# ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 32 N 2482

Date: 2014-05-06 REPLACES: —

#### ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 32

#### **Data Management and Interchange**

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

DOCUMENT TYPE	Summary of Voting/Table of Replies
TITLE	Summary of Voting on 32N2455 CD3 11179-1 ed3 Information Technology Metadata Registries (MDR) - Part 1: Framework Ed 3
SOURCE	SC32 Secretariat
PROJECT NUMBER	1.32.15.03.01.00
STATUS	The document obtained 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	9
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

# ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 32 N2482

# **Summary of Voting on Document SC 32 N 2455**

Title: CD3 11179-1 ed3 Information Technology -- Metadata Registries (MDR) - Part 1:

Framework Ed 3

Project: 1.32.15.03.01.00

"P" Member	Approval	Approval with Comments	Disapproval with Comments	Abstention with Comments
Canada			1	
Côte d'Ivoire				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				
Total "P"	5	1	2	5
"O" Member				
Austria				
Belgium				
France				1
Ghana				
Hungary				
Indonesia				
Italy				
Kazakhstan				
Norway				
Romania				
Poland				
Sweden				
Switzerland				
Total "O"				

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: <u>Timothy@Schoechle.org</u> available from the JTC 1/SC 32 WebSite http://www.jtc1sc32.org/

\*Farance Inc. administers the ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 32 Secretariat on behalf of ANSI

#### **COMMENTS:**

#### Canada

NO. See comments below:

#### Côte d'Ivoire

ABSTAIN. Lack of expertise and interest.

#### **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:

# **Portugal**

ABSTAIN. Lack of expertise and interest.

# **United Kingdom**

YES. See comments below:

MB/NC	Line number (e.g. 17)	Clause/ Subclause (e.g. 3.1)	Paragraph/ Figure/ Table/ (e.g. Table 1)	Type of comment <sup>2</sup>	Comments	Proposed change	Observations of the secretariat
CA01	044	ToC	clause 4	Ed	The Table of Contents lists a clause 4 Abbreviations and Acronyms which no longer exists. The following clauses are mis-numbered.	Refresh the Table of Contents.	
CA02	318	3.2.11	definition	Ed	The xref to the definition of <b>concept</b> is missing	Insert xref to 3.2.3	
CA03	323	3.2.12	definition	Ed	The xref to the definition of <b>concept</b> is missing	Insert xref to 3.2.3	
CA04	349	3.2.18	definition	Ed	'metamodel' is a defined term.	Make the term bold and add a xref to 3.2.20	
CA05	359	3.2.21	definition	Ed	The xref to the definition of <b>object</b> is missing	Insert xref to 3.2.22	
CA06	406	3.3.6	definition	Ed	The defined term 'concept' is not shown in bold	Make the term bold.	
CA07	530	3.3.29	definition	Ed	'data' is a defined term	Make the term bold and add a xref to 3.2.6	
CA08	546	3.3.32	definition	Ed	The xrefs to the definitions of identifier and administered item are missing	Add xrefs to 3.1.3 and 3.3.2 respectively.	
CA09	553	3.4.1	definition	Ed	administered item is not capitalized in 3.3.2, so it should not be capitalized here.	Remove the capitals.	
CA10	563	3.5.1	definition	Ed	The xref to the definition of <b>metadata item</b> is missing	Insert xref to 3.2.17	
CA11	568	3.5.2	definition	Ed	'unit of measure' is a defined term	Make the term bold and add a xref to 3.3.28	
CA12	581	4	Para 2	Ed	All but one of the terms in bold in this paragraph are defined in clause 3. The exception is inessential. This term does not need defining, so we should change or remove the emphasis.	Either replace the <b>bold</b> font by <i>italics</i> or simply remove it.	
CA13	613	5.2.1	Para 1	Ed	'a MDR' should be 'an MDR'.	Make the correction.	
CA14	669	5.3	Last line of 2 <sup>nd</sup> para on p. 13.	Ed	There is spurious text '555' at the end of the paragraph.	Delete the '555'.	
CA15	696	5.3	Line preceding Figure 1 caption	Ed	The Heading 2 style is used on the blank line preceding the Figure 1 caption, resulting in a spurious blank heading in the Navigation pane in MS Word.	Change the style to 'Normal'.	

