Public Comments on Standards Metadata Spec, v3.0
January 2003

Commentor	Element	Comment	Recommendation
Herb Whittall		I see no problem with the format and contents attached.	
Robert H. Dreyfuss Asst. V.P., Publishing Services ASTM International		Although we are not at the point of being on the committee, I would appreciate being on your email distribution.	
John Ketchell Director, CEN/ISSS - Information Society Standardization System		Thank you for the WG11 liaison statement on the above topic. We have forwarded this to Mr Bob Hager, ANSI, who is responsible for collecting the comments made on the proposal. We shall let you have the resolution of comments in due course.	
John Ketchell Director, CEN/ISSS - Information Society Standardization System		We do have some liaison matters with the MPEG people, but maybe they have provided belt and braces on this and sent this to you also. If so, sorry for the duplication...(I copied you separately my response). I have not checked, but surely we did cover amendments???	
Yukiko Ogura Secretary, ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 29 IPSJ/ITSCJ		In accordance with Resolution 11.1 taken at the 62nd ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 29/WG 11 meeting, 2002-10-21/25, Shanghai, China, I'm please to send the following liaison statement to CEN/ISSS. SC 29 N 5087 [SC 29/WG 11 N 5137] : Liaison Statement from SC 29/WG 11 to CEN/ISSS on Standards Metadata Element Set If you have any question, please do not hesitate to contact me. Thank you for your cooperation. _____ **INTERNATIONAL ORGANISATION FOR STANDARDISATION** **ORGANISATION INTERNATIONALE DE NORMALISATION** **ISO/IEC JTC1/SC29/WG11** **CODING OF MOVING PICTURES AND ASSOCIATED AUDIO INFORMATION** **ISO/IEC/JTC1/SC29/WG11 N5137** **Shanghai, October 2002**	

		Source: Convenor **Title:** Liaison Statement to CEN/ISSS WG 11 (MPEG) recognizes the efforts of The Standards Registry Committee in developing a metadata system for describing standards developed by a wide range of organizations. WG 11 has reviewed the fields and elements comprisin g the "Standards Metadata Element Set, v3.0" and would like to point out that element information identifying amendments of standards and their relationships seems to be missing from the list. We wish you well with your endeavours to develop a registry of standards.	
From: USPTOInfo@uspto.gov [mailto:USPTOInfo@uspto.gov]		Dear BHager@ANSI.ORG, The United States Patent and Trademark Office received your e-mail on 11/12/02. You will receive a response or a status from General Information Services as quickly as possible and within 1 day. Your tracking number for this request is T2002111200B7. Thank You	
From: Public.Affairs@gsa.gov [mailto:Public.Affairs@gsa.gov]		Subject: Re: Standards Metadata Specification - Public Review A copy of this reached public.affairs@gsa.gov Do you need me to send this to any specific individual or department at the General Services Administration (GSA)?	
From: Administrator [mailto:root@nar.org]		We do in fact develop standards for consumer rocket motor safety. However, in our electronic equivalent of a dead letter office because it was apparently sent to a nonexistent address at nar.org. If you can tell me what address you have, I can tell you what it probably was supposed to be, and then the right people will be getting your mailings.	
Bernard Vatant Consultant - Mondeca www.mondeca.com Chair - OASIS TM PubSubj Technical Committee		This is of interest for both Published Subjects and Standards Registry application This is an opportunity for Topic Maps Published Subjects Technical Committee to "eat its own dog food", by defining OASIS specifications as	

		Published Subjects. For those who are not aware of what Published Subjects are about, please refer to www.oasis-open.org/committees/tm-pubsubj/ There is a space dedicated to Published Subjects defined by OASIS Technical Committees at http://psi.oasis-open.org/ Whatever the scheme adopted for specification identifiers, this scheme could be included in an URL scheme under the previous space, e.g. for the proposed examples, something like: http://psi.oasis-open.org/spec/wp-ubl-codelist-01/ http://psi.oasis-open.org/spec/cs-sstc-core-00/ etc ... 2. It would be interesting to use for those PSI the metadata defined by the Standards Registry effort. http://www.ansi.org/reports/master.asp?room=70 Of course, definition of Published Subjects, use of StdsReg metadata, definition of identifiers scheme, and definition of templates for specification documents, are to be considered as orthogonal issues, but we have there indeed a great opportunity of coordination.	
Eve Maler Sun Microsystems		Karl Best has suggested that I use this list to open up a quick discussion on ways that all the OASIS TCs can get some consistency out of the ways they identify their specs. There is a set of OASIS specification template instructions here, which Norm Walsh and I put together a little while ago: http://www.oasis-open.org/spectools/docs/wd-spectools-instructions-01.html We were guessing a little bit on some of the guidelines therein, and we're also not sure who exactly is following them. Though it would be great to get input on that document as a whole, the matter of most importance right now is the piece of metadata called the "document identifier". It is discussed in this section: http://www.oasis-open.org/spectools/docs/wd-spectools-instructions-01.html#s.metadata A scheme is proposed for assigning document	

identifiers (which are intended to be used as the
root of a filename, with the extension
reflecting the format used in the file). The SAML
TC and the UBL Naming and Design Rules subcommittee
have been trying to apply this scheme as best they
can, but experience has shown that it needs some
tweaking.
I'm hoping you all can help in this endeavor.

