ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 32 N **2437**

ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 32

Data Management and Interchange

Secretariat: United States of America (ANSI)

Administered by Farance Inc. on behalf of ANSI

DOCUMENT TYPE	Summary of Voting/Table of Replies
TITLE	Summary of Voting on 32N2417 CD 19763-13 Information technology - Metamodel framework for interoperability (MFI) Part 13: Metamodel for forms registration
SOURCE	SC32 Secretariat
PROJECT NUMBER	1.32.22.01.13.00
STATUS	The document did not obtain substantial support. WG2 is requested to address the comments and revise the draft text accordingly.
REFERENCES	
ACTION ID.	ACT
REQUESTED ACTION	
DUE DATE	
Number of Pages	29
LANGUAGE USED	English
DISTRIBUTION	P & L Members
	SC Chair
	WG Conveners and Secretaries

ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 32 N2437

Summary of Voting on Document SC 32 N 2417

Title: CD 19763-13 Information technology - Metamodel framework for interoperability (MFI) Part 13: Metamodel for forms registration

Project: 1.32.22.01.13.00

"P" Member	Approval	Approval with Comments	Disapproval with Comments	Abstention with Comments
Canada			1	
China	1			
Czech Republic	1			
Egypt	1			
Finland				1
Germany				1
India				1
Japan			1	
Korea, Republic of		1		
Portugal				1
Russian Federation	1			
United Kingdom			1	
United States			1	
Total "P"	**4**	**1**	**4**	**4**
"O" Member				
Austria				
Belgium				
France				1
Ghana				
Hungary				
Indonesia				
Italy				
Kazakhstan				
Netherlands, The				
Norway				
Romania				
Poland				
Sweden				
Switzerland				
Total "O"				

COMMENTS:

Canada
NO. See comments below:

Finland
ABSTAIN. Lack of expertise and interest.

Germany
ABSTAIN. Lack of expertise and interest.

India
ABSTAIN. Lack of expertise and interest.

Japan
NO. See comments below:

Korea
YES. See comments below:

Portugal
ABSTAIN. Lack of expertise and interest.

United Kingdom
NO. See comments below:

United States
NO. See comments below:

MB/NC[1]	Line number (e.g. 17)	Clause/Subclause (e.g. 3.1)	Paragraph/Figure/Table/ (e.g. Table 1)	Type of comment[2]	Comments	Proposed change	Observations of the secretariat
CA 00	All	All	-	Ge	Canada disapproves of the draft for the reasons below. Because of the extensive nature of our comments, Canada believes a 2nd CD ballot is needed before the standard proceeds to DIS. If a CD2 ballot document is prepared and issued three months prior to the June, 2014 Plenary meeting of SC32/WG2, and all outstanding technical and editorial issues are addressed at the June 2014 Plenary meetings, then this project should be able to move to the DIS ballot stage (JTC1 level) with full support of JTC1/SC32 after that meeting.	Canada requests the CRM to take this into account in its proposed schedule for the progression of this standard to the DIS stage	
CA 01	All	All	-	Ge	Since the new template allows for text to be referenced using line numbers, Canada asks that future ballot texts include line numbers so that all NBs can reference them.	Include line numbers on the next ballot.	
CA 02	All	All		Ge	ISO standards exist in the field of forms, form design. These should be reviewed, referenced and used as and where applicable. Further there are ISO TCs who also have expertise in the development of standards related to "forms" Here follow some examples: ISO TC46 Information and Documentation, SC11 Archives/Records Management and its ISO 17933:2000 (reconfirmed in 2007) GEDI –Generic Electronic Document Interchange ISO TC154 Processes, data elements and documents in commerce, industry and administration and its ISO 8439:1990 (reconfirmed in 2000) Forms Design and Basic Layout ISO TC 159, *Ergonomics*, Subcommittee SC 4,	Project Editor requested to familiarize himself with these standards (which well may contain useful definitions of concepts related to the development of this document) as well as other useful inputs. Further, consideration should be given to forwarding a copy of the CD2 document to ISO TC46/SC11 as a liaison in order to obtain their inputs This technical committee has experts in the areas of forms design, use and interchange.	

1 **MB** = Member body / **NC** = National Committee (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

ISO/IEC/CEN/CENELEC electronic balloting commenting template/version 2012-03

MB/ NC[1]	Line number (e.g. 17)	Clause/ Subclause (e.g. 3.1)	Paragraph/ Figure/ Table/ (e.g. Table 1)	Type of comment[2]	Comments	Proposed change	Observations of the secretariat
					Ergonomics of human-system interaction. ISO 9241-143:2012 Ergonomics of human-system interaction — Part 143: Forms ISO/IEC JTC1/SC07 Software systems and engineering and its ISO 353:1997 (reconfirmed in 2007) Form design sheet and layout chart.		
CA 03		1		Te	The proposed definition for "form" is too generic and needs to be cast in a 19763-13 context and be data element based (as per introduction) (see further comments on Clause 4.2.6)	See comments on clause 4.2.6, and apply resolution here as well.	
CA 04		1	Page header	Ed	The page header shows WD instead of CD.	Correct the header as appropriate for the next ballot.	
CA 05		1	3rd para /last para	Te	The 4th paragraph is of the nature of Exclusions and as such should be given its own separate subclause, i.e. 1.2 Exclusions" As a result , there would be a Clause 1.1 Inclusions	Project Editor requested to implements	
CA 06	Multiple	2 and others	Heading	Ed	The level 1 headers are in a smaller font than the level 2 headers.	Adjust the font size of the level 1 headers.	
CA 07		Introduction 4, & 5.4.6		Te	The introduction talks about forms and form sections. Clause 4 talks about a "form section class" while Clause 5.4.3 talks about "Section_Element". Are "form section" and "Section-Element" intended to be synonyms Clause 4 does not define a "form section". Is a "form section a discrete and defined subset of the defined set of data elements comprising a form?	Project Editor requested to clarify and respond. CRM to discuss and resolve.	

