

# ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 32 N 0925

Date: 2003-01-07

REPLACES: --

<p style="text-align: center;"><b>ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 32</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>Data Management and Interchange</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>Secretariat: United States of America (ANSI)</b> <b>Administered by Pacific Northwest National Laboratory on behalf of ANSI</b></p>
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

<b>DOCUMENT TYPE</b>	Summary of Voting/Table of Replies
<b>TITLE</b>	Summary of Voting on Document SC 32 N 0870, ISO/IEC PDTR 20943-3:200x(E) Information technology — Information Technology – Procedures for achieving metadata registry content consistency – Part 3: Value domains
<b>SOURCE</b>	SC 32 Secretariat
<b>PROJECT NUMBER</b>	1.32.16.01.03.00
<b>STATUS</b>	WG 2 is directed to address the comments
<b>REFERENCES</b>	
<b>ACTION ID.</b>	ACT
<b>REQUESTED ACTION</b>	
<b>DUE DATE</b>	
<b>Number of Pages</b>	22
<b>LANGUAGE USED</b>	English
<b>DISTRIBUTION</b>	P & L Members SC Chair WG Conveners and Secretaries

Douglas Mann, Secretariat, ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 32

Pacific Northwest National Laboratory \*, 13600 Angelica Court, Chantilly, VA, 20151-3360,  
United States of America

Telephone: +1 202-566-2126; Facsimile; +1 202-566-1639; E-mail: [MannD@battelle.org](mailto:MannD@battelle.org)

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

\*Pacific Northwest National Laboratory (PNL) administers the ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 32 Secretariat on behalf of ANSI

## ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 32 N0925

### Summary of Voting on Document SC 32 N 0870, ISO/IEC PDTR 20943-3:200x(E)

**Title:** Information technology — Information Technology – Procedures for achieving metadata registry content consistency – Part 3: Value domains

<b>“P” Member</b>	<b>Approval</b>	<b>Approval with Comments</b>	<b>Disapproval</b>	<b>Abstention</b>
Australia	X			
Belgium				
Brazil				
Canada			X	
China	X			
Czech Republic	X			
Egypt				
Finland				
France				
Germany				X
Italy				
Japan				
Korea, Republic of	X			
Netherlands, The	X			
Norway	X			
Sweden				X
United Kingdom			X	
United States	X			
<b>Total “P”</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>“O” Member</b>				
Austria				
Denmark				
Russian Federation				
Switzerland				
<b>Total “O”</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>

Germany

Lack of Interest

Sweden

Lack of expertise

ISO/IEC JTC1/SC32  
Data Management and Interchange

Secretariat: USA (ANSI)

**Title:** Ballot Comments on ISO/IEC PDTR 20943-3 (SC32 N0870)

**Source:** Canada

**Date:** 2002-12-15

**Status:** Canadian National Body Ballot Response

**References:**

- 1) ISO/IEC JTC1/SC32 N0870, ISO/IEC PDTR 20943-3, *Information Technology —Procedures for Achieving metadata registry content consistency — Part 3: Value Domains*.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Canada votes "DISAPPROVAL OF THE DRAFT FOR REASONS ON THE ATTACHED" on ISO/IEC PDTR 20943-3 [Ref 1]. However, Canada generally supports this document and acceptance of these reasons and appropriate changes to the text will change our vote to approval.

## 2. BALLOT COMMENTS

The following are the Canadian comments on ISO/IEC PDTR 20943-3 [Ref 1].

As agreed at the July 2000 Manhattan meeting of WG2, Canada has used the ballot comment format defined by WG2 SD-006 [3].

The columns in the document have the following meanings:

- **SEQ #** — A sequence number indicating the total number of comments – for use by the editor in the consolidated comments document.
- **Cmnt ID** — The comment identifier assigned by the organization submitting the comment
- **See Also** — Pointers to (comment identifiers of) other comments that appear to be closely related
- **Severity** — The severity of the problem as stated by the organization submitting the comment
- **Reference** — The location in the balloted document that the organization identified as most pertaining to the comment
- **Description** — The description provided by the organization with the comment; this includes any proposed solution provided by the organization
- **Addressed By** — “Comment” if a solution was provided by the organization; a paper number if a known proposal addresses the comment; blank otherwise.

