

# ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 32 N 2332

Date: 2013-03-20

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 32N2282 ISO/IEC CD5 19763-5 Information technology - Metamodel framework for interoperability (MFI) Part 5: Metamodel for process model registration
<b>SOURCE</b>	SC32 Secretariat
<b>PROJECT NUMBER</b>	1.32.22.01.05.00
<b>STATUS</b>	WG2 is requested to resolve the comments. The document did not obtain substantial support.
<b>REFERENCES</b>	
<b>ACTION ID.</b>	ACT
<b>REQUESTED ACTION</b>	
<b>DUE DATE</b>	
<b>Number of Pages</b>	16
<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/SC 32 N2332

### Summary of Voting on Document SC 32 N 2282

**Title:** Summary of Voting on 32N2282 ISO/IEC CD5 19763-5 Information technology - Metamodel framework for interoperability (MFI) Part 5: Metamodel for process model registration

Project: 1.32.22.01.05.00

<b>“P” Member</b>	<b>Approval</b>	<b>Approval with Comments</b>	<b>Disapproval with Comments</b>	<b>Abstention with Comments</b>
Canada			1	
China	1			
Czech Republic	1			
Egypt	1			
Finland				1
Germany				1
India				1
Japan			1	
Korea, Republic of	1			
Portugal				1
Russian Federation	1			
United Kingdom			1	
United States			1	
<b>Total “P”</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>“O” Member</b>				
Austria				
Belgium				
France				1
Ghana				
Hungary				
Indonesia				
Italy				
Kazakhstan				
Netherlands, The				
Norway				
Romania				
Poland				
Sweden				
Switzerland				
<b>Total “O”</b>				

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

## **COMMENTS:**

### **Canada**

NO. See comments below:

### **Finland**

ABSTAIN. Lack of expertise and interest.

### **Germany**

ABSTAIN. Lack of expertise and interest.

### **India**

ABSTAIN. Lack of expertise and interest.

### **Japan**

NO. See comments below:

### **Portugal**

ABSTAIN. Lack of expertise and interest.

### **United Kingdom**

NO. See comments below:

### **United States**

NO. See comments below:

MB/NC <sup>1</sup>	Line number	Clause/Subclause	Paragraph/Figure/Table/	Type of comment <sup>2</sup>	Comments	Proposed change	Observations of the secretariat
CA00	All	All	-	ge	Canada disapproves of the draft for the reasons below.	Canada will change its vote to Approval if the comments below are satisfactorily addressed.	
CA01	All	All	-	ge	Since the new template allows for text to be referenced using line numbers, we generated a line numbered version of the text which is attached at the bottom of this document, and we have referenced those line numbers in our comments.	Canada asks that future ballot texts include line numbers so that all NBs can reference them.	
CA02	017	Inside cover	Document stage	Ed	Document stage 28 is not valid. CD stage is 30. DIS stage will be 40.	Choose the appropriate value for the next ballot	
CA03	134	Introduction	Para 1	Ed	The text "to streamline product development and delivery and reduce operational costs" does not read well because the first and joins two objects in the first clause, while the second and joins two clauses.	Insert a comma after 'delivery'.	
CA04	135-137	Introduction	Para 1	Ed	The third sentence does not read well: "To promote interoperation within and across enterprises, providing registration of process models in a standard repository so they can be discovered, understood and compared for use and integration will help to facilitate this kind of collaboration."	Rewrite as: "Providing registration of process models in a standard repository, so they can be discovered, understood and compared for use and integration, will help to promote interoperation within and across enterprises."	
CA05	144	Introduction	Para 3	Ed	A standard cannot intend anything.	Replace: "This part of ISO/IEC 19763 intends to provide" By: "This part of ISO/IEC 19763 provides"	
CA06	145	Introduction	Para 3	Ed	"a guidance" is not good English.	Delete the 'a'.	
CA07	167	Scope	Para 1, line 8	Ed	When the change was applied from a previous Canadian comment, the word 'the' was dropped.	Insert 'the' before function.	
CA08	225	3.1.11	Definition	Ed	'set of specification' is bad grammar.	Change to "set of specifications".	

