

Template for comments and secretariat observations

Date: 2007-12-14	Document: ISO/CD 24617-1 (N440 rev01)
------------------	---------------------------------------

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 comment ²	Comment (justification for change) by the MB	Proposed change by the MB	Secretariat observations on each comment submitted
IT	3.1 events		TE	The definition is not satisfactory and can be misleading. Event is used here as a cover term for too many entities.	As suggested from the notes, it could be better to change it with the term "eventuality". It is suggested also that two other terms should be introduced, i.e. event as "something that happens at a certain point of time or during a short period of time" and state as "something which obtains or holds true, either forever or temporally"	
IT	3.4 instant		TE		Extend the explanation with some Time Ontology definitions of instant, like OWL-Time?	
IT	3.8 temporal unit		TE		Introduction a new term "Temporal entity", which subsumes instants and intervals, like "eventuality"?	
IT	3.8 temporal unit & 3.9 duration		GE & TE	In the note 3 of 3.8 the authors claims that "the length of a temporal unit is called a duration" and in 3.9 "duration" is defined as the "length of a temporal interval". Is there a contradiction? Does the author claims that "temporal interval" and "temporal unit" are synonyms (but it is rather difficult to accept this on the basis of the definition of 3.8 "temporal unit" and the note 2 in 3.9)? Does this two terms are used as synonyms through the entire document?		
IT	3.11 point of speech		TE	The definition of "point o speech" as an instant is somehow misleading.	It would be better to change "instant" with the more neutral "moment".	
IT	3.12 & 3.12 & 3.13 & 3.14		TE		See the comments for 3.11	
IT	3.14 point of text		GE		Could the definition of "point of text" be reformulated or adapted from the "Temporal Perspective point" proposed by Kamp-Reyle (1993). It would be clearer what is meant.	
IT	3.16		ED & TE	The authors write "relations that determines how objects are ordered in time"	Consider adding "in discourse (spoken or written) after "objects".	

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.

Template for comments and secretariat observations

Date: 2007-12-14	Document: ISO/CD 24617-1 (N440 rev01)
------------------	---------------------------------------

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 comment ²	Comment (justification for change) by the MB	Proposed change by the MB	Secretariat observations on each comment submitted
					Wouldn't it be better to change the word "objects" with "eventualities and temporal entities"? Wouldn't it be necessary to state that eventualities and temporal entities are considered as objects?	
IT	3.17 tense	NOTE	TE	It is not only a property of verb forms	Due to the fact that time can be grammaticalized in different ways, it would be better to state something like "it can be realized by inflectional morphemes on verbs, but also through temporal adverbs, nouns etc.."	
IT	3.21 SLINK		TE	It is introduced, without a proper definition, the concept of temporal entity.	Specify Temporal Entity. What is it?(see also comments on 3.8)	
IT	3.22 ALINK		TE	See the comment for 3.21	See the comment for 3.21	
IT	4 Overview		ED	Good section. The content of the section could be integrated with ANNEX H (Past and current activities on temporal and event annotation). It might fit better before section 7	Consider integrating with ANNEX H, and changing the position before section 7.	
IT	4. Overview	2 nd paragraph	TE	The term "temporal object" is introduced for the first time, and it is not present in section 3.	Avoid using "temporal objects", it could be changed with "eventualities and temporal entities". (see comments on 3.1 and 3.8)	
IT	5 motivation and requirements		ED		Consider changing the position; it should fit better before section 4	
IT	6 Basic concepts and metamodel		ED		Consider changing the position; it should fit better after section 3 (Terms and definition)	
IT	6 Basic concepts and metamodel		GE	The author writes "...the time dependence of events and situations..". It can be misleading with respect to what is stated in section 3.	Consider substituting all occurrences of " events and situations" with the more comprehensive term "eventuality/ies".	
IT	6 Basic	1 st	TE	The term "markable" is introduced.	Define markable and to what it refers.	

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.