I'd like to propose the following scheme instead,
and suggest that we conduct an email discussion on
this topic until December 2. At that time, I'll
summarize and try to propose a revision of the
specification template instructions.
_____
- For contributions and proposals that are outputs
of one or more individuals /organizations but are
not an output of the
TC in question:

 p-{name_of_proposer}-{description}-nn

    Where:

    name_of_proposer

      Is typically the last name of the main
individual making the proposal.

    description

    Is some descriptive text, possibly with
embedded hyphens, that identifies the proposal.

    Nn

      Is a monotonically increasing number starting
from 00 representing the revision of the document.

 - For outputs of a TC:

    {type}-{name_of_TC}-{description}-nn

    Where:

    type
      wp=white paper
      wd=working draft (may not have reached
consensus, is in progress)
      cs=committee spec (has had 2/3 positive vote)
      This list is not closed, but new type
keywords should be added only advisedly, and
hopefully only after consultation with the
chairs list.

    name_of_TC

		Is some canonical shorthand for the TC name, or possibly one of its subcommittees (though this may make the name too long).
		
		- For OASIS Standards:
		
		   {name_of_TC}-{description}-Vnn
		
		   Where:
		
		   Vnn
		    Is a representation of the version of the Standard, however the TC wants to reflect that.
		
		 Examples:
		
		 wp-ubl-codelist-01
		   Is the second revision of the UBL TC's Code List white paper.
		
		 cs-sstc-core-00
		   Is the first revision of the Security Services TC's core specification in Committee Speciciation form.
		
		 sstc-samlcore-v10
		   Is the SAML V1.0 core specification in OASIS Standard form. (I've added "saml" to the description because "sstc" doesn't mean much to some people).
		
		 p-smith-docbooklinks-17
		   Is the seventeenth revision of Smith's proposal for DocBook linking.	

William A. Cale, ABFLO President Chemist, State of Ohio Department of Commerce Division of Industrial Compliance		Thank you for the information about your proposed Standards Registry. The Association of Bedding and Furniture Law Officials is a national organization made up of state officials that regulate the sale of bedding, upholstered furniture and stuffed toys. We adopt terminology and testing methods to promote uniformity among the various state programs. One of our biggest responsibilities is the white law label that you find on all pillows, mattresses, furniture and stuffed toys. We strive to keep this label uniform so that manufacturers can use one label on their products that will be accepted in every state.	

		After reading over the Standards Metadate Element Set, v3.0 I am not sure that the type of standards we work with fit into this criteria. I certainly understand the need for this type of registry and I applaud your efforts. Because of the regulatory nature of your work I do not feel it would be likely that our organization would use these specification.	
Stephen P. Oksala Vice President, Standards Society of Cable Telecommunications Engineers			Per your recent request, SCTE has the following observations. 1. While it would appear that having a designation, a title, and an identifier should be more than sufficient, it might not be so. We have standards which have one designation while they are under development, and a different designation after approval. For example - SCTE 55-1 2002 was known for its development life as DVS 178. In addition, we have standards which have also been approved by ITU. An example of this is SCTE 24-14 2002. It was known during development as DSS 02-11, and it has been adopted as ITU Recommendation J.173. All three of these designations might show up in a reference list (depending on when the reference was created), and two of them will continue. So it may be necessary to have some kind of "alias" list. There seems to be an assumption here that the international version of a standard is a separate creature from the national document from which it was taken, and no consideration of a bidirectional link. 2. Should the identifier be a two part field - one for the number, and one to indicate which number (e.g. ISBN, etc.)? 3. We think consideration should be given to making the description, the subject and the date of most recent action mandatory. 4. In "current status" there can be a pretty big gap between "project initiation" and "draft available". In our case, we have a project approval which could be the project initiation, but it is also the first approval. This might lead to some confusion over what date to put in when. 5. Also in status - there is the final approval by the SDO, but then there is an additional approval of the document as an ANS. This would come after published I would guess. (In these days of electronic standards, I would think that the distinction between approved and published would be pretty small.) Also -

