

# ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 32 N 1592

Date: 2007-05-24

REPLACES: \_\_\_\_\_

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

<b>DOCUMENT TYPE</b>	Disposition of Comments
<b>TITLE</b>	Disposition of Comments for ISO/IEC FCD 19763-2 Information Technology - Metamodel framework for interoperability - Part 2: Core model
<b>SOURCE</b>	WG2 - Masaharu Obayashi & Doo-Kown Baik - Project Editors
<b>PROJECT NUMBER</b>	1.32.22.01.02.00
<b>STATUS</b>	disposition of comments for issuance of FCD2 19763-2 4 month letter ballot. With the inclusion of these comments the 19763-2 text has been put forward as FCD2 19763-2 in 32N1591
<b>REFERENCES</b>	
<b>ACTION ID.</b>	FYI
<b>REQUESTED ACTION</b>	
<b>DUE DATE</b>	
<b>Number of Pages</b>	15
<b>LANGUAGE USED</b>	English
<b>DISTRIBUTION</b>	P & L Members SC Chair WG Conveners and Secretaries

Dr. Timothy Schoechle, Secretary, ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 32  
Farance Inc \*, 3066 Sixth Street, Boulder, CO, United States of America  
Telephone: +1 303-443-5490; E-mail: [Timothy@Schoechle.org](mailto:Timothy@Schoechle.org)  
available from the JTC 1/SC 32 WebSite <http://www.jtc1sc32.org/>  
\*Farance Inc. administers the ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 32 Secretariat on behalf of ANSI

## Template for comments and secretariat observations

Date: 07-05-06	Document: ISO/IEC FCD 19763-2
----------------	-------------------------------

1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
<b>MB<sup>1</sup></b>	<b>Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex</b> (e.g. 3.1)	<b>Paragraph/ Figure/Table/ Note</b> (e.g. Table 1)	<b>Type of comment<sup>2</sup></b>	<b>Comment (justification for change) by the MB</b>	<b>Proposed change by the MB</b>	<b>Secretariat observations on each comment submitted</b>

## RESOLUTION OF COMMENTS FROM FCD 19763-2

### Template for comments and secretariat observations

Date: 2007-05-06	Document: ISO/IEC FCD 19763-2
------------------	-------------------------------

1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
<b>MB<sup>1</sup></b>	<b>Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex</b> (e.g. 3.1)	<b>Paragraph/ Figure/Table /Note</b> (e.g. Table 1)	<b>Type of comment<sup>2</sup></b>	<b>Comment (justification for change) by the MB</b>	<b>Proposed change by the MB</b>	<b>Secretariat observations on each comment submitted</b>
CA-01	Introduction		ed	Consistent presentation. The capitalization of E-Business an E-Commerce is unnecessary and is inconsistent with the format in clause 4.1.1 which uses e-business and ecommerce	Replace 'E-Business and E-Commerce' by 'e-business and e-commerce'.	Accept COMPLETED
CA-02	1	Para. 1	ed	Correction to document status.	Remove the 'CD' in the document number.	Accept COMPLETED
CA-03	1	Para. 3	ed	Remove tautology.	Remove 'standardized'.	Accept (refined statements) COMPLETED
CA-04	1	Para. 3	ed	Spelling corrections and consistent presentation.	E-Businees and E-Comerce should be 'e-business and e-commerce'	Accept (deleted the phrase) COMPLETED
CA-05	2		ed	Standards may not reference documents which are still underdevelopment.	Move the reference to 20944 to the Bibliography.	Accept COMPLETED
CA-06	3.1.11		ed	Correction to grammar	'statics classification' should be 'static classification'	Accept (deleted the Note) COMPLETED
CA-07	3.1.28		ed	Consistent presentation.	The reference to ISO/IEC 19501 should not be bold.	Accept COMPLETED

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.

