

**Title:** Comments on-CD2 11179-3 Edition 3 needing further discussion  
**Source:** Ray Gates (Editor)  
**Status:** Editor's contribution  
**Action:** For discussion by WG2  
**Date:** 16 May 2010

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Seq	MB <sup>1</sup>	Clause / Subclause/ Annex/Figure /Table (e.g. 3.1, Fig 2)	Paragraph/ List item/ Note/ (e.g. Note 2)	Type of comment <sup>2</sup>	Comment (justification for change)	Proposed change	Secretariat observations on each comment submitted
001	CA 01	00 All	All	Te	All Editor's Notes should be addressed.	Some are addressed by specific comments below.	Accepted in principle. Need specific proposals.
002	CA 02	00 All	All	Te	All open issues for this project on the WG2 Issues forum should be reviewed, and a consensus reached as to which need to be addressed in this Edition.	Specific proposals will be submitted to the ballot resolution meeting.	Accepted in principle. Need specific proposals.
006	209 44 edit or 01	00 general		te	The use of packages and the lack of a combining feature make it impossible to know how the packages features are combined. This was straightforward in Edition 2, but there is no guidance in Edition 3 on how to put all this together.	Provide guidance on how to provide a whole metadata set.	Comments supplied to secretariat from 20944 Project Editor Accepted.
007	JP 01	00 General		1- Major Technical	Japan NB is strongly aware of the duplication among the ISO/IEC11179-3 Ed3 and ISO/IEC19763-3 in the term of the ontology registrations. Japan NB is not able to approve this standard unless some actual activities be initiated and confirmed in the SC32 for the reconciliation of those duplication.	None provided.	Should be addressed in MDR/MFI Harmonization study period. Do not delay progression of the document in the meantime.  Explicit reference to ontologies to be removed from normative text by resolution of JP 19 (#168)

<sup>1</sup> **MB** = Member body (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China)    \*\* = ISO/CS editing unit

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

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

0	1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
Seq	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
008	JP 02	00 General		1- Major Technical	Two different frameworks are introduced to 11179-3 Ed3. They should be one. One is a usual logical framework, where two worlds are: Real world---Universe of Discourse Representation (Designation, Symbol, Sign) world --- logical representation. The other is so-called meaning triangle framework from ISO 1087-1, where three worlds are: Real world --- object, subject field at 3.1 of ISO 1087-1 Concept world---- concept, concept system at 3.2 of ISO 1087-1 Representation world----definition, designation, terminology at 3.3,3.4., 3.5 of ISO 1087-1. What 11179-3 Ed3 specifies is a registry for Representation world, simply because we cannot handle Real world nor Concept world without representation, even though Concept and Concept_System are used as class names. A problem rises if ontologies such as SKOS are with in the scope of 11179-3 Ed3. Because ontologies, including the ones in RDF, OWL and Common Logic etc. are based on the usual logical framework and they do not represent Concept world of ISO 1087-1, but represent Real world.	Proposed changes: There are two choices. One is to limit the scope where ISO 1087-1 framework (i.e. a kind of meaning triangle). Then, its underlying framework is of ISO 1087-1 and ontologies that are based on the usual logical framework are out of scope. The other is to remove ISO 1087-1 from a normative reference and rename the classes such as "Concept" and "Concept_System". Then, its underlying framework is just of Representation world and is very flexible.	Not Accepted.  We do not agree with the distinction that has been made.  However, the resolution of JP19 (#168) removes all reference to Ontology from the description of Concept System. However, informative annexes will still illustrate that Concept_System can support at least some ontologies.
024	CA 16	03.2.05	Example needed	Te	Add a reference to an example of a composite attribute.	E.g. reference Registration.registration_state in Figure 7-1	Accepted
025	CA 17	03.2.06	Example needed	Te	Add a reference to an example of a composite datatype.	E.g. reference Registration_Record as used by Registration.registration_state in Figure 7-1	Accepted

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.