			considering point (1) above, there could also be "approvals" from international organizations. 6. We note that there is no dataa in the Rights Management filed. This needs further thought since there are two distinct kinds - rights management in the document itself, and rights management associated with the content of the standard.
Joanna Goodwin ISO			: Two editions in the same year I haven't had a chance to look at the XML metadata table since the meeting but thought I would at least do this before I forget. Here's two standards where there have been two separate editions published in the same year, demonstrating what I said at the meeting yesterday that an extra data element is required to be able to identify uniquely an ISO or ISO/IEC standard. The existence of more than one edition in the same year is rare, and I realize that in some ways its a shame to have to add to the elements to accommodate such a rare event since one of your goals is to have a limited number of elements. Meanwhile as far as I am aware there is no rule disallowing this and s o one cannot exclude that other cases may exist at some point in the future. It wouldn't surprise me if different standards bodies had different names to represent such "versioning" of documents (edition, version, etc.), and in fact within ISO we have been thinking of how we can identify better our documents. Accordingly I wouldn't propose that the element be named "edition"; maybe "Version" would be more appropriate and edition be mentioned in the definition column. Ex1: ISO 8378-3:1986 1st edition ISO 8378-3:1986 2nd edition Ex2: ISO 11076:2000 2nd edition ISO11076:2000 3rd edition demonstrating that you also need the edition to distinguish between the two. Or, of course, as an alternative, you could use the publication date, but not all organizations use a publication date do they? Will let you have any other feedback if ever.

WOODWORK INSTITUTE OF CALIFORNIA Stanley R. (Rob) Gustafson, CAE, CSI, CEO, Secretary		Well, I spent quite a bit of time trying to understand what you were presenting and I'm not sure I grasp the whole picture; however, as a standards authority we will participate if and when the standards registry is initialized. As to specific comments about the number and clarification of element descriptions, it seems to make sense. I'm sure that you have thought thru the process a lot further than we could; however a lot of it does not seem to apply to our particular situation.	
Evie Gray, ITS.P U.S. Dept of Commerce		We, at NTIA's Institute for Telecommunication Sciences, will be reviewing the "Standards Metadata Specification" on behalf of Kathy Higgins at NIST/OLES, and we plan to have comments to you by the end of December.	
Karen Boehme National Fluid Power Association			As a member of the Standards Registry Committee and on behalf of the National Fluid Power Association, I would like to go on record as approving the Standards Metadata Specification as presented.

Bill Rippey
NIST
Chairman of AWS A9 Committee
 	
Joel Milano
Senior Systems Engineer
NAVSEA/Carderock
Advisor to AWS A9 Committee
		Your solicitation for comments on the Standards Metadata Element Set, v3.0 was relayed by Len Connors of the American Welding Society (AWS) to AWS committee chairman. I am chair of the A9 Committee and herein offer comments on the Metadata specification. Joel Milano of the US Navy NAVSEA/Carderock joined me in reviewing the metadata specification.
		
		Our comments are in the attached Word document, along with "encoding" of two AWS documents in the metadata format.
		
		In summary we found that:
		 - the Metadata specification offers a concise yet robust mechanism for describing most, if not all, standards.
		 - we questioned the "optional" status of several fields. Using only the required fields yields a very stark description of a standard.
		
		Please contact me if there are questions about the comments or if you wish further feedback and discussion.
			1. In general, the Metadata specification offers a concise yet robust mechanism for describing most, if not all, standards.
			
			2. Issue of several fields being optional – why? If the purpose is so SDO's can exchange information and define data that is stored, ("What the Standards Registry committee members seek is to develop a common description or format for storing this data…"), the exchange should be a complete description of the standards.
			
			If one wanted to take a minimalist view, any standard could then be adequately described with the following fields:
			    Name
			    Document Title
			    Name of Standards Developing Organization
			    Current status
			This conveys less information than most bibliographical references! Especially essential are things like "SDO committee", "format", etc. Here is an opportunity to answer all/most questions about a standard, at once. (are we going to make a phone call/email to get the rest of the info if it doesn't appear in the database entry?) If the issue is display of certain fields in a browsed listing of standards, then this is a different issue (a quick list of certain subject standards would not want to list all attributes, so some would be optional). Opinion: for a database entry, most fields are **required**. If display of info about a standard is a separate issue, have a field called something like "required for minimal display".
			
			3. Why is "Designation" optional? Is there any circumstance where one would not exist? If it exists, why would you not store it?
			
			4. Language – where more than one is specified, is there a need to specify a standard delimiter in the string field? How can this be optional? If a standard is in German, I can't read it!
			
			5. Suggest generate and publish some examples, especially of well known standards from different organizations and in different areas. Examples would educate new users and help validate the scheme.

