

ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 32 N 1623

Date: 2007-07-15

REPLACES: —

<p>ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 32</p> <p>Data Management and Interchange</p> <p>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 ISO/IEC CD3 20944-2 Information technology - Metadata Registry Interoperability and Bindings (MDR-IB) Part 2: Coding bindings
SOURCE	SC32 Secretariat
PROJECT NUMBER	1.32.17.01.02.00
STATUS	WG2 is requested to resolve the comments
REFERENCES	
ACTION ID.	ACT
REQUESTED ACTION	
DUE DATE	
Number of Pages	8
LANGUAGE USED	English
DISTRIBUTION	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
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

ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 32 N1623

Summary of Voting on Document SC 32 N 1570

Title: ISO/IEC CD3 20944-2 Information technology - Metadata Registry Interoperability and Bindings (MDR-IB) Part 2: Coding bindings

Project: 1.32.17.01.02.00

“P” Member	Approval	Approval with Comments	Disapproval with Comments	Abstention with Comments
Australia				
Belgium				
Brazil				
Canada			1	
China	1			
Czech Republic	1			
Egypt				
Finland				
Germany				1
Japan			1	
Korea, Republic of	1			
Portugal				
Sweden				
United Kingdom			1	
United States			1	
Total “P”	3	0	4	1
“O” Member				
Austria				
Denmark				
France				
Italy				
Netherlands, The				
Norway				
Russian Federation				
Switzerland				
Total “O”				

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
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

COMMENTS:

Canada

No. See attached comments

Germany

Abstain. Lack of expertise and interest.

Japan

No. See attached comments

United Kingdom

No. See attached comments

United States

No. See attached comments

Approved Canadian Comments on SC32 N1570 CD3 20944-2

Template for comments and secretariat observations

Date: 2007-06-27

Document: ISO/IEC CD3 20944-2

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
CA 01	6.8	all	te	<p>The reserved keyword properties in section 6.8 of 20944-2 CD3 need further explanation and examples. <code>._typeas</code>: has a brief example, and <code>._value</code>: is described in 6.7, but the rest have nothing.</p> <p><code>._prop</code>:</p> <p>What other properties might the data object have? Does this keyword return just the names of available properties, or there values as well. Can properties have other than a single value?</p> <p><code>._type / ._typeas</code>:</p> <p>Is the list of valid types implementation-defined?</p> <p><code>._label</code> :</p> <p>Is this the name of the object, or something else? What if an object has multiple names?</p> <p>[This comment is Bugzilla issue 278.]</p>	Provide sample syntax for each keyword, with examples of data that might be returned for each keyword from different types of data object.	



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 CD3 20944-2

Status: Document to accompany ballot response

Author: Hajime Horiuchi

References:

[1] 32N1570, ISO/IEC CD 20944-2, Information technology — Metadata Registries Interoperability and Bindings(MDR-IB): - Part 2: Coding bindings

ISO/IEC JTC1/SC32/WG2

SEQ #	Cmnt ID	See Also	Severity	Reference	Description	Addressed By
ISO/IEC 2nd CD 19763-1						
001	JPN-P01-001		General	<i>General</i>	<p>This project consolidation and its CD ballot resolution are grounded on only the WG2 resolutions at Huntsville, which have not yet authorized by the SC32 level resolution.</p> <p>So, this consolidated project is not yet initiated and cannot go to the CD stage. So, this CD ballot is void.</p> <p>See 6.2.2.1 and Item 3, 12.5.7, ISO/IEC JTC1 N8105 ISO/IEC JTC 1 Directives, 5th Edition, Version 1.0</p>	
002	JPN-P01-002		General	<i>General</i>	<p>32N1570B-ballot for CD3 24944-2 says "Date of circulation: 2007-04-20, Closing date: 2007-07-15".</p> <p>However, 9.4.1, ISO/IEC JTC1 N8105 ISO/IEC JTC 1 Directives, 5th Edition, Version 1.0 says "In the case of CDs/PDAMs/PDISPs/PDTRs, this date should be no less than three months from the date of notification of issue."</p> <p>So, the closing date shall be after 2007-07-20.</p>	

End of Paper

Template for comments and secretariat observations

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	General		ge/te	It is not clear what the term 'coding bindings' means		
GB	General		ed	Many terms (for example "data object" in Clause 5.3.1.1) are enclosed in quotes, without any explanation as to the significance of the quotes. Either the quotes should be removed or their significance explained.		
GB	5.3		te	'Data Structuring Model'. This term is not understood.		
GB	5.3.1.1		ed	English: ... an "data object" a "data object" ...	
GB	5.3.1.1		ed	'Data objects are structured data characterized by following.' This sentence is not understood.		
GB	5.4.2.6		te	'Soft links are implicitly "chased" (automatically "dereferenced").' What is the significance of using both "chased" and "dereferenced" here? Would it not be more appropriate to just use "dereferenced"?		
GB	5.4.2.7		te	'References must be explicitly "chased" (or "dereferenced").' What is the significance of using both "chased" and "dereferenced" here? Would it not be more appropriate to just use "dereferenced"?		
GB	10		ed	This is a placeholder that should be removed.		
GB	11.2		ed	ISO 11404 is referenced in this clause, yet is not included in the normative references clause (Clause 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.

US Comments on CD3 Text For: ISO/IEC 20944, Information technology — Metadata Registries Interoperability and Bindings (MDR-IB) — Part 2: Coding bindings	Date: 2007-06-13	Document: xxx
--	------------------	----------------------

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	Proposed Disposition of Comments

0001	US	general		te	The 20944 parts 2, 3, and 4 should describe the minimum expected limits that are supported across all implementations. For example, when storing an 11179 attribute via 20944, what size should be accepted on all implementations: 1KB, 1MB, 1GB, or somewhere in between?		

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)*