

ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 32 N 1060

Date: 2003-10-03

REPLACES: --

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

| | |
|-------------------------|---|
| DOCUMENT TYPE | Summary of Voting/Table of Replies |
| TITLE | Summary of Voting on 32N1002 ISO/IEC DCOR 11179-3 Information technology –Metadata Registries (MDR) - Part 3: Registry Metamodel and basic attributes |
| SOURCE | SC 32 Secretariat |
| PROJECT NUMBER | 1.32.15.02.03.00 |
| STATUS | WG 2 should take and resolve the comments |
| REFERENCES | ACT |
| ACTION ID. | |
| REQUESTED ACTION | |
| DUE DATE | |
| Number of Pages | 4 |
| LANGUAGE USED | English |
| DISTRIBUTION | 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

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 N1060**Summary of Voting on Document SC 32 N 1002,****Title:** ISO ISO/IEC DCOR 11179-3 Information technology –Metadata Registries (MDR) - Part 3: Registry Metamodel and basic attributes

| "P" Member | Approval | Approval with Comments | Disapproval | Abstention |
|--------------------|-----------------|-------------------------------|--------------------|-------------------|
| Australia | X | | | |
| Belgium | | | | |
| Brazil | | | | |
| Canada | | X | | |
| China | | | | |
| Czech Republic | X | | | |
| Egypt | | | | |
| Finland | | | | |
| Germany | | | | |
| Italy | X | | | |
| Japan | X | | | |
| Korea, Republic of | X | | | |
| Netherlands, The | X | | | |
| Norway | X | | | |
| Portugal | | | | |
| Sweden | | | | X |
| United Kingdom | X | | | |
| United States | X | | | |
| Total "P" | 9 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| "O" Member | | | | |
| Austria | | | | |
| Denmark | | | | |
| France | | | | |
| Russian Federation | | | | |
| Switzerland | | | | |
| Total "O" | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | | | | |

SWEDEN
Lack of experts

CANADA

| SEQ # | Cmnt ID | See Also | Severity | Reference | Description | Addressed By |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|----------|-------------------|-----------|--|--------------|
| JTC1/SC32 N1002 DCOR 11179-3 | | | | | | |
| | CAN-P03-000 | | 3-Major Editorial | 00-All | Canada supports the changes proposed by the DCOR as written. Our remaining comments below identify additional problems in ISO/IEC 11179-3:2003, the resolutions of which should be added to the DCOR. Canada also requests that a revised FDIS be issued consolidating the DCOR into the standard. | |
| | CAN-P03-001 | | 4-Minor Editorial | 00-Cover | <p>The French title ISO/IEC 11179-3:2003 is not what was agreed in the resolution of FCD ballot comments. The editor made an error in the central element of the name. ISO-CS has amended the title of the 11179 family in their database on instructions from the SC32 Secretariat and the 11179-3 editor.</p> <p>Proposed Solution</p> <p>The central element of the French title should be: <i>Registre de métadonnées (RM)</i> - singular 'Registre' instead of plural 'Registres' - French acronym 'RM' instead of 'MDR'.</p> | |
| | CAN-P03-002 | | 4-Minor Editorial | 03.01.08 | In the Note, 'name' should be in bold because it is a defined term. | |
| | CAN-P03-003 | | 4-Minor Editorial | 03.02.10 | The reference to [ISO/IEC 2382-1:1998, 01.01.02] should be to [ISO/IEC 2382-1:1993, 01.01.02] | |
| | CAN-P03-004 | | 4-Minor Editorial | 03.02.11 | In the definition, 'data' should be in bold because it is a defined term. | |
| | CAN-P03-005 | | 4-Minor Editorial | 03.02.12 | In the definition, 'concept' should be in bold because it is a defined term. | |
| | CAN-P03-006 | | 4-Minor Editorial | 03.02.13 | In the definition, 'concept' should be in bold because it is a defined term. | |
| | CAN-P03-007 | | 4-Minor Editorial | 03.02.26 | In the definition, 'object' should be in bold because it is a defined term. | |
| | CAN-P03-008 | | 4-Minor Editorial | 03.03.036 | In the definition, 'data' should be in bold because it is a defined term. | |
| | CAN-P03-009 | | 4-Minor Editorial | 03.03.038 | In the definition, 'concept' should be in bold because it is a defined term. | |
| | CAN-P03-010 | | 2-Minor Technical | 03.03.099 | <p>Definition of "Permissible value" in 11179-3 does not reflect the relationships shown in the metamodel in Figure 9.</p> <p>Proposed Solution</p> <p>Use the new definition from FCD 11179-1: An ordered pair consisting of a value and its corresponding value meaning</p> | |
| | CAN-P03-011 | | 4-Minor Editorial | 03.03.139 | In the definition, 'data' should be in bold because it is a defined term. | |