NISO SSOS Comment Responses

# Public Comments

## Comment 01212

### Title: 22 Comments

### Submitter: Burkhard Raith

### Comment: table below

| **ID** | **Sect./ Line No.** | **Para/ Fig/ Table** | **Comment Type \*** | **Comments** | **Submitter-Proposed Solution** | **WG Response** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| rai-001 | 3.3.1Active standard |  | ed | (Adapted from DIN 820-4:2014):Wrong document number | (Adapted from DIN 820-3:2014) | Change to:Adapted from DIN 820-3:2014 |
| rai-002 | 3.3.1Active standard |  | ed | Giving examples is not allowed in a definition. | Make the examples a separate note. | ISO-specific style (not NISO); will leave as is. |
| rai-003 | 3.2, 3.3 and 3.4 |  | ed | All three chapters are divided into Top Level and Second Level. Why are these divisions not written as subchapters with subchapter numbers? This would make the structure much easier to recognize. For first level it is not a problem but if you look at a second-level definition, you cannot easily see that this is second level. | E.g.: Introduce “Top Level/Second Level” as separate level chapters 3.3.1 Active (Top Level)3.3.1.1 active standard3.3.2 Active (Second Level)3.3.2.1 superseding standard … | We will number the Top and Second levels (and renumber, as needed). |
| rai-004 | 3.2, 3.3 and 3.4 | all subchapters | ed ~~(te?)~~ | All terms/subchapters 3.2.x are defined as a “status”. All subchapters 3.3.x with the exception of 3.3.2 are defined as a status, whereas 3.3.2 is a standard, i.e. as a document. 3.4.1 is defined as a status, 3.4.2 to 3.4.5 are defined as documents. According to the titles of 3.2, 3.3 and 3.4 they all should be defined as a status. And it is reasonable and useful to have all these definitions as a status. | Reformulate the definitions 3.3.2 and 3.4.2 to 3.4.5 as a status | (For 3.3.2, superseding standard, see rai-005, below.)(For 3.4.2 & 3.4.3, see rai-010, below.)For 3.4.4, change/add opening phrase:Status assigned by a standardizing body to a(For 3.4.5 see rai-013, below.) |
| rai-005 | 3.3.2 superseding standard |  | te (ed?) | There are two possibilities for a superseding standard: keeping the document number or changing it. Only one is described (or the wording is too general). It is often believed that supersession definitely means that the document number is not changed. This is wrong as can be seen from a simple example: Assume that two documents are merged without technical changes to the content. Then most probably one document number is kept. From the viewpoint of the other document it is a supersession although the document number changes, and it can be a supersession because the content is not changed! (see 3.7.2) | Add text (see ISO/IEC Guide 59, 3.11) : Standard that by itself or together with other standards replaces an older version of the same standard or another standard and covers at least the same scope.  | For 3.3.2, change to following (keeping adaption note):Status assigned by a standardizing body to a standard that by itself or together with other standards replaces an older version of the same standard, or another standard, or multiple standards, and covers at least the same scope. |
| rai-006 | 3.3.3Maintenance | Note 2 | te | Note 2 is correct for “revise” but wrong for “reaffirm”. If at the end of the maintenance period the decision is “reaffirm” there is no “new work”. | Delete “reaffirm“ in note 2. | Remove “reaffirm” from Note 2. |
| rai-007 | 3.3.3Maintenance | Note 3, first bullet | te | Does that mean that the second level status “maintenance” is permanent? If so, it should be distinguished from periodic maintenance.  |  | Change Note 3 bullet one to:Continuous maintenance is the ongoing consideration… |
| rai-008 | 3.3.3Maintenance | Note 3, third bullet | te | If “stabilized maintenance” is a status, it is permanent. Then it has to be recognizably distinguished from other types of maintenance. |  | ISO & ANSI frameworks are different; if there are changes in the field of a Stabilized Maintenance standard, the maintenance type could be changed to periodic or continuous. |
| rai-009 | “3.3.4” |  | te | There is one second level status missing which can easier be seen and derived from 3.4.2 and 3.4.3. 🡪 rai 011 | Introduce 3.3.4 “???”. | (See also rai-010 & rai-011 proposal, below.See also Comment 01210)Change 3.3.2 (before renumbering) to:**3.3.2 superseding standard** Status assigned by a standardizing body to a standard that by itself or together with other standards replaces an older version of the same standard, or another standard, or multiple standards, and covers at least the same scope (Adapted from DIN 820-3:2014.)Add a new concept:**3.3.3 partially-superseding standard**Status of a standard that by itself or together with other standards partially replaces a standard, or multiple standards, and covers part of the replaced standards’ scope. |
| rai-010 | 3.4.3 (and 3.4.2) | note 1 | te | Note 1 says that there are three types of “withdrawn standards”. The first one is “with supersession”. This is a “superseded standard” (3.4.2)! So, 3.4.3 “withdrawn standard” includes 3.4.2 “superseded standard” completely but describes more, i.e. it is an hierarchically higher term. This hierarchical aspect has to be pointed out. |  | Change 3.4.2 & 3.4.3 to the following (before the renumbering):**3.4.2 withdrawn standard** Standard that is declared as being no longer active, and its status is set to “inactive.” Note 1: There are regional distinctions regarding the status, “withdrawn;” some standards organizations formally withdraw a standard, defined here as “deprecated” vs a withdrawn standard that is superseded.Note 2: A document that has been withdrawn may continue to be used, e.g., if this has been contractually agreed upon and is not forbidden by law.**3.4.2.1 superseded standard** Status assigned by a standardizing body to a withdrawn standard that has been replaced by a newer instance of the standard that covers at least the same scope.**3.4.2.2 partially-superseded standard**Status assigned by a standardizing body to a withdrawn standard that was partially replaced by a newer instance of the standard that covers at least the same scope.Note 1: Some SDOs prohibit the continued use of the partially- superseded standard, approving only the use of the newer partially replacing instance.**3.4.2.3 withdrawn standard without supersession**Status assigned by a standardizing body to a withdrawn standard that was not replaced (partially or entirely) by a newer instance of a standard that covers at least the same scope. |