## Template for comments and secretariat observations

Date: 07-05-06

Document: ISO/IEC FCD 19763-2

1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
MB <sup>1</sup>	Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex (e.g. 3.1)	Paragraph/ Figure/Table/ Note (e.g. Table 1)	Type of com- ment <sup>2</sup>	Comment (justification for change) by the MB	Proposed change by the MB	Secretariat observations on each comment submitted
CA-08	3.3	New	ed	Abbreviations used in the standard are not conveniently listed	Add a new subclause 3.3 Abbreviation and Acronyms, and list all those used in the standard, with their expansions, including: MDR, MFI, MOF, OMG, UML, XML	Accept COMPLETED
CA-09	4.1.1	Para	ed	'representation ways' is not a natural English term.	Replace 'ways' by 'methods' or 'techniques'.	Accept COMPLETED
CA-10	4.1.1 (1)	Para. 1	ed	'To as' is poor grammar.	Delete the "to" that precedes 'as a model element'.	Accept (deleted the phrase) COMPLETED
CA-11	4.1.1 (1)	Para. 2,3	ed	The paragraph that begins "On that occasion" is a continuation of the thought in the previous paragraph, and should therefore not be a separate paragraph.	Merge the paragraph with the preceding paragraph.	Accept (moved the paragraph into Annex B) COMPLETED
CA-12	4.1.1 (2)	Para. 1	ed	'has developed' is incorrect in this context.	Change 'has developed' to 'was developed' or 'has been developed'.	Accept (deleted the paragraph) COMPLETED
CA-13	4.1.1 (2)	Para. 1	ed	' is a standard of a metamodel description language' is not natural English phraseology.	Replace ' is a standard of a metamodel description language' by 'is a standard language for metamodel description '	Accept (deleted the paragraph) COMPLETED
CA-14	4.1.1 (2)	Para. 1	te	MOF only provides for the specification of a metamodel, not its management.	In line 2, change 'manage' to 'specify'.	Accept (deleted the paragraph) COMPLETED
CA-15	4.1.1 (2)	Para. 1	ed	Typos and grammatical errors.	In line 3, 'metmodel' should be 'metamodel'. In line 3, 'the unified way' should be 'a unified way'. In line 3, insert 'a' after provide.	Accept (deleted the paragraph) COMPLETED
CA-16	4.1.1 (2)	Para. 1	ed	Typo	'contract' should be 'construct'.	Accept COMPLETED

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.

## Template for comments and secretariat observations

Date: 07-05-06

Document: ISO/IEC FCD 19763-2

1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
MB <sup>1</sup>	Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex (e.g. 3.1)	Paragraph/ Figure/Table/ Note (e.g. Table 1)	Type of com- ment <sup>2</sup>	Comment (justification for change) by the MB	Proposed change by the MB	Secretariat observations on each comment submitted
CA-17	4.1.1 (2)	Para. 4	ed	In the paragraph numbered (3), there appears to be a nonprintable character preceding '(M2)'. Remove the character.	Remove the character.	Accept COMPLETED
CA-18	4.1.1 (3)	Para. 1	te	Is the use of the word 'shall' intentional. This makes such registration mandatory. Change 'shall be registered' to 'may be registered'.	Change 'shall be registered' to 'may be registered'.	Accept (moved this paragraph into the heading of Annex C) COMPLETED
CA-19	4.1.1 (3)	Para. 1	ed	Grammar Insert 'a' before 'metadata registry'.	Insert 'a' before 'metadata registry'.	Accept (refined the paragraph) COMPLETED
CA-20	4.1.1 (3)	Para. 1	te	Various terms are used to describe parts of a model, but the distinction among the terms is not clear. Specifically, the terms: 'modelling constructs', 'model elements', 'model classifiers', 'model components', 'model type' need to be clarified. Also, what I meant by 'granularities' of a model element? Explain precisely how these terms relate to each other, and what is meant by each. Ensure there is no duplication, and that each term is used correctly throughout the document.	Explain precisely how these terms relate to each other, and what is meant by each. Ensure there is no duplication, and that each term is used correctly throughout the document.	Accept (moved the paragraph into Annex C) COMPLETED
CA-21	4.1.1 (4)	Para.	te	The meaning of the clause heading is not clear Rephrase the heading.	Rephrase the heading.	Accept (moved the paragraph into Annex F) COMPLETED
CA-22	4.1.1 (4)	Para. 1	ed	Grammar In the first sentence, change 'into metadata registry' to 'in a metadata registry'.	In the first sentence, change 'into metadata registry' to 'in a metadata registry'.	Accept COMPLETED
CA-23	4.1.1 (4)	Para.	ed	Typos In line 2, 'introduced' is misspelled. In line 7, 'various' is misspelled.	In line 2, 'introduced' is misspelled. In line 7, 'various' is misspelled.	Accept (moved the paragraph into Annex F) COMPLETED

