SDMX STANDARDS

DISPOSITION LOG FOR SDMX 2.1

April 2011

Scope of the Disposition Log.

This disposition log contains all of the comments received as a result of the public review of the SDMX Version 2.1 Draft Technical Standards, and disposition made on each of these comments

Reference Document Legend

Document	Disposition log reference
DRAFT_SDMX_2-1_ANNEX_ Major_Changes.pdf	Major Changes
DRAFT_SDMX_2-1-1_SECTION_01_Framework.pdf	Section 01
DRAFT_SDMX_2-1-1_SECTION_02_InformationModel.pdf	Section 02
DRAFT_SDMX_2-1-1_SECTION_03A_XML_pdf.zip	Section 03A and sometimes a reference to the Part.
DRAFT_SDMX_2-1-1_SECTION_03B_XML_schemas_samples.zio	Section 03B and sometimes a reference to the schema
DRAFT_SDMX_2-1-1_SECTION_04_SDMX-EDI.pdf	Section 04
DRAFT_SDMX_2-1-1_SECTION_05_RegistrySpecification.pdf	Section 05
DRAFT_SDMX_2-1-1_SECTION_06_TechnicalNotes.zip	Section 06
DRAFT_SDMX_2-1-1_SECTION_07_WebServices2.zip	Section 07

Organisations Legend

Organisation	Disposition log reference
Australian Bureau of Statistics	ABS
Banca d'Italia	Banca d'Italia
cogiti e.U	Bernhard Bodenstorfer
European Central Bank	ECB
Food and Agriculture Organisation of United Nations	FAO
Bank of Finland	Bank of Finland
Swiss Federal Statistics Office	SFSO
Metadata Technology	Metadata Technology

Legend of the Disposition

Accepted. The principle of the issue and any suggested solution is accepted. The actual changes made may not reflect exactly any suggested solution.

Not Accepted. The issue and any suggested solution is not accepted. Reasons are given.

Noted. The issue is noted and relevant changes have been made (this applies in the main to typographical issues)

Clarification. This is used when a question of clarification is made.

	Disposition Log for SDMX Version 2.1 Technical Standards					
Id	**Organisation**	**Reference Document**	**Line No**	**Problem/issue**	**Suggested solution**	**Disposition**
1	SFSO	Section 02	1205	Each Categorisation can associate one IdentifiableArtefact with one Category. Multiple Categorisations can be used to build a set of IdentifiableArtefacts that are +categorisedBy the same Category. The proposition is to have one artefact “Categorisation” for each “source – target” pair. An artefact holding a collection of such categorizations seems preferable for grouping reasons. Like SDMX 2.0 Dataflows & metadatflows multiple references possibility in a category item	Creates an artefact that is a CategorisationList instead of a unique categorisation	**Not Accepted** The requirement is to be able to categorise objects without having any impact on the either the object or the category, thus enabling objects maintained by one Agency to be categorised by Category Schemes maintained by another Agency. Adding a grouping mechanism creates one more object to maintain and it is still necessary to process the Categorisations in order to determine links. Note that the REST interface now supports the ability to query for objects that reference objects matching the REST query.
2	SFSO	Section 02 Section 03B	1931 Class diagram	The class diagram indicates that a Hierarchical code has attributes validFrom and validTo. The xml schema does not include these informations.	Add attributes validFrom and validTo In xml schema for HierarchicalCode tag	**Accepted**

	Disposition Log for SDMX Version 2.1 Technical Standards					
Id	**Organisation**	**Reference Document**	**Line No**	**Problem/issue**	**Suggested solution**	**Disposition**
				In our NSI we use a lot these informations in SDMX 2.0 hierarchicalcodelists artefacts. It allows us to document “historized” hierarchies.		
3	SFSO	Section 02 Section 03B	1952	The two types of hierarchy (value based and hierarchy based) are materialized in sdmx schemas in a duplicated ways and seem partly wrong. We prefer the 2.0 expression of hierarchy that the new proposed one. The idea to add an optional code reference type to the CodeAliasRef used in 2.0 as well that the requirement to have a level reference type for each code, instead of the simple level order, produces huge size document for, at least at our point of view, useless info.	Keeps 2.0 representation, Add a simple flag in hierarchy tag to inform if level based or not.	**Accepted** Removed LevelBasedHierarchy and ValueBasedHierarchy in favor of a Hierarchy which serves both needs. This hierarchy can always define levels, and a boolean is used to indicate whether these levels are formal, or a present just for documentation purposes. These levels are now nested instead of provided in an order so that their hierarchy is unambiguous. In addtion to this, the means in which a hierarchical code references a level has been simplified. The hierarchical code is assumed to be associated with the level which is at the same nesting depth, unless it provides an explicit reference to a level.
4	SFSO	Section 02 Section 03B	1955	A value based hierarchy has no formal Levels association.	Allows value based hierarchy level documentation	**Accepted** See disposition 3.

	Disposition Log for SDMX Version 2.1 Technical Standards					
Id	**Organisation**	**Reference Document**	**Line No**	**Problem/issue**	**Suggested solution**	**Disposition**
				But it can be helpful to dispose of some non formal level documentation anyway. As even a level composed of different codelists codes can have meaningful information to associate with		
5	Banca d'Italia	Section 02	1930-1969	**Hierarchical Codelist** A *ValueBasedHierarchy* has no levels but includes *HierarchicalCodes* as well (*CodeCompositions*, if renamed according to the previous comment) just like a *LevelBasedHierarchy*; however it doesn't exist any association between the two classes that expresses this fact (it existed in the version 2.0).	Maintain the association between *ValueBasedHierarchy* and *CodeComposition* (with the same characteristics of the association between *Level* and *CodeComposition*), which existed in the version 2.0.	**Accepted** The +level association is constrained to {levelbasedHierarchy}
6	Banca d'Italia	Section 02	1930-1969	**Hierarchical Codelist** It is not clear if the version 2.1 allows that the very same code takes part in many hierarchies with different compositions in term of other codes, while this happens in practice in the real cases and was allowed by the	Maintain the possibility that the same code takes part in many hierarchies with different compositions in term of other codes: in the *+hierarchicalCode* association between the *HierarchicalCode* class and the *Code* class, specify the multiplicity *0..** on the	**Clarification** The same code can take part in many hierarchies (this is a prime use case for the HCL as described at line 1903). **Accepted** Association +parent on HierarchicalCode changed to

	Disposition Log for SDMX Version 2.1 Technical Standards					
Id	**Organisation**	**Reference Document**	**Line No**	**Problem/issue**	**Suggested solution**	**Disposition**
				version 2.0.	*HierarchicalCode* class side; moreover it seems much better to go back to the name "*CodeComposition"* (for the "*HierarchicalCode"* class), which is the name used in the version 2.0 and seems more correspondent to the real meaning of the class.	0.. 1 as the root code in the hierarchy does not have a parent). Multiplicity of 0..* is added at the HierarchicalCode end of the Association between Code and HierarchicalCode. depicting that the Code can conceptually have an association to many HierarchicalCodes. **Not Accepted** The model was changed from the version 2.0 model so as to be closer to the implementation thus making it easier to map the model and the schema. Therefore Hierarchical Code is retained.
7	SFSO	Section 02	888	In SDMX 2.0 we uses OrganisationScheme / Agencies in order to define inside our NSI the sections group responsible for maintaining some SDMX metadata. So we use the agencies hierarchy to define the Agency group ID used for artefacts		**Clarification** A valid Maintenance Agency can define its own AGENCY_SCHEME. In order to be a valid Maintenance Agency the organisation must be contained in an AGENCY_SCHEME maintained by a valid Maintenance Agency. It can be seen that such a

	Disposition Log for SDMX Version 2.1 Technical Standards					
Id	**Organisation**	**Reference Document**	**Line No**	**Problem/issue**	**Suggested solution**	**Disposition**
				agency identification. Questions - Is it a valid solution to subdivise NSI Agency in a set of “internal agencies” owning some metadata artefacts? Can we transfer these groups of “Agency ID” in the AgencyScheme, Agency list of SDMX 2.1?		system will have hierarchic Agency identifiers. This identifier comprises the AgencyID of the AGENCY_SCHEME in which it is contained followed by the period (“.”) and the Id of the agency declared n the scheme. In version 2.1 the agencyID of any MaintainableArtefact can be nested in the form xxx.yyy.zzz etc. The top level AGENCY_SCHEME is maintained by SDMX and organisations in this scheme can each have a single AGENCY_SCHEME maintained by that organisation. In order to be a valid Maintenance Agency it must be possible to trace the agency back though the various AGENCY_SCHEMEs up to the AGENCY_SCHEME maintained by SDMX. Note that SDMX does appear in the nested Id so, if the SFSO is an agency in the