0	1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
Seq	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
078	US 66	05 to 10		ed	Lack of cross reference to definitions in Clause 3 for many definitions of the following form: Conceptual_Domain is a class that represents a conceptual domain. A conceptual domain is a set of value meanings, which may either be enumerated or expressed via a description	When a concept is defined in Clause 3, it should be referenced from the class definition.	Accepted. Partially done. Needs to be checked.
079	197 73 edit or 01	05.1 05.1.1 05.1.7		te	In subclause 5.1, 5.1.1, and 5.1.7, the basic types of the metamodel are described. The 19773 features of multistring and multitext should be included. Elsewhere, the multistring and multitext features should be used, where appropriate, to provide multi-lingual capability, such as textual descriptions. Note that WG2 has spent much time developing 19773 for common, reusable features to be used in several WG2 projects, and note that 19773 has completed the FCD stage, therefore the 19773 features should be referenced and used.	Use multistring and multitext, as appropriate. Use 19773 multilingual features.	Accepted in principle but needs detailed proposals on the next round of balloting.  Comments supplied to secretariat from 19773 Project Editor
095	197 73 edit or 02	05.1.3		te	In subclause 5.1.3, the contact data does not use the 19773 contact data module. Contact data was one of the primary reasons for the creation of 19773 and a reusable set of modules.	Use the 19773 contact data module.	Comments supplied to SC32 Secretariat from 19773 Project Editor.  Discussed in London.  Accepted in principle, but needs detailed proposal on next round of balloting. Proposal must consider the impact on resolutions of #96-98 below.

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.

0	1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
Seq	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
138	CA 68	07.1.2.2.1	Editor's note	Te	Resolve CD2 Editor's Note #25:  "In response to <a href="#">Issue 176</a> , it was agreed to move 'administrative_status' from Administration_Record to 'Registration', to allow different <i>Registration Authorities</i> to record different <i>administrative_statuses</i> for the same <i>Administered_Item</i> . However, it has also be suggested that (1) we should treat administrative (event) data orthogonally to registration (quality) data (e.g. as a separate association class), and (2) that we should have the same flexibility for all attributes in <i>Administration_Record</i> ."	None provided.	Proposal required.
141	CA 70	07.1.2.6.2	Editor's note	Te	Resolve CD2 Editor's Note #26:  "If the effective date applies to the Administered_Item, and not to the Registration, why is it in the Registration_Record instead of in Administered_Item?"	None provided.	Proposal 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.

0	1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
Seq	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
144	20944 edit or 01	07.1.2.9		te	<p>Clause 7 and subclause 7.1.2.9 specify global descriptive data that applies to a registry as a whole. To date, 11179 has not had any so-called registry-wide data. This is a compatibility question for 20944 access because it is unclear how to navigate to the data.</p> <p>Furthermore, by using global values, it becomes impossible to aggregate, cache, and federate metadata because there is no mechanism for combining incompatible global data when caching/aggregating multiple registries. Likewise, federation becomes difficult because global parameters only apply to the present registry and none of the subordinate registries.</p> <p>Finally, the notion of registry-global data means that the focus in Edition 3 has shifted from a specification of descriptive data (which could be stored in a registry, or stored as standalone metadata) to specification of descriptive data that MUST exist in a registry (i.e., standalone metadata is no longer possible). This is a significant change in understanding 11179 metadata standards.</p> <p>Comments supplied to secretariat from 20944 Project Editor</p>	<p>Remove global features.</p> <p>Refactor problem to use grouping feature (e.g., group lists, similar to topic maps).</p>	<p>Not accepted.</p> <p>Editor's response:</p> <p>Registry_specification was added to resolve a previous ballot comment. Removing it is not appropriate. We should specifically address any issues. E.g:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- add text that if there is no registry, it is not required. If there are multiple registries, there should be one Registry_Specification per registry. <b>Done.</b></li> <li>- Add an optional association from Registration to Registry_Specification to indicate which registry the registration is in. This addresses the navigation issue. Registry_Specification should also be a top level access point when 20944 adds support for edition 3. <b>Needs further discussion.</b></li> <li>- Alternate proposal is for 20944 to address the Registry_Specification when it opens the registry.</li> <li>- Concern expressed that extending the model to support multiple registries may have other implications.</li> </ul>

<sup>1</sup> **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 \*\*)