| rai-011 | 3.4.3 withdrawn standard |  |  | What are the additional aspects of “withdrawn standards” in rai 010? At DIN, the difference is described as new standards developed to be supersessions of “old” standards but in the end cannot supersede these because the results are not interchangeable. Then the old standard is withdrawn without replacement (note 1!) and the new standard is published with a different document number. An undated reference to the old standard is then decided to end with the last version of the old standard. This aspect has to be mentioned/included in the text. |  | (See rai-010, above.) |
| rai-012 | 3.4.3 | note 2 | ed | “… and/or its continued use is permitted by law.” Probably there will never be a law that allows this type of use explicitly. It is the other way round: There are laws that as a consequence forbid the application of a standard. And that is a prerequisite, so it is not “and/or” but only “and”. | 🡪 “… and its continued use is not forbidden by law.” | (See proposed change in rai-010, above, **3.4.2 withdrawn standard, Note 2**.) |
| rai-013 | 3.4.5 |  | te | The only aspect in 3.4.5 added to 3.4.4 “deprecated standard” is that it is not available to the public. But how can this be? Each standard that was used by some companies for some time has to be available, e.g. in court cases. |  | Delete 3.4.5 retired standard.Add a note 3 to 3.4.1: Note 3: The term “retired” may also be used if an inactive standard is no longer made generally available. This does not impact its technical standardization status of withdrawn or deprecated |
| rai-014 | 3.5.3 |  | te | This term is extremely important for the unequivocal use (referencing) of standards in contracts. Therefore it is bad that the definition is not clear at all. “… can be uniquely distinguished … “ From what? Which manifestation is uniquely identified by ONE characteristic? Most important: By which characteristics is a manifestation of a standard uniquely identified? |  | For 3.5.3, change “An expression of an instance” to:A distinct expression of an instance… Change 3.5.3 Note to: Examples of distinct expressions can be, among others, digital vs. physical, different file formats, or content languages for the same standard instance. |
| rai-015 | 3.6.2 |  | ed/te | A sentence like that was used e.g.for a log time in ISO as the introduction to the chapter “Normative references”. This was changed few years ago because it is very often not true for ALL standards referenced in any specific application of the standard.  | E.g. “Reference deemed indispensable for some/certain implementations of the referencing standardOr see any new ISO standard. | We understand that this may be true (and is also acknowledged in the boiler plate NISO SSOS Normative Reference language), but we do not feel, in our context, it need be this explicit. |
| rai-016 | 3.6.5 undated standard reference | note | te | The note is misleading. The text describes the official interpretation, not “many cases”. The important question is what does it describe in cases when it it does not describe the “active instance”? | Add … or the last version of a withdrawn but not superseded standard.” | Change 3.6.5. definition to: Reference to the active or most recent inactive instance, e.g., the last version of a withdrawn but not superseded standard.Also made modification to Note in 8.8.3, Undated\_Designation. |
| rai-017 | 3.6.5 undated standard reference |  | te | An important but not clearly answered question is “When does the undated reference end?” (see 3.11) |  | The undated reference doesn’t end. The intent of the undated reference is to “point” to the latest instance of a standard.Change 3.6.5 Note to:In many cases, an undated reference indicates the latest instance of a standard. |
| rai-018 | 3.7.10 isRevisedTo |  | te/ed | It may be a new standard number as well. | Add (see rai 005): “… or a new standard.” | This is designator-(document-number-) agnostic.The object property defines the action of one standard being revised to another. |
| rai-019 | 3.7.13 Supersedes |  | ed | Is this definition really one for “Supersedes”? It looks like one for “Superseded” ?! |  | Change 3.7.13 definition to:A standard instance that covers at least the same scope and replaces an earlier standard instance. |
| rai-020 | 3.8.10 Reaffirmed\_Date |  | ed/te | The definition is okay but note 2 is not: Since it is an unchanged document, the dated designation does not generally include an indication of reaffirmation. |  | Change Note 2 to:Note 2: The dated designation of a reaffirmed standard ~~generally includes~~ may include an indication of reaffirmation, for example, in the form of and additional date, such as “R2021.”Also changed in 3.7.9, isReaffirmedAs Note 2. |
| rai-021 | A.3 Use of NISO SSOS … | 3rd line | te | The difference betweem edition and version in the frameworf of this document has not been defined. |  | Change A.3 paragraph one, third line in from“upcoming standard editions/versions.“ to:upcoming standard instances.Change A.3 paragraph one, last three words from“standard edition/instance.“ to: standard instance. |
| rai-022 | A.3 Use of NISO SSOS … | ISO example | te/ge | In the NISO version of the example, the aspect of “to replace” is missing completely. Since the aim and purpose of a standard may change in its development process (from “supersede” to “new standard”), should the aspect “planned” not be included? |  | See revised figure below. |