Template for comments and secretariat observations

Date: 2007-12-14	Document: ISO/CD 24617-1 (N440 rev01)
------------------	---------------------------------------

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 comment ²	Comment (justification for change) by the MB	Proposed change by the MB	Secretariat observations on each comment submitted
	concepts and metamodel	paragraph				
IT	6 Basic concepts and metamodel	2 nd paragraph	TE	The author writes “temporal objects and ...”	Define “temporal objects”. See comments on 4.	
IT	6 Basic concepts and metamodel	4 th paragraph	TE	The author writes “...verbs describing various types of states and events”	Is it really possible to identify different types of states as for events? Or states differentiate only with respect to their duration? Change with “event types” or in a way that fits with what has been stated in section 3.	
IT	6 Basic concepts and metamodel		TE & GE	The author writes “ States are thus a particular kind of extended events”. A debatable definition. The general issue is: is the definition of states and events to be linked to a general ontology of eventualities or is the metamodel the unique theoretical framework?		
IT	6 Basic concepts and metamodel		GE	Does the metamodel should include ontologies for the entities involved in temporal annotation?		
IT	7. Specification of ISO-TimeML		GE	Good section. No major comments, except for the fact that it is not very clear how the metamodel is reflected into the specification language		
IT	8 Towards a semantics for ISO-TimeML		GE	Good section. However, wouldn't be more correct to express the semantics as derived from the metamodel instead as if it is derived from the specification language?	Consider reformulating the semantics in accordance with the metamodel. Consider changing the position; it should fit better after 6.	
	8 2 Tense in language		ED	The author quotes a passage from a book of Comrie. The page from which the quotation is extracted is missing. The definition of tense provided in this subclause is more complete than those proposed in the document so far.	Add the number of the page. Consider to uniform the of tense in the whole document as the one provided in this section.	

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.

Template for comments and secretariat observations

Date: 2007-12-14

Document: ISO/CD 24617-1 (N440 rev01)

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

DE	1. Scope		GE	In the section "Scope" the distinction between SemAF/Time and ISO-TimeML is sketched in a note.	Whereas this distinction is made clear in the "note", we would suggest to "repeat" and extend on this distinction in Section 5 "Motivation and Requirements", since the reader might not have this distinction present in her/his mind. This is important, while reading the document, the reviewers sometimes get confused, if the text is about SemAF/Time or ISO-TimeML. In case the Metamodel is in fact the main part of SemAF/Time and ISO-TimeML a proposed annotation tag set (so our understanding), this should be made clearer and be stressed.	
DE	3. Terms and Definitions		ED	Unclear if the name of the authors should appear here. Also the reference to the LIRICS project is missing (as far as we can see)	Changes should be made in accordance with comments by the Secretariat on this special topic.	
DE	3.1 event		TE	As the notes mention it, the definition given can be a bit confusing. We think that to define "event" as something that can "obtain or hold true" is too broad. General facts and scientific laws also can hold "true" but are not necessarily an "event".	Following the note to this definition, wondering if the authors could not introduce two terms: "eventuality" and "event", which would reflect the comment in the note.	
DE	3.3 extended event		TE	Not very happy with the term "extended event", because "extended" is not really the complementary of "punctual".	Is the term "durable event" not better, or the like.	
DE	3.4 Instant (NOTE)		TE		Can we not add that an instant can also be considered as an interval with the property "begin" equal the property "end"?	
DE	3.8 temporal unit & 3.9 duration		TE & ED	In the NOTE to 3.8 the authors write: the "length of a temporal unit" is called "a duration". But in 3.9 you define "duration" as the length of a "temporal interval". Are you considering temporal interval and temporal as synonyms? If not temporal interval should be define (this remark is	In case of synonymy of the terms, please just select one.	

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.

Template for comments and secretariat observations

Date: 2007-12-14	Document: ISO/CD 24617-1 (N440 rev01)
------------------	---------------------------------------

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 comment ²	Comment (justification for change) by the MB	Proposed change by the MB	Secretariat observations on each comment submitted
				valid for every point in which you mention “temporal unit” or “temporal interval”.		
DE	3.11 point of speech		GE and TE	You use here “point of speech” for a specific “document creation time”. We understand clearly what is meant, but wouldn’t be better to introduce here instead the term “document creation time”, and add subcases of this “speech creation time”, “utterance creation time” in case you are dealing with a multimodal document? The GE comment is on the “point”. The creation time can be an interval as well we guess. Therefore we prefer the term “creation time”. This comment for all occurrence of “point of ...” (like point of text, point of reference etc.)	See the comment on the left.	
DE	3.13; 3.14		GE	See the comment on the “point of... “ made for 3.11.	See the comment for 3.11.	
DE	3.14 point of text		TE	“point of text” (or better “text creation time”) could be considered as a special case of the “document creation time” (see TE comment on 3.11)	See the comment for 3.11	
DE	3.17 tense (NOTE)		TE	As the authors point later in the document, not only verbs are carrying tense information.	Add in the note maybe the sentence: “... verbform, but also adverbs, adjectives and nouns etc can carry tense information.	
DE	3.19 ET-Link		TE	Just a question: are links between “punctual events” and intervals excluded? Is this the case that no punctual events can be anchored in temporal interval?	Also maybe change the word “extended events” into “durable events” or the like.	
DE	3.21 & 3.22		TE and ED	As far as we can see, the term “temporal entities” has not been introduced.	Define the term “temporal entity”	
DE	4. Overview		ED	We think that this is a good section (and this is valid in fact for the whole document). But the content of the section might fit better after section 5?	Consider interchanging section 4 and 5.	