1   **MB** = Member body / **NC** = National Committee (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

ISO/IEC/CEN/CENELEC electronic balloting commenting template/version 2012-03

| | Date: 2013-10-30 | Document: 32N2417 | Project: CD 19763-13 |

MB/NC[1]	Line number (e.g. 17)	Clause/Subclause (e.g. 3.1)	Paragraph/Figure/Table/ (e.g. Table 1)	Type of comment[2]	Comments	Proposed change	Observations of the secretariat
CA 08		2 & 3		Ed	It is a common practice in standards to have the Clause 1 Scope statement, followed by Clause 2 Normative References , Clause 3 Terms and Definitions and Clause 4 Conformance.	Make Clause 2- Normative References & Clause 3 3 Terms and Definitions and Clause 4 Conformance	
CA 09		2.2.2 , 2.2.3		Ed	Imprecise referencing. The current text in 2.2.2 contain the phrases of the nature "metamodel references in 5" "extensions to the Metamodel specified in 5" -optional MDR mapping package in 6" - any extensions to the metamodels specified in 5 or 6" However, there is no clause 6. MDR mapping is covered in 5.4.24	Since the purpose of this Clause is conformance, it is necessary to be very specific in stating what one needs to conform to. The conformance clause needs to be updated to match the current structure of clause 5 (or vice versa)	
CA 10		4.1	Terms	Ed	Referencing definitions from other standards without actually including them requires the reader to obtain and access those other standards. This document would be more usable if the required terms and definitions were repeated here, with references to indicate from whence they come.	For all terms used in this standard, include the terms and definitions in clause 4.1, with a reference to the source.	
CA 11		4.1	Para 1, line 2	Ed	The clause intends to reference a dated version of ISO/IEC 11179-3 (BTW, Ed 3 is dated 2013), but clause 3 references an undated version.	Be consistent. Reference either the dated or undated version in both places.	
CA 12		4.2	All	Ed	The standard representation of terms and definitions in an ISO/IEC standard is to list the clause number on a line by itself, then list the term on the line below.	Change the layout to follow the standard approach.	

1   **MB** = Member body / **NC** = National Committee (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

ISO/IEC/CEN/CENELEC electronic balloting commenting template/version 2012-03

MB/ NC[1]	Line number (e.g. 17)	Clause/ Subclause (e.g. 3.1)	Paragraph/ Figure/ Table/ (e.g. Table 1)	Type of comment[2]	Comments	Proposed change	Observations of the secretariat
CA 13		4.2.1	All	Te	The definition provided for the concept "annotation" is just "note", which is not very meaningful. However, the term is not used in the normative Clauses of CD1 (only in the Introduction). Unless there is Normative text in Clauses 5+ where the concept of "annotation" is used, then this entry should be deleted	Project Editor requested to delete 4.2.1 unless the concept is used in a meaningful way in normative Clause 5, in which case the definition should be improved.	
CA 14		4.2.2	All	Te	Canada could not find any use of "binary large object" or "BLOB" in the normative clauses of the CD document (unless it is embedded in a Figure)	Project Editor requested to delete 4.2.2 unless the concept is used in a meaningful way in Clauses 5+	
CA 15		4.2.3	Definition	Te	1. The proposed definition for a concept with the label "constraint" is rather terse, consists of two synonyms, and not that meaningful. In most cases it used in a general sense in the document or in a qualified manner such as 5.4.4 "constraints on data entry", 5.4.15 length constraints, 5.4.24 "input constraints, A.5.1 input field and constraints and the A.6 Example seems to be of the nature of basic logic and "standard mathematical construction". 2. This comment is made in the context of existing JTC1/SC32 standards work. The concept of "constraint" is very important and use extensively in JTC1/SC32 ISO/IEC 15944 multipart series of e-business standards. The Introduction in CD 17963 speaks of "it is essential the business information requirements that are met.."" The 15944-1 definition of the concept "constraint" is: **constraint**	1. Rethink definition of constraint and determine if need as a defined concept. It may not be necessary. 2. If deemed necessary develop a proper definition of the concept Such as **constraint (in form registration)** *rule, explicitly stated that prescribes, limits, governs or specifies any aspect of a* **form** *EXAMPLE of form constraints include those pertaining to data entry, field length, a compliance rule, etc.* [adapted from ISO/IEC 15944-1 (3.11)]	

1   **MB** = Member body / **NC** = National Committee (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

ISO/IEC/CEN/CENELEC electronic balloting commenting template/version 2012-03

MB/NC[1]	Line number (e.g. 17)	Clause/Subclause (e.g. 3.1)	Paragraph/Figure/Table/ (e.g. Table 1)	Type of comment[2]	Comments	Proposed change	Observations of the secretariat
					rule, explicitly stated, that prescribes, limits, governs or specifies any aspect of a **business transaction** NOTE 1 Constraints are specified as rules forming part of components of Open-edi scenarios, i.e., as scenario attributes, roles, and/or information bundles. NOTE 2 For constraints to be registered for implementation in Open-edi, they must have unique and unambiguous identifiers. NOTE 3 A constraint may be agreed to among parties (condition of contract) and is therefore considered an "internal constraint". Or a constraint may be imposed on parties, (e.g., laws, regulations, etc.), and is therefore considered an "external constraint". [ISO/IEC 15944-1: 2011 (3.11)3rd ed.] 3. It is important that JTC1/SC32 maintain an as harmonized vocabulary as possible.		
CA 15		4.2.4	definition	Te	1. The proposed definition seems to restrict compliance rule and its use to form design aspects only and as such would not apply to a rule governing data entry, input constraints, etc. 2. Is this a deliberate decision? 3. Also "form template" is defined as a" partial form design.." and deals with " a pattern.." only	Project Editor requested to work out and address gaps and inconsistencies among proposed definitions for compliance rule , form, form design and form template	
CA 16		4.2.5	Definition	Te	The definition introduces the concept of "field" which is not defined.	Add a definition of Field.	
CA		4.2.5	Definition	Te	The definition introduces the concept of	Possible replacement text could be	

1   **MB** = Member body / **NC** = National Committee (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

ISO/IEC/CEN/CENELEC electronic balloting commenting template/version 2012-03

MB/ NC[1]	Line number (e.g. 17)	Clause/ Subclause (e.g. 3.1)	Paragraph/ Figure/ Table/ (e.g. Table 1)	Type of comment[2]	Comments	Proposed change	Observations of the secretariat
17					"document" (not defined), should this not be changed to "form", i.e., a "completed form" is a form for which required data entry is complete based on the rules applicable for that form?	**completed form** **form** for which the required data entry for specified fields has been completed in compliance with the applicable rules NOTE Rules here include instructions, prompts, input constraints for the values which may be entered for a field based on the associated data element and its value domain.	
CA 18		4.2.6	Definition	Te	1. Why are there two definitions for the term 'form'? Each definition needs to be qualified to show the context in which it applies. 2. The definition of the concept assigned the label "form" needs to be placed in a 11179 and 19763 metadata context A possible draft replacement definition here could be: **form** formulary document consisting of a set of predefined data elements for insertion of applicable data values in compliance with a defined set of rules NOTE On the whole, a form is prepared and issued by an organization and within that organization is assigned a unique ID and a unique name(s) in each of the official languages of the issuing organization Existing ISO definitions of Form include: From ISO 9241-143:2012 clause 3.9 structured display of fields and other user-interface elements that the user reads, fills in, selects entries for (e.g. through check boxes or radio buttons) or modifies	1. Either clarify the context for each definition, or preferably delete the second definition, or demote it to a note. 2. Project Editor and CRM to consider the alternative proposed definitions.	

