

ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 32 N 1076

Date: 2004-01-09

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	Disposition of Comments
TITLE	Resolution of Comments ISO/IEC 11179 Part 6, CD ballot
SOURCE	Douglas Mann (Editor)
PROJECT NUMBER	1.32.15.02.06.00
STATUS	With the inclusion of these comments the FCD has been put forward as 32N1074
REFERENCES	
ACTION ID.	FYI
REQUESTED ACTION	
DUE DATE	
Number of Pages	25
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

Editor's Resolution of comments in 32N0996 to
JTC1/SC32 N973 CD 11179-6 - Registration

JTC1/SC32 N972 CD 11179-6

SEQ #	Cmnt ID	See Also	Severity	Reference	Description	Addressed By	
1	CAN-P06-001		4-Minor Editorial	00 -Cover Page	The title of the document should include the acronym "(MDR)" following "Metadata registries"	completed as proposed	X
2	CAN-P06-002		4-Minor Editorial	00 Foreword	In the last paragraph, before the list of parts, the general title should include the acronym "(MDR)" following "Metadata registries"	completed as proposed	X
3	US-P06-008		2-Minor Technical	00 Introduction and Scope	The introduction and scope should make it clear that this standard is not specifying how ISO/IEC Registration Authorities work. Proposed Solution This part should be retitled: Part 6: Registration and Identification	The wording was adjusted to say "could be registered" The Part is not retitled	x
4	US-P06-005		2-Minor Technical	00 Introduction; 1 st ; paragraph; 2 nd sentence	The phrase "uniqueness of a registered administered item" is incomplete. Proposed Solution Replace with the phrase "uniqueness of the identification of a registered administered item".	completed as proposed	X
5	US-P06-006		4-Minor Editorial	00 Introduction; 1 st paragraph; last sentence	Proposed Solution Replace "Organizations wishing to become" with "An organization wishing to become a".	completed as proposed	X
6	US-P06-007		3-Major Editorial	00 Introduction; Last paragraph	Proposed Solution Copy this paragraph to a sub-clause in the Scope section.	completed as proposed	X
7	US-P06-009		4-Minor Editorial	01 ; 2 nd paragraph; 1 st sentence	No need to reference other standards by their full names in the text. The full reference and name is given in the Normative References clause. Proposed Solution Replace "ISO/IEC 11179 Part 3 – Registry metamodel and basic attributes" with "ISO/IEC 11179-3".	completed as proposed	X
8	CAN-P06-003		4-Minor Editorial	02 -Normative references	In the listings for 11179, the "R" in "Registries" should be lower case. Proposed Solution	completed as proposed	X
9	US-P06-010		4-Minor Editorial	03 ; throughout	Many terms defined in this clause are used in definitions of other terms also defined in the clause. Proposed Solution Use bold type to highlight these terms and signify to the reader they are defined in the clause.	completed as proposed	X

SEQ #	Cmnt ID	See Also	Severity	Reference	Description	Addressed By	
10	CAN-P06-004		4-Minor Editorial	03 -Terms and definitions	References to 11179-3 should be dated 2003 instead of 2002. Proposed Solution	completed as proposed	X
11	US-P06-011		2-Minor Technical	03.01	The term "registry item" used in the definition is undefined. Proposed Solution Add the term and its definition to the list.	Completed as proposed	X
12	CAN-P06-005		4-Minor Editorial	03.07	The definition of "international registration data identifier" has a reference to ISO/IEC 11179-3:2002, but that document does not define or use the term. Proposed Solution Remove the reference.	completed as proposed	X
13	US-P06-012		2-Minor Technical	03.07	The definition for "IRDI" is missing in Part 3. A definition is required for "IRDI" in both parts. This definition cannot be crafted until the issue of multiple registers under a single Registration Authority is resolved. Proposed Solution	completed as proposed using 3.8 of 11179-6 edition 1	X
14	CAN-P06-006		4-Minor Editorial	03.10	The definition of "metadata item" contains a Word cross-reference error message. Proposed Solution Replace this by a reference to clause 4.	completed as proposed	X
15	US-P06-013		4-Minor Editorial	03.10	error in reference; slash at end of reference Proposed Solution Remove slash.	completed as proposed	X
16	US-P06-014		4-Minor Editorial	03.10	OLD: metadata item an instance of a metadata object This is poorly defined. What is a metadata object? Proposed Solution Add Metadata object definition from part 3	completed as proposed extracted from part 3 definition 3.2.20	X
17	US-P06-015		4-Minor Editorial	03.18	"Registration Authority an Organization responsible for maintaining a register." Registry rather than register? We have no definition for register.	Sort out as editor for register vs registry [editor note: this was in comments] The terms and definitions of "Metadata Registry" and "metadata register" have been extracted from Part 3. Text in Part 6 has been adjusted to reflect the distinction between the information system and the information store.	X

SEQ #	Cmnt ID	See Also	Severity	Reference	Description	Addressed By	
18	US-P06-016		2-Minor Technical	03.21	<p>The concept for "responsible organization" is the wrong concept because it focuses on the "mandatory" nature of things.</p> <p>responsible organization RO The organization or unit within an organization that is responsible for the contents of the mandatory attributes by which the administered item is specified.</p> <p>Proposed Solution</p> <p>The correct concept is:</p> <p>responsible organization The organization or unit within an organization that is the authoritative source for attributes of the administered item.</p>	<p>This may impact Part 3 [editor note: this was in comments]</p> <p>Completed as proposed</p>	X
19	US-P06-017		2-Minor Technical	03.22	<p>Improvements ...</p> <p>OLD: submitting organization SO - The organization or unit within an organization that has submitted the administered item for addition, change, or cancellation/withdrawal.</p> <p>Proposed Solution</p> <p>NEW: submitting organization SO - The organization or unit within an organization that has submitted requests for registry action.</p>	Completed as proposed	X
20	US-P06-018		2-Minor Technical	03.23	<p>Improvements ...</p> <p>OLD: version - the unique version identifier of the Administered Item [ISO/IEC 11179-3:2002, definition 3.3.156]</p> <p>Proposed Solution</p> <p>NEW: version - an identifier that is unique within the lifecycle of an object</p>	<p>Defer for better definition</p> <p>See US-P06-019 [21] [editor note: this was in comments]</p> <p>See # 21 below</p>	X
21	US-P06-019		4-Minor Editorial	03.23	<p>“version the unique version identifier of the Administered Item“</p> <p>Setting the version equivalent to the version identifier makes one of them redundant.</p> <p>Proposed Solution</p> <p>Re-define using some criteria that distinguishes version qualitatively from version identifier.</p>	<p>Defer for better definition</p> <p>See US-P06-018 [20] [editor note: this was in comments]</p> <p>Rejected so that the 11179:2003 definition is kept</p>	X

