NIST has not submitted comments or rebuttals. The Editor's response is the only set of statements from NIST

| Comment Number | Comment | Editor's Response |
|---|---|---|
| 1 | It is important that NIEM XML encoding be accompanied by a NIEM-conformant IEPD with all associated files. | the IEPD, when released, will be NIEM conformant. |
| 2 | The text (in the first draft) imples that a meaningless element nc:OrganizationName is required by NIEM. This is not the case. NIEM has very loose cardinality requirements on all of its types nad the nc:OrganizationType complex type does not require an nc:OrganizationName chile. | This is corrected in the second draft. Specific references to encoding are now in the Encoding documents that are outside of the standard. |
| 3 | There are several technical errors in the example on p. 156-157 of the first draft. | Agreed. The annexes have been removed from the second draft. |
| 4 | The paragrah on p. 157 is misleading that states" By referring itl and ansi-nist to the Biometrics domain, the user does not need to record existing sections. …" The namespace name (regardless of prefix) is a mandatory, integral part of an element name, and it cannot be a choice between one or the other. So to say that users are encouraged to use the biom namespace is misleading. They must use the biom namespace if that is the namespace chosen by the ITL standard. Also, saying that the user does not need to "recode existing sections" is misleading. If a namespace changes, all documentation and code that describes oir processes that XML must change. This whole section appears to be confusing prefixes with namespaces. | Agree. It was a confusing section. See new draft. Hopefully it is better |
| 5 | Elements biom:DomainDefinedDescriptiveText and biom:OtherDescriptiveText must have their names changed to be NIEM conformant A complex element (with child elements) cannot have a name ending in "Text" | This portion was exerpted directly from the 2008 version of the standard. In the file containing instructions for the NIEM-conformant encoding, I changed "DescriptiveText" to "Description" |
| 6 | The annex leaves out several important paragraphs from p. 2 of the 2008 XML specification. | These are now included in the file containing instructions for the NIEM-conformant encoding |

NIST has not submitted comments or rebuttals. The Editor's response is the only set of statements from NIST

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 7 | The tables (p. 139 of the first draft) are very confusing and appear to be aiming to do the job of the XML schema. A better approach would be to have a row for each field and use an Xpath to indicate the location of the field in the XML. Xpath is the conventional way of mapping an XML structure to an existing model, and is used widely in NIEM component mapping templates. Let the schema define and put cardinalities on the grouping elements; that is what XML Schemas are for and can define it much more precisely and accurately than a separately written table. | The affected annex is removed from the second draft. There is a detached document "Field Cross-Reference" that lists the short name (mnemonic). Agree with the Xpath referencing suggestion. I will try to update as much of the document to reflect this prior to the July meeting as is possible. |
| 8 | the current element, <ansi-nist:TransactionCategoryCode>, is of type <ansi-nist:TOTCodeType>, which does not allow us to extend the list of TOTs | |
| 9 | For Field 1.001, transaction XML tag was not specified. So whether or not the "Transaction" XML tag and its nested tags are mandatory were unclear | The 2008 version's encoding of these fields will remain intact |
| 10 | It would be nice that the 2010 version of the standard includes XML examples as it did in the 2008 version | Such a file will be prepared once it is voted upon what content revisions are accepted by the canvassees |
| 11 | For CNT, the 2010 version of the standard did not state or include the "ContentRecordSummary" field (page 35). However, it was included in the XML example (Basic10-printCard-NIEM-conformant) file. | The 2008 version's encoding of these fields will remain intact |
| 12 | Wasn't very clear whether the SRC field of 2010 version contains subfields such as OrganizationIdentification and OrganizationName as it did in the 2008 version. | The 2008 version's encoding of these fields will remain intact |
| 13 | The NIEM encoding document talks a lot about the differences from the 2008 standard. While this is very useful for discussion at the workshop, if this information ends up in the final document, it should be isolated in a separate section entitled something like “Differences from 2-2008”. The bulk of the document should describe what the 2011 standard is, not how it differs from 2008. | |

NIST has not submitted comments or rebuttals. The Editor's response is the only set of statements from NIST

14 An important sentence (below) from the 2008 version is not included. It is necessary so that implementers do not try to modify the ITL schema in unintended ways and still claim conformance. “Implementers may not introduce new elements except within the substitution elements described above, nor may they change the order or structure of elements defined by the standard.”