1   **MB** = Member body / **NC** = National Committee (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

ISO/IEC/CEN/CENELEC electronic balloting commenting template/version 2012-03

MB/NC[1]	Line number (e.g. 17)	Clause/Subclause (e.g. 3.1)	Paragraph/Figure/Table/ (e.g. Table 1)	Type of comment[2]	Comments	Proposed change	Observations of the secretariat
					OR From ISO 5127:2001, 2.1.08 document (printed or otherwise produced, with predesignated spaces for the recording of specific information		
CA 19		4.2.7	Definition	Te	There is a need to differentiate between the concept of "form design" itself and some of its basic objectives including semantic equivalency (in different "equal" languages and human interface equivalents. The definition of the concept of "form design" should focus on set of rules governing the layout, order,, identification of data elements and permitted values, data entry scripts, etc. in an IT-neutral but IT-enabled manner (= physical or electronic, no any kind of medium, etc. Then there should be rules via NOTES for semantic equivalents, for electronic data interchange, re-use of total or in part –e.g. of a form section", etc.	Project Editor requested to consider and advise. CRM to discuss and decide.	
CA 20		4.2.8	Definition	Te	The use of the word "partial" causes confusion. Should it not be "those aspects of form design… Linked to comment on 4.2.7	Project Editor requested to consider and advise CRM	
CA 21		4.2.9	Definition	Te	The proposed text is not a proper ISO definition. A predicate is used in the field of grammar and the field of logic One assume here that predicate is used in the context of the field of logic.. Another use of "predicate" is in relation to parser technology & guidelines	Project Editor to consider and advice CRM accordingly.	

1   **MB** = Member body / **NC** = National Committee (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

ISO/IEC/CEN/CENELEC electronic balloting commenting template/version 2012-03

MB/ NC[1]	Line number (e.g. 17)	Clause/ Subclause (e.g. 3.1)	Paragraph/ Figure/ Table/ (e.g. Table 1)	Type of comment[2]	Comments	Proposed change	Observations of the secretariat
					2. Reviewing the document one notes that "predicate "is often paired with "consequence". If predicate is to be a defined concept should not "consequence" be also?		
CA 22		5.1	Para 2, line 4	Te	'registry operator' is not a defined term. Use of: 'registration authority', registrar', or 'registry user'.	Replace 'registry operator' by a defined term.	
CA 23		5.1	Para 2, line 4	Ed	'a registry operators' is bad grammar	Choose between the singular and the plural.	
CA 24		5.1	Figure 1	Te	Why is a Form Design restricted to have only one language? How will multi-lingual forms be supported? Where a jurisdictional domain (country, province, state, canton, international organizations, the EU, etc..) has more than one official language, the ID of the form issued (usually) remains the same with different language indicators combined in semantically linguistic equivalent names , as well as associated linguistic equivalent instructions, scripts, etc.	Make all changes necessary to support multi-lingual forms.	
CA 25		5.1	Figure 1	Te	We find the association between Form_Design_Element and Section_Element confusing in that both role names use the qualifier 'contained'. Surely one end should be 'containing'? Probably 'containing_element'. Or are there intended to be two associations, such that a Form_Design_Element may contain Section_Elements, which in turn may contain other Form_Design_Elements? See also CA-44.	Correct or clarify as appropriate.	
CA 26		5.1	Figure 5	Te	Do we need to explicitly allow for parentheses in expressions?	Clarify how parentheses would be supported.	
CA 27		5.1	Figure 6	Te	The multiplicity of data_element_identifer should be [1..1]	Make the correction.	

1   **MB** = Member body / **NC** = National Committee (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

ISO/IEC/CEN/CENELEC electronic balloting commenting template/version 2012-03

Date: 2013-10-30	Document: 32N2417	Project: CD 19763-13

MB/ NC[1]	Line number (e.g. 17)	Clause/ Subclause (e.g. 3.1)	Paragraph/ Figure/ Table/ (e.g. Table 1)	Type of comment[2]	Comments	Proposed change	Observations of the secretariat
CA 28		5.1	Figure 6	Te	The datatype of concept_identifier should be String, not Text	Make the correction.	
CA 29		5.1	Figure 6	Te	The MDR mapping allows for Question_Elements to be mapped to Data Elements, and for Section Elements to be mapped to concepts. Why the restriction?	All of Section Elements, Presentation Elements and Question Elements should be allowed to be mapped to Data Elements and/or Concepts.	
CA 30		5.3.2	Same_as	Te	The description references owl:sameAs, but this is not explained.	Add owl: same As to the list of terms and definitions in clause 4. Add a reference to OWL to the Bibliography.	
CA 31		5.3.2	Broader than	Te	The description references skos:broader, but this is not explained.	Add skos: broader to the list of terms and definitions in clause 4. Add a reference to SKOS to the Bibliography.	
CA 32		5.3.2	Related to	Te	The description references skos:related, but this is not explained.	Add skos: related to the list of terms and definitions in clause 4. Add a reference to SKOS to the Bibliography.	
CA 33		5.3.3	Metaclass	Ed	Question is misspelled as Ouestion. The trailing comma is not needed.	Make the corrections.	
CA 34		5.3.3	Related	Te	The description references skos:related, but this is not explained.	Add skos: related to the list of terms and definitions in clause 4. Add a reference to SKOS to the Bibliography.	
CA 35		5.3.3	Broader	Te	The description references skos:broader, but this is not explained.	Add skos: broader to the list of terms and definitions in clause 4. Add a reference to SKOS to the Bibliography.	
CA 36		5.3.3	Narrower	Te	The description references skos:narrower, but this is not explained.	Add skos: narrower to the list of terms and definitions in clause 4. Add a reference to SKOS to the Bibliography.	
CA 37		5.3.5	IN, line 2 of description	Ed	'and expression' should be 'an expression'. 'pedicate' should be 'predicate'	Make the corrections.	
CA 38		5.4.1	Describing language	Te	Why is a Form Design restricted to have only one Describing Language? How will multi-lingual forms be supported?	Make all changes necessary to support multi-lingual forms.	
CA 39		5.4.2	Describes	Te	The multiplicity is incorrect. It should be [0..1] as shown in Figure 1. A Form Language could be registered before any forms which use the language.	Make the correction.	

