

ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 32 N 2333

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

| | |
|-------------------------|---|
| DOCUMENT TYPE | Summary of Voting/Table of Replies |
| TITLE | Summary of Voting on 32N2285 ISO/IEC CD3 19763-6 Information technology - Metamodel framework for interoperability (MFI) Part 6: Registry summary |
| SOURCE | SC32 Secretariat |
| PROJECT NUMBER | 1.32.22.01.06.00 |
| STATUS | WG2 is requested to resolve the comments. The document obtained substantial support. |
| REFERENCES | |
| ACTION ID. | ACT |
| REQUESTED ACTION | |
| DUE DATE | |
| Number of Pages | 10 |
| LANGUAGE USED | English |
| DISTRIBUTION | 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
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 N2333

Summary of Voting on Document SC 32 N 2285

Title: Summary of Voting on 32N2285 ISO/IEC CD3 19763-6 Information technology - Metamodel framework for interoperability (MFI) Part 6: Registry summary

Project: 1.32.22.01.06.00

| “P” Member | Approval | Approval with Comments | Disapproval with Comments | Abstention with Comments |
|--------------------|-----------------|-------------------------------|----------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| 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 |
| Total “P” | 5 | 1 | 2 | 5 |
| “O” Member | | | | |
| Austria | | | | |
| Belgium | | | | |
| France | | | | 1 |
| Ghana | | | | |
| Hungary | | | | |
| Indonesia | | | | |
| Italy | | | | |
| Kazakhstan | | | | |
| Netherlands, The | | | | |
| Norway | | | | |
| Romania | | | | |
| Poland | | | | |
| Sweden | | | | |
| Switzerland | | | | |
| Total “O” | | | | |

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
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

YES. 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

ABSTAIN. Lack of expertise and interest

| MB/ NC ¹ | Line number | Clause/ Subclause | Paragraph/ Figure/ Table/ | Type of comment ² | Comments | Proposed change | Observations of the secretariat |
|------------------------|----------------|----------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|---|---|------------------------------------|
| CA 00 | All | All | - | Ge | Canada approves the draft with the following comments. | | |
| CA 01 | 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. | |
| CA 02 | 126 | 0 Foreword | Part 9 | Ed | The name of part 9 should be: On demand model selection based on RGPS | Make the correction. | |
| CA 03 | 163 | 3.4 | Reference | Ed | The reference to ISO/IEC FDIS 11179-3:2012 should now be ISO/IEC 11179-3:2013 | Make the change. | |
| CA 04 | | 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



32N2285T-text_for_
ballot-CD3_19763-6_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 ¹ | Line number (e.g. 17) | Clause/ Subclause (e.g. 3.1) | Paragraph/ Figure/ Table/ (e.g. Table 1) | Type of comment ² | Comments | Proposed change | Observations of the secretariat |
|------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------------------|---|---------------------------------|---|---|------------------------------------|
| JP 01 | 225 | 7.1 | | Ed | "registry information" without " " is not aligning "registry administrator information" and "registry interface information". | Insert " " around registry information. | |
| JP 02 | 225 | 7.1 | | Ed | The name "registry information" is too broad. | The name of "registry information" shall be "registry core information" or "registry entry information". | |
| JP 03 | 231 | 7.1 | Note 1. | Ed | No sentence specifying the meaning of the list. | Registry information is consist of Registry class (see Error! Reference source not found.), Registry_Component class (see Error! Reference source not found.), Related_Registry class (see Error! Reference source not found.), Contact class (see Error! Reference source not found.), Classification class (see Error! Reference source not found.), Document class (see Error! Reference source not found.). Recommend this sentence included in the body, not in the note. | |
| JP 04 | 239 | 7.1 | Note 3. | Ed | Same above. | Same above. | |
| JP 05 | 244 | 7.1 | Note 4. | Ed | Same above. | Same above. | |
| JP 06 | 242 | 7.1 | | Ed | The period is incorrectly placed. | "registry interface information." Should be "registry interface information". | |
| JP 07 | 245 | 7.1 | Figure 2 | Te | "description: string" in the class Rregistry_Component is incorrect. | "description: string" should be "description: text". | |
| JP 08 | 249 | 7.2 | All | Te | Although Text is used for the Data Type of the attribute, there is no Text Data type definition. | | |
| JP 09 | 259 | 7.2.1.1 | Table | Te | Column title "Reference" and "Class" are ambiguous. | Column title "Reference" and "Class" should be Column title "AssociationReference" and "ReferencedClass". Same change should be applied to 7.2.1.2, | |