	Disposition Log for SDMX Version 2.1 Technical Standards					
Id	**Organisation**	**Reference Document**	**Line No**	**Problem/issue**	**Suggested solution**	**Disposition**
						SDMX AgencyScheme then its Id is SFSO (and not SDMX.SFSO). So providing the SFSO is declared in an AgencyScheme it can both Maintain structures and declare sub agencies in its own Agency Scheme. Note that any one agency can only maintain one Agency Scheme (it has a fixed Id of AGENCY_SCHEME and a fixed version of 1.0)
8	SFSO	Section 02	2303	In SDMX 2.1 process are quite more detailed and we thinking to use it in some cases. If we stick for a while in SDMX 2.0 do you plan a set of defined annotations to be able to port new process detail between SDMX 2.1 and 2.0?		**Not Accepted** Annotations are local to the organisation or organisations that have a common understanding of the semantic. They are not intended as a schema extension mechanism Consequently there is no intention by SDMX to define Annotation types.
9	SFSO	Section 02	1819	Question: Is a transformation defined for objectType between SDMX 2.0		**Clarification** A formal transformation is not defined at this point, but as part of the expected upgrade

	Disposition Log for SDMX Version 2.1 Technical Standards					
Id	**Organisation**	**Reference Document**	**Line No**	**Problem/issue**	**Suggested solution**	**Disposition**
				and 2.1? Ie: between "`ObjectIDType`" and "`ObjectTypeCodelistType`"		tools, this would be available. It is worth noting that these are simply the information model classes, and in most cases the mapping should be trivial.
10	ECB	Section 02	p. 47-49	SDMXStructureCodelist.xsd is in line with what was discussed during the workshop, i.e. there is no specific element named "PartialCodelist" but just an element named "Codelist". As this element inherits from ItemScheme, it has an attribute called isPartial, which can be used to indicate that the codelist only contains a subset of the codes. However, Section 02 indicates that there is a concrete class, named PartialCodeList, which inherits from a parent class named Codelist and also holds an association to it (baseCodeList). In our opinion,	Align Section 02 with the approach adopted in SDMXStructureCodelist.xsd, that is: Define a Codelist element that inherits the isPartial attribute from ItemScheme. Remove the PartialCodelist class.	**Accepted** isPartial attribute is added to Item Scheme and inherited by all Item Schemes (Code List, Concept Scheme, Category Scheme, Organisation Scheme,and Reporting Taxonomy sub classes) Partial Codelist class is removed.

	Disposition Log for SDMX Version 2.1 Technical Standards					
Id	**Organisation**	**Reference Document**	**Line No**	**Problem/issue**	**Suggested solution**	**Disposition**
				this is confusing, as, people writing classes out of the model and people writing java classes out of the schemas would most likely end up with different implementations.		
11	ECB	Section 02	p. 65-74	The XML schemas and the SDMX registry documents use the term “Dataflow” while the information model uses the term DataflowDefinition.	Use the same name (for example, Dataflow) in all documents and schemas.	**Accepted** In general the classnames for the URN, the IdentifiableObjectType enumeration in the schema and usage in the REST syntax are harmonised and are based on on the object type codelist in the SDMXcommonrefererences.xsd. The URN classname is the same as the name in the .xsd. In rare case, the classname in the model is different. This is clearly idenitified in the table of URN package and classnames in the Registry Specification (Section 05).
12	ABS	Section 07	368 & 369	**Impact of issue : Moderate** Not sure that shortening the URL is worth breaking the common format compared to the other resource names. More likely to confuse people	Don't shorten DSD and MSD. Noting this machine to machine, there is no need.	**Noted** Related issue 11.

	Disposition Log for SDMX Version 2.1 Technical Standards					
Id	**Organisation**	**Reference Document**	**Line No**	**Problem/issue**	**Suggested solution**	**Disposition**
				than help them.		
13	Metadata Technology	Section 02 Section 06	787 1215 684	MaintenanceAgency class: The classname in the URN for the maintenance agency is Agency (the same as version 2.0)	The classname should be Agency to be consistent with the table at line 684 of the Section 06	**Accepted** For consistency with the URN classnames Maintenance Agency class is renamed Agency.
14	Metadata Technology	Section 07 Section 03B	374	The object type to be queried is OrganisationScheme whereas the class is OrganisationUnitScheme Missing OrganisationUnitScheme as type for StructureWhere and in the REST	For reasons of consistency the object type should be the same as the classname or a note added in the documentation..	**Noted** Related to issue 11.
15	ECB	Section 03A		This schema allows nesting Category elements within other Category elements. This is different from the way simple hierarchies are built for organisation schemes, concept schemes and codelists, where a Parent element is used. This means that Categories sitting in different levels of a	Align handling of uniqueness constraints of category ids with the way it is done for codes, concepts and organisations.	**Not Accepted** The categories are identified according to their hierarchy, which is untrue for other items within item schemes (i.e. Category=SCHEME_ID.PARENT_ID.ID). Therefore, it is reasonable that these be implemented in a nested fashion

	Disposition Log for SDMX Version 2.1 Technical Standards					
Id	**Organisation**	**Reference Document**	**Line No**	**Problem/issue**	**Suggested solution**	**Disposition**
				hierarchy can have the same id. This behavior does not apply to the other item schemes. This is inconvenient as the collections behave differently, depending on their type.		
16	Statistics Finland	Section 07	439	Typo	Replace ALL.FLOW_ID+LATEST with ALL+FLOW_ID+LATEST	**Accepted**
17	Statistics Finland	Section 07	123	WSDL and WADL files described as normative but not provided in the draft package	Include normative WSDL and WADL files in the package	**Accepted**
18	Statistics Finland	Section 07	453	maximumNObservations counts back from the latest observation. Not possible to return only the first and last observation. This would be useful for displaying the time span in search results.	Change the name of maximumNObservations to lastNObservations and introduce new parameter firstNObservations that counts forward from the first observation	**Accepted**
19	Bank of Finland	Section 07	453	Detail parameter does not allow returning series keys and attributes only. This would be useful for displaying search results with e.g. title attributes.	Add new "NoData" option for the detail parameter that returns all documentation but no actual data.	**Accepted**
20	Bank of	Section 07	552	For additional clarification reference to relevant	Add reference to RFC 2616: Hypertext Transfer Protocol -	**Accepted**

	Disposition Log for SDMX Version 2.1 Technical Standards					
Id	**Organisation**	**Reference Document**	**Line No**	**Problem/issue**	**Suggested solution**	**Disposition**
	Finland			standards document would be useful.	HTTP/1.1 section 14.3 Accept-Encoding.	
21	Bank of Finland	Section 07	513	For additional clarification reference to relevant standards document would be useful.	Add reference to RFC 2616: Hypertext Transfer Protocol - HTTP/1.1 section 12 Content Negotiation.	**Acccepted**
22	Bank of Finland	Section 06	221, 225, 226, 243	Typo	Replace ISO 8879-1 with ISO 8859-1.	**Noted**
23	FAO	Section 02	1387 5.3.1 Class Diagram	There is a distinction in PrimaryMeasure and MeasureDimension. The problem is that Measure is not a dimension. Therefore the term MeasureDimension is confusing because it should not be part of the key. Having PrimaryMeasure forces the DSD modeler to choose one measure as a PrimaryMeasure. This is not logical because in case of	We would suggest simplifying the model and having only Measure. PrimaryMeasure can be renamed into Measure. The cardinal relationship between DataStructureDefinition and Measure can be changed from 1to1 into 1ton. MeasureDimension can be removed.	**Not Accepted** There is a need to support multiple measures in two distinct ways: 1) Where the observation value is reported for each measure in a “tuple” comprising the observation value and the identity of the measure concept. In this case there is no Primary Measure reported and the Measure Dimension is not a part of the “key”. 2) Where the observation value is reported with the full key including the key value of the Measure Dimension. In this case

	Disposition Log for SDMX Version 2.1 Technical Standards					
Id	**Organisation**	**Reference Document**	**Line No**	**Problem/issue**	**Suggested solution**	**Disposition**
				multiple measures, one measure is usually not more important than the other measure(s).		there is a single observation value which is reported for the "key". In (2) above the reporting is identical to the reporting of an observation where there are no multiple measures. Note that a Measure Dimension must reference a Concept Scheme as its representation: The Concepts in the Concept Scheme are the valid measures that can be reported. The schema binding rules described in "Data Structure Specific Schema" in SDMX_2_1_SECTION03A_PART_IV_DATA explain the various ways in which the Measure Dimension is used to support the use cases for multiple measure reporting.
24	Bernhard Bodenstorfer	Major Changes, Section 03A Part III	93, 90	The element name "MeasureDimension" is misleading and hence not ideal. It is not a dimension, because it is not used to form a key for data addressing.	"MeasureCharacteristic" or simply "Measure" would be better.	**Not Accepted** The Measure Dimension can be processed the same as any other Dimension, or it can be processed in a special way – see response to issue 23.
25	Banca d'Italia	Major Changes	74-96	The changes regarding the "*Data Attribute Attachment*" and the "*Measure Dimension*"	Eliminate the title of the paragraph (line 74: "*Support for non-time-series data*	**Accepted**

