

# ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 32 N 1970

Date: 2010-02-06

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

|                         |   |
|-------------------------|---|
| <b>DOCUMENT TYPE</b>    | Summary of Voting/Table of Replies  |
| <b>TITLE</b>            | Summary of Voting on 32N1918 FCD 24706-1 Information technology - Metadata for technical standards and specifications documents - Part 1: Document description elements |
| <b>SOURCE</b>           | SC32 Secretariat  |
| <b>PROJECT NUMBER</b>   | 1.32.24.01.00.00  |
| <b>STATUS</b>           | WG2 is requested to resolve the comments. The document did not obtain substantial support.  |
| <b>REFERENCES</b>       |   |
| <b>ACTION ID.</b>       | ACT   |
| <b>REQUESTED ACTION</b> |   |
| <b>DUE DATE</b>         |   |
| <b>Number of Pages</b>  | 16  |
| <b>LANGUAGE USED</b>    | English   |
| <b>DISTRIBUTION</b>     | P & L Members<br>SC Chair<br>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](mailto: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 N1970

### Summary of Voting on Document SC 32 N 1918

**Title:** Summary of Voting on 32N1918 FCD 24706-1 Information technology – Metadata for technical standards and specifications documents – Part 1: Document description elements

Project: 1.32.24.01.00.00

| <b>“P” Member</b>  | <b>Approval</b> | <b>Approval with Comments</b> | <b>Disapproval with Comments</b> | <b>Abstention with Comments</b> |
|--------------------|-----------------|-------------------------------|----------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Belgium            |                 |                               |                                  |                                 |
| Canada             |                 |                               | 1                                |                                 |
| China              |                 | 1                             |                                  |                                 |
| Czech Republic     | 1               |                               |                                  |                                 |
| Egypt              |                 |                               |                                  |                                 |
| Finland            |                 |                               |                                  | 1                               |
| Germany            |                 |                               |                                  | 1                               |
| India              |                 |                               |                                  |                                 |
| Japan              |                 |                               | 1                                |                                 |
| Korea, Republic of |                 |                               |                                  |                                 |
| Sweden             |                 |                               |                                  |                                 |
| United Kingdom     |                 |                               | 1                                |                                 |
| United States      |                 |                               | 1                                |                                 |
| <b>Total “P”</b>   | <b>1</b>        | <b>1</b>                      | <b>4</b>                         | <b>2</b>                        |
| <b>“O” Member</b>  |                 |                               |                                  |                                 |
| Austria            |                 |                               |                                  |                                 |
| France             |                 |                               |                                  |                                 |
| Ghana              |                 |                               |                                  |                                 |
| Indonesia          |                 |                               |                                  |                                 |
| Italy              |                 |                               |                                  |                                 |
| Kazakhstan         |                 |                               |                                  |                                 |
| Netherlands, The   |                 |                               |                                  |                                 |
| Norway             |                 |                               |                                  |                                 |
| Portugal           |                 |                               |                                  |                                 |
| Romania            |                 |                               |                                  |                                 |
| Russian Federation |                 |                               |                                  |                                 |
| Switzerland        |                 |                               |                                  |                                 |
| <b>Total “O”</b>   |                 |                               |                                  |                                 |

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](mailto: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 below:

### **China**

Yes. See comments below:

### **Germany**

Abstain. Lack of expertise and interest

### **Finland**

Abstain. Lack of expertise and interest

### **Japan**

No. See comments below:

### **United Kingdom**

No. See comments below:

### **United States**

No. See comments below:

### **ISO**

See editor's comments below:

Canadian Comments on SC32 N1918 FCD 24706

|                  |           |
|------------------|-----------|
| Date: 2010-01-14 | Document: |
|------------------|-----------|

| 1               | 2   | (3)  | 4                            | 5  | (6)  | (7)  |
|-----------------|---|--|------------------------------|--|--|--|
| MB <sup>1</sup> | Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex (e.g. 3.1) | Paragraph/ Figure/Table/ Note (e.g. Table 1) | Type of comment <sup>2</sup> | Comment (justification for change) by the MB   | Proposed change by the MB  | Secretariat observations on each comment submitted |
| CA 01           | 0 All                                       | Various                                      | Ge                           | In Jeju, SC32 approved a project split to create a second part to this standard. Therefore, the existing document becomes part 1.  | Change all existing references to 24706 to 24706-1. Make other changes as necessary to reflect the fact that this document is now Part 1.  |  |
| CA 02           | 0 Foreword                                  | New  | Ed                           | The foreword show briefly describe all parts in a multi-part standard.   | Add a description of each part to the foreword.  |  |
| CA 03           | 0 Title, 1 Scope, 5 Usage                   | Various                                      | Te                           | The current title of the document is “Metadata for technical standards and specification documents”. The Scope states that the data elements described are applicable to: “all technical standards and specification documents”, and also “all standards, technical reports and specification documents and their drafts”<br>Clause 5 Usage refers to: “All standards, technical reports, specification documents and their official drafts” | The Scope and Usage clauses should be made consistent, and the Title should be a convenient short form of the agreed upon scope.<br>‘Metadata for Standards, Technical Reports and Specification documents’ seems most appropriate.  |  |
| CA 04           | 3 Terms and Definitions                     | New  | Te                           | Several terms used within the document are not defined in clause 3. The terms and definitions should be added.   | Add the following terms to clause 3 with appropriate definitions:<br>datatype<br>DCMES (Dublin Core Metadata Element Set)<br>DCMI (Dublin Core Metadata Initiative)<br>MIME (Multipurpose Internet Mail Extensions)<br>multiplicity<br>multistring<br>obligation<br>record (in the datatyping sense) |  |
| CA 05           | 3.3 data element                            | definition                                   | Te                           | The definition of data element is that used in 11179-3:2003 (though the reference is to a non-existent 11179-1:2009). However, there has been feedback that this definition is not useful, and in edition 3 of 11179-3 it has been agreed to revert back to the definition from ISO/IEC 2382-4:1999, 04.07.01  | Use the definition from ISO/IEC 2382-4:1999, 04.07.01  |  |
| CA 06           | 4 Metadata                                  | para 2                                       | Ed                           | The first sentence does not read very clearly.<br><br>“Since metadata are data, then metadata are stored and managed in any way data can and organized through the use of a model.”  | Reword more clearly, e.g.:<br>“Since metadata are data, then metadata can be stored and managed like data and can be organized through the use of a model.”  |  |

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 <sup>1</sup> | Clause No./<br>Subclause No./<br>Annex<br>(e.g. 3.1) | Paragraph/<br>Figure/Table/<br>Note<br>(e.g. Table 1) | Type<br>of<br>com-<br>ment <sup>2</sup> | Comment (justification for change) by the MB  | Proposed change by the MB  | Secretariat observations<br>on each comment submitted |
| CA<br>07        | 6 & 7 Data<br>elements                               | Occurrence<br>(multiple)                              | Ed                                      | There are inconsistencies in the specification of the number of occurrences, when the obligation is optional. Sometimes, as in 6.1.4, the occurrence does not specify zero, even though an optional element may not be present. In other cases, e.g. in 6.1.6, zero is specified.   | Be consistent. If obligation is optional, allow zero occurrences.  |   |
| CA<br>08        | 6 & 7 Data<br>elements                               | New   | Te                                      | It is important that each of the metadata elements have a unique identifier to ensure unambiguous reference is possible when the standard is translated into other languages. Since clause numbers may change from one edition of the standard to the next, the identifiers should be assigned independently of the clause numbers. | Assign a unique identifier to each metadata element in clauses 6 and 7.  |   |
| CA<br>09        | 6.1.6  | Obligation  | Te                                      | CD2 ballot comment CA 10 was accepted but not applied. However, in light of CA 12 below, it should be applied with modification.  | Change the Obligation to: "Conditional" and add: Condition: If different from SDO name, or if the SIO contact and/or SIO committee is specified.                           |   |
| CA<br>10        | 6.1.7  | Note  | Ed                                      | Add 'though' after 'even'.  |  |   |
| CA<br>11        | 6.1.7  | Obligation  | Te                                      | CD2 ballot comment CA 13 was accepted but not applied. However, in light of CA 12 below, it should be applied with modification.  | Change the Obligation to: "Conditional" and add: Condition: If different from SDO committee, or if the SIO contact is specified. Should be omitted if SIO name is omitted. |   |
| CA<br>12        | 6.1.8  | Obligation  | Te                                      | The obligation is specified as "mandatory if different from SDO contact" (as a result of a Canadian comment on CD2), but this is not one of the standard values.  | Change the Obligation to: "Conditional" and add: Condition: If different from SDO contact. Should be omitted if SIO name and SIO committee are omitted.                    |   |
| CA<br>13        | 6.1.8  | Occurrence  | Te                                      | The occurrence is specified as: "optional"  | Change the Occurrence to: zero or more.  |   |
| CA<br>14        | 6.2  | Note  | Ed                                      | The word "within" appears to be incorrect.  | Change "within" to "which".  |   |

