



CEN/iSSS Workshop eCAT
Multilingual eCataloguing and eClassification in eBusiness

Project ePDC-1:
"Global Multilingual Product Description and Classification for
eCommerce and eBusiness"

Title: Disposition of comments on draft CWA-1 and
CWA-2 of ePDC-1

Source: WS/eCAT Secretariat

Date: 2005-03-08

Status: For information

Comments from :	Guy Pierra
Date of comments :	2004-11-26
Comments related to document :	
ePDC Part 1 (CWA 1)	<input type="checkbox"/>
ePDC Part 2 (CWA 2)	<input type="checkbox"/>

COMMENTS	Comments by ePDC-1 PT																																								
<p>Provided that, as agreed in Köln, the term "ePDC model" is replaced everywhere by "UML view of the PLIB model", I globally agree on the report. I only suggest some improvements below</p> <p>C1 Clause 3.3 Terms and definitions As a rule, the terminology is too broad and not always deeply connected with the need of the following part of the report. Moreover, when similar terms are introduced, it shall be clear what the difference is. For instance, what is the difference between an ontology, a conceptual model and an information model? My recommendation would be to simplify and reduce the definitions to introduce only what is needed by this report as specified by the ISO directives:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;"><i>"6.3.1 Terms and definitions This is an optional element giving definitions necessary for the understanding of certain terms used in the document."</i></p> <p>All the definitions from 1.6 to 1.12 are very unclear. The major distinction we need to made is the difference of a property (of an instance of a real world object e.g., "threaded_length") and an attribute (of a data model objects e.g., "symbol" for threaded_length, that describes e.g., a property). Another major distinction we need to made (everywhere) is the difference between the class level (several instances chracterized by different property/attribute values) and the instance level. Is a concept an class or an ionstance, the same for an entity, etc.</p> <p>From 1.10 and 1.11 we conclude that: 1 characteristics -> 1 attribute-value pair and attribute = characteristic name.</p> <p>So, what is the name of "symbol" ? of "domain" ? etc. If the real intend is to gave three different names to "threaded_length": (characteristics/property/attribute) without having any term for "symbol", "domain", "prefered_name", etc, the terminology is not correct as it contradicts all existing terminologies in this domain, i.e., ISO 13584, is IEC 61360 and ISO 11179.</p> <p>The table below show the various concepts we need to name and the name I understood (?) the terminology gave. The number refer to the name that should be (for my point of view) given. The "-" sign means that I understood (?) that no names were given.</p> <table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th>Concept</th> <th>Full model</th> <th>Class_level concept</th> <th>Class_descriptor</th> <th>(abstraction of) instance property</th> <th>Property descriptor (e.g.domain)</th> <th>instance</th> <th>Property value</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Level</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Conceptualisation</td> <td>Ontology</td> <td>Concept</td> <td>-</td> <td>Characteristics</td> <td>-</td> <td>-</td> <td>-</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Real world</td> <td>-</td> <td>-</td> <td>-</td> <td>Property</td> <td>-</td> <td>Entity (5)</td> <td>-</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Data model</td> <td>Data model</td> <td></td> <td>? (1)</td> <td>Attribute (3)</td> <td>? (2)</td> <td>? (4)</td> <td>value</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>- (1) and (2) should be attributes (definition 1.11 shall be charged)</p>	Concept	Full model	Class_level concept	Class_descriptor	(abstraction of) instance property	Property descriptor (e.g.domain)	instance	Property value	Level								Conceptualisation	Ontology	Concept	-	Characteristics	-	-	-	Real world	-	-	-	Property	-	Entity (5)	-	Data model	Data model		? (1)	Attribute (3)	? (2)	? (4)	value	<p>ACCEPTED: ePDC Model is meant in the sense of UML representation of the PLIB model.</p> <p>In general we agree, and moved the terminology part in a different document.</p> <p>Not clear. Need to be discussed.</p>
Concept	Full model	Class_level concept	Class_descriptor	(abstraction of) instance property	Property descriptor (e.g.domain)	instance	Property value																																		
Level																																									
Conceptualisation	Ontology	Concept	-	Characteristics	-	-	-																																		
Real world	-	-	-	Property	-	Entity (5)	-																																		
Data model	Data model		? (1)	Attribute (3)	? (2)	? (4)	value																																		