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.

## Template for comments and secretariat observations

Date: 07-05-06

Document: ISO/IEC FCD 19763-2

1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
MB <sup>1</sup>	Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex (e.g. 3.1)	Paragraph/ Figure/Table/ Note (e.g. Table 1)	Type of comment <sup>2</sup>	Comment (justification for change) by the MB	Proposed change by the MB	Secretariat observations on each comment submitted
CA-24	4.1.1 (4)	Para. 1	te	No attempt is made to categorize or describe different ways in which model components may be related to each other. The reference to 'internal components' suggest that containment is one such relationship, but surely there are others?	Add some text either describing how various model components may be related, or alternatively explaining why it is not possible to do so.	Accept (moved the paragraph into Annex F) COMPLETED
CA-25	4.1.1 (4)	Para. 1	ed	The sentence beginning 'Generally' is unclear and needs to be rewritten.	Suggested rewording: " Generally, a model component does not exist alone but may be a complex structure that contains or otherwise relates to other model components such as model classifiers."	Accept COMPLETED
CA-26	4.1.1 (5)	Para. 1	te	The whole use of the 'meaning triangle' is unclear. 'Sign' has to do with Designation, but the topic here appears to be 'Classification'. The relationship of the 'meaning triangle' to classification is not clear.	The various concepts introduced here need to be better separated and explained.	Accept (moved the clause into Annex E and Annex F, also refined the description) COMPLETED
CA-27	4.1.1 (5)	Para. 2	te	A Sign is used to Designate an object.	Replace 'It is used for pointing' by 'A Sign designates'	Accept (moved the clause into Annex E.) COMPLETED
CA-28	4.1.1 (5)	Para. 3	te	The second sentence, beginning 'It provides a meaning', is unclear. What provides meaning? The reference to the sign in the middle of the sentence obscures the meaning of the sentence.	Suggested rewording: " The model classifier specifies the meaning of the concept."	Accept (moved the clause into Annex E.) COMPLETED
CA-29	4.1.1 (5)	Para. 3	ed	Typo Grammar	replace 'my be' by 'may be' replace 'related various' by 'various related'.	Accept (moved the clause into Annex E.) COMPLETED
CA-30	4.1.1 (5)	Para. 4	ed	The paragraph about model instances is unclear and needs to be reworded.	Suggested rewording: " Model instance is a set of instances (values) of a model concept, specified by a model classifier appointed in the model concept. A model instance of the model concept, which a corresponding sign designates, may be registered as model component group derived by an upper metamodel (upper model). For example, a set of	Accept (moved the clause into Annex E.) COMPLETED

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.

