

ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 32 N 2414

Date: 2013-07-17

REPLACES: --

<p style="text-align: center;">ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 32</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Data Management and Interchange</p> <p style="text-align: center;">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 N2224 CD 11179-1 Information Technology -- Metadata Registries (MDR) - Part 1: Framework Ed 3
SOURCE	WG2 - Dan Gillman - project editor
PROJECT NUMBER	1.32.15.03.05.00
STATUS	Disposition of the comments in 32N23270 (SoV on CD 11179-1 ballot 32N2224). This accompanies 32N2413 CD2 11179-1 sent to NBs for letter ballot.
REFERENCES	
ACTION ID.	FYI
REQUESTED ACTION	
DUE DATE	
Number of Pages	50
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)
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
CA02	All	-	te	<p>1. This draft contains many changes that have not been agreed to by WG2. To the extent that these changes have been discussed at all, this was in Nov 2009 at the London meeting, and the decision at the time was to defer them for consideration in Edition 4.</p> <p>It is important that SC32/WG2 Project Editor for 11179-1 defer to and implement SC32/WG2 decisions with respect to the preparation of 11179-1. 3rd edition.</p> <p>2. The existing edition of 11179-1 is precise and focussed. The proposed CD for the 3rd edition is not. It proposes a major expansion and change in Scope for 11179-1. . According to JTC1 Directives 2.1.5.4, “, <i>any subdivision shall lie fully within the scope of the original project; otherwise a new work item proposal shall be made</i>”</p>	<p>1) Remove all changes that are not directly related to aligning Edition 3 of part 1 with Edition 3 of parts 3, 4, 5 and 6. As such the 3rd edition should be simply on the nature of harmonization and alignment with existing Parts of 11179, including the new edition for 11179-3</p> <p>2) The nature of the changes being introduced is significant enough that they should be subject to a NWI ballot, not just a project subdivision.</p> <p>3) Canada requests that SC32/WG2 comply with JTC1 Directives on this matter and instruct the Project Editor to draft the CD2 as per 1) above.</p>	New text in CD1 draft moved to Annex A (informative) and reformulated.
CA03	All	all	te	<p>Progressing to the DIS & FDIS stage for 11179-1 as soon as possible and with minimum demands on resources.</p> <p>During the past few years, the resources and experts available to support SC32/WG2 standards work has been seriously curtailed (including that of Canadian experts being able to participate in person in SC32/WG2 meetings). Given this fact, Canada does place a priority of allocating its scarce sources for the multipart 11179 metadata standard.</p> <p>While there may well be a need to develop metadata standards outside of the 11179 standard which focuses on data, such efforts should be separated from what should be a simple “update” of the existing 11179-1</p>	<p>Canada requests that at the Krakow BRM meeting on the 32N2224 CD ballot document SC32/WG2 resolves to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) prepare a draft DIS for the 3rd edition making only minimal and minor changes to 11179-1 which are required align and harmonize the document with the new editions of 11179, and in particular 11179-3; 2) defer any issues pertaining to standards development for new standards for metadata for other than data to the 2013 Plenary meeting for which those who propose such new standards(s) development can prepare a NWI proposal document, possibly for a TR rather than introducing major incompatibilities in a new edition of 	New draft to be submitted as CD2. Editor unable to meet Canada's time line.

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
					<p>11179.</p> <p>Canada makes this proposal since there may be only a few minor changes necessary to be made to the 2nd edition of 11179-1 and that therefore if its proposed solution is accepted, then a 2nd CD and associated time delay would not be necessary.</p> <p>Further, if the Project Editor for 11179-1 produces such a draft DIS ballot document no later than 30 November, 2012, then SC32/WG2 members could make comments on this draft DIS, resolve them via electronic meeting in January, and then go to DIS ballot in early February, with the result that at the 2013 Plenary meeting, DIS comments could be resolved and the 3rd edition would be going to FDIS ballot shortly thereafter.</p> <p>New and different metadata requirements such as those of the nature identified (in a preliminary manner) in the 32N2224 CD ballot document for 3rd edition of 111197-1 would be addressed (and channelled) via a NWI proposal.</p> <p>This would also save considerable time at the Krakow BRM meeting since all P-member comments pertaining to the proposed changed nature and focus of 11179-1 made by P-members could simply be deferred to the NWI proposal activities.</p>	
CA04	Foreword	List of Parts	ed	The parts of the standard are listed with two leading zeroes, e.g. 001,002. This is unnecessary, since we are unlikely to ever reach over 99 parts. In fact there are currently no plans for any new parts, so a single digit is sufficient. There was no need to change these from Edition 2.	Remove the leading zeroes from the part numbers.	Done

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
CA05	0. Introduction	all	te	The changes to the introduction reflect an expansion of the scope of 11179-1. This is not appropriate when the new edition was authorized by a project split and not a NWI ballot. It also breaks alignment and harmonization with other parts of 11179, in particular the new edition for 11179-3.	Restore the original 11179-1 text of the existing 2 nd edition. Make only minor edits where this improves readability.	Intro text reverted to edition 2 with few additions.
CA06	0-Introduction	0-3, last para.	ed	There appears to be a word missing in the sentence: “The text in the 2 nd edition concerned the description of the other five parts is included.” However, clause 0.3 is about what is new in Edition 3, so this sentence does not belong here at all.	Preferably delete the sentence. Otherwise, insert ‘with’ after ‘concerned’, to give: “The text in the 2 nd edition concerned with the description of the other five parts is included.”	Intro text reverted to edition 2 with few additions.
CA07	1. Scope	all	te	Canada does not support the proposed change and expansion in Scope of 11179-1. The existing scope is clear, focused and serves the metadata data community well. If there are new or additional or other metadata requirements they should be addressed via their own standard and be put forward for NWI ballot.	Restore the original 11179-1 Scope text of the existing 2 nd edition. Make only minor edits where this improves readability. P-members are free to put forward a NWI to put forward a NWI pertaining to metadata to be used for purposes other than to describe data. It is assumed that such a NWI proposal will take into account existing ISO/IEC and ISO standards which already cover part of the proposed different scope and focus as has been proposed.	Scope text reverted to edition 2 with few additions to account for 11179-3 Ed3.
CA08	1-Scope	2 nd para., 3 rd sentence	ed	The use of commas to mark the beginning and end of the examples is rendered confusing by the use of commas to separate items in the examples: “Metadata that is the same for more than one object is metadata for a class of objects, e.g., this metadata would apply to an object-oriented class, a datatype, XML schema, etc., is of particular interest because the class of objects might have shared commonalities in computational models and/or semantics.”	Use parentheses to mark the beginning and end of the examples. Other minor clarifications are also requested.: (a) change ‘would’ to ‘might’; (b) Insert ‘an’ before ‘XML’. “Metadata that is the same for more than one object is metadata for a class of objects (e.g., this metadata might apply to an object-oriented class, a datatype, an XML schema, etc.) is of particular interest because the class of objects might have	Scope text reverted to edition 2 with few additions to account for 11179-3 Ed3.

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
					shared commonalities in computational models and/or semantics.”	
CA09	3-Terms and Definitions	All	te	The definitions need to be pared down to the essentials and alphabetized. Currently there is too many terms that are not relevant to the standard. See other comments below that request removing new clauses.	Remove definitions that are not relevant.	Clause 3 text reverted to edition 2 with few additions to account for 11179-3 Ed3.
CA10	3-Terms and Definitions	All	ed	Where a term used in a definition is itself defined in clause 3, then it should be highlighted, e.g. using bold or <i>italic</i> font and/or providing a cross-reference to the relevant definition.	Agree on the type of highlighting to be used. Highlight all such terms.	Clause 3 text reverted to edition 2 with few additions to account for 11179-3 Ed3.
CA11	3. Terms and definitions	All	te	<p>There are serious problems and deficiencies in Clause 3.</p> <p>Limited available time and resources of Canadian experts did not permit for a more complete and thorough set of comments.</p> <p>The comments made below are considered of a major nature and in support of a systematic approach.</p> <p>The inclusion of major changes in a CD ballot document without prior agreement by the WG is inappropriate.</p> <p>SC32/WG2 needs to differentiate between the preparation of:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The 3rd edition of 11179-1 (basically in a maintenance mode); and, 2. that of a P-member developing and proposing a NWI ballot document. 	Canada recommends that the SC32/WG2 instruct the Project Editor for 11179-1 to use the existing 2 nd edition 11179-1, Clause 3 text in the preparation for the CD2 ballot document (harmonized where necessary with the new 3 rd edition of t1179-3.	Clause 3 text reverted to edition 2 with few additions to account for 11179-3 Ed3.
CA12	3. Terms and definitions	All	te	<p>Canada notes that several other standards within JTC1/SC32 use 11179-1 as a Normative Reference as the source of concepts and their definitions. In addition, other ISO/IEC and ISO standards use 11179-1 as a Normative Reference.</p> <p>Therefore any changes to the terms and definitions in</p>	<p>Existing definitions and associated terms for concepts in Clause 3 should stay as is.</p> <p>Any new definitions for new or changed concepts should become part of a NWI ballot.</p>	Clause 3 text reverted to edition 2 with few additions to account for 11179-3 Ed3.

