

# ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 32 N 2324

Date: 2013-02-07

REPLACES: —

## ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 32

### Data Management and Interchange

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

<b>DOCUMENT TYPE</b>	Summary of Voting/Table of Replies
<b>TITLE</b>	Summary of Voting on 32N2262 ISO/IEC DTR 20943-5 Information technology - Achieving Metadata Registry Content Consistency - Part 5: Semantic metadata mapping procedure (SMMP)
<b>SOURCE</b>	SC32 Secretariat
<b>PROJECT NUMBER</b>	1.32.16.01.05.00
<b>STATUS</b>	WG2 is requested to resolve the comments. The document has been approved by the member bodies of JTC1.
<b>REFERENCES</b>	
<b>ACTION ID.</b>	ACT
<b>REQUESTED ACTION</b>	
<b>DUE DATE</b>	
<b>Number of Pages</b>	14
<b>LANGUAGE USED</b>	English
<b>DISTRIBUTION</b>	P & L Members SC Chair WG Conveners and Secretaries

Dr. Timothy Schoechle, Secretary, ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 32  
Farance Inc \*, 3066 Sixth Street, Boulder, CO, United States of America  
Telephone: +1 303-443-5490; E-mail: [Timothy@Schoechle.org](mailto:Timothy@Schoechle.org)  
available from the JTC 1/SC 32 WebSite <http://www.jtc1sc32.org/>  
\*Farance Inc. administers the ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 32 Secretariat on behalf of ANSI

## ISO/IEC JTC 1 N11502

2013-01-30

Replaces:

### ISO/IEC JTC 1 Information Technology

**Document Type:** summary of voting

**Document Title:** Summary of Voting on JTC 1 N11412, Text of ISO/IEC DTR 20943-5 Information technology - Achieving Metadata Registry Content Consistency - Part 5: Semantic metadata mapping procedure (SMMP)

**Document Source:** JTC 1 Secretariat

**Project Number:**

**Document Status:** The results of this ballot are forwarded to SC 32 for review and resolution of the comments and preparation of a revised text for further processing.

**Action ID:** INFO

**Due Date:**

**Pages:**

## Result of voting

### Ballot Information

<b>Ballot reference</b>	JTC001-N-11412
<b>Ballot type</b>	DTR
<b>Ballot title</b>	<a href="#">Text of ISO/IEC DTR 20943-5 Information technology - Achieving Metadata Registry Content Consistency - Part 5: Semantic metadata mapping procedure (SMMP)</a>
<b>Opening date</b>	2012-10-28
<b>Closing date</b>	2013-01-28
<b>Note</b>	

### Member responses:

<b>Votes cast (30)</b>	Armenia (SARM) Australia (SA) Belgium (NBN) Canada (SCC) China (SAC) Côte d'Ivoire (CODINORM) Czech Republic (UNMZ) Denmark (DS) Finland (SFS) France (AFNOR) Germany (DIN) India (BIS) Ireland (NSAI) Italy (UNI) Jamaica (BSJ) Japan (JISC) Korea, Republic of (KATS) Lebanon (LIBNOR) Malaysia (DSM) Malta (MCCAA) Netherlands (NEN) Norway (SN) Pakistan (PSQCA) Russian Federation (GOST R) Singapore (SPRING SG) Spain (AENOR) Sweden (SIS) Switzerland (SNV) United Kingdom (BSI) United States (ANSI)
<b>Comments submitted (0)</b>	
<b>Votes not cast (5)</b>	Austria (ASI) Kenya (KEBS) Nigeria (SON) South Africa (SABS) United Arab Emirates (ESMA)

Questions:	
<b>Q.1</b>	"Does your National Body approve the attached DTR to go forward to publication?"
<b>Q.2</b>	"If you approve the DTR Text with comments, would you please indicate which type ? (General, Technical or Editorial)"
<b>Q.3</b>	"If you Disapprove the Draft, would you please indicate if you accept to change your vote to Approval if the reasons and appropriate changes will be accepted?"