SEQ #	Cmnt ID	See Also	Severity	Reference	Description	Address ed By
<b>JTC1/SC32/WG2 PDTR 20943-3 (SC32 N0870)</b>						
	CAN-TR3-021	CAN-TR3-043	1-Major Technical	TR3-04-01-08	<p>The distinction between a <b>data element concept</b> and a <b>conceptual domain</b> merits discussion in the working group. Another way of looking at the distinction is that a data element concept represents a property in the context of an object class (see also CAN-TR3-043), whereas the conceptual domain may be more independent of a particular object class. (Is this true?)</p> <p>This comment is intended as a placeholder just in case that discussion leads to changes to the text here. Also, this text would be useful in 11179-1.</p>	
	CAN-TR3-048		1-Major Technical	TR3-04-01-12	<p>4.1.12 is supposed to describe an unbounded domain, but the UPC example is not unbounded (it has a lower and an upper bound). The UPC domain changes rapidly but it is always controlled.</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>Proposed Solution</b></p> <p>Use UPC as an example of a rapidly changing domain, removing all references to "unbounded". The discussion of unbounded domains probably belongs in 4.1.9 under non-enumerated domains. By definition, any enumerated domain must be bounded.</p>	
	CAN-TR3-022	CAN-TR3-023	1-Major Technical	TR3-04-02 TR3-04-04	<p>4.2 uses a classification scheme as an example of structure in a value domain, and 4.4 discusses classification schemes as value domains. However, it may not be apparent to the reader that 11179 also supports classification schemes directly.</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>Proposed Solution</b></p> <p>Add text stating that 11179 also supports classification schemes directly.</p>	
	CAN-TR3-049		1-Major Technical	TR3-04-02-02	<p>4.2.2 needs an example to show how LOINC would be represented in a 11179-3 MDR.</p>	
	CAN-TR3-006	CAN-TR3-005 CAN-TR3-008	2-Minor Technical	TR3-00-All	<p>FDIS 11179-3 no longer refers to "enumerated domains", but to "enumerated value domains" and "enumerated conceptual domains".</p>	

SEQ #	Cmnt ID	See Also	Severity	Reference	Description	Address ed By
<b>JTC1/SC32/WG2 PDTR 20943-3 (SC32 N0870)</b>						
		CAN-TR3-009 CAN-TR3-010 CAN-TR3-011 CAN-TR3-012 CAN-TR3-013 CAN-TR3-014 CAN-TR3-015 CAN-TR3-016 CAN-TR3-017 CAN-TR3-018			Similarly for "non-enumerated domains".  <b>Proposed Solution</b> Change all occurrences of "enumerated domain(s)" to either "enumerated value domain(s)" or "enumerated conceptual domain(s)", as appropriate.. Similarly for "non-enumerated domains". [Note: It may be acceptable to use the term(s) "(non-)enumerated domain" if the intent is to refer generically to both value domains and conceptual domains, but if so, that should be explicitly stated. E.g. see CAN-TR3-014.]	
	CAN-TR3-027		2-Minor Technical	TR3-01-04	1.4, line 1 introduces the term "code set", which is used extensively throughout the document, but the term is not defined. Neither is it defined in any part of 11179. 4.3 line 1 states that "Code sets are lists of permissible values". There are two problems with this description.  (1) a set may be more than just a list. (2) coding implies an associated meaning.  <b>Proposed Solution</b> Add the following definition to clause 3: <b>Code set</b> – A set of permissible values and associated value meanings.  Note 1: In 11179 terminology, the permissible values correspond to a value domain (defined as "a set of permissible values"), and the associated meanings correspond to the associated conceptual domain (defined as "a set of valid value meanings").	

SEQ #	Cmnt ID	See Also	Severity	Reference	Description	Address ed By
<b>JTC1/SC32/WG2 PDTR 20943-3 (SC32 N0870)</b>						
					<p>Note 2: A list of code values would be equivalent to an enumerated value domain. But a set of codes could be defined by a rule that does not require the list to be enumerated. This is equivalent to a non-enumerated value domain. The associated meanings, correspond to the associated conceptual domain.</p> <p>&lt;end of definition&gt;</p> <p>Thus a code set would appear to be the combination of a value domain and its associated conceptual domain. Are there any value domains that could not be equated to a code set, as defined above?</p> <p>Would it be helpful to include this definition and description in the next edition of 11179-3 as well?</p> <p>Consider reducing the usage of the term code set, since it is not a term defined in 11179.</p>	
	CAN-TR3-004		2-Minor Technical	TR3-03-01	<p>The term is not as specific as its definition. The term refers to "domains", while the definition refers to "value domains".</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>Proposed Solution</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Change the term to "<b>Conceptually equivalent value domains</b>".</li> <li>2. Apply this change wherever the term is used.</li> </ol>	
	CAN-TR3-005	CAN-TR3-006	2-Minor Technical	TR3-03-02	<p>The term and definition refer to "domains", but the definition is expressed in terms of permissible values, and must therefore necessarily be referring to "value domains". Also, FDIS 11179-3 no longer refers to "enumerated domains", as used in the definition, but to "enumerated value domains" and "enumerated conceptual domains" (see also CAN-TR3-006).</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>Proposed Solution</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Change the term to "Elementary equivalent value domains".</li> </ol>	