			Two encodings of AWS documents are included belo w.
			6. "SDO Committee" should be mandatory, not optional – this info is useful for doing follow up research about the committee and possible other related documents.
			7. "Replaces" field – would requiring the use of the Designation parameter in this field help consistency?
			8. Why make "format" optional? For drafts that aren't yet in final format? If this is the case the description of this field could add the note that if drafts are not yet in final form this field shows the intended format to be used when the document is "published".
			9. I don't see something like "sanctioning organization of SDO", e.g. what ANSI is to AWS. This is potentially useful/essential info.
			"Stage of the document" - ISO has standard codes for this – see http://www.iso.ch/iso/en/widepages/stagetable.html#60. Should these be used/required? The words "international standard" would have to be changed to fit individual organizations. Disadvantage is that the numerical code alone is not very helpful if you don't have them memorized.
Larry Eils, NAMA Senior Director, Technical Services		Thank you for sending me the proposal on Standards Metadata Specifications for review. This is an interesting idea and does make sense with the number of third party standard organizations present today.	1. I believe you have the right number of data elements. 2. Definitions seem clear. Will know for sure when it is implemented. 3. Challenges will be in everyone interpreting the definitions the same, even with the comment column already doing that. 4. I do not have any other items for consideration at this time. 5. Our organization currently deals with standardization on a limited bases so I would not expect a lot of usage but it would be nice to know this type of data base is available for quick searches.

Evie Gray, NTIA/ITS.P U.S. Department of Commerce		Thank you for the opportunity to participate in the public review of the draft "ANSI Specification for Standards Metadata." Attached is a Word document of our comments on this document on behalf of Kathleen Higgins of NIST/OLES.	We at the Institute for Telecommunication Sciences (ITS), have reviewed the specification and have provided comments on behalf of Kathy Higgins of NIST/OLES. Our comments below address the specific questions listed by the Standards Registry Committee, namely:
			
			1. Are there too many (or too few) elements?
			   a. Too few: We suggest the addition of the element "version number" with its description. (The version number is controlled by the SDO or by the author of the standard being entered into the catalog. The version number is important for any standard subject to revision.) Note that the Dublin Core v1.1 attributes include "version."
			   b. Too many: We, the developers of the JSR, do not plan to include the element "language" in our list of elements identifying a standard in the JSR; all of our standards/specifications will be in English.

| | | | 2. Are the definitions of the elements clear?
   a. Yes, except that the data element called "SDO Information element" could more precisely be named "SDO Contact Information."
3. What specific challenges do you anticipate in the use of these elements as they are currently described?
   a. Our experience tells us that precise data for some of the data elements may be very elusive and difficult to identify.
   b. In our experience, agreement on specific keywords is difficult to achieve. (We agree that keywords are important and must be controlled.)
4. Other considerations in the deployment and maintenance of the registries based on this metadata specification.
   a. Accurate data entry on a volunteer basis may be difficult to obtain and validate in a timely manner.
   b. You may wish to provide more examples and more detailed help files as hyperlinks.
5. How likely is it that your organization would use this specification?
   a. Very likely. However, we will not likely need the element of "language," since all of our specifications in the JSR will be in English.
   b. We have already used this specification to good advantage. It has proved to be a useful check of the thoroughness of the standards bibliographic data that we have entered into our *Justice Standards Registry for Information Sharing* (JSR), now online at http://www.it.ojp.gov/jsr/public/index.jsp
Additional comments:

   • The definition of the "Designation" element should read: "An unambiguous…" instead of "A unambiguous…."
   • Making the SDO Contact Information optional may cause some difficulties. The custodian of any standards repository will always want to know the developer's contact information. In our JSR, we have included the mandatory data element of "submitter," which requires entering contact information about the submitter of the standard to our Registry.
   • Making the "Subject" element optional may cause serious difficulties both for the custodian of any standards repository and for the users of the repository who will often want to search the repository by subject.
   • The fields of "Datatype" and "Obligation" were omitted under the "Rights Management" element. |

			Perhaps the correct entry in the "Datatype" field would be "Character String" and for the "Obligation" field would be "Mandatory" (because copyright protection can be invoked only if the viewer sees that the document entered into the repository is copyrighted and he/she honors that copyright). • Our experience has convinced us that most custodians of standards repositories will have serious concerns about security and data integrity, neither of which is addressed in this specification. Perhaps these exclusions are deliberate because of the system-specific configuration of each repository. • In our experience, the custodians of the repository have found it useful to provide hyperlinked help files (text) connected with each data element to be entered into the repository. The subject specification does not include or discuss hyperlinked help files, perhaps because such files would need to be tailored specifically to each individual repository's design and web function. We have circulated the Draft ANSI *Standards Metadata Specification* among ANSI subcommittee members and a bibliographic expert in our DoC library to gather their inputs.
Edward Redding, Director of Information Technology, NCCLS			After having my self and some members of our standards development staff review the specifications, we have determined that it is very accurate in describing the information about the standards we develop. There are enough fields available to allow flexibility for varying standards, but not too many fields to be cumbersome.