Disposition Log for SDMX Version 2.1 Technical Standards						
Id	**Organisation**	**Reference Document**	**Line No**	**Problem/issue**	**Suggested solution**	**Disposition**
				support not only the "*non-time-series data structures*" (as the title of the paragraph would let think) but any kind of DSD; such changes are valid both for time-series-oriented and non-time-series-oriented data-sets because the exchange formats (*generic* and *data structure specific*) are in principle unique (the time-series-oriented formats are particular cases of the corresponding unified formats), as described at 2.1 (line 197-225: *2.1 Message changes*).	*structures*"), transform the two parts of the paragraph in two distinct paragraphs (*1.1.2 Data Attributes Attachment* and *1.1.3 Measure Dimension*), adjust the number of the following paragraph (*1.1.4 Concept Roles*). Verify and adjust also any other part of the SDMX 2.1 documentation where by accident such changes are referred to the *non-time-series data structures* only	
26	Banca d'Italia	Section 02	1386	The use of the term "*Dimension*" seems inconsistent in many different parts of the documentation, for example in the diagram between lines 1387 and 1388 and in the following explanation the class "*Dimension*" seems to refer only to the dimensions that are neither the time dimension nor the measure dimension while in the diagram between lines 1488 and 1489 the class	To make things consistent and more intuitive, use the term "*Dimension*" to indicate any kind of dimension (like in the diagram following line 1488), don't use the term "*Key Component*" which sounds artificial and rename objects of the diagram following line 1387 as follows: MeasureDimension - MeasureDimension (the same) TimeDimension	**Accepted** The following changes are made: Key Descriptor becomes DimensionDescriptor GroupKeyDescriptor becomes GroupDimensionDescriptor Dimension is retained as Dimension as this is the classname at version 2.0 and so is a part of the URN

	Disposition Log for SDMX Version 2.1 Technical Standards					
Id	**Organisation**	**Reference Document**	**Line No**	**Problem/issue**	**Suggested solution**	**Disposition**
				"*Dimension*" seems to refer to all dimensions, including time, non-time and measure dimensions (the latter assumption is made even in other parts of the document).	TimeDimension (the same) Dimension NonTimeDimension (or SpatialDimension or other) KeyComponent Dimension KeyDescriptor DimensionDescriptor GroupKeyDescriptor GroupDimensionDescriptor The alternative of adopting the terminology of the diagram following line 1387 (and changing the one of the diagram following line 1488) would result in a terminology more complex, less intuitive and contradictory, because the *Measure Dimension* and the *Time Dimension* wouldn't be considered to be *Dimensions* (it appears a contradiction in terms). As obvious, whichever is the choice, the terminology and the nomenclature of the classes	structure for this "component". TimeDimension, and MeasureDimension are specialised sub classes of Dimension. All three are concrete classes. Each of Dimension, TimeDimension, and MeasureDimension have different business rules (e.g. there can be a maximum of 1 Time Dimension and Measure Dimension). These restrictions are now shown as constraints which simplifies the model. The terminology "key component" in the description (line1411 onwards) is removed and the explanation uses the specific types of Dimension.

	Disposition Log for SDMX Version 2.1 Technical Standards					
Id	**Organisation**	**Reference Document**	**Line No**	**Problem/issue**	**Suggested solution**	**Disposition**
					should be aligned everywhere in the documentation.	
27	Banca d'Italia	Section 02	1440-1445	The *TimeDimension* is excluded from groups, there is no reason for this and the fact is in contrast with the adoption of exchange formats (generic and structure specific) in principle unique and with the fact that the time-oriented-formats are a particular case of the general formats.	It should be possible that the *TimeDimension* is included in groups	**Accepted** The revised model shows an association to Dimension, and hence MeasureDimension and TimeDimension from both DimensionDescriptor and GroupDimensionDescriptor
28	Banca d'Italia	Section 02	1493-1494 (table between the two lines)	The location in the Data Set at which the attribute is reported, in the case of the relationship "*Dimension (1..n)*" seems inconsistent with the adoption of exchange formats (generic and structure specific) in principle unique and with the fact that the time-oriented-formats are a particular case of the general formats. Instead it seems to consider only the case of time-oriented formats.	Change the sentence for example as follows: "*The attribute is reported at the lowest level of the Dimensions the Attribute is related to, otherwise at the level of the Group if Attachment Group(s) specified.*". This way the sentence becomes valid for every exchange format (provided that the term "Dimension" comprises also the time dimension as suggested in a previous comment).	**Accepted**
29	Banca d'Italia	Section 02	1507-1508 (table	**Class: Primary Measure, Feature: Concept Identity** The concept corresponding to	It seems more appropriate a definition like this: "*An association to the concept which*	**Accepted**

	Disposition Log for SDMX Version 2.1 Technical Standards					
Id	**Organisation**	**Reference Document**	**Line No**	**Problem/issue**	**Suggested solution**	**Disposition**
			between the two lines)	the Primary Measure (Obs_Value) doesn't seem to define the semantic of the primary measure as it is stated in the sentence, because it has a generic meaning.	*carries the values of the measures*". Primary Measure can be any concept, not just OBS_VALUE	
30	Metadata Technology	Section 02	1507	The description for MeasureDescriptor should be updated to reflect the fact that there can only be one measure now (the PrimaryMeasure).	Change description from: "A set metadata concepts that define the measures of a Data Structure Definition" to "A metadata concept that defines the measure of a Data Structure Definition"	**Accepted** Description changed to: "A metadata concept that defines the measure of a Data Structure Definition"
31	Banca d'Italia	Section 02	1507-1508 (table between the two lines)	**Class: KeyRelationship** Besides the change of nomenclature already suggested in a previous comment (*Key -> Dimension*), in the context of the attribute-relationship it may be source of misunderstandings to say that a data attribute is "*attached*" to dimensions or groups.	Change the sentences for example as follows: "*… the set of Dimensions which the Data Attribute may vary with.*"	**Accepted** Changed to ".. the set of Dimensions with which the Data Attribute may vary" +dimensions description changed to " Association to the set of Dimensions to which the Data Attribute is related" +groupKey is changed to "Association to the Group Dimension Descriptor which specifies the set of Dimensions to which the Data

Disposition Log for SDMX Version 2.1 Technical Standards						
Id	**Organisation**	**Reference Document**	**Line No**	**Problem/issue**	**Suggested solution**	**Disposition**
						Attribute is related"
32	Banca d'Italia	Section 02	1454-1455	The use of the *MeasureDimension* is very important, shouldn't be restricted to the case of multiple measures and should be allowed (if one wants) even when there is just one measure. For example, it may have the aim of representing measures formally and ever in the same way in different DSDs, independently of having one or more measure in the single DSDs. Instead the lines 1454-1455 seem not to consider this as a possible behavior, although in some cases it may be considered a very good practice.	Enrich the sentence, for example: "*The purpose of a MeasureDimension is to specify formally the meaning of the measures (because the PrimaryMeasure has a generic meaning, e.g. "obs_value") and to enable multiple measures to be defined and reported in a StructureSpecificDataSet.*".	**Accepted**
33	Metadata Technology	Section 03B		MeasureDimension/LocalRepresentation/Enumeration The reference to the Enumeration (actually a Concept Scheme) is conditional. Should this not be mandatory?		**Accepted** The reference is made mandatory.
34	FAO	Section 07	332	The problem is that only GET	We would suggest covering as	**Not Accepted**

	Disposition Log for SDMX Version 2.1 Technical Standards					
Id	**Organisation**	**Reference Document**	**Line No**	**Problem/issue**	**Suggested solution**	**Disposition**
				is covered. The problem is that with only GET, the REST interface is not completed yet and we need a complete REST interface. In our vision, SOAP is not a de facto standard anymore, the webservice world is moving to REST.	well POST, PUT and DELETE.	The Web Services Guidelines are concerned with retrieval only. This is future work for the Web Services group.
35	FAO	Section 07	368	The resource DataStructure has by definition the elements Codelists, Concepts and DataStructures. The problem is that this is usually a large file and unpleasant to use for emailing, printing, browsing and transferring in general.	It would be nice to have besides the resource DataStructure a resource which has *only* the DataStructures (the old KeyFamily).	**Clarification** This can be done. Default is not to resolve references. For additional information, please refer to section 3.3.2.3 of the Web services guidelines.
36	FAO	Section 07	338	XML is verbose and results in large files. The REST interface only supports XML.	Using JSON and/or ZIP besides XML in the specification would address the volume problem of SDMX.	**Not Accepted** This is already specified in the Web Services Guidelines for compression. This is documented for REST and SOAP. For additional information, please see section 2.5.3 and 3.7. For JSON this will be investigated for a future version of the Web Services Guidelines.