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 <sup>1</sup> | Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex (e.g. 3.1) | Paragraph/ Figure/Table/ Note (e.g. Table 1) | Type of comment <sup>2</sup> | Comment (justification for change) by the MB  | Proposed change by the MB   | Secretariat observations on each comment submitted |
| CA 15           | 6.2.7.2                                     | Note   | Ed                           | The note states: "Sometimes this term already exists", without indicating where.  | Qualify the statement in a manner similar to that used in 6.2.7.1, e.g.:<br>"i.e., the term is used in another standard"  |  |
| CA 16           | 6.3.4                                       | Para 1 & Examples                            | Te                           | The first sentence mandates the specification of formats as MIME types, but the examples include 'Paper' which is not a MIME type.  | Reword the first sentence as follows:<br>"Formats the standard is available in.<br>Note: For electronic formats, specify the formats as MIME types."  |  |
| CA 17           | 9 Bibliography                              | New  | Te                           | ISO 15836 is referenced from Annex A.   | If the reference is retained, add ISO 15836 to the Bibliography.  |  |
| CA 18           | 99 Annex A                                  | Title  | Ed                           | The document needs to specify whether Annex A is Informative or Normative. Presumably it is Informative.  | Add: "(Informative)" to the Annex title.  |  |
| CA 19           | 99 Annex A                                  | Rationale (new)                              | Ed                           | No rationale is stated for the inclusion of Annex A.  | Add some introductory text explaining why the Annex has been included.  |  |
| CA 20           | 99 Annex A                                  | Para 1                                       | Te                           | The annex heading is: "Mapping FCD 24706 to ISO 15836 Dublin Core Metadata Element set", but the annex details also refer to DCMI non-core elements and the OASIS Standards Registry.   | Add introductory text explaining the relevance of each of column included.  |  |
| CA 21           | 99 Annex A                                  | All  | Ed                           | Since any ISO technical document or specification is a published document, the ISO TC46/SC9 publication standard and its metadata requirements would apply,. As such the 1st x-reference mapping should be to the data element comprising the ISO 2108 ISBN standard  | Include a mapping to ISO 2108, and add an entry in the Bibliography.  |  |
| CA 22           | 99 Annex A                                  | All  | Ed                           | We recommend restructuring the Annex, so that the data elements from 24706 are listed first. The unique identifier added by CA 08 above should be included.<br><br>For each mapped document, there should be 2 or more columns as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• identifier used in the document</li> <li>• name used in the document</li> </ul> | Order the columns as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 24706 identifier (with clause #)</li> <li>• 24706 name in the language of the document</li> <li>• 24706 comments, as applicable</li> <li>• 2108 identifier (clause # if nothing else available)</li> <li>• 2108 name in the language of the</li> </ul> |  |

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.