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - (3) should also be property - (4) should also be entity 	
<p>C2 – 1.14 We are not interested in product categories but in concepts of products and concept of properties of products. Thus the name may possibly be changed into “product property ontology” (or whatever) but the definition shall be changed into “domain-specific ontology in which the concepts refer to product categories and to product property”.</p>	<p>We keep the name product ontology. ISO 13584 / IEC 61360 should clarify that property/value pairs are very often used to describe products (To be discussed: individual or categories ?).</p> <p>Added “... and to product property”.</p>
<p>C3 – (1.17) The real difference between on ontology and a conceptual data model is all but clear. What is the key difference? Do we need both ? why and where ? To add that it is often represented by UML class diagram add nothing (why not ER, EER, EXPRESS ..?)</p>	<p>Kept, since in new terminology part we want to show, that a conceptual data model is using language L, while an product ontology is the system S.</p> <p>Agree that a conceptual data model is also a kind of ontology (but this discussion is not part of the CWA).</p> <p>Removed the Note.</p>
<p>C4 – (1.19 – 1.20) Difference and usefulness of both “database schema” and “physical data model” ?</p>	<p>Removed.</p>
<p>C5 – (1.18) Information model. The definition is not correct: “structure” may be any kind of relationship and information model does not reflect the structure of information systems as they are built before information systems. The NOTE ON CONCEPTS refers to a completely different definition as it allow only generalization/specialization relationship. I disagree with this definition which does not fit for example with ISO 10303 and with usual practice. Finally the reference to XML shall be removed. XML is not an information modeling language: it is a ocument structuring language and a document exchange format. Moreover there is a reference to 3.14 that does not exist. Finally, if a definition is needed, I prefer the one from ISO 10303: “a formal model of a bounded set of facts, concepts or instructions to meet a specified requirement”.</p>	<p>Use of suggested Definition.</p>
<p>C6 I suggest to remove 2.10, 2.11, 2.13, 2.14 that are not necessary for this report.</p>	<p>Removed, but should be discussed if it were wise to explain the need for the self-explanation of the information model. This allows to make a clear difference to the work ISO 11179.</p>
<p>C6 - 2.5 define product category as part of a product taxonomy and 1.14 refer to product categories a part of product ontology. What is the difference with product class? If there is one, make it explicit. If there is no, use only one term.</p>	<p>Tried to make difference explicit. Changed definition of product class and product category. Added note to product category to make difference clear.</p>
<p>C7 – 4.1 and 4.2 probably an error on the term terminology defined twice. If it is not an error I disagree with the double definition of the same term (see ISO/IEC directives).</p>	<p>Removed both.</p>
<p>C8 – 2.17 Product class definition This definition ss absolutely not adapted to this report. In the remaining part of the report product class are defined by a complete model with a number of attributes and relations. The terminological part state that a class is defined by a name and a definition.</p>	<p>See above comment to C6. The new definition of product class requires properties, which is also reflected within the report.</p>
<p>C9 – 3.4 and 3.4.1 XML is not a modeling language</p>	<p>Need to be discussed. XML-Schema in our opinion is. 3.4 Picture was changed to UML + XSD 3.4.1 XML-Schema remains unchanged.</p>
<p>C10 – 3.4.1 “we need to translate an EXPRESS specification into the UML language” should read “we need to provide an UML view of the ISO 13584 EXPRESS model to make it understandable for a broader audience”.</p>	<p>ACCEPTED: It is important to note, that we if we talk about ISO 13584 we need to provide an UML view of the EXPRESS model to make it understandable for a broader audience</p>

