

ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 32 N 1908

Date: 2009-07-12

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	Summary of Voting/Table of Replies
TITLE	Summary of Voting on 32N1846 FCD2 19763-4 Information technology - Metamodel framework for interoperability (MFI) Part 4: Metamodel for model mapping
SOURCE	SC32 Secretariat
PROJECT NUMBER	1.32.22.01.04.00
STATUS	WG2 is requested to resolve the comments. The document did not obtain substantial support.
REFERENCES	
ACTION ID.	ACT
REQUESTED ACTION	
DUE DATE	
Number of Pages	11
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 N1908

Summary of Voting on Document SC 32 N 1846

Title: Summary of Voting on 32N1846 FCD2 19763-4 Information technology - Metamodel framework for interoperability (MFI) Part 4: Metamodel for model mapping

Project: 1.32.22.01.04.00

“P” Member	Approval	Approval with Comments	Disapproval with Comments	Abstention with Comments
Australia				
Belgium				
Brazil				
Canada			1	
China	1			
Czech Republic	1			
Egypt				
Finland				1
Germany				1
Japan		1		
Korea, Republic of	1			
Portugal				
Sweden				
United Kingdom			1	
United States	1			
Total “P”	4	1	2	2
“O” Member				
Austria				
Denmark				
France				
Italy				
Kazakhstan				
Netherlands, The				
Norway				
Romania				
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 comments attached below:

Finland

Abstain. Lack of information:

Germany

Abstain. Lack of expertise and interest:

Japan

Yes. See comments attached below:

United Kingdom

No. See comments attached below:

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	0-All		Ge	Canada has submitted several comments on 19763-2 which may result in changes to its model. Since 19763-4 references the model in 19763-2, part 4 should not progress to FDIS ahead of part 2, in order to keep the two parts aligned.	Defer progression of 19763-4 to FDIS until 19763-2 reaches FDIS.	
CA 02	2.2	Table 1	Ed	The table is split across 2 pages, and the column headings do not show on the second page.	Either ensure the table fits on one page, or repeat the column headings on the new page.	
CA 03	2.2	Table 1	Ed	In row b, column 'Extensions', 'agreed to the other parts' should be 'agreed to in other parts'	Make the correction.	
CA 04	2.2	Table 1	Te	We do not understand why the wording for Strictly Conforming and Conforming needs to be different for row b and row c.	Either use the wording style of row b for row c, or explain why they need to be different.	
CA 05	2.2	Last para	Te	The last paragraph of 2.2 is misplaced. It refers to Levels which is the topic of 2.3.	Move the paragraph to follow Table 2.	
CA 06	4.2.2	missing reference	Ed	4.2.11 component references artefact, so 4.2.2 should reference component.	Insert: c.f. component before Note 2.	
CA 07	4.2.7	missing references	Ed	4.2.28 object references class and instance, so 4.2.7 should reference instance and object.	Insert: c.f. instance, object before Note 2.	
CA 08	4.2.18	missing references	Ed	4.2.28 object references class and instance, so 4.2.18 should reference class and object.	Replace: c.f. object By: c.f. class, object	
CA 09	4.2.27	definition	Te	A name designates an object, it does not identify it.	Change 'identify' to 'designate'.	
CA 10	4.2.35	definition	Ed	The punctuation is incorrect.	Change the comma following 'element' to a semi-colon.	
CA 11	4.2.38	example	Ed	Association is a defined term	Use bold font for 'associations'.	

