

Disposition of Comments

Date: 30/09/2020	Document: ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 7 N 8181 (42010. CD1-v1.0)	Project: ISO/IEC/IEEE CD1 42010 (Ed2) Architecture description
----------------------------	---	--

MB/ NC ¹	Cmt No	Type of Cmt ²	Clause/ Subcl.	Para/ Fig/ Tab/	Line No	Comments and rationale	Proposed change	Res code ³	Resolution on each comment received
IT- 1- 001	1	GE			0	Reinforce the rule of data and information as element of architecture view In ISO/IEC 25024 Measurement of data quality there are some measure related to Architecture elements (defined by ISO/IEC 25010:2011).	Add a Note in 3.7 or 3.8 or 3.11 or where it is appropriate A particular view of the architecture, as described in Clause 4 of ISO/IEC 25024:2015, concerns data. Architecture of data includes architecture elements such as contextual schema, conceptual, logical, physical data models, data dictionary and documents. In practice architecture of data and data modelling, from the beginning of software engineering, have many levels, such as external model (view), conceptual, and physical (see ANSI/X3/SPARK Three Level Architecture, 1975)	AIP	A note is added to clause 3.7; but without the last sentence being contradictory to the notion of view: "A particular view of the architecture, as described in Clause 4 of ISO/IEC 25024:2015, concerns data. Architecture of data includes architecture elements such as contextual schema, conceptual, logical, physical data models, data dictionary and documents. In practice architecture of data and data modelling, from the beginning of software engineering, have many levels, such as external model (view), conceptual, and physical (see ANSI/X3/SPARK Three Level Architecture, 1975)."
INC-002	2	ED			1603	Lines 1603, 1604: reference is "8 b)"	should be "8.1 b)"	A	
INC-003	3	ED			2044	Last column title is "AchiMate" - typo	Should be "ArchiMate"	A	
INC-004	4	ED			2044	last row of table - cell under UAF and NAF columns are misaligned	Fix cell alignment	A	
INC-005	5	ED			2044	Row title of second to last row of table - Format appears to be justified which causes the "and" to dangle	Fix formatting for clarity	A	
INC-006	6	ED			2044	Row titles of first three rows are not clearly separated	expand row height so that row titles can be clearly shown with enough space between then for clarity	A	
INC	7	ED			2042	"The following table" should use a	change to "Table G.1" and	A	

1 **MB** = Member body / **NC** = National Committee (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by **)

2 **Type of comment:** **GT** = General Technical **TH** = Technical high **TL** = Technical Low **GE** = General Editorial **E** = Editorial

3 **Resolution code:** **OBE** = Superseded **AIP** = Agreed in principle **A** = Agreed R = Rejected **NA** = Non actionable

Disposition of Comments

Date:
30/09/2020Document:
ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 7 N 8181
(42010. CD1-v1.0)Project:
ISO/IEC/IEEE CD1 42010 (Ed2) Architecture
description

2.	MB/ NC ¹	Cmt No	Type of Cmt ²	Clause/ Subcl.	Para/ Fig/ Tab/	Line No	Comments and rationale	Proposed change	Res code ³	Resolution on each comment received
10.	-007						hyperlink to the Table number	include hyperlink/cross-reference		
11.	INC -008	8	ED			1051	leading dash is bolded	unbold dash	A	
12.	INC -009	9	ED			520	This sentence is out of place and points to the wrong figure. Also appears superseded by line 531 (which includes reference to the correct figure)	Delete this sentence	AIP	Refers to the right figure (figure 6).
13.	INC -010	10	ED			389	"Figure 2" is bolded	unbold "Figure 2"	A	
14.	INC -011	11	ED			279	"Clauses 6, 7 and 8" - insert space between "7" and "and"	"Clauses 6, 7 and 8"	A	
15.	INC -012	12	TE			688	NOTE An architecture description documents exactly one architecture for an entity of interest	This line seems to imply that an architecture description applies only to a system architecture and not to either a reference architecture or to the emerging concept for some customers of an objective architecture. Objective architectures apply to a family of systems not to a single architecture, but would still be an architecture description. A reference architecture could be conceptual and may not fit well with the idea that an architecture description applies to exactly one entity of interest.	AIP	Examples of Entities of Interest is already provided in Clause 3 and already include Family of Systems. After "An AD shall include a statement of its intended purpose" addition of: "NOTE 2 For a reference architecture, the entity of interest is abstract and purpose of the AD is to provide a specification for further ADs."
	INC -013	13	GE			5	Links from the ToC to each topic is excellent. Moving back and forth between topics is challenging.	Add the ability for the .pdf to display a linked outline or include a return function to go back from a linked location to the location from where the user selected the link.	AIP	Editoial problem to be considered by the ISO Central Secretariat.

1 **MB** = Member body / **NC** = National Committee (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by **)2 **Type of comment:** **GT** = General Technical**TH** = Technical high**TL** = Technical Low**GE** = General Editorial**E** = Editorial3 **Resolution code:** **OBE** = Superseded**AIP** = Agreed in principle**A** = Agreed R = Rejected**NA** = Non actionable

Disposition of Comments

Date:
30/09/2020Document:
ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 7 N 8181
(42010. CD1-v1.0)Project:
ISO/IEC/IEEE CD1 42010 (Ed2) Architecture
description

	MB/ NC ¹	Cmt No	Type of Cmt ²	Clause/ Subcl.	Para/ Fig/ Tab/	Line No	Comments and rationale	Proposed change	Res code ³	Resolution on each comment received
16.	INC -014	14	GE			258	Lines 258, 347, 405, 412, 1044, 1256, 1766: Inconsistent usage of Oxford comma. It is mostly not used, so recommend always not using it. The referenced line numbers are an incomplete list of examples where it is used.	Standardize comma use across document.	A	
17.	INC -015	15	ED			85	Lines 85, 2198: These two sections are repetitive on patents	Consider referencing introduction section		checked in the other ISO/IEC/IEEE documents (15288, 2011 edition of 42010, etc.) this paragraph is always in the Foreword and the IEEE Notice to users. Consequently, INC-015 is rejected. I.e. we keep this duplication.
18.	INC -016	16	ED			161	formatting on this link does not match other links in the paragraph, link does work but does not show up in blue text as the other links do	Use hyperlink formatting the same as other links so that the color of the link matches the other links	A	
19.	INC -017	17	ED			83	Replace at least with minimum for clarity	Publication as an International Standard requires approval by a minimum of 75 % of the national bodies casting a vote	A	
20.	INC -018	18	ED			67	Should the parenthetical include "the" ?	The ISO (International Organization for Standardization) and the IEC (International Electrotechnical Commission)	A	
21.	INC -019	19	TE			1511	Lines 1511-1519: UAFP does define a set of views, but I would not say it's a modeling language per se.	Change wording from "The Unified Architecture Framework Profile (UAFP) is a modeling language focused on representation..." to "The Unified Architecture Framework Profile (UAFP) is focused on		UAFP is an extension of UML and SysML so it is a higher level modeling language intended for modeling an enterprise architecture.

1 MB = Member body / NC = National Committee (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by **)

2 Type of comment: GT = General Technical

TH = Technical high

TL = Technical Low

GE = General Editorial

E = Editorial

3 Resolution code: OBE = Superseded

AIP = Agreed in principle

A = Agreed R = Rejected

NA = Non actionable

Disposition of Comments

Date:
30/09/2020Document:
ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 7 N 8181
(42010. CD1-v1.0)Project:
ISO/IEC/IEEE CD1 42010 (Ed2) Architecture
description

	MB/ NC ¹	Cmt No	Type of Cmt ²	Clause/ Subcl.	Para/ Fig/ Tab/	Line No	Comments and rationale	Proposed change	Res code ³	Resolution on each comment received
22.	INC -020	20	TE			1508	SysML diagram types I think should be a model view.	representation..." In the terms of this document, each SysML diagram type provides a different type of view.	A	
23.	INC -021	21	TE			645	UAF Profile is not an architecture description language; it is UAF that has been implemented in SysML. So having SysML here suffices.	remove UAF Profile from line 645	A	
24.	INC -022	22	ED			554	Missing the word design	Architecting contributes to the design, development, operation and maintenance of an entity from its initial conception		Design activity is part of the development.
25.	INC -023	23	TE			199	UAF Profile is not an architecture description language; it is UAF that has been implemented in SysML. So having SysML here suffices.	remove UAF Profile from line 199		Profile of a language is a language. UAFP should be called "UML Profile for UAF". I.e. this is a language to architect with UAF.
26.	INC -024	24	ED			971	Lines 971-977: Document-internal hyperlinks should be used when referencing other sections, e.g "(per x.x)"	Add hyperlinks	A	
27.	INC -025	25	ED			1966	Lines 1966 - 1968: Run on sentence. "but potential future areas of standardization."	ADFs often include additional content, prescriptions and relationships, such as process guidance, life cycle connections, and documentation formats, not defined by this document. These are potential future areas of standardization.	A	
28.	INC -026	26	GE			0	Document-internal hyperlinks should be used when referencing other sections, e.g "(per x.x)"	Add hyperlinks. Specific examples given below.	AIP	This should be already done. We will fix the missing hyperlinks.
29.	INC -027	27	ED			1885	Reword last phrase - "and ready to be evaluated"	solution, which is a preliminary design of the entity of interest, and prepare the solution for	A	

1 MB = Member body / NC = National Committee (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by **)

2 Type of comment: GT = General Technical

TH = Technical high

TL = Technical Low

GE = General Editorial

E = Editorial

3 Resolution code: OBE = Superseded

AIP = Agreed in principle

A = Agreed R = Rejected

NA = Non actionable

Disposition of Comments

Date:
30/09/2020Document:
ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 7 N 8181
(42010. CD1-v1.0)Project:
ISO/IEC/IEEE CD1 42010 (Ed2) Architecture
description

	MB/ NC ¹	Cmt No	Type of Cmt ²	Clause/ Subcl.	Para/ Fig/ Tab/	Line No	Comments and rationale	Proposed change	Res code ³	Resolution on each comment received
30.	INC -028	28	ED			1884	Remove unmatched ending ")"	evaluation. translate this to a specification.	A	
31.	INC -029	29	ED			1855	Remove double periods '...' - "life cycle. . While"	life cycle. While	A	
32.	INC -030	30	TE			1291	Re-word to use the term "entity" versus "system"	A viewpoint (on a entity of interest) is a form of abstraction	OBE	See WG1-745
33.	INC -031	31	TE			1289	Re-word to use the term "entity" versus "system"	A viewpoint (on a entity of interest) is an abstraction that yields a specification of the whole entity	OBE	See WG1-745
34.	INC -032	32	ED			1022	Document-internal hyperlinks should be used when referencing other sections, e.g "(per x.x)"	Add hyperlinks to Per 8.2 and Per 8.3	A	
35.	INC -033	33	ED			844	Per 6.4 does not hyperlink	Add hyperlink	A	
36.	INC -034	34	TE			379	Re-word to use the term "entity" versus "system"	... are "ilities" of the entity of interest.	A	
37.	INC -035	35	TE			109	Re-word to use the term "entity" versus "system"	Architecture descriptions are used by the parties that create, use and manage entities to	A	
38.	INC -036	36	TE			1907	I am not at all convinced that this section is useful. There is more content in architecture repository covered in ToGAF that is very useful in AD management.	Drop this section	A	
39.	INC -037	37	TE			1638	Also include legend	Include a section on Legend	A	
40.	INC -038	38	TE			1588	Should also include architecture considerations	Include a section on architecture considerations	OBE	Architecture considerations are deprecated
41.	INC -039	39	TE			1433	I find the example too abstract to understand. It is necessary to bring in a more practical example rather than some	Please include some practical examples rather than basing on mathematical equations.	A	Example is modified to be more concrete and not utilize mathematical conventions.

1 **MB** = Member body / **NC** = National Committee (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by **)2 **Type of comment:** **GT** = General Technical**TH** = Technical high**TL** = Technical Low**GE** = General Editorial**E** = Editorial3 **Resolution code:** **OBE** = Superseded**AIP** = Agreed in principle**A** = Agreed R = Rejected**NA** = Non actionable

Disposition of Comments

Date: 30/09/2020	Document: ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 7 N 8181 (42010. CD1-v1.0)	Project: ISO/IEC/IEEE CD1 42010 (Ed2) Architecture description
----------------------------	---	--

	MB/ NC ¹	Cmt No	Type of Cmt ²	Clause/ Subcl.	Para/ Fig/ Tab/	Line No	Comments and rationale	Proposed change	Res code ³	Resolution on each comment received
42.	INC -040	40	TE			1412	obscure algebras to make the notion of correspondences understandable Again the same problem as the previous one on model. This section is making an underlying assumption that correspondences occur inside models, which is not necessarily true. It is necessary to consider the model and non-model separation introduced in the standard.	The entire section needs to be revamped keeping in the distinction between models and non-models.	A	Updated to refer to View Components rather than models.
43.	INC -041	41	TE			1369	I am not sure why I need to understand the notion of model to understand this document. View can be model based or non model based as per the conceptual model.	The entire section needs to be revamped keeping in the distinction between models and non-models.	AIP	he entire section is deleted as the content is no longer relevant to the draft.
44.	INC -042	42	TE			1343	Not sure where view specifications come from. I do not see it discussed in the conceptual models or in previous sections.	If this information is necessary then it should be explained as part of the conceptual model. Otherwise, this section should be dropped.		Add lead in sentences to clarify intent: Although view specifications are not addressed in this standard, some ADFs use this concept. This section describes what these are and how they relate to the concepts in this standard.
45.	INC -043	43	TE			1337	I am not really able to understand the notion of viewpoint sets. It seems to appear out of the blue.	Viewpoint sets should either be explained in detail with reference to existing practices or the corresponding text removed from the document.	OBE	See WG1-744
46.	INC -044	44	TE			1317	This sentence is contradictory to practice. A view need not necessarily capture the entire architecture. It can capture certain characteristic elements of the architecture that are relevant in addressing a few chosen concerns	Drop this paragraph as it is not reflecting current practice.	A	

1 **MB** = Member body / **NC** = National Committee (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by **)

2 **Type of comment:** **GT** = General Technical **TH** = Technical high **TL** = Technical Low **GE** = General Editorial **E** = Editorial

3 **Resolution code:** **OBE** = Superseded **AIP** = Agreed in principle **A** = Agreed R = Rejected **NA** = Non actionable

Disposition of Comments

Date:
30/09/2020Document:
ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 7 N 8181
(42010. CD1-v1.0)Project:
ISO/IEC/IEEE CD1 42010 (Ed2) Architecture
description

1.

2.

47.

48.

49.

50.

51.

52.

53.

54.

55.

56.

57.

MB/ NC ¹	Cmt No	Type of Cmt ²	Clause/ Subcl.	Para/ Fig/ Tab/	Line No	Comments and rationale	Proposed change	Res code ³	Resolution on each comment received
INC -045	45	TE			1303	This analogy is incorrect. A legend marks only identifiable information in a map. For eg, legend can identify hospitals or stores or metro stations with a particular symbol. This has nothing to do with how the map is constructed. Viewpoint goes beyond providing the legend for the view, it provides the specification of how the view is constructed, interpreted and used.	A better analogy needs to be worked out as what has been provided here is inadequate.	OBE	See WG1-745
INC -046	46	TL			1280	Not authors but architects	Not authors but architects		This is talking about what is contained in the literature.
INC -047	47	ED			1257	Should be that are often structured	Should be that are often structured	A	
INC -048	48	TL			1241	Architecture considerations should be a separate section	Architecture considerations should be a separate section	OBE	See INC-730
INC -049	49	TE			1233	The way aspect is portrayed here is different from the definition of aspect.	Harmonize the usage of aspect with the definition in clause 3	A	
INC -050	50	TE			1037	Can some examples of the different methods be included. That will make the view methods more easy to comprehend.	Please include some examples of the different view methods.	A	
INC -051	51	TL			993	This can be moved after correspondence method to make the clauses in sequence	Move to the line next to correspondence method	A	See WG 1-617
INC -052	52	TL			986	This can be expressed as an EXAMPLE rather than as a NOTE.	Convert the NOTE into an Example		This is better expressed as a NOTE as it is not an example of applicability
INC -053	53	TL			983	This can be moved to line 1000 along with the sentence on applicable means when condition of applicability are met as they are similar	Move to line 1000 and merge with the existing line 1000	OBE	See INC 623
INC -054	54	TL			969	Architecture considerations can also be included here as they may include other factors apart from concerns, aspects and perspectives.	Add identification of one or more typical architecture considerations	OBE	Architecture consideration is deprecated as first-class entity. No need to have requirements on them.
INC	55	TE			940	Also include decisions affecting	Also include decisions affecting	A	

1 **MB** = Member body / **NC** = National Committee (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by **)2 **Type of comment:** **GT** = General Technical **TH** = Technical high **TL** = Technical Low **GE** = General Editorial **E** = Editorial3 **Resolution code:** **OBE** = Superseded **AIP** = Agreed in principle **A** = Agreed R = Rejected **NA** = Non actionable

Disposition of Comments

Date: 30/09/2020	Document: ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 7 N 8181 (42010. CD1-v1.0)	Project: ISO/IEC/IEEE CD1 42010 (Ed2) Architecture description
----------------------------	---	--

	MB/ NC ¹	Cmt No	Type of Cmt ²	Clause/ Subcl.	Para/ Fig/ Tab/	Line No	Comments and rationale	Proposed change	Res code ³	Resolution on each comment received
	-055						identification of fundamental concerns as they determine the viewpoints and views to be developed and play a significant role in the development of the architecture.	identification of fundamental concerns;		
58.	INC -056	56	TE			896	Is activity an AD element? Aren't activities process oriented and not really part of an architecture?	Perhaps a better example needs to be provided		Activity is an AD element if included in the AD
59.	INC -057	57	TL			804	Architecture frameworks do not call these stakeholder perspectives and use other names. It should be indicated in this note.	Add "Architecture frameworks explicitly do not mention these as stakeholder perspectives and may use other terms as they deem appropriate"	AIP	Add as NOTE for architecture aspects and stakeholder perspectives"
60.	INC -058	58	ED			803	This is a single list of items and not lists as mentioned here.	Change to "The list is not necessarily exhaustive" here and in other places	OBE	See WG 1-538
61.	INC -059	59	TL			762	Architecture frameworks do not call these architecture aspects and use other names. It should be indicated in this note.	Add "Architecture frameworks explicitly do not mention these as architecture aspects and may use other terms as they deem appropriate"	AIP	This list has to be converted as an example. With a sentence saying that "The architecture aspects in this example are those identified by some of the current architecture frameworks." (Same update for "stakeholder perspectives" list).
62.	INC -060	60	ED			761	This is a single list of items and not lists as mentioned here.	Change to "The list is not necessarily exhaustive" here and in other places	OBE	See WG 1-538
63.	INC -061	61	TE			747	I don't know how "people" can be an architecture aspect. People is not a characteristic or feature of an architecture	Drop People	OBE	See IN-992
64.	INC -062	62	ED			726	This is a single list of items and not lists as mentioned here.	Change to "The list is not necessarily exhaustive" here and in other places	OBE	See WG 1-538
65.	INC -063	63	ED			708	This is a single list of items and not lists as mentioned here.	Change to "The list is not necessarily exhaustive" here and	OBE	See WG1-523

1 **MB** = Member body / **NC** = National Committee (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by **)

2 **Type of comment:** **GT** = General Technical

TH = Technical high

TL = Technical Low

GE = General Editorial

E = Editorial

3 **Resolution code:** **OBE** = Superseded

AIP = Agreed in principle

A = Agreed R = Rejected

NA = Non actionable

Disposition of Comments

Date:
30/09/2020Document:
ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 7 N 8181
(42010. CD1-v1.0)Project:
ISO/IEC/IEEE CD1 42010 (Ed2) Architecture
description

	MB/ NC ¹	Cmt No	Type of Cmt ²	Clause/ Subcl.	Para/ Fig/ Tab/	Line No	Comments and rationale	Proposed change	Res code ³	Resolution on each comment received
66.	INC -064	64	TL			684	This should be a separate sentence or NOTE and should not be part of the Examples	in other places Make this a NOTE	A	
67.	INC -065	65	TL			680	Looks like something is missing in this sentence after identifying...	Perhaps, drop "and".		This is identifying information about the Eol.
68.	INC -066	66	TE			659	Is it necessary to include architecture considerations when concerns, aspects and perspectives are included? Aren't they exclusive? If both are listed then isn't it duplicate information	either include architecture considerations or concerns, aspects and perspectives.	A	Dropped architecture considerations
69.	INC -067	67	ED			656	Should be content and not contents	Should be content and not contents	AIP	Replace contents with items.
70.	INC -068	68	TE			644	No need to say "are ADLs in terms of this document"	Remove "are ADLs in terms of this document"	A	
71.	INC -069	69	TE			642	Also include Algebraic expressions which are often used as ADLs to describe software architecture	Add Algebraic expressions		Any algebraic expression cannot be considered as an ADL. Only those (like AADL) will fit the new definition
72.	INC -070	70	TE			629	What is the relationship between viewpoints and viewing conventions?	Clarify		Handled as part of the definition in clause 3
73.	INC -071	71	TE			626	The first sentence is incorrect. ADL is not any form of expression. As mentioned in the second sentence, it is a language that is used to express architecture descriptions. First sentence should be modified to say ADL is any language used to express architecture description.	Propose "ADL is any language used to express architecture description".	OBE	A distinction must be done between the possible languages usable for description of architectures [this comment] (here, natural languages, equations, etc. can be used) and languages intended to be used to describe architecture. See INC-493 resolution. 1) The definition of ADL has been updated to address this comment. 2) NOTE 1 has been added to speak about the lacunae of natural languages

1 **MB** = Member body / **NC** = National Committee (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by **)2 **Type of comment:** **GT** = General Technical**TH** = Technical high**TL** = Technical Low**GE** = General Editorial**E** = Editorial3 **Resolution code:** **OBE** = Superseded**AIP** = Agreed in principle**A** = Agreed R = Rejected**NA** = Non actionable

Disposition of Comments

Date: 30/09/2020	Document: ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 7 N 8181 (42010. CD1-v1.0)	Project: ISO/IEC/IEEE CD1 42010 (Ed2) Architecture description
----------------------------	---	--

	MB/ NC ¹	Cmt No	Type of Cmt ²	Clause/ Subcl.	Para/ Fig/ Tab/	Line No	Comments and rationale	Proposed change	Res code ³	Resolution on each comment received
										3) The paragraph after NOTE 1 explains about usage of general purpose modeling languages for this purpose.
74.	INC -072	72	TE			602	Should be both model kinds and legends	Should be both model kinds and legends	A	
75.	INC -073	73	TE			599	What is the relationship between modelling profiles and model kinds? The standard speaks of legend and model kinds only. Are modelling profiles a different mechanism apart from legend/model kinds?	Clarify	AIP	The sentence "which in turn... modeling profile" to be deleted.
76.	INC -074	74	TE			594	Does the language mentioned in this sentence, similar to an ADL or is it different?	If it is ADL then its better to use ADL rather than language here.	OBE	See WG1-469
77.	INC -075	75	TE			593	Are these features of architecture considered as architecture aspects?	To be clarified.	OBE	See WG1-469
78.	INC -076	76	TE			577	It would be useful to add a sentence explaining the typical structure of a grid. As otherwise, it is unclear what are the columns and rows of the grid and what does it achieve.	Something like "Typical grid could be constructed from a combination of stakeholder perspectives and architecture aspects"	A	
79.	INC -077	77	TE			573	For the sake of clarity, it would be useful to say that collectively, stakeholder concerns, stakeholder perspectives and architecture aspects are different kinds of architecture considerations (or something like that)	Propose to add a sentence linking concerns, aspects and perspectives to considerations to emphasize on the relationship		This is not the right place to say this. It is already covered in 5.2.6.
80.	INC -078	78	TL			567	ToGAF uses the concept of Architecture Building Blocks. I have not seen Aspects or Perspectives in ToGAF. How does Aspects and Perspectives relate to ABB?	Clarify	AIP	Architecture building blocks are dealt with as part of structure formalisms. ABB can be an example of structure formalisms in the appropriate section.
81.	INC	79	TE			567	Considering that some architecture	Is it necessary to relate ADF to	AIP	Add a NOTE 2 after NOTE 1

1 **MB** = Member body / **NC** = National Committee (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by **)

2 **Type of comment:** **GT** = General Technical

TH = Technical high

TL = Technical Low

GE = General Editorial

E = Editorial

3 **Resolution code:** **OBE** = Superseded

AIP = Agreed in principle

A = Agreed R = Rejected

NA = Non actionable

Disposition of Comments

Date: 30/09/2020	Document: ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 7 N 8181 (42010. CD1-v1.0)	Project: ISO/IEC/IEEE CD1 42010 (Ed2) Architecture description
----------------------------	---	--

	MB/ NC ¹	Cmt No	Type of Cmt ²	Clause/ Subcl.	Para/ Fig/ Tab/	Line No	Comments and rationale	Proposed change	Res code ³	Resolution on each comment received
	-079						decisions are already made in the ADF in choosing architecture aspects, stakeholder perspectives and architecture viewpoints, how does these decisions relate to an ADF?	Architecture decisions and rationale? To be clarified.		indicating this. Proposed text for NOTE: Particular architecture decisions are made in ADFs: selection of stakeholders and related concerns, specific aspects and stakeholder perspectives. An ADF will structure ADs according to these decisions
82.	INC -080	80	TL			557	No need to say "are some examples of architecture rationale"	Remove "are some examples of architecture rationale"	A	
83.	INC -081	81	TE			554	Potential redefinition of architecting	There are many other activities that are considered to be part of architecting. To be clarified.	OBE	See INC 466
84.	INC -082	82	TL			547	Its not basis for a decision but basis for making a decision.	Also include "claims" about the decision. Sometimes, it is difficult to find a basis and some decisions are based on gut feeling or instinct.	A	
85.	INC -083	83	TL			544	No need to say "are some examples of architecture decisions". The example is about architecture decisions, so this is redundant text	Remove "are some examples of architecture decisions"	A	
86.	INC -084	84	TE			540	Aspects are related to the architecture of the entity and not the entity itself.	either relate architecture aspect to the architecture of the entity or drop "aspect" from this list.	OBE	The definition of aspect has changed. See WG42-004
87.	INC -085	85	TL			526	Since the example is about correspondence, its better to use correspondence instead of relation in the examples	Replace "relation" with "correspondence" in the example	A	
88.	INC -086	86	ED			520	Should be figure 6	Should be figure 6	A	
89.	INC -087	87	TE			513	Should be an Architecture View and the aspect that it implements. Its unclear	Should be an Architecture View and the aspect that it	A	

1 **MB** = Member body / **NC** = National Committee (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by **)

2 **Type of comment:** **GT** = General Technical **TH** = Technical high **TL** = Technical Low **GE** = General Editorial **E** = Editorial

3 **Resolution code:** **OBE** = Superseded **AIP** = Agreed in principle **A** = Agreed R = Rejected **NA** = Non actionable

Disposition of Comments

Date: 30/09/2020	Document: ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 7 N 8181 (42010. CD1-v1.0)	Project: ISO/IEC/IEEE CD1 42010 (Ed2) Architecture description
----------------------------	---	--

	MB/ NC ¹	Cmt No	Type of Cmt ²	Clause/ Subcl.	Para/ Fig/ Tab/	Line No	Comments and rationale	Proposed change	Res code ³	Resolution on each comment received
90.	INC -088	88	TE			502	what the AD elements are in this case. Are these a restricted list of AD elements for ADF and ADL?	implements. If it is restricted list then it should be indicated as such. The sentence looks like it is a restricted list of constructs for ADF and ADL. There are other constructs that ADFs introduce which can also be AD elements.	OBE	The entire paragraph has been removed in the rewrite.
91.	INC -089	89	TE			499	A model kind for use cases is introducing use cases as AD elements??? Use cases are already identified as a sort of model which means they are already AD elements. Only the components of the use cases would be introduced as new AD elements	Drop "use cases"	AIP	Updated the example to list the specific use case and activity constructs.
92.	INC -090	90	TE			492	Are these constructs architecture concepts or any other information? Shouldn't these be architectural concepts only? For eg., I may introduce Task a foundational idea for my system, is that an AD element?	Clarify	A	
93.	INC -091	91	TE			489	What is being conveyed in the figure is not clearly expressed in the text in this section. It is necessary to improve upon the distinction between model kind and legends, models and non-models.	Clarify	A	
94.	INC -092	92	TE			481	Another example for a legend could be: A symbol table can be a component of an operational view	Another example for a legend could be: A symbol table can be a component of an operational view	A	Add Example: A symbology table can be a legend of an operational view.
95.	INC -093	93	TE			478	A map legend provides a representation of the symbols used in the map. It does not give much explanation and much of the	Model kind denotes the formal representation of the view component, Legend denotes the	AIP	Replace by "A specification of a model kind or legend establishes the conventions used within the view

1 **MB** = Member body / **NC** = National Committee (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by **)

2 **Type of comment:** **GT** = General Technical **TH** = Technical high **TL** = Technical Low **GE** = General Editorial **E** = Editorial

3 **Resolution code:** **OBE** = Superseded **AIP** = Agreed in principle **A** = Agreed R = Rejected **NA** = Non actionable

Disposition of Comments

Date: 30/09/2020	Document: ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 7 N 8181 (42010. CD1-v1.0)	Project: ISO/IEC/IEEE CD1 42010 (Ed2) Architecture description
----------------------------	---	--

2.	MB/ NC ¹	Cmt No	Type of Cmt ²	Clause/ Subcl.	Para/ Fig/ Tab/	Line No	Comments and rationale	Proposed change	Res code ³	Resolution on each comment received
							representation is left to individual's interpretation. While I agree with the distinction between model kind and legend which is essential for capturing non-model information, I think that it is better to give a more accurate explanation of what legend is.	informal representation of the view component.		component. These conventions typically cover the intended uses, and the specification of notations, their syntax and semantics of its governed models. A legend documents the conventions for non-model view components. A model kind can be used by more than one viewpoint in an AD. A legend denotes the category of explanations or interpretations. "
96.	INC -094	94	TE			467	Somehow, the content on view methods doesn't seem to fit into viewpoints and views. I feel that there is no continuity with regard to view methods and the relationships to viewpoints/views. Does viewpoints state what view methods to be used? It is not clear. I feel that view methods are out of the scope of viewpoints and views and should be moved out of this section.	View methods should be moved to a separate section. The relationship between view methods and viewpoints/views should be improved.	A	
97.	INC -095	95	TE			427	or a combination of stakeholder perspectives and architecture aspects.	or a combination of stakeholder perspectives and architecture aspects.	OBE	See WG1-376
98.	INC -096	96	TE			421	Potential redefinition of architecture consideration	It is defined as factors taken into account in creating an AD. To be clarified.	OBE	See WG42-007, architecture considerations no longer defined in clause 3.
99.	INC -097	97	TE			411	Should be concerns about the entity.	Should be concerns about the entity.		Concerns arise due to stakeholder perspectives. These concerns could be about the entity or architecture or AD.
100.	INC -098	98	TE			409	Examples for stakeholder perspectives are very good. More examples can be	Development, deployment and customization perspectives of a	A	

1 **MB** = Member body / **NC** = National Committee (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by **)

2 **Type of comment:** **GT** = General Technical **TH** = Technical high **TL** = Technical Low **GE** = General Editorial **E** = Editorial

3 **Resolution code:** **OBE** = Superseded **AIP** = Agreed in principle **A** = Agreed R = Rejected **NA** = Non actionable

Disposition of Comments

Date: 30/09/2020	Document: ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 7 N 8181 (42010. CD1-v1.0)	Project: ISO/IEC/IEEE CD1 42010 (Ed2) Architecture description
----------------------------	---	--

	MB/ NC ¹	Cmt No	Type of Cmt ²	Clause/ Subcl.	Para/ Fig/ Tab/	Line No	Comments and rationale	Proposed change	Res code ³	Resolution on each comment received
							included for other kinds of entities like software, enterprises, services	mobile app. Provider and consumer perspective of an hospitality service.		
101.	INC-099	99	TE			406	In the definition of Stakeholder perspective, it is mentioned that perspective is a way of thinking about an entity. However, in this sentence, architecture is also included which is contradictory to the definition.	There are several ways of thinking about the entity... There are likely to be multiple stakeholder perspectives for any entity.	A	
102.	INC-100	100	TE			403	Potential redefinition of stakeholder perspective	Stakeholder perspective is defined as way of thinking about the entity in clause 3. To be clarified.	OBE	See INC 101
103.	INC-101	101	TE			403	In the definition of Stakeholder perspective, it is mentioned that perspective is a way of thinking about an entity. However, in this sentence, architecture is also included which is contradictory to the definition.	Remove "architecture or an". Retain relationship between perspective and entity only.	A	
104.	INC-102	102	TE			403	From this statement, it is not clear what stakeholder perspectives are. The nature of relationship with concerns is ambiguous as well.	The distinction as I see it with architecture aspect is that, architecture aspects are characterizations of the architecture and stakeholder perspective is a subjective perception of the entity that results in certain concerns to be raised.	OBE	Some of the proposed ideas can be used in the update. The definition of aspects and concerns are updated.
105.	INC-103	103	TE			396	If what is said in 403 is the intent then a relation between stakeholder perspective and architecture should be introduced.	Clarify	OBE	Conceptual model has been updated
106.	INC	104	TE			386	it is unclear why concerns are subjective	Propose "Concerns are based	A	Merged with WG1 320 proposal

1 **MB** = Member body / **NC** = National Committee (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by **)

2 **Type of comment:** **GT** = General Technical **TH** = Technical high **TL** = Technical Low **GE** = General Editorial **E** = Editorial

3 **Resolution code:** **OBE** = Superseded **AIP** = Agreed in principle **A** = Agreed R = Rejected **NA** = Non actionable

Disposition of Comments

Date: 30/09/2020	Document: ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 7 N 8181 (42010. CD1-v1.0)	Project: ISO/IEC/IEEE CD1 42010 (Ed2) Architecture description
----------------------------	---	--

	MB/ NC ¹	Cmt No	Type of Cmt ²	Clause/ Subcl.	Para/ Fig/ Tab/	Line No	Comments and rationale	Proposed change	Res code ³	Resolution on each comment received
	-104						and aspects are objective. Would be useful to expand.	on the current interests and influences of the stakeholders, and is often subjective in nature. Aspects are based on experience in characterization of architectures and is more objective in nature"		
107.	INC -105	105	TL			377	Isn't this covered under non-functional properties.	Merge this example with the section on non-functional properties.	OBE	The note about "software qualities" is removed.
108.	INC -106	106	TE			373	If the entity of interest is a service then it cannot be an operational entity.	Remove "operational"	OBE	See GB-309
109.	INC -107	107	TL			356	Don't think that role, experience and beliefs are characteristics.	Drop "such"	A	
110.	INC -108	108	TE			354	Also include problems and difficulties faced, risks mitigated.	Also include problems and difficulties faced, risks mitigated.		See Note 1 to Entry for the definition of Concern
111.	INC -109	109	TE			349	Should be one or more architecture descriptions	Propose "creating one or more architecture descriptions"	A	
112.	INC -110	110	TE			344	This statement should be included in clause 3 as a NOTE for the definition of AD.	Add this as a Note to entry in Clause 3	A	
113.	INC -111	111	TE			339	Potential redefinition of architecture description	AD is defined as work product in clause 3. To be clarified.		he expression of an architecture is the work product of the architecting effort.
114.	INC -112	112	TE			331	I am not sure why manifested properties should also be considered. By definition architecture is fundamental concepts or properties.	Drop "manifest properties wrt the above"	A	
115.	INC -113	113	TE			329	Shouldn't this be purpose of architecting effort. Architecture is the fundamental concepts, properties... while architecting is conceiving, deploying, certifying and so on.	Replace "purpose of architecture" by "purpose of architecting"	OBE	See US-269. Change to "purpose of the architecture description"

1 **MB** = Member body / **NC** = National Committee (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by **)

2 **Type of comment:** **GT** = General Technical **TH** = Technical high **TL** = Technical Low **GE** = General Editorial **E** = Editorial

3 **Resolution code:** **OBE** = Superseded **AIP** = Agreed in principle **A** = Agreed R = Rejected **NA** = Non actionable

Disposition of Comments

Date:
30/09/2020Document:
ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 7 N 8181
(42010. CD1-v1.0)Project:
ISO/IEC/IEEE CD1 42010 (Ed2) Architecture
description

	MB/ NC ¹	Cmt No	Type of Cmt ²	Clause/ Subcl.	Para/ Fig/ Tab/	Line No	Comments and rationale	Proposed change	Res code ³	Resolution on each comment received
116.	INC -114	114	TE			304	Potential redefinition of architecture entity	entity is defined as subject of architecture in clause 3 but is stated as a thing here. To be clarified.	A	
117.	INC -115	115	GT			304	In some places, the term "entity" is used to mean "architecture entity", for eg, line 321, 331, 332. This usage may be confusing for a non-english speaking reader. It would be better to implement what is said in line 304 in its entirety. Anywhere where the entity is the subject of architecture, it should be expressed as architecture entity or entity-of-interest.	Harmonize the usage of entity-of-interest and architecture entity in situations where the term entity is used	A	
118.	INC -116	116	ED			279	Missing space after "7"	Missing space after "7"	A	
119.	INC -117	117	ED			250	No need to say "can be considered to be different model kinds". It is obvious	Remove "can be considered to be different model kinds"	A	
120.	INC -118	118	TL			221	Not sure why categories of concerns is provided as example for concerns.	Propose "for a robotic process automation system, quality and quantity of rework is a concern"	OBE	See INC-1259
121.	INC -119	119	ED			219	Either should not be used here to express the list.	Remove "either"	OBE	See INC-1258
122.	INC -120	120	TE			188	An ADF is also an information item. It is not a work product arising out of architecting. It is an information item that is put together by a community of stakeholders	Replace "work product" by "information item"	AIP	The document is now clarified regarding "ADF" conventions, principles and practices which can use for architecting) and "ADF specification" (information item specifying an ADF)
123.	INC -121	121	TL			170	The words "for an architecture entity" replaced with "of an entity of interest"	The words "for an architecture entity" replaced with "of an entity of interest"	A	
124.	INC	122	TE			142	This should be architecture concepts and	Replace elements with	A	

1 **MB** = Member body / **NC** = National Committee (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by **)2 **Type of comment:** **GT** = General Technical **TH** = Technical high **TL** = Technical Low **GE** = General Editorial **E** = Editorial3 **Resolution code:** **OBE** = Superseded **AIP** = Agreed in principle **A** = Agreed R = Rejected **NA** = Non actionable

Disposition of Comments

Date: 30/09/2020	Document: ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 7 N 8181 (42010. CD1-v1.0)	Project: ISO/IEC/IEEE CD1 42010 (Ed2) Architecture description
----------------------------	---	--

	MB/ NC ¹	Cmt No	Type of Cmt ²	Clause/ Subcl.	Para/ Fig/ Tab/	Line No	Comments and rationale	Proposed change	Res code ³	Resolution on each comment received
125.	-122						not any kind of elements	architecture concepts		
126.	INC -123	123	TL			141	Rather than say consisting of, which is contradictory to the intangibility and abstractness of architecture, its better to use understood by means of	Replace "consisting of" by "understood by means of"	A	
127.	INC -124	124	TE			137	Its unclear from this statement and the usage of the term "other entities" in the previous statement whether entities include software, systems, enterprises and so on or only the other entities.	The confusion is because of the phrase "other entities". Perhaps, it can be replaced by "other things"	A	See INC 893
128.	INC -125	125	TE			126	There is no conformance on model kind.	Remove "or model kind"	OBE	MK is now a conformance class
129.	INC -126	126	TE			118	The range of uses is left to an organization or a project's imagination. Using the term precisely is not necessary here as its restrictive.	Remove "more precisely"	A	
130.	INC -127	127	TE			114	Isn't this the set of activities pertaining to architecting as defined in clause 3.1?	Remove those activities that are not covered as part of architecting		This paragraph is about usage of ADs; not about architecting activities including description (as a verb) of architecton.
131.	INC -128	128	TE			114	By definition, architecture description is an expression of the architecture. Not sure why documentation is a use case for architecture description.	Remove "documentation"		This paragraph is about usage of Ads; not about architecting activities. Documentation of the entity is a valid case for usage of ADs.
132.	INC -129	129	TE			110	Entities used here is the dictionary meaning and does not mean the entities as defined in this standard. However, the usage is rather confusing.	Entities here could mean organizations or projects or other things. Its better to use either of these rather than entities which in terms of this standard means the thing being architected	AIP	Change to Organizations, Individuals and Teams.
	INC -130	130	TE			108	As per the changes to 2010 edition, it is mentioned that entity is used instead of system. However, in many places in this	Harmonize the usage of entity and architecture entity. In this particular instance, entity is more	A	

1 **MB** = Member body / **NC** = National Committee (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by **)

2 **Type of comment:** **GT** = General Technical **TH** = Technical high **TL** = Technical Low **GE** = General Editorial **E** = Editorial

3 **Resolution code:** **OBE** = Superseded **AIP** = Agreed in principle **A** = Agreed R = Rejected **NA** = Non actionable

Disposition of Comments

Date: 30/09/2020	Document: ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 7 N 8181 (42010. CD1-v1.0)	Project: ISO/IEC/IEEE CD1 42010 (Ed2) Architecture description
----------------------------	---	--

	MB/ NC ¹	Cmt No	Type of Cmt ²	Clause/ Subcl.	Para/ Fig/ Tab/	Line No	Comments and rationale	Proposed change	Res code ³	Resolution on each comment received
							document, I can notice usage of the term architecture entity while it should be entity.	appropriate.		
133.	INC -131	131	TE			107	Not only fundamental concepts and properties, but also the principles.	Propose "fundamental concepts, properties and principles"	OBE	See INC-882
134.	INC -132	132	TE			104	It is unclear who is applying these concepts, principles and procedures. Is it the organization that create and use these entities or the stakeholders?	Propose "increasingly applied by organizations"	AIP	Change to Organizations, Individuals and Teams.
135.	INC -133	133	TE			415	What is the assumption around the definition for the "Architect" role and the associated competencies as a factor of quality where experience is a factor associated with context	Clarify where the role of Architect is defined (SFIA?) and what definition of competence associated with experience is required	OBE	See FRA 1044. Since the term Architect is removed from the draft, there is no need to clarify.
136.	INC -134	134	ED			415	"exists" is required to be added after the phrase "Where no relevant prior experience"	Add "exists" as indicated in the comment	OBE	The entire paragraph has been removed in the rewrite.
137.	INC -135	135	TL			233	Is practice expected to be a part of "contextual influences" within the Environment or as a Stakeholder perspective [Reference to Line 260]	Clarify relationship of term "practice"		"Practice" is not used in the definition. It can be understood as influences; but nothing in this definition needs to say anything about "practice".
138.	INC -136	136	TL			188	"specific domain of application": unclear whether this relates to solely an environmental domain, e.g. Aviation, Health, Product Line, the domain of architecture practice e.g. Enterprise Architecture, Systems Engineering, Software Engineering, or whether it is intended to cover both.	Provide definition of the relationship between the environmental domain and the practice domain.		This is out of the scope of the document. The oxford dictionary meaning of domain to be considered in this case.
139.	INC -137	137	ED			165	URL leads to a "page no longer available" message	Correct URL link to reflect the required web page	A	a NOTE to be added which requires that Access to the IEEE Standards Dictionary Online requires a free IEEE account. It does not require

1 **MB** = Member body / **NC** = National Committee (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by **)

2 **Type of comment:** **GT** = General Technical

TH = Technical high

TL = Technical Low

GE = General Editorial

E = Editorial

3 **Resolution code:** **OBE** = Superseded

AIP = Agreed in principle

A = Agreed R = Rejected

NA = Non actionable

Disposition of Comments

Date: 30/09/2020	Document: ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 7 N 8181 (42010. CD1-v1.0)	Project: ISO/IEC/IEEE CD1 42010 (Ed2) Architecture description
----------------------------	---	--

2.	MB/ NC ¹	Cmt No	Type of Cmt ²	Clause/ Subcl.	Para/ Fig/ Tab/	Line No	Comments and rationale	Proposed change	Res code ³	Resolution on each comment received
140.										IEEE membership or any subscription fee
141.	INC -138	138	ED			163	URL appears to re-direct to a different web page than the one intended	Correct URL link to the required web page		a NOTE to be added which requires that Access to the IEEE Standards Dictionary Online requires a free IEEE account. It does not require IEEE membership or any subscription fee
142.	INC -139	139	TE			106	The relationship between “entity” and specialisations of the type entity, e.g. system, would benefit from a diagrammatic representation of the relationship and a review of the continued use of the specialised instances. At present there are still 127 uses of the term “system” in this draft.	Add a diagram near this figure and review consistency of differentiated us between the term entity and specialised type of entity	AIP	Instances of System to be reviewed and replaced with Entity. Diagram not necessary.
143.	INC -140	140	ED			1629	Sentence finishes with a ‘0’?		A	
144.	INC -141	141	ED			1351	Lines 1351-1352: Grammar too many ‘is’	Hence the view specification is usually is more technically sophisticated in terms of adherence to view construction methods and modeling techniques	A	Propose OBE. See INC 756
145.	INC -142	142	TE			289	Lines 289-291: The notion that clauses can be marked with permission of ‘may’ implies there is a discretionary part to the standard and by extension the ability to ‘tailor’ the standard. This appears to be in contradiction with the NOTE are line 292 (see below)			No proposed change. Shall, Should and May are how the clauses are structured as per ISO style guide.
	IN- 923	143	TL			272	Lines 272-273: The example refers to the term system ‘feature of a system’. This	Should not the term by entity hence the example read:	A	

1 **MB** = Member body / **NC** = National Committee (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by **)

2 **Type of comment:** **GT** = General Technical **TH** = Technical high **TL** = Technical Low **GE** = General Editorial **E** = Editorial

3 **Resolution code:** **OBE** = Superseded **AIP** = Agreed in principle **A** = Agreed R = Rejected **NA** = Non actionable

Disposition of Comments

Date: 30/09/2020	Document: ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 7 N 8181 (42010. CD1-v1.0)	Project: ISO/IEC/IEEE CD1 42010 (Ed2) Architecture description
----------------------------	---	--

2.	MB/ NC ¹	Cmt No	Type of Cmt ²	Clause/ Subcl.	Para/ Fig/ Tab/	Line No	Comments and rationale	Proposed change	Res code ³	Resolution on each comment received
							(according to this standard) is a limiting term.	"EXAMPLE an architecture view component describing a firewall can be used in several views of an architecture description to explain functional flows, behavior and safety features of an entity."		
146.	INC -144	144	GE			0	The introduction of, or superseding of the terms 'entity' and 'entity of interest' in place of system and system of interest does appear to be a reaction to resulting from an intention to be encompassing of the ideas and proclivities of those that self-identify with ICT focused enterprise architecture. Entity carries with it meanings such as being, matter, substance material. Are there cases when an architecture pertains to non-tangible beings? To be truly agnostic, could we use the term 'thing' and 'thing of interest'?			There is no real difference between "thing" and "entity". "Entity" is a term already used in other documents of the 42000 series.
147.	INC -145	145	GE			0	The elements and the relationships within this standard are too complicated and to vague. This is evidenced by the extended need to define and justify definitions throughout. This is further evidenced by instances of inconsistency (entity or system aspect or perspective etc). Line 526 use of system in example as opposed to entity Line 784-802 no mention of entity or enterprise Line 1137 subject of interest		AIP	Line 526: the examples are not valid for any kind of entity. Usage of the word "system" is valid, here. Line 784: The relevance of the provided list of stakeholders to the architecture of the entity of interest is explained by the first sentence of this clause. Line 1186: "complex systems" is replaced with "complex entities". Line 1319: updated with "Network entity" which better. Line 1433: This example is valid for a

1 **MB** = Member body / **NC** = National Committee (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by **)

2 **Type of comment:** **GT** = General Technical

TH = Technical high

TL = Technical Low

GE = General Editorial

E = Editorial

3 **Resolution code:** **OBE** = Superseded

AIP = Agreed in principle

A = Agreed R = Rejected

NA = Non actionable

Disposition of Comments

Date: 30/09/2020	Document: ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 7 N 8181 (42010. CD1-v1.0)	Project: ISO/IEC/IEEE CD1 42010 (Ed2) Architecture description
----------------------------	---	--

2.	MB/ NC ¹	Cmt No	Type of Cmt ²	Clause/ Subcl.	Para/ Fig/ Tab/	Line No	Comments and rationale	Proposed change	Res code ³	Resolution on each comment received
148.							Line 1186 complex systems Line 1319 networked system Line 1433 two views of a system Line 1531 system elements			system; but cannot be considered for any kind of entity. Line 1531: "system elements" is replaced with "entity elements".
	INC-146	146	GE			0	I still think it is nigh on impossible in the text to disentangle aspect and perspective (which also overlaps with viewpoint). The Annex in particular is inconsistent with the main text (and falls into the trap of using a common english word without respecting the special definition given to it). I drew a couple of diagrams to try to clarify in my own mind what was going on. Also attached. See file Figures relating aspects and perspectives (002).pptx	The various terms should be formalised through the diagrams, which should be normative. A suggestion for starting with the key definitions is attached. In this conception, architecture contains types of structure overlaid with compatible properties. Perspectives are aggregates of structure and property of use to stakeholders. These abstract concepts are mapped to model elements – model kinds, model properties and viewpoints.		The diagrams should not be normative (ie, claim conformance against figures) since it is not feasible to make them completely correct and complete using some formal modeling notation without making them too difficult for most readers to understand.
149.	US-147	147	GT			0	We reiterate comment from previous review, as the circumstances remain: We are very concerned about compatibility of this draft with previous edition. There are significant changes to terminology, definition and presentation of concepts, with limited new capability provided to users. The changes are lacking plausible rationale. These changes are suffering from lack of helpful examples. There is no evidence that they have been tried out before inclusion. Other changes seem to duplicate rather than enhance functionality for users. One	See specific comments below.		No action proposed here. Will be taken up for the respective comments.

1 **MB** = Member body / **NC** = National Committee (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by **)

2 **Type of comment:** **GT** = General Technical **TH** = Technical high **TL** = Technical Low **GE** = General Editorial **E** = Editorial

3 **Resolution code:** **OBE** = Superseded **AIP** = Agreed in principle **A** = Agreed R = Rejected **NA** = Non actionable

Disposition of Comments

Date: 30/09/2020	Document: ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 7 N 8181 (42010. CD1-v1.0)	Project: ISO/IEC/IEEE CD1 42010 (Ed2) Architecture description
----------------------------	---	--

	MB/ NC ¹	Cmt No	Type of Cmt ²	Clause/ Subcl.	Para/ Fig/ Tab/	Line No	Comments and rationale	Proposed change	Res code ³	Resolution on each comment received
150.							change (correspondences) actually reduces functionality for users compared with the previous edition. These changes will impact curricula, other standards, and current business practices.			
151.	US-148	148	GE			0	There is still work to be done. A number of ISO's comment dispositions are of the form "To be updated. Request for proposals." or "Examples to be updated." In some cases, the ISO dispositions are do not match draft's text; others are erroneous "View specifications are deprecated".	We have noted some of these in our comments for resolution or consideration for next draft. Additional responses to these requests will be provided at next WG meeting by US representative.		Will respond to individual comments below.
151.	US-149	149	TE			491	How does the separation of AD element correspondences and AD correspondences handle a relationship between an AD element in AD-1 and a separate AD-2? This is quite common in practice: e.g., system participating in an SoS appears as an element in the SoS AD and is defined by another separate AD for that system. Or an element of an AD conforming to a reference architecture or other external protocol? These are not handled by the current text.	Find a solution that covers ADE-to-AD correspondences. The simplest solution is to consider ADs themselves as elements of ADs, just as the set X is considered one of the subsets of X.	A	The ADE-to-AD case is handled by adding a statement that an AD is itself considered an AD element and may therefore participate in correspondences with ADEs. See 5.2.12.
152.	US-150	150	TE			1554	Unsubstantiated claim. How do aspects contribute in any way to open standards in contrast to prior approaches?	Delete subclause or justify the claim. But it is not really relevant to this standard.	OBE	See INC-675, US-678
153.	INC-151	151	TE		Ex 1 and 2	440	Lines 440-443: These two examples follow the first paragraph lines 437-439, which describes certain relationships around the concepts: architecture description, architecture view,	Revise the wording of Example 1 and 2 such as to be explicit what is the concept and what is the instance (example), along the lines of:	AIP	A telecommunications network (entity) is represented by a "network model" that can be used to express the "network connectivity deployment diagram" (architecture view)

1 **MB** = Member body / **NC** = National Committee (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by **)

2 **Type of comment:** **GT** = General Technical **TH** = Technical high **TL** = Technical Low **GE** = General Editorial **E** = Editorial

3 **Resolution code:** **OBE** = Superseded **AIP** = Agreed in principle **A** = Agreed R = Rejected **NA** = Non actionable

Disposition of Comments

Date: 30/09/2020	Document: ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 7 N 8181 (42010. CD1-v1.0)	Project: ISO/IEC/IEEE CD1 42010 (Ed2) Architecture description
----------------------------	---	--

2.	MB/ NC ¹	Cmt No	Type of Cmt ²	Clause/ Subcl.	Para/ Fig/ Tab/	Line No	Comments and rationale	Proposed change	Res code ³	Resolution on each comment received
							architecture viewpoint and probably architecture . However, there is poor correspondence between the text of the two examples. (My attempt to produce a revised part-example which is unambiguous and clear on the right I think shows the challenge in having a meaningful example which will really assist a reader to understand the concepts!)	An entity Telecommunication network is expressed with an Architecture Description 'Network Model'. A specific Architecture View 'Network connectivity deployment diagram' contained with the Architecture Description 'Network Model' addresses the concerns for one Operator 'BTx'.		contained in a telecommunications architecture description (AD) document that addresses the communications parameters such as throughput and uptime (concerns) of operators and users (stakeholders).
154.	INC -152	152	TE			481	Lines 481,419, 395: Text reads " <i>Where prior relevant experience exists, the architecture can be informed by this prior experience which is often captured in the form of particular architecture aspects and particular stakeholder perspectives.</i> " The diagram correctly models the intent of the second clause '[stakeholder] has particular stakeholder perspective'. However, it loses the first clause intent '[stakeholder] has [interest in] particular architecture aspect' since this is lost / ambiguous via the intermediate architecture concept and its relationships.	To establish better correspondence between text and Figure 2 introduce a direct relationship 'has interest in' from stakeholder to architecture aspect.	AIP	The relationship between concerns, aspects and perspectives has been improved. There is no need to add additional relationships in the figure.
155.	IT- 5- 153	153	ED	Bibliog raphy		2046	Some International standards on data can be interesting for architecture views	Add [13.2] ISO/IEC 25012:2008 Software Engineering – Software product quality requirements and evaluation (SQuaRE) – Data quality model [13.3] ISO/IEC 25024:2015 Systems and Software Engineering – Systems and	A	

1 **MB** = Member body / **NC** = National Committee (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by **)

2 **Type of comment:** **GT** = General Technical **TH** = Technical high **TL** = Technical Low **GE** = General Editorial **E** = Editorial

3 **Resolution code:** **OBE** = Superseded **AIP** = Agreed in principle **A** = Agreed R = Rejected **NA** = Non actionable

Disposition of Comments

Date: 30/09/2020	Document: ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 7 N 8181 (42010. CD1-v1.0)	Project: ISO/IEC/IEEE CD1 42010 (Ed2) Architecture description
----------------------------	---	--

2.	MB/ NC ¹	Cmt No	Type of Cmt ²	Clause/ Subcl.	Para/ Fig/ Tab/	Line No	Comments and rationale	Proposed change	Res code ³	Resolution on each comment received
156.	INC -154	154	ED			64	2. Definition of model kind is changed.	Remove extra space	OBE	This default is agree. Nevertheless the change log will be summarized and move to the Foreword. See IEEE-1092.
157.	INC -155	155	TE		Fig 1	328	A second, bi-directional relationship 'influences' could be added between the concepts Environment and Entity of interest (hyphenated?). Although this marginally adds a little complication to the ERD, it makes the concept model more consistent with explanation in rows 317-319. 'Influence' is a different and distinct relationship to 'is situated in'.	Add a bi-directional relationship 'influences' could be added between the concepts Environment and Entity of interest (hyphenated?).		Not all relationships are covered in the figure. The influences relationship is included as an indirect relationship in the figure
158.	INC -156	156	TE		Fig 1	328	'is composition of' could be made more concise	'is composed of'	OBE	The relationship no longer exists as per the changes made to the figure.
159.	INC -157	157	TE		Fig 2	395	From an information modelling perspective, and even with the informal ERD, the term 'particular' within the three relationship labels 'has particular' is no improvement compared with if they were just labelled 'has'.	Revise the three relationship labels 'has particular' to be labelled 'has'.	OBE	Conceptual model has been updated
160.	INC -158	158	TE		Fig 3, 4, 5	434	Lines 434, 450, 488: Figure 3 indicates three 'is a kind of' relationships, essentially indicating that Architecture consideration is a supertype to the other concepts, but without using the concept. If we want to avoid a specific notation for sub/supertype (conventional in many info modelling notations) an alternative that can usefully aid readability and	Consider faint shading for supertype symbols: figure 3 Architecture Consideration, figures 4 (for Architecture Consideration) and 5 (for View Component).		1) Figure has been updated. 2) Architecture considerations are no longer included in the figure. 3) An effort is made to keep the conceptual model simple in order to ease readability. The text provides the details.

1 **MB** = Member body / **NC** = National Committee (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by **)

2 **Type of comment:** **GT** = General Technical **TH** = Technical high **TL** = Technical Low **GE** = General Editorial **E** = Editorial

3 **Resolution code:** **OBE** = Superseded **AIP** = Agreed in principle **A** = Agreed R = Rejected **NA** = Non actionable

Disposition of Comments

Date: 30/09/2020	Document: ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 7 N 8181 (42010. CD1-v1.0)	Project: ISO/IEC/IEEE CD1 42010 (Ed2) Architecture description
----------------------------	---	--

2.	MB/ NC ¹	Cmt No	Type of Cmt ²	Clause/ Subcl.	Para/ Fig/ Tab/	Line No	Comments and rationale	Proposed change	Res code ³	Resolution on each comment received
161.							understandability, is to highlight the existence of the supertype, for instance, with faint shading for Architecture Consideration symbol. This comment also true of figures 4 (for Architecture Consideration) and 5 (for View Component).			
	INC -159	159	TE		Fig 4	450	I think there is a relationship between Concern and Aspect. Although the stakeholder may not realise it when they raise the Concern, it will generally relate to one or more Architecture Aspects. Otherwise, why would an Aspect be a Consideration, if it isn't related to a Concern? I think this is actually more important than Stakeholder Perspective, which is just the 'why' behind the concern. I'm not sure Stakeholder Perspective really adds much, overall.	Add relationship between Concern and Architecture Aspect.	AIP	See WG42-004
162.	INC -160	160	TE		Fig 5 (plus other s)	488	AD, View and View Component all have a nice hierarchical relationship, but one of the issues in the real world is relating these things to actual computing 'files' that most people deal with every day (Word Document, Visio file, Rhapsody model etc). The relationship between the notional 'lumps' of information (View Components etc) and the data entities (Artefacts) that realise that information isn't explicit. This is further confused by the definition of AD including the term 'work product', which seems to imply that it is a single Artefact, rather than the compilation of a	Make clear that an Architecture Description is often a collection of work products/artefacts and views might have to 'collate and present' elements from across these artefacts. Maybe add 'Artefact' and/or 'AD Element' to the relationship diagrams, with 'captures all or part of' relationship to AD, View, View Component etc.	AIP	The definition of AD is updated with notes expressing we have to consider both Work Product and Information Item perspectives. As for any Work Product and Information Item, we can consider them as being decomposable. There is no need to elaborate on decomposition for this particular case.

1 **MB** = Member body / **NC** = National Committee (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by **)

2 **Type of comment:** **GT** = General Technical **TH** = Technical high **TL** = Technical Low **GE** = General Editorial **E** = Editorial

3 **Resolution code:** **OBE** = Superseded **AIP** = Agreed in principle **A** = Agreed R = Rejected **NA** = Non actionable

Disposition of Comments

Date: 30/09/2020	Document: ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 7 N 8181 (42010. CD1-v1.0)	Project: ISO/IEC/IEEE CD1 42010 (Ed2) Architecture description
----------------------------	---	--

2.	MB/ NC ¹	Cmt No	Type of Cmt ²	Clause/ Subcl.	Para/ Fig/ Tab/	Line No	Comments and rationale	Proposed change	Res code ³	Resolution on each comment received
							number of Artefacts (or parts thereof). The actual work products are the Artefacts produced, not the notional scope of information that an AD contains (which is generally spread across a number of artefacts and summarised in an ADD). Maybe what I describe as 'Artefact' is what 'AD Element' is supposed to mean? One way of representing this is that an 'Artefact' has a many-to-many relationship with 'View Component'. I.e an Artefact (word document, rhapsody model etc) can contain part of, one, or many View Components (or other AD Elements). A couple of connected examples showing real instances of each term would be useful. A simple one and a complex one. There are already individual examples (eg line 481), but connecting them up would help people understand the whole scope of entities being defined. In fact, an example that uses most/all of the entities being described (as an appendix?) would be very useful.			
163.	INC -161	161	ED		Fig A.10	1436	This figure is currently bridging across pages 37 and 38, which compromises readability.	Adjust paging such that this figure (and all other figures) does not bridge across pages.	OBE	See INC-039. Paging will be adjusted before publication
164.	INC -162	162	TE		Fig 1	329	This is the context of the architecture description as well as the "entity of interest". If it was only for the architecture description, the "Environment", "Entity of Interest", "Stakeholder", and "Context" boxes would be removed since they	"Figure 1 - Context of architecture description and entity of interest"		The figure sets the context of the AD, which is the subject of this document. The figure includes entity, environment and context.

1 **MB** = Member body / **NC** = National Committee (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by **)

2 **Type of comment:** **GT** = General Technical **TH** = Technical high **TL** = Technical Low **GE** = General Editorial **E** = Editorial

3 **Resolution code:** **OBE** = Superseded **AIP** = Agreed in principle **A** = Agreed R = Rejected **NA** = Non actionable

Disposition of Comments

Date: 30/09/2020	Document: ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 7 N 8181 (42010. CD1-v1.0)	Project: ISO/IEC/IEEE CD1 42010 (Ed2) Architecture description
---------------------	---	--

2.	MB/ NC ¹	Cmt No	Type of Cmt ²	Clause/ Subcl.	Para/ Fig/ Tab/	Line No	Comments and rationale	Proposed change	Res code ³	Resolution on each comment received
165.	INC -163	163	TE		Fig 1	328	neither influence nor get influenced by the "Architecture Description". What defines the purpose of the Architecture Effort as an input to the Architecture Description?. Is it Stakeholder perspective or is it part of the business case for developing an Architecture and hence assumes that the case for Architecture is already sponsored if the Architecture Description is expected to be a Work Product (Project Management domain nomenclature)	Clarify the inputs to "Purpose of Architecture effort" if it is a sponsored activity to develop the AD.		Simply stating that there is a purpose is sufficient. How it arises is out of scope for this document. Change to: "Purpose of AD" per latest diagram.
166.	INC -164	164	TE		Fig 1	328	Stakeholder -> has -> Concerns: Concerns -> provide -> Context. Relationships appear to be absent from Figure 1	Add these relationships to Figure 1		The relationship is not necessary to be included in the context of AD. Concerns are more relevant to the conceptual model than the context of AD. The relationship between concern and context need not be included in the context model.
167.	INC -165	165	TE		1st below Fig 4	452	Lines 452-454: First 3 sentences read: 'An architecture viewpoint frames one or more architecture considerations (see 5.2.5). An architecture 452 consideration can be framed by more than one viewpoint. The architecture viewpoint identifies the specific 453 architecture aspects, concerns and stakeholder perspective(s) to be addressed by an architecture view.' The first two sentences do little to elaborate what is the intent of the Architecture Viewpoint frames the Architecture Consideration model fragment. The third sentence appears to	If 'identifies' is a more appropriate relationship label, then modify the label and terminology of the concept model (and Figure 4) to use 'identifies' instead of 'frames'.	AIP	Figure has been updated and frames has been introduced between viewpoints and concerns. Architecture considerations no longer exist in the figure.

1 **MB** = Member body / **NC** = National Committee (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by **)

2 **Type of comment:** **GT** = General Technical

TH = Technical high

TL = Technical Low

GE = General Editorial

E = Editorial

3 **Resolution code:** **OBE** = Superseded

AIP = Agreed in principle

A = Agreed R = Rejected

NA = Non actionable

Disposition of Comments

Date:
30/09/2020Document:
ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 7 N 8181
(42010. CD1-v1.0)Project:
ISO/IEC/IEEE CD1 42010 (Ed2) Architecture
description

2.	MB/ NC ¹	Cmt No	Type of Cmt ²	Clause/ Subcl.	Para/ Fig/ Tab/ Line No	Comments and rationale	Proposed change	Res code ³	Resolution on each comment received
168.	INC -166	166	ED		Intro	114	use the word 'identifies' as a synonym for 'frames'. This is rather weak "Architecture descriptions have many uses, such as" and doesn't bring out the full scope or rich nature.		Words "exploited fully" could be too strong regarding what we mean here.
169.	US- 167	167	TL		Item 6	65	Second sentence is irrelevant to whether a part of a view is a model or not a model. The origin or source of a view component is a process consideration—i.e., outside the scope of this standard.		This is just change history with regard to 42010:2011 edition
170.	INC -168	168	ED		NOT E 1, NOT E (For Fig 3) etc.	391	Lines 391-394, 430-433. 484-487. 587-590, 646-649: The content of these notes essentially only reproduces the intent of the NOTE on lines 323-327, which given that that says ' <i>The figures and text in the remainder of 5.2...</i> ', are redundant. If the subsequent NOTES is to be retained, it should be termed NOTE n of NOTE 1 (consistency)	A	
171.	INC -169	169	TE		Tbl G.1	2044	This table is very difficult to understand. There appears to be an inconsistency in entries. For example, in the "Stakeholder perspectives" row, most entries includes the name that each framework uses, but Zachman is listed as simply "yes". Unclear why this is. Also, what is the difference between "No" and "Not Formalized" ? Lastly, the table appears to provide additional information for the GERAM entries beyond what is provided in the other entries. Why? (Is this table advocating for GERAM?)	A	A note is added to explain the meaning of "yes" and "no" and "partial" (replacing "not formalized").

1 MB = Member body / NC = National Committee (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by **)

2 Type of comment: GT = General Technical

TH = Technical high

TL = Technical Low

GE = General Editorial

E = Editorial

3 Resolution code: OBE = Superseded

AIP = Agreed in principle

A = Agreed R = Rejected

NA = Non actionable

Disposition of Comments

Date: 30/09/2020	Document: ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 7 N 8181 (42010. CD1-v1.0)	Project: ISO/IEC/IEEE CD1 42010 (Ed2) Architecture description
----------------------------	---	--

	MB/ NC ¹	Cmt No	Type of Cmt ²	Clause/ Subcl.	Para/ Fig/ Tab/	Line No	Comments and rationale	Proposed change	Res code ³	Resolution on each comment received
172.	US-170	170	TE		Tbl G.1	2043	Table should have a legend which explains its conventions. What does “Not Formalized” mean?	Provide conventions for understanding Table.	OBE	See INC-169
173.	US-171	171	TE		Tbl G.1	2044	The entry for ArchiMate (3.0.1) is incorrect: ArchiMate formally identifies concerns for each of its Basic, Motivation, Strategy and Implementation and Migration viewpoints.		A	
174.	US-172	172	TE		Tbl G.1	2044	RM-ODP formalizes the language for each of its viewpoints, but each view uses a single language so there are no distinct view components and no distinct model kinds for those viewpoints.	Explain RM-ODP has one model kind (i.e. language) per viewpoint.	A	
175.	INC-173	173	ED	1		145	Lines 145, 146: Semicolons are used to separate items in a list that do not have commas.	Change semicolons to commas.	A	
176.	INC-174	174	ED	1		149	Lines 149, 150: Suggestion: add on to sentence for added clarity to the statement	Completeness and correctness of an architecture description are determined only relative to its use and validation.	A	
177.	US-175	175	TE	1		135	There are really two lists in this sentence: first are software, systems and enterprises—these are the fields of application. Within those fields fall the other items listed “system of systems, ... other entities”. These are examples, they are not additional fields of application.	Insert “including” after enterprises.	OBE	See INC 893
178.	US-176	176	TE	1		140	“an architecture is intangible and abstract, consisting of concepts, properties and principles” — Concepts, properties and principles can be abstract or specific, but are not intangible! The key idea is that an architecture is comprised of concepts,	Delete “intangible and” because it is incorrect. Delete “abstract” because it implies that an architecture cannot be very specific.	AIP	It is not talking about intangible concepts, properties or principles but the intangible nature of Architecture. Appropriate changes to be made.

