

ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 32 N 1075

Date: 2004-01-13

REPLACES: --

<p>ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 32</p> <p>Data Management and Interchange</p> <p>Secretariat: United States of America (ANSI) Administered by Pacific Northwest National Laboratory on behalf of ANSI</p>

DOCUMENT TYPE	Disposition of Comments
TITLE	Resolution of Comments ISO/IEC 11179 Part 5, CD ballot
SOURCE	Judith Newton (Editor)
PROJECT NUMBER	1.32.15.02.05.00
STATUS	With the inclusion of these comments the FCD has been put forward as 32N1073
REFERENCES	
ACTION ID.	FYI
REQUESTED ACTION	
DUE DATE	
Number of Pages	8
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

2003-11-20

RESOLUTION OF COMMENTS FOR FCD 11179-5

This document records the editor's response to comments in ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 32 N 0995, "Summary of Voting/Table of Replies" to ballot of SC 32 N 0972, 2nd CD ISO/IEC CD 11179-5.

The relevant Canadian comments have been addressed by the editor and incorporated into the Editor's Draft of ISO/IEC FCD 11179-5 distributed with this document. The disposition of each comment is given in the "Addressed by" column.

Please reply with any comments to the Editor's Draft by December 19, 2003.

CANADA

Project: 1.32.15.02.05.00
Title: Canadian Ballot Comments on CD 11179-5 (32N0972)
Status: Canadian Ballot Comment
Date: November 25, 2003

1. INTRODUCTION

Canada votes "DISAPPROVAL FOR THE REASONS ATTACHED" on ISO/IEC CD 11179-5 (N0972).

2. BALLOT COMMENTS

The following are the Canadian comments on ISO/IEC CD 11179-5 (N0972)

As agreed at the 2000 Manhattan meeting of WG2, Canada has used the ballot comment format defined by WG2 SD-006 and therefore the following ballot comments are sorted by sub-clause number with those comments that apply to the whole document at the beginning.

The columns in the document have the following meanings:

- **SEQ #** — A sequence number indicating the total number of comments – for use by the editor when consolidating comments.
- **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** — For use by the Editor during and following the editing meeting.

SEQ #	Cmnt ID	See Also	Severity	Reference	Description	Addressed By
JTC1/SC32 N972 CD 11179-5						
	CAN-P05-001		4-Minor Editorial	<i>00- Foreword</i>	The Title of Part 3 is incorrect. Proposed Solution It should be "Registry metamodel and basic attributes "	Done
	CAN-P05-002		4-Minor Editorial	<i>03 Terms and definitions</i>	The ISO template provides styles: TermNum, Term(s), and Definition to help standardize the presentation of the terms and definitions in clause 3. Proposed Solution Apply the standard styles.	Done
	CAN-P05-003		2-Minor Technical	<i>03 Terms and definitions</i>	The clause makes general reference to terms and definitions given elsewhere in 11179. However, it is not obvious from reading this part what those terms and definitions are. Proposed Solution Include entries (without definitions) for 11179 terms used in this document.	Done. Added terms: "administered item," "context," "name."
	CAN-P05-004		2-Minor Technical	<i>03-05 03-07 03-09</i>	The term "semantic component" is used in several places (e.g. 3.5, 3.7 and 3.9) but is not defined. Proposed Solution Add a definition for "semantic component".	Done.
	CAN-P05-005		2-Minor Technical	<i>03-05 03-07 03-09</i>	3.5, 3.7 and 3.9 each contain a Note: 3.5 - Note: an example of the application of a structure set, i.e., the logical data grouping (in a logical data model), to the semantic component of a name. 3.7 - Note: an example of the application of a structure set, i.e., a descriptive characteristic of the object class, to the	Done.