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
				<p>Clause 3 will likely have a negative affect on other standards committees and their standards who reference 11179-1 (and 11179-3) as the source for definitions of these concepts.</p> <p>Further a change in an existing definition, indicates that one is defining a different concept and that therefore on should use a new and different label as the term assigned to the definition of such a new or changed concept.</p>		
CA13	3. Terms and definitions	all	te	The 2 nd edition of 11179-1 contains a Clause 3.3 Alphabetical list of terms used in the Metamodel. This is missing in the proposed CD document	Restore Clause 3.3 and its contents in the 3 rd CD ballot document.	Clause 3 text reverted to edition 2 with few additions to account for 11179-3 Ed3.
CA14	3. Terms and definitions	all	te	<p>Use of ISO 704. versus existing use of ISO 1087-1 in 11179-1</p> <p>Canada finds the existing 11179-1 normative reference and re-use of ISO 1087-1 concepts and their definitions to be useful and sufficient.</p> <p>Canada does not support (at all) the proposed replacement of existing ISO 1087-1 referenced terms and definitions to those referencing ISO 704 especially where:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - ISO 704 in its Clause 3 does not even include the term definition reference - The proposed “adaptation” of use of ISO 704 in 3rd edition of 11179-1 significantly changes the semantics of the ISO 704 definition; and/or, - There are no Clause 3 or other Clause # references to ISO 704 , which are required as per ISO Directives <p>While Canada as a general principle, supports re-use of existing ISO standards such as ISO 704, Canada does not see any rationale or justification why 11179-1 Clause 3 definitions</p>	<p>1. Use existing ISO 1087-1 definitions in 3rd edition for 11179-1 exactly as they are in 2nd edition of 11179-1.</p> <p>2. Require any proposed use and reference to ISO 704 in Clause 3 of to be precisely referenced as ISO & JTC1 Directives</p> <p>3. Instruct the Project Editor, to provide a rationale, via a “Project Editor’s Note”, as to why any existing ISO standard term & definition should not be used “as is” but be “adapted”.</p>	Clause 3 text reverted to edition 2 with few additions to account for 11179-3 Ed3.

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
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - should not continue to reference ISO 1087; - existing definitions in ISO 704 cannot be used “as is”. 		
CA15	3. Terms and definitions	All	te	<p>Issue with use of ISO/IEC 20944-1 as a normative source for 11179-1. The 32N4222 document seems to represent a position that ISO/IEC 20944-1 should be used as a “superior” normative reference for 11179-1 rather than , existing 11179-1 itself.</p> <p>Canada does not support such an approach. ISO/IEC 11179-1 is and should be considered to be the senior and more mature standard. It is also much more widely used.</p>	Continue using existing 11179-1 Clause 3 definitions and concepts (or those of other Parts of 11179) as the “primary” source reference for existing 11179 terms and definitions.	Clause 3 text reverted to edition 2 with few additions to account for 11179-3 Ed3.
CA16	3. Terms and definitions	all	te	<p>There are existing 11179-1 concepts and their definitions which appear to be missing from the CD document. These need to be restored.</p> <p>In addition, for some of them 11179-1 is the source ISO standard and other standards re-use these 11179-1 concepts and their definitions. For example, continue use of ISO 1087-1 as was done for the earlier editions of 11179-1.</p> <p>No rationale is provided why these perfectly good definitions of concepts now need to be replaced by something quite different and then in using ISO 704, adapt them from ISO 704. Further most of these proposed changes are not even definitions in Clause 3 in ISO 704, while in other cases the proposed “adaption” changes (significantly) the definition of the concepts as stated in the source standard referenced.</p>	<p>Restore the following 2nd edition 11179-1 <u>existing</u> concepts and their definitions to the CD2 for 11179-1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 3.1.1 attribute - 3.1.2 class - 3..1. identifier (in Metadata Registry) - 3.1.4 relationship - 3.2.1 basic attribute - 3.2.1 characteristic - -3.2.4 concept system - 3.2.5 conceptual data model - 3.2.6 data - 3.2.7 data model - 3..2.10 entity - 3.2.11 essential characteristic - 3.2.12 extension 	Clause 3 text reverted to edition 2 with few additions to account for 11179-3 Ed3.

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
					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 3.2.13 general concept - 3.2.14 individual concept - - 3.2.15 intension - - 3.2.6 metadata etc, etc. as per Clauses 3.1, 3.2, and 3.3 of existing 11179-1 2 nd edition.	
CA17	3. Terms and definitions	all	te	<p>Use of ISO 704. versus existing 11179-1</p> <p>While Canada as a general principle, supports re-use of existing ISO standards such as ISO 704, Canada does not see any rationale or justification why existing definitions of ISO 704 concepts should not be used as is?</p> <p>Further, the ISO 704:1999 standard referenced has been gone through several editions since. The current edition is the 3rd edition, 2009. The 3rd edition of ISO 704:2009 is aligned and harmonized with ISO 1087-1 and uses concepts and definitions from ISO 1087-1 in its Clause 3 Definitions.</p> <p>Further, ISO 704:2009 focuses on ‘Principles and Methods’ and contains only six (6) definitions in its Clause 3.</p> <p>Finally, in Clause 3 of this proposed CD document, there are entries which reference ISO 704 as “adapted from ISO 704”. However, the following terms and definitions which are proposed to be added to the 3rd edition of 11179-1 based on ISO 704 are NOT defined in ISO 704,. These include:</p> <p>3.1.4 concept</p> <p>3.1.6 extension</p> <p>3.1.9 generic concept</p>	<p>Canada considers ISO 1087-1 to be a more useful source reference than ISO 704.</p> <p>Canada requests WG2 to instruct the Project Editor for 11179-1 to continue to use existing ISO 1087-1 definitions as referenced in 2nd edition of 11179-1.</p> <p>Canada requests that all references to ISO 704 be removed from Clause 3 until such time as change proposals are presented to explain these new concepts, provide a rationale for the need to introduce the same, and how they are based on or derived from ISO 704:2009. Work of this nature should be directed at a possible NWI proposal as identified in CA02, CA03, CA07 and others above.</p>	<p>Clause 3 text reverted to edition 2 with few additions to account for 11179-3 Ed3.</p>

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
				3.1.10 generic concept 3.1.11 intension 3.1.13 object 3.1.15 property 3.2.3 concept system 3.2.1 designation 3.3.9 terminology		
CA18	3-Terms and Definitions	Various	te	Some definitions in this document are different from the definitions of the same terms that are specified in the draft FDIS 11179-3 Edition 3. The various parts of ISO/IEC 11179 Edition 3 should be consistent in their use of terms and definitions. It is also preferable to keep the same definitions as prior editions, but there may sometimes be good reason to make changes between editions.	Make terms and definitions consistent across all parts of ISO/IEC 11179 Edition 3. Explicit comments are included for some of these terms, but all such differences should be fixed, whether or not there is an explicit comment. The one exception is 'extension', where the sense in which the term is used in part 1 is different from part 3, and part 3 has qualified its definitions to differentiate its uses of the term. These differences also exist in Edition 2.	Clause 3 text reverted to edition 2 with few additions to account for 11179-3 Ed3.
CA19	3-Terms and Definitions	Various	te	Where definitions are taken from other standards, use dated references, because definitions can change from one edition to another, and reference the specific clause where the definition may be found.	Make the necessary changes.	Clause 3 text reverted to edition 2 with few additions to account for 11179-3 Ed3.
CA20	3.1.1	Definition "characteristic"	te	The definition provided for 'characteristic' is different from that specified in the draft FDIS 11179-3 Edition 3. The various parts of Edition 3 should be consistent in their use of terms and definitions. The draft FDIS 11179-3 Edition 3 uses: characteristic abstraction of a property of an object or of a set of	Use the definition of 'characteristic' from FDIS 11179-3 Edition 3.	Removed

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
				<p>objects</p> <p>NOTE Characteristics are used for describing concepts).</p> <p>[ISO 1087-1:2000, 3.2.4]</p> <p>This document uses:</p> <p>“concept that plays the role of a determinable in a determining relation [adapted from ISO 704]</p> <p>NOTE The Oxford English Dictionary definition of "determinable (noun)" is: "That which is capable of being given a more determinate form or of being more precisely specified; spec. (in W. E. Johnson's use) a general term or concept (e.g. color) under which several specific terms or concepts fall (e.g. red, yellow, green).".</p> <p>Here Canada notes that, "characteristic" is not a defined concept in Clause 3 of ISO 704:2009, which actually references ISO 1087-1. Further, the proposed definition is not understandable in that what is a "determinable" is not defining and neither is it clear as to what is a "determining relation".</p> <p>Canada also notes that ISO 704:2009 states in its Clause 5.4.1 "It should be noted that "characteristic" is a linguistic "concept" which should not be confused with the IT concept "property".</p>		