<p>C11 – 3.4.1 “Like in natural... as possible” should read “the constraints defined in the EXPRESS model that restricts the possible interpretation of this model and thus define its semantics in a computer processable way will be expressed informally but in a human understandable way as business rules”.</p>	ACCEPTED: The constraints defined in the EXPRESS model that restrict the possible interpretation of this EXPRESS model and thus define its semantics more precise and in a computer processable way, will be expressed informally, but in a human understandable way as business rules in the UML model.
<p>C12 – 3.4.6.2 The definition of value should be changed. As a rule, an entity of a data model has an <i>identity</i>. A value is not required to have an identity. 2 is a value. In all the data modeling language I know, it is <i>not</i> an entity (even if in some of them, it may be represented as an entity).</p>	Definition changed. Concerning data modeling (Language L) we agree to the statement. Concerning model level M(PLIB): The PLIB models a value as an entity (dic_value). We tried to reflect this in the definition in the appropriate section also.
<p>C13 – 3.4.6.2 The definition of <i>product description</i> should be changed. It should read “specification of a product by a class belonging and a set of property-value pair”. The NOTE shall be removed: in the context of this report 1 property-value pair or one single “definition” is not a product description.</p>	ACCEPTED. Changed to: specification of a product by at least one product class belonging and a set of property-value pair Note has been kept, but modified : NOTE ON CONCEPT The specification is given by means of a property value pair and by means of a definition.
<p>C14 – 3.4.7.1 A product catalogue is not a description of product categories. Should read as “a set of product descriptions” (after incorporation of C13).</p>	ACCEPTED: changed to: 6.8 Product Catalogue: catalogue that contains product descriptions
<p>C15 – 5.1.1.1 It might be advisable here (after the two first paragraph) to explain briefly that this requirement is addressed by the ISO 13584 model as follows: each particular product may be represented by an aggregate of instances, a particular one (called general model) carries the product characteristics. The other ones (called functional models) carries the discipline-oriented view of the product.</p>	ACCEPTED: 1. Add sentence where suggested: Some pieces of the information is invariant to the processes of the value chain, while for each process some specific information may be added. 2. Added Chapter: “5.3.3.6 Distinguish General from Functional Model throughout the value chain”
<p>C16 – 5.1.2.10 It might be useful to state that mapping may be further specified - at the class level, using operators of description logics - all the property level, using derivation functions.</p>	ACCEPTED: Added a paragraph.

<p>C17 – 5.2.6 The ePDC2 project should not so much focus on maintenance processes but on maintenance constraints and rules for insuring interoperability</p>	<p>Agree, but within the current report a maintenance model is required by CEN/EC. Therefore a state diagram for the maintenance has been integrated. The maintenance constraints may be part of ePDC2.</p>
<p>C18 – 5.3.1.2 It might be advisable here to describe briefly how this requirement is addressed in ISO 13584 by the case_of relationship</p>	<p>We formulize requirements in the section. Therefore added:</p> <p>There is a need to have a mechanism to reference properties and classes from other dictionaries or ontologies. We will reference this relation either as</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>is_case_of</i> (which declares two properties/classes equivalent) or • <i>import_in</i> (which imports a property without any modification, not even the originator.).
<p>C19 – 5.3.3 Property definition scope. Thread diameter is not a property of a diode, even if it has some threaded part. It is a property of a diode thread feature. But this feature itself shall be defined as a diode property. Thus the thread feature is in fact a <i>domain</i> that may be shared by various properties.</p>	<p>DISAGREE. Depends on modeling of class "diode". In fact it may be modeled as suggested, but not necessarily.. Text not changed.</p>
<p>C20 – 5.3.3 Property application. It might be advisable to explain here that the criteria for applying a property in a class different from th class where it was defined is that the former should be a specialisation of the latter.</p>	<p>ACCEPTED, but import_in needs to be considered also: Changed text:</p> <p>Note: The application of a property requires either that the class where the property shall be applied is either inside the name_scope or imported in the class (see relation: name_scope, import_in).</p>
<p>C21 – 5.4 It would be useful here to introduce the simplified view of the PLIB data model presented in the Köln meeting.</p>	<p>ACCEPTED:</p> <p>To be discussed: shall we add the names of the relations to the simplified ?</p>
<p>C22 – 7 I suggest to change the header of this section to the explain 1) That the choice between one unique repository (centralized) or several repositories (decentralized approach) need to be studied in ePDC2</p>	<p>We suggest a distributed approach.</p>
<p>2) That requirement on "the" toolkit are examples of requirements on tools hits that might be used for maintaining centralized or decentralized dictionaries</p>	<p>We assume it to be the minimal requirements.</p>
<p>C23 – 7.1.1.1 There is a reference to 3.3 not understandable. However it should be noted that mapping (e.g., case_of) are part of ISO 13584-25 and that this should be studied in ePDC2. Moreover, as agreed at Köln, the ePDC model is not a different model from ISO 13584. It is only a view of it. This should be made clear all over the document</p>	<p>Added Sentence (see C21) Therefore we have chosen that the UML representation of PLIB done by ePDC will be the called ePDC data model and serve as an Reference Information Model (RIM) from which exchange formats can be derived.</p>
<p>C24 – 8 Principle 1 –</p>	<p>ACCEPTED: Changed wording.</p>