Canadian Comments on SC32 N1918 FCD 24706

|                  |           |
|------------------|-----------|
| Date: 2010-01-14 | Document: |
|------------------|-----------|

| 1               | 2  | (3)   | 4                                       | 5   | (6)  | (7)   |
|-----------------|--|---|---|---|--|---|
| MB <sup>1</sup> | Clause No./<br>Subclause No./<br>Annex<br>(e.g. 3.1) | Paragraph/<br>Figure/Table/<br>Note<br>(e.g. Table 1) | Type<br>of<br>com-<br>ment <sup>2</sup> | Comment (justification for change) by the MB                              | Proposed change by the MB  | Secretariat observations<br>on each comment submitted |
|                 |  |   |   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>any additional comments</li> </ul> | document <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2108 comments, as applicable</li> <li>15836 identifier (clause # if nothing else available)</li> <li>15836 name in the language of the document</li> <li>15836 comments, as applicable</li> <li>other columns as deemed necessary</li> </ul> |   |

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.

## Template for comments and secretariat observations

|       |                    |
|-------|--------------------|
| Date: | Document: <b>N</b> |
|-------|--------------------|

| 1                     | 2  | (3)   | 4  | 5  | (6)   | (7)   |
|-----------------------|--|---|--|--|---|---|
| <b>MB<sup>1</sup></b> | <b>Clause No./<br/>Subclause No./<br/>Annex<br/>(e.g. 3.1)</b> | <b>Paragraph/<br/>Figure/Table/<br/>Note<br/>(e.g. Table 1)</b> | <b>Type<br/>of<br/>com-<br/>ment<sup>2</sup></b> | <b>Comment (justification for change) by the MB</b>  | <b>Proposed change by the MB</b>  | <b>Secretariat observations<br/>on each comment submitted</b> |
|                       | 6.2.6  | “informa<br>tive<br>reference<br>”                              |  | Informative reference is not formal element of a international standard, according to ISO Directives-Part 2. In ISO Directives-Part 2, this element is called “informative supplementary”, and if you don’ t want to include index, you call it “bibliography” . | Change to “Informative<br>supplementary”<br>or<br>“bibliography” instead. |   |
|                       |  |   |  |  |   |   |

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.



### **Japan's comments on SC32N1918**

The NP about this standard was commenced by SC32WG2 in June of 2003 upon the request from ISO secretariat. (see ; the JTC1 coordination below)

However, it should be opposed because time passes too much by the following respects.

1) Time has passed since it was proposed first, and the continuance of the request of ANSI cannot be confirmed.

2) In the scope, there is a normative description like "All Standards Development Organizations (SDOs) should adopt this International Standard". However, it is difficult to confirm their positions or their acceptance to this statement by other SDOs.

3) Application target and usage of this standard might be limited like the standard management and the standards development, etc.

4) The discussions on this standard in the SC32WG2 meetings were so limited, so far. It is requested to be more open process on this standardization.

Then, Japan NB proposes this standardization should be restarted at first.

JTC1 coordination:

\_ Resolution 49 (October 21-25, 2002 Plenary)

\_ Interest in formalizing specification as ISO/IEC standard under SC 32.

François Coallier as initial representative.

\_ Interest in implementing metadata spec for ICT standards in coordination with Citation Analysis Rapporteur work.