Votes by members	Q.1	Q.2	Q.3
<b>Armenia (SARM)</b>	Abstention	Ignore	Ignore
<b>Australia (SA)</b>	Abstention	Ignore	Ignore
<b>Belgium (NBN)</b>	Abstention	Ignore	Ignore
<b>Canada (SCC)</b>	Disapproval the draft for the reasons below	Both	Yes
<b>China (SAC)</b>	Approval as presented	Ignore	Ignore
<b>Côte d'Ivoire (CODINORM)</b>	Abstention	Ignore	Ignore
<b>Czech Republic (UNMZ)</b>	Approval as presented	Ignore	Ignore
<b>Denmark (DS)</b>	Abstention	Ignore	Ignore
<b>Finland (SFS)</b>	Abstention	Ignore	Ignore
<b>France (AFNOR)</b>	Abstention	Ignore	Ignore
<b>Germany (DIN)</b>	Abstention	Ignore	Ignore
<b>India (BIS)</b>	Abstention	Ignore	Ignore
<b>Ireland (NSAI)</b>	Approval as presented	Ignore	Ignore
<b>Italy (UNI)</b>	Approval as presented	Ignore	Ignore
<b>Jamaica (BSJ)</b>	Abstention	Ignore	Ignore
<b>Japan (JISC)</b>	Approval as presented	Ignore	Ignore
<b>Korea, Republic of (KATS)</b>	Approval as presented	Ignore	Ignore
<b>Lebanon (LIBNOR)</b>	Abstention	Ignore	Ignore
<b>Malaysia (DSM)</b>	Abstention	Ignore	Ignore
<b>Malta (MCCAA)</b>	Abstention	Ignore	Ignore
<b>Netherlands (NEN)</b>	Abstention	Ignore	Ignore
<b>Norway (SN)</b>	Abstention	Ignore	Ignore
<b>Pakistan (PSQCA)</b>	Approval as presented	Ignore	Ignore
<b>Russian Federation</b>	Approval as	Ignore	Ignore

<b>(GOST R)</b>	presented		
<b>Singapore (SPRING SG)</b>	Abstention	Ignore	Ignore
<b>Spain (AENOR)</b>	Abstention	Ignore	Ignore
<b>Sweden (SIS)</b>	Abstention	Ignore	Ignore
<b>Switzerland (SNV)</b>	Abstention	Ignore	Ignore
<b>United Kingdom (BSI)</b>	Abstention	Ignore	Ignore
<b>United States (ANSI)</b>	Disapproval the draft for the reasons below	Ignore	Yes

Answers to Q.1: "Does your National Body approve the attached DTR to go forward to publication?"		
<b>8 x</b>	<b>Approval as presented</b>	<b>China (SAC) Czech Republic (UNMZ) Ireland (NSAI) Italy (UNI) Japan (JISC) Korea, Republic of (KATS) Pakistan (PSQCA) Russian Federation (GOST R)</b>
<b>0 x</b>	<b>Approval with comments as given below</b>	
<b>2 x</b>	<b>Disapproval the draft for the reasons below</b>	<b>Canada (SCC) United States (ANSI)</b>
<b>20 x</b>	<b>Abstention</b>	<b>Armenia (SARM) Australia (SA) Belgium (NBN) Côte d'Ivoire (CODINORM) Denmark (DS) Finland (SFS) France (AFNOR) Germany (DIN) India (BIS) Jamaica (BSJ) Lebanon (LIBNOR) Malaysia (DSM) Malta (MCCAA) Netherlands (NEN) Norway (SN) Singapore (SPRING SG) Spain (AENOR) Sweden (SIS) Switzerland (SNV) United Kingdom (BSI)</b>

Answers to Q.2: "If you approve the DTR Text with comments, would you please indicate which type ? (General, Technical or Editorial)"	
<b>0 x</b>	<b>General</b>
<b>0 x</b>	<b>Technical</b>