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

<sup>2</sup> **Type of comment:** **ge** = general **te** = technical **ed** = editorial

MB/ NC <sup>1</sup>	Line number	Clause/ Subclause	Paragraph/ Figure/ Table/	Type of comment <sup>2</sup>	Comments	Proposed change	Observations of the secretariat
CA 09		3.2	New	Ed	The abbreviation 'PSL' is used in the document but not listed in this clause.	Add PSL – Process Specification Language	
CA 10	290,291	4.2.2	Clause ref	Ed	Instead of referring to just 'in 5', use 'in clause 5'.	Make the corrections in two places.	
CA 11	294.295	4.2.3	Clause ref	Ed	Instead of referring to just 'in 5', use 'in clause 5'.	Make the corrections in two places.	
CA 12		5	All	Ed	Indefinite articles ('a' or 'an' as appropriate) are needed when discussing model elements.	Make the changes as needed. Some specific instances are identified in other comments, but the changes should be made throughout.	
CA 13	305	5.1	Para 2, line 2	Ed	'or produced' does not read well.	Change to 'or be produced'.	
CA 14	306	5.1	Para 2, line 4	Te	'business goal' is not defined. 19763-8 defines 'goal', 'role goal' and 'personal goal', but not 'business goal', though it states in the Introduction that ISO/IEC 14662 defines it. There is no need to restrict the use of this part to business goals when part 8 is not similarly restricted. The parts should be consistent. Figure 2 shows 'Goal'.  This comment restates comment CA11 on CD4 which was not accepted. We will repeat the comment until it is satisfactorily addressed.	Change 'business goal' to 'goal', here and anywhere else it is used.	
CA 15	307	5.1	Para 2, line 5	Ed	'involved in to help the execution of the process' does not read well.	At a minimum, move 'in' after help, giving:  'involved to help in the execution of the process'  But the words 'to help' add no value and could be removed, giving:  'involved in the execution of the process'	
CA 16	310, 311	5.1	Para 3, 2 <sup>nd</sup> sentence	Ed	(1) It is not obvious what the 'it' in the following text refers to: "it can be specialized as".  (2) Indefinite articles ('a') are needed before each specialization.  (3) By their nature, the specialized control constraints are mutually exclusive, so 'and' is	Rewrite as:  "In this part, a dependency can be specialized as a sequence dependency, a split dependency, or a join dependency".	

1 **MB** = Member body / **NC** = National Committee (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

MB/NC <sup>1</sup>	Line number	Clause/Subclause	Paragraph/Figure/Table/	Type of comment <sup>2</sup>	Comments	Proposed change	Observations of the secretariat
					inappropriate.		
CA 17	311-314	5.1	Para 3, lines 2 through 5	Ed	The phrase 'more specifically' refers to all the types of dependency, but the second and third types have been separated out into separate sentences.	Add 'a' before each type of dependency, and either delete 'More specifically', or restructure the three sentences into one, e.g. by using semi-colons instead of periods:  "More specifically, a sequence dependency shows that the processes are executed in order; a split dependency specifies that when the preceding process is completed, one or more of the following processes will execute in parallel; a join dependency designates that the following process will start when the selected preceding processes are completed." Additional structure could be added to the sentence by using a list.	
CA 18	314-327	5.1	Para 3	Ed	Indefinite articles ('a') are needed when discussing model elements.	'a split dependency', 'a split dependency type', 'a join dependency', 'a join dependency type'.	
CA 19	332	5.1	Para 4	Te	The sentence: "A process involvement may exist with no associated process." is not true.  It would not make sense to define a 'process involvement' without a process, and Figure 2 explicitly shows there must be exactly one process.  CA23 from CD4 was not correctly applied.	Replace the sentence by:  "A process involvement shall have exactly one associated process."	
CA 20	334,335	5.1	Para 4	Ed	The sentence: "Each role may consist of several process involvements, and each process involvement is involved only one role." needs rewording.	Replace by:  "Each role may be involved in zero, one or many process involvements, but each process involvement involves exactly one role."	
CA 21	339	5.1	Para 5, line 4	Te	The sentence: "Each process has one precondition or postcondition." Needs rewording to reflect the fact the neither or both may exist.  <b>Question: Why just one, and not many?</b>	Replace by:  "Each process may have one precondition and/or one postcondition."  Explain why only one pre-condition or post-condition is permitted, or allow many if there is	

