

ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 32 N 1919

Date: 2009-08-31

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 32N1627 Summary of Voting on CD2 24706 Information technology - Metadata for technical standards and specifications documents - Document description elements
SOURCE	WG2 - Dan Gillman and Frank Farance - project editors
PROJECT NUMBER	1.32.24.01.00.00
STATUS	Disposition of comments in SoV 32N1627 (comments on CD2 24706 letter ballot 32N1587). This accompanies 32N1818 FCD 24706 sent to NBs for 4 month letter ballot
REFERENCES	
ACTION ID.	FYI
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

Approved Canadian Comments on SC32 N1587 CD2 24706

Template for comments and secretariat observations

Date: 2009-08-30

Document: ISO/IEC CD2 24706

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	Disposition of Comments
CA 01	All	Page footers	Ed	The copyright notice is dated 2004.	Change copyright date to 2007.	Agree.
CA 02	1	para 3, line 1	Ed	There is a spurious '/' between ISO/IEC and JTC1	Replace the second '/' by a space.	Agree.
CA 03	2	11179	Te	The reference to 11179 is undated, but there are signification changes between editions. It is probably advisable to reference a specific edition by date, which will also require specifying each part separately, since different parts were published in different years.		Presently, undated reference is appropriate.
CA 04	2	New	Te	IEC 82045-1 is referenced in Clause 3.4 and should therefore be added to the Normative references.	Add a normative reference in clause 2 to: IEC 82045-1 Document management: Part 1 – Principles and Methods	Agree.
CA 05	2 / Bibliography	New	Te	IEC 82045-2 specifically relates to metadata for document management, which is the topic of CD2 24706, so should probably be referenced. However, its scope is different from the present standard, so it does not need to be a normative reference.	Add a reference in the Bibliography to: IEC 82045-2 Document management: Part 2 – Metadata elements and information reference model	Agree.
CA 06	3.4	Doc ref	Ed	The document reference is to ISO/IEC 82045-1, but on the ISO web site, the document is listed as IEC 82045-1. We also need to confirm that part 1 rather than part 2 is the best reference.	Change ISO/IEC to IEC.	Agree.
CA 07	6 and 7	various	Te	All uses (with the possible exception of 6.1.1 and 7.1) of the datatype 'character string' should be replaced by a datatype that supports multi-lingual capabilities, such as the Multitext datatype specified in CD 19773 clause 12.4.3, or the 'Text' datatype specified in WD4 11179-3.	Change all uses of 'character string' to 'Multitext', 'Text' or other agreed datatype.	Agree.
CA 08	6 and 7	various	Te	All uses of the datatype 'URL' should be replaced by 'RefLit' (as defined in CD 19773 clause 10, to allow the data element to be included either as a reference or a literal.	Change all uses of URL to Reflit.	Agree.

Template for comments and secretariat observations

Date: 2009-08-30

Document: ISO/IEC CD2 24706

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	Disposition of Comments
CA 09	6.1.4	Note	Te	The note states: "Even though there is more than one relevant SDO, there is one technical committee responsible for the standard." Is this true? For example, for a PAS submission to ISO, which is the responsible technical committee? The ISO committee that handles the PAS submission, or the external committee that originated it?	Consider the question and make changes as appropriate. At a minimum, the existing text need editorial changes. Change "Even though there is" to either "Even though there may be" or "Even when there is".	Agree on proposed change.
CA 10	6.1.6	Obligation	Te	We recommend that the SIO name be specified if the SIO committee or SIO contact is specified.	Change Obligation to: 'mandatory if different from SDO, or if the SIO Committee or SIO Contact is specified.	Agree.
CA 11	6.1.6	Occurrence	Te	Obligation is 'mandatory if different from SDO', which makes it optional if the same as the SDO. Clause 3.6 says to leave blank if same as SDO. We recommend that the SIO name be specified if the SIO committee or SIO contact is specified.	Change Occurrence to 'zero or more'. Copy the Note from 3.6 to 6.1.6. Add a note that it should be specified if the SIO Committee or SIO Contact is specified.	Agree.
CA 12	6.1.7	Note	Te	See comment CA09 on 6.1.4. Also, if there can be multiple SIOs, surely each will have its own assigned committee?	Consider the question and make changes as appropriate. At a minimum, the existing text need editorial changes. Change "Even though there is" to either "Even though there may be" or "Even when there is".	Agree,
CA 13	6.1.7	Obligation	Te	Current Obligation is: 'mandatory if different from SDO'. The dependence on the SDO should be at the same level, i.e. SDO committee. Also, SIO Committee should be specified if SIO Contact is specified.	Change Obligation to: 'mandatory if different from SDO Committee, or if the SIO Contact is specified. Should be blank if SIO name is blank.	Agree,
CA 14	6.1.7	Occurrence	Te	The occurrence is specified as 'one', but needs to be made consistent with the obligation	Change to 'zero or one' or 'zero or more' depending on the resolution of CA12.	Agree.
CA 15	6.1.8	Obligation	Te	SIO contact need not be specified if it is the same as the SDO contact.	Change to 'mandatory if different from SDO contact'	Agree,
CA 16	6.1.8	Occurrence	Te	Change to be consistent with change to Obligation based on resolution of CA15	Change to 'zero or more'	Agree.