	Disposition Log for SDMX Version 2.1 Technical Standards					
Id	**Organisation**	**Reference Document**	**Line No**	**Problem/issue**	**Suggested solution**	**Disposition**
37	FAO	Section 07	All	The use of capital letters in the URL path presents a burden to the user. Capitalized acronyms for agencies are being used in the URL, and this case is unavoidable. But capital letters are being used for the resources, query parameter values, and URL path keywords ALL, LATEST, etc. The user must now look up what the designate as capitalized, such as your use of Metadataflow versus MetadataFlow or MetaDataFlow. Query parameters on the other hand can use capitals. (Reference 2 below)	Refer to examples below	**Accepted** Whenever possible, lower cases is now used. This does not apply to artefact ids(See Issue 131 regarding Ids in SDMX).
38	Agilis			Should make all IDs case insensitive or demand all upper case.		**Rejected** Many instances are published in 2.0 with mixed case identifiers (most notably SiblingGroup). In order to effectively make the switch to identifiers (and thus URNs) to be case insensitive, the change would need to retroactive to version 2.0. Such a change would mean changing existing instances which is unacceptable.
39	FAO	Section 07	All	It has been recommended not to use an empty forward	Spec, Line 414: http://ws-entry-	**Accepted**

	Disposition Log for SDMX Version 2.1 Technical Standards					
Id	**Organisation**	**Reference Document**	**Line No**	**Problem/issue**	**Suggested solution**	**Disposition**
				slashes /?. To quote (Ref 2) "Some web services may use a trailing forward slash for collection resources. Use such conventions with care since some development frameworks may incorrectly remove such slashes or add trailing slashes during URI normalization."	point/DataStructure/ECB/ECB_EXR1/1.0/?references=Shallow Suggest, http://ws-entry-point/agencies/ECB/datastructures/ECB_EXR1?version=1.0&references=shallow	
40	FAO	Section 07	All	In specifying a resource, please consider conventional hierarchical URI patterns where the type of resource collection is identified - before the identifier of the resource is given, for example ./resources/<resourceId>. As an example, the agency is a hierarchical resource. It can be specified as http://ws-entry-point/agencies/ECB. This clearly states the hierarchy and the role of the agencyId as a parameter.	Spec, Line 414: http://ws-entry-point/DataStructure/ECB/ECB_EXR1/1.0/?references=Shallow Suggest, http://ws-entry-point/agencies/ECB/datastructures/ECB_EXR1?version=1.0&references=shallow http://ws-entry-point/agencies/ECB/datastructures/ECB_EXR1?references=none	**Not Accepted** The sequence was carefully designed based on usage experience of early designs which preferred the early identification of the resource.
41	FAO	Section 07	421	Collections specifications need	Spec Line 421 http://ws-	**Not Accepted**

	Disposition Log for SDMX Version 2.1 Technical Standards					
Id	**Organisation**	**Reference Document**	**Line No**	**Problem/issue**	**Suggested solution**	**Disposition**
				clarification and to be plural. For example, if the complete set of datastructures is desired, this would be specified as /datastructures but if a specific datastructure is desired then the URL would be /datastructures/<datastructureId>. An example of this is provided for line 421. (Ref 2)	entry-point/DataStructure/ECB/ALL/LATEST/?references=Shallow Suggest http://ws-entry-point/agencies/ECB/datastructures?version=latest&references=shallow	This would multiply the number of operations by 2.
42	FAO	Section 07	All	There are 2 different styles of representing the versions of the resource: AGENCY_ID+FLOW_ID+VERSION, or /LATEST. A suggestion here is to adopt a single style and enforce that across the metadata, data and schema queries		**Not Accepted** This cannot be achieved as stated as the syntactic context is different for the two "styles" and requires different treatment.
43	FAO	Section 07	458,464	Suggest using the Matrix parameter convention (;) for non-hierarchical portions of the URI, such as specifying the series keys. Examples are provided for Line 458 and line 464 (Ref 1, 2)	Spec Line 458 http://ws-entry-point/Data/ECB_EXR1_WEB/M.USD.EUR.SP00.A/ECB Using matrix parameters	**Not Accepted** The RESTful API defines 2 different ways of supplying parameters (see last bullet point of section 3.2 for additional information) and we'd rather avoid introducing a 3rd way.

	Disposition Log for SDMX Version 2.1 Technical Standards					
Id	**Organisation**	**Reference Document**	**Line No**	**Problem/issue**	**Suggested solution**	**Disposition**
					Suggest http://ws-entry-point/providers/ECB/data/keys;M.USD.EUR.SP00.A/data/ECB_EXR1_WEB Spec Line 464 http://ws-entry-point/Data/ECB+ECB_EXR1_WEB+LATEST/M..EUR.SP00.A/ECB+CB1 Suggest http://ws-entry-point/providers/ECB,CB1/keys;M..EUR.SP00.A/data/ECB,ECB_EXR1_WEB?version=latest http://ws-entry-point/providers/keys;M.USD,GBP,JPY.EUR.SP00.A/data/ECB_EXR1_WEB?updatedAfterDate=2009-05-15T14%3A15%3A00%2B01%3A00	
44	FAO	Section 07	464	The + symbol is used to AND sometimes and OR others. Suggest using the comma (,) for AND. (Ref 1, 2) Example in Line 464	Spec Line 464 http://ws-entry-point/Data/ECB+ECB_EXR1_WEB+LATEST/M..EUR.SP00.A/ECB+CB1 Suggest http://ws-entry-	**Accepted**

	Disposition Log for SDMX Version 2.1 Technical Standards					
Id	**Organisation**	**Reference Document**	**Line No**	**Problem/issue**	**Suggested solution**	**Disposition**
					point/providers/ECB,CB1/keys;M..EUR.SP00.A/data/ECB,ECB_EXR1_WEB?version=latest	
45	Bernhard Bodenstorfer (cogiti e.U.)	Section 03B	n.a.		Remove the redundant ZIP-in-ZIP file below “samples”.	**Accepted**
46	Bernhard Bodenstorfer	Major Changes	-1	whitespace in file name requires handling with care	remove it	**Accepted**
47	Bernhard Bodenstorfer	Section 03B ecb_exr_sg_ts_gf.xml and several other sample files similarly	in ecb_exr_sg_ts_gf.xml line 14 and at other places	Use of xsi:type instead of namespaces has disadvantages: It creates a dependence on a validation standard which is rather complex when compared to XML Namespaces. This has an impact on the learning curve, on parser complexity, and on the future standards development. Moreover, it is no longer possible to use a single DTD for multiple key families (now called DSDs). Concerning architectural principles, I believe that XML Namespaces is the intended tool to discriminate between XML vocabularies.	Use XML namespace. XML Schema types will anyway follow according to the respective schema declarations.	**Not Accepted** The advantages of using xsi:type was determined by the working groups to outweigh those which are achieved by using substitution groups. it is worth noting the xsi:type and substitution groups have the same end result, which is to point to a derived structure which defines the specifics of a given DSD data message. The main advantage of the approach of using unqualified elements with abstract types in the base schemas is that it requires a validly derived type be used which in turn ensures that the resulting message is conformant with the base message structure. In addtion, it is worth noting

	Disposition Log for SDMX Version 2.1 Technical Standards					
Id	**Organisation**	**Reference Document**	**Line No**	**Problem/issue**	**Suggested solution**	**Disposition**
						the this method also create a consistent structure so that an observation can be retrieved using the same absolute XPath, regardless of the DSD to which the data message is based upon. When using substitution groups, the absolute XPath was always different based on the namespace assigned to the DSD.
48	Bernhard Bodenstorfer	Section 02 Section 03A Part 1	1395 32	There is a potential confusion as to what a DataSetID is. In current uses of SDMX-EDI, if actually identifies the data flow. If in SDMX-ML, the identifier is used for a different purpose than data flow identification, SDMX-ML does not extend the information-model of SDMX-EDI and, hence, cannot be properly translated.	Use the original meaning of DataSet or add a DataFlowID in front of the DataSetID in the message header. For the systems I know, the former approach is sufficient and more conservative, because the “data set” in its draft meaning does not need to contain an identifier. This is easy to see, because how could a system reasobably extract the draft's DataSetID from the document if the system cannot A-PRIORI identify the “data set”.	**Not Accepted** The DataSet in the Information Model and in SDMX_ML does have an id which is independent from the Dataflow.
49	Bernhard Bodenstorfer	Section 03A	138	not clear which time concepts and use cases this is about	clarification request	**Clarification** This is simply stating that the observation time is not the only possible time value in