1 **MB** = Member body / **NC** = National Committee (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by **)

2 **Type of comment:** **GT** = General Technical **TH** = Technical high **TL** = Technical Low **GE** = General Editorial **E** = Editorial

3 **Resolution code:** **OBE** = Superseded **AIP** = Agreed in principle **A** = Agreed R = Rejected **NA** = Non actionable

Disposition of Comments

Date: 30/09/2020	Document: ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 7 N 8181 (42010. CD1-v1.0)	Project: ISO/IEC/IEEE CD1 42010 (Ed2) Architecture description
----------------------------	---	--

	MB/ NC ¹	Cmt No	Type of Cmt ²	Clause/ Subcl.	Para/ Fig/ Tab/	Line No	Comments and rationale	Proposed change	Res code ³	Resolution on each comment received
179.	US-177	177	ED	1		144	properties and principles—don't confuse the reader with misstatements. Make paragraph consistent with previous paragraph.	Replace "contents" with "elements and relationships between those elements".	OBE	The scope is significantly updated. See WG1-891.
180.	INC-178	178	ED	3		165	link does not work http://www.computer.org/sevocab/	link without final backslash works http://www.computer.org/sevocab	A	
181.	INC-179	179	ED	3		165	The link provided to the "System and software engineering – vocabulary" is dead/broken. http://www.computer.org/sevocab/ results in an HTTP 404 error	Incorporate the needed content into Clause 3 OR fix the link	A	
182.	INC-180	180	ED	3.1		221	Grammatical. "Include" is associated with "Concern"	"...Categories of concerns include...."	A	
183.	INC-181	181	ED	3.1		169	hyperlink not active for '(3.2)'	fix hyperlink	A	
184.	INC-182	182	TL	3.1		220	Although concerns include system risks and hazards (6.3), the term should not be understood to be synonymous with "risks" or "worries", but as referring to any area of interest.	At 1136 the reader encounters a clarification on Concerns. Recommend moving or copying after 220 or 221 so that clarity is available to the reader sooner in the document.	AIP	Text is copied. Note: interest is replaced with "relevance or importance".
185.	INC-183	183	ED	3.1		216	Note section position (before EXAMPLE section) is not consistent with others.	Move Note section after EXAMPLE section	A	
186.	INC-184	184	ED	3.2		175	There is no full stop at the end of the sentence which is inconsistent with the other similar lines in this section	Add full stop to the end of the sentence, prior to the closed square bracket		According to the ISO directives, there is no full stop at the end of the definitions.
187.	US-185	185	TE	3.2		174	SSE-007 was accepted, but not implemented in this draft.	Please implement accepted change.		According to SSE-007 disposition, here is the clarification for the definition: Both Architecture processes and Architecture Descriptions have to be

1 **MB** = Member body / **NC** = National Committee (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by **)

2 **Type of comment:** **GT** = General Technical

TH = Technical high

TL = Technical Low

GE = General Editorial

E = Editorial

3 **Resolution code:** **OBE** = Superseded

AIP = Agreed in principle

A = Agreed R = Rejected

NA = Non actionable

Disposition of Comments

Date: 30/09/2020	Document: ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 7 N 8181 (42010. CD1-v1.0)	Project: ISO/IEC/IEEE CD1 42010 (Ed2) Architecture description
----------------------------	---	--

	MB/ NC ¹	Cmt No	Type of Cmt ²	Clause/ Subcl.	Para/ Fig/ Tab/	Line No	Comments and rationale	Proposed change	Res code ³	Resolution on each comment received
										consistent with ISO/IEC/IEEE 15288:2015, Clause 6.4.4 Architecture Definition Process: "The results of the Architecture Definition process are widely used across the life cycle processes.". I.e., the architecture description shall address the whole life cycle of the Entity of Interest. The current practices also express the time period with milestones like "as-is" and "to-be" is order to describe evolution over the time.
188.	GB-186	186	TE	3.3		179	Proposal from INCOSE's James Martin and Tim Rabbets is that aspect is no longer 'a kind of' consideration' but 'a category of consideration'	Amend NOTE by deleting 'kinds of'.	OBE	Architecture considerations term to be removed from Clause 3. See WG42-007
189.	US-187	187	TE	3.3		176	This term seems to bundle three similar things together, without providing a basis to distinguish them. Why are aspects modified with architecture, but the other terms not focused on architecture: i.e., why not architecture concerns, and architecture perspectives? Each term has a different focus (or none).	Clarify proposed concepts toward answering these questions. See additional comments below.	OBE	Architecture considerations term to be removed from Clause 3. See WG42-007
190.	INC-188	188	TL	3.4		184	Why use the word "express" rather than "describe?" Especially since the definition of architecture consideration uses the word "describing?" The distinction between "express" and "describe" that justifies the substitution seems unclear.	Replace "express" with "describe."		This has been consistently used in 420x0 standards. No need to change
191.	INC-189	189	ED	3.4		184	hyperlink not active for '(3.2)'	fix hyperlink	A	

1 **MB** = Member body / **NC** = National Committee (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by **)

2 **Type of comment:** **GT** = General Technical **TH** = Technical high **TL** = Technical Low **GE** = General Editorial **E** = Editorial

3 **Resolution code:** **OBE** = Superseded **AIP** = Agreed in principle **A** = Agreed R = Rejected **NA** = Non actionable

Disposition of Comments

Date: 30/09/2020	Document: ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 7 N 8181 (42010. CD1-v1.0)	Project: ISO/IEC/IEEE CD1 42010 (Ed2) Architecture description
----------------------------	---	--

	MB/ NC ¹	Cmt No	Type of Cmt ²	Clause/ Subcl.	Para/ Fig/ Tab/	Line No	Comments and rationale	Proposed change	Res code ³	Resolution on each comment received
192.	INC -190	190	TE	3.5		189	"domain of application" is unclear and it is not defined anywhere in the document.	Add a definition or example definition of "domain of application" in Section 3 Terms and definitions		This is out of the scope of the document. The oxford dictionary meaning of domain to be considered in this case.
193.	INC -191	191	ED	3.5		189	hyperlink not active for '(3.2)'	fix hyperlink	A	
194.	INC -192	192	TL	3.6		198	Definition unclear. What is a "formalism" in this context? The examples provided are all examples of modeling languages. Are all ADLs modeling languages? How "formal" does the language need to be? Some may argue that some of these languages are not particularly "formal" in nature as modeling languages.	Replace with something like "a set of documented syntactic and semantic rules that govern the expression of an architecture description"	AIP	It is agreed that "fomalism" is unclear in this context. A new definition is proposed. "means of communication, with syntax and semantics, consisting of a set of representations, conventions, and associated rules used to describe an architecture"
195.	US- 193	193	TE	3.6		198	Why doesn't this definition parallel the previous two (3.4, 3.5)? An ADL is a work product —the degree to which it is formal or informal is not specified in this standard.	Replace "formalism" with "work product".	AIP	It is agreed that "fomalism" is unclear in this context; but "work product could also be misleading. A new definition is proposed. "means of communication, with syntax and semantics, consisting of a set of representations, conventions, and associated rules used to describe an architecture"
196.	INC -194	194	TL	3.7		204	Unclear why "information items" are constrained to only be "for human use."	Suggest change to ISO 15289. Suggest adding to this note a caveat that an architecture view could also be created and intended for machine consumption and not strictly limited to human consumption.	AIP	An information item is a "separately identifiable body of information that is produced, stored, and delivered for human and machine use" [Extension of the ISO 15289 definition for machine use]
197.	INC -195	195	ED	3.7		204	There is no full stop at the end of the sentence which is inconsistent with the other similar lines in this section	Add full stop to the end of the sentence, after the closed square bracket	A	

1 **MB** = Member body / **NC** = National Committee (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by **)

2 **Type of comment:** **GT** = General Technical **TH** = Technical high **TL** = Technical Low **GE** = General Editorial **E** = Editorial

3 **Resolution code:** **OBE** = Superseded **AIP** = Agreed in principle **A** = Agreed R = Rejected **NA** = Non actionable

Disposition of Comments

Date: 30/09/2020	Document: ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 7 N 8181 (42010. CD1-v1.0)	Project: ISO/IEC/IEEE CD1 42010 (Ed2) Architecture description
---------------------	---	--

	MB/ NC ¹	Cmt No	Type of Cmt ²	Clause/ Subcl.	Para/ Fig/ Tab/	Line No	Comments and rationale	Proposed change	Res code ³	Resolution on each comment received
198.	INC-196	196	TE	3.7		201	Definition of "architecture view" is not clear.	Recommend using definition from Annex A.6.1 "information item comprising part of an architecture description. A view is the result of looking at a particular entity of interest from a particular viewpoint. Also recommend providing an example of an architecture view. EXAMPLE 1 View describing the content of a product line including common parts and individual products with their variants and options.	OBE	refer WG1-673 and INC-1254
199.	US-197	197	TE	3.8		207	Whether a viewpoint includes conventions by containment or by reference is irrelevant—the key idea is that it specifies conventions (governing views).	Replace "containing" with "specifying".	AIP	"Viewpoint specification" is now distinguished from "Architecture viewpoint" in order to express that an architecture viewpoint is a set of convention while the viewpoint specification is an information item
200.	US-198	198	TE	3.8		208	Use defined terms in definitions.	Change "capture" to "frame (3.13)".	A	
201.	GB-199	199	TE	3.9		214	Architecture aspect is a fundamental category of characteristics or features	Amend to 'Architecture aspect is an organizing basis for architecture description'	OBE	See WG42-004 (Provision of a new definition). Note: "unit of modularization" is expected to address proposed "category".
202.	US-200	200	TL	3.9		212	The disposition of SSE-009 refers to WG42-004, but this item does not resolve the issue raised.	Please address proposed change.		The concern of the stakeholder could be about the entity or its architecture. See the definition of Concern and Stakeholders.
203.	US-201	201	TL	3.9		212	SSE-008 was accepted but not implemented.	Please implement change per disposition.	AIP	SSE-008 proposed "architecture aspect should be the preferred term

1 **MB** = Member body / **NC** = National Committee (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by **)

2 **Type of comment:** **GT** = General Technical **TH** = Technical high **TL** = Technical Low **GE** = General Editorial **E** = Editorial

3 **Resolution code:** **OBE** = Superseded **AIP** = Agreed in principle **A** = Agreed R = Rejected **NA** = Non actionable

Disposition of Comments

Date: 30/09/2020	Document: ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 7 N 8181 (42010. CD1-v1.0)	Project: ISO/IEC/IEEE CD1 42010 (Ed2) Architecture description
----------------------------	---	--

	MB/ NC ¹	Cmt No	Type of Cmt ²	Clause/ Subcl.	Para/ Fig/ Tab/	Line No	Comments and rationale	Proposed change	Res code ³	Resolution on each comment received
204.										where there is no ambiguity". In situations where the usage of "aspect" doesn't conflate the meaning of the sentence, aspect has been used in CD1. Nevertheless, to avoid any doubt, "Aspect" (single word) is removed from this entry.
205.	US-202	202	TE	3.9		212	This definition focuses aspects on architectures which introduces ambiguity for users of the standard: If Cost is identified as an architecture aspect, that can be interpreted, per the definition, as a typical characteristic or feature of one or more architectures. However, the feature cost of an architecture is not at all the same as the cost of a system/entity of interest. Does that mean cost is not intended to be an aspect, or that the focus is wrong? It seems aspects are invariably focused on the entity—that's the point of architecting as thing.	Clarify how to handle or eliminate this ambiguity.	OBE	See WG42-004 (Provision of a new definition).
206.	US-203	203	TE	3.9		215	The EXAMPLE exhibits exactly the ambiguity cited above (US re 212): functional and structural aspects of an architecture are distinct from functional and structural features of the entity of interest having that architecture!	Revise examples to clarify ambiguity between aspects of an architecture vs. aspects of the entity of interest.	OBE	See WG42-004 for the new definition and WG1-673 for new examples.
207.	INC-204	204	ED	3.10		221	The example is after the note which is inconsistent with the other entries	Move the EXAMPLE on line 221 to before the Note on line 219	A	
208.	GB-205	205	TE	3.10		221	It would be good to cite an example of a concern which is specific to architecture	Include 'complexity' or 'complicatedness'	A	"complexity" is added
	US-	206	TE	3.10		218	Definition of concern lacks any focus	Restore focus:	OBE	

1 **MB** = Member body / **NC** = National Committee (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by **)

2 **Type of comment:** **GT** = General Technical **TH** = Technical high **TL** = Technical Low **GE** = General Editorial **E** = Editorial

3 **Resolution code:** **OBE** = Superseded **AIP** = Agreed in principle **A** = Agreed R = Rejected **NA** = Non actionable

Disposition of Comments

Date: 30/09/2020	Document: ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 7 N 8181 (42010. CD1-v1.0)	Project: ISO/IEC/IEEE CD1 42010 (Ed2) Architecture description
----------------------------	---	--

MB/ NC ¹	Cmt No	Type of Cmt ²	Clause/ Subcl.	Para/ Fig/ Tab/	Line No	Comments and rationale	Proposed change	Res code ³	Resolution on each comment received
206						(unlike Aspect which is focused on architecture) and unlike definition of Concern in previous edition where it is clearly defined as interest in a system as its focus. Without a focus, a concern under this definition, could be completely unrelated to an entity (and therefore unrelated to its environment, or architecture, etc.). E.g., stakeholders are interested in new shoes—this should be ruled out because it is not focused on the entity of interest or its architecture.	concern interest in an entity relevant to one or more of its stakeholders.		
IT- 2- 207	207	TE	3.11		222	"Verify the use of data element. Data element is never defined in ISO/IEC 25012 and in ISO/IEC 25024. In SEVOCAB Data element is data element. (1) unique, user-recognizable, non-repeated field in a BFC (ISO/IEC 29881:2010 Information technology--Software and systems engineering--FiSMA 1.1 functional size measurement method, 3.3) (2)smallest unit of data of an IT project (ISO/IEC 29155-1:2017 Systems and software engineering--Information technology project performance benchmarking framework--Part 1: Concepts and definitions, 3.11) Note: A data element can be a character string, or a digital or graphical element in a BFC. When 'data elements' are indicated for a BFC, the number of data elements is	Replace data element with data item EXAMPLE Enterprise, organization, solution, system (including software systems), subsystem, processes, business, data (as data item or data structure), application, information technology (as a collection), mission, product, service, software item, hardware item, product line, family of systems, system of systems, collection of systems, collection of applications, etc.	A	

1 **MB** = Member body / **NC** = National Committee (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by **)

2 **Type of comment:** **GT** = General Technical **TH** = Technical high **TL** = Technical Low **GE** = General Editorial **E** = Editorial

3 **Resolution code:** **OBE** = Superseded **AIP** = Agreed in principle **A** = Agreed R = Rejected **NA** = Non actionable

Disposition of Comments

Date: 30/09/2020	Document: ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 7 N 8181 (42010. CD1-v1.0)	Project: ISO/IEC/IEEE CD1 42010 (Ed2) Architecture description
----------------------------	---	--

MB/ NC ¹	Cmt No	Type of Cmt ²	Clause/ Subcl.	Para/ Fig/ Tab/	Line No	Comments and rationale	Proposed change	Res code ³	Resolution on each comment received
						<p>always greater than 0. Syn: data item data item. (1) smallest identifiable unit of data within a certain context for which the definition, identification, permissible values, and other information is specified by means of a set of properties (ISO/IEC 25024:2015 Systems and software engineering - Systems and software Quality Requirements and Evaluation (SQuaRE) - Measurement of data, 4.9) Note: Data item is a physical object 'container' of data values. Syn: field "</p> <p>Give a definition of Data element or consider the use of Data item (see ISO/IEC 25024 "Terms and Definition" and see ISO/IEC 25024 Annex A),</p> <p>In terms and definition it is written: Data item: smallest identifiable unit of data (4.5) within a certain context for which the definition , identification, permissible values, and other information (4.21) is specified by means of a set of properties</p> <p>Note</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Field is considered a synonym of data item - Data item is a physical object "container" of data values (4.17) 			
WG 1- 208	208	TH	3.11		222	<p>Several places In the text, the word entity is used to identify possible elements of an architecture description that do not fall within the scope of the definition itself. While these uses of the term entity are not</p>	<p>Do you of the following to eliminate the ambiguous use of the term "entity" in text: 1) When entity of interest or architecture entity is the intended</p>	AIP	<p>Proposed change 1) is agreed. Regarding 2), it shall be considered that term System has many interpretations (see INCOSE and IEEE papers for example). And most</p>

1 **MB** = Member body / **NC** = National Committee (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by **)

2 **Type of comment:** **GT** = General Technical

TH = Technical high

TL = Technical Low

GE = General Editorial

E = Editorial

3 **Resolution code:** **OBE** = Superseded

AIP = Agreed in principle

A = Agreed R = Rejected

NA = Non actionable

Disposition of Comments

1.

Date: 30/09/2020	Document: ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 7 N 8181 (42010. CD1-v1.0)	Project: ISO/IEC/IEEE CD1 42010 (Ed2) Architecture description
----------------------------	---	--

2.

MB/ NC ¹	Cmt No	Type of Cmt ²	Clause/ Subcl.	Para/ Fig/ Tab/	Line No	Comments and rationale	Proposed change	Res code ³	Resolution on each comment received
						included in the definition, in many places the term entity is used as a short name for entity of interest e.g. line 306. Thus the meaning of the word "entity" must be inferred from its context of use leading to ambiguity for the intended concept. Ontologically using "entity" as a single word enables interpretation for any mass or count noun to be a subject of architecture, which casts a net beyond reasonable comprehension – something more limiting that deals with "system" is more appropriate, even if agreeing on a definition for system can be very difficult. "system" is a better choice because it has existential structure and behaviour.	meaning, use that full phrase – not short name 2) Since the EXAMPLE has an extensive list of possible entities of interest and all of them are systems of one kind or another, use the term "system" and "system of interest", and adjust Note 1 to entry accordingly. 42010:2011 identifies several kinds of system and the broadening of the list of examples simply extends that concept to cover more situations. 3) Add another Note to entry explaining how to properly interpret the word "entity" in text when not part of the longer defined term.		of these interpretations are not compatible with entities which can be the entity of interest (For example, no known reference consider a product line as a system). Regarding 3), the meaning of "entity" (as a single word") is not the purpose of this definition; but a note is needed at the beginning of this document to provide this description. This note will follow the 1st paragraph of 5.2.1
INC-209	209	TE	3.11		223	Definition of <i>entity-of-interest</i> is not consistent through the document. 136 entity-of-interest refers to the entity whose architecture is under consideration in the preparation of an architecture description 225 entity-of-interest: subject of an architecture 304 entity of interest, is used in this document to refer to those things being described, discussed or otherwise considered during an architecting effort. These definitions may all be valid and consistent (it's hard to tell), but is	Only define <i>entity-of-interest</i> in 3.11 If the additional explanations (Lines 136, 304) are needed then add them to 3.11 and use a reference back to the definition.	A	

211.

1 **MB** = Member body / **NC** = National Committee (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by **)

2 **Type of comment:** **GT** = General Technical

TH = Technical high

TL = Technical Low

GE = General Editorial

E = Editorial

3 **Resolution code:** **OBE** = Superseded

AIP = Agreed in principle

A = Agreed R = Rejected

NA = Non actionable

Disposition of Comments

Date: 30/09/2020	Document: ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 7 N 8181 (42010. CD1-v1.0)	Project: ISO/IEC/IEEE CD1 42010 (Ed2) Architecture description
----------------------------	---	--

2.	MB/ NC ¹	Cmt No	Type of Cmt ²	Clause/ Subcl.	Para/ Fig/ Tab/	Line No	Comments and rationale	Proposed change	Res code ³	Resolution on each comment received
212.	INC -210	210	TE	3.11		223	<p>confusing to spread them out through the document.</p> <p>The change from “system” to “entity” seems very strange to me as a systems engineer. This is reflected in conversations with other systems engineers, a common response being: “Do we all need to become entity engineers then?”</p> <p>I appreciate that there is a need to harmonise with 42020 & 42030 and I'm sure that there is a considerable history of lively debate about this change of term. As I haven't been party to any of that debate, it seems like a strange and unnecessary choice for a number of reasons:</p> <p>1. All of the examples listed (Ins 225-229, 308-312) are easily understood as systems in the 15288 sense of “combination of interacting elements organized to achieve one or more stated purposes” and in the new INCOSE Fellows' definition “an arrangement of parts or elements that together exhibit behavior or meaning that the individual constituents do not”. The extended sense referred to in line 314 encompassing “natural systems or conceptual systems” works fine if you use the Fellows' definition.</p> <p>2. The definition does not actually align with those in 42020 or 42030, both of which have different variations, so there is</p>	<p>Revert back to the term system and use the INCOSE Fellow's definition:</p> <p>System: an arrangement of parts or elements that together exhibit behavior or meaning that the individual constituents do not</p> <p>Or, if using the same term as 42020, 30 is paramount, define entity the same way</p> <p>entity: an arrangement of parts or elements that together exhibit behavior or meaning that the individual constituents do not</p> <p>This definition is consistent with all the ways that entity is used in this document and does away with the need to avoid defining entity.</p> <p>In any case, have the courage to make a commitment to the meaning of entity/system</p> <p>Avoiding doing so is counterproductive because it leaves too much open to interpretation..</p>		<p>There are things that are non-systems like Data, Process, Library, Data Item, Solution etc.</p> <p>Instead of overloading the term system and give a completely different meaning to what it is, the standard proposes the use of entity of interest for this purpose.</p> <p>Further, few enterprise architects agree to considering their enterprise as being a system.</p>

¹ **MB** = Member body / **NC** = National Committee (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by **)

² **Type of comment:** **GT** = General Technical

TH = Technical high

TL = Technical Low

GE = General Editorial

E = Editorial

³ **Resolution code:** **OBE** = Superseded

AIP = Agreed in principle

A = Agreed R = Rejected

NA = Non actionable

Disposition of Comments

Date: 30/09/2020	Document: ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 7 N 8181 (42010. CD1-v1.0)	Project: ISO/IEC/IEEE CD1 42010 (Ed2) Architecture description
----------------------------	---	--

2.	MB/ NC ¹	Cmt No	Type of Cmt ²	Clause/ Subcl.	Para/ Fig/ Tab/	Line No	Comments and rationale	Proposed change	Res code ³	Resolution on each comment received
							no harmonisation in any case 3. There is some discussion in this document about the change from system to entity, but nowhere does it explain why this was felt necessary. 4. Architecture Description, conceptual models in particular, are closely related to the field of ontology. In ontology, the term entity is usually reserved for the most fundamental concept from which all others are derived. Other common terms equivalent to entity are 'thing' and 'object' (Ref: "ISO 1087:2019 Terminology work and terminology science. Vocabulary" and "ISO 21838 Information technology — Top-level ontologies (TLO)"). The way entity is used in this standard (and 42020, 42030) attributes certain properties to the term entity, but does not do so clearly, and in fact the standard (incorrectly) states that it takes no position on the nature of entities (see my comment to Line 315). It is possible for the standard to make an ontological commitment to the meaning of entity (or better system) and it should to avoid confusion.			
213.	INC -211	211	TE	3.11		223	It is odd and unhelpful to have a definition that comprises two terms (e.g. entity of interest and architecture entity).	If this is a formatting issue then move line 224 to follow clause 3.9 iaw with English alphabetical convention. If it is a conflation of the concepts then this is error here or worse a difficulty in the term		Alternate term. Accepted as per ISO style guide

1 **MB** = Member body / **NC** = National Committee (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by **)

2 **Type of comment:** **GT** = General Technical **TH** = Technical high **TL** = Technical Low **GE** = General Editorial **E** = Editorial

3 **Resolution code:** **OBE** = Superseded **AIP** = Agreed in principle **A** = Agreed R = Rejected **NA** = Non actionable

Disposition of Comments

Date: 30/09/2020	Document: ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 7 N 8181 (42010. CD1-v1.0)	Project: ISO/IEC/IEEE CD1 42010 (Ed2) Architecture description
----------------------------	---	--

	MB/ NC ¹	Cmt No	Type of Cmt ²	Clause/ Subcl.	Para/ Fig/ Tab/	Line No	Comments and rationale	Proposed change	Res code ³	Resolution on each comment received
214.								entity, entity of interest and architecture entity.		
	INC-212	212	TE	3.11		222	There is an omission of the term for 'entity'. Given this is the fundamental concept of an architecture and architecture description it should be clearly defined. It therefore follow that there is an entity of interest and by definition entity(s) that are not of interest (i.e. outside the system of interest boundary, wider system of interest and environment.		OBE	See WG 1-208
215.	INC-213	213	TE	3.12		235	'or' should be 'and/or' in definition of <i>environment</i>	aggregate of surrounding things, conditions, contexts, and/or influences		This is valid as per ISO style definition.
216.	INC-214	214	TE	3.12		235	How do things, conditions, contexts and influences differ? Is there any overlap? What about interactions, which are mentioned elsewhere but not here?	Explain meaning of all concepts that constitute an <i>environment</i>		All of these concepts or terms unless defined in clause 3 would be understood with the meaning provided by the common dictionaries.
217.	INC-215	215	TE	3.12		235	<i>context</i> is a key term in this standard, but does not appear in the terminology definitions. It has a specific meaning here that is not readily understood from a standard dictionary definition because of its relationship to environment.	Add definition of <i>context</i> in Section 3		Context is used in its normal dictionary sense so no need to put into clause 3.e
218.	GB-216	216	TE	3.12		235	The inference in the definition is that the environment influences the entity of interest. This influence is bi-directional as many entities are purposeful.	Add further Note 4 to entry: Most entities are purposeful in that not only are they influenced by their environments but they in turn impact and otherwise influence their environments.	A	
219.	US-	217	ED	3.12		234	Change "aggregate" to "context".	Change "aggregate" to "context".		The current proposal does reflect the

1 **MB** = Member body / **NC** = National Committee (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by **)

2 **Type of comment:** **GT** = General Technical **TH** = Technical high **TL** = Technical Low **GE** = General Editorial **E** = Editorial

3 **Resolution code:** **OBE** = Superseded **AIP** = Agreed in principle **A** = Agreed R = Rejected **NA** = Non actionable

Disposition of Comments

Date: 30/09/2020	Document: ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 7 N 8181 (42010. CD1-v1.0)	Project: ISO/IEC/IEEE CD1 42010 (Ed2) Architecture description
----------------------------	---	--

2.	MB/ NC ¹	Cmt No	Type of Cmt ²	Clause/ Subcl.	Para/ Fig/ Tab/	Line No	Comments and rationale	Proposed change	Res code ³	Resolution on each comment received
	217									fact that a set of things (e.g. a set of interfaced systems) can be in the environment.
220.	US-218	218	TE	3.12		235	Definition of environment lacks any focus.	Add to definition: "on an entity".	AIP	Aggregate of things, conditions, contexts, or influences surrounding an entity of interest
221.	INC-219	219	TL	3.13		246	Why is this word defined here? The definition provided here is too restrictive.	Delete.		This removes the ambiguity that is present in relating architecture viewpoint to concerns
222.	JP1-220	220	ED	3.13	first line	245	Indentation is wrong.	"verb" line should be changed .		This way of writing is what we have in several other SC7 standards.
223.	INC-221	221	TL	3.14		249	Model kind is defined as being a model, not as a category of models with similar features. The term model kind is used in this standard to actually mean an information item that contains conventions for how to create of model of that kind.	1) Change name of this to "model kind specification" 2) Change definition to "information item that specifies (or defines) the conventions and characteristics for a particular kind (or sort) of model"	AIP	1) Model kind definition is updated to read: "category of model distinguished by its key characteristics and modeling conventions " 2) A definition of model kind specification is inserted to read "information item that identifies, in a complete, precise, and verifiable manner, the requirements, design, behavior, or other expected characteristics of a model kind (3.16)" Note: Similar modifications are make for ADF, ADL and Viewpoint.
224.	INC-222	222	TL	3.14		249	"Sort" is awkward and seems to be used simply as a synonym of "kind."	Replace "sort" with "category"	A	
225.	GB-223	223	ED	3.14		250	Change 'economical' to 'economic' to reflect subject is economy rather than characteristic is efficiency.	Amend accordingly	A	
226.	INC-224	224	TL	3.15		259	Unclear why this Note 1 is needed. It seems these cases are both well articulated in the description.	Delete.	A	
227.	INC	225	ED	3.15		259	missing period at end of sentence	add period	OBE	See INC-224

1 **MB** = Member body / **NC** = National Committee (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by **)

2 **Type of comment:** **GT** = General Technical **TH** = Technical high **TL** = Technical Low **GE** = General Editorial **E** = Editorial

3 **Resolution code:** **OBE** = Superseded **AIP** = Agreed in principle **A** = Agreed R = Rejected **NA** = Non actionable

Disposition of Comments

Date: 30/09/2020	Document: ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 7 N 8181 (42010. CD1-v1.0)	Project: ISO/IEC/IEEE CD1 42010 (Ed2) Architecture description
----------------------------	---	--

	MB/ NC ¹	Cmt No	Type of Cmt ²	Clause/ Subcl.	Para/ Fig/ Tab/	Line No	Comments and rationale	Proposed change	Res code ³	Resolution on each comment received
228.	INC -226	226	ED	3.15		259	There is no full stop at the end of the sentence which is inconsistent with the other similar lines in this section	Add full stop to the end of the sentence	OBE	See INC-224
229.	INC -227	227	ED	3.15	Para 3	259	The examples in line 257 all represent protagonists. The reader should be given the opportunity to also consider antagonists.	Add: “, and those with interest in the continued viability of the entity whether for good or ill will.”	OBE	See INC-224
230.	INC -228	228	ED	3.15	Para 3	259	Note 1 to entry: For clarity (see ISO 9000:2015 definition of stakeholders), Interest also includes those that are perceived to be affected by the entity or its architecture.	Reword to: Interest includes those affected or perceived to be affected by the entity or its architecture	OBE	See INC-224
231.	IN- 920	229	TE	3.16		266	Only the middle 3 rows of the Zachman Framework deal with stakeholder perspective. The top row is "input context" and the bottom row is "output context".	Change to read "EXAMPLE The labels given to the middle three rows of the Zachman..."	A	
232.	IEE E- 113 3	230	ED	3.16		266	The example is after the note which is inconsistent with the other entries	Move the EXAMPLE on lines 266/267 to before the Note on line 263	A	
233.	IN- 921	231	TE	3.16		266	Lines 266/267: The rows in the cited ADFs are not stakeholder perspectives as per the definition. They are a mixture of considerations	Delete EXAMPLE	AIP	Replace "are stakeholder perspectives" with "can be considered as stakeholder perspectives"
234.	IEE E- 113 0	232	TE	3.16		264	Lines 264/265: Sentence on typical perspectives - these are typical architecting considerations but not stakeholder perspectives.	Stakeholder perspectives are from the perspective of the beholder (or categories of such) and examples include viability, cost, risk, usability/operability, legal compliance, ease of maintenance, market	A	

1 **MB** = Member body / **NC** = National Committee (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by **)

2 **Type of comment:** **GT** = General Technical **TH** = Technical high **TL** = Technical Low **GE** = General Editorial **E** = Editorial

3 **Resolution code:** **OBE** = Superseded **AIP** = Agreed in principle **A** = Agreed R = Rejected **NA** = Non actionable

Disposition of Comments

Date: 30/09/2020	Document: ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 7 N 8181 (42010. CD1-v1.0)	Project: ISO/IEC/IEEE CD1 42010 (Ed2) Architecture description
----------------------------	---	--

	MB/ NC ¹	Cmt No	Type of Cmt ²	Clause/ Subcl.	Para/ Fig/ Tab/	Line No	Comments and rationale	Proposed change	Res code ³	Resolution on each comment received
235.								acceptability and share, ease of implementation etc. One can devise stakeholder perspectives for each of the categories of stakeholder identified in 3.15.		
236.	US-233	233	TE	3.16		261	The disposition of SSE-013 and SSE-014 refers to WG42-012, but this item does not mention or address the issues raised.	Please address proposed changes.		Architecture Perspective is no longer used. This definition is about "Stakeholder Perspective".
237.	US-234	234	TE	3.16		262	Context is undefined.	Change "in a context" to "in its environment".	OBE	This phrase is removed. See IEEE-1129
238.	INC-235	235	GE	3.16		261	Note section position (before EXAMPLE section) is not consistent with others.	Move Note section after EXAMPLE section	A	
239.	IEE E-113 6	236	ED	3.17		273	Reconsider use of term system in "behavior and safety features of a system"	behavior and safety features of an entity	A	
240.	IN-924	237	TL	3.17		273	Firewall is more usually associated with security rather than safety	Replace 'safety' with 'sedurity'	AIP	Replace 'safety' with 'security'
241.	IEE E-113 7	238	TE	3.17	2	273	The document emphasizes the use of "entity" to address the concerns of systems. So, the use of "system" in this sentence makes the reader wonder whether there is some reason why "entity" was not used here instead. The reader wonders "why could not a firewall also apply to a subsystem, business, product, service, etc?"	Change "a system" to "an entity".	A	
242.	INC-239	239	ED	3.x		193	NOTE 1 here is used inconsistently with much of the rest of the document, which utilizes the label NOTE when only one note applies to the entry.	Change NOTE 1 to NOTE in each instance.	OBE	There are now 2 notes. See INC-136
	INC	240	TE	4		279	This entire section is unclear with regard	Recommendation 1:		Conformance can be claimed for

1 **MB** = Member body / **NC** = National Committee (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by **)

2 **Type of comment:** **GT** = General Technical **TH** = Technical high **TL** = Technical Low **GE** = General Editorial **E** = Editorial

3 **Resolution code:** **OBE** = Superseded **AIP** = Agreed in principle **A** = Agreed R = Rejected **NA** = Non actionable

Disposition of Comments

Date: 30/09/2020	Document: ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 7 N 8181 (42010. CD1-v1.0)	Project: ISO/IEC/IEEE CD1 42010 (Ed2) Architecture description
----------------------------	---	--

2.

MB/ NC ¹	Cmt No	Type of Cmt ²	Clause/ Subcl.	Para/ Fig/ Tab/	Line No	Comments and rationale	Proposed change	Res code ³	Resolution on each comment received
-240						to the guidance on scope of conformance. Is it required or recommended that an architecture definition be 100% conformant with the four "situations" (unclear) starting on line 281? Is there a recommended minimum level of conformance? Is it all or nothing for all of them? Is all or nothing if you want to claim conformance for one of the provisions starting on line 281?	Formalizing the term "situation" in this sentence on line 279: "There are four situations in which claims of conformance with the provisions of this document can be made." Recommendation 2: In Section 4 the introductory paragraph starting on line 279, I recommend giving verbiage giving context to conformance for this standard. Here are some examples: "In order to be fully compliant with this standard, all requirements, denoted with situations 1 to 4 below are required to be met. It is recommended that identifiable evidence for each requirements is documented in a table format. One recommendation for documenting conformance is to create a table with each ""shall" requirement, with an associated conformance met value, (Yes/No), and some reference to the artifact supporting the conformance. Consider having an appendix with tables populated with the "shall"s for each "situation" and "should"s and "may"s.		individual cases or several cases depending on the needs of the party claiming conformance. It is not necessary to claim conformance to all cases. The way the conformance is written is valid as per ISO style guide

1 **MB** = Member body / **NC** = National Committee (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by **)

2 **Type of comment:** **GT** = General Technical **TH** = Technical high **TL** = Technical Low **GE** = General Editorial **E** = Editorial

3 **Resolution code:** **OBE** = Superseded **AIP** = Agreed in principle **A** = Agreed R = Rejected **NA** = Non actionable

Disposition of Comments

Date: 30/09/2020	Document: ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 7 N 8181 (42010. CD1-v1.0)	Project: ISO/IEC/IEEE CD1 42010 (Ed2) Architecture description
----------------------------	---	--

	MB/ NC ¹	Cmt No	Type of Cmt ²	Clause/ Subcl.	Para/ Fig/ Tab/	Line No	Comments and rationale	Proposed change	Res code ³	Resolution on each comment received
243.	INC -241	241	ED	4		279	Typo: Spacing error (twice) "Clauses 6, 7and 8."	Fix typos: "Clauses 6, 7 and 8."	A	
244.	INC -242	242	ED	4		279	Spacing looks off between the "7" and the "and"	Check that there is a space between the "7" and the "and" and insert if missing	A	
245.	WG 1- 243	243	TH	5		295	Without a normative conceptual model for an architecture description, applying the normative requirements of the later clauses is often by inference. A stronger ties between the conceptual model and the requirements on an AD would be very helpful. Lacking a normative conceptual model also makes full system architecture integration more difficult because linkage between concepts is somewhat ambiguous.	Consider restructuring the document to integrate a normative conceptual model for an AD with the requirements for individual constituent objects within that AD – essentially merging Clause 5 and 6..		The diagrams should not be normative (i.e., claim conformance against figures) since it is not feasible to make them completely correct and complete using some formal modeling notation without making them too difficult for most readers to understand. Note: the multiplicities and possibly other information regarding the relationships between the terms are described in the text of the document. A complete and detailed conceptual model is planned to be develop later in either an informative annex of a further edition or a separate document.
246.	WG 1- 244	244	ED	5		295	Since there are no normative statements in Clause 5, it is informative	Change Clause 5 title to read, "Conceptual Foundations (informative)"		It is not necessary for normative clause to have requirements
247.	INC -245	245	ED	5		302	Most (all?) of the textual content of Clauses 5.2, and 5.3 appears to consist of terminological definitions that should be moved into and in several cases reconciled with the content of Clause 3	Move the content of Clauses 5.2 (and sub-clauses) and 5.3, that defines/redefines terminology into Clause 3. See below for details	AIP	The suggestions will be taken into account to revise the Clause 5.
248.	US- 246	246	GT	5		295	"Conceptual foundations" clause is 150% as large as its predecessor (12 pages vs. 8 pages in 2011 edition), despite moving a	Remove opinions, anecdotes and focus on articulating the concepts users need to		No specific recommendations.

1 **MB** = Member body / **NC** = National Committee (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by **)

2 **Type of comment:** **GT** = General Technical **TH** = Technical high **TL** = Technical Low **GE** = General Editorial **E** = Editorial

3 **Resolution code:** **OBE** = Superseded **AIP** = Agreed in principle **A** = Agreed R = Rejected **NA** = Non actionable

Disposition of Comments

Date: 30/09/2020	Document: ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 7 N 8181 (42010. CD1-v1.0)	Project: ISO/IEC/IEEE CD1 42010 (Ed2) Architecture description
----------------------------	---	--

2.	MB/ NC ¹	Cmt No	Type of Cmt ²	Clause/ Subcl.	Para/ Fig/ Tab/	Line No	Comments and rationale	Proposed change	Res code ³	Resolution on each comment received
							subclause "Uses of Architecture Description" to an annex, and despite no new user capability provided in this version. Much of the new material is anecdotal, unsubstantiated by reference to external sources or inaccurate. Many statements seem to be about an imaginary process that users of this standard need not utilize. See details in other comments.	understand the requirements in subsequent clauses.		
249.	INC-247	247	ED	05.2.4		385	Lines 385-386: Sentence on line 386 of itself is not grammatically sound; it only makes sense as a follow on sentence to the previous sentence on lines 384-385.	Suggest remove the paragraph mark between line 385 and line 386.	A	
250.	INC-248	248	TE	5		295	My observations from reading up to and including Section 5.2.6 have led me to the impression that the concept model as outlined through section 5 has never actually been validated through example 'instantiations'. I mean by that: populated by a small number of meaningful (albeit fictitious) real examples. This does not need to be done in a modelling tool, it can be done with populated tables, where the columns of tables represent concept model concepts, and the populated rows are the 'example instances'.	The EXAMPLES included are subsets of instances used to validate the concept model. This ensures: model has some level of validation; examples are consistent with the concept model; examples exhibit clear correspondence to the concept model for readers of the document.	AIP	We will improve the existing examples
251.	INC-249	249	TE	5..4.03		639	<i>"...or a unified underlying ontology (see Annex A.6.1 on projective and synthetic view creation approaches)."</i> <i>The referenced annex 6.1 doesn't actually mention "ontology" or "unified underlying ontology", just:</i>	Remove reference Or Explain relationship between unified underlying ontology and projective and synthetic view creation approaches	A	

1 **MB** = Member body / **NC** = National Committee (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by **)

2 **Type of comment:** **GT** = General Technical **TH** = Technical high **TL** = Technical Low **GE** = General Editorial **E** = Editorial

3 **Resolution code:** **OBE** = Superseded **AIP** = Agreed in principle **A** = Agreed R = Rejected **NA** = Non actionable

Disposition of Comments

Date: 30/09/2020	Document: ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 7 N 8181 (42010. CD1-v1.0)	Project: ISO/IEC/IEEE CD1 42010 (Ed2) Architecture description
----------------------------	---	--

	MB/ NC ¹	Cmt No	Type of Cmt ²	Clause/ Subcl.	Para/ Fig/ Tab/	Line No	Comments and rationale	Proposed change	Res code ³	Resolution on each comment received
252.							<i>"There are two common approaches to the construction of views: the synthetic approach [42] and the projective approach [16]..." I can't understand why this reference is included.</i>			
253.	INC -250	250	ED	5.1		298	Typo/Incorrect in-document reference "architecture description languages (see 5.3)"	"architecture description languages (see 5.4)"	A	
254.	JP2 -251	251	TE	5.1.2, 5.2.2	Both first line	304	Lines 304, 331: There are string "architecture entity" and "architecture of entity". "architecture of entity" seems to be strange. Need to be unified.	clarify the terms.	A	
255.	INC -252	252	GE	5.2		302	Heading is "Conceptual model of architecture description" where architecture description sounds like the *act* of describing a system. Whenever "an" or "the" is omitted, this error of omission can lead to misunderstanding about what is being referred to (ie, the act of describing or the work product).	Here and everywhere else where "architecture description" is by itself, change to read " <u>an</u> architecture description" or " <u>the</u> architecture description", as appropriate.	A	
255.	INC -253	253	TE	5.2		302	I'm puzzled by the change from using UML class diagrams (UML is an ISO standard) to "informal entity-relationship diagram notation". UML class diagrams are not massively different to the "informal" diagrams used here and I can see no obvious benefit in terms of helping to " <i>facilitate comprehension by readers of this document</i> ". The only obvious difference is the omission of multiplicities, which is a serious omission that represents a significant loss of information	Add multiplicities to all relationships on conceptual model diagrams.		These are conceptual models. They are not logical or physical models where multiplicity and instances are presented. Further, one doesn't need to be an UML or SysML expert to understand the model. The informal model provides clarity to the readers. For more clarity, its better to read the text.

1 **MB** = Member body / **NC** = National Committee (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by **)

2 **Type of comment:** **GT** = General Technical **TH** = Technical high **TL** = Technical Low **GE** = General Editorial **E** = Editorial

3 **Resolution code:** **OBE** = Superseded **AIP** = Agreed in principle **A** = Agreed R = Rejected **NA** = Non actionable

Disposition of Comments

Date: 30/09/2020	Document: ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 7 N 8181 (42010. CD1-v1.0)	Project: ISO/IEC/IEEE CD1 42010 (Ed2) Architecture description
----------------------------	---	--

2.	MB/ NC ¹	Cmt No	Type of Cmt ²	Clause/ Subcl.	Para/ Fig/ Tab/	Line No	Comments and rationale	Proposed change	Res code ³	Resolution on each comment received
256.							from the 2011 version. I don't really mind what notation is used (although UML seems an obvious choice) but multiplicities are essential.			
	INC -254	254	TE	5.2		302	This comment addresses the whole Conceptual Model section, 5.2.(see also my comments on line 633). Why are the figures only intended to be informative? The Conceptual Model should form the basis of the whole standard and be communicated unambiguously, not just informative. The Figures should stand as normative alongside the text, rather than being merely informative (and incomplete). All concepts and relationships should be represented (currently not even all the terms in the vocabulary of Section 3 appear on a diagram). There is precedent for this: ISO DIS 56000 (17/04/2019) "Innovation Management" Annex A.5 includes "concept diagrams on which the thematic groups of the innovation vocabulary are based." The relationships in this case are poorly specified, but at least the concept model stands as the basis of the vocabulary and not the other way round as in this draft. In my opinion, given the nature of the topic it addresses, ISO 42010 should be exemplary in this regard and set the bar for future standards. Instead it is communicates its underlying conceptual	Develop a rigorous conceptual model that is used as the basis of the standard, communicated unambiguously and without omission, and serves as normative in the standard.		One doesn't need to be an UML or SysML expert to understand the model. The conceptual model provides clarity to the readers. For more clarity, its better to read the text. See also WG 1-243

1 **MB** = Member body / **NC** = National Committee (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by **)

2 **Type of comment:** **GT** = General Technical

TH = Technical high

TL = Technical Low

GE = General Editorial

E = Editorial

3 **Resolution code:** **OBE** = Superseded

AIP = Agreed in principle

A = Agreed R = Rejected

NA = Non actionable

Disposition of Comments

1.

Date: 30/09/2020	Document: ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 7 N 8181 (42010. CD1-v1.0)	Project: ISO/IEC/IEEE CD1 42010 (Ed2) Architecture description
----------------------------	---	--

2.

257.

258.

259.

260.

MB/ NC ¹	Cmt No	Type of Cmt ²	Clause/ Subcl.	Para/ Fig/ Tab/	Line No	Comments and rationale	Proposed change	Res code ³	Resolution on each comment received
						model incompletely and inaccurately.			
WG 1- 255	255	ED	5.2.1		321	Ambiguous "entities" and using plural when only singular is shown in figure.	Change to read, "...pertaining to an entity of interest and its architecture as a context for..."	A	
WG 1- 256	256	TL	5.2.1		310	The quote from 15704 is the old version and needs to be the current version ISO 15704:2019.	Change to read, "enterprise as described in ISO 15704[10] i.e. human undertaking or venture that has explicit and clearly defined mission, goals, and objectives to offer products or services, or to achieve a desired project outcome or business outcome	A	
INC -257	257	TE	5.2.1		319	Mixing more general "entity" with specific "entity of interest". If discussion of entity of interest is intended, it should be introduced earlier in the paragraph. Recommendation is to keep it generalized to entities.	"....throughout the life cycle of that entity."	A	
INC -258	258	TE	5.2.1		315	Statement "The nature of entities is not defined by this document." is not justifiable. The document includes several assertions that constrain the scope of what an entity is: 106, 137 An entity [has an] architecture 107, 331 [An entity is comprised of] fundamental concepts and properties 108 [An architecture entity exhibits] characteristics such as feasibility, utility and maintainability (not clear if this also applies to more general types of entity) 125 [An entity undergoes a] life cycle 173, 236, 317 [An entity (not limited to an	Remove this statement Or Make a clear ontological commitment about the nature of entity (this option would be much better) – see also my comment to Line 223. entity: an arrangement of parts or elements that together exhibit behavior or meaning that the individual constituents do not Or, a fairly clunky definition of an entity can be constructed from the assertions in the text:	A	Remove the 1st statement.

1 **MB** = Member body / **NC** = National Committee (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by **)2 **Type of comment:** **GT** = General Technical**TH** = Technical high**TL** = Technical Low**GE** = General Editorial**E** = Editorial3 **Resolution code:** **OBE** = Superseded**AIP** = Agreed in principle**A** = Agreed R = Rejected**NA** = Non actionable

Disposition of Comments

1.

Date: 30/09/2020	Document: ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 7 N 8181 (42010. CD1-v1.0)	Project: ISO/IEC/IEEE CD1 42010 (Ed2) Architecture description
----------------------------	---	--

2.

MB/ NC ¹	Cmt No	Type of Cmt ²	Clause/ Subcl.	Para/ Fig/ Tab/	Line No	Comments and rationale	Proposed change	Res code ³	Resolution on each comment received
						<p>entity-of-interest) exists in] an environment</p> <p>174 [An entity is] realized and evolves</p> <p>219 [entities of interest are] tangible or conceptual (not clear if this also applies to more general types of entity, but c.f. 316)</p> <p>236 [entities] can influence other entities</p> <p>316 An entity can be a concrete entity or an abstract entity</p> <p>317 [an entity] influences and interacts with its environment and other entities (inconsistent language, presumably meant to mean the same as tangible or conceptual in line 219, also how is interact)</p> <p>333-4 [an entity has] constituent elements that may be interrelated or interact with each other and/or the environment</p> <p>336 [An entity exhibits] behaviour and structure</p> <p>337 [An entity may be] designed, used, executed and evolved</p> <p>337 [an entity may the subject of] principles</p> <p>How can the standard be considered normative if it fails to define the most fundamental thing that it refers to? How does deliberately avoiding doing so server the user of the standard?</p>	<p>An entity is a tangible, conceptual, concrete, or abstract thing composed of constituent interacting and interrelated elements that exhibits observable properties, including behaviour, structure and architecture, ,that exists within an identifiable environment, that can influence and/or interact with other entities, and that undergoes an identifiable lifecycle comprising, as a minimum. realization and evolution</p> <p>NOTE 1: An entity may be designed, used and/or executed</p>		
INC	259	ED	5.2.1		315	Lines 315-316: The sentence "The nature	Add an expansive definition for	OBE	OBE per INC-258. Since previous

261.

1 **MB** = Member body / **NC** = National Committee (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by **)

2 **Type of comment:** **GT** = General Technical

TH = Technical high

TL = Technical Low

GE = General Editorial

E = Editorial

3 **Resolution code:** **OBE** = Superseded

AIP = Agreed in principle

A = Agreed R = Rejected

NA = Non actionable

Disposition of Comments

Date: 30/09/2020	Document: ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 7 N 8181 (42010. CD1-v1.0)	Project: ISO/IEC/IEEE CD1 42010 (Ed2) Architecture description
----------------------------	---	--

	MB/ NC ¹	Cmt No	Type of Cmt ²	Clause/ Subcl.	Para/ Fig/ Tab/	Line No	Comments and rationale	Proposed change	Res code ³	Resolution on each comment received
1.							of entities is not defined by this document. Is immediately followed by, "An entity can be a concrete entity or an abstract entity."!	"entity" to Clause 3. (Or at least reconcile the two sentences to be mutually consistent!)		sentence is removed then there is now no conflict.
262.	INC -260	260	ED	5.2.1		306	The terminological item "fields of application" is defined in 5.2.1 rather than in Clause 3	Move the definition of "fields of application" to Clause 3		We do not need a formal definition for this term. It could be understood with the meaning provided by the common dictionaries.
263.	INC -261	261	TL	5.2.1		304	Lines 304-307: These lines redefine (alter) the definition "entity of interest" and "architecture entity" in 3.11	Move definitions of terms ("the term...") to Clause 3 and reconcile with existing content	A	No remaining occurrence of "architecture entity"; except one to refer to 42020.
264.	INC -262	262	ED	5.2.1		304	'entity of interest' is not hyphenated, cf line 136 (I will not flag up any other instances like this).	Be consistent. Ensure all uses of 'entity of interest' written as 'entity-of-interest'.	OBE	See WG42-002
265.	INC -263	263	TH	5.2.1	Fig 1	328	Figure is about context of an AD, which means those things external to the AD itself. However, AD elements are internal to the AD and are therefore not part of the context.	Remove "AD Elements" from this diagram. This item is already shown on Figure 6.	A	
266.	INC -264	264	TL	5.2.1	Fig 1	328	Shouldn't "Purpose of Architecture Effort" also "provide focus for" the "Architecture Description?" Or is the "architecture effort" really supposed to be the "Architecture description effort?"	Adjust diagram to show relationship between Purpose of the architecture effort and the architecture itself.	AIP	See US-269. Purpose of Architecture Effort changed to Purpose of Architecture Description.
267.	INC -265	265	TL	5.2.1	Fig 1	328	"AD Elements" should be defined in the Definitions section. Unclear how it relates to "architecture view component" or other concepts. Suggest eliminating the abbreviation and spelling it out explicitly.	Define in Definitions section. Spell out abbreviation "AD" in the diagram.	OBE	The relationship no longer exists as per the changes made to the figure.
268.	WG 1-	266	ED	5.2.1	Fig 1	329	The lead-in for this figure calls these "Key concepts"	Change Figure 1 title to "Key concepts of architecture"	OBE	The figure is redrawn

1 **MB** = Member body / **NC** = National Committee (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by **)

2 **Type of comment:** **GT** = General Technical **TH** = Technical high **TL** = Technical Low **GE** = General Editorial **E** = Editorial

3 **Resolution code:** **OBE** = Superseded **AIP** = Agreed in principle **A** = Agreed R = Rejected **NA** = Non actionable

Disposition of Comments

Date: 30/09/2020	Document: ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 7 N 8181 (42010. CD1-v1.0)	Project: ISO/IEC/IEEE CD1 42010 (Ed2) Architecture description
----------------------------	---	--

	MB/ NC ¹	Cmt No	Type of Cmt ²	Clause/ Subcl.	Para/ Fig/ Tab/	Line No	Comments and rationale	Proposed change	Res code ³	Resolution on each comment received
269.	266							description"		
270.	INC -267	267	ED	5.2.1	Fig 1	328	The AD element definition in section 5.2.8 describes that AD elements include instances of: stakeholder, concern, architecture consideration, etc. However the entity diagram does not show relationship between AD element entity to Architecture and Stakeholder entities.	Add a line (instance of) between AD element entity and Architecture entity. Also add a line between AD element entity (instance of) and Stakeholder element	OBE	The figure is redrawn
271.	GB- 268	268	ED	5.2.1	Fig 1	328	Should be 'AD element' not 'AD elements' as per other objects	Amend accordingly	OBE	The figure is redrawn
272.	US- 269	269	TE	5.2.1	Fig 1	328	There may not be any "architecture effort". The AD may have been chosen out of a library.	Change box label to: "Purpose of AD".		Purpose of AD is completely different from purpose of AD effort. We meant the later as it determines the context for the Architecture.
273.	INC -270	270	TE	5.2.1	Fig 2	328	Line 235 defines <i>environment</i> as "aggregate of surrounding things, conditions, contexts, or influences", yet Figure 2 only shows an aggregation of Contexts.	Add other parts of <i>environment</i> to diagram Or Change definition of environment to: 'aggregate of surrounding contexts'		Not all concepts are included in the informative context model
274.	WG 1- 271	271	TE	5.2.10		525	The sentence "Correspondence methods are used to enforce architecture relations within and between architecture descriptions." Does not belong in this sub-clause because it applies to the previous sub-clause as well.	Move this sentence to a Note in the new Clause 3 definition for the term 'correspondence' (see comment for line 505).	A	See INC-457
275.	WG 1- 272	272	TE	5.2.10		522	An AD correspondence does not define a relationship but it does identify a relationship.	Change 'defines' to 'identifies'.	A	
276.	INC -273	273	TL	5.2.10		521	Lines 521-530: Definition of terminological item, "AD correspondence", is missing from Clause 3	Add (move) definition to Clause 3	AIP	An entry is added to Clause to explain what Correspondence means for AD and AD Elements.
	GB- 274	274	TE	5.2.10		526	The examples are quite low level. Some	Add other examples	A	

1 **MB** = Member body / **NC** = National Committee (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by **)

2 **Type of comment:** **GT** = General Technical **TH** = Technical high **TL** = Technical Low **GE** = General Editorial **E** = Editorial

3 **Resolution code:** **OBE** = Superseded **AIP** = Agreed in principle **A** = Agreed R = Rejected **NA** = Non actionable

Disposition of Comments

Date: 30/09/2020	Document: ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 7 N 8181 (42010. CD1-v1.0)	Project: ISO/IEC/IEEE CD1 42010 (Ed2) Architecture description
----------------------------	---	--

	MB/ NC ¹	Cmt No	Type of Cmt ²	Clause/ Subcl.	Para/ Fig/ Tab/	Line No	Comments and rationale	Proposed change	Res code ³	Resolution on each comment received
	274						higher level examples include the relationships between a technical system and the organisation (and organisational structure) that produces it, between a product line architecture and a product architecture			
277.	GB-275	275	ED	5.2.10		521	AD correspondence is a higher level issue than AD element correspondence and therefore the order of these two sections should be changed	Swap 5.2.9 and 5.2.10	A	
278.	WG 1-276	276	TE	5.2.11		540	Using "other influences" implies the preceding list, i.e. concerns about, perspectives on, etc., are also influences of the environment, which may or may not be the case..	Delete the word "other" before the word "influences:..	A	
279.	INC-277	277	TL	5.2.11		546	Architecture decisions and rationale are typically involved in relation to addressing or solving problems. These problems are the ones mentioned in my previous comment. Problems are not found in this ISO outside of the appendices.	Add an entity "problem" (as proposed in my other comments) and add an entity "decision" and "rationale". A set of viewpoints "addresses" a problem, and "supports" decisions. Decisions "use" "rationale". The rationale are "reason" for the "viewpoints" to "address" the problem.		The propsed conceptual construction is valid; but not relevant to a Standard addressing Architecture Description. I.e. "Decision" and an related "Rationale" are relevant for a Standard addressing "Decision Making". The notion of "Problem" i, this standard is seen as one or more "concerns";
280.	INC-278	278	TE	5.2.11		551	After line 551: Additional examples of "Architecture decisions and rationale"	EXAMPLE 3: Modeling tool selections to align with related architectures (e.g., Customer's Enterprise Architecture) to ensure interoperability and traceability.	A	
281.	INC-279	279	ED	5.2.11		538	Lines 538, 546-552: Definition of terminological item, "Architecture rationale", is missing from Clause 3	Add (move) definition to Clause 3		There is no need to introduce a definition for Architecture rationale. It is not a key concept for AD.

1 **MB** = Member body / **NC** = National Committee (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by **)

2 **Type of comment:** **GT** = General Technical **TH** = Technical high **TL** = Technical Low **GE** = General Editorial **E** = Editorial

3 **Resolution code:** **OBE** = Superseded **AIP** = Agreed in principle **A** = Agreed R = Rejected **NA** = Non actionable

Disposition of Comments

Date: 30/09/2020	Document: ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 7 N 8181 (42010. CD1-v1.0)	Project: ISO/IEC/IEEE CD1 42010 (Ed2) Architecture description
----------------------------	---	--

	MB/ NC ¹	Cmt No	Type of Cmt ²	Clause/ Subcl.	Para/ Fig/ Tab/	Line No	Comments and rationale	Proposed change	Res code ³	Resolution on each comment received
282.	INC -280	280	ED	5.2.11		538	Lines 538-545: Definition of terminological item, "Architecture decisions", is missing from Clause 3	Add (move) definition to Clause 3		There is no need to introduce a definition for Architecture decisions. It is not a key concept for AD.
283.	GB- 281	281	TE	5.2.11		539	Lines 539-541 OR 542-545: Architecture decisions are broader than those cited. They include applicable patterns, style(s) to be applied, range of implementation technologies or other realisations to be considered, option sets to be considered etc.	Add to list	A	
284.	WG 1- 282	282	TE	5.2.2		340	Clarify meaning of concept "architecture description (AD) elements.	Change to read, "...more architecture description (AD) information objects and relationships among those objects (see 5.2.8)	OBE	AD element is now a term defined in clause 4
285.	WG 1- 283	283	ED	5.2.2		333	The use of "its" can be interpreted to refer to either "architecture" or "entity". Some list elements seem to be using "its" to refer to the architecture and some seem to be referring to the entity. Later, line 462, relationships are elements but not here. The Note preceding Figure 1 identified objects and relationships between objects.	Change line 332 to read, "With respect to an entity of interest, architecture can pertain to..." Remove "interrelationships from line 334. Designate elements consistently in the text using either 1) objects and relationships, or 2) entities, relationships, attributes, (see next comment suggestion)	A	changes to list and second part of comment resolved with new AD element definition
286.	INC -284	284	TL	5.2.2		344	The tiering of architecture LEVELS is different from having several architecture descriptions of one architecture. Both occasions required sets of architecture descriptions, one tiered in architecture-of-architecture layers, and the other as parts of a single architecture.	Add an explanation that an architecture description within an architecture may describe an embedded architecture in addition to just another context perspective. Or ...that a context perspective may include an embedded architecture as an		Unless we define what levels and tiers are, it is difficult for readers to comprehend. It is not necessary to introduce this text here.

1 **MB** = Member body / **NC** = National Committee (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by **)

2 **Type of comment:** **GT** = General Technical **TH** = Technical high **TL** = Technical Low **GE** = General Editorial **E** = Editorial

3 **Resolution code:** **OBE** = Superseded **AIP** = Agreed in principle **A** = Agreed R = Rejected **NA** = Non actionable

Disposition of Comments

Date: 30/09/2020	Document: ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 7 N 8181 (42010. CD1-v1.0)	Project: ISO/IEC/IEEE CD1 42010 (Ed2) Architecture description
----------------------------	---	--

2.	MB/ NC ¹	Cmt No	Type of Cmt ²	Clause/ Subcl.	Para/ Fig/ Tab/	Line No	Comments and rationale	Proposed change	Res code ³	Resolution on each comment received
287.								option along with these other stakeholder perspective. I.e. another stakeholder is the manager of, and the embedding of an internal component architecture.		
288.	INC -285	285	TL	5.2.2		344	If Stakeholder needs can drive the need for different Architecture Descriptions, suggest Fig 1 be updated to depict that linkage from Stakeholders directly to Architecture Descriptions, in addition to the current linkage from Stakeholders to the Architecture.	Adjust diagram to show relationship between Stakeholder and Architecture Description.		The figure does not capture all possible relationships between the concepts.
289.	INC -286	286	TL	5.2.2		339	An architecture MAY be composed of one or more architectures, which may also be composed of one or more architectures. Currently, in the UAF DMM, an "architecture description" element may be composed of multiple architectures, but those architectures cannot, then, be composed of more. This limits utility in the architecture description to organize complex and large enterprise architectures which include tiers of architecture use and management within them. The UAF-DMM interprets this section for architecture description that then limits the design of a multi-tiered architecture.	Add an explanation that an architecture is composed of one or more architectures, and that this composition may be tiered to one or more levels.		Unless we define what levels and tiers are, it is difficult for readers to comprehend. It is not necessary to introduce this text here.
290.	INC -287	287	ED	5.2.2		348	hyperlink not active for '[14]'	fix hyperlink	A	
	INC -288	288	ED	5.2.2		339	Lines 339-343: Redefines " <i>architecture description</i> " in 3.4 (using a lot more	Refine/rewrite definition in 3.4 and remove duplication in 5.2.2	OBE	See INC-111

1 **MB** = Member body / **NC** = National Committee (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by **)

2 **Type of comment:** **GT** = General Technical **TH** = Technical high **TL** = Technical Low **GE** = General Editorial **E** = Editorial

3 **Resolution code:** **OBE** = Superseded **AIP** = Agreed in principle **A** = Agreed R = Rejected **NA** = Non actionable

Disposition of Comments

Date: 30/09/2020	Document: ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 7 N 8181 (42010. CD1-v1.0)	Project: ISO/IEC/IEEE CD1 42010 (Ed2) Architecture description
----------------------------	---	--

	MB/ NC ¹	Cmt No	Type of Cmt ²	Clause/ Subcl.	Para/ Fig/ Tab/	Line No	Comments and rationale	Proposed change	Res code ³	Resolution on each comment received
291.	GB- 289	289	ED	5.2.2		342	words) Amend 'devised for a specific purpose' to 'devised for the specific purpose'	Amend accordingly	A	
292.	INC -290	290	TE	5.2.2	4	343	This paragraph introduces a new expression, which seems to be in conflict or confused with other terms. The new term is "architecture entity". Confusion arises when considering this term against other terms used here, such as "architecture of an entity". It is not clear whether "architecture entity" represents a new concept different from "architecture of an entity", or whether they are one in the same. If they are one in the same, then use the full term so as to avoid confusion on the part of the reader whether this is something new that is different from "architecture of an entity".	Change "architecture entity" to "architecture of an entity".	A	
293.	INC -291	291	TE	5.2.2	4	341	Lines 341-343: The phrase "an architecture description is devised for a specific purpose for which the architecting effort is undertaken" is confusing as to which purpose it is addressing. Is the purpose being addressed the purpose for devising an architecture description? Or is the purpose being discussed the purpose for undertaking the architecting effort? If the implication is that these two purposes are one in the same, I believe this is an incorrect implication. I believe these two activities could have completely different purposes. The sentence is awkwardly phrased and needs to be rewritten. It is	Change to: "As a work product, an architecture description is devised to support the specific purpose for which the architecting effort is undertaken, which is distinct from the purpose of the architecture entity itself.	A	

1 **MB** = Member body / **NC** = National Committee (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by **)

2 **Type of comment:** **GT** = General Technical **TH** = Technical high **TL** = Technical Low **GE** = General Editorial **E** = Editorial

3 **Resolution code:** **OBE** = Superseded **AIP** = Agreed in principle **A** = Agreed R = Rejected **NA** = Non actionable

Disposition of Comments

Date: 30/09/2020	Document: ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 7 N 8181 (42010. CD1-v1.0)	Project: ISO/IEC/IEEE CD1 42010 (Ed2) Architecture description
----------------------------	---	--

	MB/ NC ¹	Cmt No	Type of Cmt ²	Clause/ Subcl.	Para/ Fig/ Tab/	Line No	Comments and rationale	Proposed change	Res code ³	Resolution on each comment received
294.							not clear what was the intention of this sentence. I am offering one interpretation, based on what I believe was the actual intention.			
295.	INC -292	292	TE	5.2.2	5	347	What is meant by "entity specificity"? Is this referring to one of several possible configurations of the entity? Is this referring to Product Line Engineering? How do you explain this term? How do you expect the reader to interpret this term?	Refine the term "entity specificity" or remove the term.	AIP	Term is removed
296.	WG 1- 293	293	ED	5.2.3		372	Here and elsewhere, use of short names can lead to ambiguity.	Change "concerns" to 'stakeholder concerns' and 'entity's architecture' to 'architecture of the entity of interest'.		The short manes are not ambiguous in this sentence.
297.	WG 1- 294	294	TE	5.2.3		369	This sentence was a Note for the definition of concern in 42010:2011. Of importance is that the note implies that concerns are externalities only. The examples stated in the current definition are also externalities, which makes some sense because they originate from people generally external to the entity of interest observing its behaviour. However, internal concerns are also of importance.	Add sentence, "A concern also pertains to internal structural features and component interoperability within the entity of interest, which is particularly the case when architecting a system of systems like an enterprise."	AIP	Verbatim not included.
298.	WG 1- 295	295	ED	5.2.3		368	Just any entity or is entity of interest intended.	Change 'entity' to 'entity of interest'.	A	
	WG 1- 296	296	TE	5.2.3		355	This paragraph glosses over the nature of concerns as being something more than a casual interest or importance. Concerns relate to anxiety about a situation or a	Replace the sentence with, "Stakeholder concerns range over a wide spectrum of technical and personal interests	AIP	Add to Annex A.3 on Concerns.

1 **MB** = Member body / **NC** = National Committee (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by **)

2 **Type of comment:** **GT** = General Technical **TH** = Technical high **TL** = Technical Low **GE** = General Editorial **E** = Editorial

3 **Resolution code:** **OBE** = Superseded **AIP** = Agreed in principle **A** = Agreed R = Rejected **NA** = Non actionable

Disposition of Comments

Date: 30/09/2020	Document: ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 7 N 8181 (42010. CD1-v1.0)	Project: ISO/IEC/IEEE CD1 42010 (Ed2) Architecture description
----------------------------	---	--

2.	MB/ NC ¹	Cmt No	Type of Cmt ²	Clause/ Subcl.	Para/ Fig/ Tab/	Line No	Comments and rationale	Proposed change	Res code ³	Resolution on each comment received
299.							performance requirement and are often detailed questions to answer. The sentence beginning on line 354 and ending on line 355 simply restates the definition and therefore does not add value.	and are often narrowly focused or vaguely stated, necessitating further elaboration before the architecting effort can address them successfully.."		
	INC -297	297	TL	5.2.3		369	The use of the word "concern" in the context of ISO-42010 is confusing (and concerning), and is not clearly distinguished from a stakeholder perspective. The idea that a concern "pertains to an influence" is not supported in the English diction for "concern". Previously "Stakeholder Perspective" was given in line 346, and concern is being used somewhat interchangeably with that, as well as being held by a Stakeholder in the diagrams here (relationship is Has Particular). A stakeholder perspective and a stakeholder concern are two entirely different things. An "economic" concern in line 370 is really speaking of an "economic perspective" which may require multiple viewpoints to address. There is already a "stakeholder perspective" in this ISO, and so the distinction is blurred. When one says "economic" ... the context is perspective by default.	A concern is either an anxiety, or a charge-of-responsibility. Typically an architecture and its description serve to solve problems, which cause anxiety, and for which solutions need to be explained. An architecture seeks to determine and select solutions which address those problems through provision of things such as capabilities. There needs to be a concern (i.e. problem) which is addressed in sets of Viewpoints contained in the Architecture Description. This is a different kind of "concern" from the one in this ISO. In this ISO, the stakeholder "has [a] particular" concern and "has [a] particular" stakeholder perspective, but these two things are being used nearly synonymously. Merge these two concepts (concern and stakeholder perspective), and add a new entity called "Problem". Sets of architecture aspects (or	OBE	Comment has not read the definitions of Concern and Perspective

¹ **MB** = Member body / **NC** = National Committee (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by **)

² **Type of comment:** **GT** = General Technical

TH = Technical high

TL = Technical Low

GE = General Editorial

E = Editorial

³ **Resolution code:** **OBE** = Superseded

AIP = Agreed in principle

A = Agreed R = Rejected

NA = Non actionable

Disposition of Comments

Date: 30/09/2020	Document: ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 7 N 8181 (42010. CD1-v1.0)	Project: ISO/IEC/IEEE CD1 42010 (Ed2) Architecture description
----------------------------	---	--

2.	MB/ NC ¹	Cmt No	Type of Cmt ²	Clause/ Subcl.	Para/ Fig/ Tab/	Line No	Comments and rationale	Proposed change	Res code ³	Resolution on each comment received
300.								views) are required to address a problem. The stakeholder "has" a problem (in addition to perspectives), otherwise they usually don't care about an architecture to begin with.		
301.	INC -298	298	TL	5.2.3		355	Can't concerns be relative to an architecture description in addition to the architecture?	Replace with "Concerns are matters of interest or importance to one or more stakeholders to be addressed by an architecture or architecture description."	A	
302.	INC -299	299	TL	5.2.3		351	Can't stakeholders also have interests in the architecture description in addition to an entity and its architecture?	Replace with "Stakeholders are parties with interests in an entity, its architecture, or its architecture description."	A	Implemented: @ line 429
303.	INC -300	300	TE	5.2.3		380	After 380: Additional Examples of "Stakeholders and concerns"	EXAMPLE 4: An entity's ability to maintain confidentiality, integrity, and availability for protecting operations EXAMPLE 5: An entity's ability to support a seamless transition from a legacy capability to a modernized operational capability.	A	
	INC -301	301	TE	5.2.3		367	Why does "Quality Attribute" only appear once in this architecture standard (and that reference is in the Concerns discussion)? Seems like that would be of more significance than a single reference since QAs are frequently used to help understand and assess architectures, their goodness, and their ability to meet the objectives and needs of the Owner and	Add QA discussion and architectural decisions over its life in light of the stakeholder goals/objectives.	A	"Concerns can also manifest in recognition of dependencies, quality attributes, architecture decisions, risks or other issues."

1 **MB** = Member body / **NC** = National Committee (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by **)

2 **Type of comment:** **GT** = General Technical **TH** = Technical high **TL** = Technical Low **GE** = General Editorial **E** = Editorial

3 **Resolution code:** **OBE** = Superseded **AIP** = Agreed in principle **A** = Agreed R = Rejected **NA** = Non actionable

Disposition of Comments

Date: 30/09/2020	Document: ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 7 N 8181 (42010. CD1-v1.0)	Project: ISO/IEC/IEEE CD1 42010 (Ed2) Architecture description
----------------------------	---	--

2.	MB/ NC ¹	Cmt No	Type of Cmt ²	Clause/ Subcl.	Para/ Fig/ Tab/	Line No	Comments and rationale	Proposed change	Res code ³	Resolution on each comment received
304.							User stakeholders. We do encounter at 1255 A.5 Non-functional properties, but this seems to be light treatment and incomplete discussion of QAs - also it lacks describing how to use QAs in decision making related to architecture growth, development, and evolution.			
305.	INC-302	302	TL	5.2.3		372	<p>“The purpose of an architecture description will guide the identification of concerns to consider as potentially relevant to the entity’s architecture.” Should be a part of the definition of “<i>Architecture description</i>”</p> <p>Use of the definite article in this sentence implies that there is only one purpose for an architecture description (see also commentary for line 410).</p> <p>Cf. D.2, which provides a long list of potential uses of an AD, each of which could be considered a “purpose” by a stakeholder.</p>	Move this sentence to the definition of “Architecture description” in Clause 3, in doing so reflect the fact that an architecture description may have more than one purpose, possibly even when considered from the perspective of a single stakeholder.	OBE	See GB-309
305.	INC-303	303	TL	5.2.3		363	<p>Lines 363-368:</p> <p>1. The list of phases given in this paragraph are not a complete set of all possible lifecycle phases, and this should be made clear</p> <p>2. It is not clear whether the list of points in time given in this paragraph are exemplary points in time that should be considered in relation to concerns. For example, no reference is made to “transfer of ownership”, “disposal”,</p>	<p>Reword the paragraph to:</p> <p>1) make it clear the lists are non-exhaustive</p> <p>2) avoid mentioning specific points in time, and move them instead to a note, where clarification as to their exemplary nature may be provided</p> <p>3) Fix the grammatical error (already fixed in the above text) e.g.</p>	A	

1 **MB** = Member body / **NC** = National Committee (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by **)

2 **Type of comment:** **GT** = General Technical

TH = Technical high

TL = Technical Low

GE = General Editorial

E = Editorial

3 **Resolution code:** **OBE** = Superseded

AIP = Agreed in principle

A = Agreed R = Rejected

NA = Non actionable

Disposition of Comments

Date: 30/09/2020	Document: ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 7 N 8181 (42010. CD1-v1.0)	Project: ISO/IEC/IEEE CD1 42010 (Ed2) Architecture description
----------------------------	---	--

2.	MB/ NC ¹	Cmt No	Type of Cmt ²	Clause/ Subcl.	Para/ Fig/ Tab/	Line No	Comments and rationale	Proposed change	Res code ³	Resolution on each comment received
							<p>“decommissioning”, or (many) other points in time at which very specific and unique concerns might arise in relation to the entity.</p> <p>3. Lines 366-367 contain a grammatical error, “Concerns are also manifest regarding [...]”</p>	<p>“During the entity’s life cycle, concerns can arise from the assessment of needs and requirements in many phases, including (but not limited to) concerns arising for construction, from conceptualization, from design choices made, and these concerns may be in relation to any time in the entity’s life cycle. Concerns can manifest in many ways in relation to stakeholder’s needs, goals, expectations, responsibilities, requirements, design constraints and assumptions. Concerns may also manifest regarding dependencies, quality attributes, architecture decisions, risks or other issues pertaining to the entity.</p> <p>NOTE: Examples of times in the life cycle that may give rise to concerns include, but are not limited to implementation, deployment, operation, retirement, transfer of ownership, or disposal. Many other points in time may also be relevant for a given entity and may give rise to specific, unique concerns.”</p>		
306.	INC-304	304	ED	5.2.3		354	Lines 354-380: 5.2.3 redefines (alters) the definition of “ <i>Concern</i> ”	Move the (re)definition of ‘Concern’ into a single item in	OBE	See GB-311

1 **MB** = Member body / **NC** = National Committee (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by **)

2 **Type of comment:** **GT** = General Technical **TH** = Technical high **TL** = Technical Low **GE** = General Editorial **E** = Editorial

3 **Resolution code:** **OBE** = Superseded **AIP** = Agreed in principle **A** = Agreed R = Rejected **NA** = Non actionable

Disposition of Comments

Date:
30/09/2020Document:
ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 7 N 8181
(42010. CD1-v1.0)Project:
ISO/IEC/IEEE CD1 42010 (Ed2) Architecture
description

	MB/ NC ¹	Cmt No	Type of Cmt ²	Clause/ Subcl.	Para/ Fig/ Tab/	Line No	Comments and rationale	Proposed change	Res code ³	Resolution on each comment received
307.	INC-305	305	ED	5.2.3		351	Lines 351-354: 5.2.3 redefines (alters) the definition of “ <i>Stakeholder</i> ”	Move the (re)definition of ‘Stakeholder’ into a single item in Clause 3	AIP	The paragraph is now significantly updated and is no longer a strict copy of the definition.
308.	INC-306	306	TE	5.2.3		352	Lines 352-253: Stakeholders need not be aware of the thing of interest or its architecture.	A stakeholder's interests are typically expressed as concerns about an entity or the architecture of which they are impacted		Interest here includes those who are affected or impacted by the entity or its architecture
309.	INC-307	307	TE	5.2.3		351	Stakeholders need not have an interest in the architecture or the thing, they may be unaware of it for example, stakeholders such as the legal who impart requirements, concerns, and perspectives of a legal matter that are not dependent upon the legal stakeholder being aware of the thing or its architecture.	<i>Stakeholders</i> are parties that have influence or control or are impacted by either an entity or its architecture	AIP	Keep the definition as it is and elaborate in addition to this definition. Nevertheless, here, interest in this case means any kind of influence. No need to change.
310.	GB-308	308	TE	5.2.3		378	Lines 378/380: Example is incorrect. These are not ‘ilities’ they may be operational concerns though	Delete	OBE	See FRA-1035
311.	GB-309	309	ED	5.2.3		372	Lines 372/375: Excess verbage with unclear meaning	Delete	A	
312.	GB-310	310	ED	5.2.3		369	Lines 369/371: Move text to below text ‘Concerns are . . .’ to improve structure	Amend accordingly	OBE	See INC 303
313.	GB-311	311	ED	5.2.3		354	Lines 354/355: Extract sentence ‘Concerns are . . .’ and place in separate paragraph immediately below to improve readability	Amend accordingly	A	New paragraph
314.	INC-312	312	TL	5.2.3	3	363	Lines 363-365: Suggest rewriting for clarity (parallel construction)	During the entity's life cycle, concerns can arise at any time from implementation, deployment, operation and retirement. Concerns may be	AIP	Proposal is incorporated to existing text.

