

ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 32 N 2476

Date: 2014-03-03

REPLACES: _____

ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 32

Data Management and Interchange

Secretariat: United States of America (ANSI)
Administered by Farance Inc. on behalf of ANSI

| | |
|-------------------------|--|
| DOCUMENT TYPE | Disposition of Comments |
| TITLE | Disposition of comments on N2417 CD 19763-13 Information technology - Metamodel framework for interoperability (MFI) Part 13: Metamodel for forms registration |
| SOURCE | WG2 - Steve Harris - project editor |
| PROJECT NUMBER | 1.32.22.01.13.00 |
| STATUS | Disposition of the comments in 32N2437 (SoV on CD 19763-13 ballot 32N2417). This accompanies 32N2475 CD2 19763-13 sent to NBs for letter ballot |
| REFERENCES | |
| ACTION ID. | FYI |
| REQUESTED ACTION | |
| DUE DATE | |
| Number of Pages | 23 |
| 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

| MB/NC ¹ | Line number | Clause/ Subclause | Paragraph/ Figure/ Table/ | Type of comment ² | Comments | Proposed change | Observations of the secretariat |
|--------------------|-------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|------------------------------|--|---|--|
| KR02 | Page vi | Figure Contents | Figure 8 | Ed | page of "figure 8 : Relationship between model levels" is mistyped | Change right page number. | Accepted |
| CA07 | Page viii | 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. | Accepted Introduction deliberately in natural language. In all other areas form section or form section class should be replaced with Section_Element |
| CA01 | 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. | Accepted |
| CA02 | 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, <i>Ergonomics</i> , Subcommittee SC 4, <i>Ergonomics of human-system interaction</i> . 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. | 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. | Accepted. Copies of listed standards have been requested. |
| US1 | All | All | 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" | Discuss |

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

| MB/NC ¹ | Line number | Clause/ Subclause | Paragraph/ Figure/ Table/ | Type of comment ² | Comments | Proposed change | Observations of the secretariat |
|--------------------|-------------|-------------------|---|------------------------------|--|--|--|
| | | | | | | | Motivational example against using 'answer' has been continuous prose with fields where user completes the missing words use response |
| US03 | General | | 2 nd and 4 th 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. | Accepted |
| CA06 | General | 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. | Accepted |
| KR03 | General | 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 # - ...") | Accepted |
| US10 | General | 5 | General Reference Document | te | Different types of references are needed. How to support to encourage consistency? E.g. Source, Evidence, Copyright, Implementation Guide etc Need to record Permissions and Copyrights <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 | Accepted |
| US02 | General | General | general | ed | Add line numbers to simplify review of future drafts | | Accepted |
| GB01 | General | General | General | General | Title of standard changed in Korea | 'Form registration' should be 'Forms registration' throughout the document | Accepted |
| GB03 | General | General | General | General | Conformance statement no longer meets the requirements of WG2 | Replace with the new standard text | Accepted |

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

| MB/NC ¹ | Line number | Clause/ Subclause | Paragraph/ Figure/ Table/ | Type of comment ² | Comments | Proposed change | Observations of the secretariat |
|--------------------|-------------|-------------------|---------------------------|------------------------------|--|---|---|
| GB04 | General | General | General | 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 definition of Operation_Type to cover the list of binary operators supported. | Discuss |
| US04 | General | Scope | 3 rd paragraph | | <p>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.</p> <p>“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.”</p> | Explain the difference between referencing a question on a form to a 11179-3 data element and a 19763-12 information model. | <p>Referencing an information model allows you to map the destination of data items from a form into a database to further describe the <i>database model</i> or to parts of a conceptual domain model to help locate appropriate forms as an example</p> <p>Accepted</p> |
| CA03 | Page 01 | 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. | <p>Accepted. New text:</p> <p>document comprising a structured collection of spaces, suitable instructions and rules that support the collection of specific information</p> <p>also check other definitions. ISO8439</p> |
| CA18 | Page 03 | 4.2.6 | Definition | Te | <p>1. Why are there two definitions for the term 'form'? Each definition needs to be qualified to show the context in which it applies.</p> <p>2. The definition of the concept assigned the label “form” needs to be placed in a 11179 and 19763 metadata</p> | <p>1. Either clarify the context for each definition, or preferably delete the second definition, or demote it to a note.</p> <p>2. Project Editor and CRM to consider the alternative proposed definitions.</p> | Accepted |