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 ¹ | Line number (e.g. 17) | Clause/ Subclause (e.g. 3.1) | Paragraph/ Figure/ Table/ (e.g. Table 1) | Type of comment ² | Comments | Proposed change | Observations of the secretariat |
|------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------------------|---|---------------------------------|---|--|------------------------------------|
| | | | | | | 7.2.1.3, 7.2.1.4, 7.2.1.5, 7.2.1.6, 7.2.1.7, 7.2.1.8 | |
| JP 10 | 291 | 7.2.1.5 | Table | Te | Multiplicity of provided_ registry should be mandatory. | Multiplicity of provided_ registry is "1..*" | |
| JP 11 | | Annex | All | Ed | The form of the figure number in Annex be wrong. | "Figure A.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

Template for comments and secretariat observations

Date: 2 April 2013

Document: ISO/IEC CD3 19763-6

| 1 | 2 | (3) | 4 | 5 | (6) | (7) |
|-----------------|---|--|------------------------------|---|--|--|
| MB ¹ | Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex (e.g. 3.1) | Paragraph/ Figure/Table/ Note (e.g. Table 1) | Type of comment ² | Comment (justification for change) by the MB | Proposed change by the MB | Secretariat observations on each comment submitted |
| GB 01 | General | | te | There are many instances where the presentation does not comply with the Modelling Guidelines for 19763 – Revision 2 (WG2 N1671). | Comply with the guidelines throughout. | |
| GB 02 | General | | ed | There are many instances where the English could be improved, for example, in the second paragraph of clause 1 (Scope) there is a spurious comma in the first line and mixing of tenses ("were" instead of "are") in the second line. | None provided. | |
| GB 03 | General | | ed | There are many instances where the text immediately under a heading is hanging, contrary to the requirements of 5.2.3 and 5.2.4 in Part 2 of the ISO/IEC Directives. | Introduce a numbered subclause heading immediately after the headings concerned. | |
| GB 04 | General | | te | Throughout the document there are many references to classes. Since this part specifies a metamodel the appropriate terminology is "metaclass". "Metaclass" is used in all other parts of 19763. | Amend all instances of "class" to "metaclass". | |
| GB 05 | Introduction | Para 1, line 1 | ed | "Today, in E-business (EB) or E-commerce (EC) through the Internet" This sentence gives the impression that 19763 is only required because of the existence of the internet. This is not true. Neither is the implication that is only required because of EB or EC. There are other scenarios where interoperability is equally important. | Revise to indicate that the scope of 19763 is broader. | |
| GB 06 | 1 | Paras 3 and 4 | ed | Para 3 starts "This part of the ISO/IEC 19763 family of standards specifies ..." whilst Para 4 starts "This part of the ISO/IEC 19763 family specifies ...". There is some contradiction here .What does this part specify: an nformation artifact called the Registry Summary (Para 3) or a normative metamodel (para 4)? It cannot be both. | None provided. | |
| GB 07 | 1 | Para 6 | ed | The abbreviation "MFI" is used without explanation. | Amend to read "Metamodel framework for interoperability (MFI)" | |