1 MB = Member body / NC = National Committee (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by **)

2 Type of comment: GT = General Technical

TH = Technical high

TL = Technical Low

GE = General Editorial

E = Editorial

3 Resolution code: OBE = Superseded

AIP = Agreed in principle

A = Agreed R = Rejected

NA = Non actionable

Disposition of Comments

Date:
30/09/2020Document:
ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 7 N 8181
(42010. CD1-v1.0)Project:
ISO/IEC/IEEE CD1 42010 (Ed2) Architecture
description

2.	MB/ NC ¹	Cmt No	Type of Cmt ²	Clause/ Subcl.	Para/ Fig/ Tab/	Line No	Comments and rationale	Proposed change	Res code ³	Resolution on each comment received
315.								recognized as a result of the assessment of needs and requirements for construction, conceptualization, or from design choices made.		
	INC-313	313	ED	5.2.3	5	372	Lines 372-380: I am having difficulty understanding this paragraph. Suggest rewriting for clarity. I took a stab, but I may have misunderstood the paragraph.	The architecture description's purpose will guide the identification of concerns to consider. For an existing operational entity, concerns related to its original conceptualization are most likely to be of significance for a new use and least likely to be significant for architecting an end-of-life salvage. Examples of concerns are listed below.	OBE	See GB-309
316.	IT-3-314	314	TE	5.2.3		376	Consider the sentence in Clause 1 ISO/IEC 25010 [13] concerning: ISO/IEC 25012 contains a model for data quality that is complimentary to this model	Add EXAMPLE 4 Data qualities as described in Clause 4 of ISO/IEC 25012:2008 [13.2].	A	
317.	US-315	315	TE	5.2.3		376	These are not very representative examples. The list in previous edition was more helpful for actual users. Why is that list removed?	Replace examples with: The following are concerns in the terms of this document: functionality, feasibility, usage, system purposes, system features, system properties, known limitations, structure, behavior, performance, resource utilization, reliability, security, information assurance, complexity, evolvability, openness, concurrency,		A quality by itself is not a concern. There is always some information pertaining to the quality that makes it a concern. What has been present earlier were a list which were of different types (privacy, business goals for eg). This made everything as concern which is not the case in practice. The present examples are specific concerns from different practical cases and hence more relevant

1 MB = Member body / NC = National Committee (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by **)

2 Type of comment: GT = General Technical

TH = Technical high

TL = Technical Low

GE = General Editorial

E = Editorial

3 Resolution code: OBE = Superseded

AIP = Agreed in principle

A = Agreed R = Rejected

NA = Non actionable

Disposition of Comments

Date: 30/09/2020	Document: ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 7 N 8181 (42010. CD1-v1.0)	Project: ISO/IEC/IEEE CD1 42010 (Ed2) Architecture description
----------------------------	---	--

2.	MB/ NC ¹	Cmt No	Type of Cmt ²	Clause/ Subcl.	Para/ Fig/ Tab/	Line No	Comments and rationale	Proposed change	Res code ³	Resolution on each comment received
								autonomy, cost, schedule, quality of service, flexibility, agility, modifiability, modularity, control, inter-process communication, deadlock, state change, subsystem integration, data accessibility, privacy, compliance to regulation, assurance, business goals and strategies, customer experience, maintainability, affordability and disposability		
318.	INC -316	316	TE	5.2.3	2	358	Lines 358-362: The examples presented in this paragraph all represent protagonists. The reader should be given the opportunity to also consider antagonists.	Add to this paragraph, or add an additional paragraph that addresses antagonists. For example, add "Some stakeholders may be interested in impeding the developmental progress of the entity of interest. These stakeholders may have disagreements on the grounds of political or environmental considerations, or may seek active disruption of the entity's operations, or even outright destruction of the entity. Consideration for these adversarial interests should be taken into account when developing the architecture of the entity. For example, political objections could be resolved by incorporating a negotiated	A	

1 **MB** = Member body / **NC** = National Committee (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by **)

2 **Type of comment:** **GT** = General Technical **TH** = Technical high **TL** = Technical Low **GE** = General Editorial **E** = Editorial

3 **Resolution code:** **OBE** = Superseded **AIP** = Agreed in principle **A** = Agreed R = Rejected **NA** = Non actionable

Disposition of Comments

Date: 30/09/2020	Document: ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 7 N 8181 (42010. CD1-v1.0)	Project: ISO/IEC/IEEE CD1 42010 (Ed2) Architecture description
----------------------------	---	--

2.	MB/ NC ¹	Cmt No	Type of Cmt ²	Clause/ Subcl.	Para/ Fig/ Tab/	Line No	Comments and rationale	Proposed change	Res code ³	Resolution on each comment received
319.								solution in the architecture of the entity, or threats could be mitigated by taking preventative measures."		
320.	WG 1- 317	317	ED	5.2.4		415	Incomplete sentence and fragmented phrasing.	Change to read, "When no relevant prior experience exists for the field ...associated architecture description, stakeholders and their....polices, etc.) serve as the basis for the architecture description."	OBE	The entire paragraph has been removed in the rewrite.
321.	WG 1- 318	318	TE	5.2.4		404	The statement "Concerns serve as a primary input to stakeholder perspectives" is wrong. Perspective affect concern statements, not the other way around. A stakeholder does not identify a concern and then adopt a perspective supporting that concern. A stakeholder, because of their perspective (role, responsibility, expertise, etc.), expresses a concern. This statement seems to be conflating AD development with particular ADF representations. Also see sentence at 406 that gives the proper relationship between concerns and perspectives.	Change to read, "Because concerns arise from stakeholder perspectives, concerns are often arranged in various ways into nominal stakeholder perspectives for the purpose of categorization by..." In figure 2 delete the relationship between stakeholder perspective and concern labelled as "affects" here a elsewhere it appears.	AIP	1) Relationship reversed and changed to results in. 2) Text updated
321.	WG 1- 319	319	TE	5.2.4		389	This lead-in the Figure 2 and the figure itself indicate a process for "devising an architecture description". The figure relationship labels are a mix of verbs and propositions causing confusion about that process.	Change sentence to read< "Figure 2 depicts the relationships among concerns, ... perspective as utilized in an architecture description." Change the relationship in Figure 2 between architecture description and architecture from	A	

1 **MB** = Member body / **NC** = National Committee (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by **)

2 **Type of comment:** **GT** = General Technical **TH** = Technical high **TL** = Technical Low **GE** = General Editorial **E** = Editorial

3 **Resolution code:** **OBE** = Superseded **AIP** = Agreed in principle **A** = Agreed R = Rejected **NA** = Non actionable

Disposition of Comments

Date:
30/09/2020Document:
ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 7 N 8181
(42010. CD1-v1.0)Project:
ISO/IEC/IEEE CD1 42010 (Ed2) Architecture
description

2.	MB/ NC ¹	Cmt No	Type of Cmt ²	Clause/ Subcl.	Para/ Fig/ Tab/	Line No	Comments and rationale	Proposed change	Res code ³	Resolution on each comment received
322.	WG 1- 320	320	ED	5.2.4		386	To make sense, this sentence needs elaboration with respect to subjective and objective.	'expresses' to "is expression of". Change to read, "Generally speaking, concerns of a stakeholder tend to be subjective because they arise from a stakeholder's perspective, which may include both factual and prospective thinking, while architecture aspects are more objective because they arise from agreements among experts about practice in a domain and therefore are presumed to be best practice."	A	Merged with WG1 320 proposal
323.	WG 1- 321	321	TE	5.2.4		381	This sub-clause has too much focus on ADF representation. If aspects and perspectives are only being included to support ADF explanations, then they belong in that context. However, both architecture aspects and stakeholder perspectives are central constructs to an effective AD. Each of the foundational concepts should be a separate sub-clause and a integrating sub-clause added to support the entire conceptual model of an AD. Also see last slide of Concerns are complicated PowerPoint titled "Value stream of architecting information flow"	Refactor the presentation of concepts into separate sub-clauses for each foundational concept. Add a sub-clause that presents the entire conceptual model and another sub-clause that provides a development oriented context for an AD so that the reader can understand how the concepts fit together during development of the AD. (No text is provided for this suggestion because of the effort entailed that is wasted unless the need is agreed, in which case text can be written and provided.)	A	
324.	IR0 5-	322	TE	5.2.4		403	Architecture aspects are groupings of concerns, as it explained in text, so it	Move Architecture Aspects definition to paragraph 5.2.3.	A	

1 MB = Member body / NC = National Committee (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by **)

2 Type of comment: GT = General Technical TH = Technical high TL = Technical Low GE = General Editorial E = Editorial

3 Resolution code: OBE = Superseded AIP = Agreed in principle A = Agreed R = Rejected NA = Non actionable

Disposition of Comments

Date:
30/09/2020Document:
ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 7 N 8181
(42010. CD1-v1.0)Project:
ISO/IEC/IEEE CD1 42010 (Ed2) Architecture
description

2.	MB/ NC ¹	Cmt No	Type of Cmt ²	Clause/ Subcl.	Para/ Fig/ Tab/ Line No	Comments and rationale	Proposed change	Res code ³	Resolution on each comment received
	322					makes sense to introduce this concept right after "concern" concept.			
325.	IR0 4- 323	323	TE	5.2.4	402	Classification of architectural elements into structural and behavioral elements and further classification of structural elements into active and passive elements, is getting quite common among EA community. There is no example referring to this classification as possible architecture aspects.	Add an example illustrating "active structural, behavioral and passive structural elements" classification of architectural elements, as an instance of architecture aspects notion.	A	
326.	IR0 2- 324	324	ED	5.2.4	389	This paragraph (and, Fig. 2) includes a reference to "stakeholder perspectives" concept, that has not defined yet.	It would be better to move the paragraph and the related figure after lines 403-407.	AIP	Reorder the paragraphs; but better to have this sentence before the figure 2.
327.	IR0 1- 325	325	TE	5.2.4	386	As Architecture is a conceptual construct by definition (3.2), it could not have any objective property <i>per se</i> , so it is not accurate to state that architecture aspects are more <i>objective</i> .	Considering that, for a specific architecture, concerns are very subjective (in relation to a single stakeholder), while aspects are related to a group of stakeholders.	OBE	See WG 1-320 Aspects are related to group of architecture features or characteristics
328.	INC -326	326	TL	5.2.4	419	Missing additional place where prior experience is captured.	Add to end of sentence "... and this is commonly captured in an ADF for a particular domain."	OBE	The entire paragraph has been removed in the rewrite.
329.	INC -327	327	TL	5.2.4	408	In example for an industrial production system, not clear who a "functional" stakeholder could be. Perhaps should use a different example, such as a financial stakeholder perspective which would be more pertinent example for this case.	Change functional to financial	A	
330.	INC -328	328	TL	5.2.4	386	Unclear what "Considering that, for a specific architecture," means or adds. Not apparent why concerns are necessarily subjective in nature.	Delete this sentence.	OBE	See WG 1-320
331.	INC	329	ED	5.2.4	386	Odd grammar in sentence:	Recommend changing to:	OBE	See WG 1-320

1 MB = Member body / NC = National Committee (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by **)

2 Type of comment: GT = General Technical

TH = Technical high

TL = Technical Low

GE = General Editorial

E = Editorial

3 Resolution code: OBE = Superseded

AIP = Agreed in principle

A = Agreed R = Rejected

NA = Non actionable

Disposition of Comments

Date: 30/09/2020	Document: ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 7 N 8181 (42010. CD1-v1.0)	Project: ISO/IEC/IEEE CD1 42010 (Ed2) Architecture description
----------------------------	---	--

2.	MB/ NC ¹	Cmt No	Type of Cmt ²	Clause/ Subcl.	Para/ Fig/ Tab/	Line No	Comments and rationale	Proposed change	Res code ³	Resolution on each comment received
	-329						Considering that, for a specific architecture, concerns are very subjective while aspects are more objective.	'Considering that, concerns for a specific architecture are very subjective while aspects are more objective.		
332.	INC -330	330	ED	5.2.4		415	The sentence is incomplete. Proposed change is in red. The proposed change properly links this sentence to the one on line 418.	Where no relevant prior experience exists for the field of application...	OBE	The entire paragraph has been removed in the rewrite.
333.	INC -331	331	TE	5.2.4		410	Text says "purpose of the architecture description affects their perspectives", but this is not shown in figure 2	What is shown in figure 2 is that "concern of the architecture description affects their perspectives" As stated on 372 "The purpose of an architecture description will guide the identification of concerns" So maybe the text should say "the purpose of an architecture description will guide the identification of concerns which affects their perspectives"	A	
334.	INC -332	332	ED	5.2.4		418	Typo: Missing comma in "policies etc."	Fix typo: "policies, etc."	OBE	The entire paragraph has been removed in the rewrite.
335.	INC -333	333	ED	5.2.4		410	"For all stakeholders, the purpose of the architecture description affects their perspectives" Use of the definite article in this sentence implies that (for a given stakeholder) there is only one purpose for an architecture description (see also commentary for lines 372-373). Cf. D.2, which provides a long list of potential uses of an AD, each of which	Move this sentence to the definition of "Architecture description" in Clause 3, in doing so reflect the fact that an architecture description may have more than one purpose, possibly even when considered from the perspective of a single stakeholder.		The sentence provides an explanation. This cannot be considered as a part of a definition.

1 **MB** = Member body / **NC** = National Committee (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by **)

2 **Type of comment:** **GT** = General Technical **TH** = Technical high **TL** = Technical Low **GE** = General Editorial **E** = Editorial

3 **Resolution code:** **OBE** = Superseded **AIP** = Agreed in principle **A** = Agreed R = Rejected **NA** = Non actionable

Disposition of Comments

Date: 30/09/2020	Document: ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 7 N 8181 (42010. CD1-v1.0)	Project: ISO/IEC/IEEE CD1 42010 (Ed2) Architecture description
----------------------------	---	--

	MB/ NC ¹	Cmt No	Type of Cmt ²	Clause/ Subcl.	Para/ Fig/ Tab/	Line No	Comments and rationale	Proposed change	Res code ³	Resolution on each comment received
336.	INC -334	334	ED	5.2.4		403	could be considered a “purpose” by a stakeholder. Lines 403-409: These lines redefine (alter) the definition of “ <i>Stakeholder perspective</i> ” in 3.16	Refine/rewrite definition in 3.16 and remove duplication in 5.2.4	AIP	The reiteration of the definition improves the readability. Prefer to retain it.
337.	INC -335	335	ED	5.2.4		382	Lines 382-386, 397-402: Defines a new terminological item “ <i>Architecture aspect</i> ”	Move to clause 3		The readability of the section improves if we include the definition here. This has been a practice adopted with other terms and in 42010:2011 too.
338.	INC -336	336	ED	5.2.4		415	To improve readability suggest adding additional words to the start of the sentence	Add “there is” between “Where” and “no relevant”	OBE	The entire paragraph has been removed in the rewrite.
339.	INC -337	337	ED	5.2.4		389	Bold text has been used for “Figure 2” which is inconsistent with the other times “Figure X” has been used	Remove bold from “Figure 2”	A	
340.	INC -338	338	TE	5.2.4		408	Functionality - So I could have a functional concern, a functional aspect and a functional perspective. How would these differ? This would make a good example!	Note that a stakeholder may have functional concerns, which would be addressed by functional structures (eg functional blocks), which embody the property of functionality.	OBE	See INC 327
341.	INC -339	339	TE	5.2.4		403	Ways of thinking - Well, so are aspects, aren't they?	Architecture perspectives are combinations of structural type and compatible properties, selected because of their relevance to stakeholders.		Architecture perspective is not a concept used in this standard
342.	INC -340	340	TE	5.2.4		398	Lines 398-400: There appears to be a confusion between what is a property of the architecture and what is a type of structure. Things like cost, value, performance (and functionality) are properties. Things like functional, logical	Replace this list of examples with examples that are purely type of structure, eg: - Functional hierarchy or breakdown structure - Physical hierarchy or	OBE	See GB-349

1 **MB** = Member body / **NC** = National Committee (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by **)

2 **Type of comment:** **GT** = General Technical

TH = Technical high

TL = Technical Low

GE = General Editorial

E = Editorial

3 **Resolution code:** **OBE** = Superseded

AIP = Agreed in principle

A = Agreed R = Rejected

NA = Non actionable

Disposition of Comments

Date:
30/09/2020Document:
ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 7 N 8181
(42010. CD1-v1.0)Project:
ISO/IEC/IEEE CD1 42010 (Ed2) Architecture
description

2.	MB/ NC ¹	Cmt No	Type of Cmt ²	Clause/ Subcl.	Para/ Fig/ Tab/	Line No	Comments and rationale	Proposed change	Res code ³	Resolution on each comment received
							or physical are types of structure.	breakdown structure - Cost breakdown structure		
343.	INC-341	341	ED	5.2.4		391	Repeats earlier note (not numbered)	Remove note.	OBE	See INC-168
344.	INC-342	342	TE	5.2.4		386	Doesn't make sense in English. Also unclear how an aspect is objective, when architecture itself is subjective. It would appear that features and properties are included as examples of aspects below.	Each type of structure is associated with at least one property, namely its type.	OBE	See WG 1-320
345.	INC-343	343	TE	5.2.4		382	Why typical? Types of?	Architecture aspects are types of structure found in architectures. [Delete second sentence.]	OBE	See WG42-004. The definition as changed and this sentence is removed.
346.	GB-344	344	TE	5.2.4		419	Prior experience in architecture description is encapsulated and organised using aspects.	Delete 'and particular stakeholder perspectives'	OBE	The entire paragraph has been removed in the rewrite.
347.	GB-345	345	TE	5.2.4		403	Lines 403-414: Text is not relevant to aspects but to stakeholders and their concerns	Move text to 5.2.3	A	
348.	GB-346	346	TE	5.2.4		401	Lines 401-402: See GB re 395. Examples of aspects concerning a network architecture description include functional, behavioural, physical arrangement/configuration, performance, security, dependability	Amend example	A	
349.	GB-347	347	TE	5.2.4		400	See GB re 395. Examples of aspects concerning computer system architecture description include functionality, behavioural, physical arrangement, performance, operability	Amend example	A	
350.	GB-348	348	TE	5.2.4		399	See GB re 395. Examples of aspects concerning hospitality services architecture description include	Amend example	A	

1 **MB** = Member body / **NC** = National Committee (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by **)2 **Type of comment:** **GT** = General Technical**TH** = Technical high**TL** = Technical Low**GE** = General Editorial**E** = Editorial3 **Resolution code:** **OBE** = Superseded**AIP** = Agreed in principle**A** = Agreed R = Rejected**NA** = Non actionable

Disposition of Comments

Date: 30/09/2020	Document: ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 7 N 8181 (42010. CD1-v1.0)	Project: ISO/IEC/IEEE CD1 42010 (Ed2) Architecture description
----------------------------	---	--

	MB/ NC ¹	Cmt No	Type of Cmt ²	Clause/ Subcl.	Para/ Fig/ Tab/	Line No	Comments and rationale	Proposed change	Res code ³	Resolution on each comment received
351.	GB-349	349	TE	5.2.4		398	functionality, accessibility, responsiveness, quality of service, cost See GB re 395. Examples of aspects concerning an aircraft architecture description include spatial, structural, functionality, networking, computing.	Amend example	A	
352.	GB-350	350	TE	5.2.4		381	Line 381 et seq: The whole of this section now constitutes an amalgamation of different notions of 'aspect' – see James Martin/Tim Rabbets proposal for a revision. This contains material from which a substantially revised section can be devised and which is more compatible with common notions of aspect being used elsewhere.	Replace section using material extracted from proposal.	A	
353.	GB-351	351	TE	5.2.4		381	Architecture aspects are not related to stakeholder perspectives. Amend title accordingly	Remove reference to stakeholder perspectives	A	
354.	US-352	352	TE	5.2.4		381	Why are Aspects and Perspectives presented in the same subclause? Is there an implied relationship there?	Make a single subclause, Architecture considerations , within which Concern, Aspect, Perspective are explained: both their similarities and differences.	AIP	Separate Aspect and Perspective into separate subclauses
355.	US-353	353	TE	5.2.4		383	What does "architecture aspects relate to relevant emerging or expressed concerns" mean? What are the possible relations between aspects and concerns? How does this standard capture those relationships if at all?	Please clarify what is meant, or remove.	OBE	See IN 935
356.	US-354	354	TE	5.2.4		384	This statement is not limited to aspects, but true of ANY known architecture considerations. Is this an oversight or mistake?	Change to "Usage of known architecture considerations..."	OBE	See WG42-004. The definition as changed of architecture aspect has changed.

1 **MB** = Member body / **NC** = National Committee (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by **)

2 **Type of comment:** **GT** = General Technical **TH** = Technical high **TL** = Technical Low **GE** = General Editorial **E** = Editorial

3 **Resolution code:** **OBE** = Superseded **AIP** = Agreed in principle **A** = Agreed R = Rejected **NA** = Non actionable

Disposition of Comments

Date: 30/09/2020	Document: ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 7 N 8181 (42010. CD1-v1.0)	Project: ISO/IEC/IEEE CD1 42010 (Ed2) Architecture description
----------------------------	---	--

2.	MB/ NC ¹	Cmt No	Type of Cmt ²	Clause/ Subcl.	Para/ Fig/ Tab/	Line No	Comments and rationale	Proposed change	Res code ³	Resolution on each comment received
357.	US-355	355	TE	5.2.4		386	This statement is blatantly false! How would a user of this standard determine the subjectivity/objectivity of any consideration? There is no basis in the text. Given the current definitions, it seems objectivity/subjectivity is irrelevant or orthogonal to aspects/concerns/perspectives. To support this claim, different definitions would be required.	Delete sentence.	OBE	See WG 1-320
358.	US-356	356	TE	5.2.4		389	Statement is incorrect: figure does not show how these are <i>used</i> . According to Clause 6, architecture considerations are used to select viewpoints and model kinds, but this picture shows no usage at all.	Delete sentence.	OBE	See WG1 319
359.	US-357	357	TE	5.2.4		403	The focus in this statement is inconsistent with the definition (3.16). Is the focus on the entity? Its architecture? Either?	Clarify whether definition is intended as is, or needs to be modified to handle this case.	OBE	See GB-345
360.	US-358	358	TE	5.2.4		404	Concerns are “an input” to perspectives? Does this standard require some relation between Concerns and Perspectives to be documented in a conforming AD? Although this is a process issue, I would have thought that Stakeholder Perspectives are “prior” to Concerns. The very next statement (406) also implies Perspectives are prior and Concerns result from those (differing) Perspectives. See also statement at 410. These concepts really need to be cleaned up.	Clarify relation between Concern and Perspective, if any. In doing so, please avoid “process speak” in a document that is process neutral.	OBE	See WG1-318
361.	US-	359	TE	5.2.4		410	“For all stakeholders, the purpose of the	Remove incorrect part of	A	

1 **MB** = Member body / **NC** = National Committee (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by **)

2 **Type of comment:** **GT** = General Technical **TH** = Technical high **TL** = Technical Low **GE** = General Editorial **E** = Editorial

3 **Resolution code:** **OBE** = Superseded **AIP** = Agreed in principle **A** = Agreed R = Rejected **NA** = Non actionable

Disposition of Comments

Date: 30/09/2020	Document: ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 7 N 8181 (42010. CD1-v1.0)	Project: ISO/IEC/IEEE CD1 42010 (Ed2) Architecture description
----------------------------	---	--

2.	MB/ NC ¹	Cmt No	Type of Cmt ²	Clause/ Subcl.	Para/ Fig/ Tab/	Line No	Comments and rationale	Proposed change	Res code ³	Resolution on each comment received
	359						architecture description affects their perspectives...” Many stakeholders are not even aware of an AD, let alone its purpose, but are nevertheless key stakeholders (of an entity of interest). In extreme cases, it may be that only the Architect knows “the purpose of the AD”. This statement is therefore incorrect in its generalization to all stakeholders.	statement that all stakeholders’ perspectives are affected by the purpose of an AD. That perspectives shape concerns is OK.		
362.	US-360	360	TE	5.2.4		418	This text suggests that aspects and perspectives can be prior knowledge, but concerns cannot be. Is that the intent? This is neither borne out by experience nor reflected in the definitions. Experienced stakeholders frequently have prior experiences that lead to recurring, known concerns.	Fix statement regarding which kinds of considerations can be result of prior experience. The answer seems to be all three.	OBE	The entire paragraph has been removed in the rewrite.
363.	INC-361	361	ED	5.2.4	Ex 1	398	There is no full stop at the end of the sentence which is inconsistent with the other similar lines in this section	Add full stop to the end of the sentence	A	
364.	US-362	362	TE	5.2.4	Ex 1 – 4	398	These examples of aspects clearly show a mix of subjective and objective considerations (cf. US @ 386).	Correct the claim made @386.		No proposal for change
365.	INC-363	363	ED	5.2.4	Ex 2	399	There is no full stop at the end of the sentence which is inconsistent with the other similar lines in this section	Add full stop to the end of the sentence	A	
366.	INC-364	364	ED	5.2.4	Ex 5	408	There is no full stop at the end of the sentence which is inconsistent with the other similar lines in this section	Add full stop to the end of the sentence	A	
367.	INC-365	365	ED	5.2.4	Ex 6	409	There is no full stop at the end of the sentence which is inconsistent with the other similar lines in this section	Add full stop to the end of the sentence	A	

1 **MB** = Member body / **NC** = National Committee (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by **)

2 **Type of comment:** **GT** = General Technical

TH = Technical high

TL = Technical Low

GE = General Editorial

E = Editorial

3 **Resolution code:** **OBE** = Superseded

AIP = Agreed in principle

A = Agreed R = Rejected

NA = Non actionable

Disposition of Comments

Date: 30/09/2020	Document: ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 7 N 8181 (42010. CD1-v1.0)	Project: ISO/IEC/IEEE CD1 42010 (Ed2) Architecture description
----------------------------	---	--

	MB/ NC ¹	Cmt No	Type of Cmt ²	Clause/ Subcl.	Para/ Fig/ Tab/	Line No	Comments and rationale	Proposed change	Res code ³	Resolution on each comment received
368.	WG 1- 366	366	TE	5.2.4	Fig 2	395	The relationship label in the figure are not the ones used in the text. Alignment of figure labels and w=phrasing in the text assure the intent of the text is captured in the figure. While figures are informative, they are very often the only part of the standard actually used and need to reflect the text as closely as possible.	Align Figure relationship labels to text, e.g. 'has particular' between 'stakeholder' and 'concern' is 'possess one or more than one'. Change relationship "shapes" to "determines expression of" here and elsewhere it appears.	OBE	Conceptual model has been updated
369.	IR0 3- 367	367	TE	5.2.4	Fig 2	395	Concerns are related to both Stakeholders and Entity of interest. In fact, each Concern is meaningful only in relationship between a Stakeholder and an Entity of interest. So Concern should be connected to Entity of interest, directly. In fact, each concern lays only on the relation between a stakeholder and an entity and forms a productive entity between two concepts. (Same is true for stakeholder perspective.)	Fig 2. To be redrawn to show Concern as middle concept between Entity and Stakeholder.	OBE	Conceptual model has been updated
370.	INC -368	368	TE	5.2.4	Fig 2	395	In Section 5.2.4, several relationships between architecture aspects and stakeholder concerns are developed. For example, "Collectively architecture aspects relate to relevant emerging or expressed concerns of stakeholders..." Yet, there is no indication of any relationship between architecture aspects and stakeholder concerns in Figure 2.	Include at least one relationship between architecture aspects and stakeholder concerns in Figure 1. For example, "Architecture Aspect <u>relate to</u> Concern"	AIP	Conceptual model has been updated and relationship between aspect and concern added
371.	INC -369	369	TE	5.2.4	Fig 2	396	Does not help clarify relationship between concern and architecture or perspective and architecture.	Redraw diagram as per attached.	OBE	Conceptual model has been updated
372.	GB- 370	370	TE	5.2.4	Fig 2	395	Architecture aspect is an organizing basis for architecture description. This is the key relationship for aspect i.e. not with	Delete link from aspect to architecture and replace with relationship from aspect to	OBE	Conceptual model has been updated

1 **MB** = Member body / **NC** = National Committee (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by **)

2 **Type of comment:** **GT** = General Technical **TH** = Technical high **TL** = Technical Low **GE** = General Editorial **E** = Editorial

3 **Resolution code:** **OBE** = Superseded **AIP** = Agreed in principle **A** = Agreed R = Rejected **NA** = Non actionable

Disposition of Comments

Date:
30/09/2020Document:
ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 7 N 8181
(42010. CD1-v1.0)Project:
ISO/IEC/IEEE CD1 42010 (Ed2) Architecture
description

1.

2.

373.

374.

375.

376.

377.

378.

MB/ NC ¹	Cmt No	Type of Cmt ²	Clause/ Subcl.	Para/ Fig/ Tab/	Line No	Comments and rationale	Proposed change	Res code ³	Resolution on each comment received
						architecture	architecture description		
US-371	371	TE	5.2.4	Fig 2	395	Text does not explain the relations Perspective shapes/affects Concern. Is there any normative text affected by this relationship? Why is it here?	Explain the relations, similarities and differences among the three kinds of Architecture Considerations.	AIP	Text has been improved
INC-372	372	ED	5.2.4	Para 15	412	Missing a period between "training" and "Importantly". Also delete Oxford comma to be consistent with most of the rest of document.	"perspective is the result of domain knowledge, professional experience and training. Importantly, the"	A	
INC-373	373	TE	5.2.4	15	410	Lines 410-411: I would disagree that for "all stakeholders" the purpose of the architecture description affects their perspectives. I believe there can be one or more stakeholders who are totally unaware that an architecture description even exists. For example, I would seriously doubt that regulators, taxpayers, certifying agents, and markets (from Subclause 3.15) care about or are even aware that an architecture description exists.	Change "all stakeholders" to "all stakeholders that have concerns about the architecture description".	AIP	The purpose of the AD affects the perspectives of some stakeholders.
INC-374	374	ED	5.2.4	Para 16	415	Lines 415-416: Missing verb "exists" in the first sentence of this paragraph.	Add "exists" after "Where no relevant prior experience for the field of application, the sort of entity of interest, or the form and style of architecture being devised..."	OBE	The entire paragraph has been removed in the rewrite.
WG 1-375	375	ED	5.2.5		430	There is no need to repeat this Note for every figure.	Add this Note as a footnote to Figure 1 and delete it elsewhere.	OBE	See INC-168
WG 1-376	376	TE	5.2.5		426	Sentence beginning "Architecture considerations may be..." is a representational topic, not a conceptual	Move sentence to Clause on ADF or other sub-clause on representation of architecture	AIP	Delete the sentence

1 MB = Member body / NC = National Committee (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by **)

2 Type of comment: GT = General Technical

TH = Technical high

TL = Technical Low

GE = General Editorial

E = Editorial

3 Resolution code: OBE = Superseded

AIP = Agreed in principle

A = Agreed R = Rejected

NA = Non actionable

Disposition of Comments

Date:
30/09/2020Document:
ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 7 N 8181
(42010. CD1-v1.0)Project:
ISO/IEC/IEEE CD1 42010 (Ed2) Architecture
description

2.	MB/ NC ¹	Cmt No	Type of Cmt ²	Clause/ Subcl.	Para/ Fig/ Tab/	Line No	Comments and rationale	Proposed change	Res code ³	Resolution on each comment received
379.	WG 1- 377	377	ED	5.2.5		423	foundation topic. The 'architecture' modifier serves no purpose.	considerations. Change to read, "...different kinds of considerations when developing an architecture description."	A	
380.	INC -378	378	TE	5.2.5		427	After line 427: Add examples of "Architecture considerations"	EXAMPLE 1: Transition Support from legacy to modernized capability EXAMPLE 2: Adherence to Customer directed Tools and Standards EXAMPLE 3: Information Assurance / Cybersecurity considerations	OBE	See WG42-007. Architecture considerations has been deprecated. There is no need to add examples.
381.	INC -379	379	ED	5.2.5		424	"As a work product, an architecture description addresses a set of architecture considerations." This sentence omits to mention the role of the architecture view 'between' the AD and the architecture considerations. Once this is included then the content of this sentence belongs in 3.7.	Refine/rewrite definition(s) in 3.7 and remove duplication in 5.2.5, e.g. "3.7 architecture view information item that addresses one or more architecture considerations (3.3) and makes up part of an architecture description (3.4)."	AIP	Delete the sentence. No need to change the definition of architecture view.
382.	INC -380	380	ED	5.2.5		420	Lines 420-423: These lines redefine (alter) the definition of " <i>Architecture considerations</i> " in 3.3	Refine/rewrite definition in 3.3 and remove duplication in 5.2.5	OBE	See WG42-007, architecture considerations no longer defined in clause 3.
383.	GB- 381	381	TE	5.2.5		424	Architecture aspects serve as an organizing basis for architecture description based upon prior experience. The address likely architecture considerations singly or collectively employing architecture viewpoints to	Insert after first sentence	AIP	Insert "Architecture concerns, perspectives and aspects can serve as an organizing basis for AD."

1 **MB** = Member body / **NC** = National Committee (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by **)2 **Type of comment:** **GT** = General Technical**TH** = Technical high**TL** = Technical Low**GE** = General Editorial**E** = Editorial3 **Resolution code:** **OBE** = Superseded**AIP** = Agreed in principle**A** = Agreed R = Rejected**NA** = Non actionable

Disposition of Comments

1.

Date: 30/09/2020	Document: ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 7 N 8181 (42010. CD1-v1.0)	Project: ISO/IEC/IEEE CD1 42010 (Ed2) Architecture description
----------------------------	---	--

2.

384.

385.

386.

387.

388.

MB/ NC ¹	Cmt No	Type of Cmt ²	Clause/ Subcl.	Para/ Fig/ Tab/	Line No	Comments and rationale	Proposed change	Res code ³	Resolution on each comment received
						express the architecture description.			
GB- 382	382	TE	5.2.5		422	Lines 422-423: Concerns, aspects and stakeholder perspectives are some of various architecture considerations. They are different in nature – see James Marin/Tim Rabbets proposal. Considerations may be beholder related (concerns, stakeholder perspectives) or subject-related (i.e. architecture description-related)	Amend to 'Concerns (see 5.2.3), stakeholder perspectives (see 5.2.3), and aspects (see 5.2.4) are different architectural considerations.	A	
US- 383	383	TE	5.2.5		422	Document has not explained how the 3 kinds of consideration are different. Are they used differently? Are they interchangeable? Can Operating Cost be one stakeholder's concern, another's aspect and yet another's perspective? How do the definitions support these distinctions?	Explain differences between considerations, whether they can overlap, etc. Make any changes to the definitions to reflect these differences.	AIP	Definition of architecture consideration removed (per WG42-007). The clarification is already provided as part of the definition of concerns, aspects and perspectives. There is no need to reiterate as part of architecture considerations section
INC -384	384	ED	5.2.5	Fig 3	435	Misleading scope of Figure. Not about a single consideration but rather multiple considerations.	Change figure title to "Architecture considerations"	OBE	The figure on architecture considerations has been removed.
INC -385	385	TL	5.2.5	Fig 3	430	It is my conclusion that the distinction between "concern", "architecture consideration" and "stakeholder perspective" is not clear. I agree with Figure three that a Concern (in this ISO) is a kind of Architecture Consideration. But a Concern is NOT a kind of Consideration in English diction. A consideration is merely a thought.	Merge "concern" and "stakeholder perspective" unless they can be more clearly distinguished.	AIP	See new definition of aspect, perspective and concern. Check updates of these concepts in clause 5 where the distinction has been made clear. Architecture consideration is no longer treated as a first class concept and dropped from clause 3.
GB- 386	386	TE	5.2.5	Fig 3	434	'Architecture aspect' is an organizing basis for 'architecture description'	Replace relationship between aspect and architecture consideration with 'addresses a	OBE	Architecture consideration has been deprecated and no longer exists in the figure.

1 **MB** = Member body / **NC** = National Committee (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by **)

2 **Type of comment:** **GT** = General Technical **TH** = Technical high **TL** = Technical Low **GE** = General Editorial **E** = Editorial

3 **Resolution code:** **OBE** = Superseded **AIP** = Agreed in principle **A** = Agreed R = Rejected **NA** = Non actionable

Disposition of Comments

Date:
30/09/2020Document:
ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 7 N 8181
(42010. CD1-v1.0)Project:
ISO/IEC/IEEE CD1 42010 (Ed2) Architecture
description

2.	MB/ NC ¹	Cmt No	Type of Cmt ²	Clause/ Subcl.	Para/ Fig/ Tab/	Line No	Comments and rationale	Proposed change	Res code ³	Resolution on each comment received
389.	US-387	387	TE	5.2.5	Fig 3	434	What are the relations between Perspective and Aspect? Between Aspect and Concern?	category of Add relations to explain differences between Perspective/Aspect, and Aspect/Concern. If these considerations are to be distinct, this figure should help readers understand those distinctions.	AIP	1) Figure has been updated to better reflect the relationships. 2) Text has been improved and necessary clarifications provided in clause 5
390.	JP3-388	388	TE	5.2.5	first line	421	There is a description "in architecting and in creating architecture". "architecting" includes the "creating architecture" so this description is redundant.	change the description to "in architecturing".	AIP	Change to "when Architecting"
391.	WG 1-389	389	ED	5.2.6		468	"specify the view elements specified used when"?	Delete "specified".	A	
392.	WG 1-390	390	ED	5.2.6		467	The transition from conventions to view methods is missing.	Change to read, "Among the viewpoint's conventions are view methods that specify..."	A	
393.	WG 1-391	391	TE	5.2.6		462	'how' implies process – confusing sentence structure	Change to read, "Using a meta-model or other conventions, the viewpoint specifies the manner in which elements (e.g. entities, relationships, attributes) are used when creating a view by applying that viewpoint."	A	
394.	WG 1-392	392	ED	5.2.6		459	This sentence is confusing because of phrase structure..	Change to read, "Distinct from requirements for product acceptance, architecture views can define requirements for the entity of interest that result from satisfaction of architecture considerations."	A	
395.	WG	393	TE	5.2.6		450	In 42010:2011 this sentence began	Change "dimensions" to "facet",	A	

1 MB = Member body / NC = National Committee (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by **)

2 Type of comment: GT = General Technical TH = Technical high TL = Technical Low GE = General Editorial E = Editorial

3 Resolution code: OBE = Superseded AIP = Agreed in principle A = Agreed R = Rejected NA = Non actionable

Disposition of Comments

Date:
30/09/2020Document:
ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 7 N 8181
(42010. CD1-v1.0)Project:
ISO/IEC/IEEE CD1 42010 (Ed2) Architecture
description

2.	MB/ NC ¹	Cmt No	Type of Cmt ²	Clause/ Subcl.	Para/ Fig/ Tab/	Line No	Comments and rationale	Proposed change	Res code ³	Resolution on each comment received
	1- 393						"There are two aspects to an architecture description". While the word 'aspect' has a distinguished meaning in this document, so does the word "dimension" in the context of ADF.	which is not otherwise used in this document.		
396.	WG 1- 394	394	ED	5.2.6		450	Is "views", a plural form, correct here?	Change "views" to "view" for consistency with the rest of the paragraph		We have changed all usage of architecture view to architecture views in this section.
397.	WG 1- 395	395	ED	5.2.6		446	There is no need to repeat this Note for every figure.	Add this Note as a footnote to Figure 1 and delete it elsewhere.	OBE	See INC-168
398.	WG 1- 396	396	TE	5.2.6		440	What viewpoint specifies such a view and what concerns does that viewpoint address? This view as stated is well beyond comprehension as resulting from a separation of concerns. It calls for a system architecture description with many viewpoints and views.	Provide an example that better exemplifies the granularity of a view and the concerns its viewpoint addresses, e.g. concern: what authentication will suffice for use of our software application? With view for two factor authentication protocol.	A	Examples 1 and 2 have been added to bring in more clarity.
399.	WG 1- 397	397	TE	5.2.6		437	The notion that a viewpoint can do all of the things listed is too much for an information item to accomplish precisely because it has very limited access to other viewpoints as a result of the separation of concerns – integration and interoperability become difficult to understand in isolation. This is a general problem of the AD approach as conceptualized in 42010 and it needs addressing – saying they are "concerns" is far too simplistic a response to the problem.	Add a sub-clause that presents a plausible means by which an AD assembles/integrates its various views into a coherent description of the whole entity of interest – something far more complete than a collections of parts.	AIP	1) Any discussion of the means should be the subject of 42020 and not this standard as it deals with only the conceptual elements of an AD. 2) The definitions of viewpoint and views have been updated in clause 3. Specification of viewpoints and Views have been introduced to better address the comment.
400.	INC -398	398	TL	5.2.6		453	The sentence "The architecture viewpoint ... to be addressed by an architecture	Replace "to be addressed by an architecture view" with "to be	AIP	Replace by "The architecture viewpoint identifies the specific

1 **MB** = Member body / **NC** = National Committee (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by **)2 **Type of comment:** **GT** = General Technical**TH** = Technical high**TL** = Technical Low**GE** = General Editorial**E** = Editorial3 **Resolution code:** **OBE** = Superseded**AIP** = Agreed in principle**A** = Agreed R = Rejected**NA** = Non actionable

Disposition of Comments

Date: 30/09/2020	Document: ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 7 N 8181 (42010. CD1-v1.0)	Project: ISO/IEC/IEEE CD1 42010 (Ed2) Architecture description
----------------------------	---	--

2.	MB/ NC ¹	Cmt No	Type of Cmt ²	Clause/ Subcl.	Para/ Fig/ Tab/	Line No	Comments and rationale	Proposed change	Res code ³	Resolution on each comment received
							view." may be too narrowly framed, perpetuating the misperception that a single viewpoint can only govern a single view. The following sentences use the word "views" but this sentence uses the word "view," which could be interpreted as an inconsistency.	addressed by one or more architecture views."		architecture aspects and concerns to be reflected in one or more architecture views"
401.	INC -399	399	ED	5.2.6		467	Lines 467-472: Definition of terminological item "View method" is missing from Clause 3.	Add (move) definition to Clause 3		View methods are one of the methods used in architecting. Not all concepts are defined in clause 3. There is no need to include view methods.
402.	INC -400	400	ED	5.2.6		462	This line refers to "e.g. entities, [...]" does this mean "architecture entities"? If not, would the word "artefacts" be better to avoid potential confusion?	Clarify text/change wording to match the intended meaning.		This means entities in the common dictionary sense. In this document, entity of interest is used to refer to architecture entities.
403.	INC -401	401	ED	5.2.6		436	Lines 436-445: Redefines (duplicates and extends) the definitions of "architecture view" and "architecture viewpoint" in Clauses 3.7 and 3.8	Refine/rewrite definition(s) in 3.7 and 3.8 and remove duplication in 5.2.5	AIP	Definitions have been updated in clause 3.
404.	INC -402	402	ED	5.2.6		463	The way the "see X" has been done is different to the way it has been done elsewhere in the document	Add "(see 5.2.8)" after "the viewpoint"	A	
405.	INC -403	403	TE	5.2.6		452	Architecture viewpoint - ie aspect, concern or perspective. It could be drawn more directly.	An architecture viewpoint is a model of an architecture perspective. [See attached diagram.]		The proposal is not elaborated enough to allow the 42010 editors to understand what you would like to express. I.e. with the current definition of "perspective" given by clause 3 and the definition of model we can find in common dictionaries, it is not possible to understand what "model of perspective" could mean.
406.	GB-	404	ED	5.2.6		468	'specified' is superfluous	remove	A	

1 **MB** = Member body / **NC** = National Committee (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by **)

2 **Type of comment:** **GT** = General Technical

TH = Technical high

TL = Technical Low

GE = General Editorial

E = Editorial

3 **Resolution code:** **OBE** = Superseded

AIP = Agreed in principle

A = Agreed R = Rejected

NA = Non actionable

Disposition of Comments

Date: 30/09/2020	Document: ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 7 N 8181 (42010. CD1-v1.0)	Project: ISO/IEC/IEEE CD1 42010 (Ed2) Architecture description
----------------------------	---	--

	MB/ NC ¹	Cmt No	Type of Cmt ²	Clause/ Subcl.	Para/ Fig/ Tab/	Line No	Comments and rationale	Proposed change	Res code ³	Resolution on each comment received
404.	404									
407.	GB-405	405	TE	5.2.6		467	'design rules' should be 'expression rules'	Amend accordingly	A	
408.	GB-406	406	ED	5.2.6		459	Lines 459-460: English 'Architecture views can be used to define requirements for the entity of interest, distinct from those for work product acceptance, resulting from satisfaction of architecture considerations'	Requirements for the entity of interest and its architecture can be devised from the architecture views.	OBE	See WG1-392
409.	GB-407	407	TE	5.2.6		453	Lines 453-454: The architecture viewpoint identifies the specific architecture aspects, concerns and stakeholder perspective(s) to be addressed by an architecture view	An architecture viewpoint identifies associated architecture considerations. Specific considerations relating to an architecture are addressable through the corresponding views.	OBE	Architecture considerations has been deprecated and is no longer identified by viewpoints.
410.	GB-408	408	TE	5.2.6		452	Lines 452 -453: 'An architecture viewpoint frames one or more architecture considerations . . .'. Viewpoints may be used to formally express, analyse or assess considerations multiply, wholly or partially. In fact I think that the relationship is often partial. Viewpoints are used to describe but also for analysis and assessment (e.g. in support of AEFs as per 42030)	Amend accordingly	OBE	Architecture consideration has been deprecated and is no longer included as part of views or viewpoints.
411.	US-409	409	TE	5.2.6		459	While permissible, using architecture views to express requirements seems like an edge case, rather than a motivating example. None of the examples above fall into this case. It is much more common to use architecture views to express how requirements will be solved or met. For the naïve reader, it is more important to	US representative will provide better examples to WG.		The sentence states that views can be used to define requirements and not that the view itself defines requirements. No example received from US Rep.

1 **MB** = Member body / **NC** = National Committee (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by **)

2 **Type of comment:** **GT** = General Technical **TH** = Technical high **TL** = Technical Low **GE** = General Editorial **E** = Editorial

3 **Resolution code:** **OBE** = Superseded **AIP** = Agreed in principle **A** = Agreed R = Rejected **NA** = Non actionable

Disposition of Comments

Date: 30/09/2020	Document: ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 7 N 8181 (42010. CD1-v1.0)	Project: ISO/IEC/IEEE CD1 42010 (Ed2) Architecture description
----------------------------	---	--

	MB/ NC ¹	Cmt No	Type of Cmt ²	Clause/ Subcl.	Para/ Fig/ Tab/	Line No	Comments and rationale	Proposed change	Res code ³	Resolution on each comment received
1.							convey these cases than an edge case.			
412.	US-410	410	TE	5.2.6		460	Traceability would be better discussed as a case for using Correspondences later in this Clause.	Move traceability example to 5.29, since traceability is an example usage of Correspondences.	A	
413.	US-411	411	ED	5.2.6		462	Change "elements" to "AD elements".	Change "elements" to "AD elements".	A	
414.	US-412	412	TE	5.2.6	Ex 1, 2, 4	440	Instead of brief texts purporting to be examples of views, it would be better to have an actual view, conforming to all requirements of the standard, in an annex.	Create an actual example in an annex.		Providing a consistent example is more the purpose of a guide.
415.	INC-413	413	TH	5.2.6	Fig 4	450	Viewpoint does not really "frame" stakeholder perspective. More accurate to say the VP addresses the perspective.	Change AVP <addresses> Stakeholder Perspective	OBE	The conceptual figure has been changed. There is no relationship between stakeholder perspective and AVP expressed in the figure
416.	INC-414	414	TH	5.2.6	Fig 4	450	Viewpoint does not really "frame" an architecture aspect. More accurate to say the VP addresses the aspect.	Change AVP <addresses> Architecture Aspect	OBE	The conceptual figure has been changed. There is no relationship between architecture aspect and AVP expressed in the figure
417.	WG 1-415	415	TH	5.2.6	Fig 4	444	This lead-in the Figure 4 and the figure itself indicate a process for "devising an architecture description". The figure relationship labels are a mix of active and passive verb forms causing confusion about that process. An alternative for these figures is to make all of the relationship labels single word active voice verbs or passive voice verb forms. Difficulties in identifying suitable consistent verb forms within a figure could indicate that the figures, and thus the concepts they contain, are from different extents of abstraction, i.e. concepts and	Change sentence to read<"Figure 4 depicts the relationships among architecture views and architecture viewpoints as utilized in an architecture description." Change the relationship in Figure 4 between architecture description and architecture from 'expresses' to 'is expression of', delete the relationship labelled "affects" and change label "shapes" to "determines expression of", and label	AIP	The conceptual model has been updated and corresponding text updated to better reflect alignment of the verb forms.

1 **MB** = Member body / **NC** = National Committee (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by **)

2 **Type of comment:** **GT** = General Technical **TH** = Technical high **TL** = Technical Low **GE** = General Editorial **E** = Editorial

3 **Resolution code:** **OBE** = Superseded **AIP** = Agreed in principle **A** = Agreed R = Rejected **NA** = Non actionable

Disposition of Comments

Date: 30/09/2020	Document: ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 7 N 8181 (42010. CD1-v1.0)	Project: ISO/IEC/IEEE CD1 42010 (Ed2) Architecture description
----------------------------	---	--

	MB/ NC ¹	Cmt No	Type of Cmt ²	Clause/ Subcl.	Para/ Fig/ Tab/	Line No	Comments and rationale	Proposed change	Res code ³	Resolution on each comment received
418.							meta-concepts of two distinct languages for talking about the specification of architecture descriptions.	"frames" to "is framed by"		
419.	GB-416	416	TE	5.2.6	Fig 4	450	Amend relationships concerning 'architecture aspect' to: 'Architecture aspect' is an organizing basis for 'architecture description' 'Architecture aspect' is a category of 'consideration' In fact aspect is more closely related to viewpoint than it is to view. To address this properly we may need to differentiate between specific and generic considerations. Concerns tend to be specific. Aspects and stakeholder perspectives tend to be generic.	Amend accordingly	OBE	The disposition text is: The conceptual figure has been changed. The relationship between aspects, concerns, stakeholder perspectives, viewpoints and views has changed. The corresponding text has been updated.
420.	US-417	417	TE	5.2.6	Fig 4	450	Despite the caption, most of this figure has nothing to do with views and viewpoints.	Focus diagram on Consideration, Viewpoint, View, Model Kind View Component and AD Element. Remove items above Consideration in the diagram. These have been discussed in previous figures.	OBE	Considerations is no longer part of the conceptual model or terms and definitions. The corresponding figure has been removed.
421.	INC-418	418	ED	5.2.6	Last	468	Remove the second specified from "These methods specify the view elements specified used..."	These methods specify the view elements used.....	A	
422.	INC-419	419	ED	5.2.6	NOT E 3	473	This note refers to "Clause 8.3", while no other reference of the form "x.y" makes use of the word "Clause"	Harmonise all "x.y" in-document references, either all should use "Clause", or none should	A	"Clause" refers to the whole clause. X.y refers to a subclause.
	INC-420	420	ED	5.2.6	Para 10	468	The first portion of this sentence either doesn't make sense or is very difficult to understand. Needs to be reworded for clarity. "specify/specified" and "method"	"These methods describe the process to interrogate or query ..."	OBE	See WG1 389

1 **MB** = Member body / **NC** = National Committee (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by **)

2 **Type of comment:** **GT** = General Technical **TH** = Technical high **TL** = Technical Low **GE** = General Editorial **E** = Editorial

3 **Resolution code:** **OBE** = Superseded **AIP** = Agreed in principle **A** = Agreed R = Rejected **NA** = Non actionable

Disposition of Comments

Date:
30/09/2020Document:
ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 7 N 8181
(42010. CD1-v1.0)Project:
ISO/IEC/IEEE CD1 42010 (Ed2) Architecture
description

2.	MB/ NC ¹	Cmt No	Type of Cmt ²	Clause/ Subcl.	Para/ Fig/ Tab/	Line No	Comments and rationale	Proposed change	Res code ³	Resolution on each comment received
423.	INC -421	421	ED	5.2.6	Para 10	470	are overused. Use of "the" in "when creating extensions to the metamodel" implies foreknowledge of this metamodel on the part of the reader of this document, where no such foreknowledge is made available in this document. The wording should be changed to be more general, to prevent the reader believing they missed something about "the" metamodel somewhere earlier in the document.	Change "when creating extensions to the metamodel" to "when creating extensions to a metamodel".	A	
424.	INC -422	422	ED	5.2.6	Para 10	468	Malformed grammar (dual verbs).	Change "These methods specify the view elements specified used" to "These methods specify the view elements used..." (remove "specified").	A	
425.	WG 1- 423	423	ED	5.2.7		484	See prior comments about this repeated Note	See prior suggestion regarding these repeated Notes.	OBE	See INC-168
426.	WG 1- 424	424	ED	5.2.7		482	Poor sentence structure.	Change to read, "... components and from where such view components may be sourced."	A	
427.	WG 1- 425	425	ED	5.2.7		477	Incorrect preposition used	Change "used in" to "used for"	OBE	The text no longer exists.
428.	INC -426	426	TL	5.2.7		477	Replace "sort" with "category" if "kind" is too circular.	Replace "sort of model" with "category of model."	A	
429.	INC -427	427	ED	5.2.7		475	Lines 475-479: (Re-)definition of " <i>model kind</i> " (3.14), introduction of terminological items " <i>legend</i> " and " <i>model</i> "	Rewrite 3.14, remove duplication from 5.2.7 Add (move) definitions of "legend" and "model" to Clause 3	OBE	Definitions are updated.
430.	INC	428	ED	5.2.7		474	Lines 474-481: Definition of terminological	Add (move) definition to Clause	A	

1 MB = Member body / NC = National Committee (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by **)

2 Type of comment: GT = General Technical

TH = Technical high

TL = Technical Low

GE = General Editorial

E = Editorial

3 Resolution code: OBE = Superseded

AIP = Agreed in principle

A = Agreed R = Rejected

NA = Non actionable

Disposition of Comments

Date: 30/09/2020	Document: ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 7 N 8181 (42010. CD1-v1.0)	Project: ISO/IEC/IEEE CD1 42010 (Ed2) Architecture description
----------------------------	---	--

	MB/ NC ¹	Cmt No	Type of Cmt ²	Clause/ Subcl.	Para/ Fig/ Tab/	Line No	Comments and rationale	Proposed change	Res code ³	Resolution on each comment received
2.							item, "Architecture view components", is missing from Clause 3	3		
431.	INC -429	429	ED	5.2.7		484	Not sure we need these warnings each time.	Delete warning	OBE	See INC-168
432.	GB- 430	430	TE	5.2.7		481	A specific flow diagram can be a component of a functional view for a particular architecture. A tabulation of what is the corresponding viewpoint ((static) functional viewpoint of an architecture) and what you call the elements of flow diagrams would be useful. The specific architectural elements expressed in view components are likely to feature several such view components e.g. in a static functional view, a dynamic functional view etc.	Amend accordingly, or illustrate with an exemplar so that users understand where in the hierarchy of 42010-defined concepts elements such as a standard diagram or an element featuring is such a diagram sit. UML could be used	OBE	Other proposed changes and contributions of the coauthors already extended this example to be more consistent. See INC-432.
433.	WG 1- 431	431	TE	5.2.7	Fig 5	488	This figure does not agree with text above it.	Redraw figure to agree with text. Delete the following relationships – "AVP governs AV" (it is superfluous here), "Model kind constrains View component" {that is governance), and "Legend is used in View component" (actually part of AVP). Add relationship "AVP specifies Legend" to complete the correspondence to text..	A	
434.	INC -432	432	TE	5.2.7	1	481	This paragraph exemplifies the confusion regarding the definition of "model kind". It seems to me that a flow diagram would be an example of a model kind, and that a component of a flow diagram (such as a block) would be an example of an	Change "A flow diagram can be a component of a functional view" to "A block in a flow diagram can be a component of a functional view"	AIP	Replace the example with "A data flow diagram can be a view component of a functional view. A separate control flow diagram can be a second view component in the same functional view. The functional

1 **MB** = Member body / **NC** = National Committee (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by **)

2 **Type of comment:** **GT** = General Technical **TH** = Technical high **TL** = Technical Low **GE** = General Editorial **E** = Editorial

3 **Resolution code:** **OBE** = Superseded **AIP** = Agreed in principle **A** = Agreed R = Rejected **NA** = Non actionable

Disposition of Comments

Date: 30/09/2020	Document: ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 7 N 8181 (42010. CD1-v1.0)	Project: ISO/IEC/IEEE CD1 42010 (Ed2) Architecture description
----------------------------	---	--

2.	MB/ NC ¹	Cmt No	Type of Cmt ²	Clause/ Subcl.	Para/ Fig/ Tab/	Line No	Comments and rationale	Proposed change	Res code ³	Resolution on each comment received
							architecture view component. If this is correct, then a flow diagram is not a component of a functional view. However, a block (or some other component of a flow diagram model kind) would be a component of a functional view.			view can also contain a narrative that explains how to interpret the flow diagrams in the view. The flow diagrams are model based while the narrative is not."
435.	INC -433	433	TE	5.2.7	1	477	The concept of "model kind" is not clarified in its own subclause, and is poorly addressed in this subclause. As a result, the reader is left with difficulty grasping the concept. The fourth sentence in this section needs to be enhanced to provide the needed clarification.	Change "Model kind denotes the sort of model distinguished by..." to "Model kind denotes the sort of model used to express an architecture view. Each model kind is distinguished by..."	AIP	Changed Sort to Category. This is not the only way to express an architecture view. No need to add the rest of the text.
436.	INC -434	434	TE	5.2.7	1	477	Use of "specifies the conventions used in the view component" does not go far enough to explain the concept of model kind.	Change "specifies the conventions used in the view component" to "specifies the conventions for depicting and interpreting the view component"	AIP	Replace by "A specification of a model kind or legend establishes the conventions used within the view component"
437.	WG 1- 435	435	TE	5.2.8		501	The second sentence of this paragraph is misleading and ignore the statements of the previous paragraph. Since the subjects of the sentence are ADL and ADF, this needs to be a Note..	Change to read, "Note Architecture description languages and architecture description frameworks contain AD elements that are instances of constructs and AD elements introduced as a result of model kinds and legends."	OBE	The entire paragraph has been removed in the rewrite.
438.	WG 1- 436	436	TE	5.2.8		496	Only one of two sub-constructs of viewpoint is mentioned. Also, the syntax and semantics of introduced elements are by conventions of the viewpoint. Also fix references)	Change paragraph to read, "As viewpoints (see 5.2.6), model kinds (see 5.2.7) and legends (see 5.2.7) are specified and applied, additional AD elements are introduced. The governing viewpoint determines the syntax	A	

1 **MB** = Member body / **NC** = National Committee (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by **)

2 **Type of comment:** **GT** = General Technical **TH** = Technical high **TL** = Technical Low **GE** = General Editorial **E** = Editorial

3 **Resolution code:** **OBE** = Superseded **AIP** = Agreed in principle **A** = Agreed R = Rejected **NA** = Non actionable

Disposition of Comments

Date:
30/09/2020Document:
ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 7 N 8181
(42010. CD1-v1.0)Project:
ISO/IEC/IEEE CD1 42010 (Ed2) Architecture
description

2.	MB/ NC ¹	Cmt No	Type of Cmt ²	Clause/ Subcl.	Para/ Fig/ Tab/ Line No	Comments and rationale	Proposed change	Res code ³	Resolution on each comment received
439.	WG 1- 437	437	TE	5.2.8	492	What is the intended meaning of 'construct'? Is it a class definition of instance elements? The constructs are identified in the next paragraph	and semantic conventions for these introduced AD elements." Combine paragraphs to read as, "The AD elements in an architecture description are instances of the constructs stakeholders, concern, architecture consideration,...architecture rationale and the relationships specified between those constructs."	A	
440.	INC -438	438	TL	5.2.8	502	ADF does contain any AD elements but rather identifies typical kinds of elements that can be used to instantiate AD elements.	"Architecture description languages and architecture description frameworks contain typical kinds of elements that can be used to instantiate actual AD elements put into an AD."	OBE	The entire paragraph has been removed in the rewrite.
441.	INC -439	439	ED	5.2.8	500	hyperlink not active for '[SysML]'	fix hyperlink	OBE	See INC-450
442.	INC -440	440	ED	5.2.8	496	hyperlink not active for '5.2.6'	fix hyperlink	A	
443.	INC -441	441	TL	5.2.8	491	Lines 491-503: Definition of terminological item, "Architecture description (AD) elements", is missing from Clause 3 So these are all constructs? It would appear that some of things give rise to multiple AD elements (eg a viewpoint).	Add (move) definition to Clause 3	A	Definition added in clause 3
444.	INC -442	442	TE	5.2.8	493	Lines 493-495: So these are all constructs? It would appear that some of things give rise to multiple AD elements (eg a viewpoint).			No proposal for change. The comment is valid though.
445.	INC	443	TE	5.2.8	492	Define construct	An AD element is an instance of		Please consider the dictionary

1 **MB** = Member body / **NC** = National Committee (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by **)2 **Type of comment:** **GT** = General Technical**TH** = Technical high**TL** = Technical Low**GE** = General Editorial**E** = Editorial3 **Resolution code:** **OBE** = Superseded**AIP** = Agreed in principle**A** = Agreed R = Rejected**NA** = Non actionable

Disposition of Comments

Date: 30/09/2020	Document: ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 7 N 8181 (42010. CD1-v1.0)	Project: ISO/IEC/IEEE CD1 42010 (Ed2) Architecture description
----------------------------	---	--

2.	MB/ NC ¹	Cmt No	Type of Cmt ²	Clause/ Subcl.	Para/ Fig/ Tab/	Line No	Comments and rationale	Proposed change	Res code ³	Resolution on each comment received
	-443							any type of architectural structure in an architecture description (model), or any associated information.		meaning of the term construct.
446.	GB-444	444	TE	5.2.8		501	Lines 501-503: ADLs will contain instances of aspects Consideration would be more general than concern; or add stakeholder perspective instance	Add to list	OBE	The entire paragraph has been removed in the rewrite.
447.	US-445	445	TE	5.2.8		503	This needs to mention the case above of elements introduced by a viewpoint or model kind.	Change: "legend and any AD elements introduced by its viewpoints and model kinds".	A	
448.	JP4-446	446	TE	5.2.8	4	500	This sentence refers to the SysML representation. This is an inevitable reference. So it is necessary to designate it as NORMATIVE REFERENCE	Add SysML to the NORMATIVE REFERENCES, Section2.		SysML is only referred to in an EXAMPLE and is not necessary to meeting provisions of this standard, so it does not belong in Clause 2.
449.	INC-447	447	ED	5.2.8	Ex	500	Inconsistent reference to "[SysML]"	Give numeric reference ("[34]"?)	OBE	See INC-450
450.	INC-448	448	ED	5.2.8	Para 3	496	Incorrect section references.	Change "viewpoints (see 5.2.5) or model kinds (see 5.2.6)" to "viewpoints (see 5.2.6) or model kinds (see 5.2.7)"	OBE	See WG1-436
451.	INC-449	449	TE	5.2.8	4	501	Lines 501-503: Mentioning ADLs and ADFs in a section on AD element just sows confusion. Why merge these topics before ADLs and ADFs are adequately described (in sections 5.4.3 and 5.4.2, respectively)? It just adds more confusion.	Remove the last sentence of Section 5.2.8, Paragraph 5. Add the following after the 3rd sentence of Section 5.4.2, Paragraph 1 "Architecture description frameworks contain one or more AD elements which are instances of the constructs: stakeholder, concern, architecture viewpoint, model kind and legend.	OBE	The entire paragraph has been removed in the rewrite.

1 **MB** = Member body / **NC** = National Committee (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by **)

2 **Type of comment:** **GT** = General Technical **TH** = Technical high **TL** = Technical Low **GE** = General Editorial **E** = Editorial

3 **Resolution code:** **OBE** = Superseded **AIP** = Agreed in principle **A** = Agreed R = Rejected **NA** = Non actionable

Disposition of Comments

Date: 30/09/2020	Document: ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 7 N 8181 (42010. CD1-v1.0)	Project: ISO/IEC/IEEE CD1 42010 (Ed2) Architecture description
----------------------------	---	--

	MB/ NC ¹	Cmt No	Type of Cmt ²	Clause/ Subcl.	Para/ Fig/ Tab/	Line No	Comments and rationale	Proposed change	Res code ³	Resolution on each comment received
								Add the following after the 1st sentence of Section 5.4.3, Paragraph 1 "Architecture description languages contain one or more AD elements which are instances of the constructs: stakeholder, concern, architecture viewpoint, model kind and legend.		
452.	INC -450	450	TE	5.2.8	4	499	Lines 499-500: More confusion about "model kind". The second paragraph of this section states that AD elements include instances of model kinds. A Use Case is an instance of a model kind. However, paragraph 4 states that system boundaries, actors, connectors (which are all elements of use case diagrams) are AD elements. This paragraph does not seem consistent with itself. These use case diagram elements discussed here (system boundary, actor, etc) are more in alignment with architecture view elements. Also, Use Cases don't introduce use cases. Use Case <u>Diagrams</u> introduce use cases.	Change "A model kind for Use Cases would introduce as AD elements: use cases, system boundaries, actors and several kinds of connectors (see [SysML])." to "Model kinds such as Use Case Diagrams, Activity Diagrams, Sequence Diagrams, etc., would be AD elements (see [SysML])."	AIP	Replace example by: "AD elements introduced by viewpoints or model kinds include Use Case constructs such as preconditions, actors, boundaries, systems; Activity model constructs such as activities, inputs, outputs, controls, and mechanisms; architecture or design patterns to be employed."
453.	WG 1- 451	451	ED	5.2.9		515	Do not use 'could' or 'might'	Replace both 'could' and 'might' with 'can'.	A	
454.	WG 1- 452	452	TE	5.2.9		505	Definitions belong in Clause 3. Used here the meaning of correspondence is restricted to common OED usage, which does not meet the broad need for describing novel relationships among AD	Place the following definition in Clause 3: 3.nn Correspondence Abstract relationship between	AIP	Abstract is replaced by architectural relationship in the proposal. Definition and NOTE are included in clause 3

1 **MB** = Member body / **NC** = National Committee (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by **)

2 **Type of comment:** **GT** = General Technical **TH** = Technical high **TL** = Technical Low **GE** = General Editorial **E** = Editorial

3 **Resolution code:** **OBE** = Superseded **AIP** = Agreed in principle **A** = Agreed R = Rejected **NA** = Non actionable

Disposition of Comments

1.

Date: 30/09/2020	Document: ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 7 N 8181 (42010. CD1-v1.0)	Project: ISO/IEC/IEEE CD1 42010 (Ed2) Architecture description
----------------------------	---	--

2.

MB/ NC ¹	Cmt No	Type of Cmt ²	Clause/ Subcl.	Para/ Fig/ Tab/	Line No	Comments and rationale	Proposed change	Res code ³	Resolution on each comment received
						element instances. Messages back and forth, and symmetrical equivalence are too restrictive for our need.	elements of an architecture description (3.4) or between two different architecture descriptions Note 1 to entry: Correspondences can include a wide range of relationships types including: equivalence, composition, refinement, consistency, traceability, dependency, constraint, satisfaction, obligation, etc."		
INC-453	453	E	5.2.9		506	"AD elements correspondence" appears to be a typo.	Replace "elements" with "element."	A	
INC-454	454	ED	5.2.9		506	word "elements" shouldn't be plural	An AD element correspondence can relate two or more elements within an AD or two or more elements occurring in multiple ADs.	A	
INC-455	455	ED	5.2.9		520	hyperlink not active for 'Figure 4'	fix hyperlink	A	
INC-456	456	ED	5.2.9		520	Says "Figure 4" , I think this is wrong, should be Figure 6	Change "Figure 4" to "Figure 6"	A	
INC-457	457	ED	5.2.9		507	Lines 507-519: Definition of terminological item, “correspondence method”, is missing from Clause 3	Add (move) definition to Clause 3	AIP	A definition of "correspondence" is added in clause 3. The related concepts are defined in Clause 5 and requirements in Clause 6.8 and 8.3
INC-458	458	ED	5.2.9		512	Typo: Inconsistent spacing “see[16]”	Fix typo: “see [16]”	AIP	Replaced (see[16]) with [16].
INC-459	459	TL	5.2.9		504	Lines 504-514: Definition of terminological item, “AD element correspondence”, is missing from Clause 3	Add (move) definition to Clause 3		This term can be well understood by the meaning attributed to AD element and correspondences. No need to add another definition.

1 **MB** = Member body / **NC** = National Committee (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by **)

2 **Type of comment:** **GT** = General Technical **TH** = Technical high **TL** = Technical Low **GE** = General Editorial **E** = Editorial

3 **Resolution code:** **OBE** = Superseded **AIP** = Agreed in principle **A** = Agreed R = Rejected **NA** = Non actionable

Disposition of Comments

Date: 30/09/2020	Document: ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 7 N 8181 (42010. CD1-v1.0)	Project: ISO/IEC/IEEE CD1 42010 (Ed2) Architecture description
----------------------------	---	--

	MB/ NC ¹	Cmt No	Type of Cmt ²	Clause/ Subcl.	Para/ Fig/ Tab/	Line No	Comments and rationale	Proposed change	Res code ³	Resolution on each comment received
462.	INC -460	460	TE	5.2.9		506	Elements - So these are all constructs? It would appear that some of things give rise to multiple AD elements (eg a viewpoint).	Change "elements" to "element"	A	
463.	US- 461	461	TE	5.2.9		504	Organization of 5.2.9, 5.2.10 does not follow the structure of the requirements on Correspondences in 6.8.2 and 6.8.3.	Restructure 5.2.9 and 5.2.10 to mirror the structure of the requirements related to Correspondences in 6.8.2 (Correspondences) and 6.8.3 (Correspondence Methods).	AIP	Restructuration of Clause 5 and 6 is performed to reflect the flow-down logic of the figures.
464.	JP6 -462	462	TE	5.2.9	1	507	The "correspondence method" appears suddenly. This is a specific terminology for 42010. Therefore, need precise definition for this.	Define "correspondence method" clearly.	OBE	See INC-457.
465.	JP5 -463	463	TE	5.2.9	1	505	This sentence designates the correspondence is between "two or more". It is difficult to understand the correspondence among 3 elements.	Clarify the this situation.	A	Correspondance can be an N-P relationship between elements.
466.	INC -464	464	ED	5.2.9	Para 1	505	Lines 505-506: Plural used in second sentence where singular required.	Change "An AD elements" to "An AD element"	A	
467.	INC -465	465	ED	5.3		561	hyperlink not active for 'Annex E'	fix hyperlink	A	
468.	INC -466	466	TL	5.3		553	Lines 553-561: The phrase "Architecting in the life cycle" is duplicating/redundant when compared with the definition of "Architecting" in 3.1: "conceiving, defining, expressing, documenting, communicating, certifying proper implementation of, maintaining and improving an architecture throughout the life cycle of an entity of interest" (emphasis added). In general these lines redefine/duplicate 3.1	Merge definitions to Clause 3.1 and remove duplication/redundancy	A	

1 **MB** = Member body / **NC** = National Committee (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by **)

2 **Type of comment:** **GT** = General Technical

TH = Technical high

TL = Technical Low

GE = General Editorial

E = Editorial

3 **Resolution code:** **OBE** = Superseded

AIP = Agreed in principle

A = Agreed R = Rejected

NA = Non actionable

Disposition of Comments

Date: 30/09/2020	Document: ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 7 N 8181 (42010. CD1-v1.0)	Project: ISO/IEC/IEEE CD1 42010 (Ed2) Architecture description
----------------------------	---	--

	MB/ NC ¹	Cmt No	Type of Cmt ²	Clause/ Subcl.	Para/ Fig/ Tab/	Line No	Comments and rationale	Proposed change	Res code ³	Resolution on each comment received
469.	GB- 467	467	TE	5.3		558	Software also?	Add software e.g. packages.	AIP	There is no need to reiterate the list of entities. It is already covered in introduction, clause 3.
470.	INC -468	468	ED	5.3	NOT E	561	There is no full stop at the end of the sentence which is inconsistent with the other similar lines in this section	Add full stop to the end of the sentence	A	
471.	WG 1- 469	469	TE	5.4		568	This text assumes a 2 dimensional approach to ADF. While some ADF do use a two dimensional representation, many others do not and we know that every "entity of interest" can have many different characterizing dimensions. Also missing is recognition of the cascading of ADF from very generic to implementation and the change in ADL that often occurs in step with this cascade.	Rewrite this sub-clause to accommodate frameworks of one or more dimensions discuss ADF transitions from very generic to implementation and associated ADL changes. A starting point for a suggested rewrite is appended as 5- _Revision_Suggestion.docx	A	
472.	INC -470	470	ED	5.4.2		609	need a "new line" inserted before "Note 4" to separate notes 3 & 4	to express specific architectural considerations which an architect needs to address. NOTE 4 Requirements on ADF are	A	
473.	INC -471	471	ED	5.4.2		586	hyperlink not active for 'Figure 7'	fix hyperlink	A	
474.	INC -472	472	ED	5.4.2		609	Typo: Missing line-break in "which an architect needs to address. NOTE 4 Requirements..."	Fix typo: Add line-break between "address." and "NOTE"	A	
475.	INC -473	473	ED	5.4.2		580	Lines 580-583: "For example, ..." should be extracted to formal "EXAMPLE:" statements	"Given that stakeholders look at architectures from different (stakeholder) perspectives, these can be generalized as generic perspectives. Stakeholder concerns can be better understood when	A	

1 **MB** = Member body / **NC** = National Committee (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by **)

2 **Type of comment:** **GT** = General Technical **TH** = Technical high **TL** = Technical Low **GE** = General Editorial **E** = Editorial

3 **Resolution code:** **OBE** = Superseded **AIP** = Agreed in principle **A** = Agreed R = Rejected **NA** = Non actionable

Disposition of Comments

Date: 30/09/2020	Document: ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 7 N 8181 (42010. CD1-v1.0)	Project: ISO/IEC/IEEE CD1 42010 (Ed2) Architecture description
----------------------------	---	--

2.	MB/ NC ¹	Cmt No	Type of Cmt ²	Clause/ Subcl.	Para/ Fig/ Tab/	Line No	Comments and rationale	Proposed change	Res code ³	Resolution on each comment received
								examined from different stakeholder perspectives across different architecture aspects, such as structure, behaviour and connectivity. EXAMPLE 1: Some stakeholders may look at an architecture from a business perspective and can be interested in the functionality that is required or provided (what capability of the entity is being created or changed, or what new processes are necessary?) EXAMPLE 2: Some stakeholders may look at an architecture from an economics perspective (what are the investment implications and what is the expected impact on the bottom line?)”		
476.	GB-474	474	TE	5.4.2		615	As above	Amend text to ‘While utilizing generic architecture aspects and other considerations . . . ‘ or similar	OBE	See GB-475
477.	GB-475	475	TE	5.4.2		611	Lines 611-614: Text is largely superfluous and ADFs are based upon more than just aspects and stakeholder perspectives	delete	A	
478.	GB-476	476	ED	5.4.2		609	Start NOTE 4 on new line		A	
479.	GB-477	477	TE	5.4.2		600	Lines 600-604: It is the considerations, applicable architecting methods and the norms in particular domains which determine the viewpoints and whether model-based or non-model-based views	Amend text accordingly and NOTE 3 largely superfluous then	AIP	See WG1-469 for the nature of changes.