## Template for comments and secretariat observations

Date: 14 December 2009

Document: ISO/IEC FCD 24706

| 1               | 2   | (3)  | 4                            | 5  | (6)  | (7)  |
|-----------------|---|--|------------------------------|--|--|--|
| MB <sup>1</sup> | Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex (e.g. 3.1) | Paragraph/ Figure/Table/ Note (e.g. Table 1) | Type of comment <sup>2</sup> | Comment (justification for change) by the MB   | Proposed change by the MB                    | Secretariat observations on each comment submitted |
| GB 01           | Title page                                  |  | ed                           | The standard number and title page are now out of date following the 'project split' at the Jeju meeting. This should now be Part 1: Document description elements.  | Update                                       |  |
| GB 02           | Introduction                                | para 5                                       | ed                           | "However, there are many ways to implement this, and the standard is agnostic in this regard." It is unclear what is referenced by "this" in this sentence.  | Revise to make clear.                        |  |
| GB 03           | 1   |  | ed                           | There is an inconsistency. At the end of the first para there is "Standards Registry" (capitalised) and in the second para there is (standards registry" (not capitalised).  | Use a consistent style                       |  |
| GB 04           | 2   |  | te                           | "ISO/IEC 11179 (all parts), <i>Information technology — Metadata registries (MDR)</i> ". Only Part 1 appears to be actually cited in the body of the standard so the reference to all parts is incorrect. Also, with 11179 undergoing revision, the date of the referenced edition should be quoted. | Amend  |  |
| GB 05           | 2   |  | te                           | "ISO/IEC 19773:—, <i>Information technology — Metadata modules (MM)</i> ". The ":-" is not required.   | Amend  |  |
| GB 06           | 3.4   |  | ed                           | "[ISO/IEC 82045-1:2001]". 82045 is an IEC standard, not an ISO/IEC standard (see Normative References, Clause 2.4).  | Amend  |  |
| GB 07           | 6   |  | ed                           | This clause is incorrectly formatted. The first two textual paragraphs should be preceded by a sub-clause number and heading, with subsequent sub-clauses renumbered.  | Amend  |  |
| GB 08           | 6   | first two textual paragraphs                 | te                           | The terms "record", "attribute", "datatype", "obligation" and "multiplicity" are not defined.  | Provide appropriate definitions in Clause 3. |  |
| GB 09           | 6, 7  |  | te                           | The term "in the datatyping sense" (many occurrences) is not understood. What exactly does this mean?  | Reword to make the meaning clear.            |  |

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: 14 December 2009

Document: ISO/IEC FCD 24706

| 1               | 2   | (3)  | 4                            | 5   | (6)   | (7)  |
|-----------------|---|--|------------------------------|---|---|--|
| MB <sup>1</sup> | Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex (e.g. 3.1) | Paragraph/ Figure/Table/ Note (e.g. Table 1) | Type of comment <sup>2</sup> | Comment (justification for change) by the MB  | Proposed change by the MB   | Secretariat observations on each comment submitted |
| GB 10           | 6   | second textual paragraph                     | te                           | "The attributes are described via: datatype, obligation (mandatory, optional, conditional), and multiplicity (number of occurrences permitted), examples." Is this paragraph appropriately placed? It appears to also cover the content of Clause 7.  | Restructure the document so that this is in a more appropriate place.   |  |
| GB 11           | 6.1, 6.2, 6.3                               |  | te                           | These sub-clauses are incorrectly formatted. The first textual paragraph should be preceded by a sub-sub-clause number and heading, with subsequent sub-sub-clauses renumbered.   | Amend   |  |
| GB 12           | 6.1.1                                       |  | ed                           | The style of the description is inconsistent with the style elsewhere.  | Remove "An" from the beginning of the description.  |  |
| GB 13           | 6.1.1 et seq                                |  | te                           | "multistring" is undefined.   | Provide a definition.   |  |
| GB 14           | 6.1.1 et seq                                |  | ed                           | The examples are poorly portrayed. Some are literal examples (such as "ISO/IEC 24706" in clause 6.1.1), others are indications of where an example might be seen (such as "See the Bibliography in this document" in clause 6.2.6), whilst other are multiple examples (such as "ISO and IEC" in clause 6.1.3). This is all very confusing. | Make it clear which are actual examples and which are references. Also make it clear whether it is a single example or a set of examples. |  |
| GB 15           | 6.1.4 et seq                                |  | ed                           | "ISO/IEC JTC1 / SC32 / WG2" WG2 is not a formal committee - the example should be "ISO/IEC JTC1 / SC32"   | Amend   |  |
| GB 16           | 6.1.4 et seq                                |  | ed                           | "ISO/IEC JTC1 / SC32 / WG2" The formatting of committee titles is inconsistent. The SC32 Secretariat appears to be using "ISO/IEC JTC 1/ SC 32" and te title page has "ISO/IEC JTC1 SC32"   | Use the correct format (whatever that is).  |  |
| GB 17           | 6.1.5 et seq                                |  | te                           | "Datatype: See contact information in CD ISO/IEC 19773:2007" 19773 is not yet published.  | Remove ":2007"  |  |

