

ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 32 N 1696

Date: 2007-09-05

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	Disposition of comments
TITLE	Disposition of comments on CD1 19763-4 Information technology - Framework for Metamodel interoperability Part 4: Metamodel for model mapping
SOURCE	WG2 - Toshiaki Kurokawa and He Keqing - Project Editors
PROJECT NUMBER	1.32.22.01.04.00
STATUS	Disposition of comments in 32N1510 (comments on CD1 19763-4 ballot 32N1402). This accompanies CD2 19763-4 sent to NBs for 3 month letter ballot
REFERENCES	
ACTION ID.	FYI
REQUESTED ACTION	
DUE DATE	
Number of Pages	7
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

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	Secretariat observations on each comment submitted

RESOLUTION OF COMMENTS FROM CD 19763-4

Template for comments and secretariat observations

Template for comments and secretariat observations					Date: 2006 -07 -07	Document: ISO/IEC CD 19763-4
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	Secretariat observations on each comment submitted
CAN - P04-001	0	All	0- General	While Canada continues to support work on this family of standards, we believe that serious technical problems remain. It is important that all parts be well harmonized. Therefore, further progression of parts 1 and 3, which have already reached FCD stage, needs to be deferred until Parts 2 and 4 are also ready to move to FCD.	Addressed By According to the resolution of SC32 in the Kobe meeting, it was approved that part2 would progress to FCD and, part1 and part3 would progress to FDIS. On the other hand, part 4 will move to FCD after performing 2nd CD Ballot.	Accept COMPLETED
CAN - P04-002	2 Normative References		1- Major Technical	Many standards are listed in the Normative References, but most are not referenced from the document text. References that are not truly normative should be removed or moved to the Bibliography. For those that are normative, there should be some explanation of their relevance in the normative clauses of this document	Addressed By	Accept COMPLETED
CAN - P04-003	3Definitions		4- Minor Editorial	Rename the clause to 'Terms and definitions'.	Addressed By	Accept COMPLETED
CAN - P04-004	3Definitions		3- Major Editorial	Most of the definitions in this clause are taken from other standards. The original source, including document number and clause number, should be identified.	Addressed By	Accept COMPLETED
CAN - P04-005	3Definitions		3- Major Editorial	There are many acronyms used throughout the document. Add a sub-clause to clause 3 to list and expand the acronyms.	Proposed Solution Addressed By Added the expand of abbreviations used in this part.	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.

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
CAN - P04-006	4		1- Major Technical	The family of standards used to be called 'Metamodel Framework (MMF)' but this was changed to 'Framework for Metamodel Interoperability' (for which the acronym would be FMI). Clause 1 Scope uses this new term, but clause 4 the old term. Should the new term be used in place of the old, or are they deliberately different.? If there is a deliberate difference, this should be explained.	<p>Addressed By</p> <p>The title was change into “Structure of a MetaModel for Model Mapping” and First sentence was modified such as: “This standard is a part of the family of MFI standards and is based on the MFI-2 core model.”</p>	Accept COMPLETED
CAN - P02-007	4.1		1- Major Technical	The first paragraph appears to have been copied from 19763-2, and is not true in this document. Either delete it , change the opening 'This part' to 'Part 2'.	<p>Addressed By</p> <p>It was changed into “The part 2 and this part of”</p>	Accept COMPLETED
CAN - P04-008	4.1		1- Major Technical	We have concerns with the way relationships are drawn across MOF layers. The interpretation of such relationships must be different from relationships within a layer, and needs explanation, and should probably used a different notation.	<p>Addressed By</p> <p>The ISO 19763 is only handling metadata concerning packaged components, which may be expressed by MOF, UML, XML, and so on. The 19763-2 Core Model is described as a metamodel for specifying the registry metadata. And the registering target contents are only handled as a kind of component. It is user responsibility to identify the difference among registered components. Also, specifying precise semantic of meta-layer crossing is out of scope in the 19763. But, we need classify the registered components for finding the objective artefact. So, we distinguish the upper component (model) and lower component with association types. One of the association types, “abstract syntax expression” based on the MOF, is related to meta-layer crossings. It is needed to get upper model information about lower component on some use cases. The OMG is developing many domain specific UML profiles, we have to know which profile is used to describe a particular lower component model. Proposed solution by Editor Added the following explanation to Figure 1. “The main purpose of the 19763 is to achieve the sharing common and useful modeling artefacts. The 19763 Core model is located at the MOF stack as a</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.