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

| MB/N C ¹ | Line number | Clause/ Subclause | Paragraph/ Figure/ Table/ | Type of comment ² | Comments | Proposed change | Observations of the secretariat |
|---------------------|-------------|-------------------|---------------------------------|------------------------------|--|--|---|
| | | | | | <p>context</p> <p>A possible draft replacement definition here could be:</p> <p>form</p> <p>formulary document consisting of a set of predefined data elements for insertion of applicable data values in compliance with a defined set of rules</p> <p>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</p> <p><u>Existing ISO definitions of Form include:</u></p> <p>From ISO 9241-143:2012 clause 3.9</p> <p>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</p> <p>OR</p> <p>From ISO 5127:2001, 2.1.08</p> <p>document (printed or otherwise produced, with predesignated spaces for the recording of specific information</p> | | |
| CA04 | Page 01 | 1 | Page header | Ed | The page header shows WD instead of CD. | Correct the header as appropriate for the next ballot. | Accepted |
| CA05 | Page 01 | 1 | 3 rd para /last para | Te | <p>The 4th paragraph is of the nature of Exclusions and as such should be given its own separate subclause, i.e. 1.2 Exclusions"</p> <p>As a result , there would be a Clause 1.1 Inclusions</p> | Project Editor requested to implements | <p>Resolved in principle</p> <p>Don't believe is it actually exclusions, and should be moved into introduction</p> <p>This standard provides a metamodel to describe the structure and semantics of a form devoid of any specific, domain</p> |

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

| MB/N C ¹ | Line number | Clause/ Subclause | Paragraph/ Figure/ Table/ | Type of comment ² | Comments | Proposed change | Observations of the secretariat |
|---------------------|-------------|-------------------|---------------------------|------------------------------|---|---|--|
| | | | | | | | semantics – e.g. in the healthcare, social science, eovernment and ebusiness. – 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. |
| CA08 | Page 01 | 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 | Accepted |
| CA09 | Page 01 | 2.2.2 | | Ed | Imprecise referencing. | Since the purpose of this Clause is conformance, it is necessary to be very specific in stating what one needs to | Accepted |

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

| MB/NC ¹ | Line number | Clause/ Subclause | Paragraph/ Figure/ Table/ | Type of comment ² | Comments | Proposed change | Observations of the secretariat |
|--------------------|-------------|-------------------|---------------------------|------------------------------|---|---|--|
| | | 2.2.3 | | | 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 | conform to. The conformance clause needs to be updated to match the current structure of clause 5 (or vice versa) | |
| CA10 | Page 02 | 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. | Accepted. Standards have been requested from Tim and being chased through BSi |
| CA11 | Page 02 | 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. | Accepted |
| CA12 | Page 02 | 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. | Accepted |
| GB02 | General | General | General | General | Incorrect format of definitions is used throughout the document | Reformat for the next draft | Accepted |
| US05 | Page 02 | 4 | Terms | te | Question needs to be defined | Define Question | Accepted What are the rules? Should 'section', 'instruction' etc be defined if they appear in the guise of a specific class with a formal definition? Happy to tailor the definitions as required by the committee. |
| US06 | Page 02 | 4 | Terms | te | Instruction needs to be defined | Define Instruction | |
| US07 | Page 02 | 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 | |
| CA13 | Page 02 | 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. | |

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

| MB/NC ¹ | Line number | Clause/ Subclause | Paragraph/ Figure/ Table/ | Type of comment ² | Comments | Proposed change | Observations of the secretariat |
|--------------------|-------------|-------------------|---------------------------|------------------------------|---|--|---------------------------------|
| CA16 | Page 03 | 4.2.5 | Definition | Te | The definition introduces the concept of "field" which is not defined. | Add a definition of Field. | |
| CA14 | Page 02 | 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+ | See GB14 |
| GB14 | Page 26 | | 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 | Accepted |
| CA15 | Page 03 | 4.2.3 | Definition | Te | <p>1. The proposed definition for a concept with the label "constraint" is rather terse, consists of two synonyms, and not that meaningful.</p> <p>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".</p> <p>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.."</p> <p>The 15944-1 definition of the concept "constraint" is: constraint rule, explicitly stated, that prescribes, limits, governs or specifies any aspect of a business transaction</p> <p>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.</p> <p>NOTE 2 For constraints to be registered for implementation in Open-edi, they must have unique and unambiguous identifiers.</p> <p>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</p> | <p>1. Rethink definition of constraint and determine if need as a defined concept. It may not be necessary.</p> <p>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 <i>EXAMPLE of form constraints include those pertaining to data entry, field length, a compliance rule, etc.</i> [adapted from ISO/IEC 15944-1 (3.11)]</p> | Accepted |

