Comments to

### Cameron Shorter: Cross-domain management of glossaries (Version 1.1; 23 August, 2020)

The paper presents two goals

1. Create best practices in cross-domain glossary management, for adoption by the technical writing community.
2. Build a community who define and manage geospatial terms across multiple geospatial communities.

**The first goal**
ignores the fact that such 'cross-domain glossary management' is already in function, namely in terms of **The Basel Register of Thesauri, Ontologies & Classifications (BARTOC)**:

BARTOC is a database of Knowledge Organization Systems and KOS related Registries, developed by the Basel University Library, Switzerland. Its main goal is to list as many Knowledge Organization Systems as possible at one place in order to achieve greater visibility, highlight their features, make them searchable and comparable, and foster knowledge sharing. BARTOC includes any kind of KOS from any subject area, in any language, any publication format, and any form of accessibility. BARTOC’s search interface is available in 20 European languages and provides two search options: Basic Search by keywords, and Advanced Search by taxonomy terms. A circle of editors has gathered around BARTOC from all across Europe (http://bartoc.org/en/contact) and BARTOC has been approved by the International Society for Knowledge Organization (ISKO) (http://www.isko.org/). (Source: https://bartoc.org/en/content/about)

A related service is provided by **BARTOC FAST**
FAST v1.0.3 is a federated asynchronous search tool which uses GraphQL to conduct asyncronous federated searches accessing 23 remote resources comprising a vast number of vocabularies. This service is also being developed by the Basel University Library.
It provides access to among others Finto, a Finnish thesaurus and ontology service, which includes reference to **PTO - Finnish Geospatial Domain Ontology**

References to other geospatial glossaries or vocabularies, e.g. Geolexica, were not found.

In my view, the proposed goal should focus instead on

* providing information on cross-domain glossary management to the geospatial domain, including
* fostering representatives to join the above-mentioned existing circle of editors, and
* further the cooperation among the BARTOC community and the geospatial community

**The second goal:**
To build a (new?) community, who define and manage geospatial terms ..
could reflect more precisely the input already got, namely

How does one know if an OGC standard is defining a term or not? There is a terms and definitions section. According to recent OAB guidance, these should be normative T&Ds for that particular standard. That is all well and good but - unfortunately - terms do get defined in the body of the standard including in informative clauses. (Carl Reed, 18 Aug 2020)

make sure we start off with linking specification writing processes into terminology management - both as a consumer and producer. (Rob Atkinson , Aug 16, 2020)

based on how we manage term entries (terms & defs) in tc211 i dont really believe that it is the task of the lexicon group or the lexicon group manager to actually update the content of the terms. (Reese Plews, 31-07-2020)

In fact, ISO and OGC standards are main sources for definition of technical terms, precisely because of the normative terms and definition sections. Moreover, both organizations are deeply engaged in the process of presenting terms and definitions in a consolidated and user-accessible way, in terms of ISO TC211's [Geolexica](https://isotc211.geolexica.org/) and [OGC Definition Service](https://www.ogc.org/def-server) (here represented through <https://www.opengis.net/def/CaLAThe/4.0/> which reflects the [OGC Land and Infrastructure Conceptual Model Standard (LandInfra)](https://www.ogc.org/standards/infragml) ).
As mentioned, it is a challenge to link the specification writing process into terminology management. It is proposed here, that ISO and OGC uses '[systematic reviews](https://www.iso.org/files/live/sites/isoorg/files/store/en/PUB100413.pdf)' as an occasion to check the definitions in the standard being reviewed and the inclusion of these terms and definitions into the mentioned vocabularies.
The proposed community could well be a supporting '3rd party' in such process, but the basic precondition is that *ISO and OGC establishes a mandatory review of terms and definitions as part the review process*. The [ISO Guidance on the Systematic Review process](https://www.iso.org/files/live/sites/isoorg/files/store/en/PUB100413.pdf) of 2019 seems not to address this issue.

In my view, the proposed effort for improving availability and use of geospatial terms and glossaries should

* acknowledge ISO and OGC for their efforts in consolidating and making available geospatial terms and definitions
* suggest that the ISO and the OGC establishes a mandatory review of terms and definitions as part the systematic standard review process
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