	Disposition Log for SDMX Version 2.1 Technical Standards					
Id	**Organisation**	**Reference Document**	**Line No**	**Problem/issue**	**Suggested solution**	**Disposition**
						the set of data structure components.
50	Bernhard Bodenstorfer	Section 03A	189	Typo: “refernce”		**Noted**
51	Bernhard Bodenstorfer	Section 03A	194	Typos: “remove so of the” should mean “some”		**Noted**
52	Bernhard Bodenstorfer	Section 03A	195	Typo: “generaliites”		**Noted**
53	Bernhard Bodenstorfer	Section 03A	198	Typo: hyphen “-” should be dash “–”		**Noted**
54	Bernhard Bodenstorfer	Section 03A Part I	172	It is counterintuitive to allow ANY element in the SDMX Message namespace	Since for example ID or Test will not occur there, how about an abstract placeholder type "MessagePayloadType" or so, for didactic improvement?	**Not Accepted** This is not counterintuitive, as the purpose of this abstract structure is to simply define the general message format, and this is exactly what it does. Concerning the reason that an "any" structure was chosen as opposed to using an abstract "MessagePayload" element which could be substituted; the reason for this is that it was desired that all data messages have the same payload element (i.e. DataSet). It would not be

	Disposition Log for SDMX Version 2.1 Technical Standards					
Id	**Organisation**	**Reference Document**	**Line No**	**Problem/issue**	**Suggested solution**	**Disposition**
						possible to do this as substitution group members must be global and can therefore only have on type associated with them. What this would mean is that the time series specific messages would have a payload element in a different namespace to the basic data messages. This went against the conclusions of the cross-sectional workgroup which decided that time series specific formats should be allowed so long as the payload could be processed in the same manner as the general data format payload.
55	Bernhard Bodenstorfer	Section 03B SDMXMessageFooter.xsd		suggested didactic improvement	Order the severity types: severe, warning, information. I also recommend a debug level severity. for the development environment.	**Accepted** Ordered (Error, Warning, Information) as suggested in the enumeration. **Not Accepted** Debug should not be part of the standard as it would not be typical in a counter party exchange.
56	Bernhard Bodenstorfer	Major Changes	66	Typo: “Kay Family”		**Noted**

	Disposition Log for SDMX Version 2.1 Technical Standards					
Id	**Organisation**	**Reference Document**	**Line No**	**Problem/issue**	**Suggested solution**	**Disposition**
57	Bernhard Bodenstorfer	Major Changes	227	The compact format difficult to process reliably? I tend to disagree.	Qualify the assertion so that I can qualify my criticism of it.	**Noted** Notes: the issue is that you never have an absolute XPath to any given node as you always have to rely on local element names since the namespaces in which they exist are not know. In addition, it is valid XML to have completely different names than DataSet/Series/Obs as these are substitution elements (and actually the old format did not enforce any structure). The role of the schemas should be to enforce the guidelines of the standard as much as possible, so that a valid instance of an XML document has a reasonable expectation of being valid according to the standard (although this is never entirely possible due to some limitations in XSD). The use of substitution elements left for too much vagueness in the structure of a data message.
58	Bernhard Bodenstorfer	Major Changes	304	Reader must search the location of “Implementers Notes”	State the document id where these can be found.	**Noted**

	Disposition Log for SDMX Version 2.1 Technical Standards					
Id	**Organisation**	**Reference Document**	**Line No**	**Problem/issue**	**Suggested solution**	**Disposition**
59	Bernhard Bodenstorfer	Section 06	644	Typo: “I sno”		**Noted**
60	Bernhard Bodenstorfer	Section 06	652	Typo: “defined”		**Noted**
61	Bernhard Bodenstorfer	Section 06	662	Typo: “.”		**Noted**
62	Bernhard Bodenstorfer	Section 03B SDMXMessage.xsd	Definition of BaseHeaderType	I suggest re-ordering for better semantic grouping and thus easier learning	Recommended order: ID, Test, Name, Prepared, Sender, Receiver, Agency?, DataProvider, Source, StructureRef?, DataFlowID?, DataSetID, DataSetAction, Extracted, EmbargoDate, ValidFromDate?, ValidToDate?, ReportingBegin, ReportingEnd, PublicationYear?, PublicationPeriod?	**Not Accepted** The header fields are already semantically grouped (ID-Name are the message level information, Structure-Embargo date apply to data, and Source applies to any message)
63	Bernhard Bodenstorfer	Section 03A Part IV	32	I have already ciritcised the suggestion to tightly bind SDMX-ML to XML-Schema by use of xsi:type instead of namespaces. Here I just point out that the element names were never changed, only the namespace changed to justly reflect the semantic change.	Continue to use XML Namespace, not xsi:type.	**Not Accepted** The standard is tightly bound to XML Schema as it is, and using substitution groups in no less tightly bound than using xsi:type. Both are simply a means of defining the specific content model which is a restriction of a more generalized model (e.g. specific XML attributes with

	Disposition Log for SDMX Version 2.1 Technical Standards					
Id	**Organisation**	**Reference Document**	**Line No**	**Problem/issue**	**Suggested solution**	**Disposition**
						specific values are allowed for a Series as opposed to any XML attribute as allowed in the base model).
64	Bernhard Bodenstorfer	Section 03A Part IV	33–41	Great stuff.	Go ahead with this.	**Noted**
65	Bernhard Bodenstorfer	Section 03A Part IV	80–81	There is a lot of duplication with the message header. Particularly publicationYear and Period to me seem more concerned with sender and source, hence, with the message header.	Assess the distribution and repetition of data between Header and DataSet. If overlap is required, perhaps both should (easier to learn) exactly mirror each other (at least optionally). Require that the information is compatible whenever there must be a redundancy for some reason.	**Noted** The idea is that the header provides a value for all data sets included in a message. Some data set specific fields are repeated at the data set level for specific values to be provided (overriding the header value). This is now made clear in the documentation
66	Bernhard Bodenstorfer	Section 03A Part IV	80–81	There might be potential conflicts between SDMX attributes and DSD-defined attributes.	Qualify all SDMX-attributes on the dataset with the SDMX message namespace. E.g. message:action.	**Accepted** Although the change of all components in SDMX to be case-insensitive (all IDs are now all upper-case) would eliminate any potential clash, it is still valuable to have these attributes easily distinguishable. Therefore, in all structure specific messages (data and metadata) the common attributes are now namespace qualified.

	Disposition Log for SDMX Version 2.1 Technical Standards					
Id	**Organisation**	**Reference Document**	**Line No**	**Problem/issue**	**Suggested solution**	**Disposition**
67	Bernhard Bodenstorfer	Section 03B ecb_exr_rg_ts.xml	Use of "Group" element	xsi:type is used to discriminate attachment contsraints.	Use the element name to reflect attachment constraints. This is more in line with the philosophy of the other data elements ("DataSet", "Series", "Obs") that the identifying set of dimensions in the key is expressed by the element name. This would also naturally hint on the future path for a similar variety of different series specifications, some by time, some by other dimensions such as reporting agent., and ths eventually, the grand unification of Series and Groups and later, possibly, Observations, greatly simplifying the data part of the standard.	**Not Accepted** Although the element name itself does not contain the identification of the group, there is a fixed attribute defined in the derived schemas which does, thus providing the same identification that the element name would have. As noted in issue 51, by not using substitution groups, and consistent model results regardless of the DSD on which the data is structured.
68	Bernhard Bodenstorfer	Section 03A Part IV	637	Interesting to note that on the Metadata side, XML namespaces are still proposed, other than on the data side.	Use XML namespace throughout. The COOLEST thing with a prospect to significantly reduce the standard's complexity by re-use "same syntax for same/similar patterns" would be a possibility to bootstrap the metadata framework from the data framework using a set of dedicated SDMX DSDs. These would alsp provide a great	**Not Accepted** The metadata would have been structured the same as the data if it was possible; however the nature of a metadata set does not lend itself to the better design pattern. The difference is that the bulk of a metadata set is the reported attributes, which because of their sub-structure must be elements. Because elements cannot have

	Disposition Log for SDMX Version 2.1 Technical Standards					
Id	**Organisation**	**Reference Document**	**Line No**	**Problem/issue**	**Suggested solution**	**Disposition**
					learning opportunity and proof-of-concept for applying the standard.	different types within a defined content model, the use of substitution elements is required. Outside of that, the use of unqualified elements with abstract types is still used to create the desired consistent structure. This is matter of understanding which XML design techniques truly apply to what is being done. In the case of data messages, you have a known general structure that always applies. The DSD specific format is simply a refinement of the allowable content. There is no need to place the elements in a different namespace as only the structure allowable content (not the meaning or the general structure) is changing. In reference metadata, this is still true. The difference is that whereas in data, the DSD specific component can be represented as XML attributes, the metadata attributes of a MSD must be elements due to their sub-structure. Therefore, the