15 In the “missing data” section of the NIEM encoding document, there is typo: “Mission” instead of “missing”? In 2-2008, we qualified the guidance on missing data to apply to mandatory elements, but we were silent about optional elements. Perhaps the NIEM encoding document could specifically say that optional elements are to be omitted.

16 The XML package has a root element (in 2-2008, <itl:NISTBiometricInformationExchangePackage>). There is no equivalent of a root element in traditional encoding. We were careful to say (2-2008 Section 207) that the package -- defined as the root element and its contents -- “may or may not be a complete file.” Most of the workgroup agreed that an XML package like this would usually be a payload in a “larger, user-defined data structure.” Perhaps this is a conformance issue rather than an encoding issue, but it is important that that this concept continue in the new version.

17 The xsi:schemaLocation attribute ***must*** contain two values - first the namespace name, followed by a space, followed by the schema location, so it should read: xsi:schemaLocation="**http://www.biometrics.nist.gov/standard/itl-1-2011** http://biometrics.nist.gov/standard/1-2011/ITL-Package.xsd"

18 The list of 4 elements that were revised by ITL are not complete. For example, what about itl:FingerprintImage which is different from ansi-nist:FingerprintImage (and many others)? Please just leave the list out.

19 All but the first substitution element schema snippets are incorrect because they have two consecutive quotation marks at the end of this line: <xsd:element ref=”user-domain:TwoField””/>

NIST has not submitted comments or rebuttals. The Editor's response is the only set of statements from NIST

20 The <biom:CaptureOrganization> example is not correct because it needs to have children. So it should be:

```
<biom:CaptureOrganization>
<nc:OrganizationIdentification>
<nc:IdentificationID>UNKNOWN</nc:IdentificationID>
</nc:OrganizationIdentification>
</biom:CaptureOrganization>
```

21 For record type 7, right now users are not required to define their own image record type (they can use itl:FingerprintImage, ansi-nist:FingerprintImage, etc. – all of which are substitutable for ansi-nist:RecordImage.) So maybe this should say "Implementers ***can*** define, in an extension schema,..." instead of ***should,*** and indicate the other elements they can use also (similar to the way Type-9 is described).

22 In your new draft, the record tables now have a "header" at the beginning of each record. Consider whether the NIEM encoding document should specifically reference the word "header" and say that the "header" consists of the record's element name (like itl:PackageInformationRecord) and its record-type identifier. Right now the NIEM encoding document refers to the record-type identifier as "itl:RecordCategoryCode." Under NDR, code is restricted to elements that have a fixed enumeration list. We didn't do that in 2-2008, but it would be a good idea to fix that error. The enumeration list (in the itl schema file) would have "01", "02", … "20", "98", "99" as allowable values for the record types.

23 Consider whether the NIEM encoding document should state that the binary images in the package need to be Base-64 encoded. A description of Base-64 encoding was an Annex in previous versions. That could become another "encoding" document, specific to handling binary image data?

NIST has not submitted comments or rebuttals. The Editor's response is the only set of statements from NIST

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 24 | In constructing 2-2008, we discussed character sets, and decided to use the “encoding=UTF-8” in the schema – but we retained the base standard’s references to ASCII in the text. Consider whether the NIEM encoding document should state that the only UTF-8 characters allowed are the128 8-bit US-ASCII characters. | |
| 25 | In 2-2008, we said specifically that there was no distinction between the traditionally-called binary records (Types 3-8) and other, traditionally-called ASCII records. All records were to be coded using ASCII, XML tags. | |
| 26 | The NIEM encoding document refers to an instance document and gives a web address for its location (not yet available?). An instance document would be part of a NIEM IEPD, but the order of paragraphs in the encoding document suggests that it isn’t. | |
| 27 | The IEPD would be all of the schemas. Consider whether the NIEM encoding document should also give a specific location for the “biom” schema document. There is a reference location for the default xsi:SchemaLocation; should it also say that it is the “itl” schema? The NIEM core schema needs to be reduced to a subset of elements actually used. Consider a reference location for that file. | |
| 28 | [The commeting organization] believes that the construction of the NIEM encoded biom and itl schema files, construction of a complete instance document, and subsetting NIEM core will require a workgroup. This must be acknowledged up front rather than waiting for the third day. | I agree that we need to have a workgroup. However, the time for addressing the establishment of all potential workgroups is on the third day. It is simply a matter of a lot to cover and trying to put it in some reasonsable order. |