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: 14 December 2009

Document: ISO/IEC FCD 24706

| 1               | 2   | (3)  | 4                            | 5   | (6)   | (7)  |
|-----------------|---|--|------------------------------|---|---|--|
| MB <sup>1</sup> | Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex (e.g. 3.1) | Paragraph/ Figure/Table/ Note (e.g. Table 1) | Type of comment <sup>2</sup> | Comment (justification for change) by the MB  | Proposed change by the MB   | Secretariat observations on each comment submitted |
| GB 18           | 6.1.5 et seq                                |  | te                           | “Datatype: See contact information in CD ISO/IEC 19773:2007” The contact information in the latest draft of 19773 is a ‘module’ of data, so is it appropriate to call it a ‘datatype’? Should this sub-clause (and those like it) be expanded to include all the attributes, or should the terminology within these sub-clauses be changed? | Revise structure.   |  |
| GB 19           | 6.1.8                                       | Obligation                                   | te                           | “mandatory if different from SDO contact” This implies that it is not mandatory.  | Change obligation to “optional” and add a note to explain the circumstances as to when an SIO contact should be supplied. |  |
| GB 20           | 6.1.8                                       | Occurrence                                   | ed                           | “optional” is inconsistent with the form used elsewhere.  | Change to “zero or more”  |  |
| GB 21           | 6.2   | first para                                   | ed                           | “one recording (in the datotyping sense)” - typo  | Change “recording” to “record”  |  |
| GB 22           | 6.2   | NOTE after first para                        | ed                           | “that determine within elements are mandatory or optional” - typo   | Change “within” to “which”  |  |
| GB 23           | 6.2.1                                       | Datatype                                     | te                           | Should this be “multitext” instead of “multistring”?  | –   |  |
| GB 24           | 6.2.2 et seq                                |  | te                           | “multitext” is undefined.   | Provide a definition.   |  |
| GB 25           | 6.2.4                                       |  | ed                           | “The scope contained in the standard usually clause 1” The “usually clause 1” does not add to the description of this attribute and may be misleading, particularly if this standard is used to manage a standards registry for an organisation where the ‘scope’ clause is not usually clause 1.   | Remove “usually clause 1”   |  |
| GB 26           | 6.2.7                                       | NOTE   | te                           | “tuple” is not defined.   | Provide a definition.   |  |
| GB 27           | 6.2.7                                       | NOTE   | te                           | Definitions often include notes as well as references. so is another attribute needed?  | Add a new sub-clause for “Note”   |  |
| GB 28           | 6.3.1                                       |  | te                           | This is shown as “Obligation: mandatory” and “Occurrence: one or more”, but will project editors always be known? And are project editors relevant for published standards?   | Change to “Obligation: optional” and “Occurrence: zero or more”.  |  |