Richard Cantrill Technical Director AOCS		I have been watching the development of this concept through the messages of the Standards Regs group and I find the concept a worthy undertaking and am impressed by the universal applicability of the product. I believe the activities of AOCS could be entered into such a database and would encourage the further development of the concept.	
Evie Gray, NTIA/ITS.P Mr. Lionel Difford		One of my colleagues, Mr. Difford, of the INCITS K5 committee, has sent me comments on the Standards Metadata Specification. Unfortunately, I did not receive these comments in time to forward them by the December 31 deadline. However, I'd like to forward them to you now, in hopes that you may find them useful or that you will know the answers to his 3 questions (which constitute the whole of his comments). I list his questions below the dashed line.	1. The first question was ". . . in the 'Current Status' row, will the stages also include the equivalent names, for example, those of the ISO documents." 2. The second question was: "What indication is made if an organization will not furnish any drafts of documents until they go out for public approval?" 3. The third and last question was, "By whom would this standard be updated?"

InterNational Committee for Information Technology Standards (INCITS)
INCITS Secretariat, Information Technology Industry Council (ITI)
1250 Eye St. NW, Suite 200, Washington, DC 20005
Telephone 202-737-8888; Fax 202-638-4922;
Email: incits@itic.org

Doc: **in030084**
Date: **January 12, 2003**
Reply to: Jennifer Garner
Phone: 202-626-5737
email: jgarner@itic.org

| Subject: | Proposed INCITS Comments on the Standards Metadata Specification (IT/02-1125) |

Background

At the November 2002 INCITS TC Officer Symposium, Mr. Daniel Gillman, the INCITS/L8 Chairman, agreed to consolidate the INCITS community comments in response the Standards Metadata Specification (IT/02-1125) prepared by the Standards Registry Committee and to prepare the draft INCITS comments. A call for comments was issued (IT/02-1281) and closed on December 23, 2002. Mr. Gillman has consolidated the comments and prepared the proposed INCITS comments on the Standards Metadata Specification (see Attachment).

Requested Action

INCITS Executive Board members are requested to review the proposed INCITS comments. In the absence of opposition by January 23, 2003, the comments will be submitted on behalf of INCITS.

Commenter	Element	Comment	Recommendation
Linda Hill -1		General Comment	If the decision is made to keep this set of metadata a simple, flat list of elements (ala Dublin Core), then there are some complications that will have to be handled somewhat awkwardly. I submit that this simplification will ultimately limit services (access, display, links to authoritative schemes, etc.) and database design. The following recommendations are made with the assumption that a somewhat more complex metadata design would be acceptable in order to make the collected data more useful. It involves creating some sets of nested elements. I would also recommend that the standard be expressed as an XML schema where *attributes* of *elements* is a useful device for representing some types of description.
Henry Tom - 1		General Comment	The following URL is to an ANSI press release that provides some general background on the development of this specification and the Standards Registry Committee - it also has some links to specific topics. http://www.ansi.org/public/news/2002may/metadata_spec.html
Bruce Westcott -1		General Comment	http://www.ansi.org/Public/Stdsreg/presentations/bob_hager.ppt I found it to be valuable background material, as is http://www.ansi.org/Public/Stdsreg/stdsreg.html
Dan Gillman -1		General Comment	People who want to see if a standard exists that might help them solve a problem will be able to consult the registry, too. This will increase the use of standards and may help reduce unnecessary proliferation. The best way for you to learn about the Dublin Core is to go to their web site: <http://dublincore.org>
Linda Hill –2	Description	See below for my suggestions about	Change name to *Identifier* and specify that this is "An

		the current Identifier element. Also, see Related Resources where alternative standards that are essentially the same will be referenced. This element should be the one unique identifier for all standards.	unambiguous identifier for the standard, including SDO identification." Give an example. Assume that only one identifier will be given. Make the element Mandatory.
Linda Hill –3	Identifier	This element assumes a "formal identification system" for standards, which I believe does not exist and which would require a separate standards effort to put in place. Is this necessary? An alternative would be to adopt an existing identification standard from the one that you list (DOI or ISBN). But this would add a registration burden to the standards process – obtaining and assigning the identification numbers to each published standard. My recommendation here assumes that the SDO's need and will adopt such an external identification system and that they will use it along with their own standards number, which will be recorded in the Identification element.	Change name to the identification scheme that will be used. For example, "ISBN" or "DOI" or ….. That is, make the element name specific to the standard. If more than one such standard's numbering scheme will be used, then some other solution will be needed: could be multiple elements – one for each scheme – or this element could be named something like *Universal Identifier* with two elements (or use XML attribute): *Scheme + ID*. So, if a standard actually has an ISBN + a specific standard's ID, the entry would be like: - Scheme: ISBN - ID: 1234-5566 - Scheme: SDO - ID: 00-45-1956
Charles Roswell –1	Identifier	"Recommended best practice" is to use a formal identification system, several examples of which are listed. This standard should either	

