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After review of MTS-203119-1v1.2.1v127 (in MTS(15)000025r1), the only open issue in the draft seems to be the wording related to OmitValue.

The main reason for the different wordings, proposed up to now, seems to be that while the basic concept of OmitValue has been agreed, its properties have not been discussed and agreed in detail.

Therefore, we propose to **agree the properties of OmitValue first**, and find the corresponding wording afterwards.

# OmitValue properties

1. The semantic meaning of OmitValue is to identify explicitly and unambiguously that in the argument of an interaction a given optional member of a structured data instance shall not be present.
2. OmitValue shall not be used for mandatory members, neither temporarily nor in arguments of interactions.
3. It shall be possible to use OmitValue like other values within TDL specifications, except the case in item 2) above. In particular:
   1. It shall be possible to assign OmitValue to variables
   2. It shall be possible to pass OmitValue as actual parameter
   3. It shall be possible to use OmitValue in operations (defined as function instances in TDL MM).

# Proposed wording

Once the above is agreed, please find below our input to the discussion on the concrete wording.

The following constraint has already been introduced in clause 6.3.1 DataUse:

* **Use of a 'StructuredDataInstance' with non-optional 'Member's**Non-optional members of a 'StructuredDataInstance' shall have 'DataUse' specifications assigned to them that are different from 'OmitValue'.

As it has been claimed during previous meetings, “Constraints” are only static semantic limitations. Therefore this limitation will disallow only the direct assignment of OmitValue to mandatory members, but doesn’t prevent assigning OmitValue to mandatory members indirectly, i.e. via parameterization or via assigning a variable containing OmitValue.

## In clause 6.3.8

(please note, change is proposed for the “Semantics” part only)

Semantics

An 'OmitValue' denotes a symbolic value indicating that the value of the corresponding optional 'Member' of a 'StructuredDataInstance' shall not be present (i.e. omitted) at runtime.

'OmitValue' shall not be assigned to mandatory 'Member's of 'StructuredDataInstance's neither directly nor indirectly (i.e. via parameterization or via assigning a variable containing OmitValue).

Generalization

* SpecialValueUse

Properties

There are no properties specified.

Constraints

There are no constraints specified.

## In clause 9.4.6

To have a clear and unambiguous limitation, we propose to insert:

“The 'DataUse' specification, which the 'argument' refers to, can contain 'Variable's of 'ComponentInstance's participating in this 'Interaction'. Use of a 'Variable' in an 'argument' specification implies the use of its value. Additionally, placeholders such as 'AnyValue' or 'AnyValueOrOmit' can be used if the concrete value is not known or irrelevant (see clauses 6.3.6 and 6.3.7).”

'OmitValue' shall be assigned directly or indirectly only to optional 'Member's of the ‘argument’ (see clause 6.3.8).