# Template for comments and secretariat observations

1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
MB <sup>1</sup>	Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex (e.g. 3.1)	Paragraph/ Figure/Table/ Note (e.g. Table 1)	Type of comment <sup>2</sup>	Comment (justification for change) by the MB	Proposed change by the MB	Secretariat observations on each comment submitted
					objects such as a model and a pattern, a stereotype, and/or a data element."	
CA-31	4.1.1 (5)	Para. 5	ed	The last sentence, beginning: "In addition, it is used ..." is unclear and needs to be rewritten.	None provided. We don't understand the sentence. (Editor's comment) Suggested rewording: In general, object consists of other objects, which are selected element. A ModelComponent may be build as composition of selected ModelComponents. In addition, instance of ModelSelection may be used and refered by model supporting tools.	Accept (moved the clause into Annex E and rewarded) COMPLETED
CA-32	4.1.1 (5)	Para. 6	ed	typos	"illustrated" should be "illustrates" "prescribed" should be "prescribes"	Accept (moved the clause into Annex E.) COMPLETED
CA-33	4.1.1 (5)	Para. 6	te	The text states that Figure 2 illustrates relations 'with a model of the MFI registry', but the figure does not mention either models or a registry. That is illustrated by Figure 4 on page 23.	None provided. We don't understand the paragraph.	Accept (change it by new Figure3) COMPLETED
CA-34	4.1.1 (5)	Para 7	ed	Grammar	in the first sentence, 'refer the' should be 'refer to the' and 'by sign' should be 'by a sign'.	Accept (moved the clause into Annex E.) COMPLETED
CA-35	4.1.1 (5)	Para 7	ed	The acronym MFI-2 is used before it is explained	In this sub-clause, replace all instance of "MFI-2", by: "this part of 19763". (Editor's comment) replace "MFI-2" by "MFI part2" and "MFI part1", "MFI part3" and "MFI part4" are same for MFI-1, MFI-3 and MFI-4	COMPLETED

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.

# Template for comments and secretariat observations

Date: 07-05-06

Document: ISO/IEC FCD 19763-2

1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
MB <sup>1</sup>	Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex (e.g. 3.1)	Paragraph/ Figure/Table/ Note (e.g. Table 1)	Type of comment <sup>2</sup>	Comment (justification for change) by the MB	Proposed change by the MB	Secretariat observations on each comment submitted
CA-36	4.1.1 (5)	Para 7	ed	Typo	In line 10, 'not ease' should be 'not easy'	Accept (moved the clause into Annex E.) COMPLETED
CA-37	4.1.1 (6)	Para 1	ed	Grammar	In the first sentence, 'metamodel', 'model' and 'concept' should be plural.	Accept (moved the clause into Annex F) COMPLETED
CA-38	4.1.1 (6)	Para 1	ed	Grammar	In the second sentence, 'community' should be 'communities'.	Accept (moved the clause into Annex F) COMPLETED
CA-39	4.1.1 (6)	Para 1	ed	Grammar	Replace the third sentence by: "Standards and Profiles may be used to specify sets of typical concepts based on consensus."	Accept (moved the clause into Annex F) COMPLETED
CA-40	4.1.1 (6)	Para 1	ed	Grammar	Replace the fourth sentence by: "Model components are derived from and associated with model concepts."	Accept (moved the clause into Annex F) COMPLETED
CA-41	4.1.1 (6)	Para 1	ed	The acronym MFI-2 is used before it is explained	In the fifth sentence, replace "MFI-2", by: "this part of 19763".	Accept (moved the clause into Annex F and this phrase changed by "MFI Core") COMPLETED
CA-42	4.1.1 (6)	Para 2	ed	Grammar	In the first sentence, insert 'the' before 'development' and before 'Internet'.	Accept (moved the paragraph into Introduction) COMPLETED
CA-43	4.1.1 (6)	Para 2	ed	Grammar	In the second sentence needs to be rewritten.	Accept (moved the paragraph into Introduction)

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.