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

| MB/NC ¹ | Line number | Clause/ Subclause | Paragraph/ Figure/ Table/ | Type of comment ² | Comments | Proposed change | Observations of the secretariat |
|--------------------|-------------|-------------------|---------------------------|------------------------------|--|--|--|
| | | | | | <p>parties, (e.g., laws, regulations, etc.), and is therefore considered an "external constraint".</p> <p>[ISO/IEC 15944-1: 2011 (3.11)^{3rd} ed.]</p> <p>3. It is important that JTC1/SC32 maintain an as harmonized vocabulary as possible.</p> | | |
| CA15 | Page 03 | 4.2.4 | definition | Te | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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. Is this a deliberate decision? 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 | Accepted In the model, a Compliance_Rule describes the relationship between a template and its valid implementations, but rules are elsewhere and this needs to be made clear |
| CA17 | Page 03 | 4.2.5 | Definition | Te | The definition introduces the concept of "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? | <p>Possible replacement text could be</p> <p>completed form</p> <p>form for which the required data entry for specified fields has been completed in compliance with the applicable rules</p> <p>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.</p> | Accepted |
| CA19 | Page 03 | 4.2.7 | Definition | Te | <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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</p> | Project Editor requested to consider and advise. CRM to discuss and decide. | Accepted Revise to describe form design not intent of registration |
| CA20 | Page 03 | 4.2.8 | Definition | Te | The use of the word "partial" causes confusion. | Project Editor requested to consider and advise CRM | Accepted |

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

| MB/NC ¹ | Line number | Clause/ Subclause | Paragraph/ Figure/ Table/ | Type of comment ² | Comments | Proposed change | Observations of the secretariat |
|--------------------|-------------|-------------------|---------------------------|------------------------------|---|---|---|
| | | | | | Should it not be "those aspects of form design... Linked to comment on 4.2.7 | | Will reword |
| CA21 | Page 03 | 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 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? | Project Editor to consider and advice CRM accordingly. | Accepted |
| US11 | Page 04 | 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 relationship between <i>Form_Design_Element</i> and Section_Element | Accepted – relationship will be revised |
| US08 | Page 04 | 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. | Accepted |
| US09 | Page 04 | 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 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 | Accepted Option to make a form element a classified item will be explicitly stated |
| CA22 | Page 04 | 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. | Accepted |
| CA23 | Page 04 | 5.1 | Para 2, line 4 | Ed | 'a registry operators' is bad grammar | Choose between the singular and the plural. | Accepted |

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

| MB/N C ¹ | Line number | Clause/ Subclause | Paragrap h/ Figure/ Table/ | Type of comment ² | Comments | Proposed change | Observations of the secretariat |
|------------------------|----------------|----------------------|-------------------------------------|------------------------------------|---|---|---|
| CA24 | Page 04 | 5.1 | Figure 1 | Te | <p>Why is a Form Design restricted to have only one language? How will multi-lingual forms be supported?</p> <p>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.</p> | <p>Make all changes necessary to support multi-lingual forms.</p> | <p>Accepted</p> <p>Both – individual forms of one language and multilingual forms – supported</p> <p>ensure that the form natural language is optional so doesn't need to be used in multilingual forms</p> <p>make form language attribute 'primary_textual_language' remove 'native'</p> <p>use definition of language from appropriate standard for attribute name</p> <p>Need to explain approaches to multilinguality</p> <p>type should be language_code in text</p> <p>implications on part 10 model mapping</p> |
| CA25 | Page 04 | 5.1 | Figure 1 | Te | <p>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'.</p> <p>Or are there intended to be two associations, such that a Form_Design_Element may contain Section_Elements,</p> | <p>Correct or clarify as appropriate.</p> | <p>Accepted</p> <p>Association will be revised</p> |