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
CA21	3.1.4	Definition "concept"	te	<p>The definition provided for 'concept' is different from that specified in the draft FDIS 11179-3 Edition 3. The various parts of Edition 3 should be consistent in their use of terms and definitions.</p> <p>The draft FDIS 11179-3 Edition 3 uses: unit of knowledge created by a unique combination of characteristics</p> <p>NOTE Concepts are not necessarily bound to particular languages. They are, however, influenced by the social or cultural background which often leads to different categorizations.</p> <p>[ISO 1087-1:2000, 3.2.1]</p> <p>NOTE 2 A concept is independent of its representation.</p> <p>This document uses: unit of thought differentiated by characteristics [adapted from ISO 704]</p> <p>ISO 704:2009 does not contain a definition for "concept" in its Clause 3 and where it does in other Clauses bases its work on ISO 1087-1.</p>	Use the definition of 'concept' from FDIS 11179-3 Edition 3, replacing the cross-reference to characteristic by the appropriate cross-reference in this document.	Reverted
CA22	3.1.6	Definition "extension"	te	<p>The CD has changed the reference for the definition of extension to '[adapted from ISO 704], but "Extension" is not a defined concept in ISO 704:2009, references the definition from ISO 1087-1, as did the 2nd edition of 11179-1</p>	Use the existing 1087-1 definition as found in 2 nd edition 11179-1 with the note that 11179-3 uses the term differently.	Agree
CA23	3.1.13	Definition	te	<p>This concept is not defined in ISO 704. ISO 1087-1 source should continue to be used.</p>	Keep definition of "object" as in Edition 2.	Use 1087-1 definition

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
		“object”		This ISO 1087-1 definition of object is also used as is in other JTC1/SC32 standards.		
CA24	3. 3.1	Definition “designation”	te	ISO 1087-1 defines “designation” as Representation of a concept by a sign which denotes it. NOTE: In terminology work three types of designations are distinguished: symbols, appellation, (a.k.a., names), and terms. In neither ISO 1087-1 or in ISO 704 does the character string of “signifier” occur.	Use the 1087-1 definition.	Agree
CA25	3.3.3	Definition “identifier”	te	1. In the development of 11179-1 (and -3, and elsewhere, SC32/WG2 spend considerable time and discussions, papers, contributions, etc., to develop the definition of the concept of “identifier” for use in MDR. The resulting definition has been constant since the first edition of 11179-1 and is so reference in other Parts of 11179. It is as follows: 3.1.3 identifier (in Metadata Registry) Sequence of characters, capable of uniquely identifying that with which is associated, within a specified context NOTE A name should not be used as an identifier because it is not linguistically neutral. 2. The proposed replacement text has no rationale or is supported by a paper which makes a case why the existing 11179-1 definition for “identifier” should be changed, let alone totally replaced.. Further, the proposed definition confuses the role of identifiers with those of signs (including terms or labels). It is also not understandable or readable.	Maintain existing 11179-1 definition for “identifier” (in Metadata Registry). Defer anything about “dereferencable labels:”, what is a “label”, signifier, etc., to a possible NWI proposal.	Used 11179-1 Ed2 definition

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
CA26	3.3.8	Definition “signifier”	te	<p>1. Canada has major difficulties in understanding this concept but even more so why it is needed in 11179-1.</p> <p>2. The character string “signifier” is not found in either ISO 704 or ISO 1087-1.</p> <p>3. Whatever “signifier” is meant to be it needs to be differentiated from the concept and definition of “sign”. The existing ISO definition for “sign” is</p> <p>sign any physical phenomenon interpreted to convey meaning ISO 5127:1 (1.1.3.021)</p> <p>2. Signs can be linguistic or non-linguistic in nature. The concept of “signifier” (in French “significant”) focuses on the shape of a word, its phonic component, the sequence of graphemes (e.g. letters) or phonemes (speech sounds). Oxford dictionary defines “signifier” as “a sign”s physical form (such as sound, printed word or image) as distinct from its meaning..</p> <p>3. The concept and use of “signifiers” is an area of linguistics. It was first introduced and promoted by the Swiss linguist Ferdinand de Saussure. There are criticisms of his theory on “signifiers, but this is outside the scope of SC32/WG2 and in particular that of 11179. (see further Wikipedia entry)</p> <p>4. The example does not provide “extensions” of the concept but simply different forms (or “shapes”) for representing the same concept. (i.e, the Arabic numeral 4)</p>	<p>1. Delete use of “signifier” from 11179-1.</p> <p>2. Request proponents of the introduction of this concept and definition to first contribute a paper providing a rationale and business case as to how and where this would add value to the 11179 multipart series.</p>	Discussion now in Annex A. Used the term “sing” instead.
CA27	3.4.11	Definition “information”	te	<p>1. MDR in general and 11179-1 focuses on “data” as defined by JTC1 Information technology vocabulary and widely used throughout JTC1 (and ISO standards) based</p>	<p>1. Move this text out of 11179-1 and into any eventual NWI proposal.</p>	Discussion now in Annex A

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
				<p>on ISO/IEC 2382-1. If one need a definition for “information” and that in an IT context, one should reference and use the following existing, ISO/IEC definition,</p> <p>Information (in information processing)</p> <p>Knowledge concerning objects, such as facts, events, things, processes or ideas, including concepts that within a certain context have a particular meaning</p> <p>ISO/IEC 2382-1 (01.01.01)</p> <p>2. The current text here is more informative in nature and not hat of a concise definition. It would be more appropriately placed in an Informative Annex.</p>		
CA28	3.4.13	Definition “metadata”	te	<p>1. The existing 11179-1 definition is just fine as is. This is how other parts of 11179-1 use it and it is so used and referenced in other standards.</p> <p>(Besides the 32N4221 CD document has two different definitions for “object” in Clause 3, namely, 3.1.13 & 3.5.1, so which of these two is being referred to here?)</p>	1. Maintain existing 11179-1 definition of “metadata”.	Reverted to 11179-1 Ed2
CA29	3.4.14	Definition “metadata interoperability”	te	It is not clear how this proposed definition relates to and integrates the 3.4.12 definition of the concept of interoperability. Note sure why this is even needed	1. Delete and move to possible NWI proposal document	Removed
CA30	3.4.15	Definition “reify”	te	Terms need to be nouns not verbs. “Abstraction” is not defined. Not sure where and how this is needed in 111791-1	Delete and move to possible NWI proposal document	Removed
CA31	3.5.1	Definition	te	In the CD document “object” is already identified and defined in Clause 3.1.13	Continue using existing 11179-1 definition for object.	Used 1087-1 definition

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
		"object"		This is a different definition. In any case one already has in 11179-1 the use and reference of the ISO 1087-1 based definition for "object"		
CA32	4. What is Metadata		te	This clause is too verbose and reads like a text book. An entire clause is not needed for an explanation of metadata, particularly when there are numerous standard references.	Delete entire clause. Suggest move to a TR.	Reverted to 11179-1 Ed2 text with small additions to account for 11179-3 Ed3.
CA33	5. The Lifecycle of Metadata		te	This clause is too verbose and reads like a text book. What is being described are operations and good practices like governance etc.	Delete entire clause. Suggest move to a TR.	Removed
CA34	6 Metadata in 11179		te	This clause was supposed to be expanded to discuss the expanded scope of 11179-3 Edition 3.	Add mention of the new support for Concept Systems in Edition 3. Some rationalization with the section on Classification Schemes is also required, now that part 3 has subsumed Classification Schemes within Concept Systems. WG2 also needs to decide what to do with Part 2, but that is beyond the scope of this ballot.	Reverted to 11179-1 Ed2 text with small additions to account for 11179-3 Ed3.
CA35	Annex A		te	Not relevant to the standard, but good tutorial material	Delete entire clause. Suggest move to TR	Completely rewritten with appropriate relevance to normative clauses.
CA36	All		te	Any other errors found before or during the Comment Resolution Meeting should be corrected if consensus can be reached on a resolution.	To be addressed at the CRM as required.	Reverting 11179-1 Ed2 as basis for revision removes additional errors.

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.

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
DE 1	3.1.15	Example 3	ge	The definition of property as something like “mass of 80 kg” is not compatible with the use of property in FDIS part 3 with property as a characteristic of an object class. In FDIS part 3, property is only “mass”	Clarify the use of the term property (and characteristic) between part 1 and part 3.	Clause 3 text reverted to edition 2 with few additions to account for 11179-3 Ed3.
DE 2	3.2.7	Example 4	ge	The definition implies that objects and concepts are the same. That is not true having in mind the semantic triangle (or something similar).	Delete relationship system throughout the whole document.	Clause 3 text reverted to edition 2 with few additions to account for 11179-3 Ed3.
DE 3	3.3.9	Definition	ge	A collection of designation is a “collection of designations”.	Rethink the definition of terminology.	Clause 3 text reverted to edition 2 with few additions to account for 11179-3 Ed3.
DE 4	3.4.7	Definition	ge	Not needed, not used in practice.	Delete “data terminology” throughout the document.	Clause 3 text reverted to edition 2 with few additions to account for 11179-3 Ed3.
DE 5	3.4.16	Definition	ge	Not understandable. Is “value” a synonym of “value concept”? Values are per model not concepts in part 3.	Rethink the definition of value.	Clause 3 text reverted to edition 2 with few additions to account for 11179-3 Ed3.
DE 6	4.1	Example 14	ge	This example simplifies the information models of part 3. On the one hand, that makes the example understandable. On the other hand, the readers get a wrong understanding of part 3 which is quite complex.	I suggest, adapting the example as closely as possible to the information model of part 3, e. g. by systematically introducing designations and designations_signs and skipping names, with the exception of value_domains that have really a name as attribute.	Text in Clauses 4 and 5 removed and replaced with text from Ed2 with small additions as appropriate to describe 11179-3 Ed3.
DE 7	4.2	Example 15	ge	Is there any consent about the notion that all data are metadata? In that case, ISO/IEC 11179 must cover all other data related standards.	Clearly distinguish between metadata in a common sense and data that are described by metadata.	See DE 6
DE 8	4.3	Complete	ge	Not understandable.	Completely revise.	See DE 6
DE 9	4.3	Figures	ge	The figures include implicitly an information model. It is not sure whether this information model is the same as in part 3.	Replace all figures with references to the information model of part 3.	See DE 6