1 **MB** = Member body / **NC** = National Committee (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

MB/NC <sup>1</sup>	Line number	Clause/Subclause	Paragraph/Figure/Table/	Type of comment <sup>2</sup>	Comments	Proposed change	Observations of the secretariat
						no good reason.	
CA 22	349,351	5.2	Para 2, lines 1 and 3	Ed	The use of 'on the one hand' and 'on the other hand' adds no value.	Remove these phrases.	
CA 23	349	5.2	Para 2, line 1	Ed	'metaclasses' should be 'metaclass' because with the current sentence structure is can refer only to Process_Modelling_Language.	Make the correction.	
CA 24	349	5.2	Para 2, line 1	Ed	'the subclass' should be 'a subclass', because even though it the only subclass in this part, other subclasses exist in other parts.	Make the correction.	
CA 25	350	5.2	Para 2, line 2	Ed	'the subclass' should be 'a subclass', because even though it the only subclass in this part, other subclasses exist in other parts.	Make the correction.	
CA 26	351	5.2	Para 2, line 3	Ed	'the subclasses' should be 'subclasses'.	Make the correction.	
CA 27		All	All	Te	If any further problems are discovered before or during the Comment Resolution Meeting, and a consensus can be reached on a solution, then they should be corrected.	To be determined at the CRM as required.	

END



32N2282T-text\_for\_  
ballot-CD5\_19763-5\_1

1 **MB** = Member body / **NC** = National Committee (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

MB/ NC <sup>1</sup>	Line number (e.g. 17)	Clause/ Subclause (e.g. 3.1)	Paragraph/ Figure/ Table/ (e.g. Table 1)	Type of comment <sup>2</sup>	Comments	Proposed change	Observations of the secretariat
JP 01		3.1.7 .		ed	"3.1.7." should be " 3.1.7".		
JP 02		3.1.7 . dependency		te	Since a process model is a representation of a process, processes does not exist in a process model.	"by the processes in a process model" should be "by the process".	
JP 03		3.1.8 process element		ed	It is better not to use the word "comprise" because this word has almost opposite usages such as "Great Britain comprises England, Scotland and Wales" and "England, Scotland and Wales comprise Great Britain.", and is confusing.	"comprise" should be "constitute".	
JP 04		3.1.8 process element		te	"abstraction of the modelling constructs!" should be "thing" because modelling construct is not defined and its meaning is unclear and it is not necessary.		
JP 05		3.1.11 process involvement		ed	"this process" should be "a process".		
JP 06		5.1 Overview of MFI Process model registration	Figure2	te	Registered_Ontology_Atomic_Construct of MFI-3 does not have the references "annotated_event" and "annotated_process. Precondition, Postcondition nor Exit_Condition of MFI-7 do not have the reference "constrained_process"	This is one of the problems caused by that references in both ways are always required.	
JP 07	Legend	5.2 Associations between MFI PMR and MFI Core and mapping	Figure2	ed	"subClassOf" should be "subclass".		
JP 08	(Descrip tion)	5.3.1 Process_		te	"Process_Element is an abstract metaclass each instance of which represents a specific process	See JP09	

1 **MB** = Member body / **NC** = National Committee (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

MB/ NC <sup>1</sup>	Line number (e.g. 17)	Clause/ Subclause (e.g. 3.1)	Paragraph/ Figure/ Table/ (e.g. Table 1)	Type of comment <sup>2</sup>	Comments	Proposed change	Observations of the secretariat
		Element			<p>element, which is an abstraction of the modeling constructs that comprise a process, including processes and dependencies among them."</p> <p>The meaning of "specific" is unclear and it is not necessary.</p> <p>The meaning of ", which" phrase is unclear and it can be interpreted as "only this specific process element is an abstraction of the modeling constructs that comprise a process and some other process is not an an abstraction of the modeling constructs that comprise a process".</p> <p>Almost the same comment is applicable to all the descriptions of all the other metaclases.</p>		
JP 09	(description)	5.3.1 Process_ Element		te	<p>Since Process_Element is a subclass of Model_Element, its instance does not represent a thing that constitutes a process, but an element or a component of a model, in this part, of a process model.</p> <p>Model_Element in MFI-10</p> <p>Model_Element is a metaclass each instance of which represents an element or a component in a model, such as an entity type in an information model, an event in a process model, a service operation in a service model, or an actor in a role and goal model.</p> <p>Here, an event is treated in a process model, which is maybe not true.</p>	<p>""Process_Element is an abstract metaclass each instance of which represents an element or a component in a process model that represents a process element. A process element is a thing that comprises a process, including processes and dependencies among them."</p> <p>Or it is necessary to change the definitions of process element, process, dependency etc. From a thing that constitutes a process itself from an element or a component in a process model.</p>	
JP	Supercl	5.3.1		ed	"defined in" should be "from" to be consistent with		