SEQ #	Cmnt ID	See Also	Severity	Reference	Description	Address ed By
<b>JTC1/SC32/WG2 PDTR 20943-3 (SC32 N0870)</b>						
					2. In the definition, change "enumerated domains" to "enumerated value domains". 3. In Note 2, change "Enumerated domains" to "enumerated value domains". 4. In Note 3, change "enumerated domains" to "enumerated value domains". 5. In Note 4, change "enumerated domains" to "enumerated value domains" (two occurrences). 6. Apply this change wherever the term is used.	
	CAN-TR3-008	CAN-TR3-006	2-Minor Technical	TR3-04-01	Apply CAN-TR3-006 to 4.1 paragraph 2 (4 occurrences), paragraph 3 (3 occurrences)	
	CAN-TR3-031		2-Minor Technical	TR3-04-01-02	It would be helpful to provide more guidance as to when to use a new version of an existing value domain, and when to use an independent domain.  <p style="text-align: center;"><b>Proposed Solution</b></p> Add the following text before the last sentence of the first paragraph in 4.1.2, and make the last sentence a new paragraph: <begin text>  If the purpose of the extended value domain is different from the purpose of the original value domain, the extended value domain should be defined as a new value domain. However, if the extended value domain is the result of an extension of the original purpose, then a new version of the same value domain would be appropriate. The previous version of the value domain may be retained and referenced for compatibility purposes, but from a logical perspective, the new version supersedes the old.  <end text>	
	CAN-TR3-009	CAN-TR3-006	2-Minor	TR3-04-01-04	Apply CAN-TR3-006 to the Figure in 4.1.4 (2 occurrences)	

SEQ #	Cmnt ID	See Also	Severity	Reference	Description	Address ed By
<b>JTC1/SC32/WG2 PDTR 20943-3 (SC32 N0870)</b>						
			Technical			
	CAN-TR3-032		2-Minor Technical	TR3-04-01-04	In the first line, replace "equivalent codes" by "equivalent permissible values".	
	CAN-TR3-010	CAN-TR3-006	2-Minor Technical	TR3-04-01-09	Apply CAN-TR3-006 to 4.1.9 (5 occurrences including the title).	
	CAN-TR3-044		2-Minor Technical	TR3-04-01-09	In 4.1.9, reference is made to "an exhaustive list of values". Whether or not a list is exhaustive will depend very much on content, and we believe the use of this term could lead to confusion. Note that the 2 <sup>nd</sup> WD 18022 contains a section on "exhaustive" vs. non-exhaustive". (E.g. The list of codes in ISO 3166-1 is non-exhaustive, because it allows for user extensions, while the list of codes in ISO 3166-2 are exhaustive. Since 11179-3 does not use the term "exhaustive", let the TR not use it either.  <b>Proposed Solution</b> Replace "exhaustive" by "enumerated".	
	CAN-TR3-011	CAN-TR3-006	2-Minor Technical	TR3-04-01-10	Apply CAN-TR3-006 to 4.1.10 (once in each example).	
	CAN-TR3-012	CAN-TR3-006	2-Minor Technical	TR3-04-01-11	Apply CAN-TR3-006 to 4.1.11 paragraph 1 (2 occurrences), paragraph 2 (1 occurrence)	
	CAN-TR3-013	CAN-TR3-006	2-Minor Technical	TR3-04-01-12	Apply CAN-TR3-006 to 4.1.12, title, paragraph 1 (1 occurrence), paragraph 2 (1 occurrence), paragraph 3 (4 occurrences)	
	CAN-TR3-034		2-Minor Technical	TR3-04-02-01	The examples in 4.2.1 show conceptual domain relationships. There is an open issue for 11179-3 as to how such relationships should be represented. It would be helpful if WG2 could reach agreement on this issue and include the resolution in the next draft of this document.	
	CAN-TR3-050	CAN-TR3-027	2-Minor Technical	TR3-04-03	Apply CAN-TR3-027 to 4.3.  <b>Proposed Solution</b> 1. Replace the first and second sentences by:	