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

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

0	1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
Seq	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
150	CA 75	07.1.5.1.1	Editor's note	Te	Resolve CD2 Editor's Note #27: "Now that we have introduced Registered_Item as a supertype of Administered_Item, it would seem that the 'registration' association should be with 'Registered_Item', and a separate 'administration' association with 'Administered_Item', or, if the association name is considered correct, then the classes need to be renamed to better reflect their usage. We need a statement of requirements before we can correctly model this."	None provided.	Proposal required.
151	CA 76	07.1.5.2.2	Editor's note	Te	Resolve CD2 Editor's Note #28: "What are some examples of reference_type? Is it a long reference vs a short reference; is it a legal reference vs a side note reference; is it an important reference vs an unimportant reference; etc? Why do we need it? If we do, fo interoperability, we should provide either candidate meanings and associated values, or ways to reference standardized types. Should the datatype be Text instead of String, to allow the type to be expressed in multiple languages?"	None provided.	Proposal required.
170	CA 81	08.1.2.4.1	Editor's note	Te	Resolve CD2 Editor's Note #29: "Note 1 states that the <i>relation</i> is defined by means of a <i>predicate</i> , but no predicate is specified in the model. Without a predicate, how is the relevant subset specified? It seems inadequate to infer the relation from its member links. Since <i>Relation</i> is a subtype of <i>Concept</i> , it is possible we could use <i>Assertions</i> on the <i>Concept</i> to specify the <i>Relation</i> . If this is intended it should be explicitly stated, and note 1 needs to be reworded."	None provided.	Proposal 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.

0	1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
Seq	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
183	JP 25	08.2  Classificatio  n  metamodel  region		1- Major Techn ical	This is very different from ISO/IEC 11179-2 :2005 (Ed2). Does this supersede ISO/IEC 11179-2 :2005 (Ed2)?	None provided.	Yes. WG2 needs to discuss the future of 11179-2.  No action here.
184	CA 87	08.2.1	Editor's note	Te	Resolve CD2 Editor's Note #30:  "Issue 57 identifies the need to be able to classify an Administered_Item differently in different contexts. This issue has not been addressed."	None provided.	Proposal required.
190	CA 92	10	Editor's note	Te	Resolve CD2 Editor's Note #31:  "This clause needs some rework to align the formatting with that now used in the preceding clauses. Some of the CD1 ballot comments on the descriptions of associations still need to be applied."	None provided.	Proposal required.
192	CA 93	10.1.1	Editor's note	Te	Resolve CD2 Editor's Note #32:  "Issue 107 calls for improved support of Complex Data Types."	None provided.	Proposal required.
193	CA 94	10.1.1	Editor's note	Te	Resolve CD2 Editor's Note #33:  "Issue 111 calls for the addition of support for data groups such as database tables and record definitions. Such support should also consider inclusion, encapsulation, stereotyping and inheritance."	None provided.	Proposal 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.

0	1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
Seq	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
194	CA 95	10.1.1	Editor's note	Te	Resolve CD2 Editor's Note #34: "Should we add support for XML documents and/or XML schemas?"	None provided.	Proposal required.
200	CA 96	10.2.2.2	Editor's note	Te	Resolve CD2 Editor's Note #35: "CD1 ballot comment JP04 points out the the definition of 'characteristic' ( <b>Error! Reference source not found.</b> ) states that: <i>Characteristics are used for describing concepts</i> . The text below states that a 'characteristic <u>is</u> a concept'. If this is true, it should be reflected in its definition. If it is not true, this text and corresponding text in <b>Error! Reference source not found. Error! Reference source not found.</b> should be corrected. Note: The above definition does not necessarily preclude a characteristic from also being a concept."	None provided.	Proposal required.
214	CA 102	10.3.2.9.1	Editor's note	Te	Resolve CD2 Editor's Note #36: "In the following sentence, the text following 'for example' simply repeats the original statement but applied to a Data_Element, which is not so much an example, as how any value domain is supposed to be used. Some rewording would seem to be needed."	None provided.	Proposal required.
217	CA 105	10.3.3.3	Editor's note	Te	Resolve CD2 Editor's Note #37: "It has been suggested that the described_value_domain_meaning association is redundant w.r.t. the value_domain_meaning association. However, the Editor notes that it does explicitly restrict the association to the two 'Described' subtypes. When a Conceptual_Domain and Value_Domain are a combination of Enumerated and Described domains, the two associations are not equivalent, though for navigation purposes they are still redundant. Should we include additional text explaining this?"	None provided.	Proposal 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.