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.

Template for comments and secretariat observations

Date: 2007-12-14

Document: ISO/CD 24617-1 (N440 rev01)

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
DE	4. Overview (NOTE)		ED	Is it allowed to add the name of contributors here?	Change after receiving advices from the Secretariat	
DE	4. Overview	1 st chapter	ED	The authors write "... as anchor time is..". Is not meant "as to anchor events in time is ..."	If the authors agree on the comment, implement the content of the comment.	
DE	4. Overview	2. Chapter	TE	Here the authors introduce the term "temporal objects". Is this the same as "temporal entity" and is this the same as "temporal unit"?	The use of "temporal entity" and "temporal object" to be defined in section 3.	
DE	4. Overview		ED	Depending on where you place the content of section 4 (could be after the actual section "Motivation and Requirements", as suggested above), but in any case it would be good to stress again on the distinction between SemAF/Time and ISO-TimeML. This is crucial for the understanding of the whole document	See the comment/suggestion on the left.	
DE	5. Motivation and requirements		GE	Very good section, should be before the actual section 4 we think, helping the understanding of Section 4.		
DE	5. Motivation and requirements		GE	A general comment: Since 2005 there have been more work dedicated to representation issue of time (OWL-Time seems to be on the contrary a bit sleeping). We are aware of two developments that might be worth considering for the next version of this document: the EC projects TOWL (temporal owl or the like) and MUSING, in the context of which a framework for the formal representation of time has been developed. Generally a link to Semantic Web activities could be useful, in future versions.		
DE	5. Motivation and requirements	Last chapter	GE & ED	Here something not that clear: is the proposed metamodel given by a formal theory and is the work described here consisting in describing the metamodel, and how it is linked with an annotation scheme (ISO TimeML). Is then ISO-TimeML part of the normative part at the same level as the metamodel? This comment on		

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.

Template for comments and secretariat observations

Date: 2007-12-14	Document: ISO/CD 24617-1 (N440 rev01)
------------------	---------------------------------------

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 comment ²	Comment (justification for change) by the MB	Proposed change by the MB	Secretariat observations on each comment submitted
				the base of similar work in LMF, where the standard is about the metamodel, and the tag sets are more in the (in certain cases normative) annex. We are not sure about this, here. One reviewer likes the LMF way of separating the core (the metamodel) from the annexes (tag sets etc.), which can be both normative and informative. So basically the question would be if section 7 should not be rather part of a normative annex.		
DE	6. Basic concepts and metamodel (NOTE)			Name of authors probably not to stay here.	Delete (after consultation of the Secretariat)	
DE	6.	1 st paragraph	ED	The authors introduce here the term “markables”. We guess that this term is defined somewhere else in the relevant standards for SemAF (but we couldn’t check).	Please provide for a link to the relevant definition of “markables” (if existing), or provide for a definition in this document.	
DE	6.	1 st paragraph	GE	A very nice introduction as well to the role of the metamodel (or the formal framework) to be used by annotators. But a general question here: is the proposal for a generic time ontology foreseen, that can serve as a pendant to the ISO-TimeML guidelines? Or will the metamodel be the unique “theoretical” framework?	No need to react on this comment, since it goes beyond the scope of the document. But maybe provide for some short comment on the relation between the metamodel and (possible) time ontologies, how they could accommodate in the model.	
DE	6.	Second paragraph	ED	As mentioned for Section 5, It might be interesting, if time allows it to look at newer development on the representation of time in OWL (see the project EC project TOWL and the ontologies developed by the project MUSING, among others.		
DE	6.	Fourth paragraph	ED	Close the mention that also nouns can bear information about tense, maybe also add adverbs and adjectives.	See comment on the left.	
DE	6.	Sixth paragraph	GE	You mention here a conversion function between for example “hour” and minutes”. A question about the		

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.