1   **MB** = Member body / **NC** = National Committee (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

ISO/IEC/CEN/CENELEC electronic balloting commenting template/version 2012-03

MB/ NC[1]	Line number (e.g. 17)	Clause/ Subclause (e.g. 3.1)	Paragraph/ Figure/ Table/ (e.g. Table 1)	Type of comment[2]	Comments	Proposed change	Observations of the secretariat
CA 40		5.4.2	Describes	Te	The description is incorrect. The reference is from one Form_Language to zero or more Form Design, each one of which represents a distinct Form.	Change the description to: "The set of Form Designs, each of which is described by the Form_Language.	
CA 41		5.4.5	Style	Ed	In the description, 'A optional' s/b 'An optional'	Make the correction.	
CA 42		5.4.5	Cardinality	Ed	In the description, 'repeated completed' does not read well. Are both words needed? Is there a better way to say this? Also, 'a form conforms' s/b 'a form that conforms'.	Make the correction.	
CA 43		5.4.5	Rule	Te	The description of references the term it is describing: rule = set of rules…	Suggested change: "A set of functional dependencies and constraints…"	
CA 44		5.4.6	Contained_ element	Te	See also CA-25. The references between Section_Element and Form_Design_Element are unclear.	Correct or clarify as appropriate.	
CA 45		5.4.7	Description	Te	The second sentence does not read well, and it is unclear what is meant. " Presentation elements have no notable semantic context unless specifically linked to a **Text_Element** linked to a **Section_Element**, **Question_Element**, **Input_Field** or **List_Item** (**Error! Reference source not found.**, **Error! Reference source not found.**)" Figure 1 shows a Text_Element providing meaning for a Media_Element, both of which are subclasses of Presentation_Element, so Text_Element would seem at least to have semantic content. As to context, how is a Text_Element supposed to be linked to a **Section_Element**, **Question_Element**, **Input Field** or **List_Item.** It would seem this happens only as a contained_element within a section	Please clarify what is meant. The text might be made clearer by adding some words after Text_Element, such as: "linked to a **Text_Element** that in turn is linked to a **Section_Element**,…" And possibly adding at the end "…as a contained_element" Question: "Does a container lement" contain only one data element or ca nit contain more than one, i.e., represent a field	
CA 46		5.4.7 – 5.4.9	All	Te	The presentation element appears not to have a "fallback" for the visually-impaired. Should not all	Project Editor requested to consider and advise. CRM to discuss and decide.	

1   **MB** = Member body / **NC** = National Committee (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

ISO/IEC/CEN/CENELEC electronic balloting commenting template/version 2012-03

				Date: 2013-10-30		Document: 32N2417	Project: CD 19763-13

MB/ NC[1]	Line number (e.g. 17)	Clause/ Subclause (e.g. 3.1)	Paragraph/ Figure/ Table/ (e.g. Table 1)	Type of comment[2]	Comments	Proposed change	Observations of the secretariat
					presentation media elements have a mandatory equivalent alternative text prose component such that the media element has a representation in a non-visual medium? Wouldn't it be wise to build in this mandatory requirement so that anyone considering the metamodel of a form would be reminded of the need for the visually-impaired? I don't think this requirement is covered by associations described in 5.4.8 and 5.4.9 ... those appear to be in parallel, rather than a mandatory independent media description that would be unnecessary in a text-only item. And, semantically, the proposed mandatory alternative text has the semantics of describing the media that is seen by the sighted, which is different than the text associated with a form component.		
CA 47		5.4.11	Line 1	Ed	The is an extra spaces between 'elements' and 'used'	Remove the extra space.	
CA 48		5.4.11	Title_for_ section	Ed	In the description, at the beginning of the second sentence, 'text' should be capitalized.	Make the correction.	
CA 49		5.4.11	Title_for_ section	Te	At the end of the description, the maximum multiplicity is specified as 'unbounded', when it should be 'one'.	Make the correction.	
CA 50		5.4.12	Number_for _section	Ed	In the description, 'Ao' should be An'.	Make the correction.	
CA 51		5.4.13	Instruction_f or_question	Ed	In the description, 'multiplicity' is misspelled.	Make the correction.	
CA 52		5.4.13	Instruction_ for_input_ field	Te	At the end of the description, the maximum multiplicity is specified as 'unbounded', when it should be 'one'.	Make the correction.	
CA 53		5.4.13	Additional_ text_for_ input_field	Ed	Where the reference name wraps onto a second line, force the line break to occur at a word boundary if possible.	Make the change here and anywhere else the comment is applicable.	
CA		5.4.14	Maximum_ character_	Ed	In the last line of the description, ' Its value may	Use the phraseology used in the following entry: " Its value may be set through a mapping…"	

1   **MB** = Member body / **NC** = National Committee (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

