|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| FR 001 |  |  |  | Ge | Replace must by shall (shall is the preferred ISO term for mandatory rules) | Replace must occurences by shall | Agreed. All instances of “must” have been replaced with “shall”. |
| FR 002 |  |  |  | Ge | Some figures don’t have a legend | Consider adding a legend to all figures | Agreed. Captions are added to all figures. |
| FR 003 |  |  |  | Ge | Lots of elements from ISO 19160-1 and 19157 are being redefined. | A general opinion is that this standard looks a bit fuzzy because it tries to redefine a lot of things.  The title is also misleading because, interchange maybe too general and this is more a standard about address quality and usability.  If I understand it correctly, the goal is to ensure   * that a proper address profile is used (for forms and display) * that some quality checks have been made on the address * correct address forms * correct address displays   Maybe the chapters could also be rearranged to reflect these objectives (if I am right) and the name of the classes be renamed quality-something instead of interchange-something.  Focusing only on the above elements, and reusing more 19160-1 and 19157, maybe a simpler model could be made. | Rejected. The main goal of this standard is actually to facilitate interchange of address schema (address profiles) and addresses (address instances), and supplementary data elements including the display and input templates.  This standard aims to be an interchangeable adaptation (i.e. in terms of appropriateness and simplicity) of ISO 19160-1. The only overlap with ISO 19157 is a minor part on address capability modelling, which 19157 does not address with practical specifics. We will adopt elements from 19157 in a later comment. |
| FR 004 |  | 04.01.1 |  | Te | Figure 1 differs from the use cases described in the following chapters. | Consider either developing chapter 4.1.1 in order to explain the figure, or completing the figure to reflect the use cases below (updating, using, retiring…) | Agreed. The figures have been updated. We will further develop Section 4.1.1 after the NWIP is accepted. |
| FR 005 |  | 04.01.2 |  | Te | How to create a profile of ISO 19160-1 is specified in ISO 19160-1, Annex B. But it is just informative. It means that any address model can claim to be a profile of 19160-1. | Maybe, this paragraph should begin by saying that in order to be “valid”, an address profile SHALL first be compliant with 19160-1 Annex B, and also with ISO 19106 (class 1). |  |
| FR 006 |  | 04.01.5 |  | Ed | render input forms for address input according to… | render address input forms according to… | Accepted and fixed. |
| FR 007 |  | 04.01.5 |  | Te | Application should consider…, and should… | Replace should by shall, because otherwise, this standard may fail its purpose (improve address usability) | Accepted and fixed. |
| FR 008 |  | 04.01.6 |  | Te | the publisher could… | Replace could by shall. Again, if we want this standard to be effective, we need more than recommendations | Accepted and fixed. |
| FR 009 |  | 05.02.1 |  | Te | TODO: More | To be completed | This section is to be further developed after the NWIP is accepted. |
| FR 010 |  | 06.01 |  | Te | Should the signature be defined here? | Maybe just mention that the address exchanged shall be signed, and leave the modelling to the producer as he may wish to have an other signature solution. | Accepted and fixed. More discussion about this topic may be necessary after NWIP is accepted. |
| FR 011 |  | 07.01 |  | Te | Attributes of Class InterchangeAddressProfile does not use enough ISO 19115-1 | Consider using CI\_citation for identifier, type, description.  For example, add an attribute ProfileInformation of type Ci\_citation with the above attributes | Rejected. We feel that CI\_citation carries too many unnecessary attributes for this purpose, including ISBN, ISSN, CI\_reponsibility, and so on. The IxAddressProfile is not meant to contain a citation. There is also no need to create an additional identifier |
| FR 012 |  | 07.01 |  | Te | Attributes of Class InterchangeAddressProfile  Id and Identifier.  The definition of identifier is : Used to identify this interchange address profile and provide description of it. So can it be MD\_Title instead? | Consider replacing Identifier of type MD\_Identifier by Name of type MD\_Title, within the ProfileInformation attribute (see above comment). | We are unable to find MD\_Title in ISO 19115-1:2014. We believe the “id” attribute and MD\_Identifier already provides an adequate way of identification. |
| FR 013 |  | 07.01 |  | Te | Attributes of Class InterchangeAddressProfile  Publisher | Consider using CI\_responsibility with role=publisher | To be discussed. CI\_party is used instead of CI\_responsibility here. The major difference is CI\_responsibility supports multiple CI\_parties and roles (and supports extra attributes), but here we only need the publisher. We also do not need the extra attributes defined in CI\_responsibility here. |
| FR 014 |  | 08.01 |  | Te | Why redefining the 19160-1 elements? There is no need to redefine all the address elements, because the address profile should be defined by the producer by using 19160-1 (cf. 4.1.2)  This standard should describe only the Interchange Address Profile and be based on 19160-1. | Consider keeping the elements from ISO 19160-1.  Use AddressSpecification Class from 19160-1 to reference the address profile instead of input template and display template. | Rejected. The models in this document are defined as “interchange” models: a simplified adoption of their corresponding models in 19160-1, that allows for deterministic and practical data interchange. |
| FR 015 |  | 08.01 |  | Te | There should be an attribute to store the values of address component | Keep the elements from 19160-1. | Values of a 19160-1 address component is stored in the IxAddressInstanceComponent model. |
| FR 016 |  | 09.01 |  | Te | Address capability. All the elements in this chapter have already been defined in ISO 19157 | Consider using DQ\_Result to describe address conformance to a quality test. | To be discussed. We agree the need to harmonize with 19157, however in a way that is practical and determined. |
| FR 017 |  | 10.02 |  | Te | There should not be a model for an address instance, because theoretically, it is identical to the address model already defined. | Considering removing this chapter | Rejected. The address instance is the actual address representation; the address profile is the address schema representation. |
| FR 018 |  | 11.01 |  | Te | Include a descriptive picture | Consider including a picture of a template layout and referencing the different elements described in chapter 11 for clarification. | Agree. This can be done after the NWIP is accepted. |
| FR 019 |  | Introduction |  | Ed | The models in this document heavily utilizes data models defined in ISO 19115-1: 2014 | heavily is maybe too much. Consider removing. | Agree and fixed. |
| PMG 1 |  | Form 4, purpose and justification |  |  | Would be easier to understand if it stated at least some of what Peter Tam presented in Copenhagen regarding the relationship of IETF/CalConnect work with ISO 19160-1. | In the “Purpose and justification” section of the Form 4 New Work Item Proposal, add something like:    “The current IETF / CalConnect vCard format specification (https://tools.ietf.org/html/rfc6350) is rather focused on US postal addressing. By providing an encoding of the ISO/UPU address model, CalConnect expects to have a more internationally complete format specification to propose to IETF.” | Agreed and will fix Form 4. |
| PMG 2 |  | Introduction |  |  | Would be better to explicitly mention its relationship with ISO 19160-1 directly in the Introduction. | “This document describes an encoding for a profile of the Addressing Conceptual model in ISO 19160-1” | Agree and fixed in Introduction. |
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