SEQ #	Cmnt ID	See Also	Severity	Reference	Description	Address ed By
<b>JTC1/SC32/WG2 PDTR 20943-3 (SC32 N0870)</b>						
					<p>"A code set consists of a set of values and (at least implicitly) their associated value meanings. The values in the code set may be represented by a value domain, and the corresponding value meanings by the associated conceptual domain."</p> <p>2. insert after the fifth sentence (...evokes the concept.):</p> <p>"The words that express the meaning must be interpreted in the context of the Conceptual Domain so that for example when the conceptual domain represents countries, the value meaning 'Turkey' is not interpreted as a type of bird."</p>	
	CAN-TR3-014	CAN-TR3-006	2-Minor Technical	TR3-04-04	Apply CAN-TR3-006 to 4.4, paragraph 1 (1 occurrence). This may be an instance where the generic use of "enumerated domain" is appropriate.	
	CAN-TR3-015	CAN-TR3-006	2-Minor Technical	TR3-04-05	Apply CAN-TR3-006 to 4.5, in the Example (2 occurrences).	
	CAN-TR3-016	CAN-TR3-006	2-Minor Technical	TR3-04-06	Apply CAN-TR3-006 to 4.6 (10 occurrences).	
	CAN-TR3-035		2-Minor Technical	TR3-04-06	<p>In 4.6, the paragraph below example 1 states that the enumerated (value) domain in the example uses the unit of measures 'years' to label the values meanings. However, it should be pointed out that it would be inappropriate to specify the unit of measure attribute as "years", since the permissible values (1-4) are codes, and have no directly associated unit of measure. The unit of measure attribute in the value domain should be used only where the permissible values are expressed in that unit.</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>Proposed Solution</b></p> <p>Either add explanatory text, or delete or change this example.</p>	
	CAN-TR3-036		2-Minor Technical	TR3-04-06	<p>In 4.6, example 2 shows similar value domains using different units of measure, but does not list the unit of measure attribute.</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>Proposed Solution</b></p> <p>In example 2, add:</p>	

SEQ #	Cmnt ID	See Also	Severity	Reference	Description	Address ed By
<b>JTC1/SC32/WG2 PDTR 20943-3 (SC32 N0870)</b>						
					- for value domain 1: Unit of measure: US gallon - for value domain 2: Unit of measure: liter [Note we have used the singular since the attribute is "unit of measure".]	
	CAN-TR3-017	CAN-TR3-006	2-Minor Technical	TR3-04-07	Apply CAN-TR3-006 to 4.7 (3 occurrences).	
	CAN-TR3-018	CAN-TR3-006	2-Minor Technical	TR3-04-08	Apply CAN-TR3-006 to 4.8 (2 occurrences).	
	CAN-TR3-055		2-Minor Technical	TR3-05-01	In the examples, the value meaning "Other" is assigned to the last value in the list. Typically this is not a good approach, since if the domain of values grows, "Other" ends up being in the middle of the list. <b>Proposed Solution</b> Use "0" as the value for Other. Consider adding a paragraph on this technique to the list of strategies in 5.2. Consider similar discussion of values for "Unknown" and "Not applicable".	
	CAN-TR3-060		2-Minor Technical	TR3-05-03-01	In the example based on ISO 3166, it is unclear why the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics would be the submitting organization for an International Standard. If the example is intended to represent the use of ISO 3166 by BLS, then the conceptual domain context should be qualified by Bureau of Labor Statistics in some way.	
	CAN-TR3-061		2-Minor Technical	TR3-05-03-02	In the example on measures of latitude, "Unit of Measure" and Precision are shown as "Not applicable". In fact, the Unit of Measure should be "Degrees of latitude", a precision should be specified, and a Dimensionality "Latitude" should be specified for the Conceptual Domain.	
	CAN-TR3-062		2-Minor	TR3-05-03-02	In the example based on ISO 6709:1983, it is unclear why the U.S.	