ISO/IEC/CEN/CENELEC electronic balloting commenting template/version 2012-03

MB/NC[1]	Line number (e.g. 17)	Clause/ Subclause (e.g. 3.1)	Paragraph/ Figure/ Table/ (e.g. Table 1)	Type of comment[2]	Comments	Proposed change	Observations of the secretariat
54			quantity		come mapping' is not good English.		
CA 55		5.4.14	Input_field_ instruction	Te	At the end of the description, the maximum multiplicity is specified as 'unbounded', when it should be 'one'.	Make the correction.	
CA 56		5.4.16	Multiselect	Ed	The description refers to 'The optional number of answers to the question that may be provided'…', but the datatype is Boolean so cannot be a number.	Reword as: 'An optional flag that indicates whether or not multiple answers to the question are permitted…'.	
CA 57		5.4.16	Ordered	Ed	'A flag that indicates if' would be clearer if worded as: 'A flag that indicates whether or not…'	Make the change.	
CA 58		5.4.16	Fill_in	Ed	In the description, 'that provide' s/b 'that provides'	Make the correction.	
CA 59		5.4.18	Item_prompt	Ed	The reference name should not be capitalized,	Make the correction.	
CA 60		Annex A	All	Ed	The clause numbers in the Annex should be prefixed by the Annex letter. E.g. A.1	Make the correction.	
CA 61		Annex C	All	Te	The missing Annex needs to be completed or deleted.	Complete or delete as appropriate.	
CA 62		Annex E	All	Te	The missing Annex needs to be completed or deleted.	Complete or delete as appropriate.	
CA 63		Annex F	All	Te	The missing Annex needs to be completed or deleted.	Complete or delete as appropriate.	
CA 64		Bibliography	All	Ed	The missing Bibliography needs to be completed or deleted. The Bibliography is not usually numbered as an Annex.	Complete the Bibliography and remove the Annex G label..	
CA 65		All		Ge	If any further problems are discovered before or during the Comment Resolution Meeting, and a consensus can be reached on a solution, then they should be corrected.	To be determined at the CRM as required.	

1   **MB** = Member body / **NC** = National Committee (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

ISO/IEC/CEN/CENELEC electronic balloting commenting template/version 2012-03

MB/ NC[1]	Line number (e.g. 17)	Clause/ Subclause (e.g. 3.1)	Paragraph/ Figure/ Table/ (e.g. Table 1)	Type of comment[2]	Comments	Proposed change	Observations of the secretariat
JP01	-	5.1 5.3.2	Figure 7	ed	PDF version's layout is broken.	WORD version should be converted into the correct PDF version.	
JP02	305	5.1	Figure1	ed	The format in which to save the file is a raster graphics image.	The figure should be converted to the vector graphics.	
JP03	307	5.1	Figure2	ed	The format in which to save the file is a raster graphics image.	The figure should be converted to the vector graphics.	
JP04	314	5.1	Figure4	ed	The figure is vertically stretched.	The figure should be shrunk vertically.	
JP05	314	5.1	Figure4	ed	The multiplicity of the class,"List_Field" is represented in the different way such as 1. The other multiplicities are in the same way such as 1..1 . The multiplicity in page 21 is represented as 1..1.	The multiplicity of the class, "List_Field" should be represented as 1..1.	
JP06	314	5.1	Figure4	ed	The relevance, "meaning for item" and the multiplicity , "0..1" ,of the class, "List_Item", is written vertically.	They should be written horizontally.	
JP07	320	5.1	Figure1, 2,4,5,6	ed	Data types are included in the class diagrams. e.g. label : text [0..1]	The design guideline says that class diagrams don't include data types. The data types should be deleted. e.g. label	
JP08	405	5.3.2		te	The directions of the predicates are opposite. e.g. The sentence "The object set has a broader meaning than the subject set. " is strange. cf. in OWL case `<owl:Class rdf:ID="Male">` `<rdfs:subClassOf rdf:resource="#Animal"/>` `</owl:Class>` that means "Male" is subclass of "Animal".	The directions of the predicates should be inversed. e.g. The subject set has a broader meaning than the object set.	
JP09		Annex E, F, G		ge	These Annexes are empty.		

1 **MB** = Member body / **NC** = National Committee (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

| Date: 2013/10/2 | Document: **32N4217** | Project: 1.32.22.01.13.00 |

MB/ NC[1]	Line number (e.g. 17)	Clause/ Subclause (e.g. 3.1)	Paragraph/ Figure/ Table/ (e.g. Table 1)	Type of comment[2]	Comments	Proposed change	Observations of the secretariat
					End of comments.		

1 **MB** = Member body / **NC** = National Committee (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

ISO/IEC/CEN/CENELEC electronic balloting commenting template/version 2012-03

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
KR 01	Contents	Annex B	Ed	"(informative)" should be bold	Make "(informative)" to be bold	
KR 02	Figure Contents	Figure 8	Ed	page of "figure 8 : Relationship between model levels" is mistyped	Change right page number.	
KR 03	5	All figures	Ed	Captions of figures have different format. According to ISO/IEC Directives part 2, in Subclause 6.6.5.4, the layout of figure uses hyphen instead of colon.	Change the captions by right format Replace colon to hyphen. ("Figure # : …" → "Figure # – …")	

1   **MB** = Member body (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by ******)

2   **Type of comment:**   **ge** = general   **te** = technical   **ed** = editorial

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

ISO electronic balloting commenting template/version 2001-10

MB/ NC[1]	Line number (e.g. 17)	Clause/ Subclause (e.g. 3.1)	Paragraph/ Figure/ Table/ (e.g. Table 1)	Type of comment[2]	Comments	Proposed change	Observations of the secretariat
GB01	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	General	Title of standard changed in Korea	'Form registration' should be 'Forms registration' throughout the document	
GB02	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	General	Incorrect format of definitions is used throughout the document	Reformat for the next draft	
GB03	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	General	Conformance statement no longer meets the requirements of WG2	Replace with the new standard text	
GB04	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	General	Language definition and naming of language elements for Local_Definition is insufficient.	Explicitly model the properties of Form_Element that can be addressed and set by the language – include 'read_only', default_value', 'hidden', 'disabled', 'guard' and 'value' as available properties. Extend the definintion of Operation_Type to cover the list of binary operators supported.	
GB05	Page 8 (.doc)	n.a.	Figure 5	Editorial	UML representation of language is unsatisfactory	Modelling in a textual format – such as Spoofax – so that the syntax of the language is clear.	
GB06	Page 8 (.doc)	n.a.	Figure 6	Technical	Referring to objects by identifier in class models is not standard practice	Replace 'identifiers' in MDR_Mapping for the classes themselves	
GB07	Page 13	5.4.12	n.a.	Technical	Number class could also be an ordered sequence of letters	Amend description to support this	
GB08	Figure 5	Figure 5	Figure 5	Editorial	Rearrange diagrams so as to read vertically		
GB09	Page 16	n.a.	5.4.16	Technical	No way of specifying how many of a multiselect item may be selected without a Local_Definition	Set cardinality of multiselect list items to be natural range	
GB10	Page 16	n.a.	5.4.16	Technical	No way of specifying the prompt for a fill_in	Associate a fill_in with a Prompt	
GB11	Page 16	n.a.	5.4.17	Technical	Lookup_Field class is too specific	Generalise the modelling to allow the lookup property to invoke a SQL view etc	
GB12	Page 22	n.a.	Annexes	General	Insufficient examples supplied in appendix	Expand the appendixes describing the standard with more examples	
GB13	Page 8	n.a.	Figure 6	Technical	MDR_Mapping will often be exchanged with a particular form	Create an optional association between MDR_Mapping and Form	