0	1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
Seq	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
221	CA 109	10.3.4.2	Editor's note	Te	Resolve CD2 Editor's Note #38: "The parenthetical comment above (either a <i>Described Conceptual_Domain</i> or an <i>Enumerated_Conceptual_Domain</i> ) appears incorrect, since the following paragraph requires the <i>Conceptual_Domain</i> to be a <i>Described_Conceptual_Domain</i> . Can we remove the parenthetical comment?"	None provided.	Proposal required.
222	CA 110	10.3.4.2	Editor's note	Te	Resolve CD2 Editor's Note #39: "The parenthetical comment above (either a <i>Described Conceptual_Domain</i> or an <i>Enumerated_Conceptual_Domain</i> ) appears incorrect, since the following paragraph requires the <i>Conceptual_Domain</i> to be an <i>Enumerated_Conceptual_Domain</i> . Can we remove the parenthetical comment?"	None provided.	Proposal required.
223	CA 111	10.4.1	Editor's note	Te	Resolve CD2 Editor's Note #40: "Issue 124 proposes introducing a <i>Measurement_Class</i> to group units of measure."	None provided.	Proposal required.
224	CA 112	10.4.2.1	Editor's note	Te	Resolve CD2 Editor's Note #41: "The resolution of <a href="#">Issue 125</a> states to add "unit_of_measure_scheme_reference" to "Unit_of_Measure" class, to identify source of "unit_of_measure_name". However, "unit_of_measure_name" was removed in favour of using the common facilities of <i>Designatable_Item</i> . Should we still add a scheme reference?"	None provided.	Proposal required.
227	CA 115	10.5.2.6	Editor's note	Te	Resolve CD2 Editor's Note #42: "Can we find a better name for the role <i>inputter</i> ?"	None provided.	Proposal 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.

0	1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
Seq	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
228	CA 116	10.5.3.1	Editor's note	Te	Resolve CD2 Editor's Note #43: "issue 230 recommends renaming this association to 'data element value domain' to more clearly distinguish it from 'data element concept domain'."	None provided.	Proposal required.
233	GB 23	11		ge	The status of clause 11 (edition 2 style basic attributes) is not clear. It is known to be inconsistent with the metamodel of the earlier clauses. The conformance clause suggests that it is an alternative, but the editor's note indicates that it may be made consistent. Given that 11179-3 is a conceptual model anyway, clause 11 should be dropped if its contents have now been completely covered by the metamodel. If there is a desire for some implementations to support only this limited set of attributes, an expanded conformance clause could describe the corresponding profile.	Move and convert clause 11 into an expanded conformance clause describing an edition 2 style profile.	The purpose of this clause is to describe basic attributes for uses that do not involve a registry, in the style of Edition 1. The current clause is based on the Edition 2 model. It will be revised to reflect the Edition 3 model. The conformance clause needs to be modified to allow conformance to the Basic Attributes alone by a non-registry applications.

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.

0	1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
Seq	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
252	JP 31	99 Annex B Figure B.1- Consolidated Class Hierarchy		1- Major Technical	The hierarchy of Concept needs to be examined and clarified. Are they mece or not? How each subclass is different. For example, what is a difference between (unary?) Relation and (Enumerated_?)Conceptual_Domain? What is a difference between Object_Class and (unary?) Relation? Is there a Concept that is not a Value_Meaning? What is the notion of gender? Is it a (unary) Relation or a Enumerated_Conceptual_Domain? What is the notion of male? Is it a (unary) Relation or a Value_Meaning? The difference needs to be clearly stated at the description of the classes. Why aren't Assertion, Link nor Link_End a Concept?	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Introduce General Concept and Individual Concept as subclass of Concept</li> <li>2) Assertion and Link should treated as a Concept</li> <li>3) Remove Characteristics from Concept.</li> <li>4) Do we still need still need Object_Class?</li> </ol>	<p>Not accepted.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) On other comments we have decided that the distinction depends on perspective, and we should not add the distinction at this time.</li> <li>2) Need greater rationale before this is accepted.</li> <li>3) We have examples where Characteristic is a kind of Concept.</li> <li>4) Yes, we need Object Class in clause 10.</li> </ol> <p>Consider whether what we call Characteristic should be Characteristic type.</p>
263	JP 34	99 Annex F.2.2 SKOS Example Thesaurus and general		2- Minor Technical	For example, it is not clear whether, for example, 11179 Part3 Ed3 registry stores and manages this marital status thesaurus, or, this marital status thesaurus exists outside of 11179 Part3 Ed3 registry, and 11179 Part3 Ed3 registry only stores and manages some kind of metadata (or administered_ information) and a small part of structure (or semantics) of this marital status thesaurus.	None provided.	<p>Add a constraint to Assertion that if a formula is specified, all the Concept Systems that use it must specify the same notation. <b>Done.</b></p> <p>Consider whether to add a notation to Assertion (not yet agreed).</p>

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.