SEQ #	Cmnt ID	See Also	Severity	Reference	Description	Address ed By								
<b>JTC1/SC32/WG2 PDTR 20943-3 (SC32 N0870)</b>														
			Technical		Bureau of Labor Statistics would be the submitting organization for an International Standard. If the example is intended to represent the use of ISO 6709:1983 by BLS, then the conceptual domain context should be qualified by Bureau of Labor Statistics in some way.									
	CAN-TR3-037	CAN-TR3-038 CAN-TR3-039 CAN-TR3-040	3-Major Editorial	<i>TR3-00-All</i>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Validate that all referenced URLs are functional before publication.</li> <li>2. Put these references in footnotes rather than the body of the text.</li> <li>3. Add a section to the Bibliography to list the referenced URLs.</li> </ol>									
	CAN-TR3-041		3-Major Editorial	<i>TR3-04,</i> <i>TR3-05</i>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. One of the labels in the examples is "Permissible values:", but the associated data include value meanings.</li> <li>2. The examples in clauses 4 and 5 use a syntax: &lt;value, meaning&gt; to express permissible values and their associated meanings, but nowhere is this syntax explained. Even adding an explanation before the examples requires someone to read the explanation before they read the example. [Remember that for much of the world, a comma indicates a decimal point.] It would be better if the examples were more self-explanatory.</li> </ol> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>Proposed Solution</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Change the label "permissible values:" to "permissible values and their meanings:"</li> <li>2. Preferably, use a table to structure the permissible values and their meanings (see example below). At a minimum, add text that explains the syntax prior to its use.</li> </ol> <table border="1" style="margin-left: auto; margin-right: auto;"> <thead> <tr> <th>Permissible value</th> <th>Value Meaning</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">0</td> <td>Unknown</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">1</td> <td>Male</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">2</td> <td>Female</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Permissible value	Value Meaning	0	Unknown	1	Male	2	Female	
Permissible value	Value Meaning													
0	Unknown													
1	Male													
2	Female													
	CAN-TR3-042		3-Major	<i>TR3-04-01</i>	The explanation of the relationship of a Value Domain to a Conceptual									

SEQ #	Cmnt ID	See Also	Severity	Reference	Description	Address ed By
<b>JTC1/SC32/WG2 PDTR 20943-3 (SC32 N0870)</b>						
			Editorial		<p>Domain and a Data Element Concept would benefit from a diagram.</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>Proposed Solution</b></p> <p>Include a copy of the following figure from FDIS 11179-3 Figure 3.</p> <div style="text-align: center;"> <pre> classDiagram     class Data_Element_Concept     class Conceptual_Domain     class Data_Element     class Value_Domain      Data_Element_Concept "0..*" -- "1..1" Conceptual_Domain : expressed_by     Conceptual_Domain "1..1" -- "0..*" Data_Element_Concept : having     Conceptual_Domain "1..1" -- "0..*" Data_Element : specifying     Data_Element "0..*" -- "1..1" Value_Domain : representing     Value_Domain "0..*" -- "1..1" Conceptual_Domain : represented_by     Data_Element "0..*" -- "0..*" Value_Domain : data_element_representation     </pre> </div>	
	CAN-TR3-023	CAN-TR3-022	3-Major Editorial	TR3-04-02, TR3-04-04	<p>A classification scheme is used as an example in 4.2, before classification schemes as values domains are discussed in 4.4. This seems out of sequence.</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>Proposed Solution</b></p> <p>Restructure 4.2 through 4.4 so that classification schemes as values domains are discussed before any is used as an example. It may suffice to move 4.2 after 4.4.</p>	
	CAN-TR3-054		3-Major Editorial	TR3-05	<p>Explain the structure of the clause more thoroughly.</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>Proposed Solution</b></p> <p>After the first sentence, insert:</p>	

SEQ #	Cmnt ID	See Also	Severity	Reference	Description	Address ed By
<b>JTC1/SC32/WG2 PDTR 20943-3 (SC32 N0870)</b>						
					"5.1 explains the rules for registering domains. 5.2 describes strategies for registering domains. 5.3 provides examples, based on the rules and strategies."	
	CAN-TR3-007		4-Minor Editorial	<i>TR3-00-All</i>	<p>There are several instances where "Non-enumerated" is preceded by "an" instead of "a".</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>Proposed Solution</b></p> <p>Substitute "a" for "an" as appropriate.</p>	
	CAN-TR3-019		4-Minor Editorial	<i>TR3-00-All</i>	<p>Examples are used extensively throughout the document, but many are unnumbered, and others are numbered only within the lowest level subclause. This makes it difficult to reference a particular example (e.g. the example in 4.1.4 is unnumbered but contains references to "Example 1" and "Example 2". It appears that "Example 1" is intended to refer to the unnumbered example in 4.1, and that "Example 2" is intended to refer to the unnumbered example in 4.1.1.</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>Proposed Solution</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Examples should be numbered uniquely and in sequence throughout the whole document.</li> <li>2. Existing references should be adjusted accordingly.</li> <li>3. Examples should be given descriptive captions.</li> <li>4. A Table of Examples should be included after the Table of Contents. To facilitate this, the captions should be applied using the Insert Caption feature of Word.</li> </ol>	
	CAN-TR3-024		4-Minor Editorial	<i>TR3-00-Foreword</i>	<p>The Foreword references both TR 20943-1 and 2. Part 2 does not even have a WD yet, so is unlikely to be published by the time part 3 is published. Also the name given to Part 2 does not match that in the SC32 Programme of Work, which is "XML Structured Data".</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>Proposed Solution</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Ensure that the name of part 2 is that which will be used when it is published.</li> </ol>	