1   **MB** = Member body / **NC** = National Committee (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

ISO/IEC/CEN/CENELEC electronic balloting commenting template/version 2012-03

MB/ NC[1]	Line number (e.g. 17)	Clause/ Subclause (e.g. 3.1)	Paragraph/ Figure/ Table/ (e.g. Table 1)	Type of comment[2]	Comments	Proposed change	Observations of the secretariat
GB14	Page 15	n.a.	5.4.14	Technical	Input_Field has no type available for the loading of binary large objects	Add option for the loading of binary objects. Consider constraint attributes for mime/document type	
GB15	Page 7		Figure 4	Technical	Pictorial value domains are not supported	Allow a media element to be associated with a valid value	
GB16	Page 7		5.4.2	Technical	No datatype for country code included in the standard	Include a country code datatype for the human readable language attribute on a form model	
					nb vote - disapproval with comments but would change to approve if comments were addressed	email to CSC@BSIgroup.com	

1   **MB** = Member body / **NC** = National Committee (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

ISO/IEC/CEN/CENELEC electronic balloting commenting template/version 2012-03

MB/NC[1]	Line number	Clause/Subclause	Paragraph/Figure/Table/	Type of comment[2]	Comments	Proposed change	Observations of the secretariat
US-1	Line number (e.g., 3.1)	Entire document	Input Field	te	The response to a Question is generally considered an 'answer', but answer is not used in this standard.	Change "Input_Field" to "Answer"	
US-2		General	geneal	ed	Add line numbers to simplify review of future drafts		
US-3		Scope	2nd and 4th paragraph		These two paragraphs are not related to Scope. A definition does not belong in Scope. The references to other kinds of form descriptions that the standard does not replace, which also don't belong in Scope.	Move to introduction.	
US-4		Scope	3rd paragraph		Its not clear why ISO/IEC 19763-12 is mentioned here. It is for registration of information models, not data models. An information model does not necessarily provide enough details to exchange data between systems, whereas a 11179-3 data element does. "This standard provides a metamodel to describe the structure and semantics of a form devoid of any specific, domain semantics, for purposes that include: the registration and documentation of form designs, both paper and electronic; the association of form designs with appropriate entity-relationship diagrams and data models (ISO/IEC19763-12) so that data may be faithfully exchanged between system components and between systems; the association between a set of forms whose data maybe compared, joined or composed for analysis."	Explain the difference between referencing a question on a form to a 11179-3 data element and a 19763-12 information model.	US should add as ballot comment.
US-5		4	Terms	te	Question needs to be defined	Define Question	

---

1 **MB** = Member body / **NC** = National Committee (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

ISO/IEC electronic balloting commenting template/version 2012-03

MB/ NC[1]	Line number	Clause/ Subclause	Paragraph/ Figure/ Table/	Type of comment[2]	Comments	Proposed change	Observations of the secretariat
US-6		4	Terms	te	Instruction needs to be defined	Define Instruction	
US-7		4.2	Terms and Definitions	te	Many terms used in the document are not included in this section: section, expression, consequence, question, local definition, binary operation, media element, etc	Add missing terminology	
US-8		5	General	te	There needs to be a bit more explanation of the 11179-3 and 19763-10 attributes that are inherited without forcing people to get those standards and read them.	The text could list the primary identifying and administrative attributes that are inherited from 11179, Add some examples of the important classes and attributes that are inherited in the text. You might also consider adding the 11179 classes to the diagram.	
US-9		5	General	te	Where does the semantic meaning lie? Question Level? Form Level? Should a section have an annotation that would narrow the meaning of the elements in the section? Or is it just additional/complimentary tags? Classifier might might mean there is a need to add some validation is necessary so that you don't mix inappropriate semantics.	Consider explicitly describing how 11179 "Classifier can be used to add semantics to Form_Design_Element Consider Classifier type. Consider Classifier concept Concept uri	
US-10		5	General Reference Document	te	Different types of references are needed. How to support to encourage consistency? E,g, Source, Evidence, Copyright, Implementation Guilde etc Need to record Permissions and Copyrights • Asserted rights • Permissions granted • Who owns the rights Model came from library of Congress	Include the 11179 Reference Document, and Document_Type in the standards to describe how this is supported. Import 11179 Reference Document and provide sample of the type taxonomy	
US-11		5	Figure 1	te	Open Diamond between Form_Design_Elements and Section_Element (contains)	The UML open diamond conveys containment, which would help to clarify the realtionship between *Form_Design_Element* and	

1   **MB** = Member body / **NC** = National Committee (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

ISO/IEC electronic balloting commenting template/version 2012-03

			Date: August 15, 2013	Document: **SC32 N2417-CD 19763-13**	Project: 1.32.22.01.12.00

Template for comments and secretariat observations

MB/NC[1]	Line number	Clause/Subclause	Paragraph/Figure/Table/	Type of comment[2]	Comments	Proposed change	Observations of the secretariat
						Section_Element	
US-12		5.1	Text and also Figure 5	te	The association between Expression and Binary_Operation aren't named in the figure or explained very well so it is not possible to fully understand how to use this part of the model.	Name and describe the relationship between Expression and Binary_Operation	
US-13		5.1	General	te	Are the diagrams intended to be normative? If so, include a statement about that similar to the one 11179-3 Ed 3:	Consider adding this text to section 5 **Use of UML Class diagrams and textual description** This standard uses both text and UML class diagrams to describe the metamodel. Both are normative, and are intended to be complementary. However, if a conflict exists between what is specified in UML and what is specified in text, the text takes precedence until such time as a correction is made to make them consistent. Further, if a conflict exists between a formal definition and other normative text, the formal definition takes precedence until such time as a correction is made to make them consistent. For associations, the description of the association itself takes precedence over any description in the associated classes.	US should include as ballot comment.
US-14		5.1	Figure 4	ed	The association end between Question_Element and Additional_Text at the Additional_Text end should be labelled "question_text"	Change the association end name from "additional_instruction" to "question_text"	
US-15		5.1	Figure 4	ed	The association end between Question_Element and Prompt at the Question_Element end should be labelled "prompt_for_question"	Change the association end name from "text_for_question" to "prompt_for_question'	
US-16		5.1	Figure 2	te	Form_Language		
US-17		Figure 5 and 5.3.5	Operation Type	te	Operation types that are symbols have to be escaped when representing a form design in	Change operation types that are symbols into text	