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

<sup>2</sup> **Type of comment:** **ge** = general **te** = technical **ed** = editorial

MB/ NC <sup>1</sup>	Line number (e.g. 17)	Clause/ Subclause (e.g. 3.1)	Paragraph/ Figure/ Table/ (e.g. Table 1)	Type of comment <sup>2</sup>	Comments	Proposed change	Observations of the secretariat
10	ass	Process_Element  Also most of other metaclasses			other parts of MFI and MDR.		
JP 11	(description)	5.3.2 Process		te	<p>Since Proces is a subclass of Model_Element, its instance does not represent a process (in a real world), but an element or a component of a model, in this part, of a process model.</p> <p>Model_Element in MFI-10</p> <p>Model_Element is a metaclass each instance of which represents an element or a component in a model, such as an entity type in an information model, an event in a process model, a service operation in a service model, or an actor in a role and goal model.</p> <p>Here, an event is treated in a process model, which is maybe not true.</p>	<p>""Process is an a metaclass each instance of which represents an element or a component in a process model that represents an activity or a task that constitutes a process."</p> <p>Or it is necessary to change the definitions of process element, process, dependency etc. From a thing that constitutes a process itself from an element or a component in a process model.</p>	
JP 12		5.3.2 Process	fully_realizing_service_operation	ed	"Service_Operation" should be "Service_Operation (from MFI Service registration)"		
JP 13		5.3.2 Process	achieved_goal	ed	"Goal" should be "Goal (from MFI Role and Goal registration)"		
JP 14		5.3.2 Process	constraint	te	There are two "constraint"s. Reference names have to be unique within the metaclass.		
JP 15		5.3.2 Process	constraint	ed	"Precondition" should be "Precondition (from MFI Service registration)"		
JP 16		5.3.2 Process	constraint	ed	"Postcondition" should be "Postcondition (from MFI Service registration)"		

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

<sup>2</sup> **Type of comment:** **ge** = general **te** = technical **ed** = editorial

MB/ NC <sup>1</sup>	Line number (e.g. 17)	Clause/ Subclause (e.g. 3.1)	Paragraph/ Figure/ Table/ (e.g. Table 1)	Type of comment <sup>2</sup>	Comments	Proposed change	Observations of the secretariat
JP 17		5.3.2 Process  5.3.3 Process_ Mo del  5.3.5 Event  5.3.6 Resource	annotation	ed	"Registered_Ontology_Atomic_Construct" should be "Registered_Ontology_Atomic_Construct (from MFI Ontology registration)"		
JP 18		5.3.3 Resource	Superclass	te	"Model_Element" should be "Process_Element" because the definition of resource(3.1.9) is specific to a process.		
JP 19	(descript ion)	5.3.5 Event		te	<p>Since Event is a subclass of Model_Element, its instance does not represent an event (in a real world), but an element or a component of a model, in this part, of a process model, which represent an event (in a realworld).</p> <p>Model_Element in MFI-10</p> <p>Model_Element is a metaclass each instance of which represents an element or a component in a model, such as an entity type in an information model, an event in a process model, a service operation in a service model, or an actor in a role and goal model.</p> <p>Here, an event is treated in a process model, which is maybe not true.</p>	<p>""Process_Element is an abstract metaclass each instance of which represents an element or a component in a process model that represents an eventt. A n event is is an occurrence of a particular set of Circumstances."</p> <p>Or it is necessary to change the definitions of process element, process, dependency etc. From a thing that constitutes a process itself from an element or a component in a process model.</p>	
JP 20	(descript ion)	5.3. 6 Resource  5.3.7 Dependency		te	Similar to JP19		