Disposition Log for SDMX Version 2.1 Technical Standards						
Id	**Organisation**	**Reference Document**	**Line No**	**Problem/issue**	**Suggested solution**	**Disposition**
						limitations of XSD only leave substitution group elements as an option.
69	Bernhard Bodenstorfer	Section 07	452	startPeriod, endPeriod are of different format than the data periods, where new formats have been allowed.	The introduction of a union type for data periods asks for appropriate adjustments of the query syntax so that 1. available time formats can be queried, 2. one of them can be chosen.	**Accepted** The startPeriod and endPeriod are now based on the common:StandardTimePeriodType and the documentation has been updated to explain the usage of these parameters and the possible values available to them.
70	Bernhard Bodenstorfer			SDMX_2_1_SECTION_03A_PART_II_COMMON.pdf 3110 ObservationalTimePeriodType is a union, this makes the draft standard more complex to process (e.g. sort). Note that SDMX Version 1 and 2 solely rely on simple ISO time and duration formats. These also allow specification of oddly aligned time periods, e.g. financial years starting on 1 October: <Series … TIME_FORMAT="P1Y"> <Obs TIME_PERIOD="2000-10-01" …/> <Obs TIME_PERIOD="2001-10-01"		**Not Accepted** In version 2.0, periods (semesters, trimesters, quarters, and weeks) were introduced. At this point, the standard had deviated from the simple ISO only time formats. This issue was compounded by the fact that TIME_FORMAT was often used for multiple purposes; one is that which is indicated here; specifying a duration. The second is to indicate the format of the time (although this was rather redundant and was primarily a EDI legacy hold-over). It is the general opinion that

Disposition Log for SDMX Version 2.1 Technical Standards						
Id	**Organisation**	**Reference Document**	**Line No**	**Problem/issue**	**Suggested solution**	**Disposition**
				…/> <Obs TIME_PERIOD="2002-10-01" …/> <Obs TIME_PERIOD="2003-10-01" …/> </Series> I do not see sufficient reason to break this proven model; hence, I suggest to leave it unchanged.		this no more complicates that standard than had already existed. Based on the commenter's understanding, one would always have to analyze two fields to determine the actual time period being referred to. This is no different in the new proposal, where one has to consider the date along with the reporting year start. The advantage that the new method has is that it is simple to see equivalent reporting periods from the actual time value. This is very useful for display purposes.
71	ABS	Section 03B SDMXCommon.xsd ReportingTimePeriodType Section 06 Technical Notes	609 - 629	**Impact of issue : Critical** In Australia Fiscal Years commence on 1 July. Labour Force reporting quarters are also not based on a start date of 1 January. There are also other, less common, examples of reporting years that do not start on 1 January. ABS is not the only NSI with reporting years that do not start on 1 January.	REPORTING_YEAR_START should be added to the schema as an optional element in a number of locations: 1 In the DSD as additional information where the format of the time is optional definable. 2 At the data set level, 3 At the group level, 4 At the series level and	**Accepted** ReportingYearStartDay added to the schema and the model as a sub class of (Data)Attribute.

	Disposition Log for SDMX Version 2.1 Technical Standards					
Id	**Organisation**	**Reference Document**	**Line No**	**Problem/issue**	**Suggested solution**	**Disposition**
				ABS subject matter experts, methodologists and senior management require that data is able to be reported using SDMX for quarters, years etc where the reporting year does not commence on 1 January. The fact data relates to a “non Gregorian” reporting year must be able to be determined in a standard manner in “machine to machine” exchanges of data (as well as being apparent through any user interface). ABS is therefore extremely pleased that SDMX 2.1 introduces **ReportingTimePeriodType**. The schema documentation, however, currently states *ReportingTimePeriodType defines standard reporting periods in SDMX, which are all in relation to the start day (day-month) of a reporting year which is specified in another context. If the reporting year start day is not defined, a day of January 1 is assumed.* Where to look to identify whether a start day has been specified (before assuming the	5 Possibly at the observation level.	

	Disposition Log for SDMX Version 2.1 Technical Standards					
Id	**Organisation**	**Reference Document**	**Line No**	**Problem/issue**	**Suggested solution**	**Disposition**
				default of January 1) is presently not specified within the schema. When disseminating ABS data using SDMX 2.1, if we specify a start day in conjunction with use of a ReportingTimePeriodType we need to be sure that external implementations compliant with SDMX 2.1 will correctly identify, and apply, the start day we have specified rather than assuming a default of January 1. Lines 609-629 in Section 06, cited above, provide a useful explanation for implementers of the REPORTING_YEAR_START attribute and its use. Section 06, however, is not normative. The attribute needs to be defined normatively within the standard to support consistent implementation and interpretation.		

	Disposition Log for SDMX Version 2.1 Technical Standards					
Id	**Organisation**	**Reference Document**	**Line No**	**Problem/issue**	**Suggested solution**	**Disposition**
72	Banca d'Italia	Major Changes	216-225	The two data messages, *GenericTimeSeriesData* and *StructureSpecificTimeSeriesData*, should be considered not "*variations*" but just "*particular cases*" of the two base formats (*GenericData* and *StructureSpecificData*), in fact they can be processed in the same manner as the base formats.	Substitute the word "*variation*" with the word "*particular case*" at lines 216 and 219 (and in any other possible point of the whole SDMX 2.1 documentation where the term "*variation*" is used in the same sense).	**Accepted**
73	Banca d'Italia	Section 02	1394	In the documentation there is a general difficulty in understanding the term "metadata" because it is used with different meanings. Sometimes "metadata" has the generic meaning of "data about other data" (in this sense the DSD structural definitions are metadata, as well as the MSD), other times "metadata" refers specifically to the MSD model package (in this sense the DSD structural definitions are not metadata). Just to make few examples, see the use of "metadata" at line 1394 ("valid structure of data and related metadata"), 1397	If different usages of the term "metadata" are maintained, they should be distinguished better to make them clearer. A possible solution might be to use "metadata" for the general meaning, "structural metadata" for the DSD package and "reference metadata" for the MSD package. When the term "metadata" is unessential, it would be better to eliminate it (for example, in the table between lines 1508 and 1509 it might be used simply "concept" rather than "metadata concept").	**Accepted** The term metadata (on its own) is removed whenever it can be eliminated or replaced by a more explicit term or wording.

Disposition Log for SDMX Version 2.1 Technical Standards						
Id	**Organisation**	**Reference Document**	**Line No**	**Problem/issue**	**Suggested solution**	**Disposition**
				("additional metadata attached") and in the table between lines 1508 and 1509 ("metadata concept").		
74	Banca d'Italia	Section 02	1436-1438	The statement seems to be wrong; in fact the *key components* specify the key of an *observation* and not of a *time-series*. The same statement seem to be repeated also in other parts of the document, for example in the table following the line 1507 in the description of the *key-descriptor* (pages 74-75)	Modify the sentence as follows: "*Together the Dimensions (NonTimeDimensions, TimeDimension and MeasureDimension) specify the key of an observation*". Verify and correct other parts of the documentation.	**Accepted**
75	Banca d'Italia	Section 02	1511-1601	**Section 5.4 Data Set – Relationship View** The whole section seems not fully consistent with the simplification of the exchange formats, in fact the formats (*generic* and *data structure specific*) in the proposal are in principle unique, so that the time-oriented formats are particular cases of the corresponding unified formats, instead in this section it seems	Eliminate the time-oriented classes (*TimeSeriesObservation*, *TimePeriod* and *TimeDimension*) because they are well represented by the unified classes (*SeriesObservation*, *Dimension* and *KeyValue*) and illustrate the specificity of the time-oriented case in the description of the unified classes.	**Accepted** The DataSet model has been revised to treat the Time Dimension in a unified way with other Dimension types.

Disposition Log for SDMX Version 2.1 Technical Standards						
Id	**Organisation**	**Reference Document**	**Line No**	**Problem/issue**	**Suggested solution**	**Disposition**
				that the time-oriented classes may be independent (even if they are particularizations of common and more general classes). This impression is confirmed by the fact that the time-oriented observation and the time dimension are not considered like any other observation / dimension, in fact they are explicitly and separately indicated and in a not uniform way. In this section the time-oriented classes (TimeSeriesObservation, TimePeriod and TimeDimension) seem unnecessary and confusing. Even if one would retain them all the same, they should be a particularization of the corresponding unified classes (*TimeSeriesObsevation* of *SeriesObservation*, *TimeDimension* of *Dimension* and *TimePeriod* of *KeyValue*).		
76	Banca d'Italia	Section 02	1516-1601	While the exchange formats (*generic* and *data structure specific*) are in principle unique and the time-oriented formats	When speaking in general about something that is valid for both the unified and the time-oriented formats, make examples and	**Accepted** This is reworded to reflect the changed class diagram described in issue 75.