SEQ #	Cmnt ID	See Also	Severity	Reference	Description	Address ed By
<b>JTC1/SC32/WG2 PDTR 20943-3 (SC32 N0870)</b>						
					2. Add a note after part 2 that it is under development. (The Editor should validate this approach with ISOCS.)	
	CAN-TR3-001		4-Minor Editorial	<i>TR3-00-Introduction</i>	In paragraph 3, insert "on" after "This technical report is based..."	
	CAN-TR3-025		4-Minor Editorial	<i>TR3-01-01</i>	<p>1.1 line 1 refers to: " An ISO/IEC 11179 metadata registry (MDR) (hereafter referred to as a "registry)". There are many different types of registry, but the term MDR clearly identifies a 11179 metadata registry. This will also have the advantage of promoting use of the term MDR.</p> <p>[Note however, that FDIS 11179-3 does not use MDR in the body of the text. It uses the terms "metadata registry" and "registry" interchangeably, more often the former.]</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>Proposed Solution</b></p> <p>Consider:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>replacing a use of "a/the registry" by "an/the MDR" throughout the document.</li> <li>deleting the phrase "(hereafter referred to as a "registry")" in 1.1.</li> </ol>	
	CAN-TR3-026		4-Minor Editorial	<i>TR3-01-01</i>	1.1, 1st paragraph, last line uses the phrase "information database". Would not just "database" be sufficient? I.e. are there "non" information databases?	
	CAN-TR3-002		4-Minor Editorial	<i>TR3-02-References</i>	Remove the reference to ISO/IEC 11179-3:1994. This edition has been superseded by the 2002 edition.	
	CAN-TR3-028		4-Minor Editorial	<i>TR3-03-02 Note 2</i>	A Canadian comment on the previous draft complained about the mathematical nature of the definition of "elementarily equivalent domains" in that draft and proposed text on which Note 2 is based as a replacement definition. The editor rejected the proposal, supplied his own improved wording for the definition and kept the Canadian proposal as Note 2. However, the new definition is a substantial improvement, and this Note now seems redundant.	

SEQ #	Cmnt ID	See Also	Severity	Reference	Description	Address ed By
<b>JTC1/SC32/WG2 PDTR 20943-3 (SC32 N0870)</b>						
					<b>Proposed Solution</b> Delete Note 2, and renumber subsequent Notes.	
	CAN-TR3-003		4-Minor Editorial	<i>TR3-03-Terms and definitions</i>	The Word styles are applied to the term numbers and terms are not the recommended styles, with the result that the spacing is not as recommended in the ISO/IEC Directives.  <b>Proposed Solution</b> For the term numbers 3.1 and 3.2 use the style "TermNum" instead of the present style "p2". For the terms, use the style "Term(s)", instead of the style "Definition".	
	CAN-TR3-029		4-Minor Editorial	<i>TR3-04 TR3-04-01</i>	Clause 4, item 1 refers to "general fact and principles" and the title of clause is "General facts". We suggest it would be better just to refer to "General principles".  <b>Proposed Solution</b> 1. In clause 4, item 1, replace "general fact and principles" by "general principles". 2. In clause 4.1, change the title to "General principles".	
	CAN-TR3-045		4-Minor Editorial	<i>TR3-04</i>	In the examples, the Value Domain Name is the first attribute provided. It is not always apparent from the name what the example is going to be about. Definitions are provided for the Conceptual Domains but not for the Value Domains. In a 11179-3 MDR, value domains, as administered items, will require definitions. It may also be easier to an example if the Conceptual Domain is encountered first.  <b>Proposed Solution</b> Either add Value Domain definitions, or move the Conceptual Domain name and definition before the Value Domain name, or both.	
	CAN-TR3-020		4-Minor Editorial	<i>TR3-04-01-01</i>	In the second sentence of 4.1.1, "but set" should be "but the set".	