1 **MB** = Member body / **NC** = National Committee (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

ISO/IEC electronic balloting commenting template/version 2012-03

MB/ NC[1]	Line number	Clause/ Subclause	Paragraph/ Figure/ Table/	Type of comment[2]	Comments	Proposed change	Observations of the secretariat
					XML, which is a common representation language. Use text types instead such as less_than or LT vs <		
US-18		5.4	Figure 5	ed	Name attribute in Local_Definition datatype is "text", in the text of the document its "String".	Change "name" attribute in the diagram to "string".	US should add as ballot comment.
US-19		5.4	Figure 6	ed	The attribute types in Question_Element_Data_Element_Association and Section_Element_Concept_Association in the diagram do not match the text, and are mixed "text" and "string"	Make all attributes "String" in both classes.	US should add as ballot comment.
US-20		5.4	Figure 6	ed	The data_element_identifier attribute should probably be present in every instance of this class.	Change cardinality of data_element_identifier to 1..1	US should add as ballot comment..
US-21		5.4	Figure 3	ed	The association names between Additional_Text and Section_Element does not match the text.	Change association names to match text.	US should add as ballot comment.
US-22		5.4	New Class	te	Need the ability to associate one Form_Design with another to indicate when one replaces another	Add Form_Design-Form_Design association with a "type" attribute 0..*	US should add as ballot comment.
US-23		5.4.1	Form_Design	te	How will versions convey nuanced reasons for versioning a form? Should version be a complex type? o convey that an item is released but not the current form?	Latest Version indicator? Version as a complexType? Change note from 11179 to be used? Can sections be versioned independently of Forms?	
US-24		5.4.10	Question Prompt	te	Sometimes the Prompt/text of the question comes from the answer to another question	Could possibly handle with Local Definition or Basic Mapping Package	
US-25		5.4.10	Question Prompt	te	Dynamically change the label of the next question based on previous question answers? "Piping"	Possibly Local Definition (2 approaches)	
US-26		5.4.10	Question_Element	te	How to handle pre-populating a field based on what is entered in another system, for example an EHR? Auto Population and Validation	Add text/example to explain how to handle this with the model, maybe a rule about whether certain fields are eligible for pre-population, an pointer to an external valdation?	
US-27		5.4.10	Question_Element unit_of_measure	te	There are many different standards for units of measure. There needs to be attributes that allow the form designer to specify what kind of unit of measure is being used and also text and the symbol or name	Unit-of-measure scheme_name Unit-of-measure label Unit-of-measure name	

1   **MB** = Member body / **NC** = National Committee (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

ISO/IEC electronic balloting commenting template/version 2012-03

	Template for comments and secretariat observations	Date: August 15, 2013	Document: **SC32 N2417-CD 19763-13**	Project: 1.32.22.01.12.00

MB/ NC[1]	Line number	Clause/ Subclause	Paragraph/ Figure/ Table/	Type of comment[2]	Comments	Proposed change	Observations of the secretariat
US-28		5.4.12	Number		The cardinality of the reference of Question_Element to Number and List_Item to Number is 1..1 in this element, but for Section_Element is 0..1. All three descriptions (Question_Element, Section_Element, List_Item) should be 1..1		
US-29		5.4.13	Additional_Text	te	There are lots of different kinds of text on a form. It might be useful to have an explicit set of 'types' that can be extended.	Add Additional_text Type either on the class or at the Presentation Element level?	US should add as ballot comment.
US-30		5.4.14	Input_Field	te	Maxmum_character_quantity is only applicable to a Text field	Move from Input Field to Text field	
US-31		5.4.14	Input_Field	ed	These are attribute describing the answer. The name "input field" seems like something else…	Rename "Answer_Attributes"	US should add as ballot comment.
US-32		5.4.15	Text_Field		Each Text_Field needs a language element. The Form_Language may not apply to all the text on the form.	Add an optional language attribute for Text_Field	US should add as ballot comment.
US-33		5.4.16	List_Field	te	Consider changing "fill-in" to "specify_text".	Editor's discretion	US should add as ballot comment.
US-34		5.4.16	Ordered	ed	This is an attribute, its name should be lowercase	Make "Ordered" – "ordered"	US should add as ballot comment.
US-35		5.4.17	lookup_Field	te	Answers of type list field and lookup can have a fill-in value and a list of choices, the fill-in may have min/max values, datatype, etc Other Specify _____ Select and add comment Specify site, diagnosis and prior treatment	Add fill-in to lookup field	
US-36		5.4.18	List Item guard Local	te	List Item Guard is hard to understand. A trigger is needed on an item list, why not just have 'rule' and local definition like on form design elements? it use. Are the items associated with the guard selected when the list item is selected and the value is "selected"? other list item based	Expand Local_Definition to cover Question Element and more use cases. E.g.if answer is selected, skip to Section/Question x	

1   **MB** = Member body / **NC** = National Committee (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

ISO/IEC electronic balloting commenting template/version 2012-03

| | Date: August 15, 2013 | Document: **SC32 N2417-CD 19763-13** | Project: 1.32.22.01.12.00 |