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
					metamodel conforming to MOF. Any other metamodels described using MOF are also placed at the MOF stack independently. From the 19763 view point, those metamodels are only referred as components defined by MOF and UML. In inverse, from the other metamodel view, there is no dependence to the 19763 metamodel."	
CAN - P04- 009	4.2, 4.3		1- Major Techn ical	The various levels, rules and transformations are not adequately defined.	Addressed By The metamodel was simplified to be more clear.	Accept COMPLETED
CAN - P04- 010	4.3.1		4- Minor Editori al	In Table 2, the term 'Should' should be 'Shall' to conform with ISO terminology.	Addressed By	Accept COMPLETED
CAN - P04- 011	4.3.1		4- Minor Editori al	(3) References is misspelled.	Addressed By	Accept COMPLETED
CAN - P04- 012	4.3.2		4- Minor Editori al	(3) References is misspelled.	Addressed By	Accept COMPLETED
CAN - P04- 013	4.3.3		4- Minor Editori al	(3) References is misspelled.	Addressed By	Accept COMPLETED
CAN - P04- 014	3.2.27		4- Minor Editori al	This entry is out of sequence.	Addressed By	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.

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
CAN - P04-015	4.3.5		4- Minor Editorial	The sub-clause title refers to MM-M Transformation, but the opening sentence refers to M-V Transformation.	Proposed Solution It was corrected to "MM-M Transformation"	Accept COMPLETED
CAN - P04-016	4.4		1- Major Technical	We don't understand the reference to providing an XML Schema for use with 20944.	Addressed By Proposed solution by Editor	Accept COMPLETED
CAN - P04-017	Annex C		1- Major Technical	The uses cases need explanation. They should also be less ambitious than suggesting that whole metamodels can be transformed, and start by demonstrating exactly how small models can be transformed or mapped.	Proposed Solution Addressed By The diagrams were refined with more detail examples and added a simple example.	Accept COMPLETED
CAN - P04-018	Annex C		2- Minor Technical	The first Case actually seems to contain two distinct cases.	Addressed By	Accept COMPLETED
CAN - P04-019	Annex C		1- Major Technical	The diagrams used are unclear and need explanation	Addressed By The diagrams were refined with more detail examples	Accept COMPLETED
CAN - P04-020	Bibliography		4- Minor Editorial	ISO/IEC TR 15452 should be removed, because it has been superseded by 20943-3. Subsequent entries should be renumbered, taking care to also renumber references in the text.	Addressed By This item was deleted.	Accept COMPLETED
CAN - P04-021	Bibliography		4- Minor Editorial	ISO/IEC TR 20943-1 and -3 have been published.	Proposed Solution This item was deleted in the bibliography, because of not referenced in the body.	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.

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 com- ment²	Comment (justification for change) by the MB	Proposed change by the MB	Secretariat observations on each comment submitted

JPN - P04- 001	4.3.4 Table 4		2- Major Techn ical	The name and description of Transformation Kinds in Table 4 is unclear. Especially, the 'Compilation type', 'Projection type I', 'Projection type II' and 'Metamorphose type' are different aspects. Those terms should be reconsidered and the explanation should be refined.	Addressed By The following terms were changed to understand more easily; "Metamorphose" into "Transfer", "Transformation Kinds" into "Transformation combination Types"	Accept COMPLETED
JPN - P04- 002	4.2 5.1 5.2 Table 8		2- Minor Techn ical	The term "value requirements" is unclear. It should be changed into more appropriate term or/and the definition should be provided. Also, its term should be referred in 4.2 of the convention section.	Proposed solution; 4.2 is the convention. Most of the definition is not based on BNF or any other syntactic notations. Therefore, from the terms, <immediate inherited classes>, <content and purpose>, <content and purpose>, and <constraints if necessary, written in natural language>, to remove "<>". And <M> and <O> should be described as "mandatory" and "optional" respectively. Based on the above change the following paragraph "The requirement about attributes and references for each metaclass is also specified. "<M>" means that the Attribute/Reference is mandatory and "<O>" does that it is Optional." Is not required. Therefore the paragraph should be removed. In 5.1 (1) and (2), the specifications are not precise. (1) should be changed to "Conformance on MMF Model Mapping is specified in 5.2 table 8". (2) should be changed to "Conformance on Interchange Format is specified in 5.2 table 8". In 5.2 Table 8, the first row should be changed to "MMF Mapping Model", "Only those classes specified in", and "All classes specified in", since in referenced clause 4 and Annex A only defines classes not model elements etc. Addressed By	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.

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 com- ment²	Comment (justification for change) by the MB	Proposed change by the MB	Secretariat observations on each comment submitted

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.