SEQ #	Cmnt ID	See Also	Severity	Reference	Description	Addressed By	
22	US-P06-020		2-Minor Technical	03.24	<p>Wrong concept, wrong term:</p> <p>OLD: version identifier VI - An identifier assigned to a Version under which an administered item registration is submitted or updated.</p> <p>Proposed Solution</p> <p>NEW: version identifier VI - an identifier assigned to a version of an Administered Item.</p>	completed as proposed	X
23	US-P06-021		4-Minor Editorial	04	<p>This whole clause is confusing. Subclause 4.1 doesn't really summarize the remaining subclauses. For example:</p> <p>The development of a number of registries in a distributed heterogeneous environment will be very large, both in geographic extent and in the number and diversity of the application areas, inevitably leading to the independent development of sub-systems. In this context, a second major purpose of a Registry is to document and register information at interfaces. This process provides the main foundation for interoperability, by also focusing on those administered items which cross an interface, but which are not necessarily harmonized throughout an environment. The semantics of administered items may be documented by recording the associations of the information models in which they participate.</p> <p>The need for "a number of registries in a distributed heterogeneous environment will be very large" is completely unrelated to the need for a "known process for a single registry" (which is what Part 6 is about).</p> <p>Furthermore, it's not clear if 11179-6 is a "procedure standard":</p> <p>The operational concept of the data registration is described in the following clauses. See Annex B for specific procedural details.</p> <p>Proposed Solution</p> <p>Delete Paragraph 3</p>	<p>The concept should be in Part 1 [editor note: this was in comments]</p> <p>Completed as proposed – Clause 4.1 paragraph 3 deleted</p>	X

SEQ #	Cmnt ID	See Also	Severity	Reference	Description	Addressed By	
24	CAN-P06-007		4-Minor Editorial	04.01	In the second paragraph, the use of the term "The Registry" suggests there may be only a single registry. Proposed Solution In the first sentence, replace: "The Registry" by: "A 11179 Metadata Registry". In the second sentence, replace: "In addition, the Registry" by: "Such a Registry".	completed as proposed	X
25	US-P06-022		4-Minor Editorial	04.01 ; 1 st paragraph; 1 st sentence	Proposed Solution 'provide' should be [family] 'provides'	completed as proposed	X
26	US-P06-023		2-Minor Technical	04.01 ; 3 rd paragraph; last sentence	I believe this sentence is wrong. An ISO/IEC 11179 metadata registry is designed to capture part of the semantics of administered items. The associations in information models of administered items are a small part of the semantics a registry can record. Proposed Solution Delete the sentence.	See # 26 Completed as proposed – Clause 4.1 paragraph 3 deleted	X
27	US-P06-024		4-Minor Editorial	04.01 ; 5 th paragraph; 2 nd sentence	The word "the" appears together twice. Proposed Solution Remove one of them.	completed as proposed	X
28	US-P06-025		3 - Major Editorial	04.01 ; Figure 1	I strongly disagree with the diagram because it implies many more relationships than *should* exist in an RA process. For example, we don't need to define an executive committee, a control committee, a steward, or a submitter. These kind of roles and responsibilities should be left up to the implementers of Part 6. Proposed Solution Move Clause 4.1 and Clause 4.2 to an informative annex	Completed as proposed Clauses 4.1 and 4.2 are Moved to Informative Annex XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX	X
29	US-P06-026		4-Minor Editorial	04.01 ; Figure 1	Comments on Fig 1; question necessity of Control. Committee	See # 28 This is now informative	X
30	CAN-P06-008		4-Minor Editorial	04.02.01	In para. 1, insert "to" after "desires".	completed as proposed	X
31	US-P06-027	US-P06-025	4-Minor Editorial	04.02.01 ; 1 st paragraph; 1 st sentence	"shall be an organizational element that desires operate and manage"; Proposed Solution insert 'to' before operate	completed as proposed	X
32	US-P06-028		4-Minor Editorial	04.02.01 ; 1 st paragraph; 1 st sentence	Proposed Solution Replace the phrase "that desires operate" with "that desires to operate".	completed as proposed	X

SEQ #	Cmnt ID	See Also	Severity	Reference	Description	Addressed By	
33	US-P06-029		2-Minor Technical	04.02.01.01	The term "organizational element" is undefined. This term appears in many other clauses throughout the document. Proposed Solution Add the term and definition to Clause 3.	"organizational element" is changed to "organizational unit" throughout the document	X
34	US-P06-030		4-Minor Editorial	04.02.01.01; Last sentence	"The registry registration authority"— Proposed Solution Capitalize Registration Authority.	completed as proposed	X
35	US-P06-031		3-Major editorial	04.02.01.02 04.02.01.03	These are entirely too prescriptive for organizations that already have data quality management procedures in place. Proposed Solution Rewrite clauses to state that there should be functional capability to. Remove paragraph number	See # 28 Clauses 4.1 and 4.2 were moved to an informative annex so that they are no longer normative	X
36	US-P06-032	US-P06-025	4-Minor Editorial	04.02.02 ; 1 st sentence	Proposed Solution Remove the phrase "according to this part of ISO/IEC 11179"	completed as proposed	X
37	US-P06-033	US-P06-025	4-Minor Editorial	04.02.02 ; 1 st sentence	The phrase "criteria for membership eligibility" is unclear. Is this membership in a Registration Authority or is this inclusion of administered items in a registry? Proposed Solution Replace "membership" with "registration"	completed as proposed	X
38	US-P06-034	US-P06-025	4-Minor Editorial	04.02.02.01 ;Last sentence	Proposed Solution Delete the sentence, as it is unnecessary.	completed as proposed	X
39	US-P06-035		2-Minor Technical	04.02.03 ; 1 st sentence	The term "business entity" is undefined. Proposed Solution Add the term and definition to Clause 3. Or is this organizational element.	"business entity" is changed to "organizational unit"	X
40	US-P06-036	US-P06-025	4-Minor Editorial	04.02.03 ; 1 st sentence	The phrase "coordinate the contents of mandatory attributes of related administered items" is confusing. Proposed Solution Maybe this needs to be broken into two or more sentences. In any case, it needs to be reworded.	The phrase was changed to "to insure consistence of related administered items"	X
41	US-P06-037		4-Minor Editorial	04.03 ; 1 st 2 paragraphs	First two paragraphs are "hanging paragraphs". See Part 2 of the Directives. Proposed Solution Place these first two paragraphs into sub-clause 4.3.1 and renumber the subsequent sub-clauses under 4.3 appropriately.	Completed as proposed – This is now Clause 4.1.1	X