## Template for comments and secretariat observations

Date: 07-05-06

Document: ISO/IEC FCD 19763-2

1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
MB <sup>1</sup>	Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex (e.g. 3.1)	Paragraph/ Figure/Table/ Note (e.g. Table 1)	Type of com- ment <sup>2</sup>	Comment (justification for change) by the MB	Proposed change by the MB	Secretariat observations on each comment submitted

						COMPLETED
CA-47	4.2.1	All	te	The new administered items shown in Figure 4 are unnecessarily redundant with features of 11179-3. In particular, ModelSign is simply a designation which may be associated with ModelConcept through the features of Administered Item. If the MFI needs more than the features available in Edition 2 of 11179-3, then it should use the features being proposed by the Edition 3 WD. Making a Sign a separate Administered Item adds unnecessary overhead.	Use the Designation features of WD 11179-3 Edition 3.  (Editor's comment)  <i>This edition of MFI is based on 11179-2 ed2. The name in Designation of Administered item is used as instance name for ModelSign, ModelConcept, ModelComponentSet and so on. Naming rule for them is provided in Annex A. Those name may be defined by registry administrators. However, the name in Model Sign should be decided by experts of a SDO as controlled vocabulary. Those names are different usage.</i>	Not Accepted
CA-64	5	All	ed	ISO guidelines for editing advice against hanging paragraphs at the beginning of clauses that contain sub-clauses.	Insert a sub-clause heading after the clause 5 heading, and renumber all subsequent sub-clauses. (E.g. 5.1 Overview of conformance)	Accept COMPLETED
CA-70	Annex A	Para 7	ed	The wording of the paragraph is unclear.	In the first sentence, insert 'registry' before 'metamodel'  In the second sentence. Replace 'sectors' by Reword the second sentence as follows: " Particular sectors, such as registering metamodel and model, require metadata attributes not addressed in the standard."	Accept for the first sentence Completed  On the second sentence, Which words is requested to change?
CA-71	Annex A	Para 7	ed	Grammar	Change 'is conforming' to "conforms"	Accept COMPLETED
CA-78	Annex F	Table F1	ed	Grammar	In the row labelled 'Refining', "subclasses" should be "subclass".	Accept COMPLETED
CA-79	Annex F	Table F1	ed	Grammar	In the row labelled 'Substituting', change: - 'into the component' to "by the component" - "into the new one" to "by the new one".	Accept COMPLETED

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.

## Template for comments and secretariat observations

Date: 07-05-06

Document: ISO/IEC FCD 19763-2

1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
MB <sup>1</sup>	Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex (e.g. 3.1)	Paragraph/ Figure/Table/ Note (e.g. Table 1)	Type of comment <sup>2</sup>	Comment (justification for change) by the MB	Proposed change by the MB	Secretariat observations on each comment submitted
CA-81	<i>Bibliography</i>	item 3	ed	TR 15452 has been superseded by TR 20943-3.	Delete the reference to TR 15452, and renumber the following items.	Accept COMPLETED
CA-82	<i>Bibliography</i>	item 4	ed	TR 15452 has been superseded by TR 20943-3.	Replace '200n' by '2003' and remove '(to be published)'	Accept COMPLETED
CA-83	<i>Bibliography</i>	item 5	ed	TR 20943-3 was published in 2004	Replace '200n' by '2004' and remove '(to be published)'	Accept COMPLETED
CA-84	<i>General</i>	All	ed	Throughout the document English grammar needs to be improved to make this document suitable for publication as an International Standard.	We have provided some input in these comments, but this is not enough. We recommend a second FCD.	Accept
JP-01	<i>3 Definitions</i>		4-MinorEditorial	According to JTC1 directive, editorial changes should be performed as follows: 1. The articles in the head of each definition in the section 3 should be deleted, except of cited definitions.	(Editor's comment) <a href="#">The section "3 Definitions" have been edited according to ITIF editorial comments.</a>	COMPLETED
JP-02	<i>3 Definitions</i>		4-MinorEditorial	2. The dangling paragraph in the head of the section 3 should be moved to appropriate place.	(Editor's comment) <a href="#">The section "3 Definitions" have been edited according to ITIF editorial comments.</a> <a href="#">The dangling paragraph in the head of the section 3 Is remained.</a>	COMPLETED
JP-03	<i>3 Definitions</i>		4-MinorEditorial	3. The definitions of cited terms are not needed. It should be changed in the form of listing only cited terms if not inconvenient.	(Editor's comment) <a href="#">The section "3 Definitions" have been edited according to ITIF editorial comments.</a> <a href="#">UML terms are not defined in the ISO/IEC 19501:2005 as Definition. Those are only provided as Glossary. Except of cited definitions have not</a>	COMPLETED

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.