SEQ #	Cmnt ID	See Also	Severity	Reference	Description	Addressed By
					<p>semantic component of a name.</p> <p>3.9 - Note: an example of the application of a structure set, i.e., a classification of forms with definitions, to the semantic component of a name.</p> <p>There are at least two problems here.</p> <p>(1) We do not understand what is meant by the phrase "an example of the application of a structure set". Using a complete sentence might make the meaning clearer.</p> <p>(2) The use of i.e. in each case with three different examples looks</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Proposed Solution</p> <p>The following rewording is suggested:</p> <p>3.5 - Note: An object class term is an example of the application of a structure set, (in this case the data grouping in a logical data model), to the semantic component of a name.</p> <p>3.7 - Note: A property term is an example of the application of a structure set (in this case a descriptive characteristic of the object class), to the semantic component of a name.</p> <p>3.9 - Note: A representation term is an example of the application of a structure set (in this case a classification of forms with definitions), to the semantic component of a name.</p>	
	CAN-P05-006		4-Minor Editorial	<i>04</i>	In item 2, add a reference to 11179-6 for further information.	Done.
	CAN-P05-007		4-Minor Editorial	<i>04</i>	In item 4, add a reference to 11179-3 for further information.	Done.
	CAN-P05-		2-Minor	<i>06-01</i>	The first sentence states: "Namespaces are categories used to sort	The text in

SEQ #	Cmnt ID	See Also	Severity	Reference	Description	Addressed By
	008		Technical		<p>data objects." The word "sort" is inappropriate.</p> <p>Proposed Solution A better word would be "segregate", but that is used in the next sentence. Perhaps the two sentences can be combined.</p>	subclause 6.1 has been removed. The "hanging paragraph" text formerly directly beneath the clause 6 title has become subclause 6.1, which has been renamed.
	CAN-P05-009	CAN-P05-010 CAN-P05-011	2-Minor Technical	07	<p>The fourth bullet in para. 3 states: "A uniqueness rule documents the possibility of homonyms occurring within the scope of the naming convention." The important point here is whether the naming convention provides a mechanism for making names unique. In other words, while a namespace may or may not <u>require</u> that names be unique, a naming convention may or may not <u>enable</u> names to be made unique. A naming convention that does not enable unique names should not be used for a namespace that requires unique names.</p> <p>Proposed Solution Replace the sentence by: "A uniqueness rule documents how to prevent homonyms occurring within the scope of the naming convention."</p>	Done.
	CAN-P05-010	CAN-P05-009 CAN-P05-	2-Minor Technical	07-06	<p>A naming convention only enables uniqueness. It is the <u>scope</u> of the naming convention (i.e. the associated namespace) that may or may not require unique names. The rule should be restated to</p>	Done, except that "namespace"

SEQ #	Cmnt ID	See Also	Severity	Reference	Description	Addressed By
		011			<p>clarify this distinction.</p> <p>Proposed Solution</p> <p>Proposed replacement text: "Naming conventions may be applied to various namespaces, each of which may or may not require names to be unique within their scope. Allowing non-uniqueness admits the possibility of the existence of homonyms. Each namespace should indicate whether or not non-unique names are allowed. A naming convention that is to be applied to a namespace requiring unique names should document any specific techniques (e.g. addition of a suffix) to be used to make names unique."</p>	has been replaced by "context."
	CAN-P05-011	CAN-P05-009 CAN-P05-010	2-Minor Technical	⁰⁸	<p>If comments CAN-P05-009 and CAN-P05-010 were accepted, change the description of the Uniqueness rule to be consistent.</p> <p>Proposed Solution</p> <p>Replace the single attribute by two attributes: Uniqueness rule indicator An indicator of whether or not the naming convention enables unique names (Y/N). Zero or one per naming convention. Uniqueness rule description A description of how to ensure unique names within the naming convention. Applicable only if uniqueness rule indicator = Y.</p>	Clause 8 has been removed.
	CAN-P05-012		1-Major technical	⁰⁸	<p>Note: Our vote on this ballot is not contingent on the resolution of this comment.</p> <p>The Victoria meeting of SC32 WG2 allowed 11179-3 to progress ahead of other parts on the understanding that changes to the other parts would be kept consistent with part 3 as published. However,</p>	

SEQ #	Cmnt ID	See Also	Severity	Reference	Description	Addressed By
					<p>since then three new projects have been accepted (19773-1,-2,-3) which propose to extend the metamodel outside 11179-3. It therefore seems reasonable that other parts of 11179 could also extend the model.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Proposed Solution</p> <p>See Annex A.</p>	

Editor's note: All other comments have been withdrawn from application to this edition of ISO/IEC 11179-5. They will be considered during the development of the next edition, consistent with the next edition of ISO/IEC 11179-3.