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
CA 12	4.2.40 , 4.2.41	definition	Te	The definition uses the terms specialization and generalization, but the terms are not defined, even though generalization is in bold, as if it were a defined term.	Add definitions for generalization and specialization from 19763-2. Make specialization bold in this definition. Check all other definitions for uses of both terms and make bold.	
CA 13	4.2.40	definition	Ed	4.2.28 lists cf. class, instance on one line, but 4.2.40 lists cf.generalization, cf. superclass on separate lines	Consolidate on a single line as cf. generalization, superclass.	
CA 14	4.2.41	definition	Ed	4.2.40 references subclass, so 4.2.41 should reference superclass	Add: , subclass after: cf. generalization.	
CA 15	4.4	missing abbreviation	Ed	The initialisms ACC, BCC and HMD are used in Annex C, but they are not listed in 4.4	Add: ACC aggregate core component BCC basic core component HMD hierarchical message descriptor	
CA 16	5.4.1	Table 5	Ed	The table is split across 2 pages, and the column headings do not show on the second page.	Either ensure the table fits on one page, or repeat the column headings on the new page.	
CA 17	5.4.1	Metamodel Model Rule para 1	Te	The first sentence "The Metamodel-Model Rule is constraints..." is not good English, and the intended meaning is not clear. The following sentence beginning "The Metamodel-Model Rule <u>provides</u> constraints..." does make sense.	Rewrite the sentence to clarify the meaning.	
CA 18	5.4.1	Model Value Rule para 2		The first sentence "The Model-Value Rule is constraints..." is not good English, and the intended meaning is not clear. The following sentence beginning "The Model-Value Rule <u>provides</u> constraints..." does make sense.	Rewrite the sentence to clarify the meaning.	
CA 19	5.4.2	Metamodel Model Transformation para 1	Te	The first sentence "The Metamodel-Model Transformation is constraints..." is not good English, and the intended meaning is not clear.	Rewrite the sentence to clarify the meaning.	

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
CA 20	5.4.2	Model Value Transforma- tion para 1	Te	The first sentence "The Model-Value Transformation is constraints..." is not good English, and the intended meaning is not clear.	Rewrite the sentence to clarify the meaning.	

END

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.

ISO/IEC JTC1/SC32/WG2

SEQ #	Cmnt ID	See Also	Severity	Reference	Description	Addressed By
ISO/IEC FCD2 19763-4						
001	JPN-P01-001		2 Major editorial	whole the text	Not proper font (like Tahoma) happens to be appeared in the FCD text (doc text). They should be changed to be proper font (such as Arial) Also, formatting such as section number is in disorder.	
002	JPN-P01-002		Minor editorial	1 Scope	Last sentence: "Describing and specification of ..." should be changed to "Description and specification of"	
003	JPN-P01-003		Minor editorial	2 Conformance 2.1 Overview of conformance	The references are incorrect. "(2.1) " should be "(2.2)" "(2.2)" should be "(2.3)"	
004	JPN-P01-004		Minor editorial	2.2 Degree of conformance	The last paragraph of 2.2, "A level 1 implementation ... 19763. ", should be moved at the end of 2.3	
005	JPN-P01-005		Minor editorial	2.5 Implementation Conformance Statement	The references are incorrect. "a) (2.1) " should be "(2.2)" "b) (2.2) " should be "(2.3)"	
006	JPN-P01-006		Minor editorial	5.1 Overview of MFI Model Mapping	Figure 1 is missing in the PDF text.	
007	JPN-P01-007		Minor editorial	5.3 Package of MFI Model Mapping	Figure 2 is missing in the PDF text.	
008	JPN-P01-008		Minor editorial	5.4.2 Transformation in Figure 6	Captions are overlapping	

End of Paper

Template for comments and secretariat observations

Date: 2 July 2009

Document: ISO/IEC FCD2 19763-4

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
UK	Forward		ed	The list of parts of 19763 is out of date	Include all parts of 19763	
UK	Introduction		ed	"Due to the spread of e-business and e-commerce ..." The potential use of MFI goes far beyond e-business and e-commerce and the broader application should be recognised.	Amend to include the broader potential application.	
UK	2.1		ed	"This part of ISO/IEC 19763 prescribes ..." The use of "prescribes" does not fit well within the context. Do you mean "describes"?	Amend	
UK	2.1		ed	"identify a Degree of Conformance (2.1), and" - incorrect reference	Amend "(2.1)" to read "(2.2)".	
UK	2.1		ed	"identify a Level of Conformance (2.2)." - incorrect reference	Amend "(2.2)" to read "(2.3)".	
UK	5.2		te	This says that for each attribute description the datatype and multiplicity are to be given with the attribute name and then under the use heading a statement as to whether the attribute is mandatory or optional. Similarly for reference descriptions the class and multiplicity are to be given with the reference name and then under the use heading a statement as to whether the reference is mandatory or optional. The multiplicity statement by definition indicates whether the attribute or reference is mandatory or optional, with multiplicities of [1..1] and [1..*] being mandatory and multiplicities of [0..1] and [0..*] being optional. The statement of both the multiplicity and the obligation (under use) provides the potential for inconsistency, and there are many instances in succeeding clauses where there is such inconsistency.	State either the multiplicity or the obligation status throughout, but not both.	
UK	5.3, 5.4		ge	The models are shown both diagrammatically and in text. It is unclear which takes precedence if the diagrams and the text are inconsistent.	Provide a statement indicating which of the diagrams and the text takes precedence in the case of an inconsistency.	