**\* Type of comment:** **ge** = general **te** = technical **ed** = editorial

*(From ISO/IEC/CEN/CENELEC electronic balloting commenting template/version 2012-03 template)*

**Propose (for rai-022)**

|  |
| --- |
| **Example from ISO website using ISO terminology** |
| **PREVIOUSLY** |  | **NOW** |  | **WILL BE REPLACED BY** |
| WITHDRAWN | **>** | PUBLISHED | **>** | UNDER DEVELOPMENT |
| **ISO/IEC 2382-37:2012** | **ISO/IEC 2382-37:2017** | **ISO/IEC FDIS 2382-37** |
|  |  | A standard is reviewed every 5 years Stage:90.92 (To be revised) |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| **The same information translated into NISO SSOS Top and Second Level States** |
|  |
| [*added]* **PREVIOUSLY** |  | **NOW** |  | **WILL BE REPLACED BY** |
| Top Level: INACTIVE | **>** | Top Level: ACTIVE | **>** | Top Level: IN DEVELOPMENT |
| 2nd Level: SUPERSEDED**ISO/IEC 2382-37:2012** | 2nd Level: MAINTENANCE**ISO/IEC 2382-37:2017** | 2nd Level: FINAL APPOVAL**ISO/IEC FDIS 2382-37** |
|  |  | A standard is reviewed every 5 years Stage:90.92 (To be revised) |  |  |

Figure 1: An example of how ISO uses Stage Codes to represent lifecycle information regarding individual standards. Corresponding NISO SSOS Lifecycle states shown for information.
(Source: <https://www.iso.org/standard/66693.html>. Used with permission.)