Template for comments and secretariat observations

Date: 2007-12-14	Document: ISO/CD 24617-1 (N440 rev01)
------------------	---------------------------------------

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 comment ²	Comment (justification for change) by the MB	Proposed change by the MB	Secretariat observations on each comment submitted
				metamodel here: are there any means to represent inclusion (in the sense that minute intervals are included normally in hour intervals). But this might be related to the question on the possible time ontology for the ISO document (see the two related comments above)		
DE	6.	Seventh paragraph	GE and TE	Please consider if it would make sense in modifying the expressions containing “point of...” along the lines described in the comment to 3.11.	See comment to the left and the reference to the comment on 3.11	
DE	6.	Final paragraph	GE	<p>As for the other sections, we think those are very interesting. What we are missing here in general, is how this work relates to the other projects of TC37/SC4 on linguistic annotations. LAF (which is in fact less developed than SemAF-Time), is discussing a multi-layered annotation scheme in the metamodel for linguistic annotation. SemAF/Time is proposing a metamodel that guide (among others) the ISO-TimeML annotation. It would be good to have a global view on how ISO-TimeML annotation can interact with the other linguistic resources annotation frameworks.</p> <p>We know that this is a large issue, and that this is not necessarily to be included in Part1 of SemAF. But a note on this issue might be helpful, even if pointing to further developments of the standard.</p>		
DE	6.	Figure 1	ED	Caption of the figure could be more descriptive.	Add more text to the caption of figure 1, towards a real summary.	
DE	7. Specification of ISO timeML	Overall	GE	A general comment only for the time being. Is section 7, or at least part of it, not rather a part of the metamodel? It seems to be that in section 7 many concepts (about temporal objects in text) are introduced, which in fact are “indicating the classes of objects and relations that should go into a temporal annotation scheme” (quoting from the		

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.

Template for comments and secretariat observations

Date: 2007-12-14

Document: ISO/CD 24617-1 (N440 rev01)

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
				first paragraph of Section 6. Basic concepts and metamodel). Examples for this are "SIGNAL", "leaf nodes", "SIGNAL", "Active" vs "passive" (this is not specific to ISO-TimeML) etc. We think that a slight reorganisation of Sec. 7 in Parts that belong primarily to the metamodel and to parts that are more related to the specifications of ISO-TimeML would be very beneficial. Maybe also include the ISO-TimeML in a normative annex.		
DE	Global	Global	GE	We do not go into comments of the annexes here, which are generally very good, and for which some contributions are still missing, but from the German side we will for example contribute to annotation examples. We are in favour to have this document circulated as a DIS, but please take all the comment into consideration.		
SE				The proposal as it stands is far from language-independent (which an international standard should strive to be). In fact, the Korean example in Annex E uses attribute values that are not allowed according to the guidelines in Annex A.		
FR			ge	You should take the place of a concrete user. Nobody will use ISO-24617 (aka SemAF/Time) alone. A user will use SemAF/Time together with SynAF and this aspect is not studied. What the user needs is a family of standards, not a stand-	I suggest to add a small chapter with a concrete example, on how to use SynAF with SemAF/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.

Template for comments and secretariat observations

Date: 2007-12-14	Document: ISO/CD 24617-1 (N440 rev01)
------------------	---------------------------------------

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 comment ²	Comment (justification for change) by the MB	Proposed change by the MB	Secretariat observations on each comment submitted
				alone standard. To this respect, integration should be a property taken into account since CD stage.		
FR			ge	You should use (or possibly record) data category values that respect ISO-12620. In the sense that: 1) identifiers should respect camel case naming as specified by ISO-12620 2) CD24617 uses values that are effectively in the data category registry. Currently the use of the values is a little bit messy because most of the values are not clearly defined.	You should work in close conjunction with TDG6.	
KR	2	P2	ed	Add period (.) at the end of the phrase.	ISO 8601:2004 Data elements and interchange formats – Information exchange – Representation of dates and times.	
KR	3	P2	ed	Is there any reason to write “C” of “Core annotation guidelines” in the capital letter? (cf. the normative annex of Core annotation guidelines used throughout this part of ISO 24617-1)	the normative annex of Core annotation guidelines à the normative annex of core annotation guidelines or à the normative annex of “Core annotation guidelines”	
KR	5	P4	ed	Uniform use of semi-colon between the titles of the conferences instead of comma?	TANGO 2003, Dagstuhl 2005 à TANGO 2003; Dagstuhl 2005	
KR	6	Figure 1	ed	The resolution of the graph in Figure 1 should be reader-friendly enhanced.		
KR	7	Note	ed	Typo? (claused)	This claused is a copy of ... à This clause is a copy of ...	
KR	7	Note	ed	Use period at the end of the first sentence.	This clause is a copy of TimeML 1.2.1, A Formal Specification Language for Events and Temporal	