0	1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
Seq	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
264	JP 35	99 Annex F.2.3 Example Value Domain References Table F-7 <Enumerated_Conceptual_Domain>		2-Minor Technical	This is an example of Enumerated_Value_Domain because ms:Single etc. are values. At least, they should be "notion designated (or denoted or represented) by ms:Single" etc.	None provided.	Discuss in conjunction with CA 134 (#262)  The example needs to be clarified. <b>Not yet done.</b>  This is a Conceptual Domain and the values shown are the representation of the Value Meanings of the domain.
265	OASIS	05.1.3 05.1.5		Te	Person <=> Contact model mismatches	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Suggest aligning with regrep with a common Party class that Organization and Person extend</li> <li>o Add address, phone etc. to Party</li> <li>o Take away title from Person and instead make it an attribute of association with an organization (titles or roles are in the context of a relationship with some organization)</li> </ul>	Needs discussion by WG2.  OASIS is not aligned with ISO/IEC 15944-1:2002 which uses 'Person' as ebXML uses 'Party', with subtypes of Person listed as: 'individual' and 'organization', and also 'public administration' as a subtype of 'organization' that is authorized to act on behalf of a regulator. WG2 would prefer to align with 15944. The superclass should only be introduced if there is a need to use it in the model.
266	OASIS	05.1.14		Te	Registration_Authority_Identifier	Why have separate attribute for registration_authority_identifier. Better to represent registration_authority via an Organization and use orgs identifier	11179-6 requires the use of ISO/IEC 6523 identifiers for registration authorities, but we don't want to require this for all organizations.
267	OASIS	06.1.2.2	Scoped Identifier	Te	Suggest simplifying identifier scheme. Consider providing an example that maps to a URN naming scheme	None provided.	Opportunity for the future. Needs a detailed proposal. No changes at this time.

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.

0	1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
Seq	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
268	OA SIS	06.2		Te	Designation and Definition region: This clause is very difficult to follow. It is not clear what a Designatable_Item is. Suggests providing examples and clearer definition * designation_sign attribute is particularly not clear	None provided.	<b>Examples to be considered.</b> Proposals should be submitted as FCD ballot comments.
269	OA SIS	07.1		Te	Registration metamodel region: Consider aligning this section with ISO 19135	None provided.	Proposals should be submitted as FCD ballot comments.
270	OA SIS	08.1.2.1		Te	Concept System section is difficult to understand. Suggest clarifying text and adding examples	None provided.	Examples to be considered. Proposals should be submitted as FCD ballot comments.
272	OA SIS	00 All		Ge	RegRep and 11179 have a very different model for handling language specific content. Perhaps this is an area where we can collaborate to achieve better alignment	None provided.	Opportunity for future alignment. No action at this time.
273	OA SIS	00 All		Ge	Does the spec have something analogous to ebXML RegRep RegistryPackage? If not, consider adding it as we have found it very useful.	None provided.	Editor to review RegRep RegistryPackage and compare it to MDR Registration package. However, defer changes to FCD ballot comment,
274	OA SIS	00 All		Ge	We were unable to find a place in the spec where Association support and Association metamodel was described. Consider defining a clearer Association metamodel	None provided.	Editor to review RegRep support for Association. We have Relation in Concept System in Edition 3, and Concept_Relationship in the Data Element Concept region in Edition 2, but may need Association in Data Description region. However, defer changes to FCD ballot comment,

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.

0	1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
Seq	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
275	OA SIS	00 All		Ge	We were unable to find a concept equivalent to Repository or RepositoryItem as defined in RegRep. Is this intentionally out of scope? If so, please clarify in 1. Scope section.	None provided.	Add clarifying text in scope section as requested. <b>Not yet done.</b>
276	OA SIS	00 All		Ge	Examine spec for forward references and minimize whenever possible. An example is that of Designatable_Item	None provided.	Editor to review text. However, WG2 has previously decided that a logical sequence is more important than strictly avoiding forward references. In some cases, references are in both directions and cannot be avoided.

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.