## Template for comments and secretariat observations

Date: 07-05-06

Document: ISO/IEC FCD 19763-2

1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
MB <sup>1</sup>	Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex (e.g. 3.1)	Paragraph/ Figure/Table/ Note (e.g. Table 1)	Type of comment <sup>2</sup>	Comment (justification for change) by the MB	Proposed change by the MB	Secretariat observations on each comment submitted
					deleted.	
JP-04	3 Definitions		4- Minor Editorial	4. The term used with different meaning in the different context should be cleared with appropriate qualified context name.	(Editor's comment) The section "3 Definitions" have been edited according to ITIF editorial comments.	Accept COMPLETED
GB-01	Foreword	6	ed	The reference to the standard appears as "19863"	Correct "19863" to "19763"	Accept COMPLETED
GB-02	general		ed	The English usage, whilst mostly comprehensible to a native English speaker, deviates in places from the norms of English grammar. It would be beneficial to have someone whose first language is English assist the Editor in making local changes to improve the presentation of the material.	(Editor's comment) The marked up version concerning English grammar have been received form a US committee member and experts. And the informal editing session have been held several times.	Accept COMPLETED
GB-03	general		te	The technical intent of some areas of the document is not presented with sufficient clarity for it to be understood readily by technically competent readers who have not been involved in its development.	(Editor's comment) The metamodel has been reviewed and modified for more comprehensive and consistence through discussion with experts.	Accept COMPLETED
GB-04	Introduction		ed	Some of the statements in the Introduction are applicable to standards in general and not just to this standard. It is not usual to include such statements in individual technical standards. Other statements, such as those in the last three paragraphs could usefully be moved, after some rewording, to the Scope clause.	(Editor's comment) The goal and purpose of MFI registry is registering such as artefact based on global standard. Then such general standardization activities are addressed and emphasised in the introduction.  However, the last three paragraphs have been refined.	Partly Accept COMPLETED
GB-05	4.2.1	(4) Constraints	te	The text includes in successive sentences "An instance of the ModelSign has a sign for the named element, which should be unique in the namespace." and "The combination of namespace and sign is to be unique." It is not obvious whether the first sentence is intended to specify a requirement, or merely good practice. The second sentence, which is probably implied by the	(Editor's comment) The requirement of uniqueness is specified in the attribute definition. Then the description in the constraint have been deleted.	Accept COMPLETED

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.

## Template for comments and secretariat observations

Date: 07-05-06

Document: ISO/IEC FCD 19763-2

1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
MB <sup>1</sup>	Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex (e.g. 3.1)	Paragraph/ Figure/Table/ Note (e.g. Table 1)	Type of comment <sup>2</sup>	Comment (justification for change) by the MB	Proposed change by the MB	Secretariat observations on each comment submitted

