Disposition of Comments
on
ISO/IEC 18023-1:2006/PDAM1:201x

# United States

# Overview

To prepare this Disposition of Comments document, the comments were cut and pasted from ISO/IEC JTC1/SC24 N3113 since the original document was not in a useful form. No changes to the text of the comments were made.

# General

The following comments apply to the entire document:

1. Entire document.
The content of this document should track the approved SCRs.
2. Accepted.

# Technical

## Clause 6—DRM class definitions

1. 6.2.181
The second merge instruction is incorrect. It should probably refer to the “Associate with (two-way)” row. The described text does not exist in the “Composed of (two-way)” row.
2. Accepted.
3. 6.2.239
The first merge instruction makes no sense. There are no field elements labeled column\_width and row\_width. The merge instruction should be removed.
4. Accepted.
5. 6.2.282, 6.2.283
Under 6.2.282 and 6.2.283, it is not clear whether the SRF instance label “BRITISH\_NATIONAL\_GRID” should be changed to “BRITISH\_NATIONAL\_GRID\_AIRY” to agree with the text change specified. Also there is only one example in each DRM class so the phrase “the third example in” should be removed from the merge instructions in both cases.
6. Accepted.

## Clause 7— DRM class constraints

1. 7.2.18
In the third merge instruction for 7.2.18, “srf\_context\_info” should be hyperlinked to “DataItems/Environment\_Root.html#srf\_context\_info”.
2. Accepted.
3. 7.2.18
In the 4th merge instruction for 7.2.18, the replacement text should be “component tree of”.
4. Accepted.
5. 7.2.20
The 1st merge instruction for 7.2.20, requires a change in the index but no change in the Topics table is specified. The merge instruction should include a requirement to change the text and hyperlink in the Topics table.
6. Accepted.
7. 7.2.36
In the merge instruction for 7.2.36, there is no occurrence of “<DRM Geometry Node>”. It should probably be “<DRM Geometry Edge>”.
8. Accepted.
9. 7.2.40
For 7.2.40, the replacement text cited in the 2nd merge instruction for c.3.ii should not be italicized.
10. Accepted.
11. 7.2.41
The first merge instruction for 7.2.41 requires a change in the index but no change in the Topics table is specified. The merge instruction should include a requirement to change the text and hyperlink in the Topics table.
12. Accepted.
13. 7.2.42
In the replacement text of the 4th merge instruction for 7.2.42, there is a plurality mismatch: “instances” should be “instance”.
14. Accepted.
15. 7.2.43
In the 3rd merge instruction for 7.2.43, there are two occurrences that need to be changed and this should be stated.
16. Accepted.
17. 7.2.43
In the last merge instruction for 7.2.43, the text to be replaced should be “component <DRM Table Property Description> instance”.
18. Accepted.
19. 7.2.45
In the 5th merge instruction, the replacement text is missing. It should probably be “<DRM Distance LOD Data> link objects”.
20. Accepted.
21. 7.2.45
In the last two merge instructions for 7.2.45, the hyperlinks should be removed from the replacement text.
22. Rejected. These are field references to single DRM classes.
23. 7.2.46
Add the following new instruction: “In the fourth paragraph of the <DRM Responsible Party> entry, the word “contain” should be “specify”.
24. The following text will be added: ‘In the fourth paragraph of the <DRM Responsible Party> entry, replace “contain” with “specify”.’
25. 7.2.47
In the 3rd merge instruction for 7.2.47, the text to be replaced should be “value set to”.
26. The following merge instruction will replace the current merge instruction: ‘In Item a, replace "value set to" with "field value of".’
27. 7.2.49
The merge instructions for 7.2.49 should specify that the list items should be capitalized.
28. Rejected. The elements of the list are not sentences.
29. 7.2.51
In item d of 7.2.51, “field” should be “field value”.
30. A merge instruction will be added as follows: ‘In item d, replace “field” with “field value”.’
31. 7.2.51
In item d of 7.2.51, “instance” should be “instance”.
32. A merge instruction will be added as follows: ‘In item d, replace “instnace” with “instance”.’
33. 7.2.54
In item b of 7.2.54, “<DRM Spatial Extent> instance” should be “<DRM Spatial Extent> component”.
34. Accepted.
35. 7.2.54
In item b of 7.2.54, “instances” should be “components”.
36. Accepted.
37. 7.2.57
In item d of 7.2.57, “otherwise” should be replaced by “otherwise,”.
38. A new merge instruction will be added as follows: ‘In item d, replace “otherwise” with “otherwise,”.
39. 7.2.60
The 4th merge instruction for 7.2.60 should be “In Item b.3, replace “shall not overlap” with “may have overlapping boundaries but no overlapping interiors”.
40. Rejected. This merge instruction already exists.
41. 7.2.64
In the 2nd merge instruction for 7.2.64, the last three sentences should be removed.
42. Accepted.
43. 7.2.65
The first merge instructions for 7.2.65 is not complete. In addition to the changes specified, the word “either” should be removed.
44. The following will replace the current first merge instruction: ‘In the first sentence, replace "either to the abstract value type ENUMERATION or to a numeric value type" with "to the abstract value type BOOLEAN, the abstract value type ENUMERATION, or a numeric value type".’