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: 14 December 2009 Document: ISO/IEC FCD 24706

| 1               | 2   | (3)  | 4                            | 5   | (6)   | (7)  |
|-----------------|---|--|------------------------------|---|---|--|
| MB <sup>1</sup> | Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex (e.g. 3.1) | Paragraph/ Figure/Table/ Note (e.g. Table 1) | Type of comment <sup>2</sup> | Comment (justification for change) by the MB  | Proposed change by the MB   | Secretariat observations on each comment submitted |
| GB 29           | 6.3.3                                       |  | te                           | This is shown as “Obligation: mandatory” and “Occurrence: one or more”, but the normal situation will be to replace a single standard with another single standard. However, it is possible that on replacement a standard may be split into a many part standard (a ‘many-to-one’ situation) or that many parts may be consolidated into a single standard (a ‘one-to-many’ situation). This implies that the ‘replaces’ concept should allow for many-to-many, so a separate ‘replaces’ record is required. | Remove this sub-clause and provide a complete ‘replacement’ record. |  |
| GB 30           | 7.2   | Example                                      | te                           | “ISO/IEC 11179-5 (Ed 3) draft proposal”. There is no draft proposal for an Ed 3 of 11179-5.   | Provide a different example.  |  |
| GB 31           | Annex A                                     |  |                              | The following sub-clauses of this draft are missing from the 24706 column of the table: 6.1.6, 6.1.7, 6.1.8, 6.2.1.   | Include appropriate entries.  |  |

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: 21 Jan 2010

Document: **SC32 N 1918**

| 1               | 2  | (3)   | 4                                       | 5   | (6)  | (7)   |
|-----------------|--|---|---|---|--|---|
| MB <sup>1</sup> | Clause No./<br>Subclause No./<br>Annex<br>(e.g. 3.1) | Paragraph/<br>Figure/Table/<br>Note<br>(e.g. Table 1) | Type<br>of<br>com-<br>ment <sup>2</sup> | Comment (justification for change) by the MB  | Proposed change by the MB  | Secretariat observations<br>on each comment submitted |
| US              | Introduction   |   | ed                                      | The introduction should give more description on how the metadata might be used for interoperability, such as XML bindings, HTML bindings (for web content), and so on.   | Add appropriate text.  |   |
| US              | Introduction   |   | ed                                      | The introduction should position this standard as one of many descriptive standards, i.e., it can be used in conjunction with other standards and 24706 makes no requirements on whether or not to include those standards.                           | Add appropriate text.  |   |
| US              | Clause 4   |   | te                                      | Clause 4 should give some hint to the computational model afforded by the metadata. For example, it should say that metadata can be used for "search and discovery" (a common computational model).   | Add text to explain how the elements are appropriate for search and discovery.<br><br>Add text to explain how the elements are used for promoting reuse of standard and reducing duplication of work.  |   |
| US              | Clause 5   |   | te                                      | Expand Clause 5 to include a rationale for splitting the elements in Clauses 6 & 7.   | The proposed wording is Metadata for a technical standard or specification document is separated into 2 kinds:<br>a. Elements describing the content of the document in Clause 6<br>b. Elements describing the existence of the document in Clause 7 |   |
| US              | Clauses 5 and 8                                      |   | ed                                      | Clauses 5 and 8 should be reformulated. Some of the text in Clause 5 should move to Scope, some should move to conformance. Right now there are three clauses Scope, Usage, and Conformance and they should be reduced to two: Scope and Conformance. | Analyze text and move as appropriate.  |   |
| US              | Clause 6   |   | te                                      | Clause 6 should be verified to be compatible/complete with ISONET (ISO's prior work on metadata).   | Conduct review and add results to Annex.   |   |