		specify a particular formal identification system, or specify a mechanism for identifying the system that is used in any particular case.	
Barry –1	Identifier	ISO 19115 provides an element that provides for the type or system of the identifier, in line with Charles Roswell's comment. It also allows for more than one identifier. The definition is "an unambiguous reference standard in a given context" but a document may have an identifier that is unique to its context, but varies with context, for example, the same book will have different call numbers in the Dewey Decimal and Library of Congress cataloguing systems.	A document may have an identifier that is unique to its context but varies with context, for example, the same book will have different call numbers in the Dewey Decimal and Library of Congress cataloguing systems. More than one identifier, with the identifier system provided in each case, should be possible.
Linda Hill –4	Name of SDO	Since there is a possibility that more than one SDO is involved, a simple list of elements becomes hopelessly confused without creating such a set of elements. This structure supports the use of a directory (separate database) of specific committees of SDOs, which can be referenced from the metadata record. Making the URL element specific	Create a set of nested elements to describe the SDO. Make this set of elements repeatable (unlimited) for the case where more than one SDO is involved. The set could be: SDO (unlimited) - Name (once) - Acronym (once) - Committee (once) - URL (once) - Contact information (once)

		permits the designation of the element as containing a network address, which can then be used by services (e.g., hyperlinking). Contact information can be further specified, if desired.	
Charles Roswell -2	Name of SDO	This call for providing multiple names if more than one SDO is responsible for the standard, but the maximum occurrence is shown as "one." The standard needs either to allow multiple entries of SDO names, or to specify how the elements in a single list of names are separated.	
Barry -2	SDO Information	ISO 19115, and the FGDC Metadata Standard on which much of it is based specify the contact information in detail	This item should specify the specific forms in which the contact information (phone, mail, URL…) is available and specify the required content for each form.

Linda Hill -5	Subject	Linda Hill	Create a set of nested elements, or use an XML attribute, so that the source scheme of the term or classification can be identified.
			
			For example:
			
			Subject (unlimited)
			  - Scheme (once)
			  - Term-Notation (unlimited)

Charles Roswell -3	Subject	The description states "Need provision to cite both scheme used and the specific classification identifier." That provision needs to	

		be specified.	
Bruce Westcott -2	Subject	If this standard is going to suggest that a "best practice" is to use a controlled vocabulary or formal classification scheme, I recommend that such a vocabulary or scheme be developed and published as part of this standard so that users will have a "default" thesaurus or scheme that they can use and cite in creating the record. Since this is an optional character string field, it seems that users would be able to cite multiple thesauri or schema in this field.	
Linda Hill -6	Current status	Do you need other stages, such as "superseded" or "out of print".	Add a *date* element or attribute to define "current" – that is, current as of such-and-such date – because metadata does not always keep up with reality.

For example:

Current status
 -   As of (date) (once)
 -   Status (once)

Make the five stages a specified set of domain values for the element. That is, values for this element must be one of the specified values representing stages of development. |
| Bruce Wescott -3 | Current Status | I can think of several "statuses" other than the five defined. It would be very helpful to have:
- Pending -- If further action on the standard awaits action on some other development which is a logical | |

		predecessor, it would be great to have a pointer to what that other development is. - Replaced by -- If activity has been suspended in favor of some other standard, this status should be indicated. If we go this route, it may be advisable to update the field named "Replaces" to be named "Replaces/Replaced by" and update its definition so that the field can "point" to either the predecessor or the successor.	
Linda Hill –7	Date of most recent action		Not needed as a separate element if the date element is added to the Current status as recommended above.
Linda Hill -8	Referenced standards	Is a simple narrative statement sufficient? Should this, instead, be a set of bibliographic elements describing title, organization, date, etc.?	
Barry -3	Referenced standards / related standards	A standard can contain both normative references and a bibliography of documents that it refers to. There ought to be an optional element that contains these documents that appear as non-normative references in the standard. This element is not the same as Related Resources, because the Resources element can include elements that the standard does not refer to. The two cases ought to be	

		distinguished. Also, the name of Referenced Standards should be changed to Normative References, to distinguish the other standards that are an implicit part of the standard from those the standard refers to but does not incorporate.	

