



ISO/IEC JTC1/SC7
Software Engineering
Secretariat: CANADA (SCC)

ISO/IEC JTC1/SC7 N2502

2001-06-15

Doc. Type	Comment Disposition Report
Title	Comment Disposition Report on PDTR 14143-3.4: Software Engineering - Functional size measurement - Part 3: Verification of functional size measurement methods.
Source	JTC1/SC7/WG12 Editors
Project	07.31.03
Status	Final
References	N2483
Action ID	FYI or ACT
Due Date	
Mailing Date	2001-06-15
Distribution	SC7_AG; P, O & L Members
Medium	Encoded Acrobat
No. Of Pages	21
Note	

**Comments disposition report for Letter Ballot Summary (7N2483) of PDTR 14143-3.4
Software Engineering - Functional size measurement - Part 3: Verification of functional size
measurement methods (7N2433)**

Table of disposition of comments, by country

Australia	3
Czech Republic	11
Germany	13
Japan	15
United States	20

Australia

The Australian National Body would like to thank the Project Editors and all contributors to Project 07.31.03 for their efforts in creating this document.

Australia votes to approve this document with comments.

TECHNICAL COMMENTS

AUS-TH001

Clause 3

Comment:

Part 3 of the Directives require that the Terms and definitions clause is prefaced with a lead sentence.

Recommendation:

Add a lead sentence as follows:

“For the purposes of this Technical Report, the terms and definitions of ISO/IEC 14143-1:1998 and the following apply.”

Disposition:

Accepted

AUS-TH002

Clause 4

Comment:

There are some numbering anomalies in clause 4. This means that the references in sub-cause 4.1 and figure 1 are incorrect.

Recommendation:

Correct the numbering in clause 4.

Disposition:

Accepted.

The second 4.1.2. will be renumbered 4.1.4

4.4 will be renumbered 4.3.5. This will allow the following subclauses to be renumbered 4.4 and 4.5 (with 4.5.1, 4.5.2 and 4.5.3). This renumbering will mean that the subclauses match the numbering in figure 1.

AUS-TH003

Subclauses 4.1.3, 4.1.5, 4.1.8 and A.2.3 a)

Comment:

According to Part 3 of the Directives, “clause” and “subclause” should not be used when referring to subclauses.

Recommendation:

Correct the references.

Disposition:

Accepted

EDITORIAL COMMENTS**AUS-E001**

whole document

Comment:

A number of notes and examples are not labeled and numbered correctly.

Recommendation:

Correct labeling and numbering of notes and examples.

Disposition:

Accepted

AUS-E002

Subclause 3.8, second last list item

Comment:

“same conditions” is not an example of “same conditions”.

Recommendation:

Either reword to something like “environmental conditions”, or remove.

Disposition:

Accepted - will use ‘environmental’

AUS-E003

Subclause 3.8, last list item

Comment:

What does “consultation of measurers allowed and re-consultation allowed” mean?

Recommendation:

Either remove or reword to clarify.

Disposition:

Accepted: will be deleted

AUS-E004

Subclause 3.9, examples

Comment:

“different FURS than in the previous measurements” is not a suitable example, as the object is to reproduce the same results with the same FURS.

Recommendation:

Remove.

Disposition:

Accepted

AUS-E005

Subclause 4.1.7 b)

Comment:

The punctuation used is incorrect.

Recommendation:

Remove comma after “owner”, and insert commas after “and” and “appropriate”.

Disposition:

Accepted

AUS-E006

Subclauses 4.2.2 and 4.3.1.1

Comment:

These lists do not conform to Directives Part 3, subclause 5.2.5

Recommendation:

Add a colon to the end of the introductory proposition.

Disposition:

Accepted

AUS-E007

Subclause 4.3.1

Comment:

The subclause refers to the preparation of materials for the verification. Therefore, “preparation” is a more appropriate title.

Recommendation:

Change the title from “overview” to “preparation”.

Disposition:

Accepted

AUS-E008

Subclause 4.3.4, example, last sentence

Comment:

“required” does not seem appropriate.