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
DE 10	4.4	Complete	ge	What is said in this chapter is beyond the area of application of ISO/IEC 11179.	Delete the broad discussion of interoperability.	See DE 6
DE 11	4.5	Complete	ge	To complex.	Delete.	See DE 6
DE 12	4.6	Complete	ge	Incompatible with part 3.	Adapt to part 3.	See DE 6
DE 13	4.6	Last bullet point.	ge	It is not possible with part 3, to organize property values (=permissible values in part 3).	Adapt to part 3.	See DE 6
DE 14	4.7	Complete	ge	Not understandable.	Delete.	See DE 6
DE 15	4.7	Figures	ge	Too complex.	Delete.	See DE 6
DE 16	4.8	Complete	ge	Not needed.	Delete.	See DE 6
DE 17	4.9	Complete	ge	Not needed.	Delete.	See DE 6
DE 18	4.10	Complete	ge	Not needed.	Delete.	See DE 6
DE 19	5	Complete	ge	Strong overlap to chapter 4.	Harmonize chapter 4 and 5.	See DE 6
DE 20	5.5	“repository”	ge	The text is about metadata repositories.	Check whether it is really necessary to speak of metadata repositories instead of metadata registries.	See DE 6
DE 21	6.1	Figure 9	ge	The figure is not correct. A data element has associations to an object class and to a property (via data element concept), but it does not define them itself.	Include the model from part 3.	Figure taken directly from 11179-1 Ed 2.
DE	6.3	Second	ge	The definition of permissible value is incorrect.	A permissible value is a value (like “m”) that is	Cannot understand the issue.

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
22		paragraph			associated with a value meaning (like “male”).	The statement in the text about permissible value is not a definition, and the fundamental fact that a PV is an association between a value and value meaning is described.
DE 23	6.3	Paragraph 6	ge	Conceptual domains may have relationships to each other, but only via the concepts package.	Please clarify.	Removed
DE 24	6.3	Paragraph 6	ge	Relationships between value domains are possible only as a kind of hierarchy. It is not possible to associate independent value domains to each other.	Please correct.	Restated
DE 25	6.3	Paragraphs before figure 11	ge	“The value domain is the representation for the data element.” is not true. The value domain is a representation of the conceptual domain. A problem with the information model of the data description package of part 3 is that an explicit representation of a data element concept is missing. The data element mixes this representation with the function as intermediate entity resolving an n:m-relationship between the (not existing) representation of a data element concept and a value domain.	Adapt the paragraphs to part 3.	A DEC is conceptual and cannot have a representation in any sense, except as definition. This is already accounted for. Changed “value domain is the representation” to “value domain is part of the representation”
DE 26	7.1	Paragraph 2	ge	Difference between data and “data construct” is unclear.	Please define data construct.	Added to list of examples
DE 27	7.2	Paragraph 1	ge	Data elements do not contain values.	Please correct.	Either corrected through making another edit or can't find issue.
DE 28	7.2	First bullet point after figure 12.	ge	“primarily a value domain”. No, solely value domains	Please correct.	Corrected

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 comment²	Comment (justification for change) by the MB	Proposed change by the MB	Secretariat observations on each comment submitted
DE 29	8.1.2	Second paragraph	ge	“Classification” is only useful for data elements, value domains or permissible values, because all other elements of the information model are concepts themselves.	Please clarify.	Text in entire sub-clause revised to account for needs of 11179-3 Ed 3.
DE 30	8.1.6	First paragraph	ed	RA	Please write in full the first time.	RA is listed as an abbreviation in Clause 4
DE 31	Annex A	Complete	ge	The role of this annex is unclear.	Delete the annex.	Completely rewritten with appropriate relevance to normative clauses.

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
JP 00	all		Ge	This document seems to be incompletes..	Precise definitions and explanation should be given to all parts after clause 3. Explanations and reasons should be given to all of EXAMPLES and FIGURES. The Results of the MDR/MFI Harmonization Study should be considered. We need more discussions.	Entire text reverted to edition 2 with few additions to account for 11179-3 Ed3.
JP 01	03	General Description of ISO/IEC 11179	Te	"Metadata is a kind of data that describes one or more objects." is too much.	It should be clearly distinguished between metadata and meta-object. Also, data and object.	Clause 3 reverted to 11179-1 Ed2 with appropriate changes to account for 11179-3 Ed3.
JP 02	02		Te	What is component of data?	The definition should be needed.	Clause 2 reverted to 11179-1 Ed2 with appropriate changes to account for 11179-3 Ed3.
JP 03	03	What is new edition of	Te	("descriptive data about an object")	Same as above.	Clause 3 reverted to 11179-1 Ed2 with appropriate changes to account for 11179-3 Ed3.
JP 04	1	Scope	Te	The scope of this standard was not specified.	The scope should be given.	Clause 1 reverted to 11179-1 Ed2 with appropriate changes to account for 11179-3 Ed3.
JP 05	4.1	Introduction, Example	Te	The example should be explained more precisely	Explanation of example should be given	Text in Clauses 4 and after removed and replaced with text from Ed2 with small additions as appropriate to describe 11179-3 Ed3.
JP 06	4.2	Metadata is Data	Te	The definition of metadata tells nothing. Only examples were given.	Clear definition should be needed.	See JP 5

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
JP 07	4.2 & 4.4		Te	What is "essential" ? The term, "essential," is not defined well or used as different meanings. In clause 4.2, "The essential characteristics of metadata" , However, in 4.4, "Determine which characteristics are essential, .."	Clarify the term, "essential," especially in the clause 4.4, because the "essential" is used in the definition of the steps of this specification 4.2.	See JP 5
JP 08	4.3	What is Data Fig 1		Explanations should not relay upon the color of character.	Explanation should be given exactly.	See JP 5
JP 09				What is "non defining data factors" ?	Explanation should be given exactly.	See JP 5
JP 10	4.5	Metadata Re-use		What is metadata Re-use? It sound that metadata development using existing metadata.	Title of this clause should be reconsidered.	See JP 5

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
GB 01	General	Whole document	ge	<p>The draft contains a considerable amount of material unsuitable for an international standard. In addition, a significant amount of this inappropriate content is controversial, irrelevant, contradictory with other assertions both within this document and with other parts of the standard, and in many places simply incorrect. The fundamental definition of metadata proposed here is demonstrably wrong making detailed review of much of the document, and in particular section 4, impractical.</p> <p>Later sections of the draft are unchanged from the previous version of this document and have not been revised to account for the substantive changes to registration, administration, identification, designation and classification in edition 3 of part 3. Cardinalities between the fundamental classes are also - as a consequence - incorrect. However the earlier parts of the document also fail to account for changes in part 3.</p> <p>Part 1 of a multipart standard should simply provide a framework for the parts, and delegate content to those parts unless it explains how those parts act in concert. However this document not only shadows all of the other parts of ISO/IEC 11179, it also asserts in section 1 that it 'may be used by itself' or 'with specifications other than ISO/IEC 11179'. This is unacceptable.</p> <p>The document is drafted in a conversational tone inappropriate for an international standard.</p>	<p>Move non-standard and non-framework content to an annex. Redraft the annex to ensure that is concise, correct and relevant.</p> <p>The remaining text should explain the purpose of the other parts and how they fit together to constitute a registry.</p>	<p>Entire text reverted to edition 2 with few additions to account for 11179-3 Ed3.</p>

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
GB 02	0.1	Paragraph 1	ge	<p>The definition of metadata given as the opening statement of this paragraph is incorrect. Redefinition (see section 1 para 2) is unnecessary and unhelpful. The standard should only 'narrow' the commonly held definition of metadata to indicate what types of metadata the standard addresses. This definition encompasses data that is widely - and rightly - regarded simply as 'data' within the context of its processing.</p> <p>Much of this argument stems from a misunderstanding and conflation between <i>structural metadata</i> and <i>metacontent</i> (Dublin Core style data). ISO/IEC 11179 is a standard for aspects of structural metadata - its attributes are data about data models made at the M2 layer of MOF. Making the distinction and only talking about structural metadata will make the prose more clear.</p>	Replace the definition of metadata to the standard 'data about data'. Explain that metadata is often dependent upon the context of processing and make the distinction between structural metadata and metacontent. Remove all further references to metacontent.	Intro text reverted to edition 2 with few additions to account for 11179-3 Ed3.
GB 03	0.2	Paragraph 1	te	This paragraph confuses modelling levels: the standard actually addresses the semantics of metadata so that the semantics of the data within the domain of a registry instance may be described.	Redraft to make the distinction between metalevels more clear	See GB 2
GB 04	0.2	Paragraph 2 bullet point 3	te	'space' is logically undefined in relation to electronic data.	Consider 'application instances'	See GB 2
GB 05	0.2	Paragraph 2 bullet points 5, 6	te	'components of data' again seems confused. ISO/IEC 11179 cannot easily represent complex datatypes so one suspects that 'components of metadata' is really what the author meant to say		See GB 2
GB 06	0.2	Paragraph 3 bullet point 2	ed	Part 2 seems to be superseded by part 3 edn 3. Will there be a part 2 in edition 3?		See GB 2
GB 07	0.3	Paragraph 1	ed	It is not necessary to describe non-normative changes from previous versions.	Remove paragraph	See GB 2
GB 08	0.3	Paragraphs 2, 3	ed	See above comments about metadata definition.	Remove paragraphs	See GB 2