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

<sup>2</sup> **Type of comment:** **ge** = general **te** = technical **ed** = editorial

MB/ NC <sup>1</sup>	Line number (e.g. 17)	Clause/ Subclause (e.g. 3.1)	Paragraph/ Figure/ Table/ (e.g. Table 1)	Type of comment <sup>2</sup>	Comments	Proposed change	Observations of the secretariat
		5.3.8 Sequence_ Dependency  5.3.9 Split_Depen dency  5.3.10 Join_Depen dency  5.3.11 Split_Depen dency_Optio n  5.3.12 Join_Depen dency_Optio n  5.3.13 Process_Inv olvement					
JP 21		5.3.6 Resource	Constraints	ed	"The 'consumer', 'creator' and 'user' references are mutually exclusive for any one process;" should be "The values of the references consumer', 'creator' and 'user' are mutually exclusive;".		
JP 22		5.3.11 Split_Depen dency_Optio n	Superclass	te	"Model_Element" should be "Process_Element" because this is specific to Split_Dependency, which is a subclass of Process_Element.		
JP 23		5.3.12 Join_Depen dency_Optio	Superclass	te	"Model_Element" should be "Process_Element" because this is specific to Join_Dependency, which is a subclass of Process_Element.		

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

<sup>2</sup> **Type of comment:** **ge** = general **te** = technical **ed** = editorial

MB/ NC <sup>1</sup>	Line number (e.g. 17)	Clause/ Subclause (e.g. 3.1)	Paragraph/ Figure/ Table/ (e.g. Table 1)	Type of comment <sup>2</sup>	Comments	Proposed change	Observations of the secretariat
		n					
JP 24		5.3.113 Process_Inv olvement	Superclass	te	"Model_Element" should be "Process_Element" because this is specific to Join_Process, which is a subclass of Process_Element.		
JP 25		5.3.13 Process_Inv olvement	describing_t ype	ed	"Involvement_Type!" should be "Involvement_Type(from MFI Role and Goal registration)"		
JP 26		5.3.13 Process_Inv olvement	Involving_rol e	ed	"Role!" should be "Role(from MFI Role and Goal registration)"		
JP 27		Annex A		te	The example of the meta-model is not an example supposing implementation.	Should be explained more concretely like the example of the implementation by RDBMS.	
JP 28		Annex A		te	There should be n example that has hierarchical (more than 1) decomposition of processes and show whether the association describing_model<-> described_process is used and how it is used if yes, because this is the most controversial point of this standard, which is not clarified yet.		
JP 29		Annex A	Figure A.4 at page 19	ed	It is Figure A.2.		
JP 30		Annex A	Figure A.2 Figure A.4 Figure A.6 Figure A.8	te	Process_00 should be removed because it is unclear what Process_00 is and this standard is for process model registration and not for process registration.		
JP 31		Annex B	EPC	ed	"It is used to describe business processes at the informal business level [7] " should be removed because it is not necessary for standard specifications.		
JP 32		Bibliography	[7]	ed	It should be removed because it is not necessary for standard specifications.		

1 **MB** = Member body / **NC** = National Committee (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

## Template for comments and secretariat observations

Date: 2 April 2013

Document: ISO/IEC CD5 19763-5

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 comment <sup>2</sup>	Comment (justification for change) by the MB	Proposed change by the MB	Secretariat observations on each comment submitted
GB 01	Introduction	Para 1, lines 3 to 5	ed	"To promote interoperation within and across enterprises, providing registration of process models in a standard repository so they can be discovered, understood and compared for use and integration will help to facilitate this kind of collaboration." – confusing repository and registry and missing words	Amend to read: "To promote interoperation within and across enterprises, providing for the registration of process models in a standard registry so that they can be discovered, understood and compared for use and integration will help to facilitate this kind of collaboration."	
GB 02	General		ed	There are many instances in the document where the word "modeling" is used. It was agreed at the Berlin meeting to adopt the British English spelling of "modelling" except where it forms part of a trademarked name, such as UML (Unified Modeling Language).	Amend "modeling" to "modelling" throughout.	
GB 03	1	Para 1, line 2	ed	"(PMR)" – inconsistent use of abbreviations across parts	Delete "(PMR)" – there are no other instances of its use before 3.2.	
GB 04	3.2	BPMN	ed	Inconsistency – in 1 BPMN is expanded as "Business Process Modeling Notation" yet here it is expanded as "Business Process Model and Notation".	Use consistent expansions. Although OMG has both on its website, "Business Process Modeling Notation" appears to be more natural.	
GB 05	3.2	MFI PMR	ed	Inconsistency	Amend to read: "MFI Process Model registration"	
GB 06	5.1	Fig 2	te	The figure shows Process_Involvement as being defined in this part. Since Process_Involvement is more closely related to Role than to Process it should be defined in Part 8 and not in this part.	Delete definition of Process_Involvement (5.3.13) from this part and make the necessary changes to Figures 2 and 3.	
GB 07	5.3.1		ed	A preliminary sub-clause is required to describe what follows.	Add a clause similar to clause 5.3 of CD3 of Part 7.	
GB 08	Annex A			Please note that because of time limitations this has not been reviewed.		