	Disposition Log for SDMX Version 2.1 Technical Standards					
Id	**Organisation**	**Reference Document**	**Line No**	**Problem/issue**	**Suggested solution**	**Disposition**
				are particular cases of the corresponding unified formats, in the text there are often inappropriate references to time-series objects and classes rather than to the unified objects and classes, often the description of a unified format is postponed to the description of the corresponding time-oriented format and it is almost never specified that the latter is a particular case of the former.	references to unified objects and classes only. Change the order of the exposition to describe the unified cases first and the time-series oriented cases after, stating clearly that the latter is a particular case of the former.	
77	Banca d'Italia	Section 02	2322-2449	Transformation and expression package	We agree to retain the package in the standard and to make an implementation available in the future release. A refinement of the model wouldn't be useful at this stage, therefore the following observations are intended to contribute to the future release of the package; however we are reporting these comments in order to keep track of them. [the appended UML diagrams and explanation are omitted	**Accepted** The Transformation and Expression package has been revised taking into account the comments made.

Disposition Log for SDMX Version 2.1 Technical Standards						
Id	**Organisation**	**Reference Document**	**Line No**	**Problem/issue**	**Suggested solution**	**Disposition**
					from this log]	
78	ABS	Section 03B	.xsd attachment SDMXStructureConstraint	**Impact of issue : Important** A constraint should be able to be attached to more than 1 data structure or metadata structure. While the abstract constraint allows 1 to many attachments, the content constraint and attachment constraint restrict the constraint attachment with data structures and metadata structures to just one occurrence. Both content and attachment constraints should be able to be attached to many data structures or metadata structures to ensure we can maximise reuse.	Our preference is that a constraint is able to be attached to many data structures and metadata structures, in line with the information model and the abstract class. As well, we would prefer that the keyvalue id be able to be different for different structures. This is **not** requesting a change to the restriction that a specific member selection can only be contained in one content constraint for any one attached object (line 1044 of Technical Notes). For content constraints, the restriction of an attachment to a single occurrence for data provider, dataset, metadataset, simple data source, dataflow metadata flow and provision agreement should also be removed. **Use case in support of the change.** We have a large amount of data	**Accepted** The documentation states that the Dimension id in each DSD that is being constrained is the same Id.

	Disposition Log for SDMX Version 2.1 Technical Standards					
Id	**Organisation**	**Reference Document**	**Line No**	**Problem/issue**	**Suggested solution**	**Disposition**
					described and stored in our information warehouse that we would like to make available in SDMX format on our website. While we encourage the creation of data cubes which encompass the data produced by a collection, it is usually not possible to have a single cube to describe all of the stored data. Often a number of cubes will be created with some dimensions in common. As well, our warehouse allows new cubes to be derived from other cubes. The result is that there are many situations where we have dimensions in common across many data cubes and often these are based on a major classification (e.g. Australian and New Zealand Standard Industry Classification). While dimensions may have the same title (e.g. Industry) this is not always the case and in fact we have cubes with two industry dimensions, each with a unique title. Where the content of these	

	Disposition Log for SDMX Version 2.1 Technical Standards					
Id	**Organisation**	**Reference Document**	**Line No**	**Problem/issue**	**Suggested solution**	**Disposition**
					dimensions is the same (e.g. agricultural industries) we would like to have a single constraint which can be applied to the 'industry' dimension in each cube where it is applicable. This aligns with the current situation in our warehouse where a partial code list is defined and attached to the dimensions in many cubes. While we recognise that creation of partial code lists with identity distinct from the “parent” code list has been considered and rejected for SDMX, we do not want to create a situation where we required a new content constraint for every cube even where the common dimensions contain the same restricted code list.	
79	ABS	Section 06	1181 - 1186	**Impact of issue : Moderate** For a restriction of a cube region, the examples given in the technical documentation and description in the information model are not consistent with the schema.	Suggest that example is made consistent with schema	**Noted** The examples have been corrected. The model has been amended TimeRange replaces TimeDimensionValue for the association with

	Disposition Log for SDMX Version 2.1 Technical Standards					
Id	**Organisation**	**Reference Document**	**Line No**	**Problem/issue**	**Suggested solution**	**Disposition**
						MemberSelection. Association from MemberSelection to MemberValue is made 1..* (was 0..*). Note that the model references a Component for the identity of the Dimension Attribute, and MetadataAttribute and so the one structure (MemberSelection) supports all of Dimension, Attribute, MetadataAttribute.
80	ABS	Section 07		**Impact of issue : Moderate** I was unable to locate XSDs for the request/response for the SOAP operations.	Please add.	**Accepted** These are added.
81	ABS	Section 07	392	**Impact of issue : Moderate** It is unclear whether you can use the ALL keyword for agencyID and then specify a specific id. It seems that you would be able to but that function doesn't make much sense to me.	The interaction of the keywords needs more description. Suggest further rules to clarify.	**Accepted** It is indeed possible (i.e. CL_FREQ codelists maintained by different agencies). Documentation has been amended.
82	ABS	Section 07	392	**Impact of issue : Moderate**	Suggest changing to	**Accepted**

	Disposition Log for SDMX Version 2.1 Technical Standards					
Id	**Organisation**	**Reference Document**	**Line No**	**Problem/issue**	**Suggested solution**	**Disposition**
				The use of the word 'ID' is ambiguous, especially when sitting next to agencyID.	resourceID.	The documentation is revised.
83	ABS	Section 07	404, 450.	**Impact of issue : Moderate** Section 3.2.2.2 described parameters in a very similar language to section 3.3.2.1 and it isn't clear (except very briefly in other sections or in the later examples) that the first lot of parameters (3.3.2.1) are in the URL and the second lot (3.3.3.2) are argument parameters	Make it clearer in 3.2.2.2 that these parameters go in the argument.	**Accepted** The documentation is revised.
84	ABS	Section 07	406, 452	**Impact of issue : Moderate** Some places where parameters are listed the options available are defined, where in others they are not. e.g. 'detail' at line 452 vs. 'detail' at 406.	Suggest making clearer what the options are.	**Not Accepted** All parameters list all possible options.
85	ABS	Section 07	438 (pg 18)	**Impact of issue : Moderate** It wasn't totally clear to me why the flowRef and providerRef were combined as parameters in the URL rather	Suggest clarification is needed	**Accepted** The documentation is revised.

Disposition Log for SDMX Version 2.1 Technical Standards						
Id	**Organisation**	**Reference Document**	**Line No**	**Problem/issue**	**Suggested solution**	**Disposition**
				than split into individual ones as the equivalent was earlier. I'm guessing it is because with the multiple URL parameters in this section - to be able to drop components (like version in flowRef) you need them combined.		
86	ABS	Section 07	438 (pg 18)	**Impact of issue : Moderate** It is unclear what the behaviour would be if using shorten parameter list products duplicates flow_ids from different agency_id	Suggest that shorten parameters list be removed.	**Not Accepted** The shortcut is very common in the current web service landscape, where the flow id or the provider id will be sufficient to uniquely identify a dataflow (or metadaflow) and a data provider respectively.
87	ABS	Section 07	495 (pg 23)	**Impact of issue : Moderate** Unsure as to why you can't use similar keywords such as ALL for the agencyId and the id in this section as you could earlier.	Suggest clarification is needed.	**Accepted** The documentation is revised.
88	ABS	All Sections		**Minor Editorial :** While referred to on the website itself as Section 01, Section 02 the section numbers do not appear on the	It is suggested that Section (and Part) numbers are included on the covers of PDF documents.This is particularly the case since Section 03a is now spread across 8 physical	**Noted** The cover page includes the identity of the section.