<p>This recommendation does not distinguish between classification part and product description part. It should be specified that, following ISO 13584, the product description part may itself consist of a hierarchy (identification hierarchy) with property inheritance.</p>	
<p>Moreover, it might be advisable to remove "(most commonly 4 levels)".</p>	<p>Needs to be discussed.</p>
<p>C25 – 9 Neither (Minsky 1968) quoted in 4.1.4.1, nor (Pierra 1997) quoted in 4.1.4 appear in the bibliography.</p>	<p>Already done.</p>

Comments from :	John Ketchell	
Date of comments :	1 February 2005	
Comments related to document :		
ePDC Part 1 (CWA 1)	X	
ePDC Part 2 (CWA 2)	□	

A. GENERAL COMMENTS			Comments by ePDC-1 PT

B. EDITORIAL			Comments by ePDC-1 PT
Comment number (serial number)	Section, sentence or word (chapter, paragraph...)	Amendment or addition proposed	
1.	Page 4, Contents, item 6	Indent second line	ACCEPTED
2.	Page 6, Introduction, paragraph 2	Delete surplus comma after "Systems"	ACCEPTED
3.	Page 10, section 2.2	Delete surplus full stops after "Product" and "process"	ACCEPTED
4.	Page 11, figure 1	Right hand box wording needs tidying up	ACCEPTED
5.	Page 11, section 3.1	Penultimate line, "processable" should be one word (despite Microsoft spellcheck...)	ACCEPTED
6.	Page 12, section 3.2, line 1	Delete surplus comma after "M"	ACCEPTED
7.	Idem, line 10, and other instances eg section 3.3	"The semantics of M are [?]"	ACCEPTED: "The semantic richness of M is..."
8.	Page 13, section 4.4, line 1	Missing full stop	ACCEPTED
9.	Idem, note on terms, and other instances eg sections 4.5, 4.6	Inverted comma closure the wrong way round	ACCEPTED
10.	Page 13, section 4.5	"data model that represents an high level abstract representation of a part of the real world in which we are interested."	ACCEPTED
11.	Page 14 et seq sections 4.6, 4.7, 4.12, 4.13, 4.15, 5.1, 5.2, 5.4, 5.9, 5.11, 5.12, 6.2, 6.4, 6.5, 6.7, 6.8, 6.10, 6.12, 6.14, 6.15, 9.2 to 9.7 incl.	Missing full stops	ACCEPTED
12.	Page 14, sections 4.10 and 4.11	Surely "model" not "modell"?	ACCEPTED
13.	Page 19, section 6.10, Note on concept	Refer to CWA by number	ACCEPTED
14.	Idem	"eCatalogues" small e	ACCEPTED

15.	Idem, Note on terms	Missing inverted comma closure after "classification"	ACCEPTED
16.	Page 20, section 6.11	Review use of initial capitals (not used elsewhere in these definitions)	ACCEPTED
17.	Page 20, section 6.16	Surplus comma after "that"	ACCEPTED
C. TECHNICAL			<i>Comments by ePDC-1 PT</i>

Comments from :	John Ketchell
Date of comments :	1 February 2005
Comments related to document :	
ePDC Part 1 (CWA 1)	<input type="checkbox"/>
ePDC Part 2 (CWA 2)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