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
GB 09	0.3	Paragraph 4	te	ISO/IEC 11179 is not about the semantics of data - it is about the semantics of metadata.	Revise	See GB 2
GB 10	0.3	Paragraph 4	ed	This paragraph is superfluous	Remove	See GB 2
GB 11	1.0	Header above	ed	This document is not a final draft	Remove	Scope text reverted to edition 2 with few additions to account for 11179-3 Ed3.
GB 12	1.0	Paragraph 1	ed	Part 1 of multipart standards should have only limited additional content to the parts - it should describe how the parts are related and are used together, rather than have standard components that may be used in isolation of the other parts. That it may be used with other standards is irrelevant outside of an informative annex.	Redraft standard to remove 'stand alone' elements and delegate them to the parts	See GB 11
GB 13	1.0	Paragraph 2	ed	See above comments about definitions of metadata.	Redraft	See GB 11
GB 14	1.0	Paragraph 4	ed	An explanation that distinguishes between 'ISO/IEC 11179' and Dublin Core style metadata would be helpful to the reader in an informative annex.	Move to annex	See GB 11
GB 15	2.0	General	ed	It is unclear how part 1 can be used on its own and still require parts 2-6 to be normative. If it is the intention for this part to be used on its own, then the ISO/IEC 11179 parts can only be informative.		See GB 1
GB 16	2.0	Paragraph 1 bullets 9, 10, 11	ed	ISO/IEC 11404, 19773 and 20944 are irrelevant to many implementations of ISO/IEC 11179 and thus should be informative references rather than normative, if mentioned at all at this place.		11404 normative reference kept since datatypes are a vital part of the description of data. Others removed. This is the same as the references appear in 11179-12 Ed2
GB 17	3.1.1, 3.1.4		ed	Definition of characteristic, concept should be the same as that from ISO/IEC 11179-3 edn 3 and the normative reference ISO 1087	Revise definition and check all subsequent definitions	

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
GB 18	3.1.6, 3.1.7	Examples	ed	By choosing these examples, the author risks controversy: definitions of 'planet' and 'noble gas' in the context of these examples are at the class level with a necessary and sufficient definition that allows instances - such as Saturn and Helium - to be automatically determined. Neither are treated as concepts in modern astronomy and chemistry.	Replace with less contentious examples	Clause 3 terms and definitions reverted to edition 2 with few additions to account for 11179-3 Ed3.
GB 19	3.1	General	ed	Is it necessary to continually adapt ISO 704 references: can we not find actual definitions, or use the references as is?		See GB 18
GB 20	3.1.13	General	te	The philosophical basis of ISO 704 which has objects as both material and immaterial is contentious, particularly for the life-sciences audience. Furthermore, the definition of "object" will not be required if metadata is defined as "data about data" and not as "descriptive data about objects".	Remove definition	See GB 18
GB 21	3.2.2	Example	ed	Referring to 'nuclear explosion' and 'fallout' is unnecessary.	Delete or replace with a less emotive example	See GB 18
GB 22	3.2.7	Definition	ed	'relationship system' is only mentioned once in the main prose of the document, and that reference is as an addendum that is non-normative. In any case it would be more helpful to use 'graph' which is a commonly used term with a precise definition that appears to mean the same thing.	Explain 'relationship system' inline with the text and remove the definition here. Check each definition to ensure that they contribute to the understanding of the standard	See GB 18
GB 23	3.3.3	Definition of 'identifier'	ed	Different from that of ISO/IEC 11179-3. Dereference is a programming term that might not be understood by the audience for the standard whereas the ISO/IEC 11179-3 edn 3 definition is much more accessible.	Use the ISO/IEC 11179-3 definition	See GB 18
GB 24	3.3.4	Definition of 'to dereference'	ed	Definition is only used in support of the current definition of identifier.	Remove	See GB 18

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
GB 25	3.3.5	Definition of 'label'	ed	Definition is only required in support of the definition of an identifier	Remove	See GB 18
GB 26	3.3.8	Definition of 'sign'	ed	Different from that of ISO/IEC 11179-3.	Use the ISO/IEC 11179-3 definition	See GB 18
GB 27	3.4.8	Definition of 'datatype'	ed	Different from that of ISO/IEC 11179-3.	Use the ISO/IEC 11179-3 definition	See GB 18
GB 28	3.4.16	Definition of 'value', first note	ed	"289 = 2 x 10 ² + 8 x 10 ¹ + 9 x 10 ⁰ " and "10001 = 1 x 2 ⁴ + 0 x 2 ³ + 0 x 2 ² + 0 x 2 ¹ + 1 x 2 ⁰ " should be "289 = 2 x 10 ² + 8 x 10 ¹ + 9 x 10 ⁰ " and "10001 = 1 x 2 ⁴ + 0 x 2 ³ + 0 x 2 ² + 0 x 2 ¹ + 1 x 2 ⁰ " respectively.	Revise	See GB 18
GB 29	4.1	Paragraph 1	ed	Polemic. If it is in the standard, then it is important. This is an International Standard not a white paper.	Remove or move to annex	Clauses 4 and after reverted to edition 2 with few additions to account for 11179-3 Ed3.
GB 30	4.1	Example 14	te	After having gone to some lengths to introduce terminology, the example doesn't use either this or the actual attribute names in ISO/IEC 11179-3 edn 3.	Revise example to use correct terminology	See GB 29
GB 31		Example 14	te	Object class qualifier and property qualifier are no longer attributes of ISO/IEC 11179-3 edn 3.	Remove them from the example	See GB 29
GB 32	4.2	Example 15	te	Example is incorrect. An Ampere is defined by SI as being a flow of 6.241 x10 ¹⁸ electrons per second. As such it isn't a representation of current - it is actually the number of electrons flowing through the meter.	Remove the example	See GB 29
GB 33	4.2	Paragraph 2	te	The erroneous definition of metadata is repeated.	Redraft	See GB 29
GB 34	4.2	Paragraph 5	ed	Unnecessary if the scope of the discussion of metadata is restricted to that relevant to the standard.	Remove	See GB 29
GB 35	4.3, 4.4, 4.5, 4.6, 4.7, 4.8		ed	Inappropriate content for an international standard.	Move to an informative annex or preferably a technical note	See GB 29

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
GB 36	4.8		ed	Confuses structural metadata and metacontent. If this is to remain at all it should be redrafted in terms of structural metadata only.		See GB 29
GB 37	4.9		ed	The point about variety control is laboured.	Revise to a single sentence in the introductory comments about the nature and purpose of the standard. Move this content into an informative annex/technical note.	See GB 29
GB 38	4.10	Footnote 11	ed	Inappropriate for an international standard, and not necessary for an informative annex. These details are adequately encapsulated by the computer and safely ignored for the purposes of this standard.	Remove	See GB 29
GB 39	5.1	Paragraph 1	ed	How can 'all data is about other data' (4.2), 'data that describes one or more objects' (0.1), an object be 'anything perceivable or conceivable' and 'the lifecycle of metadata has common features not all of which are shared by general data' be consistent.	Remove	See GB 29
GB 40	5	General	ed	Repeats the confusion between structural metadata and metacontent and repeats mistakes owing to the erroneous definition of metadata adopted in part 0. None of this prose about the lifecycle of metadata is directly relevant to ISO/IEC 11179, yet alone to a framework standard.	Remove	See GB 29

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
GB 41	6 and 7	General	ed	<p>These sections are little changed from edition 2. Considering the changes made to part 3 in edition 3 these sections need substantial revision. In particular these descriptions are based upon assumptions about designation, definition and identification that have significantly changed. Additionally there are facilities for the management of dimensionality that require revisions to 6.3.</p> <p>The general criticisms of relevance to the framework component of an international standard made to the previous sections can be equally applied: much of the content is inappropriate and unnecessary for an international standard and should be moved to an annex. However, in that it specifically describes elements of the standard, less needs to be deleted.</p> <p>This will remove the requirements to continually state that the prose and diagrams are non-normative, improving readability.</p>	Move content into annex	Some changes were necessary to bring it up to Ed 3 of 11179-3. New sub-clause on and fundamental model on concept systems added. Revised sub-clause describing Parts 2, 3, and 5.
GB 42	6 and 7	Diagrams (general)	ed	Data model diagrams are not in UML class diagram notation as used in ISO/IEC 11179-3 edn 3.	Revise to use UML class diagram notation.	As agreed to in Ed2, no diagram in Part 1 is normative, so a notation that enhances readability is chosen over a particular modelling paradigm.
GB 43	6.4	General	te	Classification in part 3 has fundamentally changed. The original part 1 content no longer applies.	Redraft	New text added.
GB 44	7.2	Cardinalities in figure 12 and descriptive text	te	The cardinalities between the fundamental metaclasses have changed in ISO/IEC 11179-3 edn 3.	Revise to be consistent with ISO/IEC 11179-3 edn 3	Diagrams updated to account for changes in Part 3 metamodel.

