

Comments resolved

comment on section 5 no longer makes sense, as change was adopted. comment deleted.
comment on 5.1.3 "K" no longer makes sense, as change was adopted. comment deleted.
comment in 5.1.3.1.2 moved into text. delete if incorrect.
comment in 5.2 on 'contextual binding' no longer makes sense, as change was adopted.
comment deleted.
comment in 5.2 on 'conformance' no longer makes sense, as change was adopted.
comment deleted.
comment in 5.2 on implicit and explicit expansion no longer makes sense, as change was adopted. comment deleted.
comment in 5.2 on contradiction no longer makes sense, as change was adopted.
comment deleted.
comment in 5.2.1 re 'no such concept' no longer makes sense, as change was adopted.
comment deleted.
comment in 5.2.1.2.1 re 'domain' concept no longer makes sense, as change was adopted.
comment deleted.
5.2.2.1 contains content which is commentary in nature: if comments are moved to a 'known issues' section, this belongs there
comment in 5.2.2.3 on concept domain no longer makes sense, as change was adopted.
comment deleted.
comment in 5.2.3.2 re title no longer makes sense, as change was adopted. comment deleted.
comment in 5.2.3.2.1 no longer makes sense, as change was adopted. comment deleted.
comment in 5.2.3.2.2 no longer makes sense, as change was adopted. comment deleted.
comment in 5.2.3.2.2.1 re 'compile time' no longer makes sense, as change was adopted.
comment deleted.
comment in 5.2.3.3.2 re abstract/specializable already in Known Issues; comments deleted.

remaining comments for consideration as Known Issues

4.2 "When are datatypes transmitted in instances?"
4.4 "It's not clear why "retired" is a bad word here . . ."
4.5 Confirm proposal for duplicate assignment process
4.7 Need example
5.1.3 case 3: "Not clear. Does this mean a governmental or . . ."
5.2 "Pace . . ." cf. comment on 5.2.3.2.2.1_
5.2.1.1 on term for non-generic realms; cf 5.2.1.2.3
5.2.1.2.3 on term for non-generic realms; cf 5.2.1.1
5.2.1.2.3 on cascading changes
5.2.2 "You can't just point to three . . ."
5.2.2.4 Usage Context needs more detail
5.2.3.1.1 Are Domains associated with value sets
5.2.3.1.2 Dynamic latency

5.2.3.1.3 Affirm this is exceptional to stated rules

5.2.3.2.2.1 Compile time

5.2.3.2.2.1 binding parameters not consistent with other statements; cf. comment on 5.2

5.2.3.2.2.1 message specific language

5.2.3.2.2.2 Static context binding seems prima facie to be unlikely.

5.2.3.2.2.2 message specific language again

5.2.3.2.2.3 delete section?

5.2.3.2.3 need source

5.2.3.3.3 three comments

New comment: Content relating to parameters for binding has not been reviewed by co-chairs