				first, appears to specify a requirement. However, it does not use the style prescribed by part 2 of the ISO/IEC Directives.		
GB-06	4.2.2	1	te	The first sentence appears to be incomplete. It is not obvious whether the second sentence is commentary or intended to express a requirement.	(Editor's comment) the description have been changed to be more specific corresponding to the UML diagram.	Accept COMPLETED
GB-07	4.2.4		te	The concept of "ModelSelection" requires more explanation. It provides a way of filtering sets of instances associated with a sign under a particular condition. We can guess how this might be used but are not certain.	(Editor's comment) More comprehensible example have been added in Annex G.	Accept COMPLETED
GB-08	4.3		te	The relationship between Target Package and Registry Package is not explained other than showing the ModelSelection in both places. The pictorial example in the appendix E helps slightly to confirm the intention, but further explanation in this area is needed.	(Editor's comment) More comprehensible example have been added in Annex G.	Accept COMPLETED
US-01	Clause 4.2.3 and Several other places		Te	<p>A source of confusion is the semantics of the "refers to"/"associated by" association between ModelConcept and ModelInstances. Which is a very serious problem, because it is at the very heart of the standard. part this is caused by the claim it is one of the edges in the "meaning triangle" of Ogden and Richards, which is not correct. But another part is that it actually has a polymorphic semantics, captured by the "association type" attribute of the ModelInstances. Annex F is very helpful in illustrating this feature, but much more about this needs to be said in the main body of the standard.</p> <p>Figure 1 does show that the different association types fit into the metamodel stack in different ways, but the text does not explain this clearly. And the name ModelInstances is confusing, because it is only under one of the four association types that they truly correspond to instances of a type.</p>	<p>ModelInstances should be renamed. Perhaps to ModelRealization, though I have not had time to check whether the OMG has already given a more specific meaning to the term realization. But I think it is very important to the understanding and adoption of the standard, that a name is found which fairly covers all the different meanings intended for all four association types.</p> <p>Include a fuller discussion of association types, preferably along with an illustrative figure of some sort showing both the commonality and diversity between them, should be inserted somewhere between the current Figure 1 and Figure 2.</p> <p>(Editor's comment) The suggestion from US experts, rename "ModelInstances" by "ModelComponentSet".</p>	Accept COMPLETED

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.

# Template for comments and secretariat observations

1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
MB <sup>1</sup>	Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex (e.g. 3.1)	Paragraph/ Figure/Table/ Note (e.g. Table 1)	Type of comment <sup>2</sup>	Comment (justification for change) by the MB	Proposed change by the MB	Secretariat observations on each comment submitted

					<p>The suggestion from editor. rename "Association type" by "Conceptualization type".</p> <p>Add the informative explanation of conceptualization in Annex F.</p>	
US-02	Clause 4.2	Figure 4	Te	<p>There is a need to clarify the reason for the inversion of the aggregation association between ModelComponent and ModelClassifier, compared to the "refers to"/"associated by" association between ModelConcept and ModelInstances. The inversion is seen very clearly in FDIS19763-3:2006(E), where they are seen to cross each other. While we think the inversion is correct, it also deserves some explanation. It would also appear to call for some integrity constraint to be specified, in the standard, to ensure consistency between these two associations.</p>	<p>Include explanation in the text. (Editor's comment)</p> <p>In the Core model, the difference is shown by separated packages such as Registry and Target. And add the explanation as a Note.</p> <p>"NOTE: ModelComponent may have some ModelClassifiers as model element. Meanwhile, ModelComponent may be conceptualized independently by the ModelConcept, which is classified by another ModelClassifier."</p> <p>Through editing session with US experts, Change association roles as follows in order to understand the model more clearly as natural English,:</p> <p>-ModelSign and ModeConcept: "having/specifying" by "designated by designates"</p> <p>-ModelConcept and ModeDomainProfile "/specified by" by "specifies/ specified by"</p> <p>-ModelConcept and ModelClassifier: "concept" by "classifies / classified by"</p> <p>-ModelSelection and ModelSign: "expressing / generally expressed by" by "expresses/expressed by"</p> <p>-ModelSelection and ModelComponentSet</p>	<p>Accept COMPLETED</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.