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: 2 July 2009

Document: ISO/IEC FCD2 19763-4

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
UK	5.3	Figure 2	te	Multiplicities are not shown on the LevelPairRule end of the sourceUpper, targetUpper, sourceLower and targetLower associations. It is assumed that they are 0..*.	Show multiplicities explicitly.	
UK	5.4.1	First paragraph	te	This refers to the ModelDomainProfile and ModelComponentSet metaclasses defined in 19763-2. Since it is still unclear what the role of these classes is in 19763-2, it is equally unclear what the LevelPairRule metaclass in this part is doing. Clarification is required.	(No suggestion)	
UK	5.4.1	"definition Type" attribute	te	<p>The datatype is shown as "typeCode".</p> <p>(1) "typeCode" is undefined; if it is appropriate to use it then it should be defined.</p> <p>(2) "typeCode" is used in many places and presumably they are all different.</p> <p>(3) But since this is a conceptual model it is inappropriate to use codes at all.</p> <p>(4) The description says that the value for this attribute is taken from Table 3 and Annex A, but Annex A is only informative.</p> <p>(5) The description also says "and so on", implying that the set of values is incomplete or not fully known.</p> <p>All of this indicates that the use of "typeCode" is inappropriate and either a fully specified enumeration type would be more appropriate or alternatively if it is not possible to fully specify the whole range of values then a new metaclass should be created and this should attribute should become a reference.</p>	Introduce an appropriate enumeration type or change the attribute to a reference to a new metaclass.	

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: 2 July 2009

Document: ISO/IEC FCD2 19763-4

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
UK	5.4.1	"upperRule Type" attribute	te	<p>The datatype is shown as "typeCode".</p> <p>(1) "typeCode" is undefined; if it is appropriate to use it then it should be defined.</p> <p>(2) "typeCode" is used in many places and presumably they are all different.</p> <p>(3) But since this is a conceptual model it is inappropriate to use codes at all.</p> <p>An enumeration type would be more appropriate.</p>	Introduce an appropriate enumeration type.	
UK	5.4.1	"lowerRule Type" attribute	te	<p>The datatype is shown as "typeCode".</p> <p>(1) "typeCode" is undefined; if it is appropriate to use it then it should be defined.</p> <p>(2) "typeCode" is used in many places and presumably they are all different.</p> <p>(3) But since this is a conceptual model it is inappropriate to use codes at all.</p> <p>An enumeration type would be more appropriate.</p>	Introduce an appropriate enumeration type.	
UK	5.4.1	Tables 4 and 5	ed	The use of these tables is unclear.	Provide further explanation of the use of these tables.	
UK	5.4.1	"target Lower" reference	te	The multiplicity is shown as [1..1] yet is shown as 0..1 on the diagram at Figure 2. Which is correct?	(No suggestion)	

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: 2 July 2009

Document: ISO/IEC FCD2 19763-4

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
UK	5.4.1	Constraints	te	This refers to a “Metamodel-Model Rule” and “Model-Value Rule”, implying that mapping is between levels. But in the presentation “Understanding MFI?” presented at the WG2 meeting in Sydney in May 2008 (now at WG2 N1286) the implication was that mapping is between ‘models’ at the same level, specifically at the M1 and the M2 level. During the discussion following the presentation this ‘mapping at a single level’ interpretation of the requirement was accepted. Clarification is needed as to what exactly is being mapped.	(No suggestion)	
UK	5.4.2	First paragraph	te	This refers to the ModelDomainProfile and ModelComponentSet metaclasses defined in 19763-2. Since it is still unclear what the role of these classes is in 19763-2, it is equally unclear what the Transformation metaclass in this part is doing. Clarification is required.	(No suggestion)	
UK	5.4.2	“transformationType” attribute	te	The datatype is shown as “typeCode”. (1) “typeCode” is undefined; if it is appropriate to use it then it should be defined. (2) “typeCode” is used in many places and presumably they are all different. (3) But since this is a conceptual model it is inappropriate to use codes at all. An enumeration type would be more appropriate.	Introduce an appropriate enumeration type.	

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.