Linda Hill –9	Replaces	Clearly setting out the ID of the replaced standard permits hyperlinking to the metadata for the standard, if available in the system.	Create a set of elements to describe the replaced standard(s), such as:
			
			Replaces (unlimited)
			   - Identification (once)
			   - Title (once)

Linda Hill - 10	Related resources	Same comments as for *Referenced standards* above. Actually, all these three elements: *referenced standards, replaces, and related resources* are relationships between this standard and other resources and they could all be structured the same – in fact, they could represented as *types* of relationships. For example, Relationship - Type (e.g., replaces, normative reference, …) Caution should be used in creating a system where someone has to maintain the metadata of a standard by keeping track of subsequent	

		endorsements, adoptions, etc.	
Linda Hill - 11	Format	If multiple characteristics of format need to be represented (e.g., size of file, special software/hardware requirements), then a set of elements is required. If MIME type alone is sufficient (augmented with terms for non-digital formats), then a single element will suffice. If there is a particular Registry of Mime types that is officially recognized for this purpose, it should be identified.	
Charles Roswell -4	Format	"Recommended best practice" is to select a value from a controlled vocabulary. The standard needs to specify a mechanism for identifying the controlled vocabulary used in a particular instance.	
Linda Hill - 12	Language	Why confuse things by accepting both 2 and 3 character codes? It should be stated that if there are other language versions of the standard, they will be cited as *related resources*.	Specify either 2 or 3 character language codes and the associated ISO 639 standard. Make the element Mandatory.
Charles Roswell -5	Language	The reference to RFC3066 needs to specify the publisher of RFC 3066.	
Barry -4	Language	Why is RFC 3066 only recommended, rather than required? If language can be specified under more than one system, then both the	

		language code and the system under which the code is defined must be provided, as for other identifiers. One possibility is to make RFC 3066 the default; if no system is specified, RFC 3066 is assumed.	
Linda Hill - 13	Rights management		Needs a set of elements adopted from other standards.
Barry -5	Rights management	Again ISO 19115 and the FGDC metadata standards provide guides as to how to specify the content in more detail	The different kind of rights and possible limitations under each should be listed. Guidance can be obtained from the FGDC metadata standard and ISO 19115.
Bill Ham - 1	General Comment	There are often cases where an existing standard or technical report is very similar to, but not identical to, a new document. There is often reluctance to obsolete products by removing the specific standard to which the products were designed. Yet there is a need to provide timely information in the form of new documents.	I suggest that an element be added that cites previous documents that address the same subject as the new document with specific information that indicates whether the new document is in addition to or is intended to replace the older document(s). This is different from listing the normative references in that this new element identifies previous documents with similar scopes to the new document. The element proposed in the current metadata spreadsheet that specifies which existing documents are replaced by the new document accomplishes part of the goal of the comment. However, the larger risk is that the new document does not replace the older one, that both exist in force, that conflicting requirements are stated between the two documents, and that confusion is likely.
Bill Ham - 2	General Comment		The technical editor(s) of the documents should be identified as a separate element as these are the people who are best qualified to provide supplemental information on the technical content of the documents.
Randy Presuhn	Current Status	The "Current Status" element proposed doesn't appear to map	

		nicely onto the processes of some other standards eveloping organizations. Specifically, this model doesn't seem to fit the IETF's processes (see http://www.ietf.org/rfc/rfc2026.txt) very well.	
Andy Schoka - 1	General Comments	In general, the specification lacks precision. There are many ways this is evident, for instance, all but one of the attributes has a datatype of "character string". Use of a formal datatyping language, such as in ISO/IEC 11404 (Language Independent Datatypes), is needed. Other formal data typing specifications exist, too.	
Dan Gillman and Frank Farance - 1	General Comment	Typical kinds of standards wording are not in evidence. Terms are not defined. Definitions are not precise. References are missing or not adequate.	
Dan Gillman and Frank Farance - 2	General Comment	No attributes for handling registration exist in the specification.	
Dan Gillman and Frank Farance - 3	Obligation and MaxOcurrence	The Obligation/MaxOccurrrence fields are imprecise. For instance, the attribute "Referenced Standards" is optional and unlimited. Does this mean you can specify a standard more than once? Does the list have to be in some kind of order? Does there need to be an index (e.g.	

		numbering) to the list?	
Dan Gillman - 2	General Comment	There is no provision for multi-lingual representations. Many ISO standards are published in both French and English.	
Frank Farance - 1	Current Status	The attribute "Current Status" is not harmonized with ISO stage codes.	
Dan Gillman - 3	General Comment	Attributes for "Introduction", "Scope", and "Terms and Definitions", sections commonly seen in standards documents, need to be added.	
Dan Gillman and Frank Farance - 4	General Comment and Identifier	Definitions of attributes are not precise. For instance, what does "unambiguous" really mean? In the attribute "Identifier", a URL may point to different items over time. Is this unambiguous? Also, how does one know how to de-reference a URL (Does it point to a page or a file)?	
Dan Gillman - 4	General Comment	The work needs to be harmonized with work in ISO TC 46. Has this been done?	
Dan Gillman - 5	General Comment	The specification references the Dublin Core v1.1. Why? Several attributes map to Dublin Core elements. Why choose different names? Several attributes map to the SAME Dublin Core element (e.g. SM attributes "Designation" and "Identifier" both map to DC	