Template for comments and secretariat observations

Date: 2009-08-30

Document: ISO/IEC CD2 24706

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	Disposition of Comments
CA 17	6.2	Obligation / Occurrence	Te	Different SDOs and SIOs may want to specify different rules for which items of content are mandatory. How can we accommodate this? For example, ISO requires an Abstract, which is specified 6.2.1 as 'Optional'.	Add text to specify whether and how an SDO / SIO can specify different obligations / occurrences.	Added note.
CA 18	6.2.1	Obligation / Occurrence	Te	Obligation is 'Optional', but Occurrence is 'One'. Also consider the resolution of CA17.	Make the obligation and occurrence consistent. Either make Obligation 'Mandatory', or make Occurrence 'Zero or one'.	Agree.
CA 19	6.2.2	Obligation / Occurrence	Te	Obligation is 'Optional', but Occurrence is 'One'. Also consider the resolution of CA17.	Make the obligation and occurrence consistent. Either make Obligation 'Mandatory', or make Occurrence 'Zero or one'.	Agree.
CA 20	6.2.5	Note	Te	The note refers to 'this system', but this standard does not define a system.	Delete the phrase 'described in this system.'	Agree.
CA 21	6.2.7	All	Te	Terms and Definitions are specified independently with no indication as to the associations between them. Both terms and definitions are allowed to occur one or more times, but we need to allow for multiple situations, such as: - multiple terms associated with one definition - multiple definitions associated with the same term, but which are relatively minor distinctions - multiple definitions which represent significantly different concepts, but for which the same term happens to be used (we hope, in different contexts).	Add text to describe how terms and definitions should be paired, and the context of different definitions should be specified.	Agree.
CA 22	6.2.7.1	Note 1	Te	The note refers to 'the system', but this standard does not define a system.	Reword the note to remove references to 'the system'	Agree.
CA 23	6.2.7.2	Note	Te	The note refers to 'the system', but this standard does not define a system.	Reword the note to remove references to 'the system'	Agree.
CA 24	6.2.7.3	Note item 1)	Ed	Grammar	Insert 'as' before 'described'	Agree.

Template for comments and secretariat observations

Date: 2009-08-30

Document: ISO/IEC CD2 24706

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	Disposition of Comments
CA 25	6.2.7.3	Note item 1)	Te	The reference to clause 3.1 is to that clause within CD2 24706, but because of the position of the reference could be interpreted as clause 3.1 of the ISO/IEC directives Part 2 (which happens to be the definition of the term 'standard'.	Insert 'of the document' after 'Clause 3.1'.	Agree.
CA 26	6.3.2.1	Definition	Te	The values for life-cycle status are specified by the SDO	A statement to this effect should be included.	Agree.
CA 27	6.3.6	Example	Ed	'Forward' should be 'Foreword'	Change 'Forward' to 'Foreword'.	Agree.
CA 28	8	2 nd sentence	Te	Stating that a term is not defined is meaningless.	Delete the second sentence.	Agree.

