|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| FR 001 |  |  |  | Ge | Replace must by shall (shall is the preferred ISO term for mandatory rules) | Replace must occurences by shall |  |
| FR 002 |  |  |  | Ge | Some figures don’t have a legend | Consider adding a legend 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. |  |
| 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…) |  |
| 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… |  |
| 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) |  |
| 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 |  |
| FR 009 |  | 05.02.1 |  | Te | TODO: More | To be completed |  |
| 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. |  |
| 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 |  |
| 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). |  |
| FR 013 |  | 07.01 |  | Te | Attributes of Class InterchangeAddressProfile  Publisher | Consider using CI\_responsibility with role=publisher |  |
| 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. |  |
| FR 015 |  | 08.01 |  | Te | There should be an attribute to store the values of address component | Keep the elements from 19160-1. |  |
| 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. |  |
| 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 |  |
| 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. |  |
| 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. |  |
| 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.” |  |
| 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” |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
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