MB/ NC[1]	Line number	Clause/ Subclause	Paragraph/ Figure/ Table/	Type of comment[2]	Comments	Proposed change	Observations of the secretariat
			Definition		expressions.		
US-37		5.4.18	List_Item, Figure 4, Figure 1	te	Some list items may have a media element as a prompt. This does not appear possible in the diagrams or text..	Add ability for a List_Item to be associated with a Media Element.	US should add as ballot comment.
US-38		5.4.18	Guard	te	'deselect' is not the right word for this feature. When the item is chosen, the following questions are not shown, which is different than 'deselecting' them.	Change to "stop" or "disable"	US should add as ballot comment.
US-39		5.4.18	Guard	ed	Design is misspelled "Form_Deign_Elements"	*Form_Design_Elements*	
US-40		5.4.18	Guard	te	Either a clause or normative annex is needed to describe navigation through the form.	Add section to describe.	
US-41		5.4.18	Guarded_El ement	te	Should a Presentation_Element be allowed as a Guarded_Element. What happens after the Presentation_Element if presented?	Review guarded_element	
US-42		5.4.18	Guard	te	There needs to be a way to indicate that if a value is chosen, it invalidates certain choices in a prior answer.	This might be possible with the local definition expression languages. Please provide example.	US should add as ballot comment.
US-43		5.4.18	List_Item	te	The reference to Number is not described	Describe the reference to Number 0..1 (optional)	
US-44		5.4.19	Local Definitions Expression	te	Need to handle "Edit Checks"….. it seems that there is supposed to be an action as a basis of an evaluation of the predicate (consequence). E.g. Need to specify where the constant comes from	Specify where the constant comes from	
US-46		5.4.19	Local_Defini tion	te	Consider a mre natural language like terms for the expression such as "if" "then" versus predicate and consequence	Consider revising the words used in the expression	
US-47		5.4.2	Expression	ed	"Local_Defintion" is misspelled several times in this section.	Change "Local_Defintion" to "Local_Definition"	
US-48		5.4.22	Variable	te	The description of Variable is not adequate to explain how this is to be used in a local definition.	Please provide explanatory text and an example.	

1   **MB** = Member body / **NC** = National Committee (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

ISO/IEC electronic balloting commenting template/version 2012-03

	Date: August 15, 2013				Document: **SC32 N2417-CD 19763-13**		Project: 1.32.22.01.12.00

MB/ NC[1]	Line number	Clause/ Subclause	Paragraph/ Figure/ Table/	Type of comment[2]	Comments	Proposed change	Observations of the secretariat
					Are Variables other form design elements?		
US-49		5.4.24	MDR_Mapping	te	Its also not clear what makes other data element specifications relevant.	Add text to explicitly state which attributes of Questions are to come from a data element specificiation	
US-50		5.4.24	MDR_Mappin	te	11179-3 mapping between Data Element and Question may be more complex than one-to-one and may need to be supported.	An example will be provided for the editor to consider.	
US-51		5.4.4	Compliance _Rule	te	Event Model – need to be able to specify what constitutes a 'properly completed model' ('Action List Type') . Current model seems to be a text field.	May need additional attributes or elements. Submission Rule, Transmission Rule, Security and Privacy Rule Radiation Therapy Oncology Group Follow-up Form Phase III Lung Prophylactic Cranial RT	
US-52		5.4.4	Compliance _Rule	te	May need a way to explicitly say if the Section is to be validated or not.	Add a 'validation required" indicator	US should add as ballot comment.
US-53		5.4.4	new	te	Add support for class that describes the attributes that are needed to tell an implementer of a form what to do with the completed information	If this is supported by Compliance rule, please explain. This may be important enough to make into its own class of information such as "Routing information"	US should add as ballot comment.
US-54		5.4.4	Compliance _Rule	te	Compliance rules may need to be versionied	Make Compliance Rule a Model Element	
US-55		5.4.5	Form_Design_Element Label	te	Since there is already Designation by inheritance from 11179. Is 'Label' really needed? A question can also have question_text, how is that different than Prompt?	Explain the attributes of 'label', 'name' and 'prompt' and question Text how these are different, or replace with 11179 Designation.	
US-56		5.4.5	Form_Design_Element		Why do we have label on Form_Design_Element and Prompt? What is the difference?	Clarify the difference between a Label and a Prompt	US should add as ballot comment.

1 **MB** = Member body / **NC** = National Committee (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

ISO/IEC electronic balloting commenting template/version 2012-03

	Date: August 15, 2013	Document: **SC32 N2417-CD 19763-13**	Project: 1.32.22.01.12.00

MB/ NC[1]	Line number	Clause/ Subclause	Paragraph/ Figure/ Table/	Type of comment[2]	Comments	Proposed change	Observations of the secretariat
US-57		5.4.5	Form_Design_Element cardninality	te	It could be ambiguous as to how to interpret cardinality if they conflict at different levels of the form design. The text needs to specify what is done if a question has a 1..3 cardinality in a section with 0..4?	Specify that the Containing cardinality takes precedence.	US should add as ballot comment.
US-58		5.4.5	Form_Design_Element	te	Each section, question, text_element on a form needs its own language attribute as some forms may contain the question in more than one language. The Form_Language may not apply to all the text on the form.	Add an optional Language attribute for Section, Question, Text_Element	US should add as ballot comment.
US-59		5.4.5 and 5.4.7	Presentation Element and Style	te	What is the difference between a presentation element and a Style?	Better explain Presentation Element and Style.	
US-60		5.4.6	Section Title	te	Since there is already Designation by inheritance from 11179. Is 'title' really needed? Wouldn't a designation "name" do?	Replace "title" with Designation name	
US-61		5.4.6	Section_Element ordered	te	Sections are almost always in a particular order. Ordered does not explain how the sections are ordered. Sort order might be a better attribute	Consider sort order instead of ordered. Sort order would be an explicit value	
US-62		5.4.6 and 5.4.10	Section and Question Element Prompt	te	Since there is already Designation by inheritance from 11179. Is 'Label' really needed? How are name, label and prompt different?	Explain the different purposes and use of these attributes or replace with 11179 Designation.	
US-63		5.4.9	Media_Element Prompt Input Field List Item	te	Smiley face value domain problem – the prompt might be a media element – a continuous "slider" "Visual Analog Scale". Need to be able to do this as a validated scale. Hidden Question Text Also if more than one medial element need to be able to specify the order.	Need attributes for Media Element, add a type and format? Order"	A Text_Element can have a Media_Element
US-64		5.4.9	Media_Element	te	There can be more than one media element, there needs to be a way to describe the order they are to be presented in.	Add an "display order" or "order" element for Media Element.	

1 **MB** = Member body / **NC** = National Committee (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

ISO/IEC electronic balloting commenting template/version 2012-03

Template for comments and secretariat observations

MB/ NC[1]	Line number	Clause/ Subclause	Paragraph/ Figure/ Table/	Type of comment[2]	Comments	Proposed change	Observations of the secretariat
US-65		Annex A	Logic	ed	The logic section needs natural language text to describe the predicate and consequences.	Please explain what the expression means.	
US-66		Annex A, 6	Logic	te	The examples in the annex A for Logic are hard to follow.	Provide a plain language description of what the example expression means.	

1   **MB** = Member body / **NC** = National Committee (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

ISO/IEC electronic balloting commenting template/version 2012-03