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
SE1			G	When the "logical unit" is an elements that can be repeated, this should be specified.		Agree.
SE2	Scope	Paragr 2	G	When you use a non-IT style you must still be accurate when specifying and explaining multiplicity and specifying what entities have to be treated as a unit. You also have to have better semantic definitions for many elements.		Agree.
SE3	Scope	Paragr 2	G	A better explanation about the two main categories is required, not only in the scope.	Add a sub-clause about this in 5 Usage.	Agree.
SE4	Scope		G	Missing important fact.	Include the very important fact that this standard is also for drafts.	Already says this in paragraph 3.
SE5	3.6	Note	T	This note is not for the term but for the data element.	Remove.	Agree.
SE6	6.1.1		T	There has to be one SDO/SIO assigned for each Designation identity so you can tell who has issued the Designation.	Add 6.1.1.1 Identity and 6.1.1.2 SDO or SIO	The designation already includes the identity. For example, ISO 34567 is ISO.
SE7	6.1.2		T	There has to be one language assigned for each Title text.	Add 6.1.2.1 Text and 6.1.2.2 Language (ISO language code)	This is already contained in the multilingual datatype.
SE8	6.1.3		T	The spelling of SDO (and SIO) names might be a problem. This standard cannot list them all but there should be some rules on this.	Add (here or on some general level) that the (international) acronyms should be used.	The agreement upon acronyms is outside the scope of this standard.
SE9	6.1.4		T	According to the example "SDO committee" is not correct.	Rename to SDO body or SDO sub-body and explain with "committee, working group or similar..."	Committee is the proper broad term.
SE10	6.1.5		T	It is confusing with more than one contact. Is it by different means?	Explain why.	The entity, say, might have one contact for Europe-

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.

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 com- ment ²	Comment (justification for change) by the MB		Proposed change by the MB	Secretariat observations on each comment submitted
						Africa, one for Americas from Asia-Pacific
SE11	6.1.5		T	It is not obvious what to be used in CD 19773.	Specify the data structure.	This is a normative refe and it is specified in 197
SE12	6.1.5		T	There might become a big problem to maintain contact information over time. This should be a task of the SDO.	Consider removing contact elements from this standard.	These elements are, typically, for SDOs to us
SE13	6.1.6 .. 8		T	Same as 6.13 .. 5.		Do not understand com
SE14	6.1.7		T	What is a SIO committee?	Explain or remove the element.	The issuing organization which might be different the standardizing/specif organization.
SE15	6.2		T	The content elements might be written in different languages.	Take this into consideration and add an element for this.	It is already incorporate the multixtext/multistring datatypes.
SE16	6.2.2 .. 3	Note	T	If it is not a URL to a document, what is it?	Change to: The URL shall link to a ...	Replace with reflit, as p Canada comment.
SE17	6.2.7		G	Terminology is a very important issue. However, to be useful, the terminology should be handled in a specific, more complex register where you can handle terms in different languages and definitions from different sources.		Unresolved.
SE18	6.2.7		T	The structure is not clear. It should be: One concept has one main definition (optionally in many languages) and alternative definitions and many terms (for each language).	Add: 6.2.7.1 Concept, 6.2.7.1.1 Definition, 6.2.7.1.2 Term so it is clear	Unresolved.
SE19	6.3		G	This element indicates that this standard is not just for standards but also for document aiming to become standards. It is not clear whether the elements are to be used for	Clarify.	The elements themselv not describe the history specification. However, multiple records (each

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.

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 com- ment ²	Comment (justification for change) by the MB		Proposed change by the MB	Secretariat observations on each comment submitted
				history and plans as well.		containing a set of elem could describe a history
SE20	6.3.2		T	It is Status that may have many occurrences, not Life-cycle status and Life-cycle status date.	Change.	Unresolved.
SE21	6.3.2.1		T	A code list of valid statuses ("events" might be a better name) is required.	Provide the code list.	Will consider in next bal after further research.
SE22	6.3.4		T	A code list of valid formats is required.	Provide the code list.	Agree, using MIME type
SE23	6.3.5		T	ISO codes should be used.	Use ISO codes for languages.	Agree, using ISO 639.
SE24	7.2		T	Is this element really necessary for each entry? It should be internal to the registration authority.	Remove.	Necessary for some ide usage.
SE25	7.2		T	Can It be more than one?	Explain.	Yes, it is possible for an identifier to conform to r than one convention.

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.