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
GB 45	7.3	General	te	The fundamentals of registration have changed in ISO/IEC 11179-3 edn 3 and this should be accounted for in this description.	Revise to be consistent with ISO/IEC 11179-3 edn 3	Increase extent of what can be registered is noted in text.
GB 46	8.2	Paragraph 1	ed	Conflicts with earlier assertions about the use of part 1 and the ability to conform to it and not the subsequent parts.		Clause 9 on conformance added back in from Ed 2. There are no conformance criteria for Part 1.
GB 47	Annex A	General	te	ISO/IEC 11179-3 edn 3 provides the tools for users of the standard to register and use any type of concept system, classification system and naming convention. As such a description of one particular philosophy of concepts is not required. Removing this section fixes a number of other problems including US cultural references (foot note 21), misrepresenting the IAU class of 'planet' and the instance of 'Pluto' as concepts and liberal references to wikipedia. Additionally, in the description of the derivation of concept systems, definition writing and designation creation duplicates contents from other parts to no additional benefit.	Remove	Completely rewritten with appropriate relevance to normative clauses.

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
US 002	All		Ge	Per ISO Directives Part 2 6.5 Other informative elements 6.5.1 Notes and examples integrated in the text Notes and examples integrated in the text of a document shall only be used for giving additional information intended to assist the understanding or use of the document. They shall not contain requirements ("shall"; see 3.3.1 and Table H.1) or any information considered indispensable for the use of the document, e.g. instructions (imperative; see Table H.1), recommendations ("should"; see 3.3.2 and Table H.2) or permission ("may"; see Table H.3). Notes may be written as a statement of fact.	The overall document should be reviewed with the intention of verifying that the use of Note, Example, and Footnote are properly considered. (see subsequent comments related to this.) Also consider that some text in clause/subclause may belong in Note.	Entire text reverted to edition 2 with few additions to account for 11179-3 Ed3.
US 003	0.1	Paras 1,4	Ed	Check spelling of "cataloging";	cataloguing?	Corrected
US 004	0.2	Para 3	Ed	revise wording '11179 is six part standard'	'11179 is a six part standard'	Intro reverted to edition 2 with few additions to account for 11179-3 Ed3.
US 005	0.2	Para 3, BP 5	Te	Did we chose to rename part 5 to "Naming principles" at Berlin?		See US 4
US 006	.2	first paragraph, first sentence	ed	could be made more clear... addresses the semantics of data (both terminological and computational), the	Suggested change: addresses <u>structuring the</u> semantics of data (both terminological and computational), the representation of data, and the	See US 4

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
				representation of data, and the registration of the descriptions of that data. It is through these descriptions that an accurate understanding of the semantics and a useful depiction of the data are found.	registration of the descriptions of that data. It is through these descriptions that an accurate understanding of the semantics and a useful depiction of the data are found.	
US 007	0.3	Para 1	Ed	“This way. . .”	Use “In this way,. . .”	See US 4
US 008	0.3	Para 2	Ed	“still observe its relevance”	You are treating metadata as a plural in the rest of the paragraph; this should then read “still observe their relevance”	See US 4
US 009	0.3	Para 3	Ed	“The text in . . .Edition concerned”	Replace “concerned” with “concerning”	See US 4
US 010	0.3	Para 5	Ed	“The text in . . .Edition concerned”	Replace “concerned” with “concerning”	See US 4
US 011	.3	Last Sentence	ed	grammar, looks like a typo... The text in the 2 nd edition concerned the description of the other five parts is included. An annex contains terminological principles for data.	The text in the 2 nd edition <u>concerning</u> the description of the other five parts is included. An annex contains terminological principles for data.	See US 4
US 012	.3	Second Para, last sentence	ed	“making the new approach justified”.	Remove.	See US 4
US	.3	Third		This sentence is incorrect...that metadata describe	drop this phrase from the sentence, leaving	See US 4

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
015		paragraph		an object does not lead to “this means metadata are firstly data;”	just: The distinction between data and metadata is by the existence of a descriptive relationship to some object, in which case the data is metadata.	
US 016	.3	4 th paragraph	te	Metadata Registries is the subject of ISO/IEC. And, as metadata has just been defined as data about some object, the sentence isn’t correct. The semantics of data, the subject of ISO/IEC 11179, contains both terminological and computational components. Since a description of a datum has to have these components, then a definition of a datum must reflect these facts. So the new definition of a datum is presented in terms of terminology and computation.”	Revise: Metadata Registries is the subject of ISO/IEC 11179. The metadata being registered is intended to be sufficient to describe the semantics of objects, both terminological and computational components. Since the description, of objects has to have these components, then a metadata definition of objects must reflect sufficient to capture these facts.” Or something like the above...	See US 4
US 017	1	Para 1	Ed	“parts of ISO/IEC 11179, it. . .”	Replace comma with semicolon to separate phrases	Scope reverted to edition 2 with few additions to account for 11179-3 Ed3.

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 comment²	Comment (justification for change) by the MB	Proposed change by the MB	Secretariat observations on each comment submitted
US 018	1	Para 1	Ed	Too many "it's!!	Use "the document" or "The part" or something else	See US 17
US 019	1	Para 2	Ed	Reword fourth sentence – break into two		See US 17
US 020	1.0	Scope	ed	<p>The scope of 11179-1 was established in the first edition and has not changed. It explicitly says it does not contain a general treatment of metadata, and that it does not apply to the physical treatment of data:</p> <p>1 Scope ISO/IEC 11179 specifies the kind and quality of metadata necessary to describe data, and it specifies the management and administration of that metadata in a metadata registry (MDR). It applies to the formulation of data representations, concepts, meanings, and relationships between them to be shared among people and machines, independent of the organization that produces the data. It does not apply to the physical representation of data as bits and bytes at the machine level.</p> <p>In ISO/IEC 11179, metadata refers to descriptions of data. ISO/IEC 11179 does not contain a general treatment of metadata. This part of ISO/IEC 11179</p>	Replace Scope with a slightly modified version of what is in Edition 2. The slight modifications need to address the changes that have been incorporated in this new edition of the standard.	See US 17

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 comment²	Comment (justification for change) by the MB	Proposed change by the MB	Secretariat observations on each comment submitted
				provides the means for understanding and associating the individual parts and is the foundation for a conceptual understanding of metadata and metadata registries.		
US 025	1	Para 3, BP5	Te	I thought symbols were identifiers, not codings	keep	See US 17
US 026	3.1.12	EXAMPLE 2	Ed	Replace it with whatever it is supposed to represent	Filament, lamp or electric current (I presume filament)	Clause 3 reverted to edition 2 with few additions to account for 11179-3 Ed3.
US 027	3.1.1	3.1.1 Definition of characteristic	te	The definition of "characteristic" in 11179-1 and the definition in 11179-3 Ed3 are different. In 11179-1 Ed3: Characteristic concept that plays the role of a determinable in a determining relation [adapted from ISO 704] NOTE The Oxford English Dictionary definition of "determinable (noun)" is: "That which is capable of being given a more determinate form or of being more precisely specified; spec. (in W. E. Johnson's use) a general term or concept (e.g. color) under which several specific terms or concepts fall (e.g. red, yellow, green)."	Add a Note to explain the more general definition.	See US 26

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
US 028	3.1.2, 3.1.7	3.1.2 and 3.1.7	ed	could the same term be used in the example?		See US 26
US 029	3.1.4	Definition of concept	te	<p>definition of concept is different than 11179-3 Ed From ISO Directives-2: 4.3 Homogeneity</p> <p>Uniformity of structure, of style and of terminology shall be maintained not only within each document, but also within a series of associated documents. The structure of associated documents and the numbering of their clauses shall, as far as possible, be identical. Analogous wording shall be used to express analogous provisions; identical wording shall be used to express identical provisions.</p> <p>The same term shall be used throughout each document or series of associated documents to designate a given concept. The use of an alternative term (synonym) for a concept already defined shall be avoided. As far as possible, only one meaning shall be attributed to each term chosen.</p> <p>These requirements are particularly important not only to ensure comprehension of the document, or of the series of associated documents, but also to derive the maximum benefit available through</p>	Add a Note to explain the discrepancy.	See US 26

