traditional machine-oriented logic <u>languages</u> (or <u>syntaxes</u> or <u>notations</u>).	Remove the text.	
US-14	6.1		<i>te</i>	The distinction between names and name occurrences is not made consistently in the category definitions.	Explicitly say name occurrence wherever the metamodel specifies a name occurrence.	
US-15	6.1.1.1		<i>te</i>	Both text and module can be given a name. What is the purpose of naming arbitrary text?	Either provide a rationale (including an example), or remove the facility for naming text which is not wrapped in a module. What problem is this supposed	

					to address?	
US-16	6.1.1.1		<i>te</i>	What is the difference between the name of a module and the name of the contained text?	If the capability is retained, provide a clear distinction between them. Make clear that named text is for interchange convenience, whereas module naming creates a local universe over which all internal quantifiers apply.	
US-17	6.1.1.3		<i>te</i>	“a piece of data” is not an adequate definition.	Clarify definition of a a comment as a digital artifact (including possibly images or media) with no semantics in the logic, and specify that comments are to be preserved. Add wording in conformance clauses specifying that fully (syntactically) conformant dialects cannot impose further conditions on comments.	
US-18	6.1.1.3, final sentence.		<i>te</i>	In the absence of further qualification, the note that “Particular dialects may impose conditions on the form of comments” seems to violate requirements 3. and 4. If comments are important enough to capture, then they are important enough to transcribe faithfully between dialects.	Suggest that dialects be required to faithfully transcribe <i>all</i> comments, and change cited text to read “Dialects may use comments to convey extra information, and may therefore impose interpretation conditions on appropriately structured comments. However, all dialects must preserve comments attached to sentences even when those comments derive from dialects which use different conventions.”	
US-19	6.1.1.5		<i>te</i>	Is importing transitive, and what happens when the same module is imported twice?	Make clear in 6.3 that importation is transitive, importing a module into itself is a null action that must succeed, and that importing a module more than once has no additional effect.	
US-20	6.1.1.9, and Figure 5		<i>te</i>	The inclusion of equations in the atom category clashes with my intuition and with usage of the name “atom” in other traditions. Furthermore, it is not clear why this inclusion is desirable, and in Figure 5 it is noted that it does not provide a name for “atoms” which are not equations.	Promote “equation” to a sibling of “atom”, and rename “atom” to “atomic sentence”. Make clear that in CL unbound terms are simply those which are not quantified.	
US-21	6.1.2		<i>te</i>	UML diagrams should reflect the CL abstract syntax, not the CLIF syntax	Re-draw the figures using abstract CL terminology, not CLIF.	

US-22	6.1.3		<i>te</i>	"type and "sort" aren't defined and the difference isn't clear.	Clarify the distinction and use of types vs. sorts.	
US-23	6.2	<i>3^d para.</i>	<i>te</i>	An error in the mapping?	Make clear that the mapping is correct -- there are no mappings from D to U.	
US-24	6.2		<i>te</i>	Distinction between denoting and non-denoting names is not clear Not clear what is a variable or non-variable.	Make clear the distinction between denoting and non-denoting and show their relationship to variables.	
US-25	6.2, rule E17 and E18		<i>te</i>	What is "ext"? What is "text"?	"ext" should be "rel". "text" is explained and defined in section 6.3 The conditions in 6.3 are part of the formal semantics of the table and should be numbered appropriately.	
US-26	6.2		<i>te</i>	Sequence variables require some kind of quantification in order to facilitate proof rules involving them.	Specify that sequence variables are to be quantified.	
US-27	7.1.1, second bullet		<i>te</i>	Wrong use of "should" If "Conformant dialects or sub-dialects whose parsings include other categories of sentences should categorize them as irregular sentences for Common Logic conformity"	Rewrite sentence: For Common Logic conformity, a dialect whose parsings include other categories of sentences must either identify them as irregular sentences or specify how these categories are mapped into the CL categories.	
US-28	A.2.1, last paragraph		<i>te</i>	The behavior specified for backslash escapes is non-standard, and open to needless misunderstanding. The sequence \\ should be treated as a single U+005C character, and all other sequences of \ followed by any character other than u U ' " or \ should be <i>disallowed</i> .	Redefine accordingly.	
US-29	A.3		<i>te</i>	Table needs to be complete with respect to CL abstract categories.	Complete the table.	
US-30	1	<i>P. vi</i>	<i>ed</i>	Undefined word : Logicasses (appears twice) and in other cases "CL" was replaced by "Common Logic" inadvertently.	Typo -- should be classes. Fix other occurrences.	
US-31	1	<i>p. vi</i>	<i>ed</i>	Pagination: Introduction should be on p.1	Correct the pagination. Intro should be p.vi while scope section should begin on page 1.	

US-32	6.1.1.5		<i>ed</i>	It's not clear where the discussion of identification occurs "below".	Make clear that "below" refers to the standards document and not a CL text	
US-33	C.2		<i>ed</i>	Reference to CLIF also as "the core-syntax" is confusing. If you want to call it CLIF, call it CLIF everywhere.	Change all references to "the core-syntax" to "CLIF", and change its XCL name to "CLIF".	
US-34	Bibliography		<i>ed</i>	should include ISO 13568 (Z)	Independently of item 4, Z should be mentioned as a reference (NOT a normative reference.) Use as an example of a sorted logic	