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.

Template for comments and secretariat observations

Date: 2007-12-14	Document: ISO/CD 24617-1 (N440 rev01)
------------------	---------------------------------------

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 comment ²	Comment (justification for change) by the MB	Proposed change by the MB	Secretariat observations on each comment submitted
					Expressions (October, 2005), à This clausid is a copy of TimeML 1.2.1, A Formal Specification Language for Events and Temporal Expressions (October, 2005).	
				Typo? (restructred)	The TimeML Working Group, that has been extensively restructured and revised by James Pustejovsky with some help from Kiyong Lee.	
KR	7.2.2	P4	ge	The website http://www.prismstandard.org/techdev/prismspec1.asp is dead.		
KR	7.2.2	P6	ed	"Table 5: Elements for time and date information" in bold face?	Table 5: Elements for time and date information à Table 5: Elements for time and date information	
KR	8.3	P2	ed	Add Smith (1991) to the reference list!		
KR	8.4	P2	ed	Numbering error in this section and subsequent sections!	(1) à (24), (2) à (25), ...	
KR	8.6	P2	ed	Use of uniform typeface for examples (examples in the previous sections in Palatino, but examples in this section and subsequent sections in Ariel)		
KR	8.6.1	passim	ed	No indent for the numbered examples (6), (7) and (12)		
KR	8.6.2.1	passim	ed	No indent for the numbered examples (17) and (18)		
KR	8.6.2.2	passim	ed	No indent for the numbered examples (23) and (24)		
KR	8.6.2.3	passim	ed	No indent for the numbered examples (35)		
KR	8.6.2.4	passim	ed	No indent for the numbered examples (50), (51), (52) and (53)		
KR	E.1	P1	ed	Typo (addverbials)	addverbials à adverbials	
KR	E.3	P2	ed	Adjectival and verb endings?	Adjectival and verb endings à Adjectival and verbal endings	
KR	E.3	P6 (example	ed	"y" alone does not romanize any vowel in Yale	twis-patchy-e cwu-sy-ess-keyss-swup-ni-ta à	

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.

Template for comments and secretariat observations

Date: 2007-12-14

Document: ISO/CD 24617-1 (N440 rev01)

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
		(3) and the text below (3))		Romanization system. In my opinion, 뒷받쳐 and 주시었 may well be romanized as “twis-patchi-e” and “cwu-si- ess”.	twis-patchi-e cwu-si-ess-keyss-swup-ni-ta	
KR	E.4, E.5	Note (E.4), P2 (example (5) in E.5)	ed	“y” alone does not romanize any vowel in Yale Romanization system. In my opinion, 도착했다 may well be romanized as “to.chak.ha-ess-ta”.	"to.chak.ha-yss-ta" à "to.chak.ha-ess-ta"	
KR	E.11	Table	ed	“Table: Verbal temporal endings” in bold face?	Table: Verbal temporal endings à Table: Verbal temporal endings	
KR	E.11	Table	ed	“Table: Verbal temporal endings” occurs twice. Delete one.		
KR	E.11	Table	ge	No example for (I recall, had eaten)	(I recall, had eaten) à mek-ess-te-la (I recall, had eaten)	
KR	E.11	Table	ge	No example for (I recall, may have eaten)	(I recall, had eaten) à mek-keyss-te-la (I recall, had eaten)	
KR	Bibliography	passim	ed	The bibliography need be rechecked and written uniformly: Check in particular [32], [39], [60], [75], [93], [118], [139], [143], [146], [154], and [157].		
KR	Bibliography	p.145	ge	Add Smith (1991) to the reference list.		
MT				Expertise on this subject are not available in Malta.		

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.