Recommendation:

Replace “required” with “perceived”.

Disposition:

Rejected: ‘perceived’ is very subjective. The intent of this sentence is to reflect the requirements of accuracy from the verification sponsor. Will reword the sentence as:

“This would not be a very useful result if the verification sponsor required a measurement accuracy of 90%.”

AUS-E009

Subclause 4.3.4, last sentence

Comment:

Annex A prescribes requirements, it does not present them.

Recommendation:

Change second instance of “presented” to “prescribed”.

Disposition:

Accepted

AUS-E010**Clause 4.4****Comment:**

The list items do not all follow on from the lead sentence – they are not all objects that can be “described”.

Recommendation:

In the lead sentence, remove everything after “shall”; commence item a) with “describe”; on item b), replace “detailed description of” with “describe in detail”; in item c) replace “a list that uniquely identifies” with “uniquely identify”; commence items d) and e) with “include”, commence item g) with “describe”; and in item h) replace “how the inputs are” with “describe how the inputs are to be”.

Disposition:

Accepted

AUS-E011**Subclause 4.6.2 f) and g)****Comment:**

The example in Annex C has only one section for these two items.

Recommendation:

Either combine here, or include examples of both in Annex C.

Disposition:

Accepted. f) will be removed

AUS-E012**Subclause 4.6.3 c) and d)****Comment:**

The example in Annex C does not contain the “results” as required here.

Recommendation:

Either change the example in Annex C or reword the requirements.

Disposition:

Accepted. Example will be changed

AUS-E013**Subclause 4.6.3 e****Comment:**

This requirement does not appear in the example in Annex C.

Recommendation:

Either remove the requirement or include an example in Annex C.

Disposition:

Accepted, will insert the following:

“Lead Evaluator:

John Acme ph: 123 456 789
 fx: 987 654 321
 email: John@acme.com.xyz

Assistant Evaluators:

Jane Acme ph: 123 456 789
 fx: 987 654 321
 email: Jane@acme.com.xyz

Janet Acme ph: 123 456 789
 fx: 987 654 321
 email: Janet@acme.com.xyz”

AUS-E014

Subclause A.2.1, second example, item 1)

Comment:

“certified on Method A” is not correct.

Recommendation:

Change “on” to “to”, or something more appropriate.

Disposition:

Accepted – ‘to’ selected

AUS-E015

Subclause A.2.2.2 b)

Comment:

Theories do not explain FSM Methods, but the behavior of such.

Recommendation:

Insert “behavior of the” before “FSM Method”.

Disposition:

Accepted

AUS-E016

Subclause A.2.3 d)

Comment:

Elsewhere, the “other measurement method” is referred to as the “second FSM Method”.

Recommendation:

Be consistent.

Disposition:

Accepted

AUS-E017

Subclause A.2.4, first example

Comment:

Some sentence does not seem to convey the intended meaning.

Recommendation:

Replace “largest” with “smallest” and “provided” with “produced”.

Disposition:

Accepted

AUS-E018

Subclause B.1.1, first note

Comment:

The sentence is difficult to read.

Recommendation:

Replace “generally accepted number of observations in a sample to obtain” with “generally accepted minimum sample size necessary to obtain”.

Disposition:

Accepted. It needs to be clearer, and will replace text with: “generally accepted sample size necessary to obtain”

AUS-E019

Subclause B.2.1 a)

Comment:

The sentence is confusing.

Recommendation:

Replace “its functional size” with “the functional size of the set of FURs”.

Disposition:

Accepted

AUS-E020

Subclause B.2.1 b)

Comment:

The sentence is difficult to read.

Recommendation:

Replace “measure independently the same specific set” with “independently measure the same set”.

Disposition:

Accepted

AUS-E021

Subclause B.3

Comment:

This clause should be the last in Annex B, to match the order in Annex A.

Recommendation:

Move clause to end of Annex B.

Disposition:

Accepted

AUS-E022

Subclause B.3, note 2

Comment:

The sentence is difficult to understand.