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

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

MB/NC	Line number (e.g. 17)	Clause/ Subclause (e.g. 3.1)	Paragraph/ Figure/ Table/ (e.g. Table 1)	Type of comment <sup>2</sup>	Comments	Proposed change	Observations of the secretariat
CA16	711 & 796	5.5	Figure 2	Ed	Figure 2 is referenced on p.14, but does not appear until p.17.	Move Figure 2 to as soon after the first reference as it will fit, currently p.15.	
CA17	750	5.5	3 <sup>rd</sup> para from bottom of p.15	Ed	When transforming quantities from one unit of measure to another, values will differ, so equivalence is a better concept to use than 'sameness'.	Replace 'same' by 'equivalent'.	
CA18	848-850	6.1	2 <sup>nd</sup> para on p.19	Те	The sentence "Registering the metadata item (i.e., entering the metadata into the MDR) makes it a registry item." is incorrect. The next sentence "If the registry item is also subject to administration (as in the case of a data element), it is called an administered item." is not completely true. Registration involves more than just entering the metadata into the MDR. It also requires stewardship to be specified. Part 3 differentiates a 'registry item' (just recorded), an 'identified item' (recorded and identified), a registered item (recorded, identified and registered). Also, a registered item may be either an administered item or an attached item, though we don't need that level of detail here. We just need to ensure that what is stated here does not conflict with what is specified in part 3. ('Designatable item' and 'classifiable Item' are orthogonal concepts to those above.)	Replace the two sentences with:  Recording the metadata item in an MDR makes it a registry item. Depending on requirements, the registry item may further be identified, named, classified, registered and/or administered. See ISO/IEC 11179-3:2013 clause 5.5 for details.	
CA19	870-871	6.2	2 <sup>nd</sup> list item on p.20.	Те	While several data elements may share the same representation, sharing a value domain is only possible if the associated conceptual domain is also the same, which limits the applicability.	Clarify that a value domain is tied to a single conceptual domain, so it is not enough that the values of two data elements be the same, their meaning must be the same as well.	
CA20	879-881	6.2	7 <sup>th</sup> list item on p.20, and following paragraph.	Те	The ability to relate one DEC to many CDs was introduced in ISO/IEC 11179-3:2013 as a result of Issue 437. This was requested by NCI as follow: "In order to be able to use the MDR to record all enterprise semantic metadata, a DEC needs to be able to be associated with 0-* Conceptual Domains. This is so that organizations who have entities using different	WG2 should consider how the change introduced in ISO/IEC 11179-3:2013 can be reconciled with the stated rule (which was true in Edition 2). If th two can be reconciled, some additional clarification should be provided. If they cannot be reconciled, WG2 should consider whether the relationship from DEC to CD should be restored to	

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

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

MB/NC	Line number (e.g. 17)	Clause/ Subclause (e.g. 3.1)	Paragraph/ Figure/ Table/ (e.g. Table 1)	Type of comment <sup>2</sup>	Comments	Proposed change	Observations of the secretariat
					code sets for the same DEC to be able to map their Data Elements to the same DEC, even though different CD/VDs were used."  This change appears to invalidate the rule stated in the next sentence: "There is one important rule the Figure 4 does not depict: Given a data element, the conceptual domain related to its data element concept shall be the conceptual domain of its value domain.", since the DEC may be related to multiple CDs.	the way it was in Edition 2, by raising a defect report against ISO/IEC 11179-3:2013.	
CA21	916,917	6.3	Next to last paragraph	Те	Re " Each administered item within an MDR is assigned a unique identifier." ISO/IEC 11179-3:2013 allows multiple identifiers.	Replace "a unique identifier" by "one or more unique identifiers".	
CA22	930-943	7.1.2	Description of Part 2	Те	WG2 needs to decide what to do about part 2. ISO/IEC 11179-2:2005 is inconsistent with ISO/IEC 11179-3:2013, so part 2 either needs to be updated or withdrawn. Stabilizing it is not an option if we want a consistent family of parts. Note that ISO/IEC 11179-2:2005 added no value since it simply reiterated parts of ISO/IEC 11179-3:2003. To have value, a third edition would need to expand on the information in part 3. There is no active project to update part 2.	A decision needs to be made before part 1 goes to DIS, so that this clause can be correctly aligned, or removed, as appropriate.	
CA23	1363	A.5.2	Last para	Ed	ISO/IEC TR 20943-5 is mentioned here, but is included in the normative references only through reference to the family (20943 (all parts)). Therefore, the title of this part is not available anywhere in the document.	Include the full title when referencing the document.	
CA24		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.  END OF COMMENTS	To be determined at the CRM as required.	