SEQ #	Cmnt ID	See Also	Severity	Reference	Description	Address ed By
<b>JTC1/SC32/WG2 PDTR 20943-3 (SC32 N0870)</b>						
	CAN-TR3-043	CAN-TR3-021	4-Minor Editorial	TR3-04-01-05	In 4.1.5, the data element concept <i>sex of employee</i> represents the property <i>sex</i> on the object class <i>Employee</i> , and the data element concept <i>sex of student</i> represents the property <i>sex</i> on the object class <i>Student</i> .  Is there any value to adding text to this effect?	
	CAN-TR3-033		4-Minor Editorial	TR3-04-01-07	In 4.1.7, third sentence, the term "maintenance organization" is used. ISO Directives use the term "maintenance agency". 11179 uses the term Registration Authority. A maintenance agency may maintain a registry on behalf of a registration authority. Which do we mean here? Also, some readers may not understand what a maintenance agency or registration authority is or does, so some qualifying text is suggested.  <b>Proposed Solution</b> Replace "maintenance organization for" by either: - "maintenance agency which is the authority for maintaining the code values for" or - "registration authority which is the authority for assigning the code values for".	
	CAN-TR3-046		4-Minor Editorial	TR3-04-01-10	In 4.1.10, example 1, the value domain name and description could be improved. The name should be more succinct, and the description should be more descriptive.  <b>Proposed Solution</b> Remove the phrase "and special values" from the value domain name, and change the description to: "All integers greater than or equal to 0, and special values –1 and –2."	
	CAN-TR3-047		4-Minor Editorial	TR3-04-01-10	In 4.1.10, example 2, the value domain name suggests a generic "preference scale", but the meanings assigned to two of the special values refer to "participation", which is related more to the data element than the value domain.	

SEQ #	Cmnt ID	See Also	Severity	Reference	Description	Address ed By
<b>JTC1/SC32/WG2 PDTR 20943-3 (SC32 N0870)</b>						
					<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Proposed Solution</b></p> Change the value meaning "Will not participate" to "Definitely not". Change the value meaning "Will participate" to "Definitely ".	
	CAN-TR3-038	CAN-TR3-037	4-Minor Editorial	TR3-04-02-01	The referenced URL gets redirected to another. <p style="text-align: center;"><b>Proposed Solution</b></p> Replace the reference URL by the new URL: <a href="http://unstats.un.org/unsd/">http://unstats.un.org/unsd/</a>	
	CAN-TR3-039	CAN-TR3-037	4-Minor Editorial	TR3-04-02-02	The referenced URL gets redirected to another. <p style="text-align: center;"><b>Proposed Solution</b></p> Replace the reference URL by the new URL: <a href="http://www.loinc.org/">http://www.loinc.org/</a>	
	CAN-TR3-051	CAN-TR3-052 CAN-TR3-053	4-Minor Editorial	TR3-04-03	The reference to ISO 3166 should be to ISO 3166-1.	
	CAN-TR3-056		4-Minor Editorial	TR3-04-03	In paragraph 2, first sentence, replace "trick" by "technique".	
	CAN-TR3-040	CAN-TR3-037	4-Minor Editorial	TR3-04-07	When we prepared these comments, the URL at <a href="http://pueblo.lbl.gov/~olken/mendel/w3c/xml.schema.wg/units/syntax.htm">http://pueblo.lbl.gov/~olken/mendel/w3c/xml.schema.wg/units/syntax.htm</a> was not responding.	
	CAN-TR3-057		4-Minor Editorial	TR3-05-03	Add a reference back to 5.1 to explain the structure of the tables in the examples.	
	CAN-TR3-052	CAN-TR3-051 CAN-TR3-053	4-Minor Editorial	TR3-05-03-01	The references to ISO 3166 should be to ISO 3166-1. (3 occurrences)	
	CAN-TR3-058		4-Minor Editorial	TR3-05-03-01	Either the significance of the structure of the identifiers should be explained (e.g. (93-273-8065) 1234:1), or identifiers without such complex structures should be used.	

SEQ #	Cmnt ID	See Also	Severity	Reference	Description	Address ed By
<b>JTC1/SC32/WG2 PDTR 20943-3 (SC32 N0870)</b>						
	CAN-TR3-059		4-Minor Editorial	<i>TR3-05-03-01</i>	What is the significance of the numbers in the first column of the table?	
	CAN-TR3-063		4-Minor Editorial	<i>TR3-99-Annex A</i>	Add a footnote that ISO/IEC 11179-3:2002 is to be made publicly available, and reference <a href="http://www.jtc1.org">www.jtc1.org</a> .	
	CAN-TR3-053	CAN-TR3-051 CAN-TR3-052	4-Minor Editorial	<i>TR3-99-Bibliography</i>	The reference to ISO 3166:1997 should be to ISO 3166-1:1997.	
	CAN-TR3-030		5-For Information only	<i>TR3-04-01</i>	<p>4.1 uses an example based on ISO/IEC 5812, which is currently being revised. The 2nd edition, 2003 will contain an information Annex titled "Annex A (Informative) Codes for the representation of the human sexes and cultural adaptability/Annexe A (Informative) – Codes pour la représentation des sexes humains et l'adaptabilité culturelle ". This Annex has a single code set (value domain) with value meanings expressed in multiple languages. This is something that 11179-3:2002 does not support, but one way of viewing it might be as elementarily equivalent conceptual domains.</p> <p>[Note: Because 11179-3:2002 does not support this scenario, neither should this TR at this time. This comment will be submitted to the next revision of 11179-3.]</p>	