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 comment²	Comment (justification for change) by the MB	Proposed change by the MB	Secretariat observations on each comment submitted
				automated text processing techniques and computer-aided translation.		
US 030	3.1.18	definition of concept system	te	Concept system is defined in 11179-3 Ed 3	3.2.19 concept system set of concepts (Error! Reference source not found.) structured according to the relations (Error! Reference source not found.) among them [ISO 1087-1:2001, 3.2.11]	See US 26
US 031	3.2.1, 3.2.2, 3.2.4, 3.2.5, 3.2.6	definition of relation	te	These definitions for relation are not necessary in describing the framework of 11179. Relation is defined in 11179 3 Ed3	3.2.119 relation sense in which concepts (Error! Reference source not found.) may be connected, via constituent roles.	See US 26
US 032	3.3.1	definition of designation	te	Designation has been defined in 11179-3 Ed3, is used in Part-5 and is different than in the current draft: designation association of a concept with a signifier that designates it [adapted from ISO 704]	Add a Note to explain the discrepancy with Part 3.	See US 26

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 comment²	Comment (justification for change) by the MB	Proposed change by the MB	Secretariat observations on each comment submitted
US 033	Overall		te	The scope statement has changed in ways that appear too broad. The content of the document now appears too broad s well.	Substitute Edition 2 scope wording (with minor additions to account for changes in Part 3) for scope in current draft and evaluate document to see if it remains in that new scope.	See US 17
US 035	3	3.5.1 object	te	This term was already defined, but differently, in 3.1.13. The ambiguity will sow confusion. And is this definition needed?	Remove.	See US 26
US 037	3	3.4.16 Example 13	te	The example 13 is not useful. The notion of establishing equality is irrelevant to the use of the term “value” in the context of metadata registration.	Remove these definitions	See US 26
US 038	3	3.4.11 definition of “informatio n”		Definition differs from the one in ISO/IEC 2382-1. What justifies this new one, and why do we need it in this document?	Justify or remove.	See US 26
US 040	3	3.4.1 characterizi		Don’t think these are needed – they pertain to the	remove definitions	See US 26

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 comment²	Comment (justification for change) by the MB	Proposed change by the MB	Secretariat observations on each comment submitted
		ng operations 3.4.2 data instance 3.4.3 data interchange, data exchange 3.4.4 data interoperability 3.4.5 data meaning 3.4.6 data repository 3.4.7 data terminology		definition of data and related topics, not related to the framework for metadata registries		
US 041	4	Example 14	te	this is not a particularly useful example. Since a text string is often data describing the semantics of an object, to say that you would register "Text String" as a data element in 11179 misleading and might actually serve to really confuse people who are trying to adopt the standard. This is at too low a level for practical uses of metadata registration. We want people to register the meaning of real world	remove example or provide a more representative example. For most metadata registries, a text string is a value domain...no semantics. A "text string" as described in the example	Clause 4 and after reverted to edition 2 with few additions to account for 11179-3 Ed3.

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
				<p>objects, not the meaning of :“text string”. One might say that “text string” is a Datatype...lots of things are ‘text strings’ the point of metadata registration is to understand what a particular text string actually means:</p> <p>3 Data Element Concept (DEC)</p> <p>DEC Context sample_registration_of_ieee_lom</p> <p>DEC Name text</p> <p>DEC Definition Text describing an object.</p> <p>Object Class text</p> <p>Object Class Qualifier</p> <p>Property string</p> <p>Property Qualifier</p> <p>DEC Item Identifier 01.36.04.0066.01.03</p>	has not meaning full semantics. It is a datatype that could be used with many DEC's. This is why in 11179-3 Ed 3 a Data Element Concept can be associated with more than one CD. One might record the data for the DEC as a descriptive text string, another Data Element might record the data as a text value from a set of enumerated value meanings, each of which is also a text string. This example appears to confuse computational datatypes with metadata.	
US 042	4	All	Te	Do we need this section, esp 4.4-4.5, 4.10?	Maybe better for TR or Inf Annex –Move	See US 41. Some text in these clauses moved to

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 comment²	Comment (justification for change) by the MB	Proposed change by the MB	Secretariat observations on each comment submitted
					sub-clauses 4.4 , 4.5, and 4.7 to an Annex.	Annex A.
US 043	4	First paragraph	Ed/te	This paragraph sounds a bit turgid... For example, it is easy to avoid the meticulous conceptual or computational descriptions of data, but the use of the corresponding data might be significantly hampered because the subtleties of the data are not understood or worse, they are misunderstood.	Suggest: Meticulous attention to creating and registering semantic metadata is necessary in order to ensure the data are understood.	See US 41
US 044	4.1 Intro		Ed	This clause seems to be material for a note. Some of the wording, eg "it might seem pedantic...misunderstood." Might be construed as opinion.	Rework 4.1 to introduce Metadata. eg "fundamental concepts of metadata, terminology, linguistic, computer science, and information technology disciplines." Stick to statements of fact vs words suggesting opinion.	See US 41
US 045	4.1	Example	Ge	Graphic /Table seems out of place	Relocate to Clause 6?	See US 41
US 046	4.2	2 nd para	Ge	This clause seems to be material for a note. Some of the wording eg,"data about data is incomplete..inaccurate.."	Include as note. Reconsider statements of fact (vs words suggesting opinion)	See US 41
US 047	4.2	clause	te	Metadata has already been defined in Scope. This is redundant	remove clause or make consistent with/reference to the Scope section.	See US 41

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 comment²	Comment (justification for change) by the MB	Proposed change by the MB	Secretariat observations on each comment submitted
US 048	4.3	1 st para	Ge	The first sentence states “The concepts datum, designation, and value... ” and referring to full definitons in Clause 3. Clause 3.1 is entitled “Objects and concepts” is where one might expect to find the full definitions, however, datum is in 3.4, designation is in 3.3, and datum is in 3.4.	Suggest being more precise about locations of definitions and/or not stating they are concepts.	See US 41
US 049	4.3	Fig 1	Te	Think ISO directives did not allow for color	Remove color	See US 41
US 050	4.3	Last para	Ed	“The features in red...” Color is not considered workable due to black and white copies normally distributed.	Use cross hatch or % shading.	See US 41
US 051	4.3	clause	te	It’s been established that metadata is data in the Scope section 1.0’, and the sub-clause does not add to the understanding of metadata.	Either move to annex or substantially expand the text to explain why the fact that defining and describing data is important.	See US 41
US 052	4.3	Figure 1	te	Talks about the notion of a derived concept. Not relevant to the Framework other than that all of the items in Figure 1 are forms of metadata. I think this kind of discussion may lead to confusion around what is metadata and what is data in the context of 11179. This figure mixes the two and is not consistent with 11179-3. 11179-3 does not define “temporal event” “spatial extent” as essential metadata for recording the semantics or representation of data. What is described here in come communities is considered a model fragment. Not all agree that Unit of Measure, for example, is	Move to Annex.	See US 41

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
				metadata instead of data.		
US 053	4.4	4.4 What is Data Interoperability	te	Data interoperability is out of scope for 11179. See US-NCI Comment 003. Even if it were in scope the text does not flow .. there are 3 steps mentioned which don't actually 'measure' interoperability. They seem to describes techniques or things, or processes you might go through/do to try to transform data into data than can be combined, or integrated...transformation and integration is only one kind of interoperability... and it's not the 'data' that interoperate, systems interoperate... maybe in a technical report for the process of integrating data.	Move to annex.	See US 42
US 054	4.4	Figure 2	te	this attempts to characterize some metadata as essential, and some as is inessential	Move to Annex.	See US 42
US 055	4.4	Example 18	te	characterizing metadata as essential and inessential is not related the registration of metadata, both would be registered in the MDR	Move to Annex.	See US 42
US 057	4.5	Metadata Reuse Figure 4 Grouping of characteristics	te	This could perhaps be made more relevant to 11179 if discussed from the context of grouping Object Class and Property for reuse. However, reuse of metadata in this context is a result of standardizing metadata, not in itself a standard, but might be appropriate for a technical report or related to something that might fall out of a process of cataloguing metadata in preparation for entry into	Move to Annex	See US 42

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
				an MDR. This is process related. .		
US 059	4.6	Metadata modelled as attributes	te	This clause is inconsistent with 11179-3 which has standardized the structure for describing the semantics of data. In 11179-3, each metadata attribute does not have an identifier, characteristic (name) and property. It has a name and a value, a collection of metadata attributes has an identifier. This is true in all parts of 19763 as well, individual metadata attributes don't have identifiers.	Drop this clause or make it consistent with the description of metadata attributes in 11179	See US 42
US 060	4.7	The relationship between data and metadata Figure 6 and 7	te	appreciate what is attempted here... I think its noble to try to describe at what point data becomes metadata...and the various sources from which metadata can arise...but this has already been defined ... simply .. in the Scope section that metadata is data describing objects.	Delete clause and figures or move to annex, or make more clear.	See US 42
US 061	4.7	Figure 8	te	agree that triage is important in metadata development process, but not in Framework document. Maybe a part of a metadata development TR, but would need more explanatory text.	Move to Annex	See US 41
US 062	4.8	Metadata Computational Models	te	this characterization of computational model seems out of context and confusing - up to this point computational models are discussed in the context of using datatypes to describe data, this discusses	Drop 4.8 or revise, would like to see use language that is consistent with 11179 language, and not assume that these three models are the only ones. e.g. The current text ""find all DOCUMENTS	See US 41