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: 21 Jan 2010

Document: **SC32 N 1918**

| 1               | 2  | (3)   | 4                                       | 5  | (6)   | (7)   |
|-----------------|--|---|---|--|---|---|
| MB <sup>1</sup> | Clause No./<br>Subclause No./<br>Annex<br>(e.g. 3.1) | Paragraph/<br>Figure/Table/<br>Note<br>(e.g. Table 1) | Type<br>of<br>com-<br>ment <sup>2</sup> | Comment (justification for change) by the MB   | Proposed change by the MB   | Secretariat observations<br>on each comment submitted |
| US              | Clause 6   |   | te                                      | Clause 6 should better explain the obligation/occurrence feature. For example, if something is optional and multiple, then that is the difference in meaning between nothing, exactly one (singular), an array of one (different from singular), array of three, and an array of three but in reverse order? Although the 24706 does not directly address this, all bindings have such distinctions and this is often confusing to users/implementers. | Describe the full meaning of the obligation / occurrence elements in the clause.  |   |
| US              | Clause 6   |   | te                                      | Clause 6 needs to support the equivalent of Title-Subject-Author.  | Determine what is missing and add appropriate elements.   |   |
| US              | Clause 6   |   | te                                      | Clause 6 should be verified to be compatible with the present text cataloging work at the ISO Central Secretariat. For example, ISO CS is using TBX (term-base-exchange) as an approach for terminology, and ISO CS is using well-tested text decomposition techniques (e.g., separation into clauses and subclauses). The 24706 standard should be compatible with this work.   | Conduct review and add results to Annex.  |   |
| US              | Clause 6   |   | te                                      | Clause 6 should be complete in that it includes all the present metadata for JTC1 N documents (which was used for all ISO committees).   | Conduct review and add elements as appropriate.   |   |
| US              | Sub-clause 6.2.6                                     |   | te                                      | Sub-clause 6.2.6 is for informative references. There are standards and commonly used specifications for formatting bibliographic references.  | Add an attribute for specifying which format is in use. Unfortunately, this must be optional, for many bibliographies have been produced without a specific format used or known. |   |
| US              | Annex A  |   | te                                      | Make sure the mappings in Annex A to Dublin Core and other standards are accurate  | Conduct review and add items as necessary.  |   |

<sup>1</sup> **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 \*\*)

<sup>2</sup> **Type of comment:** **ge** = general **te** = technical **ed** = editorial

**NOTE** Columns 1, 2, 4, 5 are compulsory.

## Template for comments and secretariat observations

Date: 2010-01-07

Document: **ISO/IEC 24706**

| 1                     | 2   | (3)  | 4  | 5  | (6)  | (7)  |
|-----------------------|---|--|--|--|--|--|
| <b>MB<sup>1</sup></b> | <b>Clause No./<br/>Subclause No./<br/>Annex</b><br>(e.g. 3.1) | <b>Paragraph/<br/>Figure/Table/<br/>Note</b><br>(e.g. Table 1) | <b>Type<br/>of<br/>com-<br/>ment<sup>2</sup></b> | <b>Comment (justification for change) by the MB</b>  | <b>Proposed change by the MB</b>   | <b>Secretariat observations</b><br>on each comment submitted |
|                       | 2   |  | ed   | Any document listed in Clause 2 shall be referenced "normatively" elsewhere in the text, i.e. within the context of a requirement to indicate that the user of ISO/IEC 24706 is obliged to use it. | The references listed in Clause 2 are all cited in the document in an informative way and therefore should be moved to the Bibliography at the end of the document.  |  |
|                       | General   |  | ed   | Document incorrectly refers to itself as "this document" and "this standard".  | Re-draft document so that it refers to itself as "this International Standard" everywhere except in the Foreword and Clauses 2 and 3 where "this document" is used in accordance with ISO/IEC Directives Part 2. |  |
|                       | Annex A   |  | ed   | In accordance with ISO/IEC Directives Part 2, annexes shall be specified either "informative" or "normative".  | Re-draft annex heading to read, for example, as follows:<br><br><b>Annex A</b><br>(informative)<br><br><b>Mapping FCD 24706 to ISO 15836 Dublin Core Metadata Element set</b>                                    |  |
|                       | Bibliography  |  | ed   | In accordance with ISO/IEC Directives Part 2, the bibliography shall come at the end of the document, following any annexes.   | Move the bibliography to the end of the document, following Annex A.   |  |

<sup>1</sup> **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 \*\*)

<sup>2</sup> **Type of comment:** **ge** = general **te** = technical **ed** = editorial

**NOTE** Columns 1, 2, 4, 5 are compulsory.