# Editorial

## Clause 3—Definitions, acronyms, and abbreviations

1. The table of abbreviations uses two different styles of leading. The leading providing more space should be used.
2. Accepted.

## Clause 4—Concepts

1. The change labeled as being 4.7.2.2 is actually to 4.9.5.2. The change labeled as 4.9.5.2, is actually 4.7.2.2.
2. Accepted.
3. The change labeled as being to “4.21.2 Registration of set members” is actually to “4.21.2 Registration of set members”.
4. The merge location will be changed to “4.21.3 Registration of set members”.

## Clause 5—Fundamental data types

1. Two occurrences of “MEANTING” should be “MEANING”.
2. Accepted.

## Clause 6—DRM class definitions

1. The first merge instruction for 6.2.95 belongs to 6.2.97.
2. Accepted.
3. In the comment on 6.2.89 Clarifications, the quotes between notes 3 and 4 should be removed.
4. Accepted. Both double quotes will be removed.
5. 6.2.281 and 6.2.282
In 6.2.281 and 6.2.282, the font of the row specification is incorrect. It should just be italicized.
6. Accepted.

## Clause 7—DRM class constraints

1. All of Clause 7
Many of the merge location specifications incorrectly list the subclauses as being 7.7.2.xx. These should all be of the form 7.2.xx.
2. Accepted.
3. 7.2.5
In 7.2.5, the quotes between items 5 and 6 should be removed.
4. Accepted. Both double quotes will be removed.
5. 7.2.6
The title of 7.2.6 in the amendment is incorrect. It should be “Constraints on components”.
6. Accepted.
7. 7.2.6
The title of 7.2.6 in the amendment is incorrect. It should be “Constraints on components”.
8. Accepted.
9. 7.2.12
In 7.2.12, there are four objects d, e, f, and g to append.
10. Accepted. Item g will be added to the merge instructions.
11. 7.2.23
In 7.2.23, there is no opening quotation mark for the replacement text.
12. Accepted. An opening quotation mark will be added to the merge instruction.
13. 7.2.28
In the merge instructions for 7.2.28, the replacement text should not be italicized except for the DRM class names of abstract DRM classes.
14. Accepted.
15. 7.2.45
In the 2nd merge instruction for 7.2.45, “InIn” should be “In”.
16. Accepted.
17. 7.2.61
In the last merge instruction for 7.2.61, “>” should be replaced by a period.
18. Accepted.
19. 7.2.64
In the 3rd merge instruction for 7.2.64, the insertion text should be enclosed in quotes.
20. Accepted.
21. 7.2.65
In the merge location for 7.2.65, the “Item a” should be moved to the first merge instruction.
22. Accepted.
23. 7.2.69
In the 1st merge instruction for 7.2.69, there is some improper html.
24. Accepted. The html will be repaired.
25. 7.2.71
In the 1st merge instruction for 7.2.71, the replacement text should not be italicized.
26. Accepted.