**\* Type of comment:** **ge** = general **te** = technical **ed** = editorial

*(From ISO/IEC/CEN/CENELEC electronic balloting commenting template/version 2012-03 template)*

## Comment 01211

### Title: Change tense in description

### Submitter: Anna Drage

### Comment:

(3.4.2, superseded standard)
Standard that was replaced by a newer instance of the standard that covers at least the same scope.

### Type:

Ed

### Submitter Proposed Solution:

Standard that is replaced by a newer instance of the standard that covers at least the same scope.

### Response:

Standard that has been replaced by a newer instance of the standard that covers at least the same scope.
(Note do a word search was or past tense.)

## Comment 01210

### Title: 01203 one standard can replace several standards

### Submitter: Anna Drage

### Comment:

A superseding standard can replace one or more standards.

### Type:

Te/Ed

### Submitter Proposed Solution:

Can we suggest a tweak to the current wording so that it reads
'Standard that by itself, or together with other standards, replaces another standard, *or multiple standards*, and cover at least the same scope.'

### Initial Discussion/Proposed Response:

Status of a standard that by itself or together with other standards replaces an older version of the same standard, or another standard, or multiple standards, and covers at least the same scope.

(See 01212, rai-004& rai-005 comments above/combined with.)

(Note: Double check w/rai 004 & 005)

### Response:

See resolution of Comment RAI9, which addressed the same items.

(See 01212, combined proposed response in rai-005 above.)

## Comment 01209

### Title: 01202 withdrawn, depricated and retired

### Submitter: Anna Drage

**Original Comment:**Are we saying that a standard that has been deprecated (considered faulty) may still be publicly available? The difference between withdrawn, deprecated and retired could be made clearer.

### Comment:

In response to this comment, can we suggest a small change to the Notes in Withdrawn standard?

### Type:

Te/Ed
Duplicate (except for proposed solution) with Comment 1202.

### Submitter Proposed Solution:

From

Note 1: Withdrawal is either with replacement/supersession, with partial replacement/supersession, or without replacement/supersession.

To

Note 1: Withdrawal is either with replacement/supersession, or without replacement/supersession.

Comment: A standard that is partially replaced/superseded should not necessarily be withdrawn.

### Response:

(Note: see proposed response in rai-010.)

## Comment 1208

### Title: withdrawn and depricated #01201

### Submitter: Anna Drage

### Comment:

Having reviewed this with colleagues:

#01201, 'Are we saying that a standard that has been deprecated (considered faulty) may still be publicly available? The difference between withdrawn, deprecated and retired could be made clearer. '

No action required.

### Type:

(Mostly duplicate Comment 1201).

### Submitter Proposed Solution:

### Response:

See Decision on RAI13, which covers the same items. (See 01212, rai-011& rai-013 comments above.)

## Comment 1204

### Title: No “isIdenticalto” ?

### Submitter: Anna Drage

### Comment:

(3.7.8.2)
There is an ?isIdenticalAdoptionOf? relationship but there is no ?isIdenticalto? relationship. There are instances where BSI might decide not to adopt an ISO standard, but still continue to sell it.

### Type:

Te

### Submitter Proposed Solution:

Should

?isIdenticalto?

be added to the Ontology?

### Response:

Comment withdrawn by submitter.

## Comment 1203

### Title: one standard can replace several standards

### Submitter: Anna Drage

### Comment:

A superseding standard can replace one or more standards.

### Type:Te/Ed

### Submitter Proposed Solution:

### Response:

Duplicate (see proposed solution in Comment 01210)

## Comment 1202

### Title: withdrawn, depricated and retired

### Submitter: Anna Drage

### Comment:

Are we saying that a standard that has been deprecated (considered faulty) may still be publicly available? The difference between withdrawn, deprecated and retired could be made clearer.

### Type:

### Response:

Duplicate (see proposed solution in Comment 01209)

## Comment 1201

### Title: withdrawn and depricated

### Submitter: Anna Drage

### Comment:

Are we saying that a standard that has been deprecated (considered faulty) may still be publicly available? The difference between withdrawn, deprecated and retired could be made clearer.

### Type:

Duplicate (except for title)

### Submitter Proposed Solution:

### Response:

Duplicate (except for title) with 1202 (see proposed solution in Comment 01209)