		element "Identifier", and SM attributes "Name of Standards Developing Organization (SDO)" and "SDO Committee" both map to DC element "Creator or Publisher"). This indicates that maybe the Dublin Core is not extensive enough. So, why is there a mapping at all?	
Frank Farance - 2	Description	The attribute "Description" is very imprecise. What should a user expect to retrieve from this field?	
Dan Gillman - 6	Designation	The comment in the "Designation" attribute description shows that the MaxOccurrence is most likely wrong. The definition field for every attribute should precisely define the concept. See ISO/IEC 11179-4 and ISO 704 for more details.	
Dan Gillman - 7	General Comment	The Dublin Core v1.1 is indeed an ANSI standard (ANSI/NISO Z39.85-2001) and soon to be an ISO standard, ISO DIS 15836, out of ISO TC 46/SC 4. These references should be made explicit in a document about standards metadata.	

AWS Standards Information Examples
Encoded According to Standards Metadata Element Set, v3.0
Editor, Bill Rippey, Chairman, A9 Committee of the American Welding Society
Dec. 20, 2002

Attribute Name	Description
Designation	AWS B4.0M:2000
Title	Standard Methods for Mechanical Testing of Welds
Description	Abstract – Mechanical test methods that are applicable to welds and welded joints are described. For each testing method, information is provided concerning applicable American National Standards Inst itute (ANSI), American Society for Testing and Materials (ASTM), and American Petroleum Institute (API) documents; the required testing apparatus, specimen preparation, procedure to be followed, and report requirements are also described.
Identifier	ISBN 0-87171-622-4
Name of SDO	American Welding Society (AWS)
SDO Committee	AWS B4 Committee on Mechanical Testing of Welds
SDO Information	www.aws.org
Subject	Keywords: Mechanical tests, bend tests, nick-break tests, shear tests, tension tests, fracture toughness tests, fillet weld tests, stud weld tests, hardness tests, weldability tests, groove weld tests, soundness tests.
Current Status	Published
Date of Most Recent Action	July 25, 2000
Referenced Standards	ASTM E 3, ASTM E 8, ASTM E 10, ASTM E 18, ASTM E 23, ASTM E 92, ASTM E 110, ASTM E 190, ASTM E208, ASTM A 370, ASTM E 399, ASTM B 557, ASTM E 604, AWS A3.0, AWS B10.12, AWS C5.4, AWS D1.1, API 1104, API RP 1107
Replaces	None
Related Resources	AWS Welding Handbook, Volume 1. ANSI Z49.1 Safety in Welding, Cutting, and Allied Processes.
Format	Hardcopy, 104 pages.
Language	English
Rights Management	Photocopy rights – Authorization to photocopy items for internal, personal, or educational classroom use only, or th internal, personal, or educational classroom use only of specific clients, is granted by the American Welding Society (AWS) provided that the appropriate fee is paid to the Copyright Clearance Center, 222 Rosewood Drive, Danvers, MA 01923, Tel: 978-750-8400; online: http://www.copyright.com. All standards of the AWS are voluntary consensus standards that have been developed in accordance with the rules of ANSI. When AWS standards are either incorporated in, or made part of, documents that are included in federal or state laws and regulations, their provisions carry the full legal authority of the statute. AWS disclaims liability for any injury to persons or to property, or other damages of any nature whatsoever, whether special, indirect, consequential or compensatory, directly or indirectly resulting from the publication, use of, or reliance on this standard. This standard may be superseded by the issuance of new editions. Users should ensure that they have the latest edition.

Attribute Name	Description
Designation	ANSI/AWS A3.0-94
Title	Standard Welding Terms and Definitions
Description	Abstract – This standard is a glossary of the technical terms used in the welding industry. Its purpose is to establish standard terms to aid in the communication of welding information. Since it is intended to be a comprehensive compilation of welding terminology, nonstandard terms used in the welding industry are also included. All terms are either standard or nonstandard. They are arranged in the conventional dictionary letter-by-letter alphabetical sequence.
Identifier	ISBN 0-87171-305-5
Name of SDO	American Welding Society (AWS)
SDO Committee	AWS Committee on Definitions and Symbols, Subcommittee on Definitions
SDO Information	www.aws.org
Subject	Keywords: standard welding terminology, welding definitions, brazing, soldering, thermal spraying and thermal cutting.
Current Status	Published
Date of Most Recent Action	May 23, 1994
Referenced Standards	None
Replaces	AWS A3.0-89
Related Resources	None
Format	Hardcopy, 114 pages
Language	English
Rights Management	Copyright 1994 by American Welding Society