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
				computational models for metadata. None of 11179 discussed computing on metadata, out of scope for Framework...and not very easy to follow or put in context, so can't recommend informative annex either.	[the objects whose metadata to search] whose TITLE [an identifier that names a characteristic] is GONE WITH THE WIND [the property to search for]" would be appropriate if it said "find all Reference_Document [the 11179 objects whose metadata to search] whose TITLE [an attribute that names a characteristic of Reference_Document] is GONE WITH THE WIND [the data value of the attribute Title to search for]" similar concern with the other examples/models.	
US 063	4.9	Variety control and MDRs	te	this pertains to standardization, which is a process, not part of 11179 Framework.	Drop 4.9 or make it clearer how this relates to metadata and metadata registries. "Variety Control" is not a well understood term.	See US 41
US 064	4.10	Metadata governance	te	this is simply a statement that metadata is a data and that governance pertains to it? Not needed...	Drop 4.10, already in 5.10. Content about metadata as data might belong in 4.2, nothing here is mentioned about 'levels', but was discussed in telecon..? revise text?	See US 41
US 065	5.0	The Lifecycle of Metadata	te	perhaps some recognition of the existence of metadata registry items having a lifecycle is merited in terms of discussing a metadata registry. However, this is discussed in 11179-6, Registration. The text does not address that. Instead it attempts	The original Section 5 discussed Theory of Terminology. An update to that section discussing the expansion of 11179-3 Ed into concept systems would be useful. In the style of 11179-1 Ed1, it is not necessary to recapitulate lots of the details of ISO 704	See US 41

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 comment²	Comment (justification for change) by the MB	Proposed change by the MB	Secretariat observations on each comment submitted
				to describe the lifecycle of something.. metadata development and standardization? Which is outside the scope of the Framework for Metadata registration - it might be suitable for a technical report, comments are provided in that context.	and ISO 1087-1, the short summary provided in Ed 1 was adequate, but may need updating in light of the expanded role concept systems.	
US 066	5	All	Te	Do we need this section?	Move to Annex and combine with subclauses of Clause 4 moved there.	Removed
US 067	5.2 Creation	Metadata Creation	ed	The first sentence is arguable, text that says "metadata is created when a descriptive relationship is revealed between a datum (now to become metadata) and an object (the datum describes the object)." In terms of what is meant by "creation", but suffice to say that sentence could be dropped without losing anything.	Drop first sentence. Give more precise examples of how metadata arises, such as from database rows and columns, or UML classes and attributes... or drop.	Removed
US 068	5.2 Creation	second paragraph, second bullet		This sentence needs revision, too abstract: Existing data might be revealed as having a descriptive relationship with an object (in which case the data can be viewed as metadata).	Revise to: Data might be observed as having a descriptive relationship with an object, in which case this data becomes metadata. Drop the text in parenthesis.	Removed

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 comment²	Comment (justification for change) by the MB	Proposed change by the MB	Secretariat observations on each comment submitted
				(merely data because X and Y have an associative or partitive relation with the individual human),		
US 069	5.2 Creation	last sentence	ed	this is about interoperability and should be dropped. "For the purposes of increased interoperability, one should reference the appropriate data exchange agreements, standards, and specifications when creating metadata"	Drop sentence	Removed
US 070	5.3 Observation		ed	This is about observing metadata so you can record it in a metadata repository. It is part of a process. 11179 does not define a process. Maybe a technical report, not part of the standard.	Drop section on Observation or move to annex.	Removed
US 071	5.4 Organization		ed	This is similar conceptually to "Standardization" and not needed...not notion here is better captured as "standardizing" metadata.	Drop section on Organization or move to annex.	Removed
US 072	5.5 Cataloguing		ed	This (loosely) talks about the process of cataloguing metadata ...I think it means to recognize that this must be done in order to create the metadata in a metadata repository. Since this is about process, it doesn't belong in the Framework document, part about metadata development process. Maybe a TR on the process of metadata development	Drop clause on Cataloguing or move to annex.	Removed
US 073	5.6 Storage		ed	The discussion of embedded, associated and adjacent in the 3 statements beginning with "when are useful, but redundant with the first paragraph.	Keep the three first sentence of the first paragraph, and the three bullets. The discussion of multiple copies of	Removed

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
					metadata is confusing and not necessary, as it the discussion of “assumed” metadata. Since 11179 is all about avoiding assumed metadata, making it explicit, drop that bullet all together. , drop the	
US 074	5.7 Retrieval		ed	This section address requirements for retrieving metadata – requirements should not be included in a standard. In addition, this section raises questions without solutions...also not appropriate for a standard.	Leave out or move to annex discussion of retrieval – while it might be interesting, its not addressed in 11179 family of standards and doesn’t belong in the Framework document.	Removed
US 075	5.8 Processing		ed	like retrieval, discusses requirements, not appropriate for a standard.	Leave out discussion of processing. Or move to annex.	Removed
US 076	5.9 Standardization		ed	Too broad to be appropriate.	This part could mention that 11179 and other ISO standards have standardized various categories (realms) of metadata. For example 11179-P-3 standardizes data metadata, 19763 standardizes service and process metadata.	Removed
US 077	5.10 Governance		ed	content in this section pertains to standardization of metadata, not metadata lifecycle and thus could be combined with Standardization	combine with Standardization	Removed
US 078	5.11 Retirement		ed	Should refer to 11179-6 where retirement and other lifecycle statuses are described.	Leave out discussion of retirement or move to annex.	Removed
US 079	6	Para 7	Ed	“at least stays one live birth”; I don’t understand this text	“stays” is a typo, so remove it	Accepted

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
US 080	6.1	Concepts	te	This is out of date: For ISO/IEC 11179, metadata is defined to be data that defines and describes other data. This means that metadata are data, and data become metadata when they are used in this way. This happens under particular circumstances, for particular purposes, and with certain perspectives, as	Update: For ISO/IEC 11179, metadata is defined to be data that defines and describes other objects . This means that metadata are data, and data become metadata when they are used in this way. This happens under particular circumstances, for particular purposes, and with certain perspectives, as.....	Revert to discussion of metadata as descriptive of data.
US 081	6.3	Fundamental Model of Value Domains	te	This section needs to be updated. Non-enumerated value domain and conceptual domains are now called “described value domains” and “described conceptual domains”.	Update text. See 11179-3 Ed3 3.2.1 described conceptual domain conceptual domain that is specified by a description 3.2.2 described value domain value domain that is specified by a description	Updated.
US 082	6.3		Ed	Pounds is a measure of force, and grams is a measure of mass.	Sing vs plural	These words are used in this sense as collectives and not as multiples of single units. Not accepted.
US 083	6.3	1 st para	Ed	Ref to Fig 3 incorrect	Ref Fig 11	Figure references updated.

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
US 084	7.1	Para 1	Te	“Metadata is also data, so metadata may be stored in a database” - it doesn’t seem to follow that just because metadata is data, it can be stored in a db?	Ditch the first sentence	Change "may" to "might" and look for cases where "may" is used incorrectly.
US 085	7.1	Para 2	Ed	registration, which are outside the scope	No comma after registration in 5 th sentence	Corrected
US 086	7.1	Introduction		needs to be updated to be inclusive of registration of metadata that describes things other than data	examples are metadata that describes services, processes, forms, etc.	11179-1 is reverted to descriptions of data
US 087	7.2	bullets	te	This is no longer valid: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A data element concept is related to a single conceptual domain, so all the data elements sharing the same data element concept share conceptually related representations 	A data element concept is related to one or more conceptual domain. All the data elements sharing the same conceptual domain share related representations	Updated
US 088	7.2	3 rd para	Ed	Ref to Fig 4 incorrect	Ref Fig 13	Updated
US 089	7.2	Figure 12	te	This figure is outdated. The cardinality between DEC and CD is 0,* See 11179-3 Ed3 Data Element Concept region 11.2	<pre> classDiagram class Data_Element_Concept { +data_element_concept +usage } class Conceptual_Domain { +domain } Data_Element_Concept "0..*" -- "0..*" Conceptual_Domain : data_element_concept_domain </pre>	Updated
US	7.3	2 nd & 3 rd	Ed	“Registration is” used twice differently.	In para 3 use, “The process of registration	Changed “is” to “includes” in

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
090		paras			includes the creating or maintaining administrative and other detailed metadata.	para 3.
US 091	7.3		Ed	requirements, which are outside the scope	No comma after requirements	Updated
US 092	7.3	Para 4	Te	Metadata quality is monitored through the use of a registration status . The status records the level of quality. There is no definition for quality listed and registration status only reflects one or two aspects of quality		No change
US 093	8.1.1	Para 1	Te	This edition of Part 1 currently goes way beyond the description here.	Adjust one or the other	Reverted to Ed2 wording and updated
US 094	8.1.3	Part 3	te	needs to be updated to accurately describe the scope of 11179-3 Ed3. See 11179-3 Ed scope.	Update using 11179-3 Ed.	Updated
US 095	8.1.5	Para1	Te	See if title change is in effect for part 5		New title noted
US 096	Annex A	Terminological Principles for Data	te	A description of terminological principles for data is not needed in the metadata registries framework. Additionally the Annex goes into areas that are defined in other parts of 11179 and 20943. Any information that is essential to understanding 11179 should be in clause 5, in summary form, as it was in Ed 1.	Drop the Annex or shorten to something that is similar to what was present in 11179-1 Ed 2	Annex A rewritten to include much of normative text of CD1. Focus is on 11179.

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.