A. GENERAL COMMENTS			Comments by ePDC-1 PT

B. EDITORIAL			Comments by ePDC-1 PT
Comment number (serial number)	Section, sentence or word (chapter, paragraph...)	Amendment or addition proposed	
1.	Passim	Review spelling of "catalogue", to be used here unless quoting any actual document or organization that is using the US "catalog" spelling. The quote of ISO 13584 on page 45 is a fascinating muddle of US and English spellings!	ACCEPTED
2.	Page 14, section 4.4	"Modelling" has double l in English (CEN) spelling	ACCEPTED
3.	Idem	The reference to an ISO publication should not be supplemented by a reference to an individual (sorry, Guy)	ACCEPTED, deleted reference
4.	Page 19, section 5.1.2	Surplus "A" before "classification organizations"	ACCEPTED
5.	Page 28, section 5.1.3.8	Square brackets needed for reference	ACCEPTED
6.	Page 39, section 5.3.4.1	Reference to "DIN 2003" unclear and should be deleted if it is a DIN transposition of the IEC standard	ACCEPTED, deleted reference
7.	Page 55, section 6.1.3	Heading needs "the" after "Consider"	ACCEPTED
8.	Idem, final bullet	Surplus apostrophe "GUIDs"	ACCEPTED
9.	Page 56, section 6.2	Small d for "data"	ACCEPTED
10.	Page 64, section 9	"Requirements for a website"	ACCEPTED
11.	Annexes	Under the style guide, these should be lettered "Annex A [(normative) or (informative)] et seq"	ACCEPTED
C. TECHNICAL			Comments by ePDC-1 PT

Comments from :	Barbara Gatti	
Date of comments :	8 February 2005	
Comments related to document :		
ePDC Part 1 (CWA 1)	X	
ePDC Part 2 (CWA 2)	X	

A. GENERAL COMMENTS			Comments by ePDC-1 PT
B. EDITORIAL			Comments by ePDC-1 PT
Comment number (serial number)	Section, sentence or word (chapter, paragraph...)	Amendment or addition proposed	
1.	Foreword "Two versions of the draft CWA were release to the CEN/ISSS Workshop eCAT, the draft CWA was endorsed in September 2004. The comments received were included in this final draft version."	It is not correct, as officially 18 Dec-18 Feb 2005 is the endorsement period and the final version is only prepared after that. The text for final version should be like: "A draft version of the CWA was released to WS/eCAT in September 2004. The public comment period took place from 18 Dec 2004 to 18 February 2005. The comments received were included in the final version of the CWA, which was approved at the WS/eCAT plenary on 16 March 2005"	ACCEPTED, the statement concerning the approval will be added when the CWA has been approved.
2.	Foreword "The present CWA received the support of various experts representing different organizations, a list of experts who supported the contents of this document may be viewed in the Annex".	To be changed in: The present CWA received the support of various experts representing different organizations, a list of experts who supported the contents of this document may be obtained by the CEN/ISSS Secretariat". In fact, the CWA supporters are not only the persons in acknowledgment, but all WS/eCAT members who voted in favour of the CWA. This list is communicated by WS secretariat to CEN/ISSS and then kept as record in the CEN/ISSS electronic archive.	ACCEPTED
3.	Foreword	To add a phrase in each CWA where you refer to the other one. It should be clear that the project produced two CWAs which are related.	ACCEPTED, added phrase: "It is completed by another CWA 'NAME' that has been written by the same ePDC Project Team."
C. TECHNICAL			Comments by ePDC-1 PT

Comments from :	Bodil Nistrup Madsen	
Date of comments :	17 February 2005	
Comments related to document :		
ePDC Part 1 (CWA 1)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
ePDC Part 2 (CWA 2)	<input type="checkbox"/>	

A. GENERAL COMMENTS			Comments by ePDC-1 PT
<p>(1) I am happy to see that about 40% of the concept definitions and notes are taken over directly from CWA 15045: CEN/ISSS/WS/eCAT – Final version CWA – 2004-05-12, Chapter 20 (Annex) Report: Terminology for eCatalogues and Product Classification.</p> <p>However, I find it very strange that there is nowhere in the document a reference to CWA 15045. A reference should be found both in the Foreword and 10 Bibliography, cf. C 1.</p> <p>(2) Almost all terms begin with capital letters which is wrong in a dictionary, cf. B 1.</p> <p>(3) Many of the definitions that are not taken over from CWA 15045 do not follow the rules of ISO 1087-1 : 2000 <i>Terminology work – Vocabulary – Part 1: Theory and application</i>, and ISO 704 : 2000 <i>Terminology work – Principles and methods</i>:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Many definitions start with a capital letter and end with full stop, which is not correct, cf. B 2. 2. Many definitions start with an indefinite article, which is not correct, cf. B 3. 3. Some definitions start with a verb instead of a more general concept, cf. B 4. 4. Many terms are not spelled correctly, cf. B 5. 5. Sometimes the text is not a definition, cf. B.6 and B 7. <p>(4) Some of the definitions taken over from CWA 15045 have been changed incorrectly, cf. C 2.</p> <p>(5) Some of the definitions are not clear, cf. C 3.</p> <p>note : please avoid general comment not followed by specific amendment proposals in B and C under.</p>			ACCEPTED
B. EDITORIAL			Comments by ePDC-1 PT
Comment number (serial number)	Section, sentence or word (chapter, paragraph...)	Amendment or addition proposed	
1.	4.1	association	ACCEPTED
2.	4.10	more detailed ... requirements	ACCEPTED
3.	4.10	more detailed ...	ACCEPTED
4.	4.7	type of modelling ...	ACCEPTED
5.	4.11	model	ACCEPTED