## UK vote of disapproval to ballot on FCD 20943-3, Information technology - Procedures for achieving metadata registry content consistency — Part 3: Value domains

### The UK votes No with the following comment:

The UK strongly supports this work, but notes a few minor errors and inconsistencies. Once these defects have been corrected, the UK will change its vote to positive.

SEQ #	Cmnt ID	See Also	Severity	Reference	Description	Addressed By
	GBR-P03-001		4-Minor Editorial	P03-Foreword	The ISO/IEC drafting rules are now Part 2 of the Directives (see fourth edition, 2001), but the Foreword references them as Part 3.  <b>Proposed Solution</b> Change “Part 3” in the second sentence to “Part 2”.	
	GBR-P03-002		4-Minor Editorial	P03-Foreword	The correct designation of the SC32 parent committee is ISO/IEC JTC 1, rather than ISO/IEC/TC JTC 1, as presented in the sixth paragraph of the Foreword.  <b>Proposed Solution</b> Change “ISO/IEC/TC JTC 1” in the second sentence to “ISO/IEC JTC 1”.	
	GBR-P03-003		4-Minor Editorial	P03-Foreword	The first and fourth entries in the bullet list at the end of the Foreword are both “Part 3: Value domains”. There is no need for repetition.  <b>Proposed Solution</b> Delete the first item from the bullet list at the end of the Foreword.	
	GBR-P03-004		4-Minor Editorial	P03-Introduction	References to ISO/IEC 11179-3 include the edition date. They should not do so.  <b>Proposed Solution</b> Ensure that no references in the Introduction include an edition date.	
	GBR-P03-005		4-Minor Editorial	P03-01	Of the four sub-clauses of the Scope clause, only 1.2 and 1.3 appear to satisfy the requirements of the ISO/IEC drafting rules for the contents of the Scope clause (see directives Part 2, sub-clause 6.2.1). There is no obvious reason why 1.2 and 1.3 should be separate sub-clauses. Sub-clauses 1.2 and 1.4 contain material that might better positioned after clause 3.  <b>Proposed Solution</b> None offered with comment	
	GBR-P03-006		4-Minor Editorial	P03-02	The References clause does not include the introductory text prescribed by clause 6.2.2 of the ISO/IEC drafting rules.  <b>Proposed Solution</b> None offered with comment	

SEQ #	Cmnt ID	See Also	Severity	Reference	Description	Addressed By
	GBR-P03-007		4-Minor Editorial	P03-02	Both 1994 and 2000 editions of Part 3 are listed as normative references.  <b>Proposed Solution</b> Remove the reference to the 1994 edition.	
	GBR-P03-008		4-Minor Technical	P03-02	A normative reference to ISO/IEC 20943-1 is included, but that document is not referenced elsewhere in the normative text.  <b>Proposed Solution</b> Delete the reference to ISO/IEC 20943-1	
	GBR-P03-009		4-Minor Editorial	P03-04	Many of the references to other standards in clause 4, and possibly elsewhere, include a reference to a specific edition. If done at all, this should occur only in clause 3.  <b>Proposed Solution</b> Ensure that all references in clause 3 do include an edition date, and that none in clause 4 do.	
	GBR-P03-010		4-Minor Editorial	PP03-04-02	The hanging paragraph following the 4.2 sub-clause heading violates a requirement stated in sub-clause 5.2.4 of the ISO/IEC drafting rules. Numbered headings should be introduced for this and other paragraphs in similar situations throughout the document.  <b>Proposed Solution</b> None offered with comment	
	GBR-P03-0011		4-Minor Editorial	P03-Bib	All of the references in the Bibliography are to standards. There is a helpful sentence at the start of clause 2 referencing the Bibliography, but no explanation in the Bibliography itself.  <b>Proposed Solution</b> Add text at the start of the Bibliography explaining its role, such as the following:  “Standards from which examples are used in this document are listed below. Standards to which normative reference is made are listed in clause 2.”	