	Disposition Log for SDMX Version 2.1 Technical Standards					
Id	**Organisation**	**Reference Document**	**Line No**	**Problem/issue**	**Suggested solution**	**Disposition**
				cover of the (PDF) documents themselves.	documents that could be numbered PART 0 to PART VII without needing to refer back to the website.	
89	ABS	Section 01	56 - 91	**Minor editorial:** This gives a list of the sections within the technical specification. However, Section 01 is not included in this list. This means that the first item in the list (1. The SDMX Information Model) is actually Section 02. This is confusing. SDMX-EDI and SDMX-ML are also in the opposite order in this list compared with the numbered sections. At least one ABS reader who is less familiar with SDMX found it hard to relate this list to the sections.	Suggest adding Section 01 to the list and swap around the references to SDMX-EDI and SDMX-ML. This will mean the numbering within the list is congruent with section numbers	**Noted** Framework Document added as number 1 in the list. SDMX-ML is now number 3 and SDMX-EDI is now number 4.
90	ABS	Section 01	301-304	**Minor editorial:** Is it still so relevant in SDMX 2.1 to talk about "several optimized formats…based on the specific requirements of each implementation"? We are almost down to one generic and one structure specific message type, with time series	Editors to consider whether this sentence is still appropriate.	**Accepted** The paragraph starting "The SDMX standards offer a common model and formats.." is replaced with: "The SDMX standards offer a common model and a choice of syntax and, for XML, a choice of data formats, which

	Disposition Log for SDMX Version 2.1 Technical Standards					
Id	**Organisation**	**Reference Document**	**Line No**	**Problem/issue**	**Suggested solution**	**Disposition**
				oriented subclasses of each.		support the exchange of any type of statistical data meeting the definition above"
91	ABS	Section 01	370-380	**Minor editorial:** Two references to "Key Families".	Editors to consider whether these references are still appropriate.	**Accepted** "These objects are very similar to data sets, key families ("data structure definitions" in Versions 2.0/2.1)…" changed to "These objects are very similar to data sets, data structure definitions." Line 379 – "key families" replaced with "data structure definitions"
92	ABS	Section 01	404 onwards	**Minor editorial:** The sentence "Constraints can be associated with…" no longer span the list of constrainable entities in SDMX 2.1(e.g. DSDs)	Editors to consider whether this reference is still appropriate.	**Accepted** "Constraints can be associated with data providers (typically describing the contents of a database), with data flows (typically describing the topics covered), and on the provision agreement (where a full description of time-related constraints and topical coverage is given)" As the use cases for Constraints are many and varied this sentence is

	Disposition Log for SDMX Version 2.1 Technical Standards					
Id	**Organisation**	**Reference Document**	**Line No**	**Problem/issue**	**Suggested solution**	**Disposition**
						replaced with "Constraints can be associated with data and metadata structure definitions, with data and metadata, with provision agreements, and data providers".
93	ABS	Section 01	520	**Minor editorial:** With the phasing out of specific "cross sectional" message types, should this be generalized to just "…other than time series views…".	Editors to consider whether this reference is still appropriate.	**Accepted** The sentence "SDMX provides support for cross-sectional views of data cubes" is removed. The last sentence "This approach gives time-series-based systems the ability to process many cross-sectional data sets as well as time series" Is replaced with "This approach gives time-series-based systems the ability to process many data sets other than time series representations."
94	Metadata Technology	Section 03B		Category Map: There is no mechanism to reference the hierarchy of a category		**Accepted** Changed type to allow for nested identifier

	Disposition Log for SDMX Version 2.1 Technical Standards					
Id	**Organisation**	**Reference Document**	**Line No**	**Problem/issue**	**Suggested solution**	**Disposition**
95	Metadata Technology	Section 03B		Process Step: In version 2.0 this has a mandatory Name and optional Description. This is not supported in version 2.1.		**Accepted** Name and Description added.
96	Metadata Technology	Section 03B		Registration/Datasource: Allows 2 sources which seem to allow a combination of one of: 1 simple 1 queryable 2 simple 1 simple and 1 queryable What is the reasoning behind this?		**Accepted** Uniqueness constraint added in the schema.
97	Metadata Technology	Section 02	787	The Maintainable Artefact in the Information Model has the following URL attributes: registryURL structureURL	Revise the Maintainable Artefact in the Information Model to be consistent with the schema.	**Accepted** Attibutes registryURL and repositoryURL removed from Maintainable Artefact. Attribute serviceURL added to Maintainable Artefact.

	Disposition Log for SDMX Version 2.1 Technical Standards					
Id	**Organisation**	**Reference Document**	**Line No**	**Problem/issue**	**Suggested solution**	**Disposition**
				repositoryURL The Schema has serviceURL structureURL		
98	Metadata Technology	Section 02	1507	In the Feature cell for DataAttribute, the inheritance from Component is not documented	Add inheritance from Component.	**Accepted** The inheritance from Component is added to the Feature column for Data Attribute.
99	Metadata Technology	Section 02	1507	In the table on page 77, in the Feature cell for AttributeRelationship the /conceptIdentity is not relevant	Remove the /conceptIdentity in the Feature column.	**Accepted** The/conceptIdentity is removed from the table for AttributeRelationship
100	Metadata Technology	Section 05	684	Various classnames missing, duplicated, or no longer concrete class	Delete MaintenanceAgency Duplicate CodeMap Duplicate OrganisationMap Class Hierarchy should be split into ValueHierarchy and LevelHierachy Delete TargetObject	**Accepted** The table is revised as suggested

	Disposition Log for SDMX Version 2.1 Technical Standards					
Id	**Organisation**	**Reference Document**	**Line No**	**Problem/issue**	**Suggested solution**	**Disposition**
					Add KeyDescriptorValueTarget Add IdentifiableObjectTarget Add ReportPeriodTarget Add DataSetTarget	
101	Metadata Technology	Section 03B		DataProvider This element is used for both the item scheme and the item. This is confusing	Change the element DataProvider (of DataProviderSchemeType) to DataProviderScheme	**Accepted** This was a bug.
102	Metadata Technology	Section 03B		DataConsumer This element is used for both the item scheme and the item. This is confusing	Change the element DataConsumer (of DataConsumerSchemeType) to DataConsumerScheme	**Accepted** This was a bug.
103	Metadata Technology	Section 07		The Error message states that it is used in a non-registry environment. However, if there is an error in a Structure Where query which is processed by a registry, this is the only SDMX construct that can be used to report the error	Change the documentation to remove the restriction to a non-registry environment.	**Accepted**

	Disposition Log for SDMX Version 2.1 Technical Standards					
Id	**Organisation**	**Reference Document**	**Line No**	**Problem/issue**	**Suggested solution**	**Disposition**
104	Metadata Technology	Section 07	385	The object type to be queried is Constraint, whereas this is an abstract class with two concrete classes, Content Constraint and Attachment Constraint. So each of these could have identical ids these need to be queried specifically	Remove Constraint and add Content Constraint and Attachment Constraint.	**Accepted**
105	Metadata Technology	Section 07	392	Mentions that the absence of an id is equivalent to ALL. Does this precludes any maintainable object having the id “ALL”?		**Accepted** This restriction is documented.
106	Metadata Technology	Section 03B		MSD – ReportStructure/MetadataTarget This is placed after the declaration of the MetadataAttribute. It would be more logical to place this before the MetadataAttribute.		**Not Accepted** The derivation of the report structure for a component list enforces this order. Therefore it is a matter for a tool to sort out the desire display order.
107	Metadata Technology	Section 07	406	In the REST query there is no mechanism to request “what objects reference this object”. This would be useful as it is a common requirement and very easy to add. The behaviour is “shallow” as the only	Add “inverse” to the list of allowable values on the “references” parameter.	**Accepted** The functionality was already supported as the references parameter could return both descendants (artefacts used by the matching artefact) as well as ancestors (artefacts

	Disposition Log for SDMX Version 2.1 Technical Standards					
Id	**Organisation**	**Reference Document**	**Line No**	**Problem/issue**	**Suggested solution**	**Disposition**
				requirement is to retrieve objects (or "stubs") that reference the identified object. Otherwise, the only way of making this query is via the StructureWhere.		using the matching artefact). However, the values have now been streamlined and additional options are available (for example, the possibility to return concrete types has been added).
108	Agilis	Section 03B	TS data samples	All structure specific TS samples have a root element: <StructureSpecificTime**s**eries Data> Instead of: <StructureSpecificTime**S**eries Data>	Minor typo error.	**Noted**
109	Agilis	Section 07	p. 28 – 35	Fonts & colors of all XML portions (samples, etc.) are inconsistent.		**Noted**
110	Agilis	Section 07	2.5.4	Issue with documentation on compatibility with web services in .Net, java [detailed document omitted from this disposition log]		**Accepted** This is documented in an Annex in the Technical Notes
111	Metadata Technology	Section 03A/B		Subscription does not recognise the various types of		**Accepted**

	Disposition Log for SDMX Version 2.1 Technical Standards					
Id	**Organisation**	**Reference Document**	**Line No**	**Problem/issue**	**Suggested solution**	**Disposition**
				Organisation Scheme (Agency, Data Provider, Data Consumer, Organisation Unit). It uses the abstract Organisation Scheme.		Removed OrganisationScheme and added explicit options for AgenyScheme, DataConsumerScheme, DataProviderScheme, and OrganisationUnitScheme. Note that for the first three, the selection parameters are still available even though there is only ever one scheme per agency for each of these types. Also changed the type of the Organisation element in SubscriptionType to common:OrganisationReference, which allows for a reference to any type of organisation.