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

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

Date: 2014/04/04 Document: **32N2455** Project: **1.32.15.03.01.00** 

MB/ NC <sup>1</sup>	Line number (e.g. 17)	Clause/ Subclause (e.g. 3.1)	Paragraph/ Figure/ Table/ (e.g. Table 1)	Type of comment <sup>2</sup>	Comments	Proposed change	Observations of the secretariat
JP 01	650	5.3	Fundamental model of data elements	Te	"For the purposes of ISO/IEC 11179, a data element is composed of two parts:"  Data element is not composition of object and property.  It is misleading for readers of this document at first time.	A data element concept <u>definition could</u> be composed of object definition and property definition in the metamodel.  Or,  An instance of data element is consist of value that specified VD,CD and DEC.	
JP 02	694	5.3	Figure 1	Те	Figure is misleading for inviting so as to a data element includes data element concept and value domain.  It is not inclusion of	At the Santa Fe meeting, we had discussed and sent an alternative figure to the editor.	
JP 03	667	5.3		Ed	Examples are concepts corresponding to single objects, such as "the collection of all persons" or "the collection of service sector establishments".	Object should be object class	
JP 04	669	5.3		Ed	"555" ?	Delete this	
JP 05	699 ~ 707	5.4	Data elements in data management and interchange	Ed	Data elements appear in 2 basic situations: in databases and in transactions.	In this context, "Messages" should be preferable than "transactions"  Data elements could consist messages that are exchanged between system or human, not only between databases.	
JP 06	1279	A4		Те	"Therefore, the statement is metadata." is too much.  It is true that a metadata can be described by a sentence or sentences. However, not all sentences would be prepared for representing a metadata.  In this example, the sentence is describing still a story and neither data nor metadata.	Change the explanation like;  "Sentential expression of data could be helpful for defining metadata"	

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

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

#### ISO/IEC CD3 11179-1 Framework

Date: 2014/04/04 Document: **32N2455** Project: **1.32.15.03.01.00** 

MB/ NC <sup>1</sup>	Line number (e.g. 17)	Clause/ Subclause (e.g. 3.1)	Paragraph/ Figure/ Table/ (e.g. Table 1)	Type of comment <sup>2</sup>	Comments	Proposed change	Observations of the secretariat
JP 07	1262	A.5	Metadata	Те	It is not completed. Only object perspective was discussed.  It should be clarified that how to define DEC after discussing the object perspectives as an example.	Provide DEC and VD examples	
					End of comments.		

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

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

Date: 16 April 2014 Document: ISO/IEC CD3 11179-1 (Ed 3) (SC32N2455)

1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
MB <sup>1</sup>	Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex (e.g. 3.1)	Paragraph/ Figure/Table/ Note (e.g. Table 1)	Type of com- ment <sup>2</sup>	Comment (justification for change) by the MB	Proposed change by the MB	Secretariat observations on each comment submitted
GB 01	General		ge	There are many references to Part 2 (11179-2). Since Ed 3 of 11179-3 now includes concept systems and classification there is a question over the future of Part 2.	Amend the text accordingly when the future of Part 2 has been determined by WG2.	
GB 02	3.2.20	Line 356	ed	"data model (3.2.7) that specifies one or more other data	Amend to read:	
		(pdf)		models" – but in 19763 metamodels are used to describe ontologies, process models, service models, etc, as well as information models.	data model (3.2.7) that specifies one or more other models, such as data models, process models, ontologies, etc	
GB 03	5.3	Line 669 (pdf)	ed	There is a spurious "555" at the end of the line.	Remove	
GB 04	5.3	Figure 1 – Line 694 (pdf)	ed	Since this figure is referenced at line 648 it would seem more appropriate for it to be earlier within this sub-clause.	Move the figure forward.	
GB 05	5.4	Lines 703- 704 (pdf)	ed	"Within the organization, databases are composed of records, segments, tuples, etc., which are composed of data elements." Whilst this is technically correct most people's knowledge of databases is of those based on SQL, where the equivalent construct is a row within a table.	Amend to read:  Within the organization, databases are composed of records, segments, tuples, rows within tables etc., which are composed of data elements.	
GB 06	5.5	Line 747 (pdf)	ed	Lire are no longer used – they have been replaced by the Euro.	Delete "Lire", insert "Euro".	
GB 07	5.5	Line 752 (pdf)	ed	Spelling.	Delete "Meters", insert "Metres".	
GB 08	Annex A	Line 1067 et seq	ed	Inconsistency – in the body of the draft "metamodel" is used but in this annex it is "meta-model"	Change all instances of "Meta-Model" and "meta-model" to "Metamodel" and "metamodel" respectively.	

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

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

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