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

| MB/NC ¹ | Line number | Clause/ Subclause | Paragraph/ Figure/ Table/ | Type of comment ² | Comments | Proposed change | Observations of the secretariat |
|--------------------|-------------|-------------------|---------------------------|------------------------------|--|--|---------------------------------|
| | | | | | which in turn may contain other Form_Design_Elements? See also CA-44. | | |
| CA44 | Page 20 | 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. | Accepted – see above |
| CA26 | Page 04 | 5.1 | Figure 5 | Te | Do we need to explicitly allow for parentheses in expressions? | Clarify how parentheses would be supported. | Accepted |
| CA27 | Page 04 | 5.1 | Figure 6 | Te | The multiplicity of data_element_idenfier should be [1..1] | Make the correction. | Accepted |
| US20 | Page 17 | 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 | Accepted |
| CA28 | Page 04 | 5.1 | Figure 6 | Te | The datatype of concept_identifier should be String, not Text | Make the correction. | Accepted |
| CA29 | Page 04 | 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. | Accepted |
| JP01 | Page 04 | 5.1 5.3.2 | Figure 7 | ed | PDF version's layout is broken. | WORD version should be converted into the correct PDF version. | Accepted |
| US12 | Page 04 | 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 | Accepted |
| US13 | Page 04 | 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: | <p>Consider adding this text to section 5</p> <p>Use of UML Class diagrams and textual description</p> <p>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</p> | Accepted |

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

| MB/NC ¹ | Line number | Clause/ Subclause | Paragraph/ Figure/ Table/ | Type of comment ² | Comments | Proposed change | Observations of the secretariat |
|--------------------|-------------|-------------------|-------------------------------|------------------------------|---|--|--|
| | | | | | | classes. | |
| US14 | Page 04 | 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" | Accepted Role names to be advised |
| US15 | Page 04 | 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" | Accepted |
| US16 | Page 04 | 5.1 | Figure 2 | te | Form_Language | | ?? |
| JP02 | Page 04 305 | 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. | Accepted |
| JP03 | Page 04 307 | 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. | Accepted |
| JP04 | Page 04 314 | 5.1 | Figure4 | ed | The figure is vertically stretched. | The figure should be shrunk vertically. | Accepted |
| JP05 | Page 04 314 | 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. | Accepted |
| JP06 | Page 04 314 | 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. | Accepted |
| JP07 | Page 04 320 | 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 | Accepted |
| GB15 | Page 07 | Figure 4 | Figure 4 | Technical | Pictorial value domains are not supported | Allow a media element to be associated with a valid value | Accepted |
| US37 | Page 29 | 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. | Accepted |
| GB05 | Page 08 | | Figure 5 | Editorial | UML representation of language is unsatisfactory | Modelling in a textual format – such as Spoofox – so that the syntax of the language is clear. | Accepted |

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

| MB/NC ¹ | Line number | Clause/ Subclause | Paragraph/ Figure/ Table/ | Type of comment ² | Comments | Proposed change | Observations of the secretariat |
|--------------------|-------------|--------------------|---------------------------|------------------------------|--|---|---|
| GB06 | Page 08 | | Figure 6 | Technical | Referring to objects by identifier in class models is not standard practice | Replace 'identifiers' in MDR_Mapping for the classes themselves | Partial accept. MDR will have identifiers so we can bank on that. Question elements may not be identified so this should be to the class Section to concept is also too narrow – could be data element derivation MDR-MDR mapping to be discussed elsewhere |
| GB08 | Page 08 | Figure 5 | Figure 5 | Editorial | Rearrange diagrams so as to read vertically | | Accepted |
| US17 | Page 08 | Figure 5 and 5.3.5 | Operation Type | te | Operation types that are symbols have to be escaped when representing a form design in XML, which is a common representation language. Use text types instead such as less_than or LT vs < | Change operation types that are symbols into text | Accepted |
| GB13 | Page 09 | | Figure 6 | Technical | MDR_Mapping will often be exchanged with a particular form | Create an optional association between MDR_Mapping and Form | Accepted |
| CA30 | Page 11 | 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. | Accepted |
| CA31 | Page 11 | 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. | Accepted |
| CA32 | Page 11 | 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. | Accepted |
| CA34 | Page 14 | 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. | Accepted |
| CA35 | Page 14 | 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. | Accepted |
| CA36 | Page 14 | 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. | Accepted |
| JP08 | Page 11 405 | 5.3.2 | | te | The directions of the predicates are opposite. e.g. The sentence "The object set has a broader meaning | The directions of the predicates should be inverted. e.g. The subject set has a broader meaning than the object | Discuss offline – may change label |