Recommendation:

Replace “BFC Type, and that BFC Type is critical for the functional sizing of software from that Domain given the required accuracy,” with “BFC Type and, given the required accuracy, that BFC Type is critical for the functional sizing of software in that Functional Domain,”

Disposition:

Accepted

AUS-E023

Subclause B.5 f-1)

Comment:

“regognises” is spelt incorrectly.

Recommendation:

Correct spelling.

Disposition:

Accepted

AUS-E024

Subclause B.5 h)

Comment:

The sentence does not seem to convey the intended meaning.

Recommendation:

Change “recognizes” to “produces”, and “a functional size” to “the functional size”.

Disposition:

Accepted

AUS-E025

Clause C.2 – report title and method identification

Comment:

Further in Annex C it is indicated that there is a “Method A Version 10”. Therefore, “Method A” cannot be an FSM Method as it is not uniquely identified.

Recommendation:

Change references to “Method A” to references to “Method A Version 11”, or something similar.

Disposition:

Accepted

AUS-E026

Clause C.8

Comment:

Clause title is incorrect.

Recommendation:

Change title to “Analysis of the test results”.

Disposition:

Accepted

Czech Republic

Technical:

CZE-01-TL: In the end of foreword the data 1998 is the data of the issue of Part 1 of 14143. The Parts 2, 3, 4, 5 are not published yet. The appropriate correction with indication what is the current standard and what is to be published is necessary.

Disposition

Rejected. The foreword is informative and simply provides a list of the various parts of the standard. It is neither appropriate, nor desirable, to identify the parts by date or version – any version is a part of this standard, whether historical or current. The Normative References lists those documents that are essential for the implementation of this part of ISO/IEC 14143, and the specific versions are identified by date where applicable.

CZE-02-TL: The description of the relation between the owner of the FSM method and verification team in the clause 4.1.10 is not clear.

Disposition:

Rejected. The sentence was reviewed and discussed but no modifications were found to be necessary.

CZE-03-TL: We recommend to delete the first row “a) part 3,4, and 5 of ISO/IE 14143” in the clause 4.3.1.1. It is not input for the verification.

Disposition:

Rejected: these documents are necessary for conducting verification and therefore should be considered as input to the verification procedures.

Editorial:

CZE-04-E: In the part 3 the first sentence should be added: “For the purpose of this part of ISO/IEC 14143, the definitions from 14143 – 1 and the following definitions apply.”

Disposition:

Accepted. However, wording used is that suggested by AUS-TH001.

CZE-05-E: We recommend correcting the parts a), b), c), and d) in 4.1.3 as follows:

- a) Constitute the verification team (A verification team is constituted based on identified competencies – Refer clause 4.2)
- b) Assemble the verification input (The verification inputs are identified ...)
- c) ...

Disposition:

Accepted

CZE-06-E: We recommend to add the detail explanation of the points b), c), ... , i) of the clause 4.6.2 in the form as the detail explanation of the point a) of 4.6.2 is given in the clause 4.6.3.

Disposition:

Rejected. Requirements exist for the executive summary to contain specific elements, and these are stated in clause 4.6.3. The content and format of the remaining sections of the report is left to the professional discretion of the verification team. Annex C provides an example of what some of these sections may look like, but there is no added value in mandating the elements of each section in detail.

CZE-07-E: We recommend to transfer both normative annexes A and B of the draft to the main text of the standard.

Disposition:

Rejected - The content of both Annexes A and B have been structured as Annexes, and integrated within the general content and context of this document. There is no specific reason to change the current structure of this document. The main text describes the overall process and the mandatory aspects of that process. It is applicable to all verification processes.

Annex A lists the mandatory elements of requests for each type of test. The applicability of clauses in Annex A is dependent on the specific tests requested.

Annex B presents the mandatory requirements for a number of tests that may be used for verification. There is no requirement to use any of the test methods specified in Annex B.

CZE-08-E: We recommend to denote all examples in Annex A and Annex B as a Notes in the text.