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.

## Template for comments and secretariat observations

Date: 21 March 2013	Document: <b>SC32 N 2282</b>	Project: <b>CD 19763-5</b>
---------------------	------------------------------	----------------------------

MB/ NC <sup>1</sup>	Line number (e.g. 17)	Clause/ Subclause (e.g. 3.1)	Paragraph/ Figure/ Table/ (e.g. Table 1)	Type of comment <sup>2</sup>	Comments	Proposed change	Observations of the secretariat
US 001		Introduction	Para 3, sentence 2	ed	The following sentence is incorrect english, remove the word "a" from the first part of the sentence.  "It offers a guidance ..."	Suggested rephrasing:  "It offers guidance ..."	
US 002		3 Terms, definitions and abbreviated terms	entire clause 3	ed	The terms should be in alphabetical order to make it easier to find.	Alphabetize and renumber the terms.	
US 003		3 Terms, definitions and abbreviated terms	Postcondition	ed	The syntax of the term postcondition is not the correct. It should have a hyphen, "post- condition". "precondition" is correct, and "guard condition" are the correct syntax for these terms.	Change postcondition to post-condition	
US 004		4 Conformance	entire clause	te	The use of the phrase "shall support" throughout the clause without further elaboration is ambiguous.  For example: "shall support the metamodel specified in 5;" leaves in question how to handle optional attributes and relations between classes.	We suggest reviewing 11179-3 Ed3 Conformance Clause 4 and 20944-1 for examples of how to make this clause more precise and enable interoperability between registries conforming to this part.  e.g. 11179-3 Ed3: <b>4.2.2 Strictly conforming implementations</b> A strictly conforming implementation: a) shall support all mandatory, optional and conditional data element attributes and relationships; b) shall not use, test, access, or probe for any extension features nor extensions to data element attributes; c) shall not recognize, nor act on, nor allow the production of data element attributes that are dependent on any unspecified, undefined, or implementation-defined behavior.	

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

<sup>2</sup> **Type of comment:** **ge** = general **te** = technical **ed** = editorial

## Template for comments and secretariat observations

Date: 21 March 2013	Document: <b>SC32 N 2282</b>	Project: <b>CD 19763-5</b>
---------------------	------------------------------	----------------------------

MB/ NC <sup>1</sup>	Line number (e.g. 17)	Clause/ Subclause (e.g. 3.1)	Paragraph/ Figure/ Table/ (e.g. Table 1)	Type of comment <sup>2</sup>	Comments	Proposed change	Observations of the secretariat
						NOTE The use of extensions to the metamodel or the basic attributes might cause undefined behavior"	
US 005		5 Structure of MFI Process model registration	Figure 2	ed	Figure 2 cannot be read. We understand that it is convenient to have the information on the associations between the metaclasses from RGPS and this part. We are not suggesting that you change or remove those associations, However, the print is too small to read when printed or viewed – even at 100% - on a normal size computer screen.	We suggest you split the diagram down the middle, so that the classes Process_Model, Process and RGPS Registered_Ontology_Atomic_Construct and its sub-classes and associations are in one figure, and Process_Model, Process, Process_Modeling_Language, Process_Element and Dependency and their associations are in the second figure.	

1 **MB** = Member body / **NC** = National Committee (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