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

| MB/NC ¹ | Line number | Clause/ Subclause | Paragraph/ Figure/ Table/ | Type of comment ² | Comments | Proposed change | Observations of the secretariat |
|--------------------|-------------|-------------------|---------------------------|------------------------------|--|--|---|
| | | | | | 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". | set. | SKOS primer seems to say the interpretation is 'has broader' which is the sense in the standard. http://www.w3.org/TR/skos-primer/#sechierarchy |
| CA33 | Page 14 | 5.3.3 | Metaclass | Ed | Question is misspelled as Ouestion. The trailing comma is not needed. | Make the corrections. | Accepted |
| CA37 | Page 16 | 5.3.5 | IN, line 2 of description | Ed | 'and expression' should be 'an expression'. 'pedicate' should be 'predicate' | Make the corrections. | Accepted |
| US18 | Page 17 | 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". | Accepted |
| US19 | Page 17 | 5.4 | Figure 6 | ed | The attribute types in Question_Element_Data_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. | Accepted |
| US21 | Page 17 | 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. | Accepted |
| US22 | Page 17 | 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..* | Done in part 10 Parts of 13 need to be lifted into part 10 SJH to comment on sneak peek |
| CA38 | Page 17 | 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. | Resolved above |
| US58 | Page 19 | 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 | As above |

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

| MB/NC ¹ | Line number | Clause/ Subclause | Paragraph/ Figure/ Table/ | Type of comment ² | Comments | Proposed change | Observations of the secretariat |
|--------------------|-------------|-------------------|---------------------------|------------------------------|--|---|--|
| US32 | Page 28 | 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 | Discuss |
| US23 | Page 17 | 5.4.1 | Form_Design | te | How will versions convey nuanced reasons for versioning a form? Should version be a complex type? To 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? | Done in change note – form is administered item |
| CA39 | Page 17 | 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. | Accepted Discuss modelling language cardinalities |
| CA40 | Page 17 | 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. | Accepted |
| GB16 | Page 17 | 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 | Accepted |
| US47 | Page 17 | 5.4.2 | Expression | ed | "Local_Defintion" is misspelled several times in this section. | Change "Local_Defintion" to "Local_Definition" | Accepted |
| US51 | Page 18 | 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 | Out of scope |
| US52 | Page 18 | 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 | Compliance rule out of scope |
| US53 | Page 18 | 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" | Compliance rule out of scope |
| US54 | Page 18 | 5.4.4 | Compliance_Rule | te | Compliance rules may need to be versioned | Make Compliance Rule a Model Element | Compliance rule out of scope |
| CA41 | Page 19 | 5.4.5 | Style | Ed | In the description, 'A optional' s/b 'An optional' | Make the correction. | Agreed |
| CA42 | Page 19 | 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. | Agreed |

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

| MB/NC ¹ | Line number | Clause/ Subclause | Paragraph/ Figure/ Table/ | Type of comment ² | Comments | Proposed change | Observations of the secretariat |
|--------------------|-------------|-------------------|-------------------------------------|------------------------------|---|--|--|
| CA43 | Page 19 | 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..." | Agreed |
| US55 | Page 19 | 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. | Resolve to examine and rationalise |
| US60 | Page 20 | 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 | As above |
| US62 | Page 20 | 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. | As above |
| US56 | Page 19 | 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 | Accepted Use of label seems to be redundant and will be dropped |
| US57 | Page 19 | 5.4.5 | Form_Design_Element cardinality | 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. | Withdrawn |
| US59 | Page 19 | 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. | Accepted Style is a declarative statement arranging the colour, position and layout A presentation element is some image, box or line placed on the form |
| US61 | Page 20 | 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 | Withdrawn Optimal ordering strategies will depend upon |