# Template for comments and secretariat observations

1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
MB <sup>1</sup>	Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex (e.g. 3.1)	Paragraph/ Figure/Table/ Note (e.g. Table 1)	Type of comment <sup>2</sup>	Comment (justification for change) by the MB	Proposed change by the MB	Secretariat observations on each comment submitted

					<p>“selected by/ selecting” by “selected by /selects”                      -ModelComponentSet and ModelConcept                      “refers to/associated” by “by conceptualizes/ conceptualized by” (editor’s suggestion)                      -ModelDomainProfile and ModelSpecification                      “/descriptions” by “/described by”                      -ModelComponent and ModelClassifier                      “/typed mode” by “/has”                      -ModelClassifier and ModelByMOF                      “containing/defined with UML” by “use/defined with UML”                      -ModelComponent and ModelSelection                      “/external reference” by “references”</p>	
US-03	Clause 4.1.1	Text around Figure 2	Te	The language about the meaning triangle needs to be substantially revised	<p>Revise along the lines discussed at the Huntsville WG 2 meeting.                      (Editor’s comment)                      Through discussion, it appeared that there are differences about interpretation of meaning triangle.                      In general, meaning triangle is a fundamental notion and essential aspect for human recognition. Sign is only a label to designate targeted and interesting object.                      And, to recognize the object correctly among different people, it needs to share the common concept.                      In MFI, object is modelled as a component or componentSet.                      Component in ComponentSet should have the same label.                      In general, Component can be conceptualized in the many way according to many viewpoints and purpose.                      Then, component itself should not have a particular</p>	Accept COMPLETED

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.

# Template for comments and secretariat observations

1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
MB <sup>1</sup>	Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex (e.g. 3.1)	Paragraph/ Figure/Table/ Note (e.g. Table 1)	Type of comment <sup>2</sup>	Comment (justification for change) by the MB	Proposed change by the MB	Secretariat observations on each comment submitted

					<p>label.</p> <p>It need to identify the set of components to be same labelled depend on the aspect.</p> <p>Such grouped components should be labelled and conceptualized by metamodel and model.</p> <p>In MFI, label is controlled by ModelSign, metamodel and model is specified by ModelConcept.</p> <p>One more important notion is selection.</p> <p>ModelSelection has role to give a sign (label) to particular componentSet.</p> <p>In general, object consists of other objects, which are selected element.</p> <p>ModelComponent may be build as composition of selected ModelComponents.</p> <p>In MFI, original meaning triangle is enhanced as follows:</p> <p>"Select Set of components conceptualized by on common concept defined by model and give it a controlled sign for human communication and identify artificial concept."</p>	
US-04	<i>General</i>		Te	There is no consolidated diagram, which would help the reader to comprehend the whole standard.	<p>Provide a consolidated figure, showing everything in one diagram</p> <p>(Editor's comment)</p> <p>New diagram has been added as <a href="#">Figure 3- Overview of MIF core model.</a></p>	Accept COMPLETED
US-05	<i>General</i>		Ed	The English still needs quite a bit of work. In part, to correct grammar. But many parts, including the Introduction, have the more serious problem of compositional structure as well.	<p>A marked up version with tracking changes turned on, will be provided directly to the project editor. The marked up version is not intended to make any technical changes. All technical changes would have to be made separately by the project editor.</p> <p>(Editor's comment)</p>	Accept COMPLETED

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.

## Template for comments and secretariat observations

Date: 07-05-06

Document: **ISO/IEC FCD 19763-2**

1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
<b>MB<sup>1</sup></b>	<b>Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex</b> (e.g. 3.1)	<b>Paragraph/ Figure/Table/ Note</b> (e.g. Table 1)	<b>Type of com- ment<sup>2</sup></b>	<b>Comment (justification for change) by the MB</b>	<b>Proposed change by the MB</b>	<b>Secretariat observations on each comment submitted</b>
					<a href="#">Thank you for the comments</a>	

### ITTF comments were given with marked text and attached following notes.

Use of square brackets indicates that the term is taken verbatim from the **Terms and definitions** clause of the cited document. Convert to a note wherever this is not the case.

Update numbering from here on and redraft in line with 3.1.1 to 3.1.18.

Follow presentation of Annexes A to C for remaining annexes.

These documents are either cited informatively or not at all elsewhere in the document; therefore, they may not be given as normative references. Please check all titles and years of publication against the ISO online catalogue for documents given in normative references and bibliography.

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.