SEQ #	Cmnt ID	See Also	Severity	Reference	Description	Addressed By	
42	US-P06-038	US-P06-009	4-Minor Editorial	04.03 ; 1 st paragraph	No need to reference other standards by their full names in the text. The full reference and name is given in the Normative References clause. Proposed Solution Replace "ISO/IE 11179-3:2003 <i>Information technology – Metadata registries (MDR) – Part 3: Registry metamodel and basic attributes</i> " with "ISO/IEC 11179-3".	completed as proposed	X
43	US-P06-040		4-Minor Editorial	04.03 ; 2 nd paragraph; 1 st sentence	Proposed Solution Remove "does not"; replace "address" with "addresses"; and remove "of any of the specific types of administered items but only the specifics".	completed as proposed	X
44	US-P06-041		4-Minor Editorial	04.03 ; 2 nd paragraph; 1 st sentence	This part of the ISO/IEC 11179 standard does not address the specifics of any of the specific types of administered items but only the specifics that are common to all administered items There are too many "specifics" in the above sentence ... please reword.	completed as proposed	X
45	US-P06-042		4-Minor Editorial	04.03 ; 2 nd paragraph; Last sentence	The following statement is unclear: Others may want to use this part of ISO/IEC 11179 to specify the administration of items in a Registry that does not contain any of the administered items that are specified in Part 3 of ISO/IEC 11179. Proposed Solution Change the text to: Others may want to use this part of ISO/IEC 11179 to register and manage locally defined administered item types that are not defined in Part 3.	completed as proposed	X
46	US-P06-043		2-Minor Technical	04.03 ; 2 nd paragraph; Last sentence	Proposed Solution This sentence should also appear in the Scope section.	completed as proposed	X
47	US-P06-039		4-Minor Editorial	04.03 ; 2 nd paragraph; 2 nd sentence	"It is envisioned that an organization may extend their Registry" Proposed Solution should be "its Registry".	completed as proposed	X

SEQ #	Cmnt ID	See Also	Severity	Reference	Description	Addressed By	
48	US-P06-044		2-Minor Technical	04.03.01	<p>I am opposed to the following requirement:</p> <p>Administered items registered under the provisions of this part of ISO/IEC 11179 are each assigned an International Registration Data Identifier (IRDI)</p> <p>This is not applicable to every registry. This is too heavy a burden to implement for some registries.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Proposed Solution</p> <p>Revise</p> <p>Add sentence to D.2 a): The RAI is optional in those registries that do not exchange contents with other registries.</p>	Completed as proposed	X
49	US-P06-047	US-P06-048	2-Minor Technical	04.03.02 ; 1 st paragraph; 2 nd sentence	<p>The term "registration life-cycle" is undefined. In fact, it probably does not make sense. There is no clear beginning and end for registration status for an AI.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Proposed Solution</p> <p>Recommend saying registration status is a designation of the level of registration or quality of metadata or progression.</p>	Completed as proposed	X
50	US-P06-048	US-P06-047	2-Minor Technical	04.03.02 ; 2 nd paragraph; 1 st sentence	<p>What is the "state" referred to in this sentence? I think it refers to the quality of the metadata contained in the administered item.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Proposed Solution</p> <p>Replace "state" with "quality". Editor needs to clarify</p>	<p>Dropped 1st sentence of paragraph 2. Move 2nd sentence of paragraph 2 to the end of paragraph 1.</p> <p>Melbourne meeting solution</p>	X
51	US-P06-049		4-Minor Editorial	04.03.02 ; 3 rd paragraph; 1 st sentence	<p>The word "taking" is awkward.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Proposed Solution</p> <p>Replace "taking" with "undergoing".</p>	completed as proposed	X
52	US-P06-050		4-Minor Editorial	04.03.02 ; 3 rd paragraph; 2 nd sentence	<p style="text-align: center;">Proposed Solution</p> <p>Replace sentence with "It identifies the process that is taking place within a registration status."</p>	completed as proposed	X

SEQ #	Cmnt ID	See Also	Severity	Reference	Description	Addressed By	
53	CAN-P06-009		1-Major Technical	04.03.02.01	<p>In Table 1, several registration statuses are listed as "Static Categories" implying that once set, they cannot be changed. More flexibility is required. For example:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A "Superseded" item may need to be "Retired". 2. Items "standardized elsewhere" may need to be moved to one of the "Dynamic levels". 3. Items might initially be added as "Legacy" or "Application", and subsequently may need to be moved to one of the "Dynamic levels". <p>Proposed Solution</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Replace the "Dynamic Levels" by "Lifecycle statuses", and include "Retired" and "Superseded" in this category. 2. Replace the "Static categories" by "Documentation Statuses". 3. Remove "Standardized elsewhere" as a status, and add separate attributes to reference the other source. These should be considered in the context of the NWI on Standards Metadata. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Replace the "Dynamic Levels" by "Lifecycle statuses", and include "Retired" and "Superseded" in this category. 2. Replace the "Static categories" by "Documentation Statuses". 3. Remove "Standardized elsewhere" as a status <p>Melbourne meeting solution</p>	X
54	US-P06-045		4-Minor Editorial	04.03.02.01	<p>I don't understand the distinction between "static" and "dynamic", and between "levels" and "categories".</p> <p>Proposed Solution</p> <p>Remove each occurrence of the word Category or categories</p> <p>Add a paren behind "Dynamic" of "(modifiable)"</p> <p>Add a paren behind "Static" of "(non-modifiable)"</p> <p>Annotate each registration status with static or dynamic as appropriate</p> <p>The UK had an idea on this subject at Santa Fe that needs exploration</p>	See # 53	X
55	US-P06-046		2-Minor Technical	04.03.02.01	<p>Shouldn't these levels be part of the value domain associated with certain MDR attributes? In other words, shouldn't this description be normative wording for Part 3?</p> <p>Proposed Solution</p> <p>Part 3 needs to refer to Part 6 for Registration Status values</p>	This is not applicable to Part 6 Melbourne meeting solution	X
56	US-P06-066		4-Minor Editorial	04.03.02.01 – 3 rd paragraph; Item B; 1 st sentence	<p>Proposed Solution</p> <p>Replace "progression up the Registry registration levels" with "progression through the registration levels".</p>	completed as proposed	X
57	US-P06-051	US-P06-048	2-Minor Technical	04.03.02.01 ; 1 st sentence	<p>"Registration status specified the state .."</p> <p>Proposed Solution</p> <p>Replace "state" with "quality". Editor needs to clarify</p>	Rejected Melbourne meeting solution	X
58	US-P06-059		4-Minor Editorial	04.03.02.01 ; 2 nd paragraph; 2 nd sentence	<p>Proposed Solution</p> <p>Replace "a administered item" with "an administered item"</p>	completed as proposed	X

SEQ #	Cmnt ID	See Also	Severity	Reference	Description	Addressed By	
59	US-P06-060	US-P06-059	4-Minor Editorial	04.03.02.01 ; 2 nd paragraph; 2 nd sentence	Proposed Solution "for a administered item" substitute "an" for a.	completed as proposed	X
60	US-P06-065		4-Minor Editorial	04.03.02.01 ; 3 rd paragraph; Item A – 4 th sentence	Proposed Solution Replace "Registry shall be:" with "Registry shall be as follows:". Put the list in bulleted list format.	completed as proposed	X
61	US-P06-068		4-Minor Editorial	04.03.02.01 ; 3 rd paragraph; Item C; 4 th sentence	" at any time may." Proposed Solution Drop the terminal 'may'.	completed as proposed	X
62	US-P06-067		2-Minor Technical	04.03.02.01 ; 3 rd paragraph; Item C; Last sentence	A candidate AI might contain all the attributes. It might be submitted that way. Proposed Solution Replace "does" with "may"	completed as proposed to "Item B"	X
63	US-P06-069		4-Minor Editorial	04.03.02.01 ; 3 rd paragraph; Item D; 1 st sentence	Reference to the current registration status is not made. Proposed Solution Replace "that the Control Committee" with "that the Administration Item has Recorded registration status and the Control Committee".	completed as proposed	X
64	US-P06-070		4-Minor Editorial	04.03.02.01 ; 3 rd paragraph; Item E; 1 st sentence	Reference to the current registration status is not made. Proposed Solution Replace "that the Control Committee" with "that the Administration Item has Qualified registration status and the Control Committee".	completed as proposed	X
65	US-P06-071		4-Minor Editorial	04.03.02.01 ; 3 rd paragraph; Item G; 1 st sentence	Proposed Solution Replace "approved" with "determined"; "as" with "is".	completed as proposed	X
66	US-P06-072		4-Minor Editorial	04.03.02.01 ; 3 rd paragraph; Item G; 3 rd sentence	"historic reference purposes." Proposed Solution Add "and research" after "reference". While retired items may no longer be necessary for current use, their continued existence and documentation is required for longitudinal studies and analysis.	completed as proposed	X
67	US-P06-074		4-Minor Editorial	04.03.02.01 ; 3 rd paragraph; Item H; 2 nd sentence	Proposed Solution Replace "the preference" with "preferred".	completed as proposed	X
68	US-P06-073		4-Minor Editorial	04.03.02.01 ; 3 rd paragraph; Item H; 1 st sentence	Proposed Solution Replace "approved" with "determined" and "as" with "is".	completed as proposed	X

SEQ #	Cmnt ID	See Also	Severity	Reference	Description	Addressed By	
69	US-P06-075		4-Minor Editorial	04.03.02.01 ; 3 rd paragraph; Item J; 1 st sentence	<p>Proposed Solution</p> <p>End sentence at “and has not been used recently.” Start a new sentence with “It is important to record ...”; Replace “have” with “be given”; Change third “item” to “items”; Replace “with” with “through”</p>	completed as proposed	X
70	US-P06-076		4-Minor Editorial	04.03.02.01 ; 3 rd paragraph; Item K; 1 st sentence	<p>Proposed Solution</p> <p>Replace “in use in” with “used by”</p>	completed as proposed	X
71	US-P06-077		4-Minor Editorial	04.03.02.01 ; 3 rd paragraph; Item L; 1 st sentence	<p>Proposed Solution</p> <p>Replace “that is in an” with “that is used by an”</p>	completed as proposed	X
72	US-P06-062		3-Major Editorial	04.03.02.01 ; 3 rd paragraph; items A – L	<p>The Table 1 repeats all that is in this list.</p> <p>Proposed Solution</p> <p>Readability will be enhanced if the assertions are listed as bulleted items under each lettered list heading.</p>	Completed as proposed	X
73	US-P06-063		4-Minor Editorial	04.03.02.01 ; 3 rd paragraph; items A – L	<p>Proposed Solution</p> <p>Whenever the phrase “... item in the XXX status” is used, replace it with “...item with the XXX status” in all items A – L.</p>	completed as proposed	X
74	US-P06-064		4-Minor Editorial	04.03.02.01 ; 3 rd paragraph; items A – L	<p>Proposed Solution</p> <p>Replace “status shall indicate” with “status shall mean” in items C, D, F – L.</p>	completed as proposed	X
75	US-P06-061		4-Minor Editorial	04.03.02.01 ; 3 rd paragraph; items A and B	<p>“The registered administered item does not contain all Mandatory Attribute values.”</p> <p>Proposed Solution</p> <p>Substitute “may not” for “does not”.</p>	completed as proposed	X
76	US-P06-052		2-Minor Technical	04.03.02.01 ; Table 1	<p>The term Registry Community is undefined.</p> <p>Proposed Solution</p> <p>Add the term and definition to Clause 3.</p>	This was changed to "Registry community" to make two terms. Melbourne meeting solution	X
77	US-P06-053		4-Minor Editorial	04.03.02.01 ; Table 1	<p>The status criteria for Candidate status is awkward.</p> <p>Proposed Solution</p> <p>Recommend new wording – “Proposed for progression through the registration levels.”</p>	completed as proposed	X
78	US-P06-054		4-Minor Editorial	04.03.02.01 ; Table 1	<p>Candidate: “It has been proposed for progression up the Registry registration levels.”</p> <p>Proposed Solution</p> <p>Substitute “The administered item” for It.</p>	completed as proposed	X

SEQ #	Cmnt ID	See Also	Severity	Reference	Description	Addressed By	
79	US-P06-055		4-Minor Editorial	04.03.02.01 ; Table 1	The status criteria for Superceded status is awkward. Proposed Solution Recommend new wording – “The Registration Authority determined that the Administered Item is no longer recommended for use by the Registry Community, and a successor Administered Item is now preferred for use.”	completed as proposed	X
80	US-P06-057		1-Major Technical	04.03.02.01 ; Table 1	The description of Legacy Registration Status is not clear. The phrase “and very little is known about the item” is not precise. In addition, there seems to be an assumption that an AI from a legacy application system necessarily lacks proper metadata. Proposed Solution The definition needs clarification and the Term may need to be replaced	The "Legacy" Registration Status was dropped	X
81	US-P06-058		1-Major Technical	04.03.02.01 ; Table 1	The description of Application Registration Status is not clear. The phrase “and is not specified at the logical level” is not precise. Proposed Solution The definition needs clarification and the Term may need to be replaced. Such that the Conceptual Domain and Data Element Concept information is not known	The phrase “and is not specified at the logical level” was removed.	X
82	US-P06-056		4-Minor Editorial	04.03.02.01 ; Table 1, Historical category and 1 st sentence item j	‘far’ is ambiguous and anything ‘in the past’ is historical. Proposed Solution Change all occurrences of the phrase “far past” to “past.”	completed as proposed	X
83	US-P06-078		4-Minor Editorial	04.03.02.02	This whole subclause sounds like “someone's best practices” but does not sound like normative wording in a standard. Too many details. Proposed Solution Start Para 1 with Sentence 1 and 2 of Para 2. Drop the rest of the clause	completed as proposed	X
84	US-P06-082		4-Minor Editorial	04.03.02.02 ; 1 st paragraph	“An Administration Status specifies the process that an administered item is taking within a Registration Status. It documents the process that is taking place in a registration.” One of the two sentences appears to be redundant except for the connection to registration Proposed Solution Collapse these two sentences to “An Administration Status specifies the process that an administered item is taking within a particular Registration Status during the registration activity.” Or something like that.	Ed see # 83	X
85	US-P06-079		2-Minor Technical	04.03.02.02 ; 1 st paragraph; 1 st sentence	Proposed Solution Replace sentence with “An Administration Status specifies a stage in the processes applied to Administered Items within a given Registration Status.”	Ed see # 83	X

SEQ #	Cmnt ID	See Also	Severity	Reference	Description	Addressed By	
86	US-P06-080		4-Minor Editorial	04.03.02.02 ; 1 st paragraph; Last sentence	Proposed Solution Remove "administrative".	Ed see # 83	X
87	US-P06-081		4-Minor Editorial	04.03.02.02 ; 2 nd paragraph; 2 nd sentence	Proposed Solution Replace "may impact their" with "may have an impact on their"	completed as proposed	X
88	US-P06-083		4-Minor Editorial	04.03.02.02 ; 2 nd paragraph; Item List A – C	Proposed Solution Replace "item in the" with "item with the" in all 3 list items	Ed see # 83	X
89	US-P06-084		4-Minor Editorial	04.03.02.02 ; 2 nd paragraph; Item List A – C	Proposed Solution Replace "indicates" with "means" in all 3 list items	Ed see # 83	X
90	US-P06-087		4-Minor Editorial	04.03.02.02 ; 3 rd paragraph; 1 st sentence	Proposed Solution Replace "processes" with "steps"	Ed see # 83	X
91	US-P06-085		4-Minor Editorial	04.03.02.02 ; 3 rd paragraph; Item List A – B	Proposed Solution Replace "item in the" with "item with the" in all 3 list items	Ed see # 83	X
92	US-P06-086		4-Minor Editorial	04.03.02.02 ; 3 rd paragraph; Item List A – B	Proposed Solution Replace "indicates" with "means" in all 3 list items	Ed see # 83	X
93	US-P06-088		3-Major Editorial	04.04	I oppose the inclusion, especially a prescriptive one, of procedures for registration. Standards for data is all we are after here. How RAs accomplish that, while they may be interested in examples of others' activities, should be up to the organization and not be included in a data standards document. This is an intrusion on organizational territory. Proposed Solution Change Sentence 1 to "to establish procedures for necessary activities of the registry" Clean up a-f and make these examples	Accepted. The list was changed to examples.	X

SEQ #	Cmnt ID	See Also	Severity	Reference	Description	Addressed By	
94	US-P06-089		2-Minor Technical	05.01	<p>This concept is backwards:</p> <p>Each Registration Authority shall maintain a Registry for Administered Items that fall under its purview.</p> <p>It is *not* the case that an RA exists by itself and then looks for work to do. The RA exists because a registry exists and someone is the RA is the organization responsible for administering the registry.</p> <p>Also, an RA can administer more than one registry (e.g., IANA).</p> <p>Proposed Solution</p> <p>Add a statement that a RA has unique RAI for each registry that it maintains</p> <p>Reword to resolve the first comment</p>	<p>Accepted in Melbourne to restate Clause 5.1 to " Each Metadata Registry is maintained by a Registration Authority. The Metadata Registry is for Administered Items that fall under its purview."</p> <p>Rejected in Melbourne an RAI for each</p>	X
95	US-P06-090		4-Minor Editorial	05.02 ; 1 st paragraph	<p>First paragraph "hanging paragraph". See Part 2 of the Directives.</p> <p>Proposed Solution</p> <p>Place this first paragraph into sub-clause 5.2.1 and renumber the subsequent sub-clauses under 5.2 appropriately.</p>	completed as proposed	X
96	US-P06-092		4-Minor Editorial	05.02.01	<p>This is very confusing:</p> <p>The principal participants are Registration Authorities and Submitting Organizations. Though Responsible Organizations may impact the content of individual attributes of each administered items, they do not have the purview on the composition of the registry itself, i.e., what specific metadata attributes to include with each administered item. For example, while the Registration Authority determines, in accordance to this Standard, each administered item must include the attribute Definition, the Responsible Organization ensures that the definition of a metadata item is semantically correct.</p> <p>A Registration Authority may adopt a stricter or less strict level of conformance, levying corresponding requirements on Submitting Organizations. The contents of a registry, therefore, may vary accordingly.</p> <p>It appears that conformance to Part 3 is somehow buried in 5.2.1 of Part 6.</p> <p>Proposed Solution</p> <p>Add a reference to the conformance clause of 11179-3</p>	<p>Accepted</p> <p>The text was cleaned up and the reference to 11179-3 was added</p>	X
97	US-P06-091		4-Minor Editorial	05.02.01 ; 1 st paragraph; 2 nd sentence	<p>Proposed Solution</p> <p>Replace "may impact the content" with "may have an impact on the content"</p>	completed as proposed	X

SEQ #	Cmnt ID	See Also	Severity	Reference	Description	Addressed By	
98	US-P06-093		4-Minor Editorial	05.02.02 ; 1 st paragraph; 1 st sentence	Reference to ISO/IEC 11179-3 should be changed. Proposed Solution Replace "ISO/IEC 11179 Part 3 of this international standard" with "ISO/IEC 11179-3"	completed as proposed	X
99	US-P06-094		4-Minor Editorial	05.02.02 ; 1 st paragraph; 3 rd sentence	Reference to ISO/IEC 11179-3 should be changed. Proposed Solution Replace "ISO/IEC 11179 Part 3 of this international standard" with "ISO/IEC 11179-3"	completed as proposed	X
100	US-P06-095		4-Minor Editorial	05.02.02 ; 1 st paragraph; 4 th sentence	Proposed Solution Replace "This part has" with "This part makes use of".	completed as proposed	X
101	US-P06-096		1-Major Technical	05.03	This is very weak: The language(s) to be used for the registry shall be determined and documented by the procedure prescribed by the appropriate Registration Authority. This statement makes no real requirements, right? Proposed Solution The language(s) used by the registry shall be documented by the Registration Authority.	Completed as proposed	X
102	US-P06-097		4-Minor Editorial	05.04	The following is overspecified: The availability of the contents of the registry shall be governed in accordance with the procedure prescribed by the appropriate Registration Authority. Proposed Solution Change to: Access to the contents of the registry shall be governed in accordance with the procedure prescribed by the appropriate Registration Authority.	completed as proposed	X
103	US-P06-098		4-Minor Editorial	05.05	What is meant by a "founding" registration authority? Proposed Solution No solution provided.	See # 104 The clause is deleted	X

SEQ #	Cmnt ID	See Also	Severity	Reference	Description	Addressed By	
104	US-P06-099	US-P06-098	4-Minor Editorial	05.05	<p>This kind of wording should not appear in an ISO standard:</p> <p>Since the Registration Authorities are self-governing bodies operating voluntarily under the procedures specified by this part of ISO/IEC 11179, the copyright of the Registries shall belong to the founding Registration Authorities.</p> <p>Proposed Solution</p> <p>Recommendation: delete subclause 5.5</p>	completed as proposed	X
105	US-P06-100		3-Major Editorial	06	<p>Procedural details are not related to standard conformance. Any implication that registration 'must' or 'shall' be accomplished in the manner described in the standard should be negated or removed. This view is supported by the fact that the conformance information in Clause 6 has no reference to process or procedure; therefore the means by which data conforming to 11179-3 and part 6 standards is achieved has no place in this document. If it is not going to be stated the processes have to be present for the data to be conforming, then the processes should not be a part of the standard.</p> <p>Proposed Solution</p> <p>See about removing the procedural detail in clause 6</p>	Clause 6 revised to one sentence as specified at the Melbourne meeting	X
106	US-P06-101		4-Minor Editorial	06 ; 1 st two paragraphs	<p>First two paragraphs are "hanging paragraphs". See Part 2 of the Directives.</p> <p>Proposed Solution</p> <p>Place these first two paragraphs into sub-clause 6.1 and renumber the subsequent sub-clauses under 6 appropriately.</p>	completed as proposed	X
107	US-P06-102		4-Minor Editorial	06.03 ; 2 nd paragraph; Item B	<p>A conditional attribute depends on the existence of another attribute(s) for its existence. If the antecedent doesn't exist, then by definition the conditioned attribute does not.</p> <p>Proposed Solution</p> <p>Remove the final clause ",and otherwise shall not exist."</p>	completed as proposed	X
108	US-P06-103	US-P06-100	4-Minor Editorial	06.04	<p>I don't understand 6.4 b). I see no reference to any 'levels' in clause 6.2.</p> <p>Proposed Solution</p> <p>none</p>	See #105	X
109	US-P06-104	US-P06-100	4-Minor Editorial	06.04 ; 1 st paragraph; Item B	<p>The conformance terms Level 1 and Level 2 are not previously defined.</p> <p>Proposed Solution</p> <p>Add the terms and definitions to Clause 3, and describe the terms in Clause 6.</p>	See #105	X
110	US-P06-001		3 - Major Editorial	99	<p>Annex A, B, C be made informative</p>	Completed as proposed	X

SEQ #	Cmnt ID	See Also	Severity	Reference	Description	Addressed By	
111	US-P06-106		4-Minor Editorial	99 A.01; 1 st sentence	The words "provides shows" appear together in the sentence. Proposed Solution Keep "provides" and delete "shows".	completed as proposed	X
112	US-P06-107		4-Minor Editorial	99 A.02.01; 2 nd sentence	The word "respectively" is not needed. Usually it is used to relate a list to another in a one-to-one correspondence. Here, there is no second list. Proposed Solution Delete "respectively".	completed as proposed	X
113	US-P06-108		2-Minor Technical	99 A.02.03	The RO has a subject matter expert role that is not being explicitly mentioned. Proposed Solution Make reference to subject matter expertise as part of the role of an RO.	completed as proposed	X
114	US-P06-109	US-P06-111 US-P06-113	2-Minor Technical	99 A.02.03; 1 st paragraph	Inclusion of "permissible values of administered item" does not make sense. Proposed Solution Delete the term "permissible value" or change to another term.	completed as proposed (removed "permissible values")	X
115	US-P06-112		4-Minor Editorial	99 A.03.01; 1 st paragraph; Item List	The 2 nd and 3 rd items depend on the 1 st , so they should be indented. The 4 th – 7 th depend on the 3 rd , so they should be indented twice. Proposed Solution Solution is above.	completed as proposed	X
116	US-P06-110		4-Minor Editorial	99 A.03.01; 1 st sentence	Proposed Solution Replace "an Registration" with "a Registration"	completed as proposed	X
117	US-P06-111	US-P06-109 US-P06-113	2-Minor Technical	99 A.03.01; 2 nd paragraph; 1 st sentence	What are "permissible administered item values?" Proposed Solution Define term or place term and definition in Clause 3.	Changed "permissible administered item values" To "permissible values for the administered item's attributes"	X
118	US-P06-113	US-P06-109 US-P06-111	2-Minor Technical	99 A.03.02; 1 st Item in list	The inclusion of "permissible value of an administered item" does not make sense. Proposed Solution Delete the term "permissible value" or change to another term.	Changed " permissible value of an administered item " To "permissible values for the administered item's attributes"	X
119	US-P06-114		2-Minor Technical	99 A.04.01; Item G	Proposed Solution Replace "overlapping administered" with "overlapping semantics of administered".	completed as proposed	X

SEQ #	Cmnt ID	See Also	Severity	Reference	Description	Addressed By	
120	US-P06-116		2-Minor Technical	99 A.04.02; 1 st sentence and Items A, B, F, F	The term "assigned area" is not defined. Proposed Solution Define the term or place the term and definition in Clause 3.	"assigned area" is changed to "assigned functional area" and its definition is not specified as it is in an informative annex	X
121	US-P06-117		2-Minor Technical	99 A.04.02; Item D	The term "responsible area" is not defined. Proposed Solution Define the term or place the term and definition in Clause 3.	"responsible area" is changed to "assigned functional area" and its definition is not specified as it is in an informative annex	X
122	US-P06-115		4-Minor Editorial	99 A.04.02; Item F	There are two items labeled "F". Proposed Solution Change the label of the second item labeled F to G. Update the subsequent labels accordingly in this item list.	completed as proposed	X
123	US-P06-118		2-Minor Technical	99 A.04.02; Item G	The term "assigned functional area" is not defined. Proposed Solution Define the term or place the term and definition in Clause 3.	"assigned functional area" definition is not specified as it is in an informative annex	X
124	US-P06-119		4-Minor Editorial	99 A.04.05; 2 nd paragraph; Item F	Proposed Solution Delete the word "Registry" and move the word "registration" between the words "Standard" and "status".	completed as proposed	X
125	US-P06-120		4-Minor Editorial	99 A.04.05; 2 nd paragraph; Item G	Proposed Solution Replace "technical" with "semantical".	completed as proposed	X
126	US-P06-121		4-Minor Editorial	99 A.04.05; 2 nd paragraph; Item H	Proposed Solution Replace "Registry in the" with "Registry with the".	completed as proposed	X
127	US-P06-122		4-Minor Editorial	99 A.04.05; 3 rd paragraph	Proposed Solution Replace "Intransigent" with "Intractable".	completed as proposed	X
128	US-P06-123		4-Minor Editorial	99 A.04.06; 1 st paragraph; Item E	Proposed Solution Delete "at".	completed as proposed	X
129	US-P06-124		4-Minor Editorial	99 A.04.06; 2 nd paragraph; 2 nd sentence	Proposed Solution Replace "Intransigent" with "Intractable".	completed as proposed	X
130	US-P06-125		2-Minor Technical	99 A.04.06; 2 nd paragraph; 2 nd sentence	Proposed Solution Replace the sentence with "Intractable issues may be resolved by an established procedure."	completed as proposed	X

SEQ #	Cmnt ID	See Also	Severity	Reference	Description	Addressed By	
131	US-P06-105		3-Major Editorial	99 Annexes	parts of the annex may be helpful and informative, the annex is too prescriptive for organizations that already have established other structures for such data development and registration. If included at all, which I do not support, the annexes should be informative, not normative. Proposed Solution Only annexes D & E should be normative.	See #110 Annexes A, B, and C have been changed to informative	X
132	US-P06-126		4-Minor Editorial	99 B.01.01 – 5 th sentence	Proposed Solution Replace “levels” with “level”.	completed as proposed	X
133	US-P06-127		4-Minor Editorial	99 B.01.01; 6 th sentence	Proposed Solution Replace “Control Committee roles” with “roles of the Control Committee”.	completed as proposed	X
134	US-P06-128		4-Minor Editorial	99 B.01.02; 2 nd sentence	Proposed Solution Replace “in the registration status” with “with the registration status”.	completed as proposed	X
135	US-P06-129		2-Minor Technical	99 B.01.03; 1 st sentence	The term “assigned functional area” is not defined. Proposed Solution Define the term or place the term and definition in Clause 3.	“assigned functional area” definition is not specified as it is in an informative annex	X
136	US-P06-130		4-Minor Editorial	99 B.01.03; 1 st sentence	Proposed Solution End sentence at “Control Committee”. The next sentence reads “Presented candidates are evaluated to see if they meet the criteria for “Qualified” registration status.”	completed as proposed	X
137	US-P06-131		3-Major Editorial	99 B.01.04	This clause and the listed items within essentially repeat wording in Clause 4.3.2.2 Proposed Solution No solution provided.	This was reworked to remove any suggested Administrative Status values	X
138	US-P06-132		4-Minor Editorial	99 B.01.04; Items A – C	Proposed Solution Replace “administered item in the” with “administered item with the”.	completed as proposed	X
139	US-P06-133		4-Minor Editorial	99 B.01.04; Items A – C	Proposed Solution Replace “status indicates that” with “status means that”.	completed as proposed	X
140	US-P06-134		1-Major Technical	99 B.02; 2 nd paragraph	The model whereby organizations sharing registry metadata create a super-registry between them might be outdated. The 20944 family of standards specifies the bindings necessary to read and import metadata from one registry to another. If it is determined that there may be semantic overlap between AIs originally created in the separate registries, then ROs / Stewards must get together to resolve the differences. Does a full RA need to be established? Proposed Solution Remove Clause B.2	Completed as proposed	X

SEQ #	Cmnt ID	See Also	Severity	Reference	Description	Addressed By	
141	US-P06-135		4-Minor Editorial	99 B.02; 2 nd paragraph; 1 st sentence	<p>Proposed Solution</p> <p>Replace "an Registration Authority" with "a Registration Authority".</p>	completed as proposed	X
142	US-P06-136		4-Minor Editorial	99 C.01.01	<p><i>I don't understand what 'applications' are supposed to mean. This annex is the only place the term appears.</i></p> <p>Proposed Solution</p> <p>none</p>	"application" is changed to "submission"	X
143	US-P06-137		1-Major Technical	99 C.01.03; 1 st sentence	<p>The sentence lists the possibility of a withdrawal. No subsequent clause addresses withdrawal procedures.</p> <p>Proposed Solution</p> <p>Remove "withdrawn"</p>	<p>Rejected</p> <p>Melbourne meeting solution</p>	X
144	US-P06-138		4-Minor Editorial	99 C.01.04.02; 1 st sentence	<p>The sentence does not make sense as written. It isn't clear what the intent is.</p> <p>Proposed Solution</p> <p>No solution provided.</p>	completed as proposed	X
145	US-P06-139		2-Minor Technical	99 C.01.04.03; 1 st paragraph	<p>This does not make sense. Once an AI has been submitted, it was submitted by the Submitter. That can never change.</p> <p>Proposed Solution</p> <p>No solution provided.</p>	<p>Rejected</p> <p>"A Submitter may reassign a registered item to another Submitter." An example may be to show the party that was not a third party.</p>	X
146	US-P06-140		3-Major Editorial	99 C.02	<p>I have concerns that the wording here is repetitive throughout. There should be a way to present this without a long list of steps. One suggestion is to start each new set of steps on a new page. Another is to list only the things that are different at each registration status description. In addition, it will be helpful to list each action within a step in a bulleted list.</p>	<p>Rejected</p> <p>Melbourne meeting solution</p>	X
147	US-P06-141		4-Minor Editorial	99 C.02.03; Step 1; 1 st sentence	<p>This sentence refers to the next status in the quality chain. It should refer to the current status: Recorded.</p> <p>Proposed Solution</p> <p>Write the opening sentence similar to that in Step 1 of Clause C.2.4.</p>	<p>Accepted</p> <p>A new first sentence</p> <p>"Stewards will review "Recorded" registration status level administered items periodically with the view of possibly progressing an administered item to the registration status level of "Qualified"."</p> <p>Followed by an adjustment of the second sentence</p>	X
148	US-P06-142		4-Minor Editorial	99 C.02.06; Step 10	<p>Proposed Solution</p> <p>Change Step 10 to Step 2.</p>	completed as proposed	X

SEQ #	Cmnt ID	See Also	Severity	Reference	Description	Addressed By	
149	US-P06-144		4-Minor Editorial	99 C.02.08; Possible progression from "Superseded" status	Proposed Solution Remove "one", and change "statuses" to "status".	completed as proposed	X
150	US-P06-143		4-Minor Editorial	99 C.02.08; Step 9	Proposed Solution Change Step 9 to Step 1.	completed as proposed	X
151	US-P06-145		1-Major Technical	99 C.02.10	What if the available metadata is of high enough quality that the AI can be registered at one of the dynamic levels? Even though no suitable Steward exists for the AI, it still may be possible to progress the AI from DAN ADD THE REST OF THIS	Rejected Melbourne meeting solution	X
152	US-P06-146		1-Major Technical	99 C.03.01; 1 st sentence	What if the original submitter is no longer around for consultation, for instance because of retirement. Proposed Solution No solution provided.	Rejected Melbourne meeting solution	X
153	US-P06-147		4-Minor Editorial	99 C.03.01; 2 nd sentence	Proposed Solution Remove commas after "of an administered item" and "or higher".	completed as proposed	X
154	US-P06-148		4-Minor Editorial	99 C.03.01; Penultimate sentence	Stewards also have to determine whether changes warrant a new ID, not just a new version. Proposed Solution Add text to account for this possibility.	Accepted A new next to last sentence is added "Stewards also have to determine whether changes warrant a new ID, not just a new version."	X
155	US-P06-149		4-Minor Editorial	99 C.04.01; 2 nd paragraph	Proposed Solution Consider enclosing the quoted text in a box with only the vertical lines showing, and indent the text.	Editor: This is in reference to Annex D.4.1 not C.4.1 completed as proposed	X
156	US-P06-150		4-Minor Editorial	99 D.04.02; 1 st paragraph	Proposed Solution Add country name (UK or United Kingdom) to address of BSI.	completed as proposed	X
157	US-P06-151		4-Minor Editorial	99 D.04.02; Example	Proposed Solution Add country name to address of Dun and Bradstreet. UK again?	completed as proposed	X
158	US-P06-152		4-Minor Editorial	99 D.04.02; Example; 3 rd sentence	A reference to the company Dun and Bradstreet is listed as DUNS and Bradstreet. Proposed Solution Replace 4 th instance of "DUNS" in the sentence with "Dun".	completed as proposed	X

SEQ #	Cmnt ID	See Also	Severity	Reference	Description	Addressed By	
159	US-P06-154		4-Minor Editorial	99 E.01	First two tables are not numbered. Proposed Solution Number the tables.	The tables were incorrectly labeled at the bottom. The labels have been moved to the top of the tables.	X
160	US-P06-153		4-Minor Editorial	99 E.01; 1 st paragraph	The two references to Part 3 of 11179 should be changed. Proposed Solution Change the references to ISO/IEC 11179-3.	completed as proposed	X
160.1				99 E	Editor's Entry The table titles were incorrectly placed at the bottom of each table rather than at the beginning of each table	The table titles have been moved to the tops of the tables	X
161	US-P06-157		2-Minor Technical	99 E.01; Table 2 (not numbered); Definition Source Reference attribute	Definition Source Reference should be indicative for Qualified through Preferred statuses, and Reference Document Identifier should be conditional for the same statuses. Proposed Solution Change the obligations.	completed with Reference Document Identifier as indicative. The Definition Source Reference is a group item with Reference Document Identifier as one of its attributes	X
162	US-P06-156		2-Minor Technical	99 E.01; Table 2 (not numbered); Language Identifier attribute	Country Identifier should be mandatory for Qualified through Preferred statuses wherever Language Identifier is required. Proposed Solution Change the obligations.	Rejected See 11179-3:2003 Clause 4.8.1.5 country identifier is optional. Language country identifier is only needed if there are specifics to one country and not to other countries that use the language.	X
163	US-P06-158		2-Minor Technical	99 E.01; Table 2 (not numbered); Reference Document attribute class	Reference Document should be indicative for Qualified through Preferred statuses, and the attributes ref_doc_id, ref_doc_lang_id, lang_id, and country_id should all be conditional for the same statuses. Proposed Solution Change the obligations.	completed with Reference Document Identifier as indicative. The reference document language is a group item with language identifier and country identifier as one of its attributes	X
164	US-P06-155		2-Minor Technical	99 E.01; Table 2 (not numbered); Effective Date attribute	Effective Date should be mandatory and Until Date should be indicative for Qualified through Preferred statuses. Proposed Solution Change the obligations.	Completed as proposed	X
165	US-P06-159		4-Minor Editorial	99 E.01; Tables E-6, E-7, and E-8	Make all necessary changes made through changes to Clause E – Table 2 (not numbered) to keep all information consistent.	The tables were incorrectly labeled at the bottom. The labels have been moved to the top of the tables.	X
166	US-P06-161		4-Minor Editorial	99 F.02 – 2 nd paragraph; Step 3; 1 st sentence	Proposed Solution Add text “semantics of” between “redundant” and “administered”.	completed as proposed	X

SEQ #	Cmnt ID	See Also	Severity	Reference	Description	Addressed By	
167	US-P06-160		2-Minor Technical	99 F.02; 1 st paragraph; 1 st sentence	Why do harmonization issues begin with a steward's data elements. What if a registry contains no data elements. What if the steward is not responsible for any data elements. What if the harmonization issues being considered do affect any data elements? Proposed Solution Recommend deleting the first sentence. Second sentence remove "other"	Completed as proposed	X
168	US-P06-162		4-Minor Editorial	99 F.02; 2 nd paragraph; Step 4 – 2 nd sentence	Proposed Solution Replace "data elements" with "administered items".	completed as proposed ("administered item" not "administered items")	X
169	US-P06-163		4-Minor Editorial	99 F.02; 2 nd paragraph; Step 7 – 1 st sentence	Proposed Solution Replace "data elements" with "administered items".	completed as proposed ("administered item" not "administered items")	X
170	US-P06-164		4-Minor Editorial	99 F.02; 2 nd paragraph; Step 7 – 2 nd sentence	Proposed Solution Replace "involved in a set of administered items at issue" with "is".	completed as proposed	X
171	US-P06-165		4-Minor Editorial	99 G.01; 4 th sentence	Proposed Solution Replace "finite" with "limited".	completed as proposed	X
172	US-P06-166		4-Minor Editorial	99 G.02; 3 rd paragraph; 2 nd sentence	Proposed Solution Replace "X3" with "INCITS-".	completed as proposed	X
173	US-P06-002		4 - Minor Editorial	General	The document should be reformatted so that it prints on both A4 and 8.5x11 paper. The current document does not print on 8.5x11 paper.	The editor cannot recreate the problem. It prints on a HP4050N and a HP 4050 on 8.5x11 paper	X
174	US-P06-003		3 – Major Editorial	General	Needs a Bibliography section. Several standards and possible references to registry concepts of operations and other references are not listed. Proposed Solution Create appropriate bibliography of references.	Accepted The Editor added ISO CD 19135 from ISO TC 211 and ANSI IEEE 1489	X
175	US-P06-004		3-Major Editorial	General	Much of the language throughout is repetitive. For example, clause B.1.4 repeats verbatim much of clause 4.3.2.2. Proposed Solution The editor should review for reduction of redundant text	See # 28 This is now informative	X