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

| MB/NC ¹ | Line number | Clause/ Subclause | Paragraph/ Figure/ Table/ | Type of comment ² | Comments | Proposed change | Observations of the secretariat |
|--------------------|-------------|-------------------|---------------------------|------------------------------|--|---|--|
| | | | | | | | implementation – xml is document order, rdbms will be explicit. Is it really advantageous to be more specific? |
| CA45 | Page 21 | 5.4.7 | Description | Te | <p>The second sentence does not read well, and it is unclear what is meant.</p> <p>" 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.)"</p> <p>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</p> | <p>Please clarify what is meant.</p> <p>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"</p> <p>Question: "Does a container element" contain only one data element or can it contain more than one, i.e., represent a field</p> | <p>Accepted</p> <p>Some presentation elements have semantic content by being explicitly linked to the 'semantic tree' of sections, questions and fields. The intent is to explain how this works</p> |
| CA46 | Page 21 | 5.4.7 – 5.4.9 | All | Te | <p>The presentation element appears not to have a "fallback" for the visually-impaired. Should not all 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.</p> | <p>Project Editor requested to consider and advise. CRM to discuss and decide.</p> | <p>Accepted</p> |
| US63 | Page 21 | 5.4.9 | Media_Element Prompt | te | <p>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</p> | <p>Need attributes for Media Element, add a type and format? Order"</p> | <p>Accepted</p> |

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

| MB/NC ¹ | Line number | Clause/ Subclause | Paragraph/ Figure/ Table/ | Type of comment ² | Comments | Proposed change | Observations of the secretariat |
|--------------------|-------------|-------------------|---------------------------------------|------------------------------|---|---|--|
| | | | Input Field List Item | | validated scale. Hidden Question Text Also if more than one medial element need to be able to specify the order. | | |
| US64 | Page 21 | 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. | Accepted property of the section element-form design element Will examine and revise |
| US24 | Page 22 | 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 | Supported with guarded questions and local definitions |
| US25 | Page 22 | 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) | Supported with guarded questions and local definitions. Worried that changing the question would change semantics in an opaque way |
| US26 | Page 22 | 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 validation? | Withdrawn Out of scope |
| US27 | Page 22 | 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 | Diagram imports ISO11179-3:2012 UoM |
| CA47 | Page 22 | 5.4.11 | Line 1 | Ed | The is an extra spaces between 'elements' and 'used' | Remove the extra space. | Accepted |
| CA48 | Page 22 | 5.4.11 | Title_for_ section | Ed | In the description, at the beginning of the second sentence, 'text' should be capitalized. | Make the correction. | This is a word screw-up. Text describes 'alternate_text' class Will be fixed |
| CA49 | Page 22 | 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. | As above |

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

| MB/NC ¹ | Line number | Clause/ Subclause | Paragraph/ Figure/ Table/ | Type of comment ² | Comments | Proposed change | Observations of the secretariat |
|--------------------|-------------|-------------------|---------------------------------|------------------------------|---|---|---------------------------------|
| CA50 | Page 23 | 5.4.12 | Number_for_section | Ed | In the description, 'Ao' should be An'. | Make the correction. | Accepted |
| GB07 | Page 23 | 5.4.12 | n.a. | Technical | Number class could also be an ordered sequence of letters | Amend description to support this | Accepted |
| US28 | Page 23 | 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 | | Accepted |
| CA51 | Page 24 | 5.4.13 | Instruction_for_question | Ed | In the description, 'multiplicity' is misspelled. | Make the correction. | Accepted |
| CA52 | Page 24 | 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. | Accepted |
| CA53 | Page 24 | 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. | Accepted |
| US29 | Page 24 | 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? | Will investigate |
| CA54 | Page 26 | 5.4.14 | Maximum_character_quantity | Ed | In the last line of the description, ' Its value may come mapping' is not good English. | Use the phraseology used in the following entry: " Its value may be set through a mapping..." | Accepted |
| CA55 | Page 26 | 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. | Accepted |
| US30 | Page 26 | 5.4.14 | Input_Field | te | Maxmum_character_quantity is only applicable to a Text field | Move from Input Field to Text field | Accept |
| US31 | Page 26 | 5.4.14 | Input_Field | ed | These are attribute describing the answer. The name "input field" seems like something else... | Rename "Answer_Attributes" | Renamed response |
| GB09 | Page 28 | | 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 | Accepted |