1 **MB** = Member body / **NC** = National Committee (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by **)

2 **Type of comment:** **GT** = General Technical **TH** = Technical high **TL** = Technical Low **GE** = General Editorial **E** = Editorial

3 **Resolution code:** **OBE** = Superseded **AIP** = Agreed in principle **A** = Agreed R = Rejected **NA** = Non actionable

Disposition of Comments

Date: 30/09/2020	Document: ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 7 N 8181 (42010. CD1-v1.0)	Project: ISO/IEC/IEEE CD1 42010 (Ed2) Architecture description
----------------------------	---	--

	MB/ NC ¹	Cmt No	Type of Cmt ²	Clause/ Subcl.	Para/ Fig/ Tab/	Line No	Comments and rationale	Proposed change	Res code ³	Resolution on each comment received
480.							(View components) should be used, and hence what model kinds or legends should be employed.			
481.	GB-478	478	TE	5.4.2		597	We are not in the realm of concerns-driven architecting but using prior experience of similar situations	Amend to 'customary concerns' or 'historic concerns'	OBE	See WG1-469
	GB-479	479	TE	5.4.2		593	Too much emphasis on concerns-driven architecting. Could be rephrased in terms of considerations.	Depending on the architecture or architecting considerations, appropriate viewpoints will need to be selected, and therefore the language, legend or model kind appropriate to describe the architecture from the given viewpoint would be chosen accordingly.	OBE	See WG1-469
482.	GB-480	480	TH	5.4.2		567	Line 567 et seq: See James Martin/Tim Rabbets proposal. We are proposing introducing the notion of a framework dimension as the mechanism by which a structure formalism is achieved. There are several potential framework dimensions that can be employed. This avoids the (present) situation of trying to align aspects and perspectives with columns and rows. The proposal contains useful text on the subject matter e.g. Framework dimension can be expressed using one or more architecture viewpoints Structure formalism can be expressed in terms of one or more framework dimensions. Aspect may be used as a framework dimension (as is evident in some architecting practices). Other	Incorporate into text and amend figures as per proposal	AIP	WG1-469 for nature of changes.

1 **MB** = Member body / **NC** = National Committee (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by **)

2 **Type of comment:** **GT** = General Technical **TH** = Technical high **TL** = Technical Low **GE** = General Editorial **E** = Editorial

3 **Resolution code:** **OBE** = Superseded **AIP** = Agreed in principle **A** = Agreed R = Rejected **NA** = Non actionable

Disposition of Comments

Date: 30/09/2020	Document: ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 7 N 8181 (42010. CD1-v1.0)	Project: ISO/IEC/IEEE CD1 42010 (Ed2) Architecture description
----------------------------	---	--

	MB/ NC ¹	Cmt No	Type of Cmt ²	Clause/ Subcl.	Para/ Fig/ Tab/	Line No	Comments and rationale	Proposed change	Res code ³	Resolution on each comment received
483.							dimensions which can be employed include stages of architecting, domains, and layers.			
484.	US-481	481	TE	5.4.2		575	“Structure formalism” is a poor name. Is there any precedent of use of this term? (I find none.) A formalism usually connotes something which is generally usable, but in this case, it is only a singleton that is specific to the framework. Structure graph better connotes a singleton. Framework meta model is more accurate—it is a model of the framework’s elements and relationships—not to be confused with a domain meta model, which is often a part of a framework.	Use “structure graph” or “framework meta model” instead.	OBE	See INC-895
485.	US-482	482	ED	5.4.2		594	Language, legend, model kind should be plural, since a viewpoint may use more than one of each.	Change to “languages, legends and model kinds” (plural).	OBE	See WG1-469
486.	US-483	483	ED	5.4.2		606	This NOTE seems redundant with paragraph @596. Are both needed? This subclause could be tightened up with respect to use of typical, repeated, generic. Suggest “recurring” covers many of these cases.	Change “repeated” to “recurring”. Consider using “recurring” above, instead of typical, etc.	A	
487.	US-484	484	ED	5.4.2		611	Change “generic” to “recurring”.	Change “generic” to “recurring”.		We are talking about generic and particular in this case.
488.	US-485	485	TE	5.4.2		612	What is an “aspect characterization”? This is not explained anywhere in the document.	Clarify what is meant here, perhaps using existing terms.	OBE	See GB-475
	INC-486	486	TH	5.4.2	Fig 7	591	Viewpoints in an ADF are sometimes organized by aspect and perspective, but not always. This is not the general case. The more general case is the use of a	- ADF <defines generic> Framework Dimension - Structure Formalism <structured by> Framework	AIP	See WG1-469 for the nature of changes.

1 **MB** = Member body / **NC** = National Committee (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by **)

2 **Type of comment:** **GT** = General Technical **TH** = Technical high **TL** = Technical Low **GE** = General Editorial **E** = Editorial

3 **Resolution code:** **OBE** = Superseded **AIP** = Agreed in principle **A** = Agreed R = Rejected **NA** = Non actionable

Disposition of Comments

Date: 30/09/2020	Document: ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 7 N 8181 (42010. CD1-v1.0)	Project: ISO/IEC/IEEE CD1 42010 (Ed2) Architecture description
----------------------------	---	--

2.	MB/ NC ¹	Cmt No	Type of Cmt ²	Clause/ Subcl.	Para/ Fig/ Tab/	Line No	Comments and rationale	Proposed change	Res code ³	Resolution on each comment received
							"framework dimension" of some kind where the particular dimensions used vary from one ADF to another. See file for further details and example changes to Figure 7. (PPT file: "42010 fwk dimensions 2020.0528")	Dimension - Architecture Aspect <can map to one or more> Framework Dimension - Stakeholder Perspective <can map to one or more> Framework Dimensiono - Framework Dimension <can be expressed using one or more> Architecture Viewpoint		
489.	INC-487	487	TE	5.4.2	Fig 7	592	This seems to be saying something different from the text, where viewpoints are said to be the structuring mechanism for the structure formalism (not the aspects).	Redraw as per the attached diagram	AIP	Text modified to reflect that structuring formalism organizes viewpoint. Clause rewritten per WG1-469
490.	GB-488	488	TE	5.4.2	Fig 7	591	Proposal introduces notion of 'framework dimension' of which stakeholder perspective and architecture aspect are examples	See James Martin/Tim Rabbets proposal and amended figure contained therein	AIP	See WG1-469 for the nature of changes.
491.	INC-489	489	ED	5.4.2	NOTE 4	609	NOTE 4 has ended up in with NOTE 3	Move NOTE 4 to line 610	A	
492.	INC-490	490	ED	5.4.2	Para 10	609	Lines 609-610: Note 4 is embedded (not is separate paragraph) with Note 3.	Insert <newline> before last sentence in that paragraph.	A	
493.	INC-491	491	ED	5.4.2	Para 12	615	Lines 615-618: What is the point being made to the architect? Why does the architect need to remember this? It seems like the paragraph is trying to make a point, but stops before the point is made. Is the point that the architect needs to develop AD artifacts that expose specific architecture aspects and stakeholder perspectives of the particular architecture concerns? If so, state so.	Add a sentence to this paragraph: "The architect needs to develop AD artifacts that expose specific architecture aspects and stakeholder perspectives of the particular architecture concerns using the generic mechanisms provided by the ADF."		An architect has to remember that aspects and perspectives defined in architecture description frameworks have been worked in a context (i.e. entity and environment), which can be significantly different from the context of interest that the architect has to deal with.

1 **MB** = Member body / **NC** = National Committee (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by **)

2 **Type of comment:** **GT** = General Technical **TH** = Technical high **TL** = Technical Low **GE** = General Editorial **E** = Editorial

3 **Resolution code:** **OBE** = Superseded **AIP** = Agreed in principle **A** = Agreed R = Rejected **NA** = Non actionable

Disposition of Comments

Date: 30/09/2020	Document: ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 7 N 8181 (42010. CD1-v1.0)	Project: ISO/IEC/IEEE CD1 42010 (Ed2) Architecture description
----------------------------	---	--

	MB/ NC ¹	Cmt No	Type of Cmt ²	Clause/ Subcl.	Para/ Fig/ Tab/	Line No	Comments and rationale	Proposed change	Res code ³	Resolution on each comment received
494.	INC -492	492	ED	5.4.2	Para 14	623	Use of singular where plural is required.	Change “ADF” to “ADFs”.	A	
495.	INC -493	493	TL	5.4.3		626	First sentence is too broad. Not all forms of expression used in an AD constitute an ADL. A textual description of an AD element written in natural language is a form of expression used in an AD but is not an ADL. No natural language should qualify as an ADL. All ADLs are constructed languages and could potentially be narrowed further to “modeling languages.” Suggest deleting this sentence and beginning the paragraph with the following one.	Replace “is any form of expression for use in architecture description. It is a language...” with “is a constructed language...” Consider going further and replacing “constructed” with “modeling.”	AIP	An ADL is a formally specified syntax and semantics intended for use in describing the architecture of an entity of interest. An ADL is a language for stakeholders, including those involved in the architecting effort, allowing the expression of architecture considerations and description of AD elements related to the entity of interest, and the architecting environment. An AD can use more than one ADL, even an ADL for each viewpoint.
496.	INC -494	494	ED	5.4.3		642	hyperlink not active for '[11]'	fix hyperlink	A	
497.	INC -495	495	ED	5.4.3		634	hyperlink not active for '[10]'	fix hyperlink	A	
498.	INC -496	496	TE	5.4.3		634	The statement “ <i>ontology, which can further be defined (as in ISO 15704 [10])...</i> ” is not consistent with the source cited (15704) The text in Section 5.4.3. doesn't quote 15704 accurately. 15704 Annex B2.2.4 uses the ascending formality scale for “Generic enterprise modelling concepts (GEMCs)”, not for ontology, and 15704 doesn't include “analytical theory” as a type of ontology.	Remove reference Or Quote 15704 accurately	A	
499.	INC -497	497	TE	5.4.3		633	<i>ADLs can be used to underpin an architecture description with rigor... Why has an ADL not been used to</i>	The standard could, and should, be generated as an artefact from a model built on the basis of an		While this is an interesting idea, this is not in alignment with how ISO develop standards.

1 **MB** = Member body / **NC** = National Committee (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by **)

2 **Type of comment:** **GT** = General Technical **TH** = Technical high **TL** = Technical Low **GE** = General Editorial **E** = Editorial

3 **Resolution code:** **OBE** = Superseded **AIP** = Agreed in principle **A** = Agreed R = Rejected **NA** = Non actionable

Disposition of Comments

Date: 30/09/2020	Document: ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 7 N 8181 (42010. CD1-v1.0)	Project: ISO/IEC/IEEE CD1 42010 (Ed2) Architecture description
----------------------------	---	--

2.	MB/ NC ¹	Cmt No	Type of Cmt ²	Clause/ Subcl.	Para/ Fig/ Tab/	Line No	Comments and rationale	Proposed change	Res code ³	Resolution on each comment received
							<i>underpin this standard with rigor? This would help to deliver all the benefits that the standard identifies as reasons for using ADFs and ADs. Furthermore, the ADF should be built on a well-grounded ontological theory (to use the term of line 636) that is communicated in the standard. This would ensure authors are much more thorough about defining concepts and relationships than is currently the case and pay huge dividends in terms of clarity and usability of the standard.</i>	ADF. The standard should be treated as an entity of interest and an AD created for the standard. In other words, the standard should bootstrap itself.		
500.	INC-498	498	TE	5.4.3		626	Lines 626-644: Mutual inconsistencies in terms of definitions within the standard, and with the terminology used within the standard when compared with the approach taken in authoring the standard: Line 626: "An ADL is any form of expression for use in architecture description." This is (in my opinion) a better definition of an ADL than is given in 3.6. Further, lines 642-644 are not consistent with the phrase "any form of expression", as used in line 626 NOTE: When (re-)writing the definition of an ADL it is worth bearing in mind that this standard itself uses natural language prose and 'informal entity relationship diagrams' to describe the architecture of an architecture description, in terms of: "the expression of architecture"	Reconcile and merge definitions to Clause 3.6 and remove duplication. Consider defining two distinct sub-types of "ADL": formal ADL A formalism used as a means of describing an architecture. Formal ADL are the focus of this standard. EXAMPLE: AADL [43], ArchiMate [47], Systems Modeling Language (SysML) [33], ISO 19440 [11], Business Process Model and Notation (BPMN) [33], Unified Modeling Language (UML) [37], Unified Architecture Framework (UAF) Profile [35], and the viewpoint languages of RM-ODP [2][8] informal ADL	OBE	See INC-493 Examples are compatible with the new definition. 1) The definition of ADL has been updated to address this comment. 2) NOTE 1 has been added to speak about the lacunae of natural languages 3) The paragraph after NOTE 1 explains about usage of general purpose modeling languages for this purpose. 4) EXAMPLE 3 AADL [43], ArchiMate [47], Systems Modeling Language (SysML) [33], ISO 19440 [11], Business Process Model and Notation (BPMN) [33], Unified Modeling Language (UML) [37], Unified Architecture Framework (UAF) Profile [35], and the viewpoint

1 **MB** = Member body / **NC** = National Committee (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by **)

2 **Type of comment:** **GT** = General Technical **TH** = Technical high **TL** = Technical Low **GE** = General Editorial **E** = Editorial

3 **Resolution code:** **OBE** = Superseded **AIP** = Agreed in principle **A** = Agreed R = Rejected **NA** = Non actionable

Disposition of Comments

Date: 30/09/2020	Document: ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 7 N 8181 (42010. CD1-v1.0)	Project: ISO/IEC/IEEE CD1 42010 (Ed2) Architecture description
----------------------------	---	--

	MB/ NC ¹	Cmt No	Type of Cmt ²	Clause/ Subcl.	Para/ Fig/ Tab/	Line No	Comments and rationale	Proposed change	Res code ³	Resolution on each comment received
							considerations and the AD elements describing attributes and features of the architecture, of its entities and of its environment for the audience of stakeholders" (lines 626-628) Yet neither natural language prose nor informal entity relationship diagrams are listed as ADLs, despite being used as such in the standard	Any language used to describe an architecture that does not match the definition of a formal ADL. In general, informal ADL are described in an ad hoc manner (if at all) and hence are not considered in-depth within this standard. EXAMPLE: Natural language prose and informal diagrams, as are used in this standard		languages of RM-ODP [2][8] provides the set of ADL
501.	GB-499	499	ED	5.4.3		650	Graphic could be tidied up without 'knuckles' in lines		A	
502.	JP7-500	500	TE	5.4.3	3	643	This sentence describes UML as the examples of the ADL. However, UML is not the Architecture description language. That is a notation for models. So this description is inadequate.	Remove UML from this sentence.	OBE	See INC-493. UML is compatible with the new ADL definition.
503.	US-501	501	TE	5.4.3	Fig 8	651	Figure is missing Architecture Considerations, Viewpoints, Correspondences, Legends as specified by ADLs (see Clause 7).	Update figure to match requirements.		These are covered as part of viewpoint specification.
504.	INC-502	502	ED	5.27	Fig 5	489	All labels on the figure are the same as what is used in the paragraph except "View component".	Change label "View component" to "Architecture view component" for consistency.	OBE	Figure is redrawn
505.	WG 1-503	503	TE	6		654	Two general technical comments regarding Clause 6: 1) without a normative model, i.e. a normatively stated Clause 5, many of these requirements are devoid of proper contextualization so nothing normatively links them together into a coherent whole and users are free to interpret links as they please since the	For comment part 1) see an earlier comment for line 294 about merging Clause 5 and Clause 6 such that the conceptual model becomes normative and further requirements are stated in that normative context.	AIP	Review process is verifying the consistency of clause 6, 7, and 8 with clause 5.

1 **MB** = Member body / **NC** = National Committee (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by **)

2 **Type of comment:** **GT** = General Technical **TH** = Technical high **TL** = Technical Low **GE** = General Editorial **E** = Editorial

3 **Resolution code:** **OBE** = Superseded **AIP** = Agreed in principle **A** = Agreed R = Rejected **NA** = Non actionable

Disposition of Comments

Date:
30/09/2020Document:
ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 7 N 8181
(42010. CD1-v1.0)Project:
ISO/IEC/IEEE CD1 42010 (Ed2) Architecture
description

1.

2.

MB/ NC ¹	Cmt No	Type of Cmt ²	Clause/ Subcl.	Para/ Fig/ Tab/	Line No	Comments and rationale	Proposed change	Res code ³	Resolution on each comment received
						conceptual foundation of Clause 5 is not required nor even recommended – implying that Clause 5 is to be used is insufficient (also see at line 984 the Clause 5 model is a requirement); 2) many of the sub-clauses of this clause are overly prescriptive and impose an architecture description with many "not applicable to purpose" designations for specific requirements, which adds useless content to an AD. When a 'shall' requirement becomes qualified, it becomes a "should" recommendation.	For comment part 2) make 6.1 normative by placing "shall" before include in line 655 and line 670 before 'indicates'. Then change the phrase "shall be examined and, when applicable, identified" at lines 695, 720, 741, and 782 to read, "should be examined and identified" to give a user more discretion with regard to the purpose for which the architecting effort occurs. Any template created to aid the user in preparing and AD can list all recommended items.		
506.	WG 1-504	504	ED	6.1	675	Avoid 'would' usage – be more direct	Change 'would apply' to 'applies'	OBE	The sentence has been deleted in the NOTE
507.	INC -505	505	ED	6.1	663	hyperlink not active for '6.5'	fix hyperlink	A	
508.	INC -506	506	ED	6.1	662	hyperlink not active for '6.4.3'	fix hyperlink	A	
509.	INC -507	507	ED	6.1	660	hyperlink not active for '6.4.1'	fix hyperlink	A	
510.	INC -508	508	ED	6.1	659	hyperlink not active for '6.4'	fix hyperlink	A	
511.	INC -509	509	ED	6.1	658	hyperlink not active for '6.3'	fix hyperlink	A	
512.	INC -510	510	ED	6.1	657	Lines 657, 663: Use of architecture description vs the acronym AD	Change architecture description to AD.	A	
513.	INC -511	511	TL	6.1	672	"An architecture description should be interpretable by both humans and machines."	Clarify the intention by splitting this recommendation into two separate parts: one	A	This sentence is updated to read "An architecture description should be readable by humans and machines".

1 **MB** = Member body / **NC** = National Committee (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by **)2 **Type of comment:** **GT** = General Technical**TH** = Technical high**TL** = Technical Low**GE** = General Editorial**E** = Editorial3 **Resolution code:** **OBE** = Superseded**AIP** = Agreed in principle**A** = Agreed R = Rejected**NA** = Non actionable

Disposition of Comments

Date: 30/09/2020	Document: ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 7 N 8181 (42010. CD1-v1.0)	Project: ISO/IEC/IEEE CD1 42010 (Ed2) Architecture description
----------------------------	---	--

	MB/ NC ¹	Cmt No	Type of Cmt ²	Clause/ Subcl.	Para/ Fig/ Tab/	Line No	Comments and rationale	Proposed change	Res code ³	Resolution on each comment received
							It is not clear whether the intention behind this recommendation would be met by an AD that can only be understood by machines or by an AD that can only be understood by humans?	requirement/recommendation relating to humans and one requirement/recommendation relating to machines.		Rationale: "understanding" is a problem of knowledge and level of formalism. This document does not address understandability either for humans and machine. "Both" is also deleted because some parts could be readable by machines only (i.e. encryption of data).
514.	INC-512	512	ED	6.1		659	There is no semi-colon at the end of the bullet which is inconsistent with the other bullets in the list	Add semi-colon to end of line 659	A	
515.	INC-513	513	ED	6.1		658	There is no semi-colon at the end of the bullet which is inconsistent with the other bullets in the list	Add semi-colon to end of line 658	A	
516.	INC-514	514	TL	6.1		672	Should an AD be interpretable by machines? Does this mean machines must read natural language or that AD must be created with particular ontology and syntax?		OBE	See INC-511.
517.	GB-515	515	TE	6.1		657	Lines 657-669: Identification of relevant (applicable) architecting stages, domains, key concepts and features, applicable principles etc. – list is by no means complete	Add to list and include appropriate subclauses	A	
518.	WG 1-516	516	TE	6.2		688	This Note implies that each selection of a parameter in a parameterized viewpoint requires a complete AD generation effort, which does not make sense, particularly for very generic viewpoints that specify multiple options for model kind or view methods. It seems the one-to-one relationship between viewpoint and view is	Remove all one-to-one viewpoint to view language throughout the document, enabling multiple architecture views for a viewpoint and insert in a appropriate place, probably in Clause 5, the following text: "For most architecting efforts, an	A	See WG42-013

1 **MB** = Member body / **NC** = National Committee (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by **)

2 **Type of comment:** **GT** = General Technical **TH** = Technical high **TL** = Technical Low **GE** = General Editorial **E** = Editorial

3 **Resolution code:** **OBE** = Superseded **AIP** = Agreed in principle **A** = Agreed R = Rejected **NA** = Non actionable

Disposition of Comments

Date: 30/09/2020	Document: ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 7 N 8181 (42010. CD1-v1.0)	Project: ISO/IEC/IEEE CD1 42010 (Ed2) Architecture description
----------------------------	---	--

2.	MB/ NC ¹	Cmt No	Type of Cmt ²	Clause/ Subcl.	Para/ Fig/ Tab/	Line No	Comments and rationale	Proposed change	Res code ³	Resolution on each comment received
							driving unnecessary work for complicated systems and enterprises – endangering the applicability of 42010 in those situations. For an implementation targeted AD one-to-one might make sense but for a reference AD to use across many possible implementations it does not make sense.	architecture viewpoint results in a single architecture view. For some architecting efforts, especially those for complicated abstract situations or where parameters drive alternative scenarios, an architecture viewpoint can result is multiple architecture views, very much like standing in one place and changing your visual focal length or rotating your head in a different direction."		
519.	INC-517	517	TL	6.2		688	Overly restrictive. Unclear why this should be required. What is the impact if an architecture description could capture more than one architecture for an entity of interest?	Delete sentence or clarify the need for this constraint.	A	This sentence is deleted.
520.	INC-518	518	TL	6.2		686	Overly restrictive. Unclear why this should be required.	Should be content and not contents	OBE	See INC 519
521.	INC-519	519	ED	6.2		680	Sentence as it currently reads doesn't make sense. Suggest making the changes in red "The detailed of the content of identifying and supplementary information items to be included shall be as specified by the organization and/or project".	Change sentence to: The detail of the identifying and supplementary information items to be included shall be as specified by the organization and/or project	A	
522.	INC-520	520	ED	6.2		680	Awkward sentence - Propose new sentence wording	The detailed content of the architecture description information items shall be as specified by the organization and/or project.	OBE	See INC-519.
523.	US-521	521	TE	6.2	NOT E	688	Redundant with NOTE 1 in 6.1, which includes identical text.	Move to 6.1, replacing NOTE 2.	A	

1 **MB** = Member body / **NC** = National Committee (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by **)

2 **Type of comment:** **GT** = General Technical **TH** = Technical high **TL** = Technical Low **GE** = General Editorial **E** = Editorial

3 **Resolution code:** **OBE** = Superseded **AIP** = Agreed in principle **A** = Agreed R = Rejected **NA** = Non actionable

Disposition of Comments

Date:
30/09/2020Document:
ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 7 N 8181
(42010. CD1-v1.0)Project:
ISO/IEC/IEEE CD1 42010 (Ed2) Architecture
description

	MB/ NC ¹	Cmt No	Type of Cmt ²	Clause/ Subcl.	Para/ Fig/ Tab/	Line No	Comments and rationale	Proposed change	Res code ³	Resolution on each comment received
524.	WG 1- 522	522	ED	6.3		709	"Consideration" is a poor word choice because of its other uses in the document. See ISO/IEC Directives about distinction in use of "may" and "can"	Change to read, "The architecting effort shall identify present or future stakeholders who can be impacted by the entity of interest (e.g. by its..."	A	
525.	WG 1- 523	523	ED	6.3		708	Making the list a recommendation and sentence at 709 means the NOTE is redundant and not useful.	Delete NOTE	A	
526.	WG 1- 524	524	TE	6.3		695	The list has classifications or roles of generic stakeholders, not the stakeholders themselves. Some ADs need the actual stakeholder, not just the role they occupy.	Change to read, "the following stakeholder groups should be examined and identified in the architecture description:"		This breaks the substitution rule: classes (i.e., groups of stakeholders) are explicitly called out in definition of STAKEHOLDER. Not every stakeholder listed is a stakeholder group. This is a mix. Per the definition of stakeholder, it can be individuals or organizations or classes there of, so no need to state it as stakeholder groups.
527.	INC -525	525	TL	6.3		693	Should also identify stakeholders relevant to the architecture description itself, as this may include stakeholders not relevant to the architecture.	Replace "... considered relevant to the architecture of the entity..." with "... considered relevant to the architecture description or of the architecture of the entity..."	A	
528.	INC -526	526	TE	6.3		707	After line 707: Additional stakeholders	m) Configuration Management / Data Management n) Security / Information Assurance Personnel o) External Partners (Data Consumers) p) Facility Personnel		This is only an indicative list. The standard does not ratify this list as it shall be available in all cases. No need to add to the list.
529.	INC -527	527	TE	6.3		701	Although the related note states that the list of stakeholders is not exhaustive,	Add "designers" to the stakeholders list, either as an	AIP	The list of stakeholders to be pruned

1 **MB** = Member body / **NC** = National Committee (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by **)2 **Type of comment:** **GT** = General Technical **TH** = Technical high **TL** = Technical Low **GE** = General Editorial **E** = Editorial3 **Resolution code:** **OBE** = Superseded **AIP** = Agreed in principle **A** = Agreed R = Rejected **NA** = Non actionable

Disposition of Comments

Date:
30/09/2020Document:
ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 7 N 8181
(42010. CD1-v1.0)Project:
ISO/IEC/IEEE CD1 42010 (Ed2) Architecture
description

2.	MB/ NC ¹	Cmt No	Type of Cmt ²	Clause/ Subcl.	Para/ Fig/ Tab/	Line No	Comments and rationale	Proposed change	Res code ³	Resolution on each comment received
							propose that "designers" be included as it is a primary stakeholder, possibly replacing "developers" which is more broad and probably covers several other listed stakeholders.	additional stakeholder or replacing "developers".		
530.	GB-528	528	ED	6.3		705	Suggest we advance architects up the list given their importance	Advance as proposed	A	
531.	INC-529	529	TE	6.3	NA	707	After line 707: Given prevalence of cybersecurity, recommend adding this to existing list.	m) cybersecurity specialists		This is only an indicative list. The standard does not ratify this list as it shall be available in all cases. No need to add to the list.
532.	INC-530	530	TE	6.3	2	696	Lines 696-707: Some consideration should be given to listing hostile stakeholders specifically, so that the reader becomes aware of hostile intent, just as the current lists emphasizes beneficial intent. Hostile or adversary actors could include hackers, protesters, state enemies, industrial competitors, etc. The actions that these actors take could range from outright destruction to simple socio-political objection.	Add to the list "adversaries".	A	
533.	WG 1-531	531	ED	6.4		715	"Consideration" is a poor word choice because of its other uses in the document. See ISO/IEC Directives about distinction in use of "may" and "can".	Combine sentences at line 713 and 713 to read, "An architecture description shall identify present and future architecture considerations believed to be of relevance to the architecture of the entity of interest."		rchitecture considerations are dropped as first class entity. There is no need to include requirements on them.
534.	WG 1-532	532	ED	6.4		713	"considerations considered" is poor use of words with a common root. This is a hanging paragraph.	Change to read, "... considerations believed to be of relevance to ...". Place paragraph into a citable sub-		Architecture considerations are dropped as first class entity. There is no need to include requirements on them.

1 MB = Member body / NC = National Committee (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by **)

2 Type of comment: GT = General Technical TH = Technical high TL = Technical Low GE = General Editorial E = Editorial

3 Resolution code: OBE = Superseded AIP = Agreed in principle A = Agreed R = Rejected NA = Non actionable

Disposition of Comments

Date: 30/09/2020	Document: ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 7 N 8181 (42010. CD1-v1.0)	Project: ISO/IEC/IEEE CD1 42010 (Ed2) Architecture description
----------------------------	---	--

	MB/ NC ¹	Cmt No	Type of Cmt ²	Clause/ Subcl.	Para/ Fig/ Tab/	Line No	Comments and rationale	Proposed change	Res code ³	Resolution on each comment received
535.	INC -533	533	ED	6.4		713	Almost repeated words: considerations considered - recommend deleting "considered"	clause per ISO/IEC Directives. An architecture description shall identify the architecture considerations considered relevant to the stakeholders for the architecture of the entity of interest.		rchitecture considerations are dropped as first class entity. There is no need to include requirements on them.
536.	US- 534	534	ED	6.4		713	Eliminate redundancy: considerations /considered	Delete: "considered relevant to the stakeholders"		rchitecture considerations are dropped as first class entity. There is no need to include requirements on them.
537.	WG 1- 535	535	ED	6.4.1		736	"prioritized to be addressed" is awkward phrasing.	Change to read, "... should be prioritized for addressing within..."	A	
538.	WG 1- 536	536	TE	6.4.1	NOT E 3	731	Need to provide guidance about form of concern statement.	Add the following NOTE, "Concerns expressed as interrogative questions and with as much detail as possible enable more efficient and effective architecting efforts."	AIP	Add NOTE 3 Concerns expressed as interrogative questions and with appropriate detail to the purpose of the AD enable more efficient and effective communication.
539.	WG 1- 537	537	TE	6.4.1		728	This ignores the stakeholder perspective as origin of concern added since 42010:2011. Also, avoid consideration word without architecture adjective to avoid concept confusion.	Change sentences at 728 and 729 to read, "The architecture description shall identify present or future concerns that can be of relevance to the entity of interest and for each such concern identify the stakeholder perspective and stakeholder that are the source of that concern."	A	Implemented as: An AD should consider present or future concerns which may be relevant to the entity of interest and shall identify each such concern. An AD shall identify the stakeholder perspective and stakeholder that are the source of each identified concern. Stakeholder perspectives are already discussed in clause 5.2.4. This requirement is relating concerns with perspectives and I am ok with where

1 **MB** = Member body / **NC** = National Committee (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by **)

2 **Type of comment:** **GT** = General Technical **TH** = Technical high **TL** = Technical Low **GE** = General Editorial **E** = Editorial

3 **Resolution code:** **OBE** = Superseded **AIP** = Agreed in principle **A** = Agreed R = Rejected **NA** = Non actionable

Disposition of Comments

Date:
30/09/2020Document:
ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 7 N 8181
(42010. CD1-v1.0)Project:
ISO/IEC/IEEE CD1 42010 (Ed2) Architecture
description

	MB/ NC ¹	Cmt No	Type of Cmt ²	Clause/ Subcl.	Para/ Fig/ Tab/ No	Comments and rationale	Proposed change	Res code ³	Resolution on each comment received
540.	WG 1- 538	538	TE	6.4.1	726	Add to NOTE information about use of architecture aspect examination to expose additional architecture concerns.	Change the last sentence of NOTE to read, "Additional items can be examined if deemed relevant, particularly concern items exposed by examination of relevant architecture aspects."	A	it is placed.
541.	WG 1- 539	539	TE	6.4.1	720	The list includes only concerns relative to the entity of interest as an object itself. What are some concerns relative to architecture and the architecting effort to describe that entity, which are also part of the definition.	Expand the list to include reuse of known architectures, enterprise capability and capacity to implement the entity of interest according to the architecture description, etc.	A	
542.	WG 1- 540	540	ED	6.4.1	718	This is another consider a consideration.	Change to read, "... identify the concerns believed to be of relevance to ..."	A	
543.	INC -541	541	TE	6.4.1	723	Include opportunities as the inverse of risks.	"the potential risks, opportunities, and impacts..."	A	
544.	INC -542	542	TE	6.4.1	725	After line 725: Additional concerns	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> — Corner Cases / Boundary Considerations — Heavy Use Operational Scenarios / Scalability of architecture — Security / Avoidance of Security Vulnerabilities — Transition when moving from legacy to modernized architecture 		This is only an indicative list. The standard does not ratify this list as it shall be available in all cases. No need to add these items precisely to the list.
545.	INC -543	543	ED	6.4.1	727	hyperlink not active for '5.2.3'	fix hyperlink	A	
546.	GB- 544	544	ED	6.4.1	725	Replace maintainability by sustainability as a more generic (and less machine-specific) term	replace	A	

1 MB = Member body / NC = National Committee (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by **)

2 Type of comment: GT = General Technical

TH = Technical high

TL = Technical Low

GE = General Editorial

E = Editorial

3 Resolution code: OBE = Superseded

AIP = Agreed in principle

A = Agreed R = Rejected

NA = Non actionable

Disposition of Comments

1.

Date: 30/09/2020	Document: ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 7 N 8181 (42010. CD1-v1.0)	Project: ISO/IEC/IEEE CD1 42010 (Ed2) Architecture description
----------------------------	---	--

2.

547.

MB/ NC ¹	Cmt No	Type of Cmt ²	Clause/ Subcl.	Para/ Fig/ Tab/	Line No	Comments and rationale	Proposed change	Res code ³	Resolution on each comment received
US- 545	545	TE	6.4.1	NOT E 2	727	This is not a very good list of concerns.	Insert: functionality, feasibility, usage, system purposes, system features, system properties, known limitations, structure, behavior, performance, resource utilization, reliability, security, information assurance, complexity, evolvability, openness, concurrency, autonomy, cost, schedule, quality of service, flexibility, agility, modifiability, modularity, control, inter-process communication, deadlock, state change, subsystem integration, data accessibility, privacy, compliance to regulation, assurance, business goals and strategies, customer experience, maintainability, affordability and disposability.	AIP	Will put in long list of concerns but will review for consistency with current usage and meaning in this standard.
INC -546	546	TE	6.4.1	NOT E 5	735	Should there be a recommendation that concerns expressed but not addressed should be listed? Such a list would allow reviewers of the AD to consider more easily the prioritization decisions taken around addressing concerns.	Resource limitations or other constraints can prevent an AD from addressing all concerns expressed by all identified stakeholders. Concerns that are considered fundamental to the architecture should be prioritized to be addressed within the available resources. Concerns that are not addressed should be listed to record that the concern	A	

548.

1 **MB** = Member body / **NC** = National Committee (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by **)

2 **Type of comment:** **GT** = General Technical **TH** = Technical high **TL** = Technical Low **GE** = General Editorial **E** = Editorial

3 **Resolution code:** **OBE** = Superseded **AIP** = Agreed in principle **A** = Agreed R = Rejected **NA** = Non actionable

Disposition of Comments

Date:
30/09/2020Document:
ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 7 N 8181
(42010. CD1-v1.0)Project:
ISO/IEC/IEEE CD1 42010 (Ed2) Architecture
description

2.	MB/ NC ¹	Cmt No	Type of Cmt ²	Clause/ Subcl.	Para/ Fig/ Tab/	Line No	Comments and rationale	Proposed change	Res code ³	Resolution on each comment received
549.								exists but has not been addressed.		
550.	INC -547	547	TE	6.4.1	Para 2	721	Lines 721-725: In these days of environmental concern for the future of the Earth, it seems appropriate to highlight environmental concerns.	Add to the list "environmental impacts of the development, use, and disposal of the entity of interest".	A	
551.	WG 1- 548	548	ED	6.4.2		774	Avoid consideration word without architecture adjective to avoid concept confusion. See ISO/IEC Directives about proper use of 'can' and 'may'	Change to read, "The architecting effort shall identify present or future architecture aspects that can be of relevance to the entity of interest."	A	
552.	WG 1- 549	549	TE	6.4.2		741	The list has classifications of generic aspects, not the manifest aspects or feature itself. Some ADs need the actual manifest aspect or feature, not just the categorical label.	Change to read, "the following kinds of aspects should be examined and identified in the architecture description:"	AIP	The list is updated to provide a list of aspects and not kinds of aspects.
553.	INC -550	550	TE	6.4.2		752	While the aspect called 'connectivity' may be a generic term that covers 'interfaces', recommend explicitly adding the aspect 'interface', just as aspects 'data' and 'information' are closely related and both are in the list of aspects. Interfaces are a very important aspect in the description of an architecture because these are (1) where a good deal of issues come up when physically integrating systems at the hardware and software (including firmware) level, and (2) the connectivity aspect lends itself to a more abstract description of the connection between more than one element of an architecture.	Add the aspect 'interface' to the list	A	
	INC -551	551	TE	6.4.2		760	After line 760: Addition to "Identification of architecture aspects"	s) Security	A	

1 MB = Member body / NC = National Committee (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by **)

2 Type of comment: GT = General Technical

TH = Technical high

TL = Technical Low

GE = General Editorial

E = Editorial

3 Resolution code: OBE = Superseded

AIP = Agreed in principle

A = Agreed R = Rejected

NA = Non actionable

Disposition of Comments

Date: 30/09/2020	Document: ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 7 N 8181 (42010. CD1-v1.0)	Project: ISO/IEC/IEEE CD1 42010 (Ed2) Architecture description
----------------------------	---	--

	MB/ NC ¹	Cmt No	Type of Cmt ²	Clause/ Subcl.	Para/ Fig/ Tab/	Line No	Comments and rationale	Proposed change	Res code ³	Resolution on each comment received
554.	INC-552	552	ED	6.4.2		743	Lines 743-759: Semicolons are used to separate items in a list that do not have commas.	Change semicolons to commas.		This is acceptable as per ISO style guide.
555.	INC-553	553	TE	6.4.2		743	Lines 743-760: You probably need to define all of these. I'm not sure what a structure means in this context, for example.	[I don't know what your definitions are...]		Terms used in normal dictionary sense, so no need to define in this standard.
556.	GB-554	554	TE	6.4.2		776	Lines 776-777: Prioritisation can be undertaken by establishing architectural drivers, for example particularly demanding considerations or ones which stakeholders place increased emphasis upon.	Add as final sentence.	OBE	See IEEE 1201
557.	GB-555	555	TE	6.4.2		774	Lines 774-775: The whole purpose of aspects is to introduce a logical organisation of considerations, and by exploiting relevant prior experience in this respect, improve the completeness (and through understanding the inter-dependencies, the consistency) of the architecture description.	Add 'The use of aspects as a structuring formalism should improve the (internal) completeness and consistency of the architecture description through exploiting prior architecting experience.'	AIP	Yes, add. But move to 7 where this is more appropriate
558.	GB-556	556	TE	6.4.2		764	Lines 764-769: Delete reference to stakeholder perspectives from this note as not relevant to this note.	delete	A	
559.	GB-557	557	TE	6.4.2		762	Lines 762-763: Delete note as not reflective of above comment	delete	OBE	See INC-059. Definition of Aspects is changed to better reflect relationship with concerns (See WG42-004, See INC-059). Per Example 1 in 6.6, these are architecture aspects as used in prevalent ADFs.
560.	GB-558	558	TE	6.4.2		743	Lines 743-760: I do not believe that these are a typical set of aspects. See James Martin/Tim Rabbets proposal for a set	Amend as per proposal	AIP	The list is updated to provide a list of aspects. See also comments such as INC-559, IN-992.

1 **MB** = Member body / **NC** = National Committee (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by **)

2 **Type of comment:** **GT** = General Technical **TH** = Technical high **TL** = Technical Low **GE** = General Editorial **E** = Editorial

3 **Resolution code:** **OBE** = Superseded **AIP** = Agreed in principle **A** = Agreed R = Rejected **NA** = Non actionable

Disposition of Comments

Date:
30/09/2020Document:
ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 7 N 8181
(42010. CD1-v1.0)Project:
ISO/IEC/IEEE CD1 42010 (Ed2) Architecture
description

1.

2.

MB/ NC ¹	Cmt No	Type of Cmt ²	Clause/ Subcl.	Para/ Fig/ Tab/	Line No	Comments and rationale	Proposed change	Res code ³	Resolution on each comment received
						which are more closely aligned with a logical structuring of functionality and non-functionals, the latter along the lines of speciality (US specialty) disciplines. This organisation of an architecture description is reflective of current good architecting practice, certainly as concerns engineered systems, and is extensible to cover enterprises and other forms of system and software. Reference: (PPT file: "42010 fwk dimensions 2020.0528")			
INC -559	559	TL	6.4.2	Para	741	Organizational structure is an important architecture aspect that should be added to the list.	Add "Organizational structure" to the list	A	
WG 1- 560	560	ED	6.4.3		815	Avoid consideration word without architecture adjective to avoid concept confusion. See ISO/IEC Directives about proper use of 'can' and 'may'	Change to read, "The architecting effort shall identify present or future stakeholder perspectives that can be of relevance to the entity of interest."	A	
WG 1- 561	561	TE	6.4.3		782	See comment for line 653	See suggestion at comment line 653.		No need to merge clause 5 and 6.
INC -562	562	TL	6.4.3		784	Incorrect name of perspective used in UAF. Should be strategic, not strategy.	Change strategy to strategic	A	
INC -563	563	TE	6.4.3		803	Again, interfaces are such an important part of an architecture, this is a perspective which should be on the list. While the list is identified as 'not necessarily exhaustive', interfaces should be added since they are a source of many of the issues/problems that come up in the integration of system elements and	Add the 'interface' perspective to the list	AIP	Add in EXAMPLE 2 in clause 6.5

1 MB = Member body / NC = National Committee (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by **)

2 Type of comment: GT = General Technical

TH = Technical high

TL = Technical Low

GE = General Editorial

E = Editorial

3 Resolution code: OBE = Superseded

AIP = Agreed in principle

A = Agreed R = Rejected

NA = Non actionable

Disposition of Comments

Date:
30/09/2020Document:
ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 7 N 8181
(42010. CD1-v1.0)Project:
ISO/IEC/IEEE CD1 42010 (Ed2) Architecture
description

1.

2.

566.

567.

568.

569.

570.

571.

572.

573.

MB/ NC ¹	Cmt No	Type of Cmt ²	Clause/ Subcl.	Para/ Fig/ Tab/	Line No	Comments and rationale	Proposed change	Res code ³	Resolution on each comment received
						especially for systems of systems.			
INC -564	564	TE	6.4.3		802	After line 802: Additional stakeholder perspectives	t) Capacity u) Future Mission Needs / Evolvability / Transition v) Organization	A	
INC -565	565	ED	6.4.3		784	Lines 784-801: Semicolons are used to separate items in a list that do not have commas.	Change semicolons to commas.		This is acceptable as per ISO style guide.
INC -566	566	TE	6.4.3		784	Lines 784-802: And define these too if possible.	[I don't know what your definitions are...]		Terms used in normal dictionary sense, so no need to define in this standard.
GB- 567	567	TE	6.4.3		817	Lines 817-818: Stakeholders can be prioritised by the stake they hold. Customers/sponsors come up high on the list. As should the architect since he has to balance the considerations.	Include text derived from comment 'Stakeholders can be prioritised by their relative stake. The customers, sponsors and the architects generally hold major stakes and their concerns should be influential.'	OBE	See IEEE-1205
GB- 568	568	TE	6.4.3		812	Lines 812-814: Delete text from 'likewise' – this is not relevant to this section. Also not all 'typical' stakeholders will apply to a particular architecting endeavour – in fact one of the first activities is to identify the set of stakeholders which applies.	Amend accordingly	A	
GB- 569	569	TE	6.4.3		805	Lines 805-810: Delete reference to aspects in this paragraph – it is not relevant	Amend accordingly	A	
GB- 570	570	TE	6.4.3		804	Delete for reason above – ADFs are structured using a variety of formalisms and with no clear rationale behind their categorisation of rows and columns presently.	delete	A	
GB-	571	TE	6.4.3		784	Lines 784-802: Stakeholder perspectives	Amend list accordingly	AIP	The list is improved; but this

1 **MB** = Member body / **NC** = National Committee (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by **)2 **Type of comment:** **GT** = General Technical **TH** = Technical high **TL** = Technical Low **GE** = General Editorial **E** = Editorial3 **Resolution code:** **OBE** = Superseded **AIP** = Agreed in principle **A** = Agreed R = Rejected **NA** = Non actionable

Disposition of Comments

Date: 30/09/2020	Document: ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 7 N 8181 (42010. CD1-v1.0)	Project: ISO/IEC/IEEE CD1 42010 (Ed2) Architecture description
----------------------------	---	--

	MB/ NC ¹	Cmt No	Type of Cmt ²	Clause/ Subcl.	Para/ Fig/ Tab/	Line No	Comments and rationale	Proposed change	Res code ³	Resolution on each comment received
1.							should relate to categories of typical stakeholders as per 696 to 707. Users are concerned with usage. Operators with operation. Acquirers with acquisition. Owners with ownership. Architects with completeness and consistency of understanding, feasibility of realisation, etc. We could draw up a table of correspondence between typical stakeholders and their perspectives. Some of the items on the list are stages of architecting (e.g. logical, physical), etc. which are considerations but not stakeholder perspectives.			document only aims at providing generic examples. A table like this is proposed can be found in ADF documentations. See the Zachman model for example.
574.	INC -572	572	TE	6.4.3	3	784	Add 'safety'. Understand this is not an exhaustive list, but 'safety' is as important, if not more so, than the other perspectives listed.	h) safety; i) security	AIP	Add as EXAMPLE 2 in clause 6.5
575.	INC -573	573	ED	6.4.3	NOT E 2	804	There is no full stop at the end of the sentence which is inconsistent with the other similar lines in this section	Add full stop to the end of the sentence	A	
576.	WG 1- 574	574	ED	6.5		831	Why have a separate Clause for viewpoints. It is just as easy to cite a sub=clause in the conformance clause as it is to cite a full clause.	Move the contents of Clause 8 to sub-clause 6.5 with 8.1 going to a new 6.5.1 with existing 6.5 content, 8.2 going to 6.5.2 and 8.2 going to 6.5.3.		Some part of it covers ADF and ADL related requirements.
577.	WG 1- 575	575	ED	6.5		820	Several of these sentence can be combined into a single requirements statement.	Combine line 820 and line 822 to read, "An architecture description shall include or reference each architecture viewpoint necessary to frame each relevant architecture considerations identified in 6.4."	OBE	Architecture considerations have been deprecated and hence there are no requirements on architecture considerations

1 **MB** = Member body / **NC** = National Committee (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by **)

2 **Type of comment:** **GT** = General Technical **TH** = Technical high **TL** = Technical Low **GE** = General Editorial **E** = Editorial

3 **Resolution code:** **OBE** = Superseded **AIP** = Agreed in principle **A** = Agreed R = Rejected **NA** = Non actionable

Disposition of Comments

Date:
30/09/2020Document:
ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 7 N 8181
(42010. CD1-v1.0)Project:
ISO/IEC/IEEE CD1 42010 (Ed2) Architecture
description

	MB/ NC ¹	Cmt No	Type of Cmt ²	Clause/ Subcl.	Para/ Fig/ Tab/	Line No	Comments and rationale	Proposed change	Res code ³	Resolution on each comment received
578.	INC -576	576	ED	6.5		825	hyperlink not active for 'B' and 'C'	Delete line 822 and 823. fix hyperlink	A	
579.	INC -577	577	ED	6.5		822	hyperlink not active for '6.4'	fix hyperlink	A	
580.	GB- 578	578	TE	6.5		822	Lines 822-823: Viewpoints may be used to formally express, analyse or assess considerations multiply, wholly or partially	Amend from current text using 'frames'	A	
581.	US- 579	579	TE	6.5		820	Eliminate redundant text.	Delete "or reference" per statement @670.	OBE	See IEEE-1206
582.	INC -580	580	TE	6.5.5		822	Lines 822-823: So there is a viewpoint that includes each concern, aspect or perspective.	Each architecture viewpoint shall be a model of a corresponding architecture perspective.		A viewpoint is not a model. Also not necessarily one to one from VP to AP. Architecture perspective is not a term used in this standard.
583.	WG 1- 581	581	TE	6.6		835	This statement results from a lack of a normative conceptual model. Such a model resolves the relationships between viewpoint and view without ambiguity.	State the conceptual model of Clause 5 normatively and delete this sentence. At least insert "of" after "more" so the grammar is correct.	A	
584.	WG 1- 582	582	TE	6.6		830	Incorrect sub-clause references. Since line 830, 831 and 832 all pertain to architecture considerations, use that term. This relationship occur transitively via a viewpoint and only transitively via a viewpoint. Stating it independent of the viewpoint opens the user to a direct relationship and failure to state the viewpoint as a result.	Combine the three sentences to read, " Each architecture consideration identified in in 6.4.1, 6.4.2 and 6.4.3 shall be addressed by at least one view." Remove these statements regarding a necessary transitive relationship to avoid misinterpretation of the normative requirements.	OBE	Considerations are removed.
585.	WG 1- 583	583	TE	6.6		827	Now we clearly have multiple views per viewpoint. Phrasing is awkward and should match phrasing used previously.	Rephrase as "An architecture description shall include one or more than one architecture view for each architecture viewpoint	A	

1 **MB** = Member body / **NC** = National Committee (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by **)2 **Type of comment:** **GT** = General Technical **TH** = Technical high **TL** = Technical Low **GE** = General Editorial **E** = Editorial3 **Resolution code:** **OBE** = Superseded **AIP** = Agreed in principle **A** = Agreed R = Rejected **NA** = Non actionable

Disposition of Comments

1.

Date: 30/09/2020	Document: ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 7 N 8181 (42010. CD1-v1.0)	Project: ISO/IEC/IEEE CD1 42010 (Ed2) Architecture description
----------------------------	---	--

2.

586.

587.

588.

589.

590.

591.

592.

593.

594.

MB/ NC ¹	Cmt No	Type of Cmt ²	Clause/ Subcl.	Para/ Fig/ Tab/	Line No	Comments and rationale	Proposed change	Res code ³	Resolution on each comment received
							identified in 6.5."		
INC -584	584	TL	6.6		829	Function trees express decomposition, not dependencies.	Change dependencies to decomposition	A	
INC -585	585	ED	6.6		838	the word "component" should be plural	Within a view, one or more view components can be used to selectively present some or all of	OBE	The NOTE has been deprecated.
INC -586	586	ED	6.6		831	The reference should be updated for the appropriate section. There is an extra ".2"	Change to: Each architecture aspect identified by the AD in accordance with 6.4.2 shall be addressed by at least one view	A	
INC -587	587	ED	6.6		830	The reference should be updated for the appropriate section. There is an extra ".2"	Change to: Each Concern identified by the AD in accordance with 6.4.1 shall be addressed by at least one view	A	
INC -588	588	ED	6.6		835	There is a grammatical error in the sentence	Add word in red: When an architecture description includes more than one view for two or more of its architecture viewpoints...	OBE	See WG42-013
INC -589	589	ED	6.6		840	typo '(see.(6.9))' and hyperlink not active	remove additional '('. Line 862 has a correct usage, also fix hyperlink	OBE	The NOTE has been deprecated.
INC -590	590	ED	6.6		832	hyperlink not active for '6.4.3'	fix hyperlink	A	
INC -591	591	ED	6.6		852	Overviews and Architecture are capitalized	Change to lowercase "o" and "a".	A	
US- 592	592	TE	6.6	c)	844	This draft eliminates the requirement that each view cover the whole entity of interest from the perspective of the viewpoint. No rationale is given for this change. If views are allowed to be partial, then some ADs will not be an architecture description of the whole entity of interest.	Restore requirement that each view cover the whole entity of interest system from that viewpoint; or provide reasons why this form of incompleteness is acceptable; provide users with an alternate way to achieve	OBE	See WG42-013

1 **MB** = Member body / **NC** = National Committee (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by **)

2 **Type of comment:** **GT** = General Technical **TH** = Technical high **TL** = Technical Low **GE** = General Editorial **E** = Editorial

3 **Resolution code:** **OBE** = Superseded **AIP** = Agreed in principle **A** = Agreed R = Rejected **NA** = Non actionable

Disposition of Comments

Date:
30/09/2020Document:
ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 7 N 8181
(42010. CD1-v1.0)Project:
ISO/IEC/IEEE CD1 42010 (Ed2) Architecture
description

1.

2.

MB/ NC ¹	Cmt No	Type of Cmt ²	Clause/ Subcl.	Para/ Fig/ Tab/	Line No	Comments and rationale	Proposed change	Res code ³	Resolution on each comment received
						This may be because the system boundary has not been thought out or is erroneous. This change allows such ADs which are incomplete — i.e., only depicting small portions of an entity to conform to this standard. What is rationale for allowing conforming ADs to be significantly incomplete?	complete coverage.		
INC -593	593	ED	6.6	NOT E 1	840	There is an incorrect full stop and bracket prior to the number and the text (for the number) appears to be the wrong size	Remove the full stop and bracket between “see” and “6”, check font size	OBE	The NOTE has been deprecated.
INC -594	594	ED	6.6	NOT E 1	840	Typo in formatting.	(see 6.9).	OBE	The NOTE has been deprecated.
INC -595	595	TE	6.6	NOT E 1	837	Does this statement contradict the statement in the NOTE in 6.2 (line 688) which says that “An architecture description documents exactly one architecture for an entity of interest.”?		OBE	6.2 is correct. See WG42-013
INC -596	596	TL	6.6	Para 3	830	If the comment above is taken onboard then this should refer to the concerns identified as being addressed rather than those identified.	Each concern identified as being addressed by the AD in accordance with 6.4.1 shall be addressed by at least one view.	OBE	See INC 587
INC -597	597	ED	6.6	Para 3	830	Reference should be to 6.4.1 not 6.4.2.1.	Each concern identified by the AD in accordance with 6.4.1 shall be addressed by at least one view.	A	
INC -598	598	ED	6.6	Para 4	831	Reference should be to 6.4.2 not 6.4.2.2.	Each architecture aspect identified by the AD in accordance with 6.4.2 shall be addressed by at least one view.	A	
INC -599	599	ED	6.6	Para 7	835	This doesn’t quite read correctly, it should say “for two or more of its architecture viewpoints.	When an architecture description includes more than one view for two or more of its architecture	OBE	See WG42-013

1 MB = Member body / NC = National Committee (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by **)

2 Type of comment: GT = General Technical

TH = Technical high

TL = Technical Low

GE = General Editorial

E = Editorial

3 Resolution code: OBE = Superseded

AIP = Agreed in principle

A = Agreed R = Rejected

NA = Non actionable

Disposition of Comments

Date: 30/09/2020	Document: ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 7 N 8181 (42010. CD1-v1.0)	Project: ISO/IEC/IEEE CD1 42010 (Ed2) Architecture description
----------------------------	---	--

	MB/ NC ¹	Cmt No	Type of Cmt ²	Clause/ Subcl.	Para/ Fig/ Tab/	Line No	Comments and rationale	Proposed change	Res code ³	Resolution on each comment received
602.								viewpoints, it 835 shall identify which combinations of views are meant to be taken together.		
603.	INC -600	600	TL	6.6	Para	841	Should design/architecture assumptions and constraints be included as part of an architecture view?	Add design/architecture assumptions and constraints to the list	OBE	The NOTE has been deprecated.
604.	INC -601	601	TE	6.6	Para 10	847	Definitions for “model-based” and “non-model based” are not provided in the main body of this document. These concepts are introduced in the Change History on page v. Most readers will not read the change history upon reading the main body of this document.	Either reference the Change History for definitions of these terms, or provide a Note after line 847 that repeats the definitions of these terms.	AIP	The sentence has been deleted. It is handled in a better way in requirements on view components.
605.	AU- 1- 602	602	TL	6.7		877	It is not clear what is non-model. A real-world practical example would be helpful.	We propose to add: “For example, an information source may be a record of <i>expert opinion</i> , rather than a formal model that one can analyse using calculations, simulation, or any other suitable analysis method.”	A	
606.	GB- 603	603	TE	6.7		869	Lines 869-870: Architectural perspectives and architectural textures would benefit from clarification through definition or amplification.	Amplify what these are		Reference exists in informative NOTE
607.	WG 1- 604	604	ED	6.8.2		895	Poor grammar	Change to read, "... any governing correspondence methods (see 6.8.3)."	A	
608.	WG 1- 605	605	ED	6.8.2		894	Missing AD abbreviation	Change to read, "Each AD correspondence,,,".	A	
609.	WG 1- 606	606	ED	6.8.2		893	Poor grammar	Change to read, "... any governing correspondence	A	

1 **MB** = Member body / **NC** = National Committee (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by **)

2 **Type of comment:** **GT** = General Technical **TH** = Technical high **TL** = Technical Low **GE** = General Editorial **E** = Editorial

3 **Resolution code:** **OBE** = Superseded **AIP** = Agreed in principle **A** = Agreed R = Rejected **NA** = Non actionable

Disposition of Comments

Date:
30/09/2020Document:
ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 7 N 8181
(42010. CD1-v1.0)Project:
ISO/IEC/IEEE CD1 42010 (Ed2) Architecture
description

	MB/ NC ¹	Cmt No	Type of Cmt ²	Clause/ Subcl.	Para/ Fig/ Tab/	Line No	Comments and rationale	Proposed change	Res code ³	Resolution on each comment received
1.										
2.										
609.	606							methods (see 6.8.3)."		
610.	INC -607	607	ED	6.8.2		894	Left out "AD" to clarify this is "AD correspondence" and not "AD element correspondence"	"Each AD correspondence..."	A	
	US- 608	608	TE	6.8.2		889	Disposition of SSE-042 still does not address the 3 cases of correspondence utilized in actual practice.	Please address this issue to support all three use cases.	AIP	Regarding the 3 kinds of correspondence identified by SSE-042: - 1) between AD elements; - 2) between ADs; - 3) between AD elements and ADs. "An AD element correspondence shall identify its participating AD elements." is case #1 "Each (AD) correspondence shall identify the participating ADs." is case #2 "An AD element correspondence may involve elements within an AD or across several ADs." could have been a more precise description of case 3; But it is preferred to provide a note in the definition of the AD element stating that an AD can be considered as an AD element in another AD.
611.	INC -609	609	ED	6.8.2	Para 5	894	Missing "AD".	Change "Each correspondence" to "Each AD correspondence"	A	
612.	WG 1- 610	610	TE	6.8.3		903	Missing reference to self when involved in an AD correspondence and can eliminate line 909 - 911	Change to read, "... methods applying to itself or to its AD elements." Delete line 909 – 911.	A	
613.	INC -611	611	ED	6.8.3		922	This is section 6.8.3, so there is no need to reference itself	"(see 8)."	OBE	See WG1-613
614.	INC	612	ED	6.8.3		908	hyperlink not active for 'see 7'	fix hyperlink	A	

1 **MB** = Member body / **NC** = National Committee (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by **)2 **Type of comment:** **GT** = General Technical**TH** = Technical high**TL** = Technical Low**GE** = General Editorial**E** = Editorial3 **Resolution code:** **OBE** = Superseded**AIP** = Agreed in principle**A** = Agreed R = Rejected**NA** = Non actionable

Disposition of Comments

Date:
30/09/2020Document:
ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 7 N 8181
(42010. CD1-v1.0)Project:
ISO/IEC/IEEE CD1 42010 (Ed2) Architecture
description

2.	MB/ NC ¹	Cmt No	Type of Cmt ²	Clause/ Subcl.	Para/ Fig/ Tab/	Line No	Comments and rationale	Proposed change	Res code ³	Resolution on each comment received
615.	-612									
616.	WG 1- 613	613	TL	6.8.3	NOT E 3, 4 and 5	915	These NOTES belong in clause 5.2.9 or 5.2.10.	Move NOTES 3, 4 and 5 to sub-clause 5.2.9 or 5.2.10.	A	
617.	WG 1- 614	614	ED	6.9.2		936	Improve readability by using first sentence as lead-in to second sentence.	Change to read, "Since recording every architecture decision about an entity of interest is not practical, a decision recording and sharing strategy..."	A	
618.	INC -615	615	TE	6.9.2		947	After line 947: Additional Decision recording criteria	— Decisions affecting performance /evolvability — Decision is linked to requirement compliance — Decision is linked to technical standard selection — Decision is linked to system vulnerability mitigation	A	
	INC -616	616	TE	6.9.2	Para 3	939	Lines 939-947: Assumptions are established in architecture work to temporarily resolve unknowns that prevent the work from moving forward. However, it is critical to track assumptions in the architecture and eventually replace them with known information. The decision to replace an assumption with known information is a critical record to capture in order to document the resolution of that assumption. Decisions to resolve assumptions with known information should be captured in this list of key decisions to be captured in an architecture	Add to the list "decisions that result in the replacement of assumptions with known information".	A	

1 **MB** = Member body / **NC** = National Committee (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by **)2 **Type of comment:** **GT** = General Technical **TH** = Technical high **TL** = Technical Low **GE** = General Editorial **E** = Editorial3 **Resolution code:** **OBE** = Superseded **AIP** = Agreed in principle **A** = Agreed R = Rejected **NA** = Non actionable

Disposition of Comments

Date:
30/09/2020Document:
ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 7 N 8181
(42010. CD1-v1.0)Project:
ISO/IEC/IEEE CD1 42010 (Ed2) Architecture
description

2.	MB/ NC ¹	Cmt No	Type of Cmt ²	Clause/ Subcl.	Para/ Fig/ Tab/	Line No	Comments and rationale	Proposed change	Res code ³	Resolution on each comment received
619.	WG 1- 617	617	TE	7.1		988	description. This list ignores the variety of abstract extents ADFs exhibit. A reference ADF is rather different from an implementation ADF in structure and content yet both are ADF but with different purposes. While an architecture description framework is an architecture description organized in a particular way to achieve a particular purpose, this document does not prescribe that purpose nor can it set requirements for how such a purpose is achieved. Any of the AD elements can be irrelevant to that purpose and that is why the inclusion list a recommendation rather than a requirement.	Remove lines 988 – 1005 or rewrite in more realistic and practical text consistent with inclusion recommendations.	OBE	The changes of definitions of terms make this comment no longer applicable.
620.	WG 1- 618	618	TE	7.1		984	This statement make an informative Clause a normative reference for this requirement, which is not a permitted construction for a standard. The following NOTE also calls Clause 5 normative and it is not.	Delete the sentence or change 'shall' to 'can'. Delete NOTE 2 or rephrase to remove requirement language.	AIP	Change to "to the <u>concepts</u> in Clause 5"
621.	WG 1- 619	619	TL	7.1		971	Item c), d) and e) are all architecture consideration and that term should be used. An ADF without a stated concern is possible if for no other reason than such a concern can be trivially stated as purpose of the ADF.	Combine c), d) and e) into on list item as, "c) the identification of one or more than one architecture consideration as specified in 6.4.1, 6.4.2 or 6.4.3."		Architecture consideration is deprecated as first-class entity. No need to have requirements on them.
622.	WG 1- 620	620	TE	7.1		967	The requirement for inclusion is too ridged and unrealistic. (We'll move more horses with a carrot than a stick.) Conformance to a recommendation is still conformance.	Change to read, "An architecture description framework should include: ..."	A	
623.	INC	621	TL	7.1		973	Structure formalism is not always relevant	Change to allow this with "may"	AIP	Update to read 'f)g) the definition of

1 MB = Member body / NC = National Committee (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by **)

2 Type of comment: GT = General Technical

TH = Technical high

TL = Technical Low

GE = General Editorial

E = Editorial

3 Resolution code: OBE = Superseded

AIP = Agreed in principle

A = Agreed R = Rejected

NA = Non actionable

Disposition of Comments

Date:
30/09/2020Document:
ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 7 N 8181
(42010. CD1-v1.0)Project:
ISO/IEC/IEEE CD1 42010 (Ed2) Architecture
description

2.	MB/ NC ¹	Cmt No	Type of Cmt ²	Clause/ Subcl.	Para/ Fig/ Tab/	Line No	Comments and rationale	Proposed change	Res code ³	Resolution on each comment received
	-621						to an ADF so should not require this element	rather than "shall"		one or more structuring formalism to organize viewpoints, if applicable (per 5.4.2);"
624.	INC -622	622	TE	7.1		969	Items b-e are applicable to each Viewpoint in the ADF, not to the ADF as a whole	b) the identification of one or more typical stakeholders <u>for each viewpoint in the framework</u> c) the identification of one or more typical concerns <u>for each viewpoint in the framework</u> d) the identification of one or more generic architecture aspects <u>for each viewpoint in the framework</u> e) the identification of one or more generic stakeholder perspectives <u>for each viewpoint in the framework</u>	AIP	This list is elaborated with the flow-down approach described by Clause 5 and related figures Stakeholders->their concerns->viewpoints->perspectives & aspects. No need to implement the proposed changes; but there is a need to reorder this list to show this flow-down.
625.	INC -623	623	TE	7.1		1000	Delete this line. This is section 7.1. Also the definition of "applicable" is captured in lines 989 - 999 through their references.	DELETE "Applicable means when conditions of applicability (see 7.1) are met."	A	See WG 1-617
626.	INC -624	624	TE	7.1		983	Suggest making this statement a requirement rather than a recommendation.	Replace "should" with "shall".		Too stringent to require this
627.	INC -625	625	ED	7.1		995	hyperlink not active for '6.4.2' and '6.4.3'	fix hyperlink	A	See WG 1-617
628.	INC -626	626	ED	7.1		987	hyperlink not active for '5'	fix hyperlink	A	
629.	INC -627	627	ED	7.1		985	hyperlink not active for '5'	fix hyperlink	A	
630.	INC -628	628	ED	7.1		981	hyperlink not active for '7'	fix hyperlink	A	
631.	INC -629	629	ED	7.1		977	hyperlink not active for '8'	fix hyperlink	A	

1 MB = Member body / NC = National Committee (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by **)

2 Type of comment: GT = General Technical

TH = Technical high

TL = Technical Low

GE = General Editorial

E = Editorial

3 Resolution code: OBE = Superseded

AIP = Agreed in principle

A = Agreed R = Rejected

NA = Non actionable

Disposition of Comments

Date:
30/09/2020Document:
ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 7 N 8181
(42010. CD1-v1.0)Project:
ISO/IEC/IEEE CD1 42010 (Ed2) Architecture
description

	MB/ NC ¹	Cmt No	Type of Cmt ²	Clause/ Subcl.	Para/ Fig/ Tab/	Line No	Comments and rationale	Proposed change	Res code ³	Resolution on each comment received
632.	INC-630	630	ED	7.1		976	hyperlink not active for '8'	fix hyperlink	A	
633.	INC-631	631	ED	7.1		975	hyperlink not active for '8'	fix hyperlink	A	
634.	INC-632	632	ED	7.1		974	hyperlink not active for '6.4.2' and '6.4.3'	fix hyperlink	A	
635.	INC-633	633	ED	7.1		972	hyperlink not active for '6.4.3'	fix hyperlink	A	
636.	INC-634	634	ED	7.1		971	hyperlink not active for '6.4.2'	fix hyperlink	A	
637.	INC-635	635	ED	7.1		969	hyperlink not active for '6.3'	fix hyperlink	A	
638.	GB-636	636	ED	7.1		1003	Change 'frameworks' to 'framework'	Amend - English	OBE	Replaced by abbreviation ADF
639.	GB-637	637	TE	7.1		975	The relevant domain of interest, if applicable	Add to list	A	
640.	GB-638	638	TE	7.1		975	or can express architecture aspects	Add to end	A	
641.	GB-639	639	TE	7.1		973	Lines 973-974: An ADF shall include the identification of one or more framework dimension as per James Martin / Tim Rabbets proposal. Reference: (PPT file: "42010 fwk dimensions 2020.0528")	Amend to 'the specification of one or more structure formalism structured by framework dimensions, such as architecture aspects or stakeholder perspectives, and which are expressible through architecture viewpoints	OBE	See INC-621
642.	US-640	640	TE	7.1		967	These requirements seem much more complex than previous edition. Have any examples been produced to determine whether these requirements are actionable by users?	Clean up, or better explain, these requirements.		These requirements reflect current practice in existing ADF's.
643.	US-	641	ED	7.1		991	Combine bullets @995 and @991, as	Combine bullets @995 and	OBE	Architecture considerations are

1 **MB** = Member body / **NC** = National Committee (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by **)2 **Type of comment:** **GT** = General Technical**TH** = Technical high**TL** = Technical Low**GE** = General Editorial**E** = Editorial3 **Resolution code:** **OBE** = Superseded**AIP** = Agreed in principle**A** = Agreed R = Rejected**NA** = Non actionable

Disposition of Comments

Date: 30/09/2020	Document: ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 7 N 8181 (42010. CD1-v1.0)	Project: ISO/IEC/IEEE CD1 42010 (Ed2) Architecture description
----------------------------	---	--

2.	MB/ NC ¹	Cmt No	Type of Cmt ²	Clause/ Subcl.	Para/ Fig/ Tab/	Line No	Comments and rationale	Proposed change	Res code ³	Resolution on each comment received
	641						architecture considerations. This should precede bullet @993 about viewpoints, because any of these considerations can drive choice of viewpoints.	@991, as architecture considerations.		deprecated and are no longer a first class entity
644.	US-642	642	TE	7.1		1000	Circular reference of this section to itself. However, the draft is missing significant text on Conditions of Applicability. See 2011 edition, 6.1.	Restore text on CoA from 2011, 6.1.	AIP	This sentence is removed. Note: the 2011 edition does define CoA formally.
645.	US-643	643	TE	7.1	f)	973	"Structure formalism" has not been sufficiently defined for users to meet this requirement. In fact, the text here is inconsistent with 5.4.2 which describes a structure formalism in terms of architecture considerations, correspondences, and viewpoints while here it refers to aspects and perspectives.	Establish the details of "structure formalism" so that its requirements can be met; and find a better name.	OBE	See INC-621
646.	INC-644	644	ED	7.2		1013	Broken reference "(per a)"	"(per 6.3)"	OBE	This line was deleted during the rewrite of the requirements
647.	INC-645	645	TE	7.2		1007	Suggest making this statement a requirement rather than a recommendation.	Replace "should" with "shall".	A	
648.	INC-646	646	TL	7.2		1006	Lines 1006-1013: "Architecture description languages" (see also discussion/rant above)	(See discussion/rant above in the context of 5.4.3) Each use of "ADL" within the section should be changed to "formal or informal ADL".	OBE	Refer INC-192
649.	GB-647	647	ED	7.2		1012	Stakeholders don't hold considerations – they hold stakes	Amend to '... may identify one or more typical stakeholders and the architecture considerations in which they have an interest'	A	
650.	US-648	648	TE	7.2	a)	1008	What is a viewing convention? It is never defined, but here is introduced as a requirement to have one (or more).	Define VC.	OBE	Viewing convention is now called view method and is now defined in clause 5.

1 **MB** = Member body / **NC** = National Committee (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by **)

2 **Type of comment:** **GT** = General Technical **TH** = Technical high **TL** = Technical Low **GE** = General Editorial **E** = Editorial

3 **Resolution code:** **OBE** = Superseded **AIP** = Agreed in principle **A** = Agreed R = Rejected **NA** = Non actionable

Disposition of Comments

Date:
30/09/2020Document:
ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 7 N 8181
(42010. CD1-v1.0)Project:
ISO/IEC/IEEE CD1 42010 (Ed2) Architecture
description

1.

2.

651.

652.

653.

654.

655.

656.

657.