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: 2 April 2013

Document: ISO/IEC CD3 19763-6

| 1 | 2 | (3) | 4 | 5 | (6) | (7) |
|-----------------|---|--|------------------------------|--|--|--|
| MB ¹ | Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex (e.g. 3.1) | Paragraph/ Figure/Table/ Note (e.g. Table 1) | Type of comment ² | Comment (justification for change) by the MB | Proposed change by the MB | Secretariat observations on each comment submitted |
| GB 08 | 6 | Para 1, lines 1 and 2 | te | "The major purpose of the ISO/IEC 19763 (MFI) family of standards is to enable interoperability among registries." This statement totally misrepresents the purpose of 19763. MFI is about interoperability between IT-based information systems whether that interoperability is achieved through the exchange of data (or information) or by the reuse of processes or services. Registries are just a tool that helps to facilitate interoperability. | Rewrite. | |
| GB 09 | 6.1 | | te | The two paragraphs and the diagram in this sub-clause confuse the purpose of this part of MFI and the purpose of MFI overall. In particular the title of Figure 1 (Illustration of Registry Interoperability) is very unhelpful. | None provided. | |
| GB 10 | 7.1 | Fig 2, 7.2.1.1, 7.2.1.2, 7.2.1.3 and 7.2.1.4 | te | The only attributes for the four metaclasses "Classification", "Contact", "Document" and "Organization" have the same two attributes which would indicate that there is some similarity, which could be generalized, between them. | None provided. | |
| GB 11 | 7.1 | Fig 2, 7.2.1.1, 7.2.1.2, 7.2.1.3 and 7.2.1.4 | te | The four metaclasses "Classification", "Contact", "Document" and "Organization" are shown as abstract metaclasses and the note to Figure 2 gives the reason being that "the information is already governed by other standards. Annex B shows an example in which the concrete model is related to the abstract class of Registry Summary." The examples in Annex B show the metaclasses in this part being the superclass of the equivalent metaclasses in MDR Part 3. Is this the meaning intended? This appears to be at variance with our understanding of the issues being addressed. | Either reverse the relationship to the MDR Part 3 metaclasses or provide a better explanation as to why the MDR Part 3 metaclasses are subclasses of the metaclasses in this part. | |

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: 2 April 2013

Document: ISO/IEC CD3 19763-6

| 1 | 2 | (3) | 4 | 5 | (6) | (7) |
|-----------------|---|--|------------------------------|--|---------------------------|--|
| MB ¹ | Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex (e.g. 3.1) | Paragraph/ Figure/Table/ Note (e.g. Table 1) | Type of comment ² | Comment (justification for change) by the MB | Proposed change by the MB | Secretariat observations on each comment submitted |
| GB 12 | 7.1 | Fig 2, 7.2.1.3 and 7.2.1.6 | te | There is a problem with the associations between the "Document" metaclass and the "Registry" metaclass. The associations in Fig 2 read that each document must be SLA document for one and only one registry AND each document must be promotion document for one and only one registry AND each document must be manual document for one and only one registry (ie each document must fulfil all three roles). The text in 7.2.1.3 provides a description for the "SLA_for_registry" reference that starts "When the instance of Document ..." which implies some optionality. The associations should be read as each document must be SLA document for one and only one registry OR promotion document for one and only one registry OR manual document for one and only one registry. The issue then is whether these are exclusive ORs (to fully describe a registry three documents are needed) or inclusive ORs (a document may fulfil more than one role). If it is the former a constraint needs to added to 7.2.1.3 to this effect and a note added to Fig 2. If it is the latter, the multiplicity at the "registry" end of all three associations needs to be relaxed to 0..1. | None provided. | |
| GB 13 | 7.1 | Fig 2, 7.2.1.4, 7.2.1.6 and 7.2.1.7 | te | There is a similar problem with the associations between the "Interface" metaclass and the "Registry" and "Registry_Component" metaclasses. The associations in Fig 2 read that each interface must be application interface for one and only one registry AND each interface must be application interface for one and only one registry component. We believe that the intention is that each interface must be application interface for one and only one registry OR application interface for one and only one registry component, and in this case the OR is an exclusive OR. A constraint needs to added to 7.2.1.4 to this effect and a note added to Fig 2. | None provided. | |

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: 2 April 2013

Document: ISO/IEC CD3 19763-6

| 1 | 2 | (3) | 4 | 5 | (6) | (7) |
|-----------------------|--|---|------------------------------------|--|---|---|
| MB¹ | Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex (e.g. 3.1) | Paragraph/ Figure/Table/ Note (e.g. Table 1) | Type of comment² | Comment (justification for change) by the MB | Proposed change by the MB | Secretariat observations on each comment submitted |
| GB 14 | 7.2.1.4 | “component” reference description | ed | "this relation designates" – incorrect terminology | Amend to read "this association designates" | |
| GB 15 | 7.2.1.4 | “registry” reference description | ed | "this relation designates" – incorrect terminology | Amend to read "this association designates" | |
| GB 16 | Annex A, Annex B and Annex C | | | Please note that because of time limitations these have 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.