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

| MB/NC ¹ | Line number | Clause/ Subclause | Paragraph/ Figure/ Table/ | Type of comment ² | Comments | Proposed change | Observations of the secretariat |
|--------------------|-------------|-------------------|---|------------------------------|---|---|--|
| GB10 | Page 28 | | 5.4.16 | Technical | No way of specifying the prompt for a fill_in | Associate a fill_in with a Prompt | Accepted |
| GB11 | Page 28 | | 5.4.17 | Technical | Lookup_Field class is too specific | Generalise the modelling to allow the lookup property to invoke a SQL view etc | Accepted revise to provide more flexibility |
| CA56 | Page 28 | 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...' | Accepted, but change from Boolean to natural_range |
| CA57 | Page 28 | 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. | Accepted |
| CA58 | Page 28 | 5.4.16 | Fill_in | Ed | In the description, 'that provide' s/b 'that provides' | Make the correction. | Accepted |
| US33 | Page 28 | 5.4.16 | List_Field | te | Consider changing "fill-in" to "specify_text". | Editor's discretion | Accepted Will investigate – model refinement in 'fill-in' is likely for CD2 |
| US35 | Page 28 | 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 | Will investigate – see US35 |
| CA59 | Page 29 | 5.4.18 | Item_prompt | Ed | The reference name should not be capitalized, | Make the correction. | Accepted |
| US36 | Page 29 | 5.4.18 | List Item guard Local Definition | 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 expressions. | Expand Local_Definition to cover Question Element and more use cases. E.g.if answer is selected, skip to Section/Question x | Accepted Will re-word guard Add new properties to form elements |
| US38 | Page 29 | 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" | Accepted |
| US39 | Page 29 | 5.4.18 | Guard | ed | Design is misspelled "Form_Deign_Elements" | <i>Form_Design_Elements</i> | Accepted |

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

| MB/NC ¹ | Line number | Clause/ Subclause | Paragraph/ Figure/ Table/ | Type of comment ² | Comments | Proposed change | Observations of the secretariat |
|--------------------|-------------|-------------------|------------------------------|------------------------------|--|--|--|
| US40 | Page 29 | 5.4.18 | Guard | te | Either a clause or normative annex is needed to describe navigation through the form. | Add section to describe. | Accepted |
| US41 | Page 29 | 5.4.18 | Guarded_ Element | te | Should a Presentation_Element be allowed as a Guarded_Element. What happens after the Presentation_Element if presented? | Review guarded_element | Accepted |
| US42 | Page 29 | 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. | Discuss philosophy of constraints |
| US43 | Page 29 | 5.4.18 | List_Item | te | The reference to Number is not described | Describe the reference to Number 0..1 (optional) | Accepted |
| US44 | Page 30 | 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 | Accepted Local definitions to be substantially revised |
| US46 | Page 30 | 5.4.19 | Local_Definition | 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 | Accepted |
| US48 | Page 32 | 5.4.22 | Variable | te | The description of Variable is not adequate to explain how this is to be used in a local definition. Are Variables other form design elements? | Please provide explanatory text and an example. | Accepted Variables are generally the values of input fields |
| US49 | Page 32 | 5.4.24 | MDR_Map ping | 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 specification | Accepted |
| US50 | Page 32 | 5.4.24 | MDR_Map pin | 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. | Accepted |
| GB12 | Page 35 | | Annexes | General | Insufficient examples supplied in appendix | Expand the appendixes describing the standard with more examples | Accepted |
| CA60 | Page 35 | Annex A | All | Ed | The clause numbers in the Annex should be prefixed by the Annex letter. E.g. A.1 | Make the correction. | Accepted |
| US65 | Page 35 | Annex A | Logic | ed | The logic section needs natural language text to describe the predicate and consequences. | Please explain what the expression means. | Accepted |
| US66 | Page 36 | 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. | Accepted |

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

| MB/N C¹ | Line number | Clause/ Subclause | Paragrap h/ Figure/ Table/ | Type of comment ² | Comments | Proposed change | Observations of the secretariat |
|-------------------------------|------------------------|------------------------------|---|---|--|--|--|
| CA61 | Page 39 | Annex C | All | Te | The missing Annex needs to be completed or deleted. | Complete or delete as appropriate. | Accepted |
| CA62 | Page 42 | Annex E | All | Te | The missing Annex needs to be completed or deleted. | Complete or delete as appropriate. | Accepted |
| JP09 | Page 42 | Annex E, F, G | | ge | These Annexes are empty. | | Accepted |
| CA63 | Page 42 | Annex F | All | Te | The missing Annex needs to be completed or deleted. | Complete or delete as appropriate. | Accepted |
| CA64 | Page 42 | 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.. | Accepted |

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