

ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 32 N 1758

Date: 2008-05-27

REPLACES: _____

ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 32

Data Management and Interchange

Secretariat: United States of America (ANSI)
Administered by Farance Inc. on behalf of ANSI

DOCUMENT TYPE	Disposition of Comments
TITLE	Disposition of comments in 32N1625 Summary of Voting on CD3 20944-4 - Information technology - Metadata Registry Interoperability and Bindings (MDR-IB)
SOURCE	WG2 - Frank Farance - Project Editor
PROJECT NUMBER	1.32.17.01.04.00
STATUS	Disposition of comments in 32N1624 (comments on CD1 20944-4 ballot 32N1572). This accompanies FCD 20944-4 sent to NBs for 4 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

Approved Canadian Comments on SC32 N1572 CD1 20944-4

Template for comments and secretariat observations

Date: 2007-06-27

Document: ISO/IEC CD3 20944-4

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	3	Footnote	ed	Footnote 6 refers to 'additional terms and definitions', but this document itself contains no terms and definitions.	Change 'additional' to 'the'	Unclear why the change is requested.
CA 02	5.6.1	Event Complete	te	In the text the resulting state is specified as 'Wait for Connect', but in Figure 1 it is 'Wait for command'	In the text description of Event Complete. Change 'wait for connect' to 'wait for command'	Unclear what is wrong.
CA 03	5.6.1	Knockdown Connection	te	In both Figure 1 and the accompanying text, once a connection has been closed, the state changes to 'End'. While this is appropriate for the client model, the server should revert to the 'wait for connect' state.	Change the figure and the text to return to the 'wait for connect' state once a connection has been ended. Add a 'shutdown' event to change from 'wait for connect' to 'end'.	The End state is correct because the connect thread ends (the server is always listening for new connections).
CA 04	11.2.1	Para 1.	ed	'transfer' s/b 'transferred'	Change 'transfer' to 'transferred'.	Will fix.
CA 05	11.2.1	Example	ed	The words 'corresponds to' appear both before and after the URL.	Remove the first occurrence of 'corresponds to'	Will fix.
CA 06	11.2.1	Example	te	The URI includes the syntax: VD;id=1234 to specify the id of a value domain. Where is this syntax explained?	If the syntax is already explained somewhere, provide a reference. If it is not, add an explanation. Also add a reference to 20944-5 clauses 5.7.29 and 5.7.34 as the specification of the path that is used.	This is a hypothetical syntax for an illustration, it is NOT standardized.
CA 07	12.2.1	Example	te	same comment as for CA06	See CA06.	See above.
CA 08	12.2.2	Example	te	same comment as for CA06	See CA06.	See above.
CA 09	12.2.3	Example	te	same comment as for CA06	See CA06.	See above.
CA 10	12.2.4	Example	te	same comment as for CA06	See CA06.	See above.
CA 11	12.2.5	Example	te	same comment as for CA06	See CA06.	See above.

Template for comments and secretariat observations

Date: 2007-06-27 Document: ISO/IEC CD3 20944-4

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
CA 12	12.2.6	Example	te	same comment as for CA06	See CA06.	See above.

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 20944-4

Status: Document to accompany ballot response

Author: Hajime Horiuchi

References:

[1] 32N1572, ISO/IEC CD 20944-4, Information technology — Metadata Registries Interoperability and Bindings(MDR-IB): Part4: Protocol bindings

SEQ #	Cmnt ID	See Also	Severity	Reference	Description	Addressed By
ISO/IEC 2nd CD 19763-1						
001	JPN-P01-001		General	General	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. So, this consolidated project is not yet initiated and cannot go to the CD stage. So, this CD ballot is void. 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	Resolved at 2007-07 WG2 meeting.
002	JPN-P01-002		General	General	32N1572B-ballot for CD3 24944-4 says "Date of circulation: 2007-04-20, Closing date: 2007-07-15". 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." So, the closing date shall be after 2007-07-20.	Resolved at 2007-07 WG2 meeting.

End of Paper

2	(3)	4	5		(6)	(7)
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		ed	Many terms (for example "remote procedure call" in Clause 5.4.3) are enclosed in quotes, without any explanation as to the significance of the quotes. Either the quotes should be removed or their significance explained.		Some quotes were removed. In other cases quoted text was retained because it corresponds to items in the state diagram.
GB	1		ed	'This Part of this International Standard specifies provisions that are common across protocol bindings for the 20944 family of standards, and this Part provides the individual protocol bindings themselves.' This sentence needs rewriting to improve understanding.		Unclear what is unclear about this statement.
GB	2		te	The references for the ????? standards should be included.		This comment identifies specific change.
GB	4		ed	This clause should be included in the Scope clause (Clause 1).		This is a purpose statement which is not included in scope.
GB	5.3		te	'The data model of 20944-2 is incorporated via normative reference.' There is no data model in 20944-2.		Change "data model" to "data structure".
GB	5.4		ed	'The control refers to the methods of causing actions among the parties communicating.' Missing word?	The control model refers to the methods of causing actions among the parties communicating.	Change "control" to "control model".
GB	7		ed	'This Part describes the common conceptual model and common data services across all coding bindings.' Is the use of the word 'coding' here an error?		Change "coding binding" to "protocol bindings"
GB	10		ed	This is a placeholder that should be removed.		Placeholder is necessary for future standardization.

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 4: Protocol 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?		See response to 20944-2 comment.
0002	US	general		te	Explain the rationale for multiple language bindings, e.g., why isn't LDAP + XML enough?		This comment is relevant to Part 3 and not Part 4.

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)*