<b>0 x</b>	<b>Editorial</b>	
<b>1 x</b>	<b>Both</b>	<b>Canada (SCC)</b>
<b>29 x</b>	<b>Ignore</b>	<b>Armenia (SARM)</b> <b>Australia (SA)</b> <b>Belgium (NBN)</b> <b>China (SAC)</b> <b>Czech Republic (UNMZ)</b> <b>Côte d'Ivoire (CODINORM)</b> <b>Denmark (DS)</b> <b>Finland (SFS)</b> <b>France (AFNOR)</b> <b>Germany (DIN)</b> <b>India (BIS)</b> <b>Ireland (NSAI)</b> <b>Italy (UNI)</b> <b>Jamaica (BSJ)</b> <b>Japan (JISC)</b> <b>Korea, Republic of (KATS)</b> <b>Lebanon (LIBNOR)</b> <b>Malaysia (DSM)</b> <b>Malta (MCCAA)</b> <b>Netherlands (NEN)</b> <b>Norway (SN)</b> <b>Pakistan (PSQCA)</b> <b>Russian Federation (GOST R)</b> <b>Singapore (SPRING SG)</b> <b>Spain (AENOR)</b> <b>Sweden (SIS)</b> <b>Switzerland (SNV)</b> <b>United Kingdom (BSI)</b> <b>United States (ANSI)</b>

Answers to Q.3: "If you Disapprove the Draft, would you please indicate if you accept to change your vote to Approval if the reasons and appropriate changes will be accepted?"

<b>2 x</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>Canada (SCC)</b> <b>United States (ANSI)</b>
<b>0 x</b>	<b>No</b>	
<b>28 x</b>	<b>Ignore</b>	<b>Armenia (SARM)</b> <b>Australia (SA)</b> <b>Belgium (NBN)</b> <b>China (SAC)</b> <b>Czech Republic (UNMZ)</b> <b>Côte d'Ivoire (CODINORM)</b> <b>Denmark (DS)</b> <b>Finland (SFS)</b> <b>France (AFNOR)</b> <b>Germany (DIN)</b> <b>India (BIS)</b> <b>Ireland (NSAI)</b> <b>Italy (UNI)</b> <b>Jamaica (BSJ)</b> <b>Japan (JISC)</b> <b>Korea, Republic of (KATS)</b> <b>Lebanon (LIBNOR)</b> <b>Malaysia (DSM)</b> <b>Malta (MCCAA)</b>

Netherlands (NEN)  
 Norway (SN)  
 Pakistan (PSQCA)  
 Russian Federation (GOST R)  
 Singapore (SPRING SG)  
 Spain (AENOR)  
 Sweden (SIS)  
 Switzerland (SNV)  
 United Kingdom (BSI)

Comments from Voters		
Member:	Comment:	Date:
<b>Canada (SCC)</b>	<b><i>Comment File</i></b>	2013-01-23 16:38:18
<a href="#">CommentFiles/JTC001-N-11412_SCC.doc</a>		
<b>United States (ANSI)</b>	<b><i>Comment File</i></b>	2013-01-25 20:53:25
<a href="#">CommentFiles/JTC001-N-11412_ANSI.doc</a>		

Comments from Commenters		
Member:	Comment:	Date:

1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
MB <sup>1</sup>	Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex (e.g. 3.1)	Paragraph/ Figure/Table/ Note (e.g. Table 1)	Type of com- ment <sup>2</sup>	Comment (justification for change) by the MB	Proposed change by the MB	Secretariat observations on each comment submitted
CA00	0-Ballot	-	Ge	Canada has voted 'Disapprove with Comments' on this ballot, for the reasons stated below. Canada supports the project and will change its vote to Approval on satisfactory resolution of these comments.	See detailed comments below.	
CA01	2-Normative references	11179-3	Ed	The document references the 3 <sup>rd</sup> edition of 11179-3 with the date 2012, but the FDIS ballot does not close until Jan 2013.	Change 2012 to 2013.	
CA02	3.1 Terms and definitions	All	Ed	When reading a definition, there is no easy way to know whether the words used are defined terms.	Where a defined term is used in the definition of another term, highlight the defined term in <b>bold</b> in the definition where it is used. (If a term is used more than once in the same definition, only the first occurrence should be high-lighted.)  See the following entries for specific instances, but the change should be applied to any other instances we may have missed.	
CA03	3.1 Terms and definitions	3.1.2	Ed	In the definition, 'heterogeneity' is a defined term.	Use bold font as per CA02.	
CA04	3.1 Terms and definitions	3.1.3	Ed	In the definition, 'heterogeneity' is a defined term.	Use bold font as per CA02.	
CA05	3.1 Terms and definitions	3.1.5	Ed	In the definition, 'heterogeneity' is a defined term.	Use bold font as per CA02.	
CA06	3.1 Terms and definitions	3.1.7	Ed	In the definition, 'heterogeneity' is a defined term.	Use bold font as per CA02.	
CA07	3.1 Terms and definitions	3.1.10	Ed	In the definition, 'metadata element set' is a defined term.	Use bold font as per CA02.	
CA08	3.1 Terms and definitions	3.1.11	Ed	In the definition, 'metadata element set' and 'primary metadata element set' are defined terms.	Use bold font as per CA02.	
CA09	3.1 Terms and definitions	3.1.12	Ed	In the definition, 'heterogeneity' is a defined term.	Use bold font as per CA02.	