0	1	2		(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
#	NB 1	Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex	Paragraph/ Figure/Table / Note #	Com- ment type ²	Comment (justification for change) by the NB	Proposed change by the NB	Proposed Disposition of Comments	
0001	US	6		te	The notion of "occurrence" does not make sense because the semantics of "not exactly one" are not defined. For example, what is the meaning if there is more than one? Does the ordering of the instances need to be preserved? Does the ordering have meaning?	Use more precise data modelling concepts.	Deferred to next ballot, awaiting results of research on NB usage.	
0002	US	6.1		te	Need to clarify what "one logical unit" means.		Replaced with "record" (in the datatyping sense).	
0003	US	6.1.4		te	It is unclear why SDO committee is "mandatory". In the US, ANSI standards are published without knowing, say, that INCITS/L8 was the committee that developed it.	Change to "optional".	Agree.	
0004	US	6.1.5		te	It is unclear why SDO contact is "mandatory". The metadata is invalid and cannot be understood if the standards developer's contact information is not present?	Change to "optional".	Agree.	
0005	US	6.1.6		te	It is unclear why SIO name is "mandatory". Is the SIO like a "publisher"? Even Dublin Core doesn't make publisher mandatory, so why should it be here?	Change to "optional".	Agree.	
0006	US	6.1.7		te	It is unclear why SIO committee "mandatory". For example, there are ANSI/ISO/IEEE standards where there is no SIO committee.	Change to "optional".	Agree.	
0007	US	6.1.7		te	In addition to SIO, it should be clear what organization handles the interpretations of the standard.	Add metadata to support the recording of the interpreting organization. This is especially important for certain JTC1 PAS standards and certain ISO MA (maintenance authorities) where the standard is interpreted by a different organization.	Deferred to next ballot, awaiting research.	
0008	US	6.1.7		te	It is unclear why there is only one SIO committee. A standard may be issued from several organizations simultaneously, such as ISO standards (issued by ISO) and ANSI-		Agree, zero or more.	

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)*

US Comments on CD2 Text For: ISO/IEC 24706, Information technology — Metadata for technical standards and specifications documents

Date: 2009-08-30

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
					adopted-ISO-standards (issued by ANSI).		
0009	US	6.1.8		te	It is unclear why SIO contact is "mandatory". The metadata is invalid and cannot be understood if the standards developer's contact information is not present?	Change to "optional".	Agree.
0010	US	6.2		ge,te	These elements should use a "reflit" datatype from ISO/IEC 19773 where the metadata creator is given the choice of using a reference (e.g., a URL) or a literal (e.g., a copy of the literal text).	Use 19773 reflit datatypes.	Agree.
0011	US	6.2		ge,te	These elements only handle a single language. For ISO standards some documents have 2, 3, and more languages. The 19773 multitext datatype should be used, which is based upon 19773 reflit datatypes.		Agree.
0012	US	6.4		te	A set of elements should be provided such that one can attach a particular role in association with the description/reference to a standard. For example, the hypothetical standard ISO 98765 has the title "International Handwriting for Roman Letters". It would be helpful to attach optional metadata to this standard regarding the role of the standard. These roles are described in ISO/IEC Guide 2 regarding conformity. These roles are: reference (i.e., making a reference to a standard, e.g., for procurement -- "Z requires this standard") reference certification (i.e., certification of a reference -- "X certifies that Z requires this standard") declaration of conformity (i.e., declaring that Y conforms to this standard) certification of declaration of conformity (i.e., X certifies that Y conforms to this standard) So sample 24706 metadata might be: 24706_designation: ISO 98765:2007	Add section on reference context.	Deferred to next ballot awaiting research.

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)*

US Comments on CD2 Text For: ISO/IEC 24706, Information technology — Metadata for technical standards and specifications documents

Date: 2009-08-30

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
					24706_title: International Handwriting for Roman Letters ***new**24706_normative_role: declaration of conformity which means that the object this metadata associated with declares conformity to ISO 98765:2007.		
0013	US	6.5		te	It should be possible that additional metadata is added to the 24706 set, and that one can include such additional elements in a standard way so that conforming 24706 systems copy/store/transfer these additional elements.	Add section on other optional metadata.	Deferred to next ballot, see comment above.
0014	US	Annex A		te	A mapping of Dublin Core elements should be provided, too.		Agree.
0015	US	Annex B		te	Numerous formatting and editorial changes are needed.		Agree.

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)*