MB/ NC ¹	Cmt No	Type of Cmt ²	Clause/ Subcl.	Para/ Fig/ Tab/	Line No	Comments and rationale	Proposed change	Res code ³	Resolution on each comment received
US-649	649	TE	7.2	c)	1010	7.2 seems to be suffering some editing failures. An ADL (like a viewpoint or model kind) can introduce AD elements, but it does not "implement view components". These only appear in ADs, given the current definitions.	Revisit text here against earlier drafts and previous edition. It seems to be missing significant elements and introducing erroneous ones.	OBE	See IEEE-1232
INC-650	650	ED	7.2	Last	1013	Line 1013 has a reference of (per a) at the end of the last sentence. But the reference for per a does not make sense. Per b would make more sense since it is addressing ADL and architecture considerations	Change (per a) to (per item b)	A	
WG 1-651	651	TE	8.1		1018	An architecture aspect may be identified for which no typical stakeholder is identifiable or for which almost all stakeholders are identified, e.g. system security.	Change to read, "b) known typical stakeholders..."	A	insert "known" before typical.
GB-652	652	TE	8.1		1022	Or legends	Add to end	A	
GB-653	653	TE	8.1		1017	As per James Martin /Tim Rabbets proposal the text needs to be amended to reflect the relationship between viewpoint and concerns/aspects. Reference: (PPT file: "42010 fwk dimensions 2020.0528")	Change to 'one or more concerns (per 6.x) framed by this viewpoint or architecture aspects expressed using this viewpoint'.	AIP	In lieu of the changes to the definition of aspects, the changed text will be different from the proposal. (one or more concerns framed and one or more aspects refined by the concerns)
US-654	654	TE	8.1		1020	Missing item: c) one or more model kinds and legends. Without this, there is no required contents in an AD!—since required content is at the view component level.	New item c); renumber accordingly.	AIP	See IEEE 1235
WG 1-655	655	ED	8.2		1056	Be consistent with verb form. Both 'will be' and 'is' appear in paragraph	Change 'will be' to 'are' in 2 places here and on line 1066.	A	

1 **MB** = Member body / **NC** = National Committee (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by **)2 **Type of comment:** **GT** = General Technical **TH** = Technical high **TL** = Technical Low **GE** = General Editorial **E** = Editorial3 **Resolution code:** **OBE** = Superseded **AIP** = Agreed in principle **A** = Agreed R = Rejected **NA** = Non actionable

Disposition of Comments

Date: 30/09/2020	Document: ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 7 N 8181 (42010. CD1-v1.0)	Project: ISO/IEC/IEEE CD1 42010 (Ed2) Architecture description
----------------------------	---	--

	MB/ NC ¹	Cmt No	Type of Cmt ²	Clause/ Subcl.	Para/ Fig/ Tab/	Line No	Comments and rationale	Proposed change	Res code ³	Resolution on each comment received
658.	WG 1- 656	656	TE	8.2		1034	The stakeholders are irrelevant for many model kinds and for those needing stakeholders they will be indemnified to meet the needs of the model kind.	Delete line 1034.	A	
659.	INC -657	657	TE	8.2		1030	Suggest making this statement a requirement rather than a recommendation.	Replace "should" with "shall".	A	
660.	US- 658	658	TE	8.2		1030	Missing elements of specification (in comparison to previous drafts).	Add new item b): "the language, notation, convention or modelling technique to be used"; renumber other items accordingly.	A	
661.	US- 659	659	ED	8.2		1035	Fix mistaken cross reference.	Change reference from "Item c)" to "Item b)".	A	
662.	WG 1- 660	660	TE	8.3		1058	Model kinds provide view methods as well.	Insert note after line 1058 to read, "NOTE 2 Many model kind provide view methods as part of the modelling paradigm."	OBE	See IN-1022 and IEEE-1240
663.	INC -661	661	TE	8.3		1059	Use of undefined terminological item " <i>non-model</i> ". I'm not even sure what this is meant to mean – perhaps " <i>informal model</i> "? If so, then almost all other uses of " <i>model</i> " up to this point are probably meant to mean " <i>formal model</i> "?	Add definition of " <i>model</i> " and the sub-types " <i>formal model</i> " and " <i>informal model</i> " to Clause 3 (q.v. discussion of " <i>formal ADL</i> " and " <i>informal ADL</i> " above!). Review all other uses of " <i>model</i> " and clarify as necessary.		Using usual dictionary meaning of this term, not needed in Clause 3.
664.	INC -662	662	TE	8.3		1051	Lines 1051-1052: Definition of terminological item, "Correspondence methods", is missing from Clause 3	Add (move) definition to Clause 3 (and reconcile with definition moved from 5.2.9)		Using usual dictionary meaning of this term, not needed in Clause 3.
665.	INC -663	663	TE	8.3		1049	Lines 1049-1050: Definition of terminological items, "Design methods" and "Implementation methods", are missing from Clause 3	Add (move) definitions to Clause 3		Using usual dictionary meaning of this term, not needed in Clause 3.
666.	INC	664	TE	8.3		1047	Lines 1047-1048: Definition of	Add (move) definition to Clause		Using usual dictionary meaning of

1 **MB** = Member body / **NC** = National Committee (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by **)

2 **Type of comment:** **GT** = General Technical **TH** = Technical high **TL** = Technical Low **GE** = General Editorial **E** = Editorial

3 **Resolution code:** **OBE** = Superseded **AIP** = Agreed in principle **A** = Agreed R = Rejected **NA** = Non actionable

Disposition of Comments

Date:
30/09/2020Document:
ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 7 N 8181
(42010. CD1-v1.0)Project:
ISO/IEC/IEEE CD1 42010 (Ed2) Architecture
description

2.	MB/ NC ¹	Cmt No	Type of Cmt ²	Clause/ Subcl.	Para/ Fig/ Tab/	Line No	Comments and rationale	Proposed change	Res code ³	Resolution on each comment received
	-664						terminological item, "Analysis methods", is missing from Clause 3	3		this term, not needed in Clause 3.
667.	INC -665	665	TE	8.3		1045	Lines 1045-1046: Definition of terminological item, "Interpretive methods", is missing from Clause 3	Add (move) definition to Clause 3		Using usual dictionary meaning of this term, not needed in Clause 3.
668.	INC -666	666	TE	8.3		1042	Lines 1042-1044: Definition of terminological item, "Construction methods", is missing from Clause 3	Add (move) definition to Clause 3		Using usual dictionary meaning of this term, not needed in Clause 3.
669.	INC -667	667	TE	8.3		1038	Line 1038-1041: Definition of terminological item, "View methods", is missing from Clause 3	Add (move) definition to Clause 3 (and reconcile with definition moved from 5.2.6)		Using usual dictionary meaning of this term, not needed in Clause 3.
670.	GB- 668	668	ED	8.3		1062	English – change 'is' to 'are'	Amend	A	
671.	GB- 669	669	ED	8.3		1057	English – change 'is' to 'are'	Amend	A	
672.	IT- 4- 670	670	TE	8.3	NOT E	1053	Clarify the term model data	Add a definition		Using usual dictionary meaning of this term, not needed in Clause 3.
673.	INC -671	671	TL	8.8.1		886	Not a good reason to permit known inconsistencies to persist in an architecture description. Known incompleteness is fine, but a known inconsistency is fundamentally different and more concerning. An inconsistency exists when the architecture description enables two or more incompatible assertions, e.g., there are no dependencies and there are dependencies, or the dependency is only in one direction and only in the opposite direction.	Clarify that compliance with the standard requires the nonexistence of known inconsistencies.		Conformance only means AD meets requirements of the standard, not that the AD is somehow complete or correct in all respects.
674.	INC -672	672	TH	8.8.1		880	It seems overly generous to allow an architecture description to claim	Clarify that compliance with the standard requires the		Conformance only means AD meets requirements of the standard, not that

1 **MB** = Member body / **NC** = National Committee (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by **)2 **Type of comment:** **GT** = General Technical **TH** = Technical high **TL** = Technical Low **GE** = General Editorial **E** = Editorial3 **Resolution code:** **OBE** = Superseded **AIP** = Agreed in principle **A** = Agreed R = Rejected **NA** = Non actionable

Disposition of Comments

Date: 30/09/2020	Document: ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 7 N 8181 (42010. CD1-v1.0)	Project: ISO/IEC/IEEE CD1 42010 (Ed2) Architecture description
----------------------------	---	--

2.	MB/ NC ¹	Cmt No	Type of Cmt ²	Clause/ Subcl.	Para/ Fig/ Tab/	Line No	Comments and rationale	Proposed change	Res code ³	Resolution on each comment received
							compliance to the standard when it contains known inconsistencies. If political constraints force the architecture description developers to be unable to reconcile inconsistencies, it seems reasonable to impose the consequence that they cannot claim conformance.	nonexistence of known inconsistencies.		the AD is somehow complete or correct in all respects.
675.	WG 1- 673	673	TE	3		159	Rather than place a very long segment of text here as a comment or try to break it apart disjoint parts for individual definitions, a PowerPoint presentation, Concern is complicated.pdf, is attached that includes identification of problems with several terms, addresses the ongoing debate over concern and aspect, identifies a more consistent approach to term selection.	The PowerPoint makes specific recommendations for changes to 4 terms - concern, aspect, view and viewpoint. (The last slide identifies a "value chain of architecting information flow that is addressed in a later comment.)	AIP	See INC-1254-1259
676.	GB- 674	674	ED	A.1		1070	English – change 'using' to 'user'	Amend	AIP	It is better to delete using rather than change it to user.
677.	INC -675	675	TL	A.10		1524	Unclear why open architectures are described here. There doesn't seem to be any particular distinction between open architectures and non-open architectures as far as their architecture descriptions are concerned.	Delete section A.10 or identify particular architecture description considerations applicable to open architectures.	A	
678.	GB- 676	676	ED	A.10		1566	Insert 'an' before 'essential' - English	Amend	OBE	See INC-675, US-678
679.	GB- 677	677	TE	A.10		1542	Delete 'Data Fusion Interface (MCS TA-defined),' since should not have been included	Amend	OBE	See INC-675, US-678
680.	US- 678	678	TE	A.10		1524	What is the need for including a discussion of open architectures in this standard?	Delete A.10 it is unrelated to the remainder of the standard.	A	

1 **MB** = Member body / **NC** = National Committee (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by **)

2 **Type of comment:** **GT** = General Technical **TH** = Technical high **TL** = Technical Low **GE** = General Editorial **E** = Editorial

3 **Resolution code:** **OBE** = Superseded **AIP** = Agreed in principle **A** = Agreed R = Rejected **NA** = Non actionable

Disposition of Comments

Date:
30/09/2020Document:
ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 7 N 8181
(42010. CD1-v1.0)Project:
ISO/IEC/IEEE CD1 42010 (Ed2) Architecture
description

1.

2.

681.

682.

683.

684.

685.

686.

687.

688.

MB/ NC ¹	Cmt No	Type of Cmt ²	Clause/ Subcl.	Para/ Fig/ Tab/	Line No	Comments and rationale	Proposed change	Res code ³	Resolution on each comment received
AU- 2- 679	679	TL		A.11	1456	This architecture description or views are developed for different types of stakeholders. ArchiMate is a very comprehensive language to model the architecture for architects, managers and developers, in practice, it is not suitable for modelling/ presenting architecture to senior managers and executives level strategic stakeholders. This is evident an outdated modelling approach as depicted in "Figure A.11 – Example of a correspondence satisfying the Task-Interactions rule"		A	The goal was a simple, vendor-neutral example to help motivate the idea of correspondences.
INC -680	680	ED	A.2		1098	hyperlink not active for '3.2'	fix hyperlink	A	
INC -681	681	ED	A.2		1088	hyperlink not active for '3.2'	fix hyperlink	A	
GB- 682	682	ED	A.2		1114	First 'to' in line is superfluous	Delete 'to' after 'drive'	A	
INC -683	683	TE	A.3		1130	Viewpoint frames . . . - Untrue – but would be true for considerations.	Viewpoint is a model of perspective, which directly or indirectly addresses one or more concerns.		The terms viewpoint and perspective needs to be looked at using the definitions provided in clause 3.and not the dictionary definitions.
GB- 684	684	TE	A.3		1132	It allows stakeholders to focus purely on what is of interest to them rather than ' a few things at a time'	Amend text accordingly	A	
GB- 685	685	TE	A.3		1116	Lines 1116 - 1129: Delete as quotation conflates concerns and aspects. Concerns does not appear in the quote to be related directly to specific classes of stakeholders. It is an argument for aspects.	Delete		""separation of concerns" is a key-concept for Architecture Description. Line 1116 explains the origin.
INC	686	ED	A.4.1		1155	Need commas around "stakeholder	The other dimension,	A	

1 MB = Member body / NC = National Committee (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by **)

2 Type of comment: GT = General Technical TH = Technical high TL = Technical Low GE = General Editorial E = Editorial

3 Resolution code: OBE = Superseded AIP = Agreed in principle A = Agreed R = Rejected NA = Non actionable

Disposition of Comments

Date: 30/09/2020	Document: ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 7 N 8181 (42010. CD1-v1.0)	Project: ISO/IEC/IEEE CD1 42010 (Ed2) Architecture description
----------------------------	---	--

2.	MB/ NC ¹	Cmt No	Type of Cmt ²	Clause/ Subcl.	Para/ Fig/ Tab/	Line No	Comments and rationale	Proposed change	Res code ³	Resolution on each comment received
689.							perspective"	"stakeholder perspective," is also fundamental and captures what an architect does,		
690.	INC -687	687	ED	A.4.1		1147	"set" should be plural	respective rows and columns comprise, it appears there are at least 2 orthogonal sets of considerations which	A	
691.	INC -688	688	TE	A.4.1		1162	Issues - Is this a fourth kind of consideration?	Some architectural concerns are addressed directly via architectural perspectives, others are addressed indirectly via structural types and architectural properties.		This is better handled using structure categories which is discussed in clause 5. Further, architecture considerations are deprecated in this document.
692.	INC -689	689	TE	A.4.1		1155	Lines 1155-1161: Clear as mud, sorry	Similarly, Architects do not necessarily address all architecture perspectives simultaneously nor even all possible perspectives. Some perspectives may not be important for particular architecting efforts.		This paragraph is about "Stakeholder perspectives" and is about what sakteholders think; while aspects is driven by why the architecture should cover. These are complementary approaches.
693.	INC -690	690	TE	A.4.1		1152	Some aspects . . . - Confusing because aspect is defined as one of the three architecture considerations	Some aspects may not be important for...	A	
694.	GB- 691	691	GE	A.4.1		1140	Lines 1140-1160: The proposal from James Martin /Tim Rabbets introduces the notion of 'dimension' (framework dimension) which can apply to aspects and stakeholder perspectives inter alia. The proposal contains much useful text which can be drawn from to populate this subsection	Section should cover the issues of dimensions of an architecture description, fundamental role of architecture aspects, and typical stakeholder perspectives. It can refer also to architecting stages, domains, layers of an architecture.	AIP	Concept of 'framework dimension' is covered by the concept now called 'structural category'. An ADF defines the structural categories used in its structuring formalism to organize its viewpoint specifications.
	INC	692	TE	A.4.2		1204	In spite of the caveat in lines 2207 thru	(1) On line 1204 replace "safety,	A	

1 **MB** = Member body / **NC** = National Committee (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by **)

2 **Type of comment:** **GT** = General Technical **TH** = Technical high **TL** = Technical Low **GE** = General Editorial **E** = Editorial

3 **Resolution code:** **OBE** = Superseded **AIP** = Agreed in principle **A** = Agreed R = Rejected **NA** = Non actionable

Disposition of Comments

1.

Date: 30/09/2020	Document: ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 7 N 8181 (42010. CD1-v1.0)	Project: ISO/IEC/IEEE CD1 42010 (Ed2) Architecture description
----------------------------	---	--

2.

MB/ NC ¹	Cmt No	Type of Cmt ²	Clause/ Subcl.	Para/ Fig/ Tab/	Line No	Comments and rationale	Proposed change	Res code ³	Resolution on each comment received
-692						2209, addressing 'Safety, Security, and Privacy Aspects of the an architecture vs Concerns. Given the challenges we see in systems today, whether they be self-driving cars, IoT (like "smart" appliances - think ovens with internet connectivity or baby monitors with cameras), or medical devices and disease tracking apps, safety, security, and privacy should not longer be just treated as concerns and should be "full-blown" aspects of the architecture. Lines 1197 thru 1199 do suggest concerns may "over time" become codified into aspects. That said, these three need be addressed "up front" and not only be seen as something that will be addressed in time (if ever, just because we didn't see the concern coming from stakeholders until much later in the lifecycle of the architecture development.)	security" with "portability," (or some other "ility") and (2) Insert in between lines 1196 and 1197, the following: "Safety, Security, and Privacy should be considered as primary aspects and given full consideration along with other aspects, such as functional and structural aspects, due to the impact on the architecture if they are not addressed early on the specification and development of the architecture." (3) Again, in spite of the caveat on line 761, add 'safety', 'security', and 'privacy' to the list of aspects in clause 6.4.2 lines 741-742.		
695. INC -693	693	ED	A.4.2		1207	Sentence ends with a colon instead of a period	with "cross-cutting concerns" (See [26]).	A	
696. INC -694	694	ED	A.4.2		1195	there is an "aa" where an "a" should be	or a sequence diagram or a colored Petri net; the statistical properties of the process can be described by a simulation	A	
697. INC -695	695	ED	A.4.2		1191	extra comma right before period	Some architecture aspects can be considered primary (e.g. functional and structural aspects).	A	
698. INC -696	696	ED	A.4.2		1207	“.” instead of a full stop at the end of the sentence	Replace the colon with a full stop at the end of the sentence, after the closed bracket	A	

1 **MB** = Member body / **NC** = National Committee (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by **)

2 **Type of comment:** **GT** = General Technical **TH** = Technical high **TL** = Technical Low **GE** = General Editorial **E** = Editorial

3 **Resolution code:** **OBE** = Superseded **AIP** = Agreed in principle **A** = Agreed R = Rejected **NA** = Non actionable

Disposition of Comments

Date: 30/09/2020	Document: ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 7 N 8181 (42010. CD1-v1.0)	Project: ISO/IEC/IEEE CD1 42010 (Ed2) Architecture description
----------------------------	---	--

	MB/ NC ¹	Cmt No	Type of Cmt ²	Clause/ Subcl.	Para/ Fig/ Tab/	Line No	Comments and rationale	Proposed change	Res code ³	Resolution on each comment received
699.	INC-697	697	ED	A.4.2		1191	There is an erroneous comma after the bracket and before the full stop	Remove the comma after the closed bracket	A	
700.	INC-698	698	TE	A.4.2		1185	Why talking about views now?	Views are architecture models incorporating relevant architectural aspects (types of structure) and properties.		Views are not always models. Aspects are not types of structure.
701.	INC-699	699	TE	A.4.2		1184	characteristic or a feature of an architecture - Ok – was this stated earlier?	Aspect is type of structure.		
702.	INC-700	700	TE	A.4.2		1170	Aspect was earlier defined as a type of consideration	Collectively the architecture aspects provide the basis for capturing all of the relevant form of structure in the architecture.	A	
703.	INC-701	701	TE	A.4.2		1168	Lines 1168-1169: Change definition of aspects - focus architecture considerations such as characteristics - ????	Architecture aspects are types of structure found in architectures. [the rest of the section will need to be rewritten to reflect this definition]		The comment is unclear because the definition of "Aspect" already focuses on "Characteristics of an architecture". This way of thinking is consistent with the previous edition and a significant set of references to aspects. The proposal (association of "aspect" with "structure") is neither consistent with the comment, nor consistent with known references.
704.	GB-702	702	TE	A.4.2		1172	Lines 1172 - 1207: The text can be updated to reflect email exchanges since drafting including reference to other sources on this usage of the term 'aspect'. Reference: (PPT file: "42010 fwk dimensions 2020.0528")	Update section per text in reference (last slide).	A	
705.	GB-703	703	TE	A.4.2		1168	Lines 1168-1171: The proposal has clarified the definition of architecture aspect	This document uses the term <i>architecture aspect</i> as an organizing basis for architecture description. Aspects can be used to focus architecture	A	

1 **MB** = Member body / **NC** = National Committee (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by **)

2 **Type of comment:** **GT** = General Technical **TH** = Technical high **TL** = Technical Low **GE** = General Editorial **E** = Editorial

3 **Resolution code:** **OBE** = Superseded **AIP** = Agreed in principle **A** = Agreed R = Rejected **NA** = Non actionable

Disposition of Comments

Date: 30/09/2020	Document: ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 7 N 8181 (42010. CD1-v1.0)	Project: ISO/IEC/IEEE CD1 42010 (Ed2) Architecture description
----------------------------	---	--

MB/ NC ¹	Cmt No	Type of Cmt ²	Clause/ Subcl.	Para/ Fig/ Tab/	Line No	Comments and rationale	Proposed change	Res code ³	Resolution on each comment received
							considerations such as characteristics into cohesive subsets of an architecture description. Collectively the aspects cover all relevant architecture considerations and are organized in a way which draws upon theory and established practice. The aspects align with technical architecting specialisms which access relevant architectural information to be able to analyze, synthesize, assess, elaborate their particular aspect(s) and in turn add to (ie, develop, embellish, elaborate one, increase confidence in, etc) the architectural information. Examples of such specialisms include information architects and analysts, security architects, ARM (RAM-D) engineers, human factors specialists, human organization experts, and cost forecasters.		
706. INC -704	704	ED	A.4.2	Ex	1195	“aa” before sequence	Replace “aa” with “a”	A	
707. INC -705	705	ED	A.4.2	Ex	1195	Typo “aa sequence diagram” should be “a sequence diagram”.	EXAMPLE The functional aspect can be described by a functional decomposition diagram; the process or behavioral 1193 aspect that helps one	A	

1 **MB** = Member body / **NC** = National Committee (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by **)

2 **Type of comment:** **GT** = General Technical **TH** = Technical high **TL** = Technical Low **GE** = General Editorial **E** = Editorial

3 **Resolution code:** **OBE** = Superseded **AIP** = Agreed in principle **A** = Agreed R = Rejected **NA** = Non actionable

Disposition of Comments

Date: 30/09/2020	Document: ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 7 N 8181 (42010. CD1-v1.0)	Project: ISO/IEC/IEEE CD1 42010 (Ed2) Architecture description
----------------------------	---	--

2.	MB/ NC ¹	Cmt No	Type of Cmt ²	Clause/ Subcl.	Para/ Fig/ Tab/	Line No	Comments and rationale	Proposed change	Res code ³	Resolution on each comment received
								understand what is the process that performs this function can be described by an activity diagram 1194 or a sequence diagram or a colored Petri net; the statistical properties of the process can be described by a simulation 1195 model, and so on.		
708.	INC-706	706	ED	A.4.2	Last	1207	Inconsistent referencing style nad incorrect end of sentence – "(See [26]);" should read "(see [26])."	The concept of aspects has been used in software development to deal 1206 with "cross-cutting concerns" (see [26]).	A	
709.	INC-707	707	ED	A.4.2	Para 7	1195	Misspell	Change "or aa sequence diagram" to "or a sequence diagram"	A	
710.	WG 1-708	708	TE	A.4.3		1223	The statement regarding GERAM is incorrect. GERAM is not a 2D grid and the corresponding notion of perspectives applies to each of its dimensions.	Change to read, "...NAF calls them "subjects of concern". GERAM has two of its three primary dimensions representing extent of abstraction (genericity) and life cycle modelling phase. The basic idea is similar across these frameworks..."2 of its 2 of its dimensions	A	
711.	INC-709	709	ED	A.4.3		1216	extra special characters in sentence. Take out the extra symbols « and ".	phase, level of abstraction, etc.	AIP	See INC-710
712.	INC-710	710	ED	A.4.3		1215	extra special characters in sentence. Take out the extra symbols « and ".	phase, level of abstraction, etc.	A	
713.	INC-711	711	ED	A.4.3		1215	missing comma after clause "such as"	such as, by stakeholder	A	
714.	INC	712	ED	A.4.3		1214	Incorrect use of colon before clause "such	Perspective leads to an	A	

1 **MB** = Member body / **NC** = National Committee (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by **)

2 **Type of comment:** **GT** = General Technical **TH** = Technical high **TL** = Technical Low **GE** = General Editorial **E** = Editorial

3 **Resolution code:** **OBE** = Superseded **AIP** = Agreed in principle **A** = Agreed R = Rejected **NA** = Non actionable

Disposition of Comments

Date:
30/09/2020Document:
ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 7 N 8181
(42010. CD1-v1.0)Project:
ISO/IEC/IEEE CD1 42010 (Ed2) Architecture
description

2.	MB/ NC ¹	Cmt No	Type of Cmt ²	Clause/ Subcl.	Para/ Fig/ Tab/	Line No	Comments and rationale	Proposed change	Res code ³	Resolution on each comment received
715.	-712						as"	understanding of how focused aspects of a subject relate to each other and the whole,		
716.	INC -713	713	ED	A.4.3		1216	Level of abstraction has one symbol at the start of the statement << and one symbol at the end of the statement "	Assuming that the symbols either side of level of abstraction are supposed to be the same, make them common to the correct symbol	AIP	See INC-710
717.	INC -714	714	ED	A.4.3		1215	Level of abstraction has one symbol at the start of the statement << and one symbol at the end of the statement "	Assuming that the symbols either side of level of abstraction are supposed to be the same, make them common to the correct symbol	AIP	See INC-710
718.	INC -715	715	TE	A.4.3		1215	Lines 1215-1216: Or are these different perspectives?	Viewpoint is a model of perspective.		The proposal is not elaborated enough to allow the 42010 editors to understand what you would like to express. I.e. with the current definition of "perspective" given by clause 3 and the definition of model we can find in common dictionaries, it is not possible to understand what "model of perspective" could mean.
719.	GB- 716	716	TE	A.4.3		1220	Amend 'architecture frameworks' to 'architecture description frameworks'	Amend accordingly	A	
	GB- 717	717	TE	A.4.3		1220	Lines 1220-1230: This material really falls under the heading of 'framework dimensions'	Insert heading at start 'framework dimensions' Need to check that rows are universally stakeholder perspectives – we should report what the rows and columns are used for (and they may be called different things as compared with their usage) in certain common	AIP	Proposal is Implemented as Structuring categories.

1 **MB** = Member body / **NC** = National Committee (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by **)2 **Type of comment:** **GT** = General Technical**TH** = Technical high**TL** = Technical Low**GE** = General Editorial**E** = Editorial3 **Resolution code:** **OBE** = Superseded**AIP** = Agreed in principle**A** = Agreed R = Rejected**NA** = Non actionable

Disposition of Comments

Date: 30/09/2020	Document: ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 7 N 8181 (42010. CD1-v1.0)	Project: ISO/IEC/IEEE CD1 42010 (Ed2) Architecture description
----------------------------	---	--

	MB/ NC ¹	Cmt No	Type of Cmt ²	Clause/ Subcl.	Para/ Fig/ Tab/	Line No	Comments and rationale	Proposed change	Res code ³	Resolution on each comment received
1.								grids rather than shoehorn them into our preferred pattern of aspects and stakeholder perspectives.		
720.	GB-718	718	TE	A.4.3		1209	Lines 1209-1219: The text really refers to any perspective held by an observer of an entity. A stakeholder perspective is a beholder (observer) based perspective when the beholder is a stakeholder in the entity being observed (and more specifically is used in conjunction with a category of, or typical such, stakeholders). The focus on the entity being observed concerns the stakeholder interests.	Insert text at start to state how we use stakeholder perspective in this standard as precursor to existing text.	A	
721.	INC-719	719	ED	A.4.3	Para 1	1215	Inconsistent use of quotation marks - «level of abstraction» – should be “level of abstraction”	Perspective leads to an understanding of how focused aspects of a subject relate to each other and to the whole: 1214 such as by stakeholder (stakeholder type), domain, phase, “level of abstraction”, etc.	AIP	See INC-710
722.	INC-720	720	ED	A.4.3	Para 2	1216	Inconsistent use of guillemets/quotes. Use one or the other but not both in one instance.	Change «level of abstraction” to “level of abstraction”	AIP	See INC-710
723.	INC-721	721	ED	A.4.3	Para 2	1215	Inconsistent use of guillemets/quotes. Use one or the other but not both in one instance.	Change «level of abstraction” to “level of abstraction”	AIP	See INC-710
724.	INC-722	722	ED	A.4.4		1241	"Architecture considerations" is not a complete sentence.	Delete?	OBE	See INC-730
725.	INC-723	723	ED	A.4.4		1242	Extra word should be deleted which results in blank line.	"no text left"	OBE	See INC-730
726.	INC-724	724	ED	A.4.4		1241	Dangling words "Architecture Considerations" after last sentence should	usually represent aspect-related items and the rows usually	OBE	See INC-730

1 **MB** = Member body / **NC** = National Committee (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by **)

2 **Type of comment:** **GT** = General Technical **TH** = Technical high **TL** = Technical Low **GE** = General Editorial **E** = Editorial

3 **Resolution code:** **OBE** = Superseded **AIP** = Agreed in principle **A** = Agreed R = Rejected **NA** = Non actionable

Disposition of Comments

Date: 30/09/2020	Document: ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 7 N 8181 (42010. CD1-v1.0)	Project: ISO/IEC/IEEE CD1 42010 (Ed2) Architecture description
----------------------------	---	--

2.	MB/ NC ¹	Cmt No	Type of Cmt ²	Clause/ Subcl.	Para/ Fig/ Tab/	Line No	Comments and rationale	Proposed change	Res code ³	Resolution on each comment received
							be removed	represent perspective-related items.		
727.	INC -725	725	ED	A.4.4		1242	"Architecture Considerations" is not a complete sentence	remove or make a complete sentence	OBE	See INC-730
728.	INC -726	726	ED	A.4.4		1236	says "properties of or concepts", should not have "of"	remove "of"	A	
729.	INC -727	727	ED	A.4.4		1235	Says "Likewise, the viewing". Sentence is incorrect -- needs "if".	change to "Likewise, if the viewing"	A	
730.	INC -728	728	ED	A.4.4		1241	Lines 1241 / 1242: There is an erroneous "Architecture Considerations" at the end of the sentence	Remove "Architecture Considerations" from the end of the sentence	OBE	See INC-730
731.	INC -729	729	TE	A.4.4		1245	Lines 1245-1247: You would always do this, even if driven by stakeholder concerns!	Leave as is		
732.	INC -730	730	ED	A.4.4		1241	Lines 1241-1242: Architecture considerations – Heading?	Delete "Architecture Considerations"	OBE	Architecture considerations are deprecated. There is no need to highlight it in the Annex
733.	INC -731	731	TE	A.4.4		1237	Aspects and perspectives - What about concerns?	Leave as is.		
734.	INC -732	732	TE	A.4.4		1232	Lines 1232-1233: Thinks about something - These are really not easy to distinguish. Aspect was a previously defined as a feature of characteristic of an architecture, not a way of viewing.	Architecture perspectives are combinations of structural type and compatible properties, selected because of their relevance to stakeholders.		See INC-698
735.	GB- 733	733	GT	A.4.4		1232	Lines 1232-1254: The present text perpetuates that confusion. In the proposal from James Martin / Tim Rabbets a clear distinction is drawn between the two, An architecture aspect is an organizing basis for architecture description. A stakeholder perspective is a way of considering an entity as typically held by (a category of) stakeholder.	Present text requires revision to reflect this and can draw upon material in proposal – it may also be more suitably included under previous heading of 'framework dimensions' if adopted	A	

1 **MB** = Member body / **NC** = National Committee (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by **)

2 **Type of comment:** **GT** = General Technical

TH = Technical high

TL = Technical Low

GE = General Editorial

E = Editorial

3 **Resolution code:** **OBE** = Superseded

AIP = Agreed in principle

A = Agreed R = Rejected

NA = Non actionable

Disposition of Comments

Date: 30/09/2020	Document: ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 7 N 8181 (42010. CD1-v1.0)	Project: ISO/IEC/IEEE CD1 42010 (Ed2) Architecture description
----------------------------	---	--

	MB/ NC ¹	Cmt No	Type of Cmt ²	Clause/ Subcl.	Para/ Fig/ Tab/	Line No	Comments and rationale	Proposed change	Res code ³	Resolution on each comment received
736.	INC -734	734	ED	A.4.4	Para 1	1235	Lines 1235-1236: I don't think this reads correctly – see suggested alternative.	When the perspective is shifted, then often the properties or concepts are different. Likewise, when the viewing aspect is changed then different properties of, or concepts about the entity are seen.	A	
737.	INC -735	735	ED	A.4.4	Para 2	1241	Lines 1241-1242: Last two words "Architecture Considerations" are not required.		OBE	See INC-730
738.	INC -736	736	ED	A.4.4	Para 2	1241	Lines 1241-1242: Unfinished sentence "Architecture Considerations". Not sure if this is an unfinished sentence or it was meant to be section A.4.5.	Delete, finish sentence, or make title of A.4.5.	OBE	See INC-730
739.	GB- 737	737	TE	A.4.5		1260	Lines 1260-1261: The proposal from James Martin / Tim Rabbets brings clarity to the handling of non-functionals and firmly brings them into the remit of being addressed through architecture aspects. Reference: (PPT file: "42010 fwk dimensions 2020.0528")	Amend accordingly (since this is informative annex, the specifics can be handled during editing stage after the meeting)	A	
740.	WG 1- 738	738	TE	A.5		1257	The list items are general categories.	Insert 'categories of' before 'stakeholder'		These are not categories of stakeholder concerns
741.	INC -739	739	ED	A.5		1257	missing verb "are"	resilience), are stakeholder concerns that are often structured using the notion of aspects. These non-functional...	A	
742.	INC -740	740	ED	A.5		1259	(e.g. effectiveness)	Add comma after e.g. (e.g., effectiveness)	A	
743.	INC -741	741	TE	A.5		1264	Lines 1264-1266: Surely they will manifest in some perspectives, and possible some aspects too.	Illities are properties – as explained in the first para of 1256. They therefore manifest as		illities as characteristics shall be reflected by Architecture aspects.

1 **MB** = Member body / **NC** = National Committee (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by **)

2 **Type of comment:** **GT** = General Technical **TH** = Technical high **TL** = Technical Low **GE** = General Editorial **E** = Editorial

3 **Resolution code:** **OBE** = Superseded **AIP** = Agreed in principle **A** = Agreed R = Rejected **NA** = Non actionable

Disposition of Comments

Date:
30/09/2020Document:
ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 7 N 8181
(42010. CD1-v1.0)Project:
ISO/IEC/IEEE CD1 42010 (Ed2) Architecture
description

2.	MB/ NC ¹	Cmt No	Type of Cmt ²	Clause/ Subcl.	Para/ Fig/ Tab/	Line No	Comments and rationale	Proposed change	Res code ³	Resolution on each comment received
744.								properties in perspectives, not as structural types (aspects). Need to rewrite section if this view is accepted.		
745.	GB-742	742	TE	A.5		1261	Lines 1261-1263: Of course the architect should be concerned with all such considerations	Insert '(other than the architect)' after 'unlikely'	A	
746.	INC-743	743	ED	A.5	Para 1	1257	Missing verb.	Change "stakeholder concerns that often structured" to "stakeholder concerns that are often structured"	A	
747.	WG 1-744	744	TE	A.6.1		1327	How does this fit into 42010. It is about methodology.	Delete lines 1327 - 1332	A	
748.	WG 1-745	745	TE	A.6.1		1284	The historical information is interesting but could mislead readers regarding use of 42010. The things identified as metaphors are actually analogy.	Delete lines 1284 – 1310.		What is written is correct and useful to understand the foundations of the concepts.
749.	INC-746	746	TH	A.6.1		1317	Overly restrictive. Unclear why this should be required. It should be acceptable to create a view that limits the scope of displayed AD elements to only those elements pertinent to a given question. Otherwise, this standard requires the creation of "eye chart" views that may be far less useful at communicating to the stakeholders to whom the views are intended to serve. Do I really need to see all requirements pertinent to a system, if my question is really only about a subset of those requirements for a subset of the system?	Delete entire paragraph.	A	
749.	INC	747	TH	A.6.1		1311	Overly restrictive. Unclear why this should	Delete entire paragraph.	A	

1 MB = Member body / NC = National Committee (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by **)

2 Type of comment: GT = General Technical TH = Technical high TL = Technical Low GE = General Editorial E = Editorial

3 Resolution code: OBE = Superseded AIP = Agreed in principle A = Agreed R = Rejected NA = Non actionable

Disposition of Comments

Date: 30/09/2020	Document: ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 7 N 8181 (42010. CD1-v1.0)	Project: ISO/IEC/IEEE CD1 42010 (Ed2) Architecture description
----------------------------	---	--

2.	MB/ NC ¹	Cmt No	Type of Cmt ²	Clause/ Subcl.	Para/ Fig/ Tab/	Line No	Comments and rationale	Proposed change	Res code ³	Resolution on each comment received
	-747						be required. It should be acceptable to create a view that combines conventions from multiple viewpoints. In fact, some of the most useful views in architecture descriptions are views that bridge concepts from multiple viewpoints, e.g., depicting traceability relationships or dependency relationships between DoDAF/MoDAF/NAF/UAF viewpoints. It should not be necessary to synthesize an artificial viewpoint that aggregates conventions across multiple viewpoints to establish a "joint" viewpoint.			
750.	INC -748	748	ED	A.6.1		1287	Refers to viewpoint being defined in Clause 0. There is no Clause 0. I assume it is meant to refer to Clause A.6.1 where viewpoint was defined	specified in Clause A.6.1.	OBE	See WG1-745
751.	INC -749	749	ED	A.6.1		1289	Lines 1289-1292: These lines should be indented under the colon on line 1288.	Indent 1290-1292.	OBE	See WG1-745
752.	INC -750	750	ED	A.6.1		1280	specifies need - based on audience	While the use of multiple views is widespread, authors differ on what views are needed, based on audience, and on appropriate methods for expressing each view.	A	
753.	INC -751	751	ED	A.6.1		1287	The link to the Clause is broken as there is no Clause 0	Replace Clause 0 with the correct Clause number	OBE	See WG1-745
754.	GB- 752	752	TE	A.6.1		1287	Reference to Clause 0	Correct reference	OBE	See WG1-745
755.	GB- 753	753	TE	A.6.1		1284	Lines 1284-1285: Two further occurrences of first class	Remove if cannot be clarified	A	
756.	GB- 754	754	TE	A.6.1		1282	Lines 1282-1283: It is unclear what 'first class' means here – can this be put into	Suggest delete text 'and treating ...'	A	

1 **MB** = Member body / **NC** = National Committee (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by **)

2 **Type of comment:** **GT** = General Technical

TH = Technical high

TL = Technical Low

GE = General Editorial

E = Editorial

3 **Resolution code:** **OBE** = Superseded

AIP = Agreed in principle

A = Agreed R = Rejected

NA = Non actionable

Disposition of Comments

Date: 30/09/2020	Document: ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 7 N 8181 (42010. CD1-v1.0)	Project: ISO/IEC/IEEE CD1 42010 (Ed2) Architecture description
----------------------------	---	--

	MB/ NC ¹	Cmt No	Type of Cmt ²	Clause/ Subcl.	Para/ Fig/ Tab/	Line No	Comments and rationale	Proposed change	Res code ³	Resolution on each comment received
							plain English or deleted?			
757.	GB-755	755	TE	A.6.1		1277	The definition of view cited here is that of a perspective and is not correct	Change to 'a view is a way of expressing an entity of interest from a particular viewpoint.' It is an information item comprising part of an architecture description.	A	
758.	INC-756	756	TL	A.6.2		1361	Unclear why a view is not constrained by the standard to only implement a single view specification, while the view is only allowed to utilize conventions from a single viewpoint. This seems backward. Are there any multiplicity constraints in the relation between a view and a view specification? The wording "A view implements a view specification..." seems ambiguous. Does a view implement a single view specification (and only one)?	Clarify multiplicity relationship between view and view specification if there is intended to be a constraint imposed by the standard.	OBE	View specification section is no longer relevant to current draft and deleted completely. See INC 041.
759.	GB-757	757	TE	A.6.2		1355	Lines 1355-1360: Presently ADFs rarely use the concepts of aspects and perspectives as we have defined them	Propose delete paragraph as material is addressed elsewhere	A	Propose OBE. See INC 756
760.	GB-758	758	TE	A.6.2		1343	This is the first mention of 'view specification' I believe. It is an important concept it would benefit from inclusion in a conceptual model and referring to in the main body of the text e.g. 5.2.6	Include extension to conceptual model to cover view specification		Tied to INC-042
761.	US-759	759	TE	A.6.2		1343	"View specification" was removed/termed a synonym for Viewpoint. This example does not even depict all the parts of a viewpoint specified in this draft!	Delete subclause; or rename Viewpoint and fill in the details to make an actual example.		Tied to INC-042
762.	INC-760	760	ED	A.6.2	Para 3	1351	Double verb	Change "is usually is" to remove one of the "is".	A	Propose OBE. See INC 756
763.	GB-	761	ED	A.7		1408	Quaint punctuation '- i.e.,'	Amend punctuation	A	

1 **MB** = Member body / **NC** = National Committee (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by **)

2 **Type of comment:** **GT** = General Technical

TH = Technical high

TL = Technical Low

GE = General Editorial

E = Editorial

3 **Resolution code:** **OBE** = Superseded

AIP = Agreed in principle

A = Agreed R = Rejected

NA = Non actionable

Disposition of Comments

Date:
30/09/2020Document:
ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 7 N 8181
(42010. CD1-v1.0)Project:
ISO/IEC/IEEE CD1 42010 (Ed2) Architecture
description

	MB/ NC ¹	Cmt No	Type of Cmt ²	Clause/ Subcl.	Para/ Fig/ Tab/	Line No	Comments and rationale	Proposed change	Res code ³	Resolution on each comment received
764.	GB-762	762	TE	A.7		1406	'outside'? unclear what is meant here	'external'	A	
765.	GB-763	763	TE	A.7		1405	Insert 'other' before stakeholders since architects are stakeholders	Amend accordingly	A	
766.	GB-764	764	TE	A.7		1394	Lines 1394-1395: This sentence reads as if aspects are an afterthought and more related to view specifications	Amend to 'an architecture view is an information item; its subject is a specific set of stakeholder concerns or aspects framed by its governing viewpoint or addressed by its applicable view specification'	OBE	The entire section on Models has been removed as it is no longer relevant to the document.
767.	GB-765	765	ED	A.7		1383	Remove – and capitalise as 'In other words . . .'	Amend accordingly	A	
768.	INC-766	766	TL	A.8		1441	Example not as clear as it should be.	Replace with "Consider two viewpoints: Hardware Components and Software Components."	A	Clarified and simplified example
769.	INC-767	767	TL	A.8		1419	It seems overly generous to allow an architecture description to claim compliance to the standard when it contains known inconsistencies. If political constraints force the architecture description developers to be unable to reconcile inconsistencies, they should not expect to be able to claim conformance.	Clarify that compliance with the standard requires the nonexistence of known inconsistencies.		Conformance only means AD meets requirements of the standard, not that the AD is somehow complete or correct in all respects.
770.	INC-768	768	TL	A.8		1416	While this sentence is correct, it seems insufficient. A single model can be internally inconsistent (self-inconsistent), especially if the model is a "mental model" or is constructed without a mechanism for enforcing internal consistency, e.g., "Powerpoint" diagramming.	Add a sentence after the first one, which reads something like "Whenever a model is constructed without a mechanism for enforcing internal consistency, it may be internally inconsistent."	OBE	See INC-040.Updated to refer to View Components and AD elements rather than models.

1 **MB** = Member body / **NC** = National Committee (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by **)2 **Type of comment:** **GT** = General Technical **TH** = Technical high **TL** = Technical Low **GE** = General Editorial **E** = Editorial3 **Resolution code:** **OBE** = Superseded **AIP** = Agreed in principle **A** = Agreed R = Rejected **NA** = Non actionable

Disposition of Comments

Date: 30/09/2020	Document: ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 7 N 8181 (42010. CD1-v1.0)	Project: ISO/IEC/IEEE CD1 42010 (Ed2) Architecture description
----------------------------	---	--

	MB/ NC ¹	Cmt No	Type of Cmt ²	Clause/ Subcl.	Para/ Fig/ Tab/	Line No	Comments and rationale	Proposed change	Res code ³	Resolution on each comment received
771.	INC -769	769	ED	A.8		1452	There is no figure A.2. I assume it refers to the immediately following figure which is Figure A.11	This correspondence method could be satisfied by the correspondence shown in Figure A.11 where there are Users,	A	changed reference to figure A.11
772.	INC -770	770	ED	A.8		1443	Software Components needs	Delete s from needs (Software Components need)	OBE	This wording no longer exists.
773.	INC -771	771	TE	A.8	Fig A.11	1455	The collection boxes in the figure need to have labels in the tab sections of the graphics (USERS, OPERATORS, AUDITORS). The tabs are currently blank, unlabeled.	Add labels of USERS, OPERATORS, and AUDITORS to appropriate tabs of the collection graphics in the figure	A	Labelled the tabs as architecture views
774.	GB- 772	772	TE	A.9		1520	Insert 'expresses' before 'aspects' – framing only applies to concerns	Amend	A	
775.	GB- 773	773	ED	A.9		1519	Replace 'of' by 'with' – better English	Amend	A	
776.	GB- 774	774	ED	A.9		1505	Delete ',' after 'specifying'	Amend	A	
777.	GB- 775	775	ED	A.9		1500	Amend to Systems Modeling Language (SysML)	Spell out in full first		There is no need to spell out in full
778.	GB- 776	776	TE	A.9		1495	Insert 'express' before aspects as these aren't framed	Amend accordingly	AIP	Delete "or aspects".
779.	GB- 777	777	ED	A.9		1493	Lines 1493-1494: Replace 'architecture description language' by 'ADL' since abbreviation already introduced	Amend accordingly	A	
780.	INC -778	778	ED	A4.4		1245	hyperlink not active for '5.2.3'	fix hyperlink	A	
781.	INC -779	779	ED	A6.1		1342	hyperlink not active for 'B' and 'C'	fix hyperlink	A	
782.	INC -780	780	TH	Annex A		1064	Lines 1063-1567: This whole section has clearly been written by a different set of(?) authors to those that created the (already) conflicting definitions of Clauses 3 and 5,	Please, please, please consider having a single , integrated definition of terminology in the standard, to prevent differences	A	

1 **MB** = Member body / **NC** = National Committee (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by **)

2 **Type of comment:** **GT** = General Technical

TH = Technical high

TL = Technical Low

GE = General Editorial

E = Editorial

3 **Resolution code:** **OBE** = Superseded

AIP = Agreed in principle

A = Agreed R = Rejected

NA = Non actionable

Disposition of Comments

Date: 30/09/2020	Document: ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 7 N 8181 (42010. CD1-v1.0)	Project: ISO/IEC/IEEE CD1 42010 (Ed2) Architecture description
----------------------------	---	--

	MB/ NC ¹	Cmt No	Type of Cmt ²	Clause/ Subcl.	Para/ Fig/ Tab/	Line No	Comments and rationale	Proposed change	Res code ³	Resolution on each comment received
783.							since it introduces a third , conflicting set of meanings for the terminology used in the standard.	in definitions creeping in. Do not (re-)define, explain, or expand on the meaning of terms anywhere else.		
784.	INC -781	781	TE	Annex B		1572	Lines 1572-1676: Introduces yet more terminology, such as "slots", "sub-slots", "anti-concerns", ... This section uses binary-gendered language ("her") throughout	Please, please, please consider having a single , integrated definition of terminology in the standard, to prevent differences in definitions creeping in. Do not (re-)define, explain, or expand on the meaning of terms anywhere else. Use non-binary gendered language, such as "them", "themselves",...	A	Removed gendered language. Removed meta syntactic constructs ("slots" and "subslots").
785.	INC -782	782	ED	Appendix G	Table G.1	2043	There is insufficient space between the row descriptors on the left side of the table, which makes the table difficult to read. e.g., the first 3 row descriptors abut each other and the reader needs to take extra time to resolve the formatting to understand the table information	Some rows need additional vertical space to ensure clear separation of the row descriptors. Specifically, the first 3 rows and the last 2 rows.	A	
786.	INC -783	783	ED	Appendix G	Table G.1	2043	All table contents should be vertical-middle justified to ensure a clear reading of the table. Some information abuts each other and a reader needs to take extra time to resolve the formatting to understand the table information. e.g., 3rd row ("Concern identification") is top justified and abuts the prior 2nd row description ("Stakeholder identification")	Recommend that all table contents be vertical-middle justified	A	
786.	INC -784	784	ED	Appendix G	Table G.1	2043	First Row - the row description "information identifying the ADF" is	Include the full text to the truncated "information identifying	AIP	

1 **MB** = Member body / **NC** = National Committee (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by **)

2 **Type of comment:** **GT** = General Technical **TH** = Technical high **TL** = Technical Low **GE** = General Editorial **E** = Editorial

3 **Resolution code:** **OBE** = Superseded **AIP** = Agreed in principle **A** = Agreed R = Rejected **NA** = Non actionable

Disposition of Comments

Date:
30/09/2020Document:
ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 7 N 8181
(42010. CD1-v1.0)Project:
ISO/IEC/IEEE CD1 42010 (Ed2) Architecture
description

	MB/ NC ¹	Cmt No	Type of Cmt ²	Clause/ Subcl.	Para/ Fig/ Tab/	Line No	Comments and rationale	Proposed change	Res code ³	Resolution on each comment received
787.							confusing -- perhaps the row descriptor text is truncated?. The table has responses such as "Yes" which do not correlate to the criteria	the ADF" and capitalize the first word.		
788.	INC-785	785	ED	Appendix G	Table G.1	2043	The row descriptions should be bold text, similar to the column descriptions	Recommend bold text for all row descriptions on the left side of the table.	A	
789.	INC-786	786	TE			206	I've regularly seen confusion over the term Viewpoint – it is often naturally used as a synonym of View, and sometimes assumed to mean 'group of Views'. View Specification or View Conventions are much clearer terms (and the former is already added as a note).	Use the synonym 'View Specification' mentioned in the note as the main term.		This is not backward compatible with 42010:2011 edition. The current note explains usage of "view specification" in some communities and frameworks. Further more, if "view specification" becomes a synonym of "architecture viewpoint", then "viewpoint specification" will become very confusing.
790.	INC-787	787	ED	B.2		1575	B.2.4 through B.2.7 are not aligned with listing in Section 8	Align Section 8 and Appendix B.2, for example, move B.2.7 to become B.2.5, etc.	A	Aligned B.2 with Clause 8 and Clause 5—there were several disconnects regarding terms.
791.	INC-788	788	ED	B.2.12		1647	hyperlink works, but there is no 8 f). This link is applicable to 8 c).	fix text and hyperlink	AIP	This is referring to clause 8.3 and clause 5.2.11
792.	INC-789	789	ED	B.2.12	Para 1	1647	The reference to another section is incorrect. The reference is to 8 f). It is unclear what this refers to.	Correct the erroneous reference.	AIP	This is referring to clause 8.3 and clause 5.2.11
793.	INC-790	790	ED	B.2.4		1589	section referenced in this sentence is incorrect and needs to be resolved. I believe the intended section is "7.1 a)", not "8 a)"	replace "8 a)" with "7.1 a)"	A	
794.	INC-791	791	ED	B.2.4		1589	Make the reference be to 8.1 a) instead of 8 a).	A listing of the architectural related concerns to be framed by this viewpoint per 8.1 a). This is critical information for ...	A	
794.	INC	792	ED	B.2.4		1590	"her" is used as a descriptor for the	Replace "her" with "them"	A	

1 MB = Member body / NC = National Committee (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by **)

2 Type of comment: GT = General Technical

TH = Technical high

TL = Technical Low

GE = General Editorial

E = Editorial

3 Resolution code: OBE = Superseded

AIP = Agreed in principle

A = Agreed R = Rejected

NA = Non actionable

Disposition of Comments

Date:
30/09/2020Document:
ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 7 N 8181
(42010. CD1-v1.0)Project:
ISO/IEC/IEEE CD1 42010 (Ed2) Architecture
description

2.	MB/ NC ¹	Cmt No	Type of Cmt ²	Clause/ Subcl.	Para/ Fig/ Tab/	Line No	Comments and rationale	Proposed change	Res code ³	Resolution on each comment received
	-792						architect. Perhaps "them" would be better as more generic and inclusive			
795.	INC -793	793	TE	B.2.4		1592	Anti-concerns implies a negative concern. What the standard is intending is to declare what viewpoint should not be concerned with. Hence the term 'anti-concern' can be misleading. Suggest remove the term 'anti-concern' but keep the guidance on viewpoints being specified to not have concerns of type.		A	
796.	INC -794	794	TE	B.2.4	2	1592	Define anti-concern	An anti-concern is a matter that is not of interest or importance to any known stakeholder	OBE	See INC 793
797.	INC -795	795	ED	B.2.5		1595	section referenced in this sentence is incorrect and needs to be resolved. I believe the intended section is "7.1 d)", not "8 d)"	replace "8 d)" with "7.1 d)"	A	
798.	INC -796	796	ED	B.2.5		1596	"her" is used as a descriptor for the architect. Perhaps "them" would be better as more generic and inclusive	Replace "her" with "them"	A	
799.	INC -797	797	ED	B.2.5		1595	Appears to be an erroneous "As" at the start of the sentence	Remove the "As" from the start of the sentence	A	
800.	GB- 798	798	ED	B.2.5		1596	Use of 'her' to refer to an architect – suggest revise text to avoid use of pronoun or use them	Amend	A	
801.	INC -799	799	ED	B.2.6		1599	section referenced in this sentence is incorrect and needs to be resolved. I believe the intended section is "7.1 e)", not "8 e)"	replace "8 e)" with "7.1 e)"	A	
802.	INC -800	800	ED	B.2.6		1600	"helps her decide" is gender specific	should be "helps him or her decide"	A	

1 MB = Member body / NC = National Committee (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by **)

2 Type of comment: GT = General Technical TH = Technical high TL = Technical Low GE = General Editorial E = Editorial

3 Resolution code: OBE = Superseded AIP = Agreed in principle A = Agreed R = Rejected NA = Non actionable

Disposition of Comments

Date:
30/09/2020Document:
ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 7 N 8181
(42010. CD1-v1.0)Project:
ISO/IEC/IEEE CD1 42010 (Ed2) Architecture
description

	MB/ NC ¹	Cmt No	Type of Cmt ²	Clause/ Subcl.	Para/ Fig/ Tab/	Line No	Comments and rationale	Proposed change	Res code ³	Resolution on each comment received
803.	INC -801	801	ED	B.2.6		1600	"her" is used as a descriptor for the architect. Perhaps "them" would be better as more generic and inclusive	Replace "her" with "them"	A	
804.	INC -802	802	ED	B.2.6		1599	Appears to be an erroneous "As" at the start of the sentence	Remove the "As" from the start of the sentence	A	
805.	GB- 803	803	ED	B.2.6		1600	Use of 'her' to refer to an architect – suggest revise text to avoid use of pronoun or use them	Amend	A	
806.	INC -804	804	ED	B.2.7		1603	Lines 1603-1604: section referenced in this sentence is incorrect and needs to be resolved. I believe the intended section is "7.1 b)", not "8 b)"	replace "8 b)" with "7.1 b)"	A	
807.	INC -805	805	ED	B.2.7		1603	Make the reference be to 8.1 b) instead of 8 b).	A listing of the stakeholders expected to be users or audiences for views prepared using this viewpoint per 8.1 b).	A	
808.	INC -806	806	ED	B.2.8.1		1610	missing first Bracket "per 7.1 h)"	should be "per (7.1 h)"	A	
809.	INC -807	807	ED	B.2.8.1	Para 2	1613	The sentence refers to B.2.7.5, which appears incorrect (B.2.7.5 does not exist). The sentence refers to operations as opposed to method, which is referenced in B.2.8.5; however the context appears to fit.	Change reference to B.2.8.5	A	
810.	INC -808	808	ED	B.2.8.2		1629	It is not clear the intent of this statement because the reference to "0" is unclear what is being talked about. "... in the sense of 0." is indecipherable.	replace "0" with whatever pointer reference or term is intended.	A	
811.	INC -809	809	ED	B.2.8.2		1629	"Entities, attributes, relationships and constraints are all AD elements in the sense of 0." I don't understand this sentence, is "0" a broken reference?	Fix broken reference or rewrite "in the sense of 0".	A	
812.	INC	810	ED	B.2.8.2		1629	Not sure what "in the sense of 0" is	Update "in the sense of 0" as	A	

1 **MB** = Member body / **NC** = National Committee (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by **)2 **Type of comment:** **GT** = General Technical**TH** = Technical high**TL** = Technical Low**GE** = General Editorial**E** = Editorial3 **Resolution code:** **OBE** = Superseded**AIP** = Agreed in principle**A** = Agreed R = Rejected**NA** = Non actionable

Disposition of Comments

Date:
30/09/2020Document:
ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 7 N 8181
(42010. CD1-v1.0)Project:
ISO/IEC/IEEE CD1 42010 (Ed2) Architecture
description

2.	MB/ NC ¹	Cmt No	Type of Cmt ²	Clause/ Subcl.	Para/ Fig/ Tab/	Line No	Comments and rationale	Proposed change	Res code ³	Resolution on each comment received
	-810						supposed to be referring to. Should it point to a clause?	appropriate		
813.	INC -811	811	ED	B.2.8.2	Para 2	1629	What is "0" in "in the sense of 0." This appears to be a typographical error. If it is not a typographical error, then the reference to "0" is not understood.	Change "0" to something meaningful, or else explain what the reference to "0" implies.	A	
814.	GB- 812	812	ED	B.2.8.4		1636	Replace 'model' by 'modeling' to improve English	Amend	A	
815.	INC -813	813	TE	B.2.8.5		1639	Circular and incomplete reference. Sentence refers to discussion of View methods in B.2.9. Review of B.2.9 refers back to B.2.8; no View methods exist in B.2.8, only Model methods, the subject of B.2.8.5. Section 8.3, line 1037, discusses View methods, so this seems the right reference.	Change reference from B.2.9 to 8.3. Also, why refer to View Methods in the section on Model Methods? If they are the same, or serve the same purpose, make this clear in the text.	A	
816.	INC -814	814	ED	B.2.8.5		1639	States "See the discussion of view methods in B.2.9" but B.2.9 doesn't have what I would refer to as a discussion as it is a single line item which doesn't provide much expansion...	Perhaps review the "See the discussion of view methods in B.2.9" as it doesn't obviously add much value	A	
817.	INC -815	815	ED	B.2.9		1641	Mislabeled the section name referred to in the following text, "See the discussion of View Methods in B.2.8." I think it should say to see the Model Methods discussion.	replace "View Methods" with "Model Methods"		This is referring to clause 8.3 and clause 5.2.11
818.	INC -816	816	TE	B.2.9		1641	Circular and incomplete reference. Sentence refers to discussion of View methods in B.2.8. Review of B.2.8 refers back to B.2.9; no View methods exist in B.2.8, only Model methods, the subject of B.2.8.5. Section 8.3, line 1037, discusses View methods, so this seems the right reference.	Change reference from B.2.8 to 8.3.	A	

1 MB = Member body / NC = National Committee (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by **)

2 Type of comment: GT = General Technical

TH = Technical high

TL = Technical Low

GE = General Editorial

E = Editorial

3 Resolution code: OBE = Superseded

AIP = Agreed in principle

A = Agreed R = Rejected

NA = Non actionable

Disposition of Comments

Date:
30/09/2020Document:
ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 7 N 8181
(42010. CD1-v1.0)Project:
ISO/IEC/IEEE CD1 42010 (Ed2) Architecture
description

	MB/ NC ¹	Cmt No	Type of Cmt ²	Clause/ Subcl.	Para/ Fig/ Tab/	Line No	Comments and rationale	Proposed change	Res code ³	Resolution on each comment received
819.	INC -817	817	ED	B.2.9		1641	States "See the discussion of view methods in B.2.8" but this just points back to the top level of the section within which this subsection exists...it does not point to a specific element (the element within this section that has view methods in is B.2.9 where this link is contained!)	Perhaps review the "See the discussion of view methods in B.2.8" as it doesn't obviously add much value	AIP	This is referring to clause 8.3 and clause 5.2.11
820.	INC -818	818	ED	B.2.9	Para 1	1641	The reference to another section is incorrect. Either the referenced title of the sections is wrong, or the referenced section number is wrong. Section B.2.8 does not address View methods.	Correct the erroneous reference to another section.	AIP	This is referring to clause 8.3 and clause 5.2.11
821.	INC -819	819	ED	B.3	Para 10	1668	The reference number is incorrect.	Change "[26]" to "[27]"	A	
822.	INC -820	820	ED	B.3	Para 10	1668	The title of the referenced article is incorrect.	Change "view model of architecture" to "view model of software architecture".	A	
823.	INC -821	821	ED	Bibliog raphy		2132	link does not work http://pubs.opengroup.org/archimate/	URL should be https://publications.opengroup.org/archimate-library/archimate-standards	A	
824.	INC -822	822	ED	Bibliog raphy		2095	in "242https"	need a space between the '2' and the 'h'	OBE	Reference to wikipedia deleted
825.	INC -823	823	ED	Bibliog raphy	Other refer ence s	2109	The current version of the SysML specification is version 1.5 released in 2017. The only reference to a specific version of SysML is for version 1.4. I suggest listing the latest version of the specification.	Change "version 1.1" to "version 1.5", and change date from "November 2008" to "May 2017".	A	
826.	INC -824	824	ED	Bibliog raphy		2067	Inconsistent use of 'capitalize first word only' policy.	Change "Open Distributed Processing" to "Open distributed processing".	A	
827.	INC	825	ED	Bibliog		2050	Inconsistent use of 'capitalize first word	Change "Open Distributed	A	

1 **MB** = Member body / **NC** = National Committee (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by **)2 **Type of comment:** **GT** = General Technical **TH** = Technical high **TL** = Technical Low **GE** = General Editorial **E** = Editorial3 **Resolution code:** **OBE** = Superseded **AIP** = Agreed in principle **A** = Agreed R = Rejected **NA** = Non actionable

Disposition of Comments

Date: 30/09/2020	Document: ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 7 N 8181 (42010. CD1-v1.0)	Project: ISO/IEC/IEEE CD1 42010 (Ed2) Architecture description
----------------------------	---	--

	MB/ NC ¹	Cmt No	Type of Cmt ²	Clause/ Subcl.	Para/ Fig/ Tab/	Line No	Comments and rationale	Proposed change	Res code ³	Resolution on each comment received
	-825			raphy			only' policy.	Processing" to "Open distributed processing".		
828.	GB-826	826	ED	C.1		1688	Superfluous line	Delete	A	
829.	GB-827	827	ED	C.2		1697	Lines 1697-1698: Format between paragraphs has gone awry	Amend	A	
830.	GB-828	828	ED	C.2		1691	Replace 'to' by 'for' - English	Amend	A	
831.	AU-3-829	829	TL	C3/C4		1718	the text of the two sections is practically identical	merge C3 and C4 and explain: "Given the situation that 15288 and 12207 are now practically identical, the use of this standard in either systems engineering processes or software engineering processes is the same"		12207 and 15288 are evolving separately. Consequently, it is better to consider them in different clauses to possibly add specificities in further editions of this document.
832.	INC-830	830	ED	Change history	Bullet 4	64	Bullet should end with a full stop to be consistent with the rest	Add full stop to the end of bullet 4	OBE	This default is agree. Nevertheless the change log will be summarized and move to the Foreword. See IEEE-1092.
833.	INC-831	831	ED	Change history	Bullet 7	64	"Legend" has been capitalised which is inconsistent with the rest of the document	Remove capitalisation from legend in bullet 7	OBE	This default is agree. Nevertheless the change log will be summarized and move to the Foreword. See IEEE-1092.
834.	GB-832	832	TE	D.2		1820	Entities may employ multiple styles	Change 'style' to 'style(s)'	A	
835.	GB-833	833	TE	D.2		1816	An entity only has a single environment	Use 'environment' in place of 'environments'	AIP	Intended uses, and environment and contexts
836.	GB-834	834	ED	E		1848	Lines 1848-1907: The correct references of standards needs to be applied throughout this section i.e. ISO/IEC/IEEE 15288 and ISO/IEC/IEEE 24748	Amend	A	
837.	INC	835	ED	E.2		1864	hyperlink not active for '6'	fix hyperlink	A	

1 **MB** = Member body / **NC** = National Committee (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by **)

2 **Type of comment:** **GT** = General Technical **TH** = Technical high **TL** = Technical Low **GE** = General Editorial **E** = Editorial

3 **Resolution code:** **OBE** = Superseded **AIP** = Agreed in principle **A** = Agreed R = Rejected **NA** = Non actionable

Disposition of Comments

Date: 30/09/2020	Document: ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 7 N 8181 (42010. CD1-v1.0)	Project: ISO/IEC/IEEE CD1 42010 (Ed2) Architecture description
----------------------------	---	--

	MB/ NC ¹	Cmt No	Type of Cmt ²	Clause/ Subcl.	Para/ Fig/ Tab/	Line No	Comments and rationale	Proposed change	Res code ³	Resolution on each comment received
838.	INC -836	836	ED	E.2		1888	[as defined in ISO...)]	Remove the close parenthesis. Or change opening bracket to a parenthesis and remove the closing bracket.	A	
839.	INC -837	837	ED	E.2		1864	... Architecture Definition process'.	Remove the hyphen.	A	
840.	INC -838	838	ED	E.2		1882	Lines 1882-1884: Typo: Mismatched parenthesis, "The architect will also consider the high level requirements that the entity needs to satisfy (functional and non-functional requirements), and from the business analyst's perspective translate this to a specification)"	Fix typo, either add opening parenthesis, or remove spurious closing parenthesis.	A	
841.	INC -839	839	ED	E.2		1855	Typo: Spurious full-stop: "throughout the entity's life cycle. . While [...]"	Fix typo è "throughout the entity's life cycle. While [...]"	A	
842.	INC -840	840	ED	E.2		1888	There is an additional closed bracket at the end of the "as defined in ISO15288"	Remove the round closed bracket, after the square closed bracket after the "as defined in ISO15288" text	A	
843.	INC -841	841	ED	E.2		1884	There is an additional closed bracket at the end of the sentence	Remove the closed bracket after specification at the end of the sentence	A	
844.	INC -842	842	ED	E.2		1855	There is a double full stop at the end of the sentence	Remove the extra full stop between life cycle and While	A	
845.	GB- 843	843	ED	E.2		1863	Simplification of English – 'Typically architecting develops solution alternatives and versions, therefore Architecture Descriptions document the status and history of their content.'	The status and history of solution alternatives and versions are expressed as architecture descriptions.	A	
846.	GB- 844	844	ED	E.2		1855	Repeated period	Delete one	A	
847.	INC	845	ED	E.2	NOT	1864	Typo: Spurious apostrophe: "NOTE 1	Fix typo è "NOTE 1	A	

1 **MB** = Member body / **NC** = National Committee (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by **)

2 **Type of comment:** **GT** = General Technical **TH** = Technical high **TL** = Technical Low **GE** = General Editorial **E** = Editorial

3 **Resolution code:** **OBE** = Superseded **AIP** = Agreed in principle **A** = Agreed R = Rejected **NA** = Non actionable

Disposition of Comments

Date:
30/09/2020Document:
ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 7 N 8181
(42010. CD1-v1.0)Project:
ISO/IEC/IEEE CD1 42010 (Ed2) Architecture
description

2.	MB/ NC ¹	Cmt No	Type of Cmt ²	Clause/ Subcl.	Para/ Fig/ Tab/ Line No	Comments and rationale	Proposed change	Res code ³	Resolution on each comment received
	-845				E 1	ISO/IEC/IEEE 15288 [6] describes the Architecture Definition process ¹ .	ISO/IEC/IEEE 15288 [6] describes the Architecture Definition process.		
848.	INC -846	846	ED	E.2	Para 2	1855 Double period at end of second sentence.	Change to single period.	A	
849.	INC -847	847	ED	F.2		1947 end the sentence with a period vice semicolon	Change semicolon to period.	OBE	See INC-036
850.	INC -848	848	ED	F.2		1932 end the sentence with a period vice semicolon	Change semicolon to period.	OBE	See INC-036
851.	AU- 4- 849	849	TH	Figure 7		592 The concepts of Perspective and Aspect seem to be at odds with the way the words are used in UAF or NAF. The reasons appear to be that the list of aspects in these ADFs is heterogeneous. The idea is that perhaps there are two more concepts hiding, which are the concepts that describe the dimensions of these ADFs. Namely, the descriptions in these ADFs are geared toward subjective presentations (in terms of form/understandability and content) rather than some objective way of separating the facts to be presented (or not) in a description, on the basis of a metamodel view.	It is suggested to introduce two more concepts in Fig.7 that directly correspond to rows and columns of the main ADFs.		Structural category and structuring formalism are introduced to deal with this scenario. Each framework can use specific additional concepts for establishing their formalism which is specific to these frameworks. No need to add more concepts.
852.	INC -850	850	ED	Forew ord		106 AD has been used as an acronym (line 130) but has not been established within the foreword. Line 106 is the first place that architecture description is used in the foreword so should be included there	Add (AD) after "architecture description" to define the acronym	A	
853.	INC -851	851	ED	Forew ord		73 Joint technical committee has not been defined as an acronym	Add (JTC) after "joint technical committee" to define the	A	

1 **MB** = Member body / **NC** = National Committee (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by **)2 **Type of comment:** **GT** = General Technical **TH** = Technical high **TL** = Technical Low **GE** = General Editorial **E** = Editorial3 **Resolution code:** **OBE** = Superseded **AIP** = Agreed in principle **A** = Agreed R = Rejected **NA** = Non actionable

Disposition of Comments

Date:
30/09/2020Document:
ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 7 N 8181
(42010. CD1-v1.0)Project:
ISO/IEC/IEEE CD1 42010 (Ed2) Architecture
description

1.

2.

854.

855.

856.

857.

858.

859.

860.

861.

862.

863.