6.	4.8	The wording: 'synonymous name for class' should be changed into a proper definition. NB! According to ISO 1087-1 a name has the following definition: 3.4.2 appellation, name: verbal designation (3.4.1) of an individual concept (3.2.2)	ACCEPTED "synonym for class"
7.	6.6	The wording: 'Every data element type has ...' is not a definition but a text explaining <i>data element type</i> and <i>domain</i> .	ACCEPTED "defines a of ..."
C. TECHNICAL			Comments by ePDC-1 PT
Comment number (serial number)	Section, sentence or word (chapter, paragraph...)	Amendment or addition proposed	
1.	Foreword: 3 rd paragraph	Add a reference to 15045, e.g.: CWA 15045, Multilingual catalogue strategies for eCommerce and eBusiness, comprises a Report: Terminology for eCatalogues and Product Classification, Chapter 20 (Annex), from which many concepts, definitions and notes have been included in this draft CWA.	ACCEPTED, added reference in the foreword, in Section 1 (Normative references", and bibliography.
2.	4.5	CWA 15045: data model that represents an abstract view of the real world Definition in ePDC Part 1 (CWA 1) – (errors/bad wording underlined): data model that represents an high level abstract representation of a part of the real world <u>we're interested in</u>	ACCEPTED
3.	4.9	CWA 15045: data model that represents the organization of information in a manner that reflects the structure of an information system Definition in ePDC Part 1 (CWA 1) is unclear: a formal model of a bounded set of facts, concepts or instructions to meet a specified requirement	DISAGREE, the reference to ISO 10303 here is suitable

Comments from :	Maarten Koens
Date of comments :	18 February 2005
Comments related to document :	CWA 2
ePDC Part 1 (CWA 1)	<input type="checkbox"/>
ePDC Part 2 (CWA 2)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

A. GENERAL COMMENTS			Comments by ePDC-1 PT
<p>1. The underlying assumption is this CWA is that the perfect classification scheme that complies with all recommendations as described in § 10 results in a better chance to find the right product in a large e-catalogue with greater efficiency of the search process than the classic keyword search process that searches the product descriptions with one or more keywords in a logic expression. May be that is a correct assumption. Or may be it is not. I would have liked to see a comparison of both search strategies.</p> <p>2. The paragraphs on the ePDC data model (§ 5.3, § 5.4 and § 5.6 including figure 15) are for me too abstract to follow. I would like to see most of these in an appendix. And I would love to see an explanation of the data model by the authors in a workshop that takes me through every entity and its relations to other entities.</p>			<p>1: PARTLY ACCEPTED Added the following statement after Principle 4 in Section 10: "While adding keywords and sets of properties to product classes benefits searching for products in eCatalogues, it also requires additional resources for defining and maintaining these components. However, sets of properties fulfil many more roles (see below). Therefore, the issue of following principle 4 may not be seen from the view of product search strategies only. A detailed comparison of different search strategies was not in the scope of the ePDC project."</p> <p>2: see below</p>
B. EDITORIAL			Comments by ePDC-1 PT
Comment number (serial number)	Section, sentence or word (chapter, paragraph...)	Amendment or addition proposed	
1.	§ 10	<p>Add a comparison of two search strategies in a typical large e-catalogue:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - using a classification compliant with the ePDC recommendations - using keyword search on the product descriptions. 	DISAGREE, this is beyond the scope of the ePDC1 project
2.	§ 5.3, § 5.4 and § 5.6	Summarise and move most of it to an appendix.	DISAGREE, these parts are core components of the CWA and may not be moved to an appendix.
C. TECHNICAL			Comments by ePDC-1 PT
