Template for comments and secretariat observations IST/41.0126/05

Date: 2005-12-19	Document: **CD 19756**

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 com-ment**[2]	**Comment (justification for change) by the MB**	**Proposed change by the MB**	**Secretariat observations** on each comment submitted
GB			Te	As the syntax used for describing Conflict Items, etc, is based on the Infoset notation the W3C Infoset spec should be referenced as a normative document.		
GB			Te	It is not clear what is meant by some terms, including but by no means limited to: "The value of an (the in other cases) occurrence" "warning equivalent" "tuple list"		
GB			Ed	Replace all sentences ending in two periods with a single period. For sentences without a period add one.		
GB			Ed	Replace all occurrences of "the this" by "this"		
GB			Ed	Replace most occurrences of "constrains" by "constraints"		
GB			Ed	Replace all occurrences of "An ScopePattern" by "A ScopePattern"		
GB			Ed	Replace all occurrences of "must be conform" to "must conform"		
GB			Ed	Replace "allows to" or "allow to" by "allow users to"		
GB			Te	The term "Infoset notation" should be dropped as misleading, as there is no such notation, only a convention that is not described in the unreferenced W3C Infoset specification. Instead the convention used should be briefly described within the TMCL standard itself.		
GB			Te	Some attributes that specify selection criteria are named xxxSelector but this term is not used consistently. All attributes that specify constraints should be named xxxConstraint.		
GB	Scope		Ed	Is the claim in the Scope clause that the language can be used "to constrain any aspect of topic maps" true? Should		

1 **MB** = Member body (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. FR for France; comments from the CMC 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: 2005-12-19 | Document: **CD 19756** |

MB[1]	Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex (e.g. 3.1)	Paragraph/ Figure/Table/ Note (e.g. Table 1)	Type of com-ment[2]	Comment (justification for change) by the MB	Proposed change by the MB	Secretariat observations on each comment submitted
				"any aspect" be "most aspects"		
GB	4.2.1		Te	In 4.2.1 - shouldn't the schemaID at least be constrained to be an IRI ?		
GB	4.2.3			4.2.3 The second sentence is unclear as it has no context. It requires further explanation. ScopePattern could be generalized further. For example allow combinations of AND and OR by allowing a [simpleTopicExpression] or [orTopicExpression] to be a list of TopicIdentification items *or* ScopePattern items. With some generalization and a renaming of this item (TopicSetItem?), you could reuse the pattern for specifying player constraints on Role Schema Items (and probably elsewhere too).		
GB	4.2.5		Te	The order in which constructs are describe is somewhat confusing. For example, Topic Identification item is introduced in 4.2.2 with no previous mention of the concept. Similarly IRISchema is introduced in 4.2.5 without previous reference or cross-reference. The role of terms needs to be clear when first introduced. The terms used in the psuedo-language for describing contexts do not a) match terms defined in the text or b) use a consistent terminology within themselves.		
GB	4.2.7		Te	4.2.7 TopicNameSchemaItem should have a [match] attribute		
GB	4.2.10		Te	Terms with the same name should be defined with the same meaning and text (see the definition of [scopeSelector] in 4.2.10 for example of where there is an inconsistency) PlayRole is not the usual way of referring to roles: we normally say "PlaysRole"		

1 **MB** = Member body (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. FR for France; comments from the CMC editing unit are identified by ***)

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

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

CEN electronic balloting commenting template/version 2001-10

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 com-ment[2]	Comment (justification for change) by the MB	Proposed change by the MB	Secretariat observations on each comment submitted
GB	4.2.11		Te	The [allPlayersFrom] and [one of] attributes seem srange. AScopePattern could be reused here to replace these two. That would add some extra power to the constraint and replace two attributes with one.		
GB	4.3.7		Te	In 4.3.7 the subclauses have no titles. In general [cardMin] and [cardMax] are very poorly specified and seem to have been just pasted in without modifying for their context. These definitions need rewriting for each occurrence of the attributes in the document.		

1   **MB** = Member body (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. FR for France; comments from the CMC editing unit are identified by ***)

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

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

CEN electronic balloting commenting template/version 2001-10