MB/ NC ¹	Cmt No	Type of Cmt ²	Clause/ Subcl.	Para/ Fig/ Tab/	Line No	Comments and rationale	Proposed change	Res code ³	Resolution on each comment received
							acronym		
INC-852	852	GE	Forward, and 3.11	1	73	Lines 73, 227: For all references of information technology - include "digital"	information/digital technology		IT is well known and is a broad expression. No need to talk about digital, analog, etc.
US-853	853	TE	G	Table G.1	2044	5.2.3 states that RM-ODP uses distribution transparencies as concerns. Annex C.5 identifies concerns for each RM-ODP viewpoint; but this table shows no concerns related to RM-ODP. This is a significant inconsistency.	Repair conflicting claims about RM-ODP. Perhaps WG19 should review for correctness.	A	Table is update for identification of concerns: "Yes (in viewpoints)"
US-854	854	TE	G	Table G.1	2044	By what reasoning is it determined that Zachman Interrogatives are Aspects rather than Concerns?	Explain basis for classifying Interrogatives as Aspects rather than Concerns or some other kind of Architecture Consideration.	AIP	The association of "interrogatives" (columns) with "aspect" is defined in the Zachman's paper referenced in the current draft of 42010 Ed2. See "Rule 1" of this paper.
INC-855	855	ED	G.1		1954	(summarized in Figure 7)	Remove bold typeface	A	
INC-856	856	ED	G.1		1954	Definition references shall point to the unique definition in Clause 3	Rewrite Clause 3, and use this as the basis of definition references.		The proposed change is not related to the comment.
INC-857	857	ED	G.1		1954	Figure 7 is written in bold which is inconsistent with the rest of the document	Remove the bold attribute from the Figure 7 text	A	See INC-855
INC-858	858	ED	G.1	Table G.1	2043	The table has the last item listed incorrectly as AchiMate vice ArchiMate	Change AchiMate to ArchiMate in the table and align columns	A	
INC-859	859	ED	G.2		1958	hyperlink not active for '4.5'	fix hyperlink	A	
INC-860	860	TE	G.3.1		1985	The phrase "in the context of an enterprise" appears to be unnecessarily limiting the use of the listed architecture frameworks.	Remove the phrase "in the context of an enterprise" from the sentence.	A	
INC-861	861	ED	G.3.1		1979	NOTE 1 here is used inconsistently with much of the rest of the document, which utilizes the label NOTE when only one	Change NOTE 1 to NOTE.	A	

1 MB = Member body / NC = National Committee (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by **)

2 Type of comment: GT = General Technical

TH = Technical high

TL = Technical Low

GE = General Editorial

E = Editorial

3 Resolution code: OBE = Superseded

AIP = Agreed in principle

A = Agreed R = Rejected

NA = Non actionable

Disposition of Comments

Date: 30/09/2020	Document: ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 7 N 8181 (42010. CD1-v1.0)	Project: ISO/IEC/IEEE CD1 42010 (Ed2) Architecture description
----------------------------	---	--

	MB/ NC ¹	Cmt No	Type of Cmt ²	Clause/ Subcl.	Para/ Fig/ Tab/	Line No	Comments and rationale	Proposed change	Res code ³	Resolution on each comment received
							note applies to the entry.			
864.	GB-862	862	ED	G.3.1		1975	Lines 1975-1976: Repetition of OASIS . . .	Delete duplicate	A	
865.	INC-863	863	ED	G.3.1	Para 2	1975	Lines 1975-1976: OASIS is mentioned as a reference twice, back-to-back, in the same sentence.	Remove one of these duplicative references to OASIS, or replace with reference to UAF, which is prominently mentioned throughout this standard.	OBE	See GB-862
866.	GB-864	864	TE	G.3.1/ G.3.2		1970	Lines 1970-2004: Reference could be made to 'framework dimensions' if this concept is accepted	Include 'Domains are an example of a framework dimension.' 'Layers are an example of a framework dimension'- line 1997/1998 etc.		We are not using Framework dimensions.
867.	INC-865	865	TE	G.3.3	Para 2	2007	Zachman refers to these as "interrogatives", as indicated in Table G.1.	Change "questions" to "interrogatives".	A	But explain that interrogatives are same as questions
868.	INC-866	866	ED	G.3.3	Para 3	2013	Bad grammar.	Change "specifying of" to either "specification of" or "specifying".	A	
869.	INC-867	867	ED	G.3.4		2018	hyperlink not active for '2'	fix hyperlink	A	
870.	INC-868	868	ED	G.3.4		2018	Example is not capitalised as per the rest of the document	Replace Example with EXAMPLE	A	
871.	GB-869	869	TE	G.3.4		2020	Lines 2020-2021: Text refers to grids based upon aspects and stakeholder perspectives and warrants review to potentially talk about framework dimensions such as aspects and stakeholder perspectives	Insert 'framework dimensions such as' before 'some form'	OBE	The paragraph is updated and now talks about "structure categories to represent distribution of architecture viewpoints"
872.	INC-870	870	ED	G.4	G.1	2043	extraneous spaces (bottom/last entry in first column)	remove the extra spaces between 'Legends' and the word 'and'	A	
873.	INC-871	871	ED	G.4	Table G.1	2043	Cell sizes of last row of the UAF and NAF columns inconsistent with other rows in those columns	Move vertical line dividing cells containing "No" and "NAF Chapter 2" in the last row of the	A	

1 **MB** = Member body / **NC** = National Committee (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by **)

2 **Type of comment:** **GT** = General Technical

TH = Technical high

TL = Technical Low

GE = General Editorial

E = Editorial

3 **Resolution code:** **OBE** = Superseded

AIP = Agreed in principle

A = Agreed R = Rejected

NA = Non actionable

Disposition of Comments

Date:
30/09/2020Document:
ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 7 N 8181
(42010. CD1-v1.0)Project:
ISO/IEC/IEEE CD1 42010 (Ed2) Architecture
description

2.	MB/ NC ¹	Cmt No	Type of Cmt ²	Clause/ Subcl.	Para/ Fig/ Tab/	Line No	Comments and rationale	Proposed change	Res code ³	Resolution on each comment received
874.	INC -872	872	ED	G.4	Table G.1	2043	Content of the Zachman Architecture Aspects cell ('Called " interrogatives"') breaks in the middle of the word interrogatives without proper hyphenation.	UAF and NAF columns to align with the preceding rows of those columns. Hyphenate "interrogatives" using accepted hyphenation rule.		Column size adjusted
875.	INC -873	873	ED	G.4	Table G.1	2043	Justified spacing of the legend in column 1 ("Legends and correspondence methods") should be left justified to avoid misplaced spacing	Adjust to left justify text	A	
876.	INC -874	874	ED	G.4	Table G.1	2043	Formatting of left most column is difficult to read quickly since adjacent sections run together without space, line, or some other delimiter	Recommend updating to do at least one of the following: 1) add vertical space between rows of the table, (2) indenting subsequent wrap lines for any given row entry in first column (hanging indent), or (3) adding lines to demark rows in column 1	A	
877.	INC -875	875	ED	G.4	Table G.1	2044	Misaligned columns at UAF and NAF (columns) and Framework methods (row).	Adjust widths of UAF and NAF columns for the Framework methods row.	A	
878.	INC -876	876	ED	G.4	Table G.1	2044	Word wrapping at intersection of Zachman (column) and Architecture aspects (row).	Adjust width of Zachman column.	A	
879.	INC -877	877	ED	IEEE Notice to Users		2213	the link does not work http://standards.ieee.org/IPR/disclaimers.html	should be lowercase (ipr) http://standards.ieee.org/ipr/disclaimers.html	AIP	This has to be worked by the Central Secretariat. This is not an issue for WG42
880.	INC -878	878	ED	IEEE Notice		2197	link does not work http://standards.ieee.org/reading/ieee/interp/index.html	cannot find valid link	AIP	This has to be worked by the Central Secretariat. This is not an issue for WG42
881.	INC -879	879	ED	IEEE Notice		2194	link does not work http://standards.ieee.org/reading/ieee/upd	cannot find valid link	AIP	This has to be worked by the Central Secretariat. This is not an issue for

1 MB = Member body / NC = National Committee (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by **)

2 Type of comment: GT = General Technical

TH = Technical high

TL = Technical Low

GE = General Editorial

E = Editorial

3 Resolution code: OBE = Superseded

AIP = Agreed in principle

A = Agreed R = Rejected

NA = Non actionable

Disposition of Comments

1.

Date: 30/09/2020	Document: ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 7 N 8181 (42010. CD1-v1.0)	Project: ISO/IEC/IEEE CD1 42010 (Ed2) Architecture description
----------------------------	---	--

2.

882.

883.

884.

885.

886.

MB/ NC ¹	Cmt No	Type of Cmt ²	Clause/ Subcl.	Para/ Fig/ Tab/	Line No	Comments and rationale	Proposed change	Res code ³	Resolution on each comment received
			to Users			ates/errata/index.html			WG42
INC -880	880	ED	IEEE Notice to Users		2190	link does not work https://ieeexplore.ieee.org/xpl/standards.jsp	"xpl" in the URL should be "xplore"	AIP	This has to be worked by the Central Secretariat with IEEE. This is not an issue for WG42
INC -881	881	ED	Introdu ction		130	AD not yet defined	add (AD) after "architecture description" on line 106	A	
INC -882	882	TE	Introdu ction		107	Lines 107, 331: [An entity is comprised of] fundamental concepts and properties It's not clear to me what it means for something to be "comprised of concepts" – my understanding is that concepts are separate things that intelligent beings create to help them understand entities, rather than something that is fundamental to the entities themselves	Only refer to an entity's properties as being something it possesses: e.g. assists in the understanding of the entity's properties	AIP	Line: 106 - delete an entity at end of line Line: 331 - Delete of an entity
INC -883	883	ED	Introdu ction		130	AD is referred to without prior expansion (unlike ADFs and ADLs earlier in the same page). (yes I know AD appears later on p2, but expanding in line would improve readability).	...AD (Architecture Description) ...	A	
INC -884	884	ED	Introdu ction		128	...consult Clause 5... This phrase seems to pop out of nowhere. I searched for all instances of Clause 5 to find out where it was defined, but all found instances appeared to be similar citations. Confused. Ah, I find reading on that Section 4 Conformance has line 279: The requirements in this document are contained in Clauses 6, 7, and 8. So Clause is a term for the sections / sub-	Be clearer, particularly in this first occurrence, what Clause 5 is.	A	Title is added after the Clause reference since it is better to do not have forward reference in the introduction.

1 **MB** = Member body / **NC** = National Committee (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by **)2 **Type of comment:** **GT** = General Technical**TH** = Technical high**TL** = Technical Low**GE** = General Editorial**E** = Editorial3 **Resolution code:** **OBE** = Superseded**AIP** = Agreed in principle**A** = Agreed R = Rejected**NA** = Non actionable

Disposition of Comments

Date: 30/09/2020	Document: ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 7 N 8181 (42010. CD1-v1.0)	Project: ISO/IEC/IEEE CD1 42010 (Ed2) Architecture description
----------------------------	---	--

	MB/ NC ¹	Cmt No	Type of Cmt ²	Clause/ Subcl.	Para/ Fig/ Tab/	Line No	Comments and rationale	Proposed change	Res code ³	Resolution on each comment received
887.	INC -885	885	ED	Introdu ction		106	sections! ...architecture description... Other than the contents page this is the first occurrence where this phase is used. This is an opportunity to expand, as proposed.	... Architecture Description (AD) ...	A	
888.	INC -886	886	GE	Introdu ction	N/A	118	Line 118 introduces Annex D and line 130 introduces Annex F. The other Annexes are not discussed.	Add text to introduce the other annexes.	AIP	Annexes are referenced where appropriate; but it is understood that some other annexes could be referenced here as well.
889.	INC -887	887	TE	Legen d	Fig 5	476	Use of 'Legend' is quite a large extension to its natural usage meaning 'a key on a diagram'. Given the term 'View Component', wouldn't it be more natural to have a corresponding term like 'View Component Specification/Convention', mirroring the hierarchy between View and View Component? See also comments about line 207 regarding 'Viewpoint'. This might also help with the general understanding of the term 'Model Kind', which appears on the surface to be descriptive (i.e. describes what sort of model something is), but is actually governing/directive (Model Component Conventions etc).	Add 'View Component Specification/Convention', of which types are 'Model Kind/Model Conventions' and 'Legend' (or more appropriate term, which I'm struggling to think of at the moment!).	AIP	The term Specification has been included in clause 3 to handle different kinds of specifications. It can be views, viewpoints, legend, model kind or view components.
890.	INC -888	888	GE	Line 2	Abstr act	2214	Reconsider use of term system in "sustainment of architecture of systems "	sustainment of architecture of entities	A	
891.	INC -889	889	TL	N/A	Note 1	203	Note 1 for architecture view also applies to section 3.8 as well.	Either add Note 1 on line 203/204 to architecture viewpoint (3.8) or add Information Item as its own term (a new 3.14)	AIP	Several other occurrences of "information item" are also in the document. A definition is inserted.
892.	INC -890	890	TL	Note		292	The Note implies that an architecture description must comprises all of the			This depends on the way the requirements are written (check

1 **MB** = Member body / **NC** = National Committee (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by **)

2 **Type of comment:** **GT** = General Technical **TH** = Technical high **TL** = Technical Low **GE** = General Editorial **E** = Editorial

3 **Resolution code:** **OBE** = Superseded **AIP** = Agreed in principle **A** = Agreed R = Rejected **NA** = Non actionable

Disposition of Comments

Date: 30/09/2020	Document: ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 7 N 8181 (42010. CD1-v1.0)	Project: ISO/IEC/IEEE CD1 42010 (Ed2) Architecture description
----------------------------	---	--

2.	MB/ NC ¹	Cmt No	Type of Cmt ²	Clause/ Subcl.	Para/ Fig/ Tab/	Line No	Comments and rationale	Proposed change	Res code ³	Resolution on each comment received
893.							elements and relationship between these elements. Further implying that an omission of element and or relationship would render the architecture description non conformant. Is this intended?			usage of Shall, Should and May)
	WG 1- 891	891	TE	Scope		133	Attached is a comparison of the Scope statement from 42010:2011 with the Scope statement of CD1, which indicates that: 1) authors chose to include in the Scope statement more information about existing contents of 42010:2011, or 2) the Scope of CD1 differs significantly from the Scope statement in 42010:2011. See attached file ScopeCompare.docx	Verify that the CD1 Scope statement is consistent with the Scope statement provided on Form04 for the NP ballot to initiate the revision project: "The proposed International Standard will codify key aspects of current practice for the description of architectures. The International Standard will apply to the architectures of enterprises, products (goods or services), systems, software, etc. This International Standard will also apply to the architectures of other entities such as Systems of systems, Product lines, Family of systems, Service lines, etc."	AIP	The scope is updated in accordance to the Form04 and the evolution of the concepts.
894.	INC -892	892	ED	Scope 1		143	'entity of interest' is not hyphenated, cf line 136	Be consistent. Ensure all uses of 'entity of interest' written as 'entity-of-interest'.	OBE	See WG42-002
895.	INC -893	893	ED	Scope 1		134	Lines 134-136: This sentence is constructed "descriptions for software, systems,... and other entities." It seems curious to list all specific examples, prior to the generic 'other entities'.	Rephrase the sentence to read 'descriptions for various entities, including for example software, systems,... and business domains.;	A	

1 **MB** = Member body / **NC** = National Committee (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by **)

2 **Type of comment:** **GT** = General Technical **TH** = Technical high **TL** = Technical Low **GE** = General Editorial **E** = Editorial

3 **Resolution code:** **OBE** = Superseded **AIP** = Agreed in principle **A** = Agreed R = Rejected **NA** = Non actionable

Disposition of Comments

Date: 30/09/2020	Document: ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 7 N 8181 (42010. CD1-v1.0)	Project: ISO/IEC/IEEE CD1 42010 (Ed2) Architecture description
----------------------------	---	--

2.	MB/ NC ¹	Cmt No	Type of Cmt ²	Clause/ Subcl.	Para/ Fig/ Tab/ Line No	Comments and rationale	Proposed change	Res code ³	Resolution on each comment received
896.	INC -894	894	TE		Fig 2 403	There doesn't seem to be a clear demarcation between Stakeholder Perspective and Architecture Aspect, especially in the examples (Example 5 seems to list aspects not perspectives). If Stakeholder Perspective just provides the 'why' behind a concern, perhaps it is just another term for 'Job Role' (or maybe derived from Job Role). Because it is the job role and associated responsibilities that generate the concerns. Or is Stakeholder Perspective just intended to be a grouping of concerns that are associated with a particular job role? Maybe this is a simpler description? Overall, I think Stakeholder Perspectives are 'overegged' at present, with overcomplex relationships, whereas Architecture Aspects are more useful, as they are almost the 'bit of the arch' that answers a Concern. A Stakeholder Perspective just gives context/reasoning for a Concern, whereas Architecture Aspects, when linked to a list of Concerns, can give a list of 'things to cover' within an AD in order to answer all the concerns.	Simplify relationships for Stakeholder Perspective (provides context for a Concern). Consider	A	Change to Concern <affects> Stakeholder Perspectives
897.	INC -895	895	TE		Fig 7 575	Very 'unnatural language' term. Took me several reads to understand it, would be harder for a newbie. 'Organising Structure' would be an easier term to understand. Relationships would be: ADF contains Organising Structure Organising Structure organises Viewpoint	Rename <i>Structure Formalism</i> as <i>Organising Structure</i> Rename <i>Structured by relationship</i> as <i>Organises by</i> . Consider whether there are other organising structures too, and why this one is included but	AIP	Replace "structure formalism" by "structuring formalism"

1 **MB** = Member body / **NC** = National Committee (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by **)

2 **Type of comment:** **GT** = General Technical **TH** = Technical high **TL** = Technical Low **GE** = General Editorial **E** = Editorial

3 **Resolution code:** **OBE** = Superseded **AIP** = Agreed in principle **A** = Agreed R = Rejected **NA** = Non actionable

Disposition of Comments

Date: 30/09/2020	Document: ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 7 N 8181 (42010. CD1-v1.0)	Project: ISO/IEC/IEEE CD1 42010 (Ed2) Architecture description
----------------------------	---	--

2.	MB/ NC ¹	Cmt No	Type of Cmt ²	Clause/ Subcl.	Para/ Fig/ Tab/	Line No	Comments and rationale	Proposed change	Res code ³	Resolution on each comment received
							Organising Structure organises by Arch Aspect It seems like there might be many other organising structures and/or 'mappings' within an ADF too. Why mention just this one?	<i>others aren't.</i>		
898.	IN-896	896	TL			65	In the change history, the term used to refer to the subject of architecture should be entity. It is not subject of architecture description.	Replace AD by Architecture in Change History 1.	OBE	This default is agree. Nevertheless the change log will be summarized and move to the Foreword. See IEEE-1092.
899.	IN-897	897	TL			101	Please include a list of entities that is presented in clause 3 in the introduction so that the reader knows upfront what entities are.	Add EXAMPLES of entities to this section	A	
900.	IN-898	898	TL			106	An architecture is the fundamental concepts, properties... of an entity. An entity's architecture would be an entity's fundamental concepts, properties... of an entity. There is no need to say "entity's".	Drop "entity's" as it is redundant	A	
901.	IN-899	899	TL			108	For the sake of consistency in this paragraph, it would be better to use entity rather than architecture entity here	Replace "architecture entity" by "entity"	A	
902.	IN-900	900	TL			109	A system is a kind of entity. No need to state systems or other entities. Entities will suffice	Drop "systems or other"	A	
903.	IN-901	901	TE			119	The different characteristics of architecture descriptions are not highlighted in this document. The properties mentioned here are not in alignment with the ISO 25000 square series of standards. There are passing references to completeness, correctness. This is not an exhaustive list of AD	Drop the sentence "The provisions of this document..."	A	

1 **MB** = Member body / **NC** = National Committee (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by **)

2 **Type of comment:** **GT** = General Technical **TH** = Technical high **TL** = Technical Low **GE** = General Editorial **E** = Editorial

3 **Resolution code:** **OBE** = Superseded **AIP** = Agreed in principle **A** = Agreed R = Rejected **NA** = Non actionable

Disposition of Comments

Date: 30/09/2020	Document: ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 7 N 8181 (42010. CD1-v1.0)	Project: ISO/IEC/IEEE CD1 42010 (Ed2) Architecture description
----------------------------	---	--

2.	MB/ NC ¹	Cmt No	Type of Cmt ²	Clause/ Subcl.	Para/ Fig/ Tab/	Line No	Comments and rationale	Proposed change	Res code ³	Resolution on each comment received
904.	IN-902	902	TE			167	characteristics. ToGAF speaks about an architecture development methodology. As per this definition, ADM doesn't seem to be architecting even though many of the activities outlined here are done as part of ADM	Clarify		The purpose of this definition is to define what the activity; not how the activity is performed which is the purpose of a methodology.
905.	IN-903	903	TE			167	Are these activities done during the life-cycle of architecture or are these uses of architecture?	Clarify		This definition describe what architecting is with a set of activities sustaining an architecture to be considered over the life cycle of the associated entity.
906.	IN-904	904	TE	3,1		168	Certifying can not be architecting	Use "Evaluating" or "Assessing" instead of certifying		Certifying goes beyond evaluating or assessing. Certification in architecting is well addressed in Systems Architecting book by Rechtin & Maier. No need to replace.
907.	IN-905	905	TL	3,3		177	This definition sounds like it should be "architecture description consideration". The language used in 5.2.5 expresses the concept more clearly.	factors taken into account in architecting and in creating an architecture description	OBE	Architecture considerations term to be removed from Clause 3. See WG42-007
908.	IN-906	906	TE			179	Are concerns, aspects and perspectives the only factors? Different architecture frameworks propose different factors (for eg: layers, facets, dimensions, domains, technologies), how does one deal with all these factors?	Clarify	OBE	Architecture considerations term to be removed from Clause 3. See WG42-007
909.	IN-907	907	TE			182	I may not be adopting any process and maybe adopting some agile practices to synthesize an architecture. Does that mean that the result is not an AD? I would consider AD to be an information item. Further, its quite possible that there could	Replace "work product" with "information item"	OBE	It is important to distinguish AD as the result of an Architecting work, AD as the way to provide information to the stakeholders and AD specification providing the requirements to get this AD done. See WG42-008

1 **MB** = Member body / **NC** = National Committee (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by **)

2 **Type of comment:** **GT** = General Technical

TH = Technical high

TL = Technical Low

GE = General Editorial

E = Editorial

3 **Resolution code:** **OBE** = Superseded

AIP = Agreed in principle

A = Agreed R = Rejected

NA = Non actionable

Disposition of Comments

Date: 30/09/2020	Document: ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 7 N 8181 (42010. CD1-v1.0)	Project: ISO/IEC/IEEE CD1 42010 (Ed2) Architecture description
----------------------------	---	--

	MB/ NC ¹	Cmt No	Type of Cmt ²	Clause/ Subcl.	Para/ Fig/ Tab/	Line No	Comments and rationale	Proposed change	Res code ³	Resolution on each comment received
910.							be cases where architects need not necessarily follow a process to formulate an architecture.			
911.	IN-908	908	TE			187	Don't think that there is any process presented in this standard or in 42020 that delivers an ADF as a work product. From the point of view of this standard, it should be an information item.	Replace "work product" with "information item"	AIP	The document is now clarified regarding "ADF" conventions, principles and practices which can use for architecting) and "ADF specification" (information item specifying an ADF)
912.	IN-909	909	TL	3,7		202	View is not a part but point of view	"Architecture Description expressed to satisfy a/single point of view of stakeholder" is proposed change or/ other way is "Architecture description created for expressing architecture viewpoint (3.8)"	OBE	refer WG1-673
913.	IN-910	910	TH	3,8		207	Perhaps the term defined here is "architecture viewpoint specification". It would seem that an architecture viewpoint is the subset of information about an architecture considered relevant to a particular stakeholder, purpose or concern.	Change to architecture viewpoint specification	AIP	The ambiguity is agree. For this reason the next release will distinguish "Architecture viewpoint" (conversion) from "Viewpoint Specification" (Information item).
914.	IN-911	911	ED	3,8		208		change "capture" to "address"	OBE	OBE. See US-198
915.	IN-912	912	TE			214	Modularity and Extensibility are architecture characteristics. Are these architecture aspects? What is the distinction between aspects and non-aspects?	Clarify	OBE	See WG42-004 (Provision of a new definition). Note: "Modularity" is addressed by the new definition.
	IN-913	913	TL	3,9		214	An aspect, in engineering, is not really a single item of information.	How about "a subset of the architectural information,	OBE	See WG42-004 (Provision of a new definition).

1 **MB** = Member body / **NC** = National Committee (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by **)

2 **Type of comment:** **GT** = General Technical **TH** = Technical high **TL** = Technical Low **GE** = General Editorial **E** = Editorial

3 **Resolution code:** **OBE** = Superseded **AIP** = Agreed in principle **A** = Agreed R = Rejected **NA** = Non actionable

Disposition of Comments

Date: 30/09/2020	Document: ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 7 N 8181 (42010. CD1-v1.0)	Project: ISO/IEC/IEEE CD1 42010 (Ed2) Architecture description
----------------------------	---	--

	MB/ NC ¹	Cmt No	Type of Cmt ²	Clause/ Subcl.	Para/ Fig/ Tab/	Line No	Comments and rationale	Proposed change	Res code ³	Resolution on each comment received
916.								covering a set of related features and/or characteristics of one or more architectures"?		
917.	IN-914	914	TE			218	Does everything that a stakeholder is interested about a concern? What is the distinction between concern and non-concern? The problem with this definition is, stakeholders would be interested in too many things about the situation or the entity that would hamper the architecture in a significant way.	Clarify	OBE	Note 1 to entry: Concerns stated in the interrogative form with reference to specific rather than categorical difficulties, problems, or requirements, such as use cases.
918.	IN-915	915	TE			218	I always find this particular definition of concern to be overloaded. In the sense, that anything that the stakeholder is interested in, is treated as the stakeholder's concern even if it may not really be the case. Further, this definition seems to imply that there is a cloud (for a lack of better word) of concerns from which the architect tries to identify something that is useful. Its better to have a clearer articulation of what a concern is.	Propose "matters of interest or importance that impact one or more stakeholders". Anything that does not impact the stakeholder need not be a concern.	OBE	
919.	IN-916	916	TE			259	Interest in the context of stakeholder holds a different meaning as outlined in Note 1 to entry. This meaning should also be considered for concern.	Add Note 1 to Entry of Stakeholder to Concern to clarify what interest means	OBE	See INC-224
920.	IN-917	917	TL			263	It is not about something but the entity.	Replace "something" by "entity"	A	
921.	IN-918	918	TL			264	Cannot use stakeholder role as role itself is part of the stakeholder definition	Drop "stakeholder role"	A	See IN-919
	IEE E-113	919	TL			265	What is the difference between type of concern and categories of concern? The former is used in this line while the later is	Use either type or category but not both	OBE	See INC-1259

1 **MB** = Member body / **NC** = National Committee (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by **)

2 **Type of comment:** **GT** = General Technical **TH** = Technical high **TL** = Technical Low **GE** = General Editorial **E** = Editorial

3 **Resolution code:** **OBE** = Superseded **AIP** = Agreed in principle **A** = Agreed R = Rejected **NA** = Non actionable

Disposition of Comments

Date: 30/09/2020	Document: ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 7 N 8181 (42010. CD1-v1.0)	Project: ISO/IEC/IEEE CD1 42010 (Ed2) Architecture description
----------------------------	---	--

	MB/ NC ¹	Cmt No	Type of Cmt ²	Clause/ Subcl.	Para/ Fig/ Tab/	Line No	Comments and rationale	Proposed change	Res code ³	Resolution on each comment received
	1						used in the example for concerns. I believe that both of them should reflect the same idea.			
922.	IEE E- 113 5	920	TE	3,17		270	It is not a term which can be express in Architecture. There is no viewpoint for component unless it is itself a entity of Interest	Remove term		View component is akin to a sub-view. No need to delete.
923.	IN- 921	921	ED			308	For the sake of consistency, change per to as described, as discussed to as described in line 309.	For the sake of consistency, change per to as described, as discussed to as described in line 309.	A	
924.	IN- 922	922	TL			317	Replace by "entity of interest" to separate the architecture entity from the other entity	Replace by "each entity of interest"	A	
925.	IN- 923	923	TL			318	Replace by "entity of interest" to separate the architecture entity from the other entity	Replace by "entity of interest"	A	
926.	IN- 924	924	TL			319	Replace by "entity of interest" to separate the architecture entity from the other entity	Replace by "entity of interest"	A	
927.	IN- 925	925	TL	5.2.1	1	329	Perhaps we can also show that a stakeholder uses an architecture description.			The proposed relationship is outside the scope of this figure. The figure focuses on the context of AD.
928.	IN- 926	926	TL			331	Replace by "entity of interest" to separate the architecture entity from the other entity	Replace by "entity of interest"	A	
929.	IN- 927	927	TL			332	Replace by "entity of interest" to separate the architecture entity from the other entity	Replace by "entity of interest"	A	
930.	IN- 928	928	TE			344	This statement seems to imply that more than one distinct AD is necessary to understand an architecture which is not really the case.	Replace "several" by "one or more"	A	
931.	IN- 929	929	TL			345	An AD can be based on stakeholder, viewpoint, stakeholder perspective, ...	Drop "different"	OBE	The proposal cannot be directly implmented in lite of the changes made in this clause.
932.	IN-	930	TL			351	Please repeat the NOTE 1 to entry in	Add content pertaining to	OBE	NOTEs are not repeated. This notion

1 **MB** = Member body / **NC** = National Committee (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by **)

2 **Type of comment:** **GT** = General Technical **TH** = Technical high **TL** = Technical Low **GE** = General Editorial **E** = Editorial

3 **Resolution code:** **OBE** = Superseded **AIP** = Agreed in principle **A** = Agreed R = Rejected **NA** = Non actionable

Disposition of Comments

Date: 30/09/2020	Document: ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 7 N 8181 (42010. CD1-v1.0)	Project: ISO/IEC/IEEE CD1 42010 (Ed2) Architecture description
----------------------------	---	--

	MB/ NC ¹	Cmt No	Type of Cmt ²	Clause/ Subcl.	Para/ Fig/ Tab/	Line No	Comments and rationale	Proposed change	Res code ³	Resolution on each comment received
1.										
2.										
933.							Stakeholder on Interests which means that a stakeholder who has an interest in an entity or its architecture may also be affected by the entity or its architecture	Interest from Note 1 to Entry in the Stakeholder definition		is already covered in this revised paragraph.
934.	IN-931	931	TL	5.2.3		353	"the architecture they aware of " is not correct expression for concern	Proposed "Or expectation from Entity of Interest in peculiar way" This peculiar way may come from awareness of stakeholder from sinilar archiected entities		The current text is cleared, compred to the proposal. No change.
935.	IN-932	932	TL			363	This is one of the ways in which concerns arise in relation to stakeholder needs and requirements. The 2nd sentence in this paragraph cover the text in a better way.	Propose to drop the first sentence.	OBE	See INC-312
936.	IN-933	933	TE			369	The way concerns manifest about the architecture is not included.	Add a sentence "Concerns can manifest in many ways in relation to architecture goals, decisions, characteristics, expression, assumptions, ..."	AIP	"Goals" is clarified to "architecture goals". Others are included, but "expression" is not understood in this list.
937.	IN-934	934	ED	5.2.3		374		"but very unlikely" instead of "and very unlikely"	OBE	See GB-309
938.	IN-935	935	TE			382	Architecture aspects are determined based on prior experience. This means that there would have been some concerns that aided in establishing these aspects. These concerns need not necessarily be emerging or expressed by stakeholders as they may not have the relevant experience as mentioned here.	Drop "emerging or expressed"	A	
939.	IN-936	936	ED	5.2.4		382		Architectural aspects are sets of related characteristics or features	OBE	See INC-335.
	IN-937	937	TL	5.2.4		386	Aspects are certainly objective. Pretty much all of 5.2.3 is devoted to explaining	Delete this sentence	OBE	See WG 1-320

1 **MB** = Member body / **NC** = National Committee (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by **)

2 **Type of comment:** **GT** = General Technical **TH** = Technical high **TL** = Technical Low **GE** = General Editorial **E** = Editorial

3 **Resolution code:** **OBE** = Superseded **AIP** = Agreed in principle **A** = Agreed R = Rejected **NA** = Non actionable

Disposition of Comments

Date:
30/09/2020Document:
ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 7 N 8181
(42010. CD1-v1.0)Project:
ISO/IEC/IEEE CD1 42010 (Ed2) Architecture
description

2.	MB/ NC ¹	Cmt No	Type of Cmt ²	Clause/ Subcl.	Para/ Fig/ Tab/	Line No	Comments and rationale	Proposed change	Res code ³	Resolution on each comment received
940.							why concerns also have an objective basis			
941.	IN-938	938	TE			387	This is based on the assumption that the architecture characteristics or features as encoded as architecture aspects have some correlation to the entity's features or characteristics and this correlation is documented somewhere.	This is a overloaded statement and is not necessarily true. Propose to drop this sentence.		Sentence is correct as it stands.
942.	IN-939	939	TE			388	One Architecture aspect may lead to determination of one or more concerns or many architecture aspects may lead to determination of one concern. Both the cases are possible	Include both the cases of determining concerns from architecture aspects.	A	
943.	IN-940	940	TL	5.2.4		395		Add "addresses" or "relates to" arrow from architecture aspect to concern.	OBE	Conceptual model has been updated
944.	IN-941	941	TE			396	Stakeholder face many situations and conditions and would like to utilize the entity in these situations/conditions. They may be particular situations where they would really like to use the entity.	Add "has interest in" relationship between Stakeholder and context. Context of an entity cannot be in isolation of the stakeholder.	OBE	Conceptual model has been updated
945.	IN-942	942	TE			396	Stakeholder perspective about the entity depends upon the context. Different contexts leads to different ways of thinking about the entity.	Add Context influences Stakeholder perspective relationship in the figure and corresponding text	OBE	Conceptual model has been updated
946.	IN-943	943	TL			403	Its incorrect to say that the stakeholder perspective are ways of thinking about an architecture here when the definition says stakeholder perspective is ways of thinking about an entity	Drop "architecture or an"	A	
	IN-944	944	TL			407	There are multiple perspectives about the entity. There could be multiple perspectives about the architecture but	Drop "architecture or"	A	

1 MB = Member body / NC = National Committee (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by **)

2 Type of comment: GT = General Technical

TH = Technical high

TL = Technical Low

GE = General Editorial

E = Editorial

3 Resolution code: OBE = Superseded

AIP = Agreed in principle

A = Agreed R = Rejected

NA = Non actionable

Disposition of Comments

Date: 30/09/2020	Document: ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 7 N 8181 (42010. CD1-v1.0)	Project: ISO/IEC/IEEE CD1 42010 (Ed2) Architecture description
----------------------------	---	--

2.	MB/ NC ¹	Cmt No	Type of Cmt ²	Clause/ Subcl.	Para/ Fig/ Tab/	Line No	Comments and rationale	Proposed change	Res code ³	Resolution on each comment received
947.							that is not considered to be addressed by stakeholder perspective as per the definition in clause 3			
	IN-945	945	TE			413	Not sure why the kind of stakeholders are specifically taken up with regard to non-architect stakeholders. Every stakeholder has certain perspectives, its immaterial whether they are architects or non-architects	Drop this sentence	OBE	See FRA 1044
948.	IN-946	946	ED	5.2.4		417		"driven by"	OBE	The entire paragraph has been removed in the rewrite.
949.	IN-947	947	TE			419	In addition to particular set of stakeholders. Aspects and Perspectives that are captured often are based on certain stakeholders	Add "in addition to particular stakeholders"	OBE	The entire paragraph has been removed in the rewrite.
950.	IN-948	948	TL			421	As per definition in Clause 3, architecture consideration is factor taken into account in describing an architecture description. What is said here is different from the definition in clause 3	Potential redefinition. Revert back to the definition in clause 3 or do not introduce this definition here.	OBE	See WG42-007, architecture considerations no longer defined in clause 3.
951.	IN-949	949	TE			423	Also, state that there could be other kinds of architecture considerations as well.	Also, state that there could be other kinds of architecture considerations that arise due to architecture practice	A	
952.	IN-950	950	TH			439	Frame is defined as "to formulate or construct in a particular style or language", when used as considerations framed by that viewpoint, it becomes considerations formulated or constructed in a particular style or language by that viewpoint. Viewpoint doesn't formulate or construct considerations. Viewpoints are shaped or established by the	Replace framed by shaped or established	OBE	Relationships between concerns and aspects and the deprecation of architecture considerations are updated, "Frames" is now restored. See INC 165

1 **MB** = Member body / **NC** = National Committee (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by **)

2 **Type of comment:** **GT** = General Technical **TH** = Technical high **TL** = Technical Low **GE** = General Editorial **E** = Editorial

3 **Resolution code:** **OBE** = Superseded **AIP** = Agreed in principle **A** = Agreed R = Rejected **NA** = Non actionable

Disposition of Comments

Date: 30/09/2020	Document: ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 7 N 8181 (42010. CD1-v1.0)	Project: ISO/IEC/IEEE CD1 42010 (Ed2) Architecture description
----------------------------	---	--

	MB/ NC ¹	Cmt No	Type of Cmt ²	Clause/ Subcl.	Para/ Fig/ Tab/	Line No	Comments and rationale	Proposed change	Res code ³	Resolution on each comment received
953.							considerations which is more appropriate then formulation/construction.			
	IN-951	951	TH			452	Frame is defined as "to formulate or construct in a particular style or language", when used as viewpoint frames one or more considerations, it becomes viewpoints formulates or constructs in a particular style or language considerations. Viewpoint doesn't formulate or construct considerations. Viewpoints are shaped or established by the considerations which is more appropriate then formulation/construction.	Replace frames by shapes or establishes	OBE	rchitecture consideration has been deprecated and is no longer included as part of views or viewpoints. Reverted back to viewpoint frames concerns.
954.	IN-952	952	TE			453	If what is said here with regard to viewpoint identifies concerns, stakeholders, aspects is true then it is contrary to viewpoint frames considerations (concerns, aspects, perspectives are kinds of considerations).	Clarify	AIP	Architecture considerations has been deprecated and viewpoints no longer frame architecture considerations.
955.	IN-953	953	TH			456	This line speaks about another relationship between viewpoints and considerations which is viewpoint addresses considerations. In my point of view, viewpoint identifies considerations holds true when developing the AD. However, conceptually, viewpoint addresses considerations is more meaningful than viewpoint frames considerations	Retain two cases. One is Viewpoint identifies considerations. The second is Viewpoint addresses considerations.	AIP	Will clarify this
956.	IN-954	954	TE	5.2.6		462	Concept presented for consideration: A viewpoint specifies which architecture elements should be included in a view, and how they should be mapped to		A	See WG1-391.

1 **MB** = Member body / **NC** = National Committee (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by **)

2 **Type of comment:** **GT** = General Technical **TH** = Technical high **TL** = Technical Low **GE** = General Editorial **E** = Editorial

3 **Resolution code:** **OBE** = Superseded **AIP** = Agreed in principle **A** = Agreed R = Rejected **NA** = Non actionable

Disposition of Comments

Date: 30/09/2020	Document: ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 7 N 8181 (42010. CD1-v1.0)	Project: ISO/IEC/IEEE CD1 42010 (Ed2) Architecture description
----------------------------	---	--

	MB/ NC ¹	Cmt No	Type of Cmt ²	Clause/ Subcl.	Para/ Fig/ Tab/	Line No	Comments and rationale	Proposed change	Res code ³	Resolution on each comment received
957.	IN-955	955	TE			463	representations in the view, using a metamodel or other conventions provided by the viewpoint. No need to speak about metamodel here. That is one of the ways in which viewpoints are applied	Remove "a metamodel or other"	OBE	See WG1-391
958.	IN-956	956	TL			468	The sentence formulation is incorrect. These methods specify the view elements specified used????	These methods specify the view elements used when creating	A	
959.	IN-957	957	TL			470	Creating extensions to the metamodel is a particular view method. Similarly, modeling profile and modeling patterns are particular techniques. No need to get into this specifics	Drop the sentence "Furthermore, these methods... model kinds"	A	
960.	IN-958	958	ED			476	Its either a model kind or a legend. There is no need for another "by"	Propose "by a model kind or a legend"		The extra 'by' adds clarity.
961.	IN-959	959	TL	5.2.7		477	an explanatory sentence about model kind and how it helps interpretation would be useful here. The proposed sentence could perhaps replace the current "sort of model" sentence.	A <i>model kind</i> identification, such as "plumbing model" or "economics model", draws upon viewer awareness of well-understood representation conventions in a particular domain to aid in the interpretation of view representations.	AIP	The text has been rewritten to better reflect model kind, view components, views and viewpoints.
962.	IN-960	960	TE			478	To be consistent with how model kind is defined, the way legend is defined could be "denotes the sort of explanations or interpretations for a view component"	A legend denotes the sort of explanations or interpretations for a view component	OBE	See INC-093
963.	IN-961	961	TL			479	A view component is not like a library that can be shared. It is a component that is replicated across multiple views.	Replace shared by part of	A	
964.	IN-	962	TL			492	Its not necessarily any construct but only	Replace any construct by	A	

1 **MB** = Member body / **NC** = National Committee (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by **)

2 **Type of comment:** **GT** = General Technical **TH** = Technical high **TL** = Technical Low **GE** = General Editorial **E** = Editorial

3 **Resolution code:** **OBE** = Superseded **AIP** = Agreed in principle **A** = Agreed R = Rejected **NA** = Non actionable

Disposition of Comments

Date: 30/09/2020	Document: ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 7 N 8181 (42010. CD1-v1.0)	Project: ISO/IEC/IEEE CD1 42010 (Ed2) Architecture description
----------------------------	---	--

2.	MB/ NC ¹	Cmt No	Type of Cmt ²	Clause/ Subcl.	Para/ Fig/ Tab/	Line No	Comments and rationale	Proposed change	Res code ³	Resolution on each comment received
							architectural concepts.	architectural concept or architectural construct		
965.	IN- 963	963	TH	5.2.8		492	I am a bit confused: is an entity, state, relationship, process etc an AD element? If so, how does it fit into 493-495 - is it a view component? From 5.2.7, I sort of gathered that a view component is a bigger chunk. So is an entity or relationship not an AD element? Is that what 499-500 are addressing, that these are AD elements introduced by a governing viewpoint? If so, perhaps it could be explained differently, as suggested. Note that lines 502-503 add to the confusion.	(493) Add: "Instances of the concepts above are AD elements", followed by current 493-495. Then, on line 497 "are introduced, usually corresponding to specific elements in the architecture e.g. entities, relationships, states etc". The conventions, 499-500 then becomes much clearer.	A	Note: add text and examples re Model Kinds to 5.2.8
966.	IN- 964	964	TE			505	Its better to use AD elements instead of elements in this section. AD elements have particular meaning in this document while elements have the dictionary meaning which is not the same.	Use AD elements consistently rather than elements in this section	A	
967.	IN- 965	965	TE			540	Aspects are about the architecture of the entity and not the entity itself	Should be aspects of an entity's architecture	OBE	The definition of aspect has changed. See WG42-004
968.	IN- 966	966	TL	5.2.11		542	The first three example items all relate to description rather than architecture	Suggest moving these three to the end of the example list rather than beginning.	OBE	The definition of aspect has changed. See WG42-004
969.	IN- 967	967	TL	5.2.11		549	Would be good to add "impact on quality attributes", it is the most common rationale for architecture decisions!		A	
970.	IN- 968	968	TL			572	These are generic architecture aspects and stakeholder perspectives	These are generic architecture aspects and stakeholder perspectives	AIP	WG1-469 for nature of changes.
971.	IN- 969	969	TE			574	Do Viewpoints in ADFs identify or address or frame architecture considerations? I	Change frame to identify	A	

1 **MB** = Member body / **NC** = National Committee (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by **)

2 **Type of comment:** **GT** = General Technical **TH** = Technical high **TL** = Technical Low **GE** = General Editorial **E** = Editorial

3 **Resolution code:** **OBE** = Superseded **AIP** = Agreed in principle **A** = Agreed R = Rejected **NA** = Non actionable

Disposition of Comments

1.

Date: 30/09/2020	Document: ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 7 N 8181 (42010. CD1-v1.0)	Project: ISO/IEC/IEEE CD1 42010 (Ed2) Architecture description
----------------------------	---	--

2.

972.

973.

974.

975.

976.

977.

978.

MB/ NC ¹	Cmt No	Type of Cmt ²	Clause/ Subcl.	Para/ Fig/ Tab/	Line No	Comments and rationale	Proposed change	Res code ³	Resolution on each comment received
						believe that it's the former.			
IN-970	970	TE			575	The notion of correspondences between concerns, aspects and perspectives has not been discussed earlier. If they are critical they need to be introduced in the appropriate clauses as part of conceptual foundations	Clarify whether correspondences between architecture considerations is necessary and if it is so then introduce them in the conceptual foundations itself		Since all the constructs discussed in this document are AD elements and correspondences occur between AD elements, this is already addressed. There is no need to specifically say that correspondence occur only between architecture considerations.
IN-971	971	TE			575	I find the term structure formalism to be rather obscure in nature. I am not really clear what is meant by structure formalism. Given that it is not defined anywhere in clause 3, it is subject to many interpretations. If the intent is to talk about how the AD is organized by the ADF then probably organization or structure or model could work here	Replace structure formalism by an appropriate term. The current usage is amenable to considerable subjectivity	AIP	See INC-895
IN-972	972	TH			576	This is another relationship between architecture considerations and viewpoints (organizes)	It is necessary to decide what are the possible relationships between viewpoints and architecture considerations and retain only those relationships across the document	AIP	See WG1-469 for the nature of changes.
IN-973	973	TE			593	Is it the viewpoint of a stakeholder or viewpoint on the entity? So far, the document does not discuss about stakeholder viewpoints, its stakeholder perspectives or architecture viewpoints.	Clarify	OBE	See WG1-469
IN-974	974	TL			596	Not users but stakeholders. User is a role introduced in the entity.	Replace users by stakeholders	OBE	See WG1-469
IN-975	975	TL			602	Not only legends, but also model kinds	Should be model kinds and legends	A	
IN-	976	TL			612	Aspect is characteristic or feature of an	Drop "characterization"	OBE	See GB-475

1 **MB** = Member body / **NC** = National Committee (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by **)

2 **Type of comment:** **GT** = General Technical **TH** = Technical high **TL** = Technical Low **GE** = General Editorial **E** = Editorial

3 **Resolution code:** **OBE** = Superseded **AIP** = Agreed in principle **A** = Agreed R = Rejected **NA** = Non actionable

Disposition of Comments

Date:
30/09/2020Document:
ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 7 N 8181
(42010. CD1-v1.0)Project:
ISO/IEC/IEEE CD1 42010 (Ed2) Architecture
description

	MB/ NC ¹	Cmt No	Type of Cmt ²	Clause/ Subcl.	Para/ Fig/ Tab/	Line No	Comments and rationale	Proposed change	Res code ³	Resolution on each comment received
	976						architecture. No idea what aspect characterization will entail.			
979.	IN-977	977	TL			619	Architecture models are not discussed in the standard	Drop "and architecture models"	A	
980.	IN-978	978	TL			621	Architecture models are not discussed in the standard	Drop "and architecture models"	A	
981.	IN-979	979	TL			627	Architecture aspects are defined as the characteristic or features of architecture. Does this sentence means AD elements describing the aspects?	Clarify or deprecate	A	
982.	IN-980	980	TL			631	Is viewing convention part of viewpoint or a completely different concept?	Clarify	OBE	See definition of viewpoint in clause 3
983.	IN-981	981	TL			664	It is necessary to split architecture views and architecture view components	In this line speak about architecture views and in the next one add "architecture view component(s) for each architecture views included"	A	
984.	IN-982	982	TE	6,1		672	should be bioth human as well as machine look to much expectation from ADL	Architecture description should follow the guideline and syntax of ADL	OBE	Usage of one or more ADL is not mandatory. Natural language can be possible. Nevertheless, this sentence is clarified. See INC-511
985.	IN-983	983	ED			680	Not "and supplementary information" but "any supplementary information"	Replace "and" by "any"		This sentence is a precision of the previous one. The "and" in both sentences articulate the "indentification" and "suplemantary information".
986.	IN-984	984	TH	6,2		686	Do we really mean that architecture descriptions shall include the results of all evaluations performed? Surely not, surely it is a judgment call whether the results of any particular evaluation should be included in a description of the architecture.	Change "shall" to "may"	A	"May." is agreed.

1 **MB** = Member body / **NC** = National Committee (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by **)2 **Type of comment:** **GT** = General Technical**TH** = Technical high**TL** = Technical Low**GE** = General Editorial**E** = Editorial3 **Resolution code:** **OBE** = Superseded**AIP** = Agreed in principle**A** = Agreed R = Rejected**NA** = Non actionable

Disposition of Comments

Date: 30/09/2020	Document: ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 7 N 8181 (42010. CD1-v1.0)	Project: ISO/IEC/IEEE CD1 42010 (Ed2) Architecture description
----------------------------	---	--

	MB/ NC ¹	Cmt No	Type of Cmt ²	Clause/ Subcl.	Para/ Fig/ Tab/	Line No	Comments and rationale	Proposed change	Res code ³	Resolution on each comment received
987.	IN-985	985	TL			695	Isn't this a recommendation?	Replace shall by should	A	
988.	IN-986	986	TL	6,3		695	"when applicable" still seems a bit too strong. For example, if I am describing the architecture of a telescope, acquirers may be an applicable stakeholder, but I may not deem their interests sufficiently significant to identify their concerns, create views addressing their concerns and so on. This comment probably applies to all occurrences of "when applicable".	Change to "examined, and when considered relevant"...	A	
989.	IN-987	987	TE			707	1. Vendors/Suppliers 2. Strategic Personnel	Just add "Vendors" with a slash at Suppliers Add Strategic Personnel explicitly		This is only an indicative list. The standard does not ratify this list as it shall be available in all cases. No need to add to the list.
990.	IN-988	988	TL	6,3		708	Few more important stakeholders may be added	Following may be added Buyers Managers Infrastructure team / providers		This is only an indicative list. The standard does not ratify this list as it shall be available in all cases. No need to add to the list.
991.	IN-989	989	TL	6,3		709	Shall again seems too strong. Overall, suggest reviewing every shall carefully. It is not our intention to override the judgment of people creating architecture descriptions, and overburden them.	Consideration "should" be given	OBE	See WG1-522
992.	IN-990	990	TL			720	It would be useful to augment this list of concerns with more categories	Resilience, Extensibility, Adaptability, Evolvability, Latency, Resource utilization, Effectiveness, Operability, Usefulness, Complexity could be some concerns	A	
993.	IN-991	991	TE			726	Usability and Interoperability	Usability and Interoperability may be added as well	A	

1 **MB** = Member body / **NC** = National Committee (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by **)

2 **Type of comment:** **GT** = General Technical **TH** = Technical high **TL** = Technical Low **GE** = General Editorial **E** = Editorial

3 **Resolution code:** **OBE** = Superseded **AIP** = Agreed in principle **A** = Agreed R = Rejected **NA** = Non actionable

Disposition of Comments

1.

Date: 30/09/2020	Document: ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 7 N 8181 (42010. CD1-v1.0)	Project: ISO/IEC/IEEE CD1 42010 (Ed2) Architecture description
----------------------------	---	--

2.

994.

995.

996.

997.

998.

999.

1000.

MB/ NC ¹	Cmt No	Type of Cmt ²	Clause/ Subcl.	Para/ Fig/ Tab/	Line No	Comments and rationale	Proposed change	Res code ³	Resolution on each comment received
IN-992	992	TE			743	Some of these are not really characteristics or features of architectures. True some ADFs identify these as rows/columns of their grid. However, these ADFs do not specifically mention these as aspects. That being the case, it is necessary to filter this list and consider only those that are characteristics or features of architectures	Drop data, activity, people, information, parameters, constraints, requirements.		Definition of Aspects is changed to better reflect relationship with concerns (See WG42-004). Per Example 1 in 6.6, these are architecture aspects as used in the prevalent ADFs.
IN-993	993	TE			761	"Statutory and"	Add "Statutory" to Regulatory	A	
IN-994	994	TL			762	As mentioned earlier, this list needs to be pruned based on the relevance to the definition of architecture aspect as defined in this document	Consider only those aspects that are in alignment with the definition in clause 3	OBE	Definition of Aspects is changed to better reflect relationship with concerns (See WG42-004, See INC-059). Per Example 1 in 6.6, these are architecture aspects as used in prevalent ADFs.
IN-995	995	TL			762	As mentioned earlier, this list needs to be pruned based on the relevance to the definition of perspective as defined in this document	Consider only those perspectives that are in alignment with the definition in clause 3	OBE	Definition of Aspects is changed to better reflect relationship with concerns (See WG42-004, See INC-059). Per Example 1 in 6.6, these are architecture aspects as used in prevalent ADFs.
IN-996	996	TL			784	Some of these are not necessarily perspectives while they can be rows/columns of a grid as defined in an ADF. It is necessary to map these perspectives with the definition in clause 3 and consider only those that match the definition.	Drop actual resources, metadata	A	These two perspectives have to be deleted
IN-997	997	TE			803	Legal	add Legal as well	A	
IN-	998	TE			834	It would be useful to augment this list	Something like the identification	AIP	Add: Each architecture view

1 **MB** = Member body / **NC** = National Committee (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by **)

2 **Type of comment:** **GT** = General Technical **TH** = Technical high **TL** = Technical Low **GE** = General Editorial **E** = Editorial

3 **Resolution code:** **OBE** = Superseded **AIP** = Agreed in principle **A** = Agreed R = Rejected **NA** = Non actionable

Disposition of Comments

Date:
30/09/2020Document:
ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 7 N 8181
(42010. CD1-v1.0)Project:
ISO/IEC/IEEE CD1 42010 (Ed2) Architecture
description

1.

2.

1001.

1002.

1003.

1004.

1005.

1006.

1007.

MB/ NC ¹	Cmt No	Type of Cmt ²	Clause/ Subcl.	Para/ Fig/ Tab/	Line No	Comments and rationale	Proposed change	Res code ³	Resolution on each comment received
						with information about view components	of view components that are part of the view		component shall adhere to the conventions of its governing architecture viewpoint.
IN-999	999	TL			879	Is consistency a characteristic or an architecture relation? Since correspondences deal with architecture relation, how can they be used to deal with consistency as a characteristic	Clarify		Consistency is a quality factor. Inconsistency is a default. This word is used in this clause with meaning defined by common dictionary and is compatible with ISO/IEC/IEEE 24765 for example.
IN-1000	1000	TE	6.8.2		890	Do we really mean that every single AD element correspondence in the entire description shall be identified?	Change to "An architecture description may include a list of AD element correspondences".	A	
IN-1001	1001	TL			894	Should be AD correspondence	Should be AD correspondence	A	
IN-1002	1002	TE	6.8.3		903	Whether to include correspondence methods in the architecture description is a judgment call. But if included, the method shall be conformant, as specified in subsequent lines.	"An architecture description may identify correspondence methods applying to its AD elements".	A	
IN-1003	1003	TE			904	"Appropriate" instead of "Holds"	904 line wouldn't it be appropriate to say " Appropriate " instead of "Holds" For each 903 included correspondence method, an architecture description shall record whether the method holds	A	
IN-1004	1004	TL			909	The 2nd sentence in this paragraph is a duplication of the 2nd sentence in the paragraph starting in line 903. One of these can be deprecated	Move the 2nd sentence to a new paragraph and deprecate it here and elsewhere	A	
IN-1005	1005	TL			915	There is no design in this document. Stating that correspondences are	Drop "designed to be"	A	

1 MB = Member body / NC = National Committee (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by **)

2 Type of comment: GT = General Technical TH = Technical high TL = Technical Low GE = General Editorial E = Editorial

3 Resolution code: OBE = Superseded AIP = Agreed in principle A = Agreed R = Rejected NA = Non actionable

Disposition of Comments

Date: 30/09/2020	Document: ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 7 N 8181 (42010. CD1-v1.0)	Project: ISO/IEC/IEEE CD1 42010 (Ed2) Architecture description
----------------------------	---	--

	MB/ NC ¹	Cmt No	Type of Cmt ²	Clause/ Subcl.	Para/ Fig/ Tab/	Line No	Comments and rationale	Proposed change	Res code ³	Resolution on each comment received
1008.	IN-1006	1006	TL			922	designed to be compatible is incorrect Self referring NOTE	Drop this NOTE	OBE	See WG1-613
1009.	IN-1007	1007	TE			923	This section discusses about recording rationales and decisions. Architecture decisions are the crucial information and rationale is reasons for making the decisions. Its better to name this section as Recording of architecture decisions or Recording of architecture decisions and rationale	Rename section as "Recording of architecture decisions or Recording of architecture decisions and rationale"	A	
1010.	IN-1008	1008	TE			924	The order of clauses should be decisions followed by rationale. A decision is first made with regard to a set of choices. The rationale is then worked out for this decisions. Hence it is necessary to change the order.	Swap sections 6.9.1 and 6.9.2	A	
1011.	IN-1009	1009	TE			936	Line 934 already says only decisions considered key to architecture or entity should be included. Not sure why this statement is necessary.	Drop the sentence "It is not practical to record..."	OBE	see WG1-614
1012.	IN-1010	1010	TL			939	The decisions covered here should be relevant to the architectural concepts discussed in this standard. Any other criteria may not be relevant.	Include only those criteria that are relevant to the concepts discussed in this standard		Recording is in the scope. I.e. an AD records decisions. This content reflects the current statement of this standard.
1013.	IN-1011	1011	TL			951	Aspects are about the architecture of the entity and not the entity itself	Clarify	OBE	See changes in the definition of aspects and its relationships with concerns.
1014.	IN-1012	1012	TL			956	This is already covered as part of rationale (line 931)	Drop this sentence	A	
1015.	IN-1013	1013	TE			973	Are the structure formalisms for organizing	Link Structure formalism to	OBE	See INC-621

1 **MB** = Member body / **NC** = National Committee (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by **)

2 **Type of comment:** **GT** = General Technical **TH** = Technical high **TL** = Technical Low **GE** = General Editorial **E** = Editorial

3 **Resolution code:** **OBE** = Superseded **AIP** = Agreed in principle **A** = Agreed R = Rejected **NA** = Non actionable

Disposition of Comments

Date:
30/09/2020Document:
ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 7 N 8181
(42010. CD1-v1.0)Project:
ISO/IEC/IEEE CD1 42010 (Ed2) Architecture
description

2.	MB/ NC ¹	Cmt No	Type of Cmt ²	Clause/ Subcl.	Para/ Fig/ Tab/	Line No	Comments and rationale	Proposed change	Res code ³	Resolution on each comment received
	101 3						aspects and perspectives or organizing views and viewpoints? What kind of organization is necessary for the generic aspects and perspectives? For a complex system with many views/viewpoints, organization or structuring is required for the viewpoints and views.	viewpoints and views and how they are organized rather than to aspects and perspectives.		
1016.	IN- 101 4	1014	TL			977	Correspondence methods and framework methods should be dealt with individually. There may be other view methods that should be considered as well.	j) Correspondence methods, k) Framework methods, and; l) Any other view methods.	A	
1017.	IN- 101 5	1015	TE			980	Key Result Areas/Quantitative Framework	add Key Result Areas to Frameworks		The NOTE is about the methods that are part of the framework. Key result areas are not methods but outputs/outcomes.
1018.	IN- 101 6	1016	TL			983	Can be merged with line 1000 as both refer to the conditions of applicability	Merge lines 983 and line 1000	OBE	See INC 623
1019.	IN- 101 7	1017	TL	7,1		984	It is a bit strange for this to be normative, because in essence it makes the conceptual model, which we think of as informative content, normative. It is also not clear why it is necessary to make it normative: ADFs are defined relatively rarely and involve a huge amount of work, surely definers would make it consistent with the conceptual model as a matter of well-formedness.	An architecture description framework should be consistent with the conceptual model in clause 5.		Clause 5 is normative. Normative does not mean just requirements but also includes statements of fact or intention.
1020.	IN- 101 8	1018	TE			988	This seems to be a repeat of the requirements stated in lines 967 to 979. Is this necessary? Can't this be merged with the earlier text?	Clarify	OBE	See WG 1-617
1021.	IN-	1019	TE			1001	Not sure adherence is a necessity for this	Clarify and drop if not necessary	OBE	See WG 1-617

1 **MB** = Member body / **NC** = National Committee (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by **)2 **Type of comment:** **GT** = General Technical **TH** = Technical high **TL** = Technical Low **GE** = General Editorial **E** = Editorial3 **Resolution code:** **OBE** = Superseded **AIP** = Agreed in principle **A** = Agreed R = Rejected **NA** = Non actionable

Disposition of Comments

Date:
30/09/2020Document:
ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 7 N 8181
(42010. CD1-v1.0)Project:
ISO/IEC/IEEE CD1 42010 (Ed2) Architecture
description

2.	MB/ NC ¹	Cmt No	Type of Cmt ²	Clause/ Subcl.	Para/ Fig/ Tab/	Line No	Comments and rationale	Proposed change	Res code ³	Resolution on each comment received
	101 9						standard. There is already a conformance clause that covers requirements for what does it mean to conform to different parts of this standard			
1022.	IN- 102 0	1020	TL	7,2		1007	The Conformance clause (4, line 285) mentioned conformance for ADLs, but section 7.2 has no shalls.	Need to examine more carefully what is the absolute minimum an ADL must have in order to be conformant e.g. a collection of AD elements, rules for how the elements come together in views, rationale and/or view methods that establish why the resulting views and associated view methods are sufficient to address architecture considerations, and correspondence methods across views if relevant.	OBE	See INC-645
1023.	IN- 102 1	1021	TL			1022	Should information pertaining to legend be included in requirements?	Clarify and add if necessary	A	
1024.	IN- 102 2	1022	TE			1037	View methods define operations that apply to views. However, correspondence methods are used to construct relations between AD elements which may not be part of the view. Don't think that correspondence methods fit under view methods.	Move correspondence methods outside the scope of view methods	A	Move correspondence methods outside the scope of view methods. See action related to IEEE-1240
1025.	IN- 102 3	1023	TE	A5		1256	A separate section on Non Functional requirements w.r.t emerging technologies like IOT, AI & ML, Block Chain and cloud technologies is preferred. We have observed that Non functional requirements	Introduce a separate section for Non functional requirements for emerging technologies		This should be the objective of the SQUARE series of standards and not here.

1 **MB** = Member body / **NC** = National Committee (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by **)2 **Type of comment:** **GT** = General Technical**TH** = Technical high**TL** = Technical Low**GE** = General Editorial**E** = Editorial3 **Resolution code:** **OBE** = Superseded**AIP** = Agreed in principle**A** = Agreed R = Rejected**NA** = Non actionable

Disposition of Comments

Date:
30/09/2020Document:
ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 7 N 8181
(42010. CD1-v1.0)Project:
ISO/IEC/IEEE CD1 42010 (Ed2) Architecture
description

1.

2.

1026.

1027.

1028.

1029.

1030.

MB/ NC ¹	Cmt No	Type of Cmt ²	Clause/ Subcl.	Para/ Fig/ Tab/	Line No	Comments and rationale	Proposed change	Res code ³	Resolution on each comment received
						methods and outcomes defer completely when compared to traditional technologies.			
IN-1024	1024	TE	A6		1343	More examples can be given from different stakeholder view points such as footprint, Business views, Capability views, Data views, Technology views, Non functional aspect related reviews at a high level. This will give specific guidance to users of this document	Introduce examples in specific areas or introduce some categories of views to help audience of the document to fully understand intention of this section		Purpose of this section is to describe what these are and how they relate to the concepts in this standard. No need to provide multiple examples.
FRA-1025	1025	TE	Intro		127	Conformance to "Model kind" is no longer addressed in clause 4.	Remove "model kind".	OBE	MK is now a conformance class
FRA-1026	1026	TL	Intro		130	This sentence does not follow logically explanation of the introduction	Remove this sentence.	A	
FRA-1027	1027	TL	1		151	It could be useful to refer to ISO/IEC/IEEE 42020 for further information about the architecture description process.	Refer to ISO/IEC/IEEE 42020 with a sentence explaining relationship between description, conceptualization and elaboration.	A	
FRA-1028	1028	TH	3.5		193	Not convinced that this is the first quality of ADF	First quality of ADF is to provide a practical environment including one or more items of the following non-exhaustive list: a selection of viewpoints, terminology related to the scope of use of the ADF, a methodology, a library of usable patterns, a library of applicable standards and a set of	AIP	Appropriate NOTES and explanation to be added in clause 5.4.2

1 MB = Member body / NC = National Committee (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by **)

2 Type of comment: GT = General Technical

TH = Technical high

TL = Technical Low

GE = General Editorial

E = Editorial

3 Resolution code: OBE = Superseded

AIP = Agreed in principle

A = Agreed R = Rejected

NA = Non actionable

Disposition of Comments

Date: 30/09/2020	Document: ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 7 N 8181 (42010. CD1-v1.0)	Project: ISO/IEC/IEEE CD1 42010 (Ed2) Architecture description
----------------------------	---	--

	MB/ NC ¹	Cmt No	Type of Cmt ²	Clause/ Subcl.	Para/ Fig/ Tab/	Line No	Comments and rationale	Proposed change	Res code ³	Resolution on each comment received
1031.	FRA - 102 9	1029	TE	3.10		219	"which may be either tangible or conceptual" does not bring any value added in this definition (I.e. we know that an entity can be tangible or not) and can lead to understanding errors or translation problem because using 2 "either..or" in the same sentence.	Remove "which may be either tangible or conceptual".	OBE	See INC-1258
1032.	FRA - 103 0	1030	TE	3.11		226	An entity can also be an architecture. "Architecture of architectures" is perhaps a subject of interest for ISO JTC1/AG8 working on "Meta-Reference Architecture"... Note that in the case of Meta-Reference Architecture, the (meta-Reference) architecture is related to zero, one or more entities of interest.	Add Architecture to the example (with perhaps an explanation)	AIP	Add a NOTE about meta-reference architecture probably in clause 5 or Annex A
1033.	IN- 925	1031	TL	3.17		273	For a firewall "security" is more relevant than "safety"	Replace "safety" by "security".	A	
1034.	FRA - 103 2	1032	ED	5.1		298	ADF and ADL are addressed in 5.4	Update the reference	A	
1035.	FRA - 103 3	1033	TH	5.2.1	Fig.1	329	There is no evidence that each entity has always an architecture; but it understood that an architecture always relates to an entity.	Change the relationship direction and put another label (e.g. "pertains").		The entity of interest by our definition has an architecture. We are not talking about an entity in general, which is what is being read as.
1036.	FRA - 103 4	1034	TH	5.2.1	Fig.1	329	A stakeholder can also have concerns in the context or/and the environment. Examples: - Stakeholder concern in city pollution when entity of interest is a car. - Shareholder of a company	Add links for these additional relationships.	AIP	We will not add these links in figure 1. Figure 4 is a better place to talk about this. The current definition of concern does take this into account. Concern is matter of interest or importance to the stakeholder which can be about

1 **MB** = Member body / **NC** = National Committee (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by **)

2 **Type of comment:** **GT** = General Technical **TH** = Technical high **TL** = Technical Low **GE** = General Editorial **E** = Editorial

3 **Resolution code:** **OBE** = Superseded **AIP** = Agreed in principle **A** = Agreed R = Rejected **NA** = Non actionable

Disposition of Comments

Date:
30/09/2020Document:
ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 7 N 8181
(42010. CD1-v1.0)Project:
ISO/IEC/IEEE CD1 42010 (Ed2) Architecture
description

1.

2.

1037.

1038.

1039.

1040.

MB/ NC ¹	Cmt No	Type of Cmt ²	Clause/ Subcl.	Para/ Fig/ Tab/	Line No	Comments and rationale	Proposed change	Res code ³	Resolution on each comment received
						concerned in the deployment context of Entity; do not really care about the entity.			the entity, its architecture, its environment and so on. It is not necessary to show all the relationships. This figure is only about the context of the AD. Perhaps, add a NOTE to clarify this.
FRA - 103 5	1035	TH	5.2.3		378	Example 3 is valid; but tracking, LOS reception, etc. are not "ilities".	Replace "ilities" with "features".	A	
FRA - 103 6	1036	TE	5.2.4		382	Fully agree with the first sentence; but the second one is not clear enough. The sentence should describe how aspects and concerns are related by the architect(s) when describing the architecture.	Proposal for the 2 nd sentence of this paragraph: "While architecting, the architect(s) will exhibit architecture aspects to show how the architecture addresses the concerns. The definition of the relationships between architecture aspects and the stakeholders concerns are based on the experience of the architects and are assessed by the stakeholders with their understanding and knowledge."	AIP	"While architecting, the architect(s) will identify architecture aspects to show how the architecture views address the concerns. The definition of the relationships between architecture aspects and the stakeholders concerns are based on the experience of the architects and are assessed by the stakeholders with their understanding and knowledge."
FRA - 103 7	1037	TE	5.2.4		382	"Collectively" is not understood. Each aspect can relate to relevant emerging or expressed concerns of stakeholders based upon prior Experience.	Each aspect can relate to relevant emerging or expressed concerns of stakeholders based upon prior Experience.	A	
FRA - 103 8	1038	TE	5.2.4		386	Agree; but an explanation is need regarding the subjectivity and objectivity.	A concern is subjective because related to what a stakeholder has in mind. An aspect should be more objective if the architect tries defining it in order to satisfy the set of known stakeholders.	OBE	See WG 1-320

1 MB = Member body / NC = National Committee (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by **)

2 Type of comment: GT = General Technical

TH = Technical high

TL = Technical Low

GE = General Editorial

E = Editorial

3 Resolution code: OBE = Superseded

AIP = Agreed in principle

A = Agreed R = Rejected

NA = Non actionable

Disposition of Comments

Date: 30/09/2020	Document: ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 7 N 8181 (42010. CD1-v1.0)	Project: ISO/IEC/IEEE CD1 42010 (Ed2) Architecture description
----------------------------	---	--

	MB/ NC¹	Cmt No	Type of Cmt²	Clause/ Subcl.	Para/ Fig/ Tab/	Line No	Comments and rationale	Proposed change	Res code³	Resolution on each comment received
1041.	FRA - 103 9	1039	E	5.2.4		391	One occurrence of this note is sufficient for the whole document	Keep only one occurrence of this note at the beginning of the document.	OBE	See INC-168
1042.	FRA - 104 0	1040	TH	5.2.4	Fig. 2	396	It is surprise to do not see a relationship between “Stakeholder perspective” and “architecture description” when considering that Zachman, NAF, UAF, etc. consider perspectives and aspects as two “dimensions” guiding the selection of viewpoints.	Add a relationship between “Stakeholder perspective” and “architecture description”: a perspective is a way to understand the architecture description.	OBE	Conceptual model has been updated
1043.	FRA - 104 1	1041	TE	5.2.4	Fig. 2	396	Considering the 2 nd sentence of 5.2.4, we can expect a relationship between “architecture aspect” and “concern”	Add a relationship between “architecture aspect” and “concern”. According to the 2 nd sentence of 5.2.4, the relationship name is “related” (even if this verb brings a weak semantic.)	OBE	Conceptual model has been updated
1044.	FRA - 104 2	1042	ED	5.2.4		398	As long as cost and value can be understood as concerns, for example, make an editorial update to show that examples 1..4 are examples of aspects.	Add a sentence before Example 1: “The 4 following examples illustrate architecture aspects.”	AIP	Since this is a section on Aspects, the examples are about aspects only. No need to add the sentence.
1045.	FRA - 104 3	1043	ED	5.2.4		408	As long as business and management can be understood in many ways, make an editorial update to show that examples 5 and 6 are examples of perspectives.	Add a sentence before Example 1: “The 2 following examples illustrate stakeholder perspectives.”	OBE	This section is now about perspectives, so the examples are about stakeholder perspectives only.
1046.	FRA - 104 4	1044	TE	5.2.4		413	Generalize this explanation.	Replace “architect's perspective” by “Stakeholder perspective” according to figure 2 and remove the following line.	A	
1047.	FRA - 104	1045	TE	5.2.5	Fig. 3	435	Considering the 2 nd sentence of 5.2.4, we can expect a relationship between “architecture aspect” and “concern”	Add a relationship between “architecture aspect” and “concern”. According to the 2 nd	AIP	The relationship name is “is refined by”

1 **MB** = Member body / **NC** = National Committee (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by **)

2 **Type of comment:** **GT** = General Technical **TH** = Technical high **TL** = Technical Low **GE** = General Editorial **E** = Editorial

3 **Resolution code:** **OBE** = Superseded **AIP** = Agreed in principle **A** = Agreed R = Rejected **NA** = Non actionable

Disposition of Comments

Date: 30/09/2020	Document: ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 7 N 8181 (42010. CD1-v1.0)	Project: ISO/IEC/IEEE CD1 42010 (Ed2) Architecture description
----------------------------	---	--

	MB/ NC ¹	Cmt No	Type of Cmt ²	Clause/ Subcl.	Para/ Fig/ Tab/	Line No	Comments and rationale	Proposed change	Res code ³	Resolution on each comment received
	5							sentence of 5.2.4, the relationship name is “related” (even if this verb brings a weak semantic.)		
1048.	FRA - 104 6	1046	TE	5.2.6	Fig. 4	451	Only a part of this figure is necessary to sustain the explanation of this clause.	Remove all the concepts and relationships not directly connected to viewpoints and views.	AIP	Concepts that are not necessary has been removed.
1049.	FRA - 104 7	1047	TH	5.2.6		453	“The architecture viewpoint identifies the specific architecture aspects, concerns and stakeholder perspective(s) to be addressed by an architecture view.” does not reflect figure 4. Description of figure 4 is preferred because easier to understand and closer to the 2011 edition.	“The architecture viewpoint frames architecture consideration (i.e. Architecture aspects, concerns and stakeholder perspective(s)) to be addressed by an architecture view.”	OBE	Figure 4 modified and text changed to match. VP only frames concerns now, not other two considerations.
1050.	FRA - 104 8	1048	TE	5.2.6		459	This sentence looks inconsistent because we can expect the satisfaction of the architecture considerations to be a way to facilitate the acceptance of the entity (and of course the related work products).	Please explain or remove this paragraph. Nevertheless, it is interesting to see an attempt to relate “architecture” with “requirements” because there are debates about that.	OBE	The whole paragraph is remove
1051.	FRA - 104 9	1049	TE	5.2.6	Fig. 4	451	According to line 467, the figure 4 should include “View method”.	Add “View method” and the relationship with “Architecture View” could be “specifies”.		View methods are one of the methods used in architecting. Not all concepts are included in the figure, only the key concepts are depicted. There is no need to include view methods.
1052.	FRA - 105 0	1050	TE	5.2.6		436	In clause, recommendation to use always the same wording for “element”, and “view element”	Use “view element”.	A	
1053.	FRA	1051	TE	5.2		302	In clause, recommendation to use always	Use “Architecture Description	A	

1 **MB** = Member body / **NC** = National Committee (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by **)

2 **Type of comment:** **GT** = General Technical **TH** = Technical high **TL** = Technical Low **GE** = General Editorial **E** = Editorial

3 **Resolution code:** **OBE** = Superseded **AIP** = Agreed in principle **A** = Agreed R = Rejected **NA** = Non actionable

Disposition of Comments

Date: 30/09/2020	Document: ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 7 N 8181 (42010. CD1-v1.0)	Project: ISO/IEC/IEEE CD1 42010 (Ed2) Architecture description
----------------------------	---	--

2.	MB/ NC ¹	Cmt No	Type of Cmt ²	Clause/ Subcl.	Para/ Fig/ Tab/	Line No	Comments and rationale	Proposed change	Res code ³	Resolution on each comment received
	- 105 1						the same wording for “element”, “Architecture Description Element”, “view element” and “Architecture view components”.	element” or describe the difference between all these terms. For example, “Components” can be tangible and elements can be logical.		
1054.	FRA - 105 2	1052	TH	5.3		553	This clause describing activities is out of the scope of 42010 (Architecture Description as a work-product).	Remove this clause or rewrite it to show how Architecture Description is used during the whole life cycle of the related entity.	A	
1055.	FRA - 105 3	1053	TH	5.4.2		570	“Architecting Domain” could be understood as the community of the architect.	Replace “Architecting Domain” by “Domain of interest” (to be understood as business domain where the Entity and its related architecture take place.).	A	
1056.	FRA - 105 4	1054	ED	General		0	Usage of words in Italic is unclear.	Explain or remove Italic notation.	A	Italics are used for key-words
1057.	FRA - 105 5	1055	ED	5.4.2		576	Move this example to be a separate paragraph.	Rewrite this example with the ISO style directives.	A	
1058.	FRA - 105 6	1056	E	5.4.2		580	Move this example to be a separate paragraph.	Rewrite this example with the ISO style directives.	A	
1059.	FRA - 105 7	1057	ED	5.4.2	Fig.7	592	It would be good to have Aspect on the left-hand side and perspective on the right-hand side, like in figure 2, 3 and 4	Align the look of this figure with figure 2, 3 and 4.		All the conceptual models have been updated. Aspects and perspectives no longer exist in the ADF figure
1060.	FRA -	1058	TE	5.4.2		600	Line 600 gives a rationale to insert “Architecture Consideration” linked to	Insert “model kind” in figure 7 (consistency with figure 4 to be	OBE	See WG42-007. Architecture consideration is removed from

1 **MB** = Member body / **NC** = National Committee (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by **)

2 **Type of comment:** **GT** = General Technical **TH** = Technical high **TL** = Technical Low **GE** = General Editorial **E** = Editorial

3 **Resolution code:** **OBE** = Superseded **AIP** = Agreed in principle **A** = Agreed R = Rejected **NA** = Non actionable

Disposition of Comments

Date:
30/09/2020Document:
ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 7 N 8181
(42010. CD1-v1.0)Project:
ISO/IEC/IEEE CD1 42010 (Ed2) Architecture
description

2.	MB/ NC ¹	Cmt No	Type of Cmt ²	Clause/ Subcl.	Para/ Fig/ Tab/ Fig.	Line No	Comments and rationale	Proposed change	Res code ³	Resolution on each comment received
1061.	105 8						"model kind" and "legend".	checked.)		Clause 3 and this figure is removed from Clause 5
1062.	FRA - 105 9	1059	TL	5.4.2		603	It is better to talk about "architecture consideration" which reinforces the role of this term.	Shorten this sentence with usage of "architecture consideration".	A	
1063.	FRA - 106 0	1060	TE	5.4.2		616	Aspects and perspectives are not artefacts.	Replace "artefacts" by "architecture considerations".	OBE	See GB-475
1064.	FRA - 106 1	1061	TE			642	This example illustrates 2 kinds of ADLs: generic languages independent for any ADF and ADF-specific language.	Include in this Clause a paragraph to discuss genericity and specificity of ADLs with regards to ADFs.		The updated definition of ADL takes both these cases into account.
1065.	FRA - 106 2	1062	TE	5.4.3	Fig. 8	651	"ontology" and "metamodel" are significantly described in this clause and consequently should be added in figure 8	Add "ontology" and "metamodel" in figure 8		The figures include the key-concepts. These two concepts are considered as secondary.
1066.	FRA - 106 3	1063	TE	6.2		686	This statement is unclear because mixing description and evaluation considerations and description is referring to itself.	Change to read: "An AD shall conform to the AD recommendations made in previous evaluations of the architecture or other ADs of related architecture. Non-conformances shall be explained with rationales."	AIP	"An AD shall consider the AD recommendations made in previous evaluations of the architecture or other ADs of related architecture. Non-conformances shall be explained with rationales."
1067.	FRA - 106 4	1064	TH	6.4.1	Note 5	735	A warning should be given about the incompleteness of the AD	Add a sentence at the end of note 5 saying: Nevertheless, concerns not addressed by AD are areas of risk regarding stakeholder satisfaction/agreement, decision-making, feasibility of solution,	A	

1 **MB** = Member body / **NC** = National Committee (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by **)2 **Type of comment:** **GT** = General Technical**TH** = Technical high**TL** = Technical Low**GE** = General Editorial**E** = Editorial3 **Resolution code:** **OBE** = Superseded**AIP** = Agreed in principle**A** = Agreed R = Rejected**NA** = Non actionable

Disposition of Comments

Date: 30/09/2020	Document: ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 7 N 8181 (42010. CD1-v1.0)	Project: ISO/IEC/IEEE CD1 42010 (Ed2) Architecture description
----------------------------	---	--

	MB/ NC ¹	Cmt No	Type of Cmt ²	Clause/ Subcl.	Para/ Fig/ Tab/	Line No	Comments and rationale	Proposed change	Res code ³	Resolution on each comment received
								performance of the project and benefits for the involved organization(s).		
1067.	FRA - 106 5	1065	E	6.4.3		805	Note 3 of 6.4.3. is identical to note 3 of 6.4.2. Recommendation is to avoid repetition.	Note 3 of 6.4.3. can refer to note 3 of 6.4.2.	A	
1068.	FRA - 106 6	1066	E	6.4.3		811	Note 4 of 6.4.3. is identical to note 4 of 6.4.2. Recommendation is to avoid repetition.	Note 4 of 6.4.3. can refer to note 4 of 6.4.2.	A	
1069.	FRA - 106 7	1067	TH	6.6		830	There is here a contradiction with note 5 of clause 6.4.1 talking about limitation of AD.	Rewrite this sentence to introduce limitation of AD, which should be justified.	AIP	"Each concern identified by the AD in accordance with 6.4.2.1 shall be addressed by at least one view. Nevertheless, ressources limitation or order constraints can lead to focus on a subset."
1070.	FRA - 106 8	1068	TH	6.6		831	There is here a contradiction with note 5 of clause 6.4.1 talking about limitation of AD.	Rewrite this sentence to introduce limitation of AD, which should be justified.	AIP	Each architecture aspect identified by the AD in accordance with 6.4.2.2 shall be addressed by at least one view. Nevertheless, ressources limitation or order constraints can lead to focus on a subset.
1071.	FRA - 106 9	1069	TH	6.6		832	There is here a contradiction with note 5 of clause 6.4.1 talking about limitation of AD.	Rewrite this sentence to introduce limitation of AD, which should be justified.	A	Each stakeholder perspective identified by the AD in accordance with 6.4.3 shall be addressed by at least one view. Nevertheless, ressources limitation or order constraints can lead to focus on a subset.
1072.	FRA - 107	1070	TH	6.9.1		924	Rationale for AD limitation should also be recoded.	An architecture description should include a rationale for AD limitation (e.g. resource problem,	A	

1 **MB** = Member body / **NC** = National Committee (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by **)

2 **Type of comment:** **GT** = General Technical

TH = Technical high

TL = Technical Low

GE = General Editorial

E = Editorial

3 **Resolution code:** **OBE** = Superseded

AIP = Agreed in principle

A = Agreed R = Rejected

NA = Non actionable

Disposition of Comments

1.

Date: 30/09/2020	Document: ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 7 N 8181 (42010. CD1-v1.0)	Project: ISO/IEC/IEEE CD1 42010 (Ed2) Architecture description
----------------------------	---	--

2.

1073.

1074.

1075.

1076.

1077.

1078.

1079.

MB/ NC ¹	Cmt No	Type of Cmt ²	Clause/ Subcl.	Para/ Fig/ Tab/	Line No	Comments and rationale	Proposed change	Res code ³	Resolution on each comment received
0							timing problem and effort avoided for well-known description already covered by other ADs).		
FRA - 107 1	1071	TH	6.9.2		938	The following list of points is supposed to be not exhaustive.	Add a note after the list to say that this note is not exhaustive.	AIP	Replace "are" with "includes"
FRA - 107 2	1072	TE	6.9.2		948	The following list of points is supposed to be not exhaustive.	Add a note after the list to say that this list is not exhaustive.	A	
FRA - 107 3	1073	TE	7.1		967	An ADF should identify the list of ADLs usable to implement its formalism. Otherwise, this is a risk in the ADF usage.	Add a bullet point with the identification of the list of ADLs usable to implement its formalism.	A	
FRA - 107 4	1074	TE	8.3		1041	This list is certainly not exhaustive.	Add a note after the list to say that this list is not exhaustive.	A	
FRA - 107 5	1075	TL	Annex A		1064	A 15 pages annex is definitively too long for notes on the terms and concepts. This annex is written like a thesis; not a set of notes.	Replace quotes with references. Focus on the key-characteristics and avoid long rationales.		This annex is currently appreciated by other reviewers; but we will consider this comment.
FRA - 107 6	1076	TH	A.1		1068	Recommendation to do not confuse people with the term « design ». This document is about AD.	Replace "design principles" with "architecture principles".	AIP	The particular line talks about the design principles of the document rather than that of Architecture or AD. To avoid the confusion, its better to drop "design" rather than replace "design" by "architecture". Done
FRA - 107	1077	TL	A.1		1082	As being very introductive, the last paragraph could grouped with the first one.	Group the last paragraph with the first one.	A	

1 **MB** = Member body / **NC** = National Committee (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by **)

2 **Type of comment:** **GT** = General Technical **TH** = Technical high **TL** = Technical Low **GE** = General Editorial **E** = Editorial

3 **Resolution code:** **OBE** = Superseded **AIP** = Agreed in principle **A** = Agreed R = Rejected **NA** = Non actionable

Disposition of Comments

Date:
30/09/2020Document:
ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 7 N 8181
(42010. CD1-v1.0)Project:
ISO/IEC/IEEE CD1 42010 (Ed2) Architecture
description

	MB/ NC ¹	Cmt No	Type of Cmt ²	Clause/ Subcl.	Para/ Fig/ Tab/	Line No	Comments and rationale	Proposed change	Res code ³	Resolution on each comment received
1080.	FRA - 107 8	1078	TL	A.2		1100	"Architecture as Concept" is not in line with the definition.	"Architecture as concepts" (plural) The end of the phrase is accepted.		This a philosophical statement which means that architecture can be considered to be a conceptualization of the entity (philosophically). It is not talking about what architecture contains or understood as.
1081.	FRA - 107 9	1079	TL	A.2		1101	"Architecture as Property" is not in line with the definition.	"Architecture as properties: wherein architecture is a set of properties or attributes of an entity of interest." Better to simply quote the Oxford dictionary with "a particular part or feature of a situation, an idea, a problem, etc."		This a philosophical statement which means that architecture can be considered to be a conceptualization of the entity (philosophically). It is not talking about what architecture contains or understood as.
1082.	FRA - 108 0	1080	TL	A.4.1		1149	We never saw "aspect" use for "category".		AIP	Deleted the sentence
1083.	FRA - 108 1	1081	ED	A.4.1		1160	The sentence "The use of aspects and perspectives is compatible..." is not only about perspective.	Put this sentence in a separate paragraph.	A	
1084.	FRA - 108 2	1082	TL	A.6.1		1296	The note is more readable than the mathematical expression.	Replace the mathematical expression with the note.	OBE	See WG1-745
1085.	FRA - 108 3	1083	TL	A.6.1		1303	This mathematical expression is not easily readable. Replace it with the meaning.	a view is to a viewpoint as a map is to a legend.	OBE	See WG1-745
1086.	FRA -	1084	TE	F.1		1912	An introduction is needed, of course.	The introduction should at least explain how AD are managed	OBE	See INC-036

1 **MB** = Member body / **NC** = National Committee (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by **)2 **Type of comment:** **GT** = General Technical **TH** = Technical high **TL** = Technical Low **GE** = General Editorial **E** = Editorial3 **Resolution code:** **OBE** = Superseded **AIP** = Agreed in principle **A** = Agreed R = Rejected **NA** = Non actionable

Disposition of Comments

Date: 30/09/2020	Document: ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 7 N 8181 (42010. CD1-v1.0)	Project: ISO/IEC/IEEE CD1 42010 (Ed2) Architecture description
----------------------------	---	--

2.	MB/ NC ¹	Cmt No	Type of Cmt ²	Clause/ Subcl.	Para/ Fig/ Tab/	Line No	Comments and rationale	Proposed change	Res code ³	Resolution on each comment received
	108 4							from the development point of view (Annex E should be referenced, here), from the user point of view (AD library should be addressed, here) and from the implementer point of view (AD registry should be addressed, here)		
1087.	OM G- 108 5	1085	GT	Doc		0	A well written document and an incremental improvement on previous versions. As a practitioner in MBSE and architecture for many years, I appreciate that terminology can be heavily overloaded, and it can be difficult to define a comprehensive and cohesive set of definitions. There is no perfect set of terms that will be understood as meaning the same thing by all readers, but this set provides a consistent set that does not diverge too much from current standards. It also moves the practice forward towards a model-based paradigm with an integrated dictionary rather than a diagram based one.	None		Thanks very much for your comments
1088.	OM G- 108 6	1086	GT			0	As an general comment I found the document to be well written and understandable and givent he advances in thinking around around architectural descriptions and how they relate to Arhcitecture frameworks, i think this is a huge improvement on the 2011 version of 42010. Saying that I have some minor quibbles with the language			Thanks very much for your comments

1 **MB** = Member body / **NC** = National Committee (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by **)

2 **Type of comment:** **GT** = General Technical **TH** = Technical high **TL** = Technical Low **GE** = General Editorial **E** = Editorial

3 **Resolution code:** **OBE** = Superseded **AIP** = Agreed in principle **A** = Agreed R = Rejected **NA** = Non actionable

Disposition of Comments

Date:
30/09/2020Document:
ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 7 N 8181
(42010. CD1-v1.0)Project:
ISO/IEC/IEEE CD1 42010 (Ed2) Architecture
description

1.

2.

1089.

1090.

1091.

MB/ NC ¹	Cmt No	Type of Cmt ²	Clause/ Subcl.	Para/ Fig/ Tab/	Line No	Comments and rationale	Proposed change	Res code ³	Resolution on each comment received
						used in some sections as it can be very contorted but I understand why this is the case and think it would cause more problems trying to make easier read as you would lose the precise intent of the words. All in all a good piece of work.			
OM G- 108 7	1087	TL	5.2.1	Fig 1	328	This comment applies to several figures. The multiplicity of the diagram relationships implies that they are one to one. For example, in Figure 2, there is a "Stakeholder has particular concern" and "Concern affects Stakeholder Perspective." The descriptive text leading up to Figure 2 implies that the relationships can be many to many. For example, "aspects relate to relevant emerging or expressed concerns of stakeholders". The wording of the relationships or the elements should be changed to reflect the multiplicity of the text so that they are consistent. I realize that this may result in pairings that are not grammatical ("A Stakeholder has one or more Concern"), but I believe that this is preferable. There will be circumstances where multiplicity will be one to one and it will be difficult to differentiate these.	The simplest solution would be to change the plurality of the nouns. This will avoid changing the text to describe the multiplicity as one or more, which I believe that the authors are trying to avoid. This is the case with AD Elements for example. Changes would be "Stakeholders have Entities of Interest", "Entities of Interest have Architectures", "Stakeholder have interests in Architectures". In general, the diagrams should be updated to be consistent with the text.		Usual practices in concept models in to express the concept with singular forms. The absence of multiplicity does not mean a 1:1 multiplicity. The text expresses these multiplicities as needed.
OM G- 108 8	1088	E	A.4.2		1195	typo, text reads "or aa sequence diagram"	should be single aa	A	
OM G-	1089	TE	5.2.1	N/A	310	Lines 310, 311: Clarification that enterprises can have more than one	human undertakings or ventures that have definite missions,	A	

1 MB = Member body / NC = National Committee (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by **)

2 Type of comment: GT = General Technical TH = Technical high TL = Technical Low GE = General Editorial E = Editorial

3 Resolution code: OBE = Superseded AIP = Agreed in principle A = Agreed R = Rejected NA = Non actionable

Disposition of Comments

Date: 30/09/2020	Document: ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 7 N 8181 (42010. CD1-v1.0)	Project: ISO/IEC/IEEE CD1 42010 (Ed2) Architecture description
----------------------------	---	--

	MB/ NC ¹	Cmt No	Type of Cmt ²	Clause/ Subcl.	Para/ Fig/ Tab/	Line No	Comments and rationale	Proposed change	Res code ³	Resolution on each comment received
	108 9						mission or outcome.	goals and objectives to offer products or services, or to achieve desired project outcomes or business outcomes.		
1092.	OM G- 109 0	1090	TL	6,7		861	Lines 861,862 and 865: The text seems to indicate that the view components are present in only one model kind and it should adhere to the conventions of that model kind. The reality is that the view components appear in several modelkinds and have several conventions depending on the model kind. (line 865 does not get you out of this)	Suggest that you change the text to be something like this A view component may be a part of more than architecture view and it may appear in more than one model kind. When in multiple model kinds it must adhere to the representational conventions of that model kind.	OBE	See IEEE 1215
1093.	IEE E- 109 1	1091	TE			65	Change history, item 5: "Correspondences between architecture description is added..." only one of the two corresponding things is identified, also, subject-verb agreement problem.	Complete the phrase, "correspondences between architecture description and ??? Are added..."	OBE	This default is agree ("Correspondences between Architecture Descriptions").. Nevertheless the change log will be summarized and move to the Foreword. See IEEE-1092.
1094.	IEE E- 109 2	1092	Ed			65	Change history is customarily included in the Foreword or Introduction	Move to the Foreword or Introduction.	A	
1095.	IEE E- 109 3	1093	TE	Forwar d		66	IEEE-12 (A) is not implemented in CD1: Highlighted comments in MEC must be addressed. Include IEEE/IEC disclaimer paragraphs. File: 102461700003-P42010_MEC.pdf	Implement MEC-required changes.	A	Include IEEE/IEC disclaimer paragraphs.
1096.	IEE E- 109 4	1094	GE	1		140	Every real, deployed, system has an architecture, but not every such system has an architecture description in an accessible form. However, the architecture of real systems can be	I would say: Whereas the architecture of a system is tangible and concrete, even if not described, the description of a system architecture is a		An architecture is not a tangible entity. AD can be considered as the tangible form.

1 **MB** = Member body / **NC** = National Committee (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by **)

2 **Type of comment:** **GT** = General Technical **TH** = Technical high **TL** = Technical Low **GE** = General Editorial **E** = Editorial

3 **Resolution code:** **OBE** = Superseded **AIP** = Agreed in principle **A** = Agreed R = Rejected **NA** = Non actionable

Disposition of Comments

Date: 30/09/2020	Document: ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 7 N 8181 (42010. CD1-v1.0)	Project: ISO/IEC/IEEE CD1 42010 (Ed2) Architecture description
----------------------------	---	--

2.	MB/ NC ¹	Cmt No	Type of Cmt ²	Clause/ Subcl.	Para/ Fig/ Tab/	Line No	Comments and rationale	Proposed change	Res code ³	Resolution on each comment received
							discovered and described ... given suitable effort and the tools / methods to describe it.	tangible work product, consisting of concepts, principles, and carefully described elements and their properties and relationships. It may be produced as part of the design process, or discovered after the fact.		
1097.	IEE E- 109 5	1095	Ed	1		143	The title identifies that the subject of interest is 'architecture description' NOT 'architecture'. There is no confusion if you reference the fragment of the conceptual figure.	Delete 'and does not specify requirements for any entity of interest or their environment'. If needs be add the fragment of the conceptual model i.e. Architecture Description - expresses-> Architecture <- HAS Entity(System)		As long as "environment" and "entity of interest" are included in figure 1 and clause 3, it is better to keep this phrase.
1098.	IEE E- 109 6	1096	Ed	1		144	undefined acronyms ADF and ADL here. Acronyms should be spelled out on first use.	architecture description framework (ADF) and architecture description language (ADL)	A	
1099.	IEE E- 109 7	1097	TE	1		148	CD1 does not complete disposition of IEEE-2 despite AIP disposition, stating "This change will be considered in lite of the other changes made in the document."	Recommend original replacement: "This document does address the verification of conformance of an architecture description against a certain architecture description framework. This document does not address the validation of an architecture description in relation to its use." Somewhere further into the document (clause 7), add a	AIP	This document addresses neither verification nor validation. These activities are out of the scope. A paragraph is needed to address conformance as defined in clause 4.

1 **MB** = Member body / **NC** = National Committee (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by **)

2 **Type of comment:** **GT** = General Technical **TH** = Technical high **TL** = Technical Low **GE** = General Editorial **E** = Editorial

3 **Resolution code:** **OBE** = Superseded **AIP** = Agreed in principle **A** = Agreed R = Rejected **NA** = Non actionable

Disposition of Comments

Date: 30/09/2020	Document: ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 7 N 8181 (42010. CD1-v1.0)	Project: ISO/IEC/IEEE CD1 42010 (Ed2) Architecture description
----------------------------	---	--

2.	MB/ NC ¹	Cmt No	Type of Cmt ²	Clause/ Subcl.	Para/ Fig/ Tab/	Line No	Comments and rationale	Proposed change	Res code ³	Resolution on each comment received
1100.								clause about the verification of an architecture description against an architecture description framework.		
	IEE E- 109 8	1098	TE	1		148	"This document does not address concerns about the completeness or correctness of an architecture description. Completeness and correctness of an architecture description are determined only relative to its use." Neither statement is true. a) the standard defines correspondence rules to address these concerns. Completeness is a product of the elements (AD tuples) established, whether relationships are transitive and whether elements are shown in the respective views - NOT use. If I have a System A which has an interface with System B and this isn't visible for the description of one of the systems this is an error. If I have a transitive relationship this affects / constrains or acts as a validation test for the correctness... The assertions have to be logically consistent e.g. Claim (that A meets requirement B) <- supports- Argument <-opposes- Evidence BUT (with error) Evidence -proves->Claim. There are also consistency rules with respect to showing the same particular element involved in the relationships.	Delete 'This document does not address concerns about the completeness or correctness of an architecture description. Completeness and correctness of an architecture description are determined only relative to its use.'	AIP	This sentence is modified and a phrase is added to take into account the proposed exception about correspondance. Update to read "This document does not explicitly address concerns about the completeness or correctness of an AD, which are determined only relative to its use. Nevertheless, completeness and correctness of an AD can be partially checked, for example, through the consistency of the AD elements established, whether relationships are transitive and whether elements are shown in the respective views. Consistency rules can also be defined with respect to showing the same particular element has correspondences with an AD.."
1101.	IEE E-	1099	TE	3		158	IEEE-30 (AIP) CD1 did not address rationale for non-backward compatible	Provide rationale for changes to terms and definitions.	A	

1 **MB** = Member body / **NC** = National Committee (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by **)

2 **Type of comment:** **GT** = General Technical **TH** = Technical high **TL** = Technical Low **GE** = General Editorial **E** = Editorial

3 **Resolution code:** **OBE** = Superseded **AIP** = Agreed in principle **A** = Agreed R = Rejected **NA** = Non actionable

Disposition of Comments

Date: 30/09/2020	Document: ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 7 N 8181 (42010. CD1-v1.0)	Project: ISO/IEC/IEEE CD1 42010 (Ed2) Architecture description
----------------------------	---	--

	MB/ NC ¹	Cmt No	Type of Cmt ²	Clause/ Subcl.	Para/ Fig/ Tab/	Line No	Comments and rationale	Proposed change	Res code ³	Resolution on each comment received
	109 9						changes in definitions, terminology. Non backward compatible changes to Requirements will be addressed separately.			
1102.	IEE E- 110 0	1100	TE	3.1		168	The person who certifies proper implementation of an architecture is an assessor, evaluator, or auditor, not an architect doing architecting.	remove "certifying proper implementation of"		Certification in architecting is well addressed in Systems Architecting book by Rechtin & Maier.
1103.	IEE E- 110 1	1101	GE	3		173	Architecture definition changed to include life cycle processes rather than system.	Revert back to ISO 42010:2011 definition to retain fit in ISO 15288:2015 and focus on system-of-interest.		We already clearly stated in the previous draft of the 42010 update, 42020 and 42030 that "entity" is a broader term than "system". See the "non-system" explanation in 42020. It is also stated in 15288 that Architecture shall cover the whole cycle life of an entity with its related processes.
1104.	IEE E- 110 2	1102	TE	3,2		173	This definition of "architecture" seems so watered down as to be meaningless. "Concepts or properties of an entity in its environment" could be as easily applied to a baseball team in its home stadium as to a system. How is this a useful definition for software, system, and enterprise architecture?	From: fundamental concepts or properties related to an entity in its environment (3.12) and governing principles for the realization and evolution of this entity and its related life cycle processes To: fundamental concepts or properties related to an architecture entity (3.11) in its environment (3.12), embodied in its elements, relationships, and governing principles for the realization and evolution of this		Embodied means expressed as. This was the reason for dropping this extraneous information. No need to discuss

1 **MB** = Member body / **NC** = National Committee (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by **)

2 **Type of comment:** **GT** = General Technical **TH** = Technical high **TL** = Technical Low **GE** = General Editorial **E** = Editorial

3 **Resolution code:** **OBE** = Superseded **AIP** = Agreed in principle **A** = Agreed R = Rejected **NA** = Non actionable

Disposition of Comments

Date:
30/09/2020Document:
ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 7 N 8181
(42010. CD1-v1.0)Project:
ISO/IEC/IEEE CD1 42010 (Ed2) Architecture
description

1.

2.

1105.

1106.

1107.

1108.

1109.

MB/ NC ¹	Cmt No	Type of Cmt ²	Clause/ Subcl.	Para/ Fig/ Tab/	Line No	Comments and rationale	Proposed change	Res code ³	Resolution on each comment received
							entity and its related life cycle processes		
IEE E- 110 3	1103	TE	3,2		175	How can 42020 act as the primary source for a term in 42010 that existed before 42020 even existed?	The change should be defined in terms to the changes made to the 42010:2011 definition with reference to 42020 if needs be.		There is not necessary to provide a complete history of changes for a definition. It is sufficient to quote either a reference or a reference with updates. Here, the aim is to align with 42020 and 42030 definition. Nevertheless, the change log has to trace the evolution.
IEE E- 110 4	1104	TE	3.3		176	Architecture consideration is not well thought out as a superclass of Aspect, Concern, Perspective, should organize its subclasses.	Organize subclasses as follows: aspect pertains to architecture; concern pertains to entity; stakeholder perspective pertains to entity.	OBE	Architecture considerations term to be removed from Clause 3. See WG42-007
IEE E- 110 5	1105	TE	3,3		177	As defined 'architecture consideration' is an 'architecture description consideration' - they inform / constrain the description of the architecture. The architecture is agnostic / independent of these.	Change to 'architecture description consideration' (or simply delete the concept)		These are factors which influence the architecture. Some of these factors do govern the architecture description. However, considerations predominantly play a dual role. No need to change to AD considerations
IEE E- 110 6	1106	GE	3		185	Architecture Description Element missing from definitions i.e an element that may appear in an architecture description. No need to refer 'instance' this is particular to some software languages and not true for all AD element notations.	Add definition for 'AD element. - 'An element that may appear in an architecture description'	AIP	he proposed definition simply uses "element", "architecture" and "description" in a different order which does not provide a value added. Proposed definition (adapted from the Oxford dictionary): "part of an architecture description (3.4) that expresses the architecture"
IEE E- 110	1107	TE	3.6		198	An ADL need not be a "formalism". This implies an ADL must have a formal syntax and semantics: that is overly prescriptive	Change definition to: "conventions for describing an architecture" to align with rest of	OBE	refer INC-192

1 MB = Member body / NC = National Committee (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by **)

2 Type of comment: GT = General Technical

TH = Technical high

TL = Technical Low

GE = General Editorial

E = Editorial

3 Resolution code: OBE = Superseded

AIP = Agreed in principle

A = Agreed R = Rejected

NA = Non actionable

Disposition of Comments

Date: 30/09/2020	Document: ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 7 N 8181 (42010. CD1-v1.0)	Project: ISO/IEC/IEEE CD1 42010 (Ed2) Architecture description
----------------------------	---	--

2.	MB/ NC ¹	Cmt No	Type of Cmt ²	Clause/ Subcl.	Para/ Fig/ Tab/	Line No	Comments and rationale	Proposed change	Res code ³	Resolution on each comment received
	7						(without providing any normative requirements in 7) and unnecessarily limiting for this standard. An ADL need only define a set of conventions for representing architectures. "Conventions" is consistent with the terminology elsewhere in this standard (for frameworks, viewpoints and model kinds) on which ADL specifications are based.	document.		
1110.	IEE E- 110 8	1108	GE	3,6		199	Architecture Description Language. 'UAF profile' is incorrectly listed as an example of an ADL - it isn't - it is an XML description of a set of UML node and connector elements i.e. it is a definition to enable a UML tool to implement them using the UML (an ADL). A UML profile is not an ADL [and indeed the UML or the SysML are themselves implemented using UML profiles).	Delete 'UAF profile' from 'EXAMPLE Architecture analysis and design language (AADL), ArchiMate, SysML, UML, UAF Profile.'	OBE	See INC-023. In any case, AADL is an ADL.
1111.	IEE E- 110 9	1109	TE	3,7		200	This definition of "architecture view" leaves out the essential part about it being compliant with an architecture viewpoint and addressing concerns from a particular perspective.	From: architecture view: information item comprising part of an architecture description (3.4) To: architecture view: information item comprising part of an architecture description (3.4) expressing the architecture of a system from the perspective of specific system concerns	OBE	refer WG1-673
1112.	IEE E-	1110	TE	3,7		200	architecture view' is now inconsistent with 'architecture description framework' etc. If	Change to 'architecture description view' (or remove	OBE	refer WG1-673

1 **MB** = Member body / **NC** = National Committee (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by **)

2 **Type of comment:** **GT** = General Technical **TH** = Technical high **TL** = Technical Low **GE** = General Editorial **E** = Editorial

3 **Resolution code:** **OBE** = Superseded **AIP** = Agreed in principle **A** = Agreed R = Rejected **NA** = Non actionable

Disposition of Comments

Date: 30/09/2020	Document: ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 7 N 8181 (42010. CD1-v1.0)	Project: ISO/IEC/IEEE CD1 42010 (Ed2) Architecture description
----------------------------	---	--

	MB/ NC ¹	Cmt No	Type of Cmt ²	Clause/ Subcl.	Para/ Fig/ Tab/	Line No	Comments and rationale	Proposed change	Res code ³	Resolution on each comment received
	111 0						you're going to add 'description' to concept names this should be consistent throughout.	'description from architecture description framework)		
1113.	IEE E- 111 1	1111	TE	3,8		206	Ditto 'architecture viewpoint' should be 'architecture description viewpoint' to be consistent.	Change to 'architecture description viewpoint' (or remove 'description from architecture description framework)	OBE	refer WG1-673
1114.	IEE E- 111 2	1112	TE	3,8		209	'Note 1 to entry: In some communities and architecture frameworks, "view specification" is used to mean the same thing as this document's "architecture viewpoint" concept.' This is confusing and may not always be true and WG 42 have no control over any external concept definitions defined by third parties. In the last WD a Viewpoint Specification and Architecture Viewpoint were distinct concepts so that community presumably thought they were different). If that community needs help it should lie in their documentation. It isn't a common concept. This looks to try and justify the 'Viewpoint Specification' as a concept. Extra synonyms and alternatives just serves to muddy and confuse the conceptual model.	Delete Note 1	OBE	refer WG1-673
1115.	IEE E- 111 3	1113	TE	3.9		214	Disposition of IEEE-32 and IEEE-33 does not clarify 'characteristic' (or 'typical' or 'feature'). Reference to WG42-008, WG42-003 does not elucidate this issue. Why must an aspect be 'typical'? And how does the reader determine whether something is an aspect. How are 'untypical' characteristics or features to be	Define or remove terms like typical that cannot be operationalized by users.	OBE	See WG42-004 (Provision of a new definition).

1 **MB** = Member body / **NC** = National Committee (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by **)

2 **Type of comment:** **GT** = General Technical **TH** = Technical high **TL** = Technical Low **GE** = General Editorial **E** = Editorial

3 **Resolution code:** **OBE** = Superseded **AIP** = Agreed in principle **A** = Agreed R = Rejected **NA** = Non actionable

Disposition of Comments

Date:
30/09/2020Document:
ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 7 N 8181
(42010. CD1-v1.0)Project:
ISO/IEC/IEEE CD1 42010 (Ed2) Architecture
description

2.	MB/ NC ¹	Cmt No	Type of Cmt ²	Clause/ Subcl.	Para/ Fig/ Tab/	Line No	Comments and rationale	Proposed change	Res code ³	Resolution on each comment received
1116.	IEE E- 111 4	1114	TE	3.9		215	handled which frequently arise in unprecedented systems? These are (still, see WD4 IEEE-35) poor examples — they are both (structural and functional) considered concerns elsewhere in the document. References to WG42-008 and WG42-003 do not resolve the issue.	Find examples of aspects that are not concerns.	OBE	See WG1-673 for new examples.
1117.	IEE E- 111 5	1115	TE	3.10		218	Previous edition refers to "system concerns". Modified definition, with removal of "system" radically changes meaning of concern in this document from system concerns to stakeholder concerns. Definition should not allow concerns about shoes, dinner, viruses, etc. which are unrelated to the subject of this document.	Fix definition: interest in an entity relevant to one or more of its stakeholders	OBE	Note 2 to entry: Not all stated concerns are relevant to the purpose of the architecting effort.
1118.	IEE E- 111 6	1116	Ed	3,1		219	The original note in 42010:2011 was a more broad and useful expression of concerns because it included useful examples.	From: Note 1 to entry: A concern can apply either to an entity of interest, which may be either tangible or conceptual, to an architecture, to a situation or to an action. To: Note 1 to entry: A concern pertains to any tangible or conceptual influence on a system in its environment, including developmental, technological, business, operational, organizational, political, economic, legal, regulatory, ecological and social		Not correct. The term "Entity" is broader than "System". Also, the examples given earlier were too broad. See INC-1258, INC-1259

1 **MB** = Member body / **NC** = National Committee (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by **)2 **Type of comment:** **GT** = General Technical **TH** = Technical high **TL** = Technical Low **GE** = General Editorial **E** = Editorial3 **Resolution code:** **OBE** = Superseded **AIP** = Agreed in principle **A** = Agreed R = Rejected **NA** = Non actionable

Disposition of Comments

Date:
30/09/2020Document:
ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 7 N 8181
(42010. CD1-v1.0)Project:
ISO/IEC/IEEE CD1 42010 (Ed2) Architecture
description

2.

1119.

MB/ NC ¹	Cmt No	Type of Cmt ²	Clause/ Subcl.	Para/ Fig/ Tab/	Line No	Comments and rationale	Proposed change	Res code ³	Resolution on each comment received
IEE E- 111 7	1117	TE	3.10		221	These are poor examples of concerns because they are introduced as "categories of concerns". Better examples were provided in previous edition.	influences. Replace examples with list from previous edition: The following are concerns in the terms of this International Standard: functionality, feasibility, usage, system purposes, system features, system properties, known limitations, structure, behavior, performance, resource utilization, reliability, security, information assurance, complexity, evolvability, openness, concurrency, autonomy, cost, schedule, quality of service, flexibility, agility, modifiability, modularity, control, inter-process communication, deadlock, state change, subsystem integration, data accessibility, privacy, compliance to regulation, assurance, business goals and strategies, customer experience, maintainability, affordability and disposability. The distribution transparencies described in the Reference Model of Open Distributed Processing [ISO/IEC 10746-1] are concerns in the terms of this International Standard. Software properties as described in SQUARE [ISO/IEC	OBE	See INC-1259 and WG1-673 for new examples.

1 **MB** = Member body / **NC** = National Committee (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by **)2 **Type of comment:** **GT** = General Technical**TH** = Technical high**TL** = Technical Low**GE** = General Editorial**E** = Editorial3 **Resolution code:** **OBE** = Superseded**AIP** = Agreed in principle**A** = Agreed R = Rejected**NA** = Non actionable

Disposition of Comments

Date:
30/09/2020Document:
ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 7 N 8181
(42010. CD1-v1.0)Project:
ISO/IEC/IEEE CD1 42010 (Ed2) Architecture
description

2.	MB/ NC ¹	Cmt No	Type of Cmt ²	Clause/ Subcl.	Para/ Fig/ Tab/	Line No	Comments and rationale	Proposed change	Res code ³	Resolution on each comment received
1120.	IEE E- 111 8	1118	TE	3.11		222	Architecture entity is NOT a synonym for entity of interest — see ISO/IEC/IEEE 42020.	Remove synonym	A	
1121.	IEE E- 111 9	1119	TE	3,11		223	This new definition, "entity of interest" or "architecture entity", as defined, is so vague and overloaded as to appear meaningless. The most extreme example that springs to mind is that both "data (as a data element)" and "system of systems" are listed in the text as "entity of interest". You might as well have just adopted "thing" or "object" and let everything else be a specialization of that. Can it really be said that a "data element" has an architecture in any useful sense?	From: 3.11 entity of interest architecture entity: subject of an architecture (3.2) To: 3.11 architecture entity: subject of an architecture (3.2). Strike data element.		This new definition will help address entities like Data, Capability, Mission which were hitherto not under the ambit of System. Data element is a constituent part of a data architecture. It does require architecture.
1122.	IEE E- 112 0	1120	TE	3.11		230	This NOTE has nothing to do with "entity of interest"—it pertains to use of qualifiers with the term architecture (3.2).	Delete.	A	
1123.	IEE E- 112 1	1121	TE	3,12		236	For our space data systems the actual physical environment is an extremely important aspect, but it is missing. The real physical environment can also affect other kinds of systems.	From: Note 1 to entry: The environment of an entity includes external entities that can have various kinds of influences on the entity, such as developmental, technological, business, operational, organizational, political, economic, legal, regulatory, ecological and social	AIP	Note 1 to entry: The environment of an entity of interest includes external entities that can have various influences upon the entity of interest, such as developmental, technological, business, operational, organizational, political, economic, legal, regulatory, ecological and social influences as well as external physical effects such as

1 **MB** = Member body / **NC** = National Committee (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by **)2 **Type of comment:** **GT** = General Technical**TH** = Technical high**TL** = Technical Low**GE** = General Editorial**E** = Editorial3 **Resolution code:** **OBE** = Superseded**AIP** = Agreed in principle**A** = Agreed R = Rejected**NA** = Non actionable

Disposition of Comments

1.

Date: 30/09/2020	Document: ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 7 N 8181 (42010. CD1-v1.0)	Project: ISO/IEC/IEEE CD1 42010 (Ed2) Architecture description
----------------------------	---	--

2.

MB/ NC ¹	Cmt No	Type of Cmt ²	Clause/ Subcl.	Para/ Fig/ Tab/	Line No	Comments and rationale	Proposed change	Res code ³	Resolution on each comment received
							influences. To: Note 1 to entry: The environment of an entity includes external entities that can have various kinds of influences on the entity, such as developmental, technological, business, operational, organizational, political, economic, legal, regulatory, ecological and social influences as well as external physical effects such as electromagnetic radiation, charged particles, gravitational effects, and electric and magnetic fields.		electromagnetic radiation, charged particles, gravitational effects, and electric and magnetic fields.
1124.	IEE E- 112 2	TE	3.12		240	Note 2 claims that it is more appropriate to refer to a test context than to use the common wording of test environment. Since the word context is not defined in this document and is also part of the definition, the rationale for this preference is unclear.	Remove the second sentence in note 2.		Legend is used in its normal dictionary sense so no need to put into clause 3.
1125.	IEE E- 112 3	TE	3.12		242	Note 3 is a remark about context, not environment, and does not add information about the term being defined.	Remove Note 3.		It is about a constituent element of the environment. No need to delete.
1126.	IEE E- 112 4	TE	3		247	Missing definition of 'legend'	Define legend.		Legend is used in its normal dictionary sense so no need to put into clause 3.
1127.	IEE	TE	3.14		250	wrong word: economical models means	Replace economical with	A	

1 **MB** = Member body / **NC** = National Committee (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by **)

2 **Type of comment:** **GT** = General Technical **TH** = Technical high **TL** = Technical Low **GE** = General Editorial **E** = Editorial

3 **Resolution code:** **OBE** = Superseded **AIP** = Agreed in principle **A** = Agreed R = Rejected **NA** = Non actionable

Disposition of Comments

Date: 30/09/2020	Document: ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 7 N 8181 (42010. CD1-v1.0)	Project: ISO/IEC/IEEE CD1 42010 (Ed2) Architecture description
----------------------------	---	--

	MB/ NC ¹	Cmt No	Type of Cmt ²	Clause/ Subcl.	Para/ Fig/ Tab/	Line No	Comments and rationale	Proposed change	Res code ³	Resolution on each comment received
	E-1125						that the models have nothing in excess (thrifty).	economic		
1128.	IEE E-1126	1126	TE	3.14		252	note 1. This note is about modeling conventions, not about model kind. It belongs with a definition or discussion of Modeling conventions.	Omit the note or move it to a related subclause, such as 5.2.7, or add a definition of modeling convention: notation, syntax, and semantics used in a model	AIP	The model kind specification typically cover the modeling conventions with specification of notations, syntax and semantics of the related kind of models.
1129.	IEE E-1127	1127	TE	3.14		252	Conventions also typically address intended usage of model kind.	Add: "and intended uses".	A	
1130.	IEE E-1128	1128	Ed	3.15		259	The source of the definition should be cited	{SOURCE: ISO/IEC/IEEE 42020:2019]		This definition is close to 42020; but refined to reflect to purpose of this document.
1131.	IEE E-1129	1129	TE	3.16		262	The phrases, "in a context," and "especially as it relates to concerns" do not provide any useful insight into how to use the definition nor is there any normative text using these predicates: there is no requirement when documenting a stakeholder perspective to include a context; and there is no requirement when documenting a stakeholder perspective to relate it to any concerns. So these phrases can only confuse readers.	Change definition: "way of thinking about an entity"	A	
1132.	IN-919	1130	TE	3.16		265	Delete "stakeholder" it is redundant with what is in the definition.	Delete "stakeholder" it is redundant with what is in the definition.	A	
1133.	IEE E-	1131	TE	3.16		265	IEEE-43 was not resolved. It suggested a perspective may be a grouping of	Change 'types of stakeholder concern' to 'groupings' of		Architecture Perspective is no longer used. This definition is about

1 **MB** = Member body / **NC** = National Committee (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by **)

2 **Type of comment:** **GT** = General Technical **TH** = Technical high **TL** = Technical Low **GE** = General Editorial **E** = Editorial

3 **Resolution code:** **OBE** = Superseded **AIP** = Agreed in principle **A** = Agreed R = Rejected **NA** = Non actionable

Disposition of Comments

Date:
30/09/2020Document:
ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 7 N 8181
(42010. CD1-v1.0)Project:
ISO/IEC/IEEE CD1 42010 (Ed2) Architecture
description

1.

2.

1134.

1135.

MB/ NC ¹	Cmt No	Type of Cmt ²	Clause/ Subcl.	Para/ Fig/ Tab/	Line No	Comments and rationale	Proposed change	Res code ³	Resolution on each comment received
113 2						concerns.	concerns.		"Stakeholder Perspective".
IN- 922	1132	TE	3,17		269	I tend to think of "architecture component" as an entity that may exist outside of any views in which it appears. It is not just in a "view". The words in the definition, in fact, seems to support that.	From: view component architecture view component constituent of one or more architecture views (3.7) EXAMPLE an architecture view component describing a firewall can be used in several views of an architecture description to explain functional flows, behavior and safety features of a system. To: architecture component constituent of one or more architecture views (3.7) EXAMPLE an architecture component describing a network firewall can be used in several views of an architecture description to explain functional flows, behavior, and security features of a system. Different views may focus on different aspects (3.9) of the component.		View component is a part of a view. It is not a part of the architecture, hence is not an architecture component.
IEE E- 113 4	1133	TE	3,17		268	view component'. This would be much more simply and explicitly defined as 'AD element'. A 'view component' is legitimately part of the structure of the view whereas 'AD element' can be defined as an element that appears within an AD'. View components may be defined that are	As a minimum change to 'architecture view component'. Ideally change to 'Architecture description element'		By definition a view component is part of a view, so each view component must be part of the AD within which the view resides. Other "views" like those for management purposes are not "architecture view components" so don't fall in the

1 **MB** = Member body / **NC** = National Committee (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by **)2 **Type of comment:** **GT** = General Technical **TH** = Technical high **TL** = Technical Low **GE** = General Editorial **E** = Editorial3 **Resolution code:** **OBE** = Superseded **AIP** = Agreed in principle **A** = Agreed R = Rejected **NA** = Non actionable

Disposition of Comments

Date: 30/09/2020	Document: ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 7 N 8181 (42010. CD1-v1.0)	Project: ISO/IEC/IEEE CD1 42010 (Ed2) Architecture description
----------------------------	---	--

2.	MB/ NC ¹	Cmt No	Type of Cmt ²	Clause/ Subcl.	Para/ Fig/ Tab/	Line No	Comments and rationale	Proposed change	Res code ³	Resolution on each comment received
							purely for management purposes and never appear in an AD. They aren't the same and the subject of the standard is architecture description so there ought to be the concept of the minimum unit of architecture description (which to be consistent has to be a triple - node - connector - node because with out the connector it cannot be describing the relationship of the AD element to anything (itself included)). 'view component' is incorrect because 'view' does not exist - it is defined as 'architecture view' in 3.7			category of being a view component as used in this standard.
1136.	IEE E- 113 4	1134	TE	4		278	Not implemented or resolved: IEEE-52 (AIP): "This should be relooked considering the change in definitions of model kind made by WG42-012" There was no modification to semantics of model kind that would prohibit this. WG42-012 does not address conformance issue.	Add model kind as conformance case.	A	
1137.	IEE E- 113 5	1135	TE	4		278	A standard is a "requirements" document containing normative language statements, which constitute the conformance criteria. There is no such thing as partial conformance precisely because the interrelationship among requirements form a whole architecture description with respect to the purpose of that description. That doe snot mean users cannot use just parts of the standard, which is often the case, but then they are not conforming to the architecture	Delete Clause 4. If the authors desire to have conformance for parts of 42010, then they should separate the document into parts with separate conformance requirements. This partitioning into separate normative parts may help to resolve comments from others.		According to ISO directives, part 2, all clauses are normative and informative material in note or annexes are declared as informative

1 **MB** = Member body / **NC** = National Committee (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by **)

2 **Type of comment:** **GT** = General Technical **TH** = Technical high **TL** = Technical Low **GE** = General Editorial **E** = Editorial

3 **Resolution code:** **OBE** = Superseded **AIP** = Agreed in principle **A** = Agreed R = Rejected **NA** = Non actionable

Disposition of Comments

Date:
30/09/2020Document:
ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 7 N 8181
(42010. CD1-v1.0)Project:
ISO/IEC/IEEE CD1 42010 (Ed2) Architecture
description

2.	MB/ NC ¹	Cmt No	Type of Cmt ²	Clause/ Subcl.	Para/ Fig/ Tab/	Line No	Comments and rationale	Proposed change	Res code ³	Resolution on each comment received
1138.	IEE E- 113 6	1136	TE	4		278	description model and requirements of 42010. Conformance. 'claims' never demonstrate conformance - a claim is made by a claimant and hence conformance is demonstrated by a claimant (a unit of organisation)	Change 'claim shall demonstrate conformance' to 'claimant shall demonstrate conformance'		The proposed wording proposes a specific process and associated roles. The document only states what has to be done; not how to do that.
1139.	IEE E- 113 7	1137	TE	4		279	'The requirements in this document are contained in Clauses 6, 7 and 8'. In terms of requirement engineering / conformance the conceptual model becomes a normative requirement by virtue of 'An architecture description framework shall establish its consistency with the provisions of the conceptual model in Clause 5' at 985. The conceptual model contains no multiplicities and the text in section 5 states that the text is the master source of requirements not the conceptual model ('The figures are intended to be informative to illustrate the key concepts 327 described throughout Clause 5..'...	The conceptual model must be the master source of requirement - delete		Conceptual model per line 985 is only referred to as requiring consistency by an ADF. The conceptual model is the not the master source of requirements in other cases. The conceptual model graphics are intended to be informative to help the reader understand the text.
1140.	IEE E- 113 8	1138	TE	4		289	Modern practice, including model based architecting, treats model kinds as assets or reusable modeling practices, not occurring only as "owned" within viewpoints but separately combinable with other model kinds to make new viewpoints. This is found in industrial practice, recent standards for architecture frameworks such as IEEE 2413 for IOT, ISO Smart Cities (11 viewpoints, 109 model kinds), and the defense NATO AF.	Add item 5) When conformance is claimed for a model kind, the claim shall demonstrate that the model kind meets the requirements listed in 8.2.	A	

1 MB = Member body / NC = National Committee (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by **)

2 Type of comment: GT = General Technical

TH = Technical high

TL = Technical Low

GE = General Editorial

E = Editorial

3 Resolution code: OBE = Superseded

AIP = Agreed in principle

A = Agreed R = Rejected

NA = Non actionable

Disposition of Comments

Date: 30/09/2020	Document: ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 7 N 8181 (42010. CD1-v1.0)	Project: ISO/IEC/IEEE CD1 42010 (Ed2) Architecture description
----------------------------	---	--

	MB/ NC ¹	Cmt No	Type of Cmt ²	Clause/ Subcl.	Para/ Fig/ Tab/	Line No	Comments and rationale	Proposed change	Res code ³	Resolution on each comment received
1141.	IEE E- 113 9	1139	Ed	5		323	All the figures have an identical note of the form 'NOTE 1 Figure 7 uses an informal entity-relationship diagram notation'. They are identical differing only in terms of the figure number. This clutters the document unnecessarily.	State it the once at the beginning and delete all the other instances.	A	
1142.	IEE E- 114 0	1140	TE	5		323	'figures rounded rectangles represent information objects' is not true. 'Environment', 'Entity' 'Stakeholder' are not information objects. They are simply concepts or entities. They describe things of different types, some of which might be information but some are 'real' things.	rounded rectangles identify concepts'		The rectangles are information objects of the conceptual model as distinguished from the information relationships among concepts. The representation of the AD elements is a different matter.
1143.	IEE E- 114 1	1141	Ed	Fig 1		329	Assuming that the recommendations in earlier items are accepted, these clauses and figures should all be changed to comply.	From: Entity of Interest To: Architecture Entity	OBE	See other dispositions. No change.
1144.	IEE E- 114 2	1142	TE		Figure 1	329	Consistency. 'Architecture Description is a composition of AD Element' vs 'Context is part of Environment'. Adds unnecessary additional relationship.	Change 'Architecture Description is a composition of AD Element to 'AD Element is part of Architecture Description'	AIP	New Text: AD is comprised of AD elements to be in alignment with the definition of ADE
1145.	IEE E- 114 3	1143	GE		Figure 1	329	Unclear whether there is only one Architecture Description (of a System)	Add multiplicities to figure 1		
1146.	IEE E- 114 4	1144	TE	5.2.2		335	Based on recommended change to 3.12 (IPR-24)[IEEE-1121]	From: its interactions or interrelationships with other entities in its environment; To: its interactions or interrelationships with other entities in its environment or the	A	

1 **MB** = Member body / **NC** = National Committee (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by **)

2 **Type of comment:** **GT** = General Technical **TH** = Technical high **TL** = Technical Low **GE** = General Editorial **E** = Editorial

3 **Resolution code:** **OBE** = Superseded **AIP** = Agreed in principle **A** = Agreed R = Rejected **NA** = Non actionable

Disposition of Comments

Date: 30/09/2020	Document: ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 7 N 8181 (42010. CD1-v1.0)	Project: ISO/IEC/IEEE CD1 42010 (Ed2) Architecture description
----------------------------	---	--

	MB/ NC ¹	Cmt No	Type of Cmt ²	Clause/ Subcl.	Para/ Fig/ Tab/	Line No	Comments and rationale	Proposed change	Res code ³	Resolution on each comment received
1147.	IEE E- 114 5	1145	Ed	5.2.2		343	"purpose of the architecture entity itself".What is an 'architecture entity'. Is this a valid use of the term entity?	environment itself; Should this be 'architecture description'?	AIP	Should be understood as "entity of interest".
1148.	IEE E- 114 6	1146	GE	5.2.2		344	'The architecture of an entity of interest can be understood through several distinct architecture descriptions, each created for a different purpose relative to the architecture and stakeholder needs. Different architecture descriptions can, for example, be based on the stakeholder (or stakeholder perspective), time period(sometimes termed epoch), viewpoint, entity specificity, or a specific context within the environment. NOTE ISO/IEC/IEEE 42020 [14] specifies a set of process descriptions for architecting which can be employed in support of creating an architecture description. This is not the subject of this standard. This standard defines 'what' wrt architecture description - the 'how' is defined by 42020. There is too much in this revision that seeks to blur the boundaries. There should be clear space between 42010 and 42020 to avoid error and inconsistency. All that is needed is a simple multiplicity on Figure 1 and it is clear. Additional content = higher cost of maintenance, increased chance of error or inconsistency, harder to find (key points get lost in the noise).	Delete paragraph beginning 'The The architecture of an entity can be understood .'....		The paragraph explains how architecture can be understood; not how to work in order to get that. The note refers to 42020 for the process. I.e. the document does not explain the process.
1149.	IEE	1147	TE	5.2.3		350	5.2.3–5 Discussion of stakeholders,	Eliminate redundancies and	A	

1 **MB** = Member body / **NC** = National Committee (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by **)

2 **Type of comment:** **GT** = General Technical **TH** = Technical high **TL** = Technical Low **GE** = General Editorial **E** = Editorial

3 **Resolution code:** **OBE** = Superseded **AIP** = Agreed in principle **A** = Agreed R = Rejected **NA** = Non actionable

Disposition of Comments

Date: 30/09/2020	Document: ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 7 N 8181 (42010. CD1-v1.0)	Project: ISO/IEC/IEEE CD1 42010 (Ed2) Architecture description
----------------------------	---	--

2.	MB/ NC ¹	Cmt No	Type of Cmt ²	Clause/ Subcl.	Para/ Fig/ Tab/	Line No	Comments and rationale	Proposed change	Res code ³	Resolution on each comment received
	E- 114 7						concerns, aspects, stakeholder perspectives is too long for no real value. Does not explain how to distinguish them as considerations, or if they need to be, or how they interrelate.	reorder. A more logical progression would be: Stakeholders -> Consideration -> Perspective -> Concern -> Aspect		
1150.	IEE E- 114 8	1148	TE	5.2.4		381	IEEE-75 (OBE) ref WG1-003 does not provide the requested distinction between perspective and viewpoint.	What is rationale for reinventing the wheel?	AIP	The new definition and corresponding writeup in clause 5 provides the necessary distinction.
1151.	IEE E- 114 9	1149	TE	5.2.4		381	This draft adds aspects and stakeholder perspectives as architecture consideration without any attempt to integrate with concerns which leaves readers with difficulty to apply these concepts.	Clarify relation among architecture considerations as implemented in requirements on ADFs and AD. (Any solution may also apply to specification of ADLs, as well.)	AIP	Architecture considerations as a term has been deprecated. However, the relationship between aspects, perspectives and concerns is strengthened. See updated definitions in clause 3 and usage in clause 5.
1152.	IEE E- 115 0	1150	TE	5.2.4		381	Disposition of IPR-25 claims "current practice" but there are no references that demonstrate this current practice—in contrast to stakeholders and concerns which are practiced widely.	Provide evidence or eliminate claims.		Current practice is not always documented in ways that can be referenced. The subject matter experts in the WG are the authorities on what constitutes current practice.
1153.	IEE E- 115 1	1151	GE	5.2.4		381	Why do we need to be told that it is possible to classify things? This is not the subject of such a standard. There are many potential mechanisms by which an architecture description or architecture framework can be arranged. What the standard should focus on is requirements that increase consistency of the architecture description content. Classifiers add nothing but extra concepts, space. They do not help the content one bit. It would be much better to focus on	Delete 5.2.4		The comment provides more or less what was described in the previous edition. This document extends the set of necessary concepts to better formalize the relationship between Stakeholder concerns and architectures through aspects and perspectives. As the size and complexity of the entity increases, viewpoints by itself are not sufficient. Certain classification is necessary to organize

1 **MB** = Member body / **NC** = National Committee (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by **)

2 **Type of comment:** **GT** = General Technical **TH** = Technical high **TL** = Technical Low **GE** = General Editorial **E** = Editorial

3 **Resolution code:** **OBE** = Superseded **AIP** = Agreed in principle **A** = Agreed R = Rejected **NA** = Non actionable

Disposition of Comments

1.

Date: 30/09/2020	Document: ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 7 N 8181 (42010. CD1-v1.0)	Project: ISO/IEC/IEEE CD1 42010 (Ed2) Architecture description
----------------------------	---	--

2.

MB/ NC ¹	Cmt No	Type of Cmt ²	Clause/ Subcl.	Para/ Fig/ Tab/	Line No	Comments and rationale	Proposed change	Res code ³	Resolution on each comment received
						consistency rather than front-end window-dressing. A framework might legitimately consist of only one or a handful viewpoint - you do not need need classifiers to manage. In fact the need for classifiers is indicative of the size being too large to manage i.e. structural errors. The aim should be to keep Ads and AFs small and tight. It is not aspects that determine how / whether concerns are addressed - it is the match/comparison between triples from the metamodel and each concern (use of nodes alone is not sufficient because of multiple paths in a metamodel and nodes do not form assertions on their own). Aspects are purely a means to order things.			the architecture and its description. Aspects, Perspectives, Dimensions are some concepts utilized in ADFs to bring in this organization. A standard is a documentation of best practice and hence this practice in ADFs needs to be standardized.
1154.	IEE E- 115 2	1152	GE	5.2.4	382	"characteristics or features of one or more architectures". Are Architecture Aspects characteristics or features of an Entity (system-of-interest)? There is some confusion between properties of an entity vs properties of an architecture of an entity.	When the concept of system-of-interest is included then functions and characteristics are features and characteristics of the system as expressed in the architecture description.		Architectures also exhibit certain characterization. Aspects deal with this characterisation. Not clear what the proposal for change is.
1155.	IEE E- 115 3	1153	TE	5.2.4	382	The description in this section manages to convolve "aspect" with "concern" and does so in a way that renders these concepts less distinct and useful. Furthermore, if "aspects" are expressed as "concerns", they will perforce be addressed in views. In a way these are no different in importance than concerns, it seems that they are maybe just	From: Architecture aspects are typical characteristics or features of one or more architectures. Collectively architecture aspects relate to relevant emerging or expressed concerns of stakeholders based upon prior experience within a field of		The proposal does not help at all to clarify what aspects are. It replaces "Architecture aspects" with an undefined term "architecture concern". This term cannot be considered as a synonym of "stakeholder concern" because not compatible with the definition provided in clause 3.10.

1 **MB** = Member body / **NC** = National Committee (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by **)

2 **Type of comment:** **GT** = General Technical **TH** = Technical high **TL** = Technical Low **GE** = General Editorial **E** = Editorial

3 **Resolution code:** **OBE** = Superseded **AIP** = Agreed in principle **A** = Agreed R = Rejected **NA** = Non actionable

Disposition of Comments

1.

Date: 30/09/2020	Document: ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 7 N 8181 (42010. CD1-v1.0)	Project: ISO/IEC/IEEE CD1 42010 (Ed2) Architecture description
----------------------------	---	--

2.

MB/ NC ¹	Cmt No	Type of Cmt ²	Clause/ Subcl.	Para/ Fig/ Tab/	Line No	Comments and rationale	Proposed change	Res code ³	Resolution on each comment received
						frequently addressed ones. Also, concerns are no more "subjective" than "aspects", unless somehow organizational, legal, regulatory, and ecological concerns are just subjective. After reviewing sec 6.4.1 and 6.4.3 I am even more convinced that these definitions need further work.	application. Usage of known architecture aspects can enable a more systematic coverage of the range of established concerns and also the identification of new concerns. Considering that, for a specific architecture, concerns are very subjective while aspects are more objective. To: Certain architecture concerns, such as functional or structural characteristics, are typical features that will appear in views in more than one architecture. Collectively these kinds of architecture concerns relate to frequently expressed or emerging concerns of stakeholders based upon prior experience within a field of application. Usage of known architecture viewpoints can enable a more systematic coverage of the range of established concerns and also the identification of new concerns.		
1156. IEE E- 115 4	1154	TE	5.2.4		382	IEEE-68 (AIP). Disposition seems confused about difference between aspects and concerns. Concerns have traditionally been used to organize ADs	Remove unsubstantiated statements wrt aspect/concern.		Aspect as a "cross cutting concern" is unique to software engineering and is not generally present in systems engineering or enterprise

1 **MB** = Member body / **NC** = National Committee (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by **)

2 **Type of comment:** **GT** = General Technical **TH** = Technical high **TL** = Technical Low **GE** = General Editorial **E** = Editorial

3 **Resolution code:** **OBE** = Superseded **AIP** = Agreed in principle **A** = Agreed R = Rejected **NA** = Non actionable

Disposition of Comments

Date: 30/09/2020	Document: ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 7 N 8181 (42010. CD1-v1.0)	Project: ISO/IEC/IEEE CD1 42010 (Ed2) Architecture description
----------------------------	---	--

	MB/ NC ¹	Cmt No	Type of Cmt ²	Clause/ Subcl.	Para/ Fig/ Tab/	Line No	Comments and rationale	Proposed change	Res code ³	Resolution on each comment received
1157.	IEE E- 115 5	1155	TE	5.2.4		384	whereas aspects describe cross-cutting concerns. So the claim here (unsubstantiated) is actually backwards! IEEE-73 asked for clarification to substantiate a claim in Use of "systematic". Disposition was "This is not a claim"! There is nothing in this draft that makes this any more true of aspects than concerns or perspectives. How are aspects more systematic?	Delete statment. It remains unsubstantiated.	AIP	engineering. See WG42-004. The definition as changed of architecture aspect has changed.
1158.	IEE E- 115 6	1156	TE	5.2.4		386	The definitions in 3 do not support this claim of subjective/objective. It seems subjective/objective is independent of any of the architecture considerations.	Delete sentence	OBE	See WG 1-320
1159.	IEE E- 115 7	1157	GE	5.2.4		387	The comment of 382 is expressed better in this line.	See above. Note: This relates to Design Characteristic found in ISO 15288:2015 related to a system-of-interest. Some of the aspects also relate to system requirements. There is an important relationship across models emerge from the aspects.	OBE	
1160.	IEE E- 115 8	1158	TE	5.2.4		415	This whole section talks about "architecture aspects", "stakeholder perspectives", and missing expertise which did not apper in the earlier version. This smacks of "change for change's sake". Since views were defined expressly for "expressing the architecture of a system from the perspective of specific system concerns" this just seems to introduce an extra level of indirection	From: Where no relevant prior experience for the field of application, the sort of entity of interest, or the form and style of architecture being devised, an architecture and its associated architecture description is likely to be driven from stakeholders and their respective concerns	AIP	The entire paragraph has been removed in the rewrite to better align with the changes in the definition of concerns, aspects and perspectives. The existing and proposed text no longer considered relevant to the document.

1 **MB** = Member body / **NC** = National Committee (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by **)

2 **Type of comment:** **GT** = General Technical **TH** = Technical high **TL** = Technical Low **GE** = General Editorial **E** = Editorial

3 **Resolution code:** **OBE** = Superseded **AIP** = Agreed in principle **A** = Agreed R = Rejected **NA** = Non actionable

Disposition of Comments

Date:
30/09/2020Document:
ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 7 N 8181
(42010. CD1-v1.0)Project:
ISO/IEC/IEEE CD1 42010 (Ed2) Architecture
description

1.

2.

MB/ NC ¹	Cmt No	Type of Cmt ²	Clause/ Subcl.	Para/ Fig/ Tab/	Line No	Comments and rationale	Proposed change	Res code ³	Resolution on each comment received
						and vagueness without any added clarity.	(often expressed as goals, requirements, constraints, policies etc.). Where prior relevant experience exists, the architecture can be informed by this prior experience which is often captured in the form of particular architecture aspects and particular stakeholder perspectives. To: Without an adopted form and style of architecture, the architecture description is likely to be driven from stakeholders and their respective concerns (often expressed as goals, requirements, constraints, policies etc.). With adoption of a formal architecture methodology the entity's architecture can be captured in the form of specific architecture views that address particular stakeholder concerns and architecture features.		
1161. IEE E- 115 9	1159	TE	5.2.5	Figure 3	435	Concern is a kind of Architecture Consideration is not correct. Architecture Consideration - 'typical characteristic or feature of one or more architectures'. A Concern may be any kind of concern (held by a stakeholder). ['matter of interest or importance to a stakeholder']. Some but not all of these may relate to architecture	Delete 'Architecture Consideration' from the conceptual model.	A	

1 **MB** = Member body / **NC** = National Committee (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by **)2 **Type of comment:** **GT** = General Technical**TH** = Technical high**TL** = Technical Low**GE** = General Editorial**E** = Editorial3 **Resolution code:** **OBE** = Superseded**AIP** = Agreed in principle**A** = Agreed R = Rejected**NA** = Non actionable

Disposition of Comments

1.

Date: 30/09/2020	Document: ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 7 N 8181 (42010. CD1-v1.0)	Project: ISO/IEC/IEEE CD1 42010 (Ed2) Architecture description
----------------------------	---	--

2.

MB/ NC ¹	Cmt No	Type of Cmt ²	Clause/ Subcl.	Para/ Fig/ Tab/	Line No	Comments and rationale	Proposed change	Res code ³	Resolution on each comment received
						(or its description, or the task, decisions etc. - see 219 'Note 1 to entry: A concern can apply either to an entity of interest, which may be either tangible or conceptual, to an architecture, to a situation or to an action.'). Is is not therefore correct to assert that Concern is a kind of is a kind of Architecture Consideration. This is a direct consequence of introducing unnecessary concepts with ever slight differences between them. Concern needs to remain because rationale, decisions et al later on in the process address it. Architecture Consideration is redundant. The standard does not preclude mechanisms for classifying views, viewpoints etc if the concept 'architecture consideration' is removed. It adds nothing but additional work and complexity to all.			
1162.	IEE E- 116 0	1160	TE	5.2.6	437	'A view is governed by its Viewpoint' / Figure 4. It is impossible to tell whether a view is governed by a single viewpoint and whether a viewpoint governs more than one view because there are no multiplicities.	Add multiplicities to the Conceptual model figures.		The figures are conceptual in nature and hence there was no need to use multiplicity related symbols. Wherever necessary, plural relationship names have been used to better clarify the concepts and their relationships.
1163.	IEE E- 116 1	1161	TE	5.2.6, Fig 4	450	This figure reveals the circular logic that has been introduced by adding the Architecture Aspect and Architecture Consideration concepts, as indicated in the comment on 5.2.4. Here is the circle: Architecture Description "expresses"	Some of the new features that appear in this document, such as the addition of model based views and non-model based views (Fig 5), and the clarifications re correspondences	AIP	Circular logic in the figure to be deprecated. Do not agree to other proposals

1 **MB** = Member body / **NC** = National Committee (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by **)

2 **Type of comment:** **GT** = General Technical **TH** = Technical high **TL** = Technical Low **GE** = General Editorial **E** = Editorial

3 **Resolution code:** **OBE** = Superseded **AIP** = Agreed in principle **A** = Agreed R = Rejected **NA** = Non actionable

Disposition of Comments

1.

Date: 30/09/2020	Document: ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 7 N 8181 (42010. CD1-v1.0)	Project: ISO/IEC/IEEE CD1 42010 (Ed2) Architecture description
----------------------------	---	--

2.

MB/ NC ¹	Cmt No	Type of Cmt ²	Clause/ Subcl.	Para/ Fig/ Tab/	Line No	Comments and rationale	Proposed change	Res code ³	Resolution on each comment received
						Architecture; Architecture "has particular" Architecture Aspect; Architecture Aspect "is a kind of" Architecture Consideration; Architecture Consideration "is addressed by" Architecture View; Architecture View "is contained in" Architecture Description"; and around it goes. Figure 2 from 42010:2011 had no such circularities and was much clearer.	(Fig 6) are really useful elaborations on the older document. But these additions of "architecture aspects" and "stakeholder perspectives", as first class objects, seem to be not as well thought out and just bring clutter instead of clarity. I believe that "architecture aspects" are just another way of saying "concerns". I think that "stakeholder perspectives" are just another way of saying "concerns" as well, and both will get addressed in "views" that comply with "viewpoint specs". I think that can be stated simply in the descriptions without cluttering the diagrams (and descriptions) with new terminology that is not clearly articulated. See also comment on fig 7 in 5.4.2.		
1164.	IEE E- 116 2	1162	TE	5.2.6	Figure 4	450	Architecture Aspect is not a property of Architecture - it's a humanly held construct akin to Perspective. The Architecture is completely agnostic - the aspect only arises when the human looks at or thinks about the architecture. It's not really any different from Stakeholder Perspective - both are combinations of Stakeholder + Perspective (association classes).	Delete 'Architecture Aspect'. At worst delete it and describe it as a synonym for 'Stakeholder Perspective'	Aspect is a property of the architecture as used in this standard and as used in architecting practices.

1 **MB** = Member body / **NC** = National Committee (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by **)

2 **Type of comment:** **GT** = General Technical **TH** = Technical high **TL** = Technical Low **GE** = General Editorial **E** = Editorial

3 **Resolution code:** **OBE** = Superseded **AIP** = Agreed in principle **A** = Agreed R = Rejected **NA** = Non actionable

Disposition of Comments

Date:
30/09/2020Document:
ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 7 N 8181
(42010. CD1-v1.0)Project:
ISO/IEC/IEEE CD1 42010 (Ed2) Architecture
description

2.

1165.

MB/ NC ¹	Cmt No	Type of Cmt ²	Clause/ Subcl.	Para/ Fig/ Tab/	Line No	Comments and rationale	Proposed change	Res code ³	Resolution on each comment received
IEE E- 116 3	1163	TE	5.2.6		454	<p>The text in this section appears to point to exactly the sorts of confusions described relative to Fig 4. The last sentence quoted in the "From:" text seems to be an accurate statement of how architecture viewpoints have been used. But the first two sentences describe relationships that are completely absent from Fig 4. Where is the relationship in this figure for "architecture viewpoint identifies the specific architecture aspects, concerns and stakeholder perspective(s) to be addressed by an architecture view?"</p> <p>Where is the relationship for "viewpoint provides guidance and direction to those who are creating, interpreting or using the architecture views"?</p>	<p>From: The architecture viewpoint identifies the specific architecture aspects, concerns and stakeholder perspective(s) to be addressed by an architecture view. The viewpoint provides guidance and direction to those who are creating, interpreting or using the architecture views. There are two dimensions to an architecture viewpoint: the architecture considerations which are addressed, and the conventions it establishes for the creation, interpretation, analysis and other uses of the architecture views.</p> <p>To: There are two dimensions to an architecture viewpoint: the architecture considerations which are addressed, and the conventions it establishes for the creation, interpretation, analysis and other uses of the architecture views. The architecture viewpoint identifies the specific architecture concerns, elements, relationships, and perspective(s) to be addressed by an</p>	AIP	Replace text by: There are two facets to a specification of an architecture viewpoint: the architecture aspects and concerns which are identified, and the conventions it establishes for the creation, interpretation, analysis and other uses of the architecture views

1 **MB** = Member body / **NC** = National Committee (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by **)2 **Type of comment:** **GT** = General Technical **TH** = Technical high **TL** = Technical Low **GE** = General Editorial **E** = Editorial3 **Resolution code:** **OBE** = Superseded **AIP** = Agreed in principle **A** = Agreed R = Rejected **NA** = Non actionable

Disposition of Comments

Date: 30/09/2020	Document: ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 7 N 8181 (42010. CD1-v1.0)	Project: ISO/IEC/IEEE CD1 42010 (Ed2) Architecture description
----------------------------	---	--

2.	MB/ NC ¹	Cmt No	Type of Cmt ²	Clause/ Subcl.	Para/ Fig/ Tab/	Line No	Comments and rationale	Proposed change	Res code ³	Resolution on each comment received
								architecture view. The viewpoint provides guidance and direction to those who are creating, interpreting or using the architecture views. And then fix Fig 4 so that it accurately represents these relationships as the previous Fig 2 did.		
1166.	IEE E- 116 4	1164	TE	5.2.6		456	'There are two dimensions to an architecture viewpoint: the architecture considerations which are addressed, and the conventions it establishes for the creation, interpretation, analysis and other uses of the architecture views.' This is confusing and incomplete. There are many 'parts' to an architecture viewpoint, not just considerations and conventions - correspondence, model kinds et al. We do not need yet another term for organising viewpoints as it becomes ever harder to differentiate these and serves no useful purpose- this is 'window dressing'. This sentence adds nothing with respect to the rest of the paragraph - it just restates previous text in a different form. It is not necessary for the understanding or construction of a viewpoint. Less is more. More is less.	Delete sentence beginning 'There are two dimensions...'	OBE	See IEEE 1163
1167.	IEE E- 116 5	1165	TE	5.2.6		459	"Architecture views can be used to define requirements for the entity of interest". This highlights the lack of purpose for an architecture within the context of a life	The difference between an aspect, concern and requirement must be clearly identified.	OBE	See FRA-1048

1 **MB** = Member body / **NC** = National Committee (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by **)

2 **Type of comment:** **GT** = General Technical **TH** = Technical high **TL** = Technical Low **GE** = General Editorial **E** = Editorial

3 **Resolution code:** **OBE** = Superseded **AIP** = Agreed in principle **A** = Agreed R = Rejected **NA** = Non actionable

Disposition of Comments

Date: 30/09/2020	Document: ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 7 N 8181 (42010. CD1-v1.0)	Project: ISO/IEC/IEEE CD1 42010 (Ed2) Architecture description
----------------------------	---	--

2.	MB/ NC ¹	Cmt No	Type of Cmt ²	Clause/ Subcl.	Para/ Fig/ Tab/	Line No	Comments and rationale	Proposed change	Res code ³	Resolution on each comment received
1168.	IEE E- 116 6	1166	Ed	5.2.6		462	cycle. Other processes identify requirements. How does the view define requirements? "The viewpoint specifies how elements ..." Are these AD Elements or System Elements or elements from ERD. The term Entity in this sense, detracts from elements of the Entity as system-of-interest.	should say aspects of the entity-of-interest.	AIP	In which AD elements (e.g. entities, relationships, attributes) are used when creating a view by applying? No need to talk about aspects
1169.	IEE E- 116 7	1167	TE	5.2.6		467	View method is missing from the diagram Figure 4	View method seems to be an important AD Element not visible on diagrams (figures).		View methods are one of the methods used in architecting. Not all concepts are included in the figure.
1170.	IEE E- 116 8	1168	TE	5.2.6		467	This clause introduces the term "view methods", but this does not appear to be a formally defined concept, at least in this section. As it is used in this clause it probably should be. It is treated in Sec 8.3. Furthermore, it appears that "view methods" should probably be named "viewpoint methods". Since they appear to be a part of the viewpoint spec that controls the rules on views, aren't they properly a part of the viewpoint spec, rather than any view?	From: View methods specify design rules, modeling methods, analysis techniques and other operations on views. These methods specify the view elements specified used when creating the view, methods to interrogate or query the views to assess how well, for example, the architecture can satisfy stakeholder concerns or address decision maker questions. Furthermore, these methods serve as a basis when creating extensions to the metamodel in the form of a project-specific modeling profile and modeling patterns, documented as new viewpoints and model kinds.		1) View methods are now handled separately. 2) View ethods are used in the construction of the view. It is not necessary to tie them up with the viewpoint and rename them as viewpoint methods.

1 **MB** = Member body / **NC** = National Committee (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by **)

2 **Type of comment:** **GT** = General Technical **TH** = Technical high **TL** = Technical Low **GE** = General Editorial **E** = Editorial

3 **Resolution code:** **OBE** = Superseded **AIP** = Agreed in principle **A** = Agreed R = Rejected **NA** = Non actionable

Disposition of Comments

Date: 30/09/2020	Document: ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 7 N 8181 (42010. CD1-v1.0)	Project: ISO/IEC/IEEE CD1 42010 (Ed2) Architecture description
---------------------	---	--

2.

MB/ NC ¹	Cmt No	Type of Cmt ²	Clause/ Subcl.	Para/ Fig/ Tab/	Line No	Comments and rationale	Proposed change	Res code ³	Resolution on each comment received
							<p>To: Viewpoint methods define operations that apply to views. A viewpoint may include one or more viewpoint methods. Viewpoint methods provide guidance, heuristics, metrics, patterns, design rules or guidelines, best practices and examples to aid in view construction and use of views governed by the viewpoint. These methods specify the view elements to be used when creating a view, methods to interrogate or query the views to assess how well, for example, the architecture can satisfy stakeholder concerns or address decision maker questions. Furthermore, these methods serve as a basis when creating extensions to the metamodel in the form of a project-specific modeling profile and modeling patterns, documented as new viewpoints and model kinds.</p> <p>And then fix Fig 5 to show Viewpoint Methods and their relationship to Views. Maybe this is really an elaboration of the "governs" relationship and deserves its own Figure?</p>		

1 **MB** = Member body / **NC** = National Committee (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by **)

2 **Type of comment:** **GT** = General Technical **TH** = Technical high **TL** = Technical Low **GE** = General Editorial **E** = Editorial

3 **Resolution code:** **OBE** = Superseded **AIP** = Agreed in principle **A** = Agreed R = Rejected **NA** = Non actionable

Disposition of Comments

Date: 30/09/2020	Document: ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 7 N 8181 (42010. CD1-v1.0)	Project: ISO/IEC/IEEE CD1 42010 (Ed2) Architecture description
----------------------------	---	--

	MB/ NC ¹	Cmt No	Type of Cmt ²	Clause/ Subcl.	Para/ Fig/ Tab/ Line No	Comments and rationale	Proposed change	Res code ³	Resolution on each comment received
1171.	IEE E- 116 9	1169	TE	5.2.6	470	'Furthermore, these methods serve as a basis when creating extensions to the metamodel in the form of a project-specific modeling profile and modeling patterns, documented as new viewpoints and model kinds.'. There is no such thing as a modeling profile. I suspect this is a UML hangover - and this standard is supposed to be agnostic of 'how'. Even a UML profile is not a viewpoint or even a model kind (it is simply a palette of elements - not even a metamodel) so this is technically incorrect.	Delete sentence starting at 'Furthermore ...'		All tool vendors provide modelling profiles of some sort that supports different architecture frameworks, architecture description frameworks. Incorrect to say that modelling as a concept does not exist.
1172.	IEE E- 117 0	1170	Ed	5.2.7	481	A flow diagram can be a component...	should say 'view component['	A	
1173.	IEE E- 117 1	1171	TE	5.2.7	489	view method is missing from the diagram	add view method to the diagram.	AIP	here are many methods that aid in the construction of the view. The conceptual models does not include all the terms. It is not necessary to include view method in the diagram.
1174.	IEE E- 117 2	1172	TE	5.2.7	489	Viewpoint also specifies legend	add relationship from viewpoint to legend.	A	
1175.	IEE E- 117 3	1173	TE	5.2.8	492	Architecture Description Element. 'An AD element is an instance of any construct in an architecture description.' This is not true. There are many notations where an AD element is not an instance - this is only true for particular software ones. It is also inconsistent with a non-model-based AD	Change to 'An AD element is any element that may appear in an Architecture Description.'		The definition of AD element is updated. The proposed change can be implemented because completely circular (reusing the same words in a different order without any value added.)

1 **MB** = Member body / **NC** = National Committee (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by **)

2 **Type of comment:** **GT** = General Technical **TH** = Technical high **TL** = Technical Low **GE** = General Editorial **E** = Editorial

3 **Resolution code:** **OBE** = Superseded **AIP** = Agreed in principle **A** = Agreed R = Rejected **NA** = Non actionable

Disposition of Comments

Date:
30/09/2020Document:
ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 7 N 8181
(42010. CD1-v1.0)Project:
ISO/IEC/IEEE CD1 42010 (Ed2) Architecture
description

2.	MB/ NC ¹	Cmt No	Type of Cmt ²	Clause/ Subcl.	Para/ Fig/ Tab/	Line No	Comments and rationale	Proposed change	Res code ³	Resolution on each comment received
1176.							An AD element is any element that may appear in an AD (not all elements in a metamodel for example are AD elements - some are used to set up inheritance structures for properties/behaviour).			
	IEE E- 117 4	1174	TE	5.2.9		513	One powerful feature of the correspondence concept is the ability to relate objects that are defined and elaborated in one view to representations of that same object in another view. RM-ODP used the term in this way. This does not seem to be covered by the present definition.	From: EXAMPLE A correspondence between an AD element within a view and the concern that it addresses; an AD element and the aspect that it implements; an interface and the standard to which the interface conforms. To: EXAMPLE A correspondence between an AD element within a view and the concern that it addresses; between an AD element and the function that it implements; between an interface on a component and the stack of standards to which the interface conforms; between a data object on a functional flow and the full data structure definition.	A	
1177.	IEE E- 117 5	1175	TE	5.2.10		521	Text does not address how ADs can be linked to AD elements: such as subsystem element in a system of systems AD to its own AD; or compliance of an AD element to an external AD. These are very common situations.	Provide discussion of how this case is supported by the revision.	OBE	See US-608
1178.	IEE	1176	TE	5.2.10		521	IEEE-92 (OBE) does not resolve the issue	Provide solution for AD element	OBE	See US-608

1 **MB** = Member body / **NC** = National Committee (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by **)2 **Type of comment:** **GT** = General Technical **TH** = Technical high **TL** = Technical Low **GE** = General Editorial **E** = Editorial3 **Resolution code:** **OBE** = Superseded **AIP** = Agreed in principle **A** = Agreed R = Rejected **NA** = Non actionable

Disposition of Comments

Date:
30/09/2020Document:
ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 7 N 8181
(42010. CD1-v1.0)Project:
ISO/IEC/IEEE CD1 42010 (Ed2) Architecture
description

2.	MB/ NC ¹	Cmt No	Type of Cmt ²	Clause/ Subcl.	Para/ Fig/ Tab/	Line No	Comments and rationale	Proposed change	Res code ³	Resolution on each comment received
1179.	E- 117 6						raised: how to handle correspondences between AD elements and another AD.	to AD case of correspondence.		
	IEE E- 117 7	1177	GE	5.2.10		529	'Correspondence methods are used to enforce architecture relations among AD elements.' This is not true as used in this standard - there is no requirement to have a correspondence method and hence no means to enforce traceability, consistency et al. The one correspondence rule that should be required is where a metamodel is used that each concern is addressed by one or more relations (otherwise there may be concerns that cannot ever be addressed).		AIP	Delete the sentence (line no 524)
1180.	IEE E- 117 8	1178	TE	5.2.11		538	(538--541 and 546-548) This section on "Architecture Decisions" appears to contain two rather different concepts without making the distinctions clear. One appears to be the choice of architecture methods made in determining how to represent the architecture. The other is the set of architectural decisions and choices made as part of trade studies during the process of determining the features of the architecture. These are different.	From: 5.2.11 Architecture decisions and rationale An architecture decision is a collection of choices made in the overall context of an architecture. Such decisions pertain to concerns about, perspectives on, aspects of, requirements on an entity, or other influences of the environment. and Architecture rationale records explanation, justification or reasoning about architecture decisions that have been made. The rationale for a decision can		The proposal is talking about a specific way or approach of how architecture decisions and rationales are utilized. There is no need to get into the specifics. All of this is covered in 42020.

1 **MB** = Member body / **NC** = National Committee (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by **)2 **Type of comment:** **GT** = General Technical**TH** = Technical high**TL** = Technical Low**GE** = General Editorial**E** = Editorial3 **Resolution code:** **OBE** = Superseded**AIP** = Agreed in principle**A** = Agreed R = Rejected**NA** = Non actionable

Disposition of Comments

1.

Date: 30/09/2020	Document: ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 7 N 8181 (42010. CD1-v1.0)	Project: ISO/IEC/IEEE CD1 42010 (Ed2) Architecture description
----------------------------	---	--

2.

MB/ NC ¹	Cmt No	Type of Cmt ²	Clause/ Subcl.	Para/ Fig/ Tab/	Line No	Comments and rationale	Proposed change	Res code ³	Resolution on each comment received
							<p>include: the basis for a decision, alternatives and trade-offs considered, potential consequences of the decision, and citations to sources of additional information.</p> <p>To:</p> <p>5.2.11 Architecture decisions and rationale</p> <p>An architecture decision is a collection of choices made in the overall context of creating an architecture. There are two different kinds of architectural decisions to be made. The first is the choice of architecture methods made to determine how to represent the architecture. The second is the set of architectural decisions and choices made as part of trade studies during the process of determining the features of the architecture.</p> <p>The first kind of decisions pertain to concerns about, perspectives on, aspects of, requirements on an entity, or other influences of the environment. This includes choices of methods and tools. and</p> <p>The second kind of descisions are made while conducting</p>		

1 **MB** = Member body / **NC** = National Committee (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by **)

2 **Type of comment:** **GT** = General Technical **TH** = Technical high **TL** = Technical Low **GE** = General Editorial **E** = Editorial

3 **Resolution code:** **OBE** = Superseded **AIP** = Agreed in principle **A** = Agreed R = Rejected **NA** = Non actionable

Disposition of Comments

Date: 30/09/2020	Document: ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 7 N 8181 (42010. CD1-v1.0)	Project: ISO/IEC/IEEE CD1 42010 (Ed2) Architecture description
----------------------------	---	--

2.	MB/ NC ¹	Cmt No	Type of Cmt ²	Clause/ Subcl.	Para/ Fig/ Tab/	Line No	Comments and rationale	Proposed change	Res code ³	Resolution on each comment received
								architectural trade studies, where the architecture rationale records explanation, justification or reasoning about architecture decisions that have been made. The rationale for a decision can include: the basis for a decision, alternatives and trade-offs considered, potential consequences of the decision, and citations to sources of additional information.		
1181.	IEE E- 117 9	1179	GE	5,3		553	Not appropriate in this work product description of architecture description. The shared ecosystem described in this section is a potential solution to a different problem.	See attached document to see how this changes the purpose of the work product. (also see row 5 in this spreadsheet.	A	
1182.	IEE E- 118 0	1180	TE	5.4.2		569	The text: "An ADF identifies typical stakeholders within that architecting domain together with their typical concerns. Within the ADF, these are expressed through generic stakeholder perspectives and generic architecture aspects" suggests that: 1) aspects, concerns and perspectives are treated differently from each other in ADFs while 6.4 suggests each is simply a kind of architecture consideration—which is it? and 2) That there is a relationship between typical stakeholders and concerns and generic aspects and perspectives.—What is the intended relation between concerns,	Clarify relation among architecture considerations as implemented in requirements on ADFs and AD. (Any solution may also apply to specification of ADLs, as well.)	AIP	WG1-469 for nature of changes.

1 **MB** = Member body / **NC** = National Committee (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by **)

2 **Type of comment:** **GT** = General Technical **TH** = Technical high **TL** = Technical Low **GE** = General Editorial **E** = Editorial

3 **Resolution code:** **OBE** = Superseded **AIP** = Agreed in principle **A** = Agreed R = Rejected **NA** = Non actionable

Disposition of Comments

Date: 30/09/2020	Document: ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 7 N 8181 (42010. CD1-v1.0)	Project: ISO/IEC/IEEE CD1 42010 (Ed2) Architecture description
----------------------------	---	--

2.	MB/ NC ¹	Cmt No	Type of Cmt ²	Clause/ Subcl.	Para/ Fig/ Tab/	Line No	Comments and rationale	Proposed change	Res code ³	Resolution on each comment received
1183.							aspects and perspectives? How is this captured in an ADF and how does this carry over to individual ADs following that ADF?			
	IEE E- 118 1	1181	TE	5.4.2		571	This section includes several instances of the use of "architecture aspects" (see comments on 5.2.6) which only seems to muddy the discussion. This addresses one of these. The term "viewpoints" is substituted for "aspects".	From: Within the ADF, these are expressed through generic stakeholder perspectives and generic architecture aspects. Usage of ADFs in different situations is likely to identify new combinations of stakeholder perspectives and architecture aspects. To: Within an ADF, these are expressed through generic stakeholder perspectives and generic architecture viewpoints. Usage of ADFs in different situations is likely to identify new combinations of stakeholder perspectives and architecture viewpoints.	AIP	WG1-469 for nature of changes.
1184.	IEE E- 118 2	1182	TE	5.4.2		574	Structure formalism that relates architecture considerations and correspondences does not need a new term. Correspondences are not included in the diagram and architecture aspects are there. The addition of the extra terms Stakeholder perspectives architecture considerations make it more difficult to highlight the purpose of an ADF.	Use perspective as the way to group stakeholder concerns, architecture aspects and use correspondences to relate them together. The only new term is a perspective that groups multiple concerns, viewpoints and views. The current set of terms can be simplified.		Architecture consideration is dropped from the figure (See WG42-007) but the rest of the terms are necessary

1 **MB** = Member body / **NC** = National Committee (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by **)

2 **Type of comment:** **GT** = General Technical **TH** = Technical high **TL** = Technical Low **GE** = General Editorial **E** = Editorial

3 **Resolution code:** **OBE** = Superseded **AIP** = Agreed in principle **A** = Agreed R = Rejected **NA** = Non actionable

Disposition of Comments

Date: 30/09/2020	Document: ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 7 N 8181 (42010. CD1-v1.0)	Project: ISO/IEC/IEEE CD1 42010 (Ed2) Architecture description
---------------------	---	--

2.

1185.

MB/ NC ¹	Cmt No	Type of Cmt ²	Clause/ Subcl.	Para/ Fig/ Tab/	Line No	Comments and rationale	Proposed change	Res code ³	Resolution on each comment received
IEE E- 118 3	1183	TE	5.4.2		579	This comment is related to that for lines 571-573. Viewpoints is substituted for "aspects", and viewpoints are identified as the means of providing stakeholder perspective, with no loss of meaning.	<p>From: Given that stakeholders look at architectures from different (stakeholder) perspectives, these can be generalized as generic perspectives. For example, some stakeholders look at an architecture from a business perspective and can be interested in the functionality that is required or provided (what capability of the entity is being created or changed, or what new processes are necessary?) or in the economics perspective (what are the investment implications and what is the expected impact on the bottom line?). Stakeholder concerns can be better understood when examined from different stakeholder perspectives across different architecture aspects, such as structure, behavior and connectivity.</p> <p>To: Given that stakeholders look at architectures from different (stakeholder) perspectives, these can be generalized using generic viewpoints. For example, some stakeholders look at an architecture from a business</p>	AIP	See WG1-469 for the nature of changes.

1 **MB** = Member body / **NC** = National Committee (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by **)

2 **Type of comment:** **GT** = General Technical **TH** = Technical high **TL** = Technical Low **GE** = General Editorial **E** = Editorial

3 **Resolution code:** **OBE** = Superseded **AIP** = Agreed in principle **A** = Agreed R = Rejected **NA** = Non actionable

Disposition of Comments

Date: 30/09/2020	Document: ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 7 N 8181 (42010. CD1-v1.0)	Project: ISO/IEC/IEEE CD1 42010 (Ed2) Architecture description
----------------------------	---	--

2.	MB/ NC ¹	Cmt No	Type of Cmt ²	Clause/ Subcl.	Para/ Fig/ Tab/	Line No	Comments and rationale	Proposed change	Res code ³	Resolution on each comment received
								perspective and can be interested in the functionality that is required or provided (what capability of the entity is being created or changed, or what new processes are necessary?) or in the economics perspective (what are the investment implications and what is the expected impact on the bottom line?). Stakeholder concerns can be better understood when examined from different stakeholder perspectives across different architecture viewpoints, such as structure, behavior and connectivity. And then fix Fig 7 to remove "stakeholder perspective" and "stakeholder aspects". Make the relationship between ADF and Arch VP be "ADF defines set of Arch VP". Notice that both Stakeholder Perspectives and Stakeholder Aspects only have incoming relationships. That seems to say that they do not directly affect anything.		
1186.	IEE E- 118 4	1184	TE	5.4.2		592	Figure needs View methods	Add view methods to the diagram		There is no need to talk about specific mechanisms involved in constructing the views as part of the conceptual figure.
1187.	IEE	1185	TE	5.4.2		611	This comment is also related to that for	From:	OBE	See GB-475

1 **MB** = Member body / **NC** = National Committee (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by **)

2 **Type of comment:** **GT** = General Technical **TH** = Technical high **TL** = Technical Low **GE** = General Editorial **E** = Editorial

3 **Resolution code:** **OBE** = Superseded **AIP** = Agreed in principle **A** = Agreed R = Rejected **NA** = Non actionable

Disposition of Comments

1.

Date: 30/09/2020	Document: ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 7 N 8181 (42010. CD1-v1.0)	Project: ISO/IEC/IEEE CD1 42010 (Ed2) Architecture description
----------------------------	---	--

2.

MB/ NC ¹	Cmt No	Type of Cmt ²	Clause/ Subcl.	Para/ Fig/ Tab/	Line No	Comments and rationale	Proposed change	Res code ³	Resolution on each comment received
E- 118 5						lines 571-573. Viewpoints is substituted for "aspects", and viewpoints are identified as the means of providing stakeholder perspective, with no loss of meaning.	<p>ADFs are mechanisms by which generic stakeholder perspectives and architecture aspects are identified and captured. In the context of an architecture description, aspect characterizations further enable a systematic examination and organization of a portion of the concepts and properties ascribed as architecturally relevant and consistent with the architecting purpose. While utilizing generic architecture aspects and stakeholder perspectives, the architect needs to remember that these artifacts are based on prior architecting efforts and therefore represent conclusions reflecting the architecting purpose for which they were created in relation to a particular entity of interest in a particular environment.</p> <p>To: ADFs are mechanisms by which generic stakeholder perspectives and architecture viewpoints are identified and captured. In the context of an architecture description, viewpoints further enable a systematic examination and organization of a portion of</p>		

1 **MB** = Member body / **NC** = National Committee (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by **)

2 **Type of comment:** **GT** = General Technical **TH** = Technical high **TL** = Technical Low **GE** = General Editorial **E** = Editorial

3 **Resolution code:** **OBE** = Superseded **AIP** = Agreed in principle **A** = Agreed R = Rejected **NA** = Non actionable

Disposition of Comments

Date: 30/09/2020	Document: ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 7 N 8181 (42010. CD1-v1.0)	Project: ISO/IEC/IEEE CD1 42010 (Ed2) Architecture description
----------------------------	---	--

2.	MB/ NC ¹	Cmt No	Type of Cmt ²	Clause/ Subcl.	Para/ Fig/ Tab/	Line No	Comments and rationale	Proposed change	Res code ³	Resolution on each comment received
								the concepts and properties ascribed as architecturally relevant and consistent with the architecting purpose. While utilizing generic architecture viewpoints to address stakeholder concerns, the architect needs to remember that these artifacts are based on prior architecting efforts and therefore represent conclusions reflecting the architecting purpose for which they were created in relation to a particular system entity in a particular environment.		
1188.	IEE E- 118 6	1186	TE	5.4.2		612	"systematic" Unsubstantiated claim. References	Delete statement or provide some substantiation for this claim.	OBE	See GB-475
1189.	IEE E- 118 7	1187	TE	5.4.3		630	"...viewing conventions which specify how information is selected, transformed and presented in a view. Viewing conventions determine the information which is captured..." The term connotes a method used by viewers (readers) of a view. What about construction of views? How are viewing conventions different from view methods for creating and organizing a view? Why are they limited to views (since ADLs need not include a full viewpoint but can	Rename – as in the remainder of the document – as methods (8.3).	A	

1 **MB** = Member body / **NC** = National Committee (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by **)

2 **Type of comment:** **GT** = General Technical **TH** = Technical high **TL** = Technical Low **GE** = General Editorial **E** = Editorial

3 **Resolution code:** **OBE** = Superseded **AIP** = Agreed in principle **A** = Agreed R = Rejected **NA** = Non actionable

Disposition of Comments

Date: 30/09/2020	Document: ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 7 N 8181 (42010. CD1-v1.0)	Project: ISO/IEC/IEEE CD1 42010 (Ed2) Architecture description
----------------------------	---	--

	MB/ NC ¹	Cmt No	Type of Cmt ²	Clause/ Subcl.	Para/ Fig/ Tab/	Line No	Comments and rationale	Proposed change	Res code ³	Resolution on each comment received
1190.	IEE E- 118 8	1188	TE	5.4.3		651	be a single model kind)? The model kind provides a way to create and understand view component not the ADL. The ADL may also provide rationally for selection of MK.	The figure 8 is not clear about the role of Model Kind related to View Component.		There is no proposal for change to address the comment .
1191.	IEE E- 118 9	1189	Ed	6.1		654	Why does 6 have an extensive Introduction (essentially repeating the requirements of the Clause, whereas 7 and 8 do no.	Remove repetition of requirements. It is confusing to readers and is not consistent with Introductions to Clauses 7, 8. Delete lines 656–669.		The requirements in clause 6.1 introduction are not repeated in the rest of the sections in clause 6. Per changes in clause 7.1, similar introduction is included.
1192.	IEE E- 119 0	1190	TE	6.1		659	IEEE-98 (OBE) is not resolved by WG42-003. "Relevant" still appears in listed items without explanation.	Delete.		The concerns, aspects and perspectives that are relevant to the stakeholders.
1193.	IEE E- 119 1	1191	TE	6,1		660	Starting with IEEE 1471 the definition of a viewpoint spec (sec 5.3) included "The language, modeling techniques, or analytical methods to be used in constructing a view based upon the viewpoint,". This documentation of the language, methods, and representations appears to be missing from this current instantiation of the spec.	From: identification of the relevant concerns (see 6.4.1); identification of the relevant architecture aspects (see 6.4.2.2); identification of the relevant stakeholder perspectives (see 6.4.3); a definition or a reference for each architecture viewpoint used in the architecture description (see 6.5); architecture view(s) and view components for each architecture viewpoint used (see 6.6 and 6.7); a record of known inconsistencies among the		The proposal is covered by Clause 5 and 8 with the notion of "View methods". View methods specify expression rules, modeling methods, analysis techniques and other operations on views

1 **MB** = Member body / **NC** = National Committee (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by **)

2 **Type of comment:** **GT** = General Technical **TH** = Technical high **TL** = Technical Low **GE** = General Editorial **E** = Editorial

3 **Resolution code:** **OBE** = Superseded **AIP** = Agreed in principle **A** = Agreed R = Rejected **NA** = Non actionable

Disposition of Comments

Date: 30/09/2020	Document: ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 7 N 8181 (42010. CD1-v1.0)	Project: ISO/IEC/IEEE CD1 42010 (Ed2) Architecture description
----------------------------	---	--

MB/ NC ¹	Cmt No	Type of Cmt ²	Clause/ Subcl.	Para/ Fig/ Tab/	Line No	Comments and rationale	Proposed change	Res code ³	Resolution on each comment received
							architecture description's required contents (see 6.8.1); To: identification of the relevant concerns (see 6.4.1); identification of the relevant architecture aspects (see 6.4.2.2); identification of the relevant stakeholder perspectives (see 6.4.3); a definition or a reference for each architecture viewpoint used in the architecture description (see 6.5); architecture view(s) and view components for each architecture viewpoint used (see 6.6 and 6.7); <u>language, modeling techniques, or analytical methods to be used in constructing a view (???)</u> ; a record of known inconsistencies among the architecture description's required contents (see 6.8.1);		
1194. IEE E- 119 2	1192	TE	6.3		709	"Consideration shall be given to identifying other present or future stakeholders..." This requirement is improperly worded as it is not feasible to verify whether consideration was or was not given and by whom.	An architecture description shall identify present or future stakeholders who may be impacted... Editors to similarly reword instances of "Consideration shall be given," as in 6.4, 6.4.1, 6.4.3	OBE	See WG1-522

1 **MB** = Member body / **NC** = National Committee (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by **)

2 **Type of comment:** **GT** = General Technical **TH** = Technical high **TL** = Technical Low **GE** = General Editorial **E** = Editorial

3 **Resolution code:** **OBE** = Superseded **AIP** = Agreed in principle **A** = Agreed R = Rejected **NA** = Non actionable

Disposition of Comments

Date:
30/09/2020Document:
ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 7 N 8181
(42010. CD1-v1.0)Project:
ISO/IEC/IEEE CD1 42010 (Ed2) Architecture
description

	MB/ NC ¹	Cmt No	Type of Cmt ²	Clause/ Subcl.	Para/ Fig/ Tab/	Line No	Comments and rationale	Proposed change	Res code ³	Resolution on each comment received
1195.	IEE E- 119 3	1193	Ed	6.4		712	Remove unnecessary redundancy within 6.4.1–6.4.3 by moving redundant notes on Granularity, Resource Limitations and text "Consideration shall be given..." to 6.4. They do not need to be repeated for each kind of Architecture Consideration.	Move redundant NOTES and text.	OBE	See WG1-522
1196.	IEE E- 119 4	1194	TE	6.4.1		717	Previous edition had a much more useful list of Concerns. Why is it removed? Nothing has changed to require its removal	Restore EXAMPLE Concerns: functionality, feasibility, usage, purpose, features, properties, known limitations, structure, behavior, performance, resource utilization, reliability, security, information assurance, complexity, complicatedness, elegance, rationale, principles evolvability, openness, concurrency, autonomy, cost, schedule, quality of service, flexibility, agility, modifiability, modularity, control, communication, deadlock, state change, subsystem integration, data accessibility, privacy, compliance to regulation, assurance, business goals and strategies, customer experience, maintainability, affordability and disposability.	AIP	A list of concerns will be inserted but a review is needed for consistency with current usage and meaning in this standard.
1197.	IEE E- 119 5	1195	TE	6.4.2		741	IPR-55 (R) CD1 has still not deconflicted aspects and concerns.	Clarify relationship.	OBE	See definition of aspect and concerns in clause 3
1198.	IEE	1196	TE	6.4.2		761	Given that: "Collectively architecture	Add: An architecture description		True that aspects relate to concerns,

1 MB = Member body / NC = National Committee (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by **)

2 Type of comment: GT = General Technical

TH = Technical high

TL = Technical Low

GE = General Editorial

E = Editorial

3 Resolution code: OBE = Superseded

AIP = Agreed in principle

A = Agreed R = Rejected

NA = Non actionable

Disposition of Comments

Date: 30/09/2020	Document: ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 7 N 8181 (42010. CD1-v1.0)	Project: ISO/IEC/IEEE CD1 42010 (Ed2) Architecture description
----------------------------	---	--

2.	MB/ NC ¹	Cmt No	Type of Cmt ²	Clause/ Subcl.	Para/ Fig/ Tab/	Line No	Comments and rationale	Proposed change	Res code ³	Resolution on each comment received
	E- 119 6						aspects relate to relevant emerging or expressed concerns of stakeholders..." (5.2.4). An AD must document these relationships.	shall identify the relationship of each identified aspect with any identified stakeholders holding that perspective.		but this is captured in the ADF and is not pertinent for capturing in AD.
1199.	IEE E- 119 7	1197	TE	6.4.2		761	Given: Figure 2 presents strong two-way relationships (i.e., shapes / affects) between Concern and Stakeholder Perspective. These relationships must be documented in an AD.	Add: An architecture description shall identify the relationship of each identified aspect with any identified stakeholders holding that perspective.	AIP	Add: An architecture description shall identify the relationship of each identified concern with relevant stakeholder perspectives.
1200.	IEE E- 119 8	1198	TE	6.4.2		762	Why is this limited to one or two current frameworks? These are not particularly helpful as most appeared as Concerns in earlier edition. Is the revision claiming that these are no longer Concerns but should be "reclassified" as aspects? The definitions do not support that change.	Find examples that help readers to distinguish Aspects from Concerns from Stakeholder Perspectives.	OBE	Definition of Aspects is changed to better reflect relationship with concerns (See WG42-004, See INC-059). Per Example 1 in 6.6, these are architecture aspects as used in prevalent ADFs.
1201.	IEE E- 119 9	1199	Ed	6.4.2		768	"See A.4 for examples"	Isn't this Annex G.	A	
1202.	IEE E- 120 0	1200	TE	6.4.2		774	Architecture aspects to be considered really seem to be most useful in ensuring that an appropriate set of viewpoints are selected to address stakeholder concerns. Why not just state that?	From: Consideration shall be given to identifying present or future architecture aspects which may be relevant to the entity of interest. Architecture aspects that are considered necessary for proper description of the architecture should be prioritized so that they are addressed within the	OBE	See WG1-548

1 **MB** = Member body / **NC** = National Committee (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by **)

2 **Type of comment:** **GT** = General Technical **TH** = Technical high **TL** = Technical Low **GE** = General Editorial **E** = Editorial

3 **Resolution code:** **OBE** = Superseded **AIP** = Agreed in principle **A** = Agreed R = Rejected **NA** = Non actionable

Disposition of Comments

1.

Date: 30/09/2020	Document: ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 7 N 8181 (42010. CD1-v1.0)	Project: ISO/IEC/IEEE CD1 42010 (Ed2) Architecture description
----------------------------	---	--

2.

MB/ NC ¹	Cmt No	Type of Cmt ²	Clause/ Subcl.	Para/ Fig/ Tab/	Line No	Comments and rationale	Proposed change	Res code ³	Resolution on each comment received
							available resources and constraints. To: Consideration shall be given to identifying present or future architecture aspects which may be relevant to the entity of interest. Architecture viewpoints should be selected to support proper description of these stakeholder concerns so that they are addressed within the available resources and constraints.		
1203.	IEE E- 120 1	1201	TE	6.4.2	776	Requirement that includes: "considered necessary for proper description of the architecture should be prioritized" is out of scope. This is a process requirement hidden within a product standard.	Delete requirement.	A	
1204.	IEE E- 120 2	1202	TE	6.4.3	778	The list of items in this section on "Stakeholder Perspectives" seems entirely misplaced. The normal definition of "perspective" is "a particular attitude toward or way of regarding something; a point of view." Strategy, standards, business, technology do not seem to readily fit this definition, but they do fit the definition of "Concerns". Note that the section on "Concerns", is rather scant and high level. I think that the definitions of 6.4.1 and 6.4.3 could be swapped with a net gain in clarity. This proposed definition of the term	From: 6.4.3 Identification of stakeholder perspectives An architecture description shall identify stakeholder perspectives considered relevant to the architecture of the entity of interest. Each stakeholder perspective shall be linked with participating stakeholders. To: 6.4.1 Identification of stakeholder concerns	AIP	Replace text in clause 6.4 by: An AD shall identify the concerns considered relevant to the architecture of the entity of interest. Update text in clause 6.8 as: Each concern identified by the AD in accordance with 6.4 shall be addressed by at least one view in accordance with the view's governing viewpoint.

1 **MB** = Member body / **NC** = National Committee (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by **)

2 **Type of comment:** **GT** = General Technical **TH** = Technical high **TL** = Technical Low **GE** = General Editorial **E** = Editorial

3 **Resolution code:** **OBE** = Superseded **AIP** = Agreed in principle **A** = Agreed R = Rejected **NA** = Non actionable

Disposition of Comments

Date:
30/09/2020Document:
ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 7 N 8181
(42010. CD1-v1.0)Project:
ISO/IEC/IEEE CD1 42010 (Ed2) Architecture
description

1.

2.

1205.

1206.

1207.

MB/ NC ¹	Cmt No	Type of Cmt ²	Clause/ Subcl.	Para/ Fig/ Tab/	Line No	Comments and rationale	Proposed change	Res code ³	Resolution on each comment received
						"Concern" seems to be entirely aligned with what appears in A.3.	An architecture description shall identify stakeholder concerns considered relevant to the architecture of the system entity. Each stakeholder concern shall be linked with participating stakeholders and addressed within one (or more) of the selected viewpoints. NOTE: Every one of the identified concerns will result in a view, or in elements in a view, that address these concerns.		
IEE E- 120 3	1203	TE	6.4.3		782	IEEE-107 (AIP) ref WG42-003 Same problem with perspectives as aspects.	Find examples that help readers to distinguish Aspects from Concerns from Stakeholder Perspectives.	OBE	1) Definition of aspects and concerns are changed in clause 3 to better reflect the relationships between aspects, perspectives and concerns. 2) Examples of concerns, aspects and perspectives are updated to reflect the change in definition.
IEE E- 120 4	1204	TE	6.4.3		803	Figure 2 depicts that Stakeholders have particular Stakeholder Perspectives. This must be documented in an AD. Perspectives must be linked to stakeholders having that perspective; otherwise non-sensical cases might arise: e.g., an AD including a stakeholder perspective for Plumbing with no stakeholders interested in that perspective!	Add: An architecture description shall associate each identified perspective with any identified stakeholders holding that perspective.	A	
IEE E- 120	1205	TE	6.4.3		817	Requirement that includes: "considered necessary for proper description of the architecture should be prioritized" is out of	Delete requirement.	A	

1 **MB** = Member body / **NC** = National Committee (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by **)2 **Type of comment:** **GT** = General Technical**TH** = Technical high**TL** = Technical Low**GE** = General Editorial**E** = Editorial3 **Resolution code:** **OBE** = Superseded**AIP** = Agreed in principle**A** = Agreed R = Rejected**NA** = Non actionable

Disposition of Comments

Date:
30/09/2020Document:
ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 7 N 8181
(42010. CD1-v1.0)Project:
ISO/IEC/IEEE CD1 42010 (Ed2) Architecture
description

2.	MB/ NC ¹	Cmt No	Type of Cmt ²	Clause/ Subcl.	Para/ Fig/ Tab/	Line No	Comments and rationale	Proposed change	Res code ³	Resolution on each comment received
	5						scope. This is a process requirement hidden within a product standard.			
1208.	IEE E- 120 6	1206	Ed	6.5		820	Include is defined at beginning of Clause to cover the by reference case..	Delete "or reference".		The normal definition of "Include" does not consider referenced items as included items.
1209.	IEE E- 120 7	1207	TE	6.6		827	IEEE-113 (R) claims "The notion of one viewpoint to many views is prevalent in practice. Hence, it is necessary to change the rule discussed in earlier versions of the standard. Example for N views associated to 1 viewpoint: NAFv3 NSV4 (same for DoDAF SV4) are commonly expressed with a function tree (arborescence view) and functional chains." However, this is not an example of 1 viewpoint -- multiple views. According to NAFv3, NSV is the view(point). [NAFv4 in aligning with 42010 acknowledges that what NAFv3 called 'views' were intended as 'viewpoints'.] That viewpoint defines several "subviews" including NSV4 (NSV-1 through NSV-12!) "where each subview comprises of specific diagrams and specifications, intended to support a specific purpose, and intended to be communicated to specific stakeholders and specific Communities of Interest." — subviews correspond to model kinds in 42010. This case was already anticipated in the 2011 edition, without breaking the 1	Restore requirement or find use case for its removal that can not be met under that requirement.		Common case that a single viewpoint has several corresponding views to cover different timeframes, different geographic regions, different scenarios, different product variants in a product line architecture, different market segments, etc.

1 **MB** = Member body / **NC** = National Committee (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by **)2 **Type of comment:** **GT** = General Technical**TH** = Technical high**TL** = Technical Low**GE** = General Editorial**E** = Editorial3 **Resolution code:** **OBE** = Superseded**AIP** = Agreed in principle**A** = Agreed R = Rejected**NA** = Non actionable

Disposition of Comments

Date:
30/09/2020Document:
ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 7 N 8181
(42010. CD1-v1.0)Project:
ISO/IEC/IEEE CD1 42010 (Ed2) Architecture
description

2.	MB/ NC ¹	Cmt No	Type of Cmt ²	Clause/ Subcl.	Para/ Fig/ Tab/	Line No	Comments and rationale	Proposed change	Res code ³	Resolution on each comment received
1210.	IEE E- 120 8	1208	TE	6.6		830	viewpoint – 1 view requirement. Combine 830–832 to refer to architecture considerations. There is nothing here to distinguish the cases for aspects, concerns and perspectives.	Delete 830–832; replace with: "Each architecture consideration identified by the AD in accordance with 6.4 shall be addressed by at least one architecture view."		Yes, these are all considerations but good to be clear by having separate requirement for each kind of consideration.
1211.	IEE E- 120 9	1209	TE	6,6		834	A single architecture viewpoint, or a view constructed using that viewpoint spec, may address more than one concern. This should be made clear.	From: Each architecture view shall adhere to the conventions of its governing architecture viewpoint. To: Each architecture view shall adhere to the conventions of its governing architecture viewpoint. Each architecture view may address more than one concern.	A	
1212.	IEE E- 121 0	1210	TE	6.6		837	Restore NOTE 1 on View covering whole entity of interest.	NOTE 1 The requirement that each architecture view covers the whole entity of interest with respect to the concerns or aspects framed by its governing viewpoint is essential to the completeness of the architecture description. Within a view, one or more view parts can be used to selectively present some or all of the informational content required by the viewpoint to highlight points of interest, without violating this requirement.	AIP	It is is not necessary to require that each view covers the entire entity of interest with regard to the purpose and scope of the AD. With regard to the purpose and scope of the AD, it might be scoped to purposely be limited to one particular portion of the entity, sometimes by direction, sometimes by limited time or resources, sometimes by purpose of the architecting effort.
1213.	IEE	1211	TE	6.6		837	The weakening of this requirement is to	Change "multiple" to		Sometimes multiple architectures are

1 **MB** = Member body / **NC** = National Committee (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by **)2 **Type of comment:** **GT** = General Technical **TH** = Technical high **TL** = Technical Low **GE** = General Editorial **E** = Editorial3 **Resolution code:** **OBE** = Superseded **AIP** = Agreed in principle **A** = Agreed R = Rejected **NA** = Non actionable

Disposition of Comments

Date: 30/09/2020	Document: ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 7 N 8181 (42010. CD1-v1.0)	Project: ISO/IEC/IEEE CD1 42010 (Ed2) Architecture description
----------------------------	---	--

	MB/ NC ¹	Cmt No	Type of Cmt ²	Clause/ Subcl.	Para/ Fig/ Tab/	Line No	Comments and rationale	Proposed change	Res code ³	Resolution on each comment received
	E- 121 1						enable alternative architectures to be depicted within 1 AD.	"alternative".		needed, eg for different products in a product line architecture, different architectures for different epochs, different architectures for different market segments, etc
1214.	IEE E- 121 2	1212	TE	6.6		838	2nd sentence of this NOTE does not make sense nor does it fit with first sentence.	Delete 2nd sentence.	OBE	The NOTE has been deprecated.
1215.	IEE E- 121 3	1213	TE	6.6		841	Draft removes requirement from previous edition that each view cover the whole system/entity of interest from the perspective of its governing viewpoint. This is an essential requirement for architecture descriptions—otherwise the entity/system boundary may be misunderstood/incorrect. Draft provides no explanation for the incompatible change; provides to work around; thereby introduces difficulties in checking completeness of ADs.	Restore essential requirement. Otherwise, provide: rationale for change (how does this change improve the standard)? Revise c) one or more view components that address all of the architecture considerations (per 6.4) framed by its governing architecture viewpoint for the entity of interest;	OBE	See WG42-013
1216.	IEE E- 121 4	1214	TE	6.7		860	Why is version control only identified as a requirement on View Components? What about version identification for ADs, VPs, MKs, Vs, ADFs, ADLs—the other primary information items and work products.	Make a consistent policy about version identification for all information items, work products.	A	
1217.	IEE E- 121 5	1215	TE	6,7		865	View Components that are represented in different views may expose different levels of detail. This possibility, and the relationships among such views of shared elements should be expressed by Correspondence Rules. This is entirely	From: A view component may be a part of more than one architecture view. To: A view component may be a part	A	

1 **MB** = Member body / **NC** = National Committee (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by **)

2 **Type of comment:** **GT** = General Technical **TH** = Technical high **TL** = Technical Low **GE** = General Editorial **E** = Editorial

3 **Resolution code:** **OBE** = Superseded **AIP** = Agreed in principle **A** = Agreed R = Rejected **NA** = Non actionable

Disposition of Comments

1.

Date: 30/09/2020	Document: ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 7 N 8181 (42010. CD1-v1.0)	Project: ISO/IEC/IEEE CD1 42010 (Ed2) Architecture description
----------------------------	---	--

2.

	MB/ NC ¹	Cmt No	Type of Cmt ²	Clause/ Subcl.	Para/ Fig/ Tab/	Line No	Comments and rationale	Proposed change	Res code ³	Resolution on each comment received
							consistent with Note 1 and clause 6.8.	of more than one architecture view. The relationships among components shared across such views should be expressed as Correspondences.		
1218.	IEE E- 121 6	1216	TE	6.8.2		889	IEEE-130 (OBE) Disposition states there is only one case, but draft has two cases: AD element to element and AD to AD. Still missing is AD element to AD.	Provide for 3rd case: AD element to AD	AIP	See US-608
1219.	IEE E- 121 7	1217	TE	6.8.2		889	Correspondences and Correspondence Methods must support AD/ADL/ADF to AD element correspondences. These are needed to express compliance conditions and relations within architecture landscapes, adherence to frameworks, etc.	Revise requirements to allow AD/ADF/ADL-to-AD element correspondences. The simplest approach is to unify the two cases	AIP	Add the following cases: - An AD element correspondence may involve elements within an ADF or across several ADFs. - An AD element correspondence may involve elements within an ADL or across several ADLs
1220.	IEE E- 121 8	1218	TE	7.1		966	Combine c), d) and e) into a single item c) in terms of architecture considerations.	Replace with: "c) the identification of one or more generic architecture considerations (per 6.4)"		Important for the ADF to make distinctions between the kinds of architecture considerations, namely by declaring which ones are identified and what kind they are deemed to be.
1221.	IEE E- 121 9	1219	TE	7.1		969	Why are some items labelled "typical" and some labelled "generic"? How do users of the standard apply this distinction? How are the typical and generic items related?	Resolve use of TYPICAL and GENERIC	A	"Typical" is kept.
1222.	IEE E- 122 0	1220	TE	7.1		973	"Structure formalism" is not a recognizable term. Isn't this known as a framework metamodel?	Replace term with more familiar one.	OBE	See INC-621
1223.	IEE E- 122	1221	TE	7.1		973	Many existing frameworks use concerns to organize viewpoints. This case must not be excluded in the statement of this	Revise as: "the specification of one or more structure formalisms to organize architecture	OBE	See INC-621

1 **MB** = Member body / **NC** = National Committee (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by **)

2 **Type of comment:** **GT** = General Technical **TH** = Technical high **TL** = Technical Low **GE** = General Editorial **E** = Editorial

3 **Resolution code:** **OBE** = Superseded **AIP** = Agreed in principle **A** = Agreed R = Rejected **NA** = Non actionable

Disposition of Comments

Date: 30/09/2020	Document: ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 7 N 8181 (42010. CD1-v1.0)	Project: ISO/IEC/IEEE CD1 42010 (Ed2) Architecture description
----------------------------	---	--

2.	MB/ NC ¹	Cmt No	Type of Cmt ²	Clause/ Subcl.	Para/ Fig/ Tab/	Line No	Comments and rationale	Proposed change	Res code ³	Resolution on each comment received
	1						requirement.	considerations and their relations to architecture viewpoints";		
1224.	IEE E- 122 2	1222	TE	7.1		973	An ADF must include a "structure formalism" but the standard has no guidance on 1) what a structure formalism contains; 2) how it relates to architecture considerations; and 3) how it relates to other elements of an ADF.	Provide an adequate basis for users to meet this requirement.	OBE	See INC-621
1225.	IEE E- 122 3	1223	TE	7,1	f)	973	An architecture framework has to have classifier mechanisms (architecture aspect) and legends (977) but is not required to specify correspondence rules. Why are means or organising content mandatory and more important than the consistency of the architecture resulting description?	Delete requirement for architecture aspects and legend.	OBE	See INC-621
1226.	IEE E- 122 4	1224	TE	7,1	g)	975	Should reference specific subsection - 8.1.	Change (per 8) to (per 8.1)	A	
1227.	IEE E- 122 5	1225	TE	7,1	g)	975	Consistency. 'architecture viewpoints that frame those typical concerns' / Figure 7 'Architecture Viewpoint frames Concern' / s 8.1- Concern is not a kind of Architecture Consideration (comment on 435). Whereas s 8.1 1017 an Architecture Viewpoint frames Architecture Consideration (i.e. more than just a Concern)	Correct Figure 3. Delete Concern is a kind of Architecture Consideration, reinstate Architecture Viewpoint frames Concern.	A	
1228.	IEE E- 122 6	1226	TE	7,1	h)	976	Should reference specific subsection - 8.2	Change (per 8) to (per 8.2)	A	

1 **MB** = Member body / **NC** = National Committee (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by **)

2 **Type of comment:** **GT** = General Technical

TH = Technical high

TL = Technical Low

GE = General Editorial

E = Editorial

3 **Resolution code:** **OBE** = Superseded

AIP = Agreed in principle

A = Agreed R = Rejected

NA = Non actionable

Disposition of Comments

Date:
30/09/2020Document:
ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 7 N 8181
(42010. CD1-v1.0)Project:
ISO/IEC/IEEE CD1 42010 (Ed2) Architecture
description

1.

2.

1229.

1230.

1231.

1232.

MB/ NC ¹	Cmt No	Type of Cmt ²	Clause/ Subcl.	Para/ Fig/ Tab/	Line No	Comments and rationale	Proposed change	Res code ³	Resolution on each comment received
IEE E- 122 7	1227	TE	7,1	i)	977	The reference to legends is incorrect ('identification of one or more legends that specify these architecture viewpoints (per 8)')- legends are not defined or present in section 8. Legends do not specify anything. If a legend is supposed to be a title then this is superfluous since Architecture Viewpoint and Annex B ought to cover this. In any case legend is described as 'A legend offers readers the conventions used in preparing' - this is what the Architecture Viewpoint itself does. Legend in any case only applies to non-model-based ADs (Figure 5).	Change to 'shall identify one or more architecture viewpoints.'	OBE	See updated notion of viewpoints, legends and model kinds
IEE E- 122 8	1228	TE	7,1		984	'An architecture description framework shall establish its consistency with the provisions of the conceptual model in Clause 5' makes the conceptual model normative. The reference is too broad - it should only apply parts of the conceptual model with which Architecture Description has a relationship i.e. Figure 7 and not any other figure. If any other view identifies relationships with Architecture Framework that are not present in Figure 7 this is an error. The text does not constitute the conceptual model.	Change 'conceptual model in Clause 5' to 'conceptual model in Figure 7'.	AIP	Change to "An architecture description framework shall establish its consistency with the concepts in 5.4.2"
IEE E- 122 9	1229	TE	7.1		988	How do these requirements interact with the items labelled typical and generic? Is there any way in which they are treated differently?	If no difference, remove "typical" and "generic" above.	OBE	See WG 1-617
IEE E-	1230	TE	7.2		1006	Should specify: architecture conventions, 1 or more model kinds, optional:	Specification is incomplete (cf previous edition).	AIP	The list is updated with: viewing conventions, 1 or more model kinds,

1 **MB** = Member body / **NC** = National Committee (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by **)2 **Type of comment:** **GT** = General Technical**TH** = Technical high**TL** = Technical Low**GE** = General Editorial**E** = Editorial3 **Resolution code:** **OBE** = Superseded**AIP** = Agreed in principle**A** = Agreed R = Rejected**NA** = Non actionable

Disposition of Comments

Date:
30/09/2020Document:
ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 7 N 8181
(42010. CD1-v1.0)Project:
ISO/IEC/IEEE CD1 42010 (Ed2) Architecture
description

2.	MB/ NC ¹	Cmt No	Type of Cmt ²	Clause/ Subcl.	Para/ Fig/ Tab/	Line No	Comments and rationale	Proposed change	Res code ³	Resolution on each comment received
1233.	123 0						viewpoints (to handle cases like Archimate), correspondence methods,			viewpoints and correspondence methods.
1234.	IEE E- 123 1	1231	TE	7.2		1008	What is a viewing convention? Why are they associated with ADLs but not with ADFs, viewpoints and model kinds?	Delete a). Associated methods are 'inherited' through b) the selection of model kinds or viewpoints. Unless revision chooses to associate one or more methods with an ADL not otherwise associated with its specified viewpoints and model kinds.	OBE	See US-648
1235.	IEE E- 123 2	1232	TE	7.2		1010	Delete. An ADL does not include instances of applying its viewpoints or model kinds.	Delete.	OBE	The original comment was referring to view components which was removed. However, the present change to viewpoints and model kinds is now relevant to the comment.
1236.	IEE E- 123 3	1233	TE	6.10.3		1014	IEEE-132 (AIP) not implemented.	Add: A correspondence method holds if an associated correspondence can be shown to be satisfied. A correspondence method is violated if an associated correspondence cannot be shown to be satisfied or when no associated correspondence exists.	A	
1236.	IEE E- 123 4	1234	TE	8.1		1016	IEEE-160 (A) Disposition accepted but not implemented in CD1. "languages, notations, modelling techniques" are not view methods. They should not be confused with methods. These should be termed "conventions" associated with the model kind. In addition, there may be	Rewrite as: d) a specification of each identified model kind (per 8.2 Model Kinds);	A	

1 **MB** = Member body / **NC** = National Committee (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by **)2 **Type of comment:** **GT** = General Technical**TH** = Technical high**TL** = Technical Low**GE** = General Editorial**E** = Editorial3 **Resolution code:** **OBE** = Superseded**AIP** = Agreed in principle**A** = Agreed R = Rejected**NA** = Non actionable

Disposition of Comments

Date: 30/09/2020	Document: ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 7 N 8181 (42010. CD1-v1.0)	Project: ISO/IEC/IEEE CD1 42010 (Ed2) Architecture description
----------------------------	---	--

2.	MB/ NC ¹	Cmt No	Type of Cmt ²	Clause/ Subcl.	Para/ Fig/ Tab/	Line No	Comments and rationale	Proposed change	Res code ³	Resolution on each comment received
							associated methods. These should be termed model methods (which is much less awkward than view part methods).			
1237.	IEE E- 123 5	1235	TE	8.1		1018	The requirement is missing any reference to model kinds, which provide the content of the resulting views.	Add: b) one or more model kinds used in this viewpoint;	AIP	Should be specification of one or more model kinds and legends used by this viewpoint
1238.	IEE E- 123 6	1236	TE	8.1		1022	This text refers to methods; content is determined in previous requirement.	Change to: "one or more model kind methods".	A	
1239.	IEE E- 123 7	1237	TE	8.1		1024	Case for architecture description languages should also be listed here.	Change to: "as a part of an architecture description framework (per 7.1) or architecture description language (per 7.2) or ..."	A	
1240.	IEE E- 123 8	1238	TE	8.1		1025	Subclause 7.1 should have an equivalent statement like this in regard to generic and typical items specified.	Exact wording would be pending on resolution of other comments on use of typical and generic.	AIP	Addressed in 7—NOT here.
1241.	IEE E- 123 9	1239	TE	8.2		1032	Missing the inclusion of conventions which are an intrinsic part of a model kind.	Change to: "the conventions and model methods to be used..."	A	
1242.	IEE E- 124 0	1240	TE	8.3		1037	Unify treatment of methods of Views, Models, ADF, ADLs	Allow methods of Models, ADFs, ADLs as well as Views; provide a unified description of methods based on 8.3.		The discussion regarding methods will be improved in the document; but the document will not address methods of ADF, ADL and Model. Even if view methods and correspondence methods can be considered, referenced or included in ADF, ADL and modeling methods.
1243.	IEE	1241	TE	8,3		1049	This section is unclear from an	this is going too far away from	A	Design & Implementation methods to

1 **MB** = Member body / **NC** = National Committee (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by **)

2 **Type of comment:** **GT** = General Technical **TH** = Technical high **TL** = Technical Low **GE** = General Editorial **E** = Editorial

3 **Resolution code:** **OBE** = Superseded **AIP** = Agreed in principle **A** = Agreed R = Rejected **NA** = Non actionable

Disposition of Comments

Date: 30/09/2020	Document: ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 7 N 8181 (42010. CD1-v1.0)	Project: ISO/IEC/IEEE CD1 42010 (Ed2) Architecture description
----------------------------	---	--

2.	MB/ NC ¹	Cmt No	Type of Cmt ²	Clause/ Subcl.	Para/ Fig/ Tab/	Line No	Comments and rationale	Proposed change	Res code ³	Resolution on each comment received
	E-124 1						architectural point of view. Implementation methods that relate to construct or realize entities .. Is not part of architecting or architecture but non architectural models that do support other life cycle processes. This is where architecture is potentially beyone its purpose for architecting in the life cycle. Models however do apply across the life cycle.	the purpose of architecture to a model based approach to development across the whole life cycle.		be removed from the list.
1244.	IEE E-124 2	1242	TE	8,3		1055	the distinction between model and non-model may be introduced to describe items that cross the processes in the life cycle. This is extending the work product beyone a fit in the life cycle. Other processes may have models however, they are not architecture models.	This is attempting to address model based system engineering rather than architecting.		This is allowing non-model elements to be part of the view which is always the case. Enough rationale has been provided in WD4 comments resolution for this. Refer to related dispositions in WD4.
1245.	IEE E-124 3	1243	Ed	7.1		1102	IEEE-141 (A) Not implemented per disposition	Delete "coverage and"		This text doesn't exist.
1246.	IEE E-124 4	1244	TE	A.4.2		1185	"Starting with concerns" implies a process that is not specified by this standard.	Delete paragraph	AIP	we will clarifiy
1247.	IEE E-124 5	1245	TE	A.6.1		1299	The analogy : 'That viewpoint can be applied to many entities. Each view is one such application. Similarly, a program is one application of an algorithm in an executable form.' is incorrect and misleading - it implies that a view is an instance of a viewpoint. It isn't. A viewpoint is a specification for a view. A	Delete analogy	OBE	See WG1-745

1 **MB** = Member body / **NC** = National Committee (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by **)

2 **Type of comment:** **GT** = General Technical **TH** = Technical high **TL** = Technical Low **GE** = General Editorial **E** = Editorial

3 **Resolution code:** **OBE** = Superseded **AIP** = Agreed in principle **A** = Agreed R = Rejected **NA** = Non actionable

Disposition of Comments

Date:
30/09/2020Document:
ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 7 N 8181
(42010. CD1-v1.0)Project:
ISO/IEC/IEEE CD1 42010 (Ed2) Architecture
description

1.

2.

1248.

1249.

1250.

1251.

1252.

MB/ NC ¹	Cmt No	Type of Cmt ²	Clause/ Subcl.	Para/ Fig/ Tab/	Line No	Comments and rationale	Proposed change	Res code ³	Resolution on each comment received
						view is a design response to the specification/ requirement - not an instance. This mistake has led to many incorrect statements / uses of 'viewpoint'.			
IEE E- 124 6	1246	TE	A.6.2		1343	OBE	Delete subclause: it is OBE with removal of "view specification".		Tied to INC-042
IEE E- 124 7	1247	Ed	A.7		1378	The definition cited for work product is actually from IEEE 730.	Remove the reference to ISO/IEC 15504-1 which is withdrawn and refer to IEEE 730. Add to the Bibliography. IEEE 730-2014 IEEE Standard for Software Quality Assurance Processes	AIP	ISO/IEC 15504 has been revised by: ISO/IEC 33001:2015 Information technology – Process assessment – Concepts and terminology as of March, 2015 and is no longer available at ISO
IEE E- 124 8	1248	Ed	B.2.8.2		1629	Entities, attributes, relationships and constraints are all AD elements in the sense of 0.' Missing reference '0'?	Insert correct reference instead of '0'	A	
IEE E- 124 9	1249	TE	Annex E		1844	Architecting in the life cycle is not the subject of 42010. It is the subject of 42020. Unnecessary words, concepts make maintenance of the standard harder and more time-consuming and increase the likelihood of inconsistencies. This amount of overlap makes it harder for the user to identify and refer to the correct (master) standard - it encourages reference to potentially incorrect and/or inconsistent informative standards.	Delete Appendix E		This Annex contains useful information and should not be removed.
IEE E- 125	1250	TE	G		2043	Table entry for RM-ODP states Concern Identification is "not formalized". However, this contradicts Annex C.5 where the	Fix table with reference to Annex C.5 or original source.	A	

1 **MB** = Member body / **NC** = National Committee (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by **)2 **Type of comment:** **GT** = General Technical **TH** = Technical high **TL** = Technical Low **GE** = General Editorial **E** = Editorial3 **Resolution code:** **OBE** = Superseded **AIP** = Agreed in principle **A** = Agreed R = Rejected **NA** = Non actionable

Disposition of Comments

Date: 30/09/2020	Document: ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 7 N 8181 (42010. CD1-v1.0)	Project: ISO/IEC/IEEE CD1 42010 (Ed2) Architecture description
----------------------------	---	--

2.	MB/ NC ¹	Cmt No	Type of Cmt ²	Clause/ Subcl.	Para/ Fig/ Tab/	Line No	Comments and rationale	Proposed change	Res code ³	Resolution on each comment received
	0						concerns for each RM-ODP viewpoint are listed according to ISO/IEC 10746-3.			
1253.	IEE E- 125 1	1251	TE			2048	Bibliography Item 1: IEEE 1471 was superseded by ISO/IEC/IEEE 42010. It is unnecessary to cite a superseded, withdrawn version in the successor standard.	Remove this reference. If it is considered useful to keep the Eeles and Crips reference [23] as discussed in B.3, remove the reference to IEEE 1471.	A	
1254.	IEE E- 125 2	1252	TE			2062	Bibliography item 9: ISO/IEC 15504-1 has been canceled and replaced by ISO/IEC 33001:2015.	Remove ISO/IEC 15504-1 from the Bibliography.	A	
1255.	INC - 125 3	1253	TE	6.4.2		743	The aspects listed here are not consistent with the meaning of aspect as explained in 5.2.4. The things listed here are really the "framework dimensions" that are used to organize viewpoints in an ADF. Reference: (PPT file: "42010 fwk dimensions 2020.0528")	Change to be identified as a list of "framework dimensions" and move list to 7.1 since these are really "dimensions" that are considered and included in ADF, as appropriate. Move NOTE 2 to 7.1. Delete NOTE 1. Add EXAMPLE list of aspects to 6.4.2 to include some like those listed in 5.2.4.	AIP	See updated definition of aspects and examples of aspects and concerns
1256.	INC - 125 4	1254	TH	3,7		200	Agree with WG1-673 change to definition of Architecture View. Inserting here to allow for specific disposition of this particular proposed change.	information item comprising part of an architecture description (3.4) <u>that expresses the architecture (3.2) of an entity of interest (3.11) as specified by an architecture viewpoint (3.8)</u>	AIP	information item, governed by an architecture viewpoint (3.8), comprising part of an architecture description (3.3)
1257.	INC - 125 5	1255	TH	3,8		205	Agree with WG1-673 change to definition of Architecture Viewpoint. Inserting here to allow for specific disposition of this particular proposed change.	information item containing conventions <u>specified by the individual or organization architecting (3.1) for the creation, interpretation and use of an</u>	AIP	Update definition to: conventions for the creation, interpretation and use of an architecture view (3.8) to frame one or more concerns (3.10). See US-197

1 **MB** = Member body / **NC** = National Committee (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by **)

2 **Type of comment:** **GT** = General Technical **TH** = Technical high **TL** = Technical Low **GE** = General Editorial **E** = Editorial

3 **Resolution code:** **OBE** = Superseded **AIP** = Agreed in principle **A** = Agreed R = Rejected **NA** = Non actionable

Disposition of Comments

Date: 30/09/2020	Document: ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 7 N 8181 (42010. CD1-v1.0)	Project: ISO/IEC/IEEE CD1 42010 (Ed2) Architecture description
----------------------------	---	--

2.	MB/ NC ¹	Cmt No	Type of Cmt ²	Clause/ Subcl.	Para/ Fig/ Tab/	Line No	Comments and rationale	Proposed change	Res code ³	Resolution on each comment received
1258.								architecture views (3.7) to capture satisfy one or more than <u>one</u> architecture considerations (3.3) attributed to one or more than <u>one</u> stakeholder perspective (3.16)		
1258.	INC - 125 6	1256	TH	3,8		203	Agree with WG1-673 change to Notes to Entry for Architecture Viewpoint. Inserting here to allow for specific disposition of this particular proposed change.	Add this note: Note 1 to entry: A viewpoint is a frame of reference for the architecture considerations determined by the architect as relevant to the purpose of the architecture description containing the viewpoint. Note 2 to entry: In some communities of practice and architecture frameworks, "view specification" is used to mean the same thing as this document's "architecture viewpoint" concept.	AIP	Note 1 to entry: A viewpoint is a frame of reference for the architecture considerations determined by the architect as relevant to the purpose of the architecture description containing the viewpoint. the concerns determined by the architect as relevant to the purpose of the architecture description. Note 2 to entry: In some communities of practice and architecture frameworks, "view specification" is used to mean the same thing as this document's "architecture viewpoint" concept.
1259.	INC - 125 7	1257	TH	3,9		211	Agree with WG1-673 change to definition of Architecture Aspect. Inserting here to allow for specific disposition of this particular proposed change.	typical characteristic or feature of one or more <u>than one</u> architectures (3.2) Add 3 notes to entry: Note 1 to entry: An aspect can pertain either to an entity of interest, which may be either tangible or conceptual, to an architecture, to a situation or to	AIP	Regarding the new definition of Aspect (See disposition of WG42-004) The proposed note 2 is no longer needed. The two other proposed notes will be inserted in the definition. Note 1 and 3 are accepted.

1 **MB** = Member body / **NC** = National Committee (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by **)

2 **Type of comment:** **GT** = General Technical **TH** = Technical high **TL** = Technical Low **GE** = General Editorial **E** = Editorial

3 **Resolution code:** **OBE** = Superseded **AIP** = Agreed in principle **A** = Agreed R = Rejected **NA** = Non actionable

Disposition of Comments

Date: 30/09/2020	Document: ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 7 N 8181 (42010. CD1-v1.0)	Project: ISO/IEC/IEEE CD1 42010 (Ed2) Architecture description
----------------------------	---	--

2.

MB/ NC ¹	Cmt No	Type of Cmt ²	Clause/ Subcl.	Para/ Fig/ Tab/	Line No	Comments and rationale	Proposed change	Res code ³	Resolution on each comment received
							<p>an action.</p> <p>Note 2 to entry: The granularity of an aspect with respect to the entity of interest varies widely, from an isolated view to many distinct or composed views, and often does not align exactly with architecting purpose.</p> <p>Note 3 to entry: The identification of an aspect is the result of prior knowledge experience and praxis in the domain to which the aspect applies.</p>		
1260.	INC - 125 8	1258 TH	3.10		216	<p>Agree with WG1-673 change to definition of Concern. Inserting here to allow for specific disposition of this particular proposed change.</p> <p>See related comment about Examples for this term.</p>	<p>matter of interest or importance to a stakeholder (3.15) <u>about an aspect (3.9) of an entity of interest (3.11)</u></p> <p>Note 1 to entry: A concern can apply either to an entity of interest, which may be either tangible or conceptual, to an architecture, to a situation or to an action.</p> <p><u>Note 1 to entry: Concerns stated in the interrogative form with reference to specific rather than categorical difficulties, problems, or requirements, such as use cases, better aid the architecting effort.</u></p>	AIP	<p>matter of relevance or importance to a stakeholder (3.18) regarding an entity of interest (3.12)</p> <p>Note 1 to entry: Concerns stated in the interrogative form with reference to specific rather than categorical difficulties, problems, or requirements, such as use cases.</p> <p>Note 2 to entry: Not all stated concerns are relevant to the purpose of the architecting effort.</p>

1 **MB** = Member body / **NC** = National Committee (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by **)

2 **Type of comment:** **GT** = General Technical

TH = Technical high

TL = Technical Low

GE = General Editorial

E = Editorial

3 **Resolution code:** **OBE** = Superseded

AIP = Agreed in principle

A = Agreed R = Rejected

NA = Non actionable

Disposition of Comments

Date:
30/09/2020Document:
ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 7 N 8181
(42010. CD1-v1.0)Project:
ISO/IEC/IEEE CD1 42010 (Ed2) Architecture
description

2.	MB/ NC ¹	Cmt No	Type of Cmt ²	Clause/ Subcl.	Para/ Fig/ Tab/	Line No	Comments and rationale	Proposed change	Res code ³	Resolution on each comment received
1261.	INC - 125 9	1259	TH	3.10		219	<p>Agree with WG1-673 modification of Example 1 and addition of Example 2 for Concern. Delete examples provided and replace with more appropriate examples to help clarify distinction between aspects and concerns.</p> <p>Inserting here to allow for specific disposition of this particular proposed change.</p>	<p>Note 2 to entry: Not all stated concerns are relevant to the purpose of the architecting effort.</p> <p>EXAMPLE 1 Categories of Concerns includes statements such as: What is the risk of toxin exposure to employees?, When are we able to begin on-site maintenance for customers?, How are we measuring customer satisfaction with product quality?, Does our cash flow expectation during development meet expense obligations?, What selection criteria are used to verify trust in supplier ability to meet our production schedule? risks, opportunities, satisfaction, affordability and trust.</p> <p>EXAMPLE 2 A concern related to a requirement can be stated as, Our new product line for elder care facilities needs to comply with at least 12 of the IEC TR 62907:2014 use cases recommendations.</p>	AIP	Examples are now utilized as part of clause 5.
1262.	WG 42- 001	1260	TE	3.4		181	Add Note in Architecture Description definition. Subject of AD is Architecture of an Entity of interest		A	
1263.	WG 42-	1261	TE			0	Entity-of-interest should not use "-"		A	

1 MB = Member body / NC = National Committee (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by **)

2 Type of comment: GT = General Technical

TH = Technical high

TL = Technical Low

GE = General Editorial

E = Editorial

3 Resolution code: OBE = Superseded

AIP = Agreed in principle

A = Agreed R = Rejected

NA = Non actionable

Disposition of Comments

Date:
30/09/2020Document:
ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 7 N 8181
(42010. CD1-v1.0)Project:
ISO/IEC/IEEE CD1 42010 (Ed2) Architecture
description

2.	MB/ NC ¹	Cmt No	Type of Cmt ²	Clause/ Subcl.	Para/ Fig/ Tab/	Line No	Comments and rationale	Proposed change	Res code ³	Resolution on each comment received
1264.	WG 42- 003	1262	TE	6.1		658	Reword to "identification of stakeholders of the entity of interest"		A	
1265.	WG 42- 004	1263	TE	3.9		211	Add definition of Aspect:	"unit of modularization of concerns within an architecture description, capturing characteristics or features of the entity of interest"	A	
1266.	WG 42- 005	1264	TE	3.9		211	Add NOTE to Aspect definition:	"Aspects enable the architect to analyze, address and structure architecture concerns. In general, there is a many-to-many relation between aspects and concerns. An aspect can pertain either to an entity of interest, to an architecture, or to an environment (such as to a situation or action)."	A	
1267.	WG 42- 006	1265	TE	Annex G		1948	Add Kruchten's 4+ 1 as a framework in the Annex		A	
1268.	WG 42- 007	1266	TE	5.2.5		420	- There is no need to have a definition of "architecture consideration" is clause 3. This phrase can be understood with the definitions provided by the common dictionaries. - But a concept description is needed (i.e. clause 5.2.5 is kept and possibly improved. - This phrase "architecture consideration" simplifies the text of the 42010.		A	
1269.	WG	1267	TH	1		134	It is stated that this document does not	Update the document to read	A	

1 **MB** = Member body / **NC** = National Committee (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by **)2 **Type of comment:** **GT** = General Technical**TH** = Technical high**TL** = Technical Low**GE** = General Editorial**E** = Editorial3 **Resolution code:** **OBE** = Superseded**AIP** = Agreed in principle**A** = Agreed R = Rejected**NA** = Non actionable

Disposition of Comments

Date: 30/09/2020	Document: ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 7 N 8181 (42010. CD1-v1.0)	Project: ISO/IEC/IEEE CD1 42010 (Ed2) Architecture description
----------------------------	---	--

	MB/ NC ¹	Cmt No	Type of Cmt ²	Clause/ Subcl.	Para/ Fig/ Tab/	Line No	Comments and rationale	Proposed change	Res code ³	Resolution on each comment received
	42-008						specify ADs, ADFs, ADLs, viewpoints and models kinds.	that this document specifies requirements allowing to specify ADs, ADFs, ADLs, viewpoints and models kinds.		
1270.	WG 42-009	1268	TH	3		158	A definition of "specification" is necessary in this document.		A	
1271.	WG 42-010	1269	TH	3		158	As long as his document does not specify ADs, ADFs, ADLs, viewpoints and models kinds, it is better to do not have entries in Clause 3 for AD specification, ADF specification, ADL specification, viewpoint specification and model kind specification.	Decision made on the 28th of July: as long as AD specification, ADF specification, ADL specification, viewpoint specification and model kind specification are not concepts of this document, it is better to refer to these specifications with specification of AD, specification of ADF, specification of ADL, specification of architecture viewpoint and specification of model kind.	A	
1272.	WG 42-011	1270	TL	3		163	Access to the IEEE Standards Dictionary Online now requires a free IEEE account. It does not require IEEE membership or any subscription fee. Yes, that is the correct link.	Add a note to say that.	A	
1273.	WG 42-012	1271	TE	3		271	According to the current definition every single symbol in a view is a separate view component. That was not the original intent of this term. A view component is a "separable" portion of a view that can be	"separable portion of one or more architecture views that is governed by a model kind or some other viewing convention."	A	

1 **MB** = Member body / **NC** = National Committee (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by **)

2 **Type of comment:** **GT** = General Technical

TH = Technical high

TL = Technical Low

GE = General Editorial

E = Editorial

3 **Resolution code:** **OBE** = Superseded

AIP = Agreed in principle

A = Agreed R = Rejected

NA = Non actionable

Disposition of Comments

Date:
30/09/2020Document:
ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 7 N 8181
(42010. CD1-v1.0)Project:
ISO/IEC/IEEE CD1 42010 (Ed2) Architecture
description

1.

2.

1274.

1275.

1276.

MB/ NC ¹	Cmt No	Type of Cmt ²	Clause/ Subcl.	Para/ Fig/ Tab/	Line No	Comments and rationale	Proposed change	Res code ³	Resolution on each comment received
						governed by a model kinds or some other convention used in the view.			
WG 42- 013	1272	TH	5.2.6		454	This statement is not consistent with line 827	Update the document to state that: An architecture viewpoint governs one or more architecture views.	A	
WG 42- 014	1273					Remark coming for JTC1/AG8 after presentation of the Draft: "a Viewpoint can be considered as a contract"	Add a note to reflect this possibility.	A	
WG 42- 015	1274					The viewpoint specifies <i>which</i> model kinds are to be used when constructing views. The model kind specifies the <i>contents of</i> view components of that kind. So there should be no conflict if the architect follows the rules: the viewpoint specifies relations <i>among</i> view components; the model kind specifies conventions <i>within</i> view components. If there were a conflict, architect could not use the off-the-shelf specs of that VP and MK, but would need to deconflict with explicit changes (to VP or MK) by inclusion or reference.		A	Update of the Clause "8.1 Specification of an architecture viewpoint", Clause "8.2 Specification of a model kind"

1 MB = Member body / NC = National Committee (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by **)

2 Type of comment: GT = General Technical

TH = Technical high

TL = Technical Low

GE = General Editorial

E = Editorial

3 Resolution code: OBE = Superseded

AIP = Agreed in principle

A = Agreed R = Rejected

NA = Non actionable