Disposition:

Rejected – See disposition of CZE-07

Germany

Germany votes NO with comments:

The German reviewing team would like to thank all contributors to PDTR 14143-3.4:2001 for their efforts in creating this innovative document. However, the following comments should be addressed:

DEU-TH01: Page 9, B2.1

Comment: The method suggested for accuracy assessment does not measure accuracy as defined in 3.2 and 3.3. Experts of Method A at best identify the true value for Method A but not necessarily the true value defined in 3.2 and 3.3. The suggested method appears to be measuring reproducibility.

Suggestion: replace B2.1.a with: "Domain experts (not associated with a specific FSM Method) should agree on the relative size of 2 or more sets of FUR."

Disposition: Rejected

The test for reproducibility will produce information with respect to a range of values, not with respect to a specific reference value.

The proposed test in B2.1 is designed to ensure that such a reference value is determined and then the other values are measured and compared against it.

It should be noted also that an accuracy test is conducted only for a single measurement method at any one time. It is not conducted across multiple measurement methods, which could have some significant differences of design.

While the proposal of 'Domain experts (not associated with the method)' is interesting in theory, this concept within the domain of functional size measurement is still at the research stage, and researchers are trying to determine how to implement such a concept and related techniques. The concept has not been fully tested and no consensus has yet been reached in the scientific community on this issue. The concept is not ready to be integrated into a standard type of document.

DEU-TH02: Page 2, 3.8 and 3.9

Comment: The difference between repeatability and reproducibility is not clear. If robustness is meant by reproducibility then it should be pointed out.

Suggestion: clarify.

Disposition : Rejected

The definitions presented are the standard definitions from the measurement field (ISO basic and general terms in metrology'). Readers requiring further information should refer to the document specifically referenced in the Normative references clause.

DEU-TH03 Page 14, Annex C

Comment: In its present form the example in Annex C is only of limited value since it does not provide an example for the most salient parts of the Verification Report namely sections Results, Analysis and Evaluation.

Suggestion: Provide examples for Results, Analysis and Evaluation for the sample Verification Report.

Disposition: Rejected

If a National Body was to provide an example of the use of document, their results could maybe be introduced in the document. It is not an ISO requirement, nor current ISO practice, to include complete examples of the use of the document. The sections of the report included in the example provide an example of how to meet specific requirements for the executive summary, and some additional guidance for other sections. With the exception of the executive summary, the format and content of each section is left to professional discretion of the verification team.

DEU-TL01: Page 2, 3.8

Comment: The first example of repeatability suggesting to have the same measurers repeating their count at a different time is a questionable. A more acceptable condition would be the same type of measurer.

The second example would be more appropriate and should start with “same” for each bullet point.

Suggestion: replace: “same measurers” with “same type of measurers”,

Disposition: Rejected

Then it would be clearly a situation with different conditions of measurements. This would mean that reproducibility is being tested. In various domains, it is quite acceptable to have the same measurers repeat the measurements to test reproducibility.

DEU-ED01: Page 4, Figure 1

Comment: Since “ plan verification “ is section 4.4 (and not 4.35 as shown in Figure 1) all further references of Figure 1 are incorrect.

Suggestion: Correct references in Figure 1

Disposition: Accepted in part – changes will be made to the numbering of the sub clauses. Refer AUS-TH002

DEU-ED02: Throughout the document

Comment: The abbreviation FURs is used when it should be FUR (Functional User Requirements).

Suggestion: Replace FURs with FUR.

Disposition: Accepted

DEU-ED03: page 14, line 1

Comment: The reference method is Method B (not Method A)

Suggestion: replace “Method A” with “Method B”.

Disposition: Accepted

Japan

Vote:

- APPROVAL OF THE DRAFT AS PRESENTED
- APPROVAL OF THE DRAFT WITH COMMENTS AS GIVEN ON THE ATTACHED
 - general:
 - technical:
 - editorial:
- DISAPPROVAL OF THE DRAFT FOR REASONS ON THE ATTACHED
- Acceptance of these reasons and