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

2 **Type of comment:** **ge** = general **te** = technical **ed** = editorial

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



1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
MB <sup>1</sup>	Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex (e.g. 3.1)	Paragraph/ Figure/Table/ Note (e.g. Table 1)	Type of com- ment <sup>2</sup>	Comment (justification for change) by the MB	Proposed change by the MB	Secretariat observations on each comment submitted
CA10	3.2 Abbreviation	NISO	Ed	The abbreviation NISO is used in clause 3.1.1 and elsewhere, but is not listed in clause 3.2	Add and entry for NISO as 'National Information Standards Organization' with a link to <a href="http://www.niso.org">www.niso.org</a> and a NOTE that it is a USA organization.	
CA11	9-Bibliography	New	Ed	Clauses 3.1.1 and 3.1.6 reference a NISO publication.	Add the referenced publication to the Bibliography.	
CA12	9-Bibliography	New	Ed	Clause 3.1.8 references ISO/TS 18876-1	Add the referenced document to the Bibliography.	
CA13	All		Te	Any other errors found before or during the Ballot Resolution meeting should be corrected if consensus can be reached on a resolution.	To be addressed at the CRM as required.	

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

2 **Type of comment:** **ge** = general **te** = technical **ed** = editorial

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

<b>Comments on DTR Text For: ISO/IEC 20943-5 Information technology - Achieving Metadata Registry Content Consistency - Part 5: Metadata mapping procedure</b>				Date: 2012-12-03	Document: <b>SC32/N2262</b>
--	--	--	--	------------------	-----------------------------

0	1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
#	NB 1	Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex	Paragraph/ Figure/Table/ Note #	Com- ment type <sup>2</sup>	Comment (justification for change) by the NB	Proposed change by the NB	Secretariat observations on each comment submitted

001	US	Intro	1	ed	Last sentence is not clearly written.	Suggest "For example, synonyms may cause discrepancies. If two data elements mean the same thing but have different names, that difference may cause data under each to be flagged as incompatible when they aren't."	
002	US	Intro	2	ed	The 3 <sup>rd</sup> and 4 <sup>th</sup> sentences both begin with "For example". The 4 <sup>th</sup> sentence really has the example.	Remove "For example" in the 3 <sup>rd</sup> sentence.	
003	US	Intro	2	ed	3 <sup>rd</sup> sentence. DC, MARC, and MODS are metadata schemas. But, we think you have taken the "metadata" in the title of the Part and applied it to a need to compare only metadata schemas. The metadata comparison is about the descriptions of the underlying data (to be able to achieve interoperability)	Change "metadata, such as" to "metadata schemas, such as".	
004	US	Intro	2	ed	3 <sup>rd</sup> sentence. "a book" is jarring.	Change to "books".	
005	US	Intro	2	te	Last sentence. This sentence doesn't fit in this paragraph. Factoring results in different data elements, not necessarily different names. More importantly, given the 1 <sup>st</sup> paragraph, it begins to sound as if the only difference under consideration is a one between names, and that is hardly the case in the document.	Suggest "So, the result might be significantly different data elements in different schemas, even though eh schemas describe the same objects."	
006	US	Intro	3	te	Last sentence. Again, there is an emphasis on different names.	Suggest removing the sentence.	
007	US	Intro	4	ed	Last sentence – "semantic metadata mapping" no longer corresponds with the title of the document.	Remove "semantic".	
008	US	Scope	1	ed	Wording is not appropriate for a Scope statement in places. Plus, crosswalks can't conform to 11179, but they might be based on the standard.	Change "set up" to "describe", change "making" to "establishing", and change "that conform to" to "based on".	
009	US	Scope	2	ed	The reference to registries may be too vague.	Change "among registries" to "among ISO/IEC 11179-based registries".	
010	US	4	1	te	The paragraph isn't clear. We either cover DEC and CD mapping, or we cover DE, DEC, CD, and	Restrict to DEC and CD mapping. This will be consistent with other comments later.	

1 NB = National body (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the Secretariat editing unit are identified by \*\*)

page 1 of 4

2 Type of comment: ge = general te = technical ed = editorial NOTE Columns 1, 2, 4, 5 are compulsory. ISO electronic balloting commenting template (enhanced 2002-08)

<b>Comments on DTR Text For: ISO/IEC 20943-5 Information technology - Achieving Metadata Registry Content Consistency - Part 5: Metadata mapping procedure</b>	Date: 2012-12-03	Document: <b>SC32/N2262</b>
--	------------------	-----------------------------

0	1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
#	NB 1	Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex	Paragraph/ Figure/Table/ Note #	Com- ment type <sup>2</sup>	Comment (justification for change) by the NB	Proposed change by the NB	Secretariat observations on each comment submitted

					VD mapping. This says both.	Mapping between designations of Value Meanings in Value Domains can be described separately in a new clause.	
011	US	4	1	ed	The text is a hanging paragraph. See the Directives.	Add a new sub-clause 4.1 and put the amended (from US 010) text there.	
012	US	4.1	Figure 1 and Figure 2	ed	The procedure could be applied to DEC's describing the data in statistical data sets. The elements do not have to be metadata elements. The metadata in the title of this Part refers to the descriptions of the DEC's, not whether such DEC's describe metadata. There, the title of the top box appears wrong.  Yes, DC, MARC, and other specs are described as metadata standards. But, they still are schemas for some data.	Change "metadata element sets" to "sets of DEC's". Then, shorten "data element concepts" in the titles in the other 2 boxes to "DEC's".	
013	US	4.1	2 and 3	ed	"Metadata element sets" again.	Use of "metadata element sets" in the paragraphs should be changed as in US-012.	
014	US	4.1.1	Title and throughout including Table 1	ed	"Metadata element sets" again.	Use of "metadata element sets" in the sub-clause should be changed as in US-012.	
015	US	4	Entire clause	ge, te	The CD and VD case is described in 4.2 and seems disconnected from 4.1. By addressing them together, we ensure data interoperability, since each datum is a designation of a VM, at its lowest level. For example, a datum described by the DEC "marital status of person" also identifies the status a particular person belongs: single, married, widowed, and divorced. So, data interoperability, the goal of harmonization procedures, requires looking at both DEC's and CD's together.	Tie sub-clauses 4.1 and 4.2 more tightly together. In particular, note how the CD is used to classify objects corresponding to the OC according to the Property in the DEC. Even though DEC's can be the same, their CD's may differ substantially. This has an impact on how well data may be translated from one system to another. This is why making a stop point at the DEC may not make sense.	
016	US	4.1.2	1	te	To evaluate DEC's, the order requires looking at OC's then P's. However, one may have the	The procedure should take this into account. In comparing DEC's, it makes	

1 NB = National body (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the Secretariat editing unit are identified by \*\*)

<b>Comments on DTR Text For: ISO/IEC 20943-5 Information technology - Achieving Metadata Registry Content Consistency - Part 5: Metadata mapping procedure</b>				Date: 2012-12-03	Document: <b>SC32/N2262</b>
--	--	--	--	------------------	-----------------------------

0	1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
#	NB <sup>1</sup>	Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex	Paragraph/ Figure/Table/ Note #	Comment type <sup>2</sup>	Comment (justification for change) by the NB	Proposed change by the NB	Secretariat observations on each comment submitted

					following 2 DEC's: Sex of bears Sex of deer Even though the OC's differ, the P's are the same. It may be possible to combine the data described in some meaningful ways, and if we look at the OC first, we may miss the similarity exposed through the use of the same P.	sense to organize by P's first in some circumstances.	
017	US	4.2	Entire sub-clause	te	Table 3 applies just as well to comparing VM's as it does DEC's, OC's, and P's.	Consistent with US-015 and US-016, incorporate this into an expanded method of comparing VM's, P's, and OC's together.	
018	US	4.2	Entire sub-clause	te	The sub-clause mixes the ideas of comparing CD's (through VM's) with comparing VD's (through designations, i.e., PV's). The semantics are not contained in the PV in general. Some designations are terms, and therefore they are linguistic and convey meaning, but codes do not. Plus, you are missing the semantic comparisons available in each VM.	If you want to include a comparison of the designations in a VD, then add a new sub-clause to do this. Separate the VM comparison for CD's from the PV comparison for VD's. They aren't the same. They don't follow the same rules, and the rules that apply for VM's are the same as for DEC's, OC's, and P's.	
019	US	Bibliography	Item [7]	ed	A later version has been published	Update to: ISO TR25100:2012, Intelligent transport systems System architecture – Harmonization of ITS data concepts.	
020	US	3.1.7		ed	Need reference to ISO 1087-1	Add [ISO 1087-1:2000)	
021	US	4.1.1.2	Table 1	ed	DCMI is an unexplained abbreviation	Add explanation to clause 3.2	
022	US	4.1.3.1		ed	The meaning of "properties hidden in" is unclear	Clarify	
023	US	4.1.3.1		ed	Inappropriate use of "we"	Reformulate the sentence	
024	US	4.1.3.1	Clause 3 last sentence	ed	Inappropriate reference to "Appendix B"	Correct to "Annex B"	
025	US	4.2.1	End of sentence	ed	'decomposition is only one aspect of recomposition	Replace decomposition with recomposition	
026	US	throughout		ge	The term "metadata element set" is confusing	Change to "sets of DEC's" throughout	

1 NB = National body (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the Secretariat editing unit are identified by \*\*)

2 Type of comment: ge = general te = technical ed = editorial NOTE Columns 1, 2, 4, 5 are compulsory. ISO electronic balloting commenting template (enhanced 2002-08)

<b>Comments on DTR Text For: ISO/IEC 20943-5 Information technology - Achieving Metadata Registry Content Consistency - Part 5: Metadata mapping procedure</b>	Date: 2012-12-03	Document: <b>SC32/N2262</b>
--	------------------	-----------------------------

0	1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
#	NB <sup>1</sup>	Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex	Paragraph/ Figure/Table/ Note #	Com- ment type <sup>2</sup>	Comment (justification for change) by the NB	Proposed change by the NB	Secretariat observations on each comment submitted

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

<sup>2</sup> Type of comment: ge = general te = technical ed = editorial NOTE Columns 1, 2, 4, 5 are compulsory. ISO electronic balloting commenting template (enhanced 2002-08)

## Template for comments and secretariat observations

Date: 2013-01-29

Document: **ISO/IEC DTR 20943-5**

1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
<b>MB<sup>1</sup></b>	<b>Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex (e.g. 3.1)</b>	<b>Paragraph/ Figure/Table/ Note (e.g. Table 1)</b>	<b>Type of com- ment<sup>2</sup></b>	<b>Comment (justification for change) by the MB</b>	<b>Proposed change by the MB</b>	<b>Secretariat observations on each comment submitted</b>
**	1	Scope	ed		ISO/IEC 11179 is a series. Refer to it either as "the ISO/IEC 11179 series" or specify the part number, e.g. ISO/IEC 11179-5.	
**	2	Normative references	ed	ISO 704 is not cited in the document.	Move the reference into the Bibliography.	
**	2	Normative references	ed	ISO 1087-1 is not cited in the document.	Move the reference into the Bibliography.	
**	2	Normative references	ed	ISO/IEC 11179-5 is not cited in the document.	Move the reference into the Bibliography.	
**	2	Normative references	ed	ISO/IEC TR 20943-1 is not cited normatively in the document.	Either cite the document normatively (shall) or move it into the Bibliography.	
**		Bibliography	ed	ISO references should appear first in the list.	Reorder the list so that ISO references appear first.	

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

2 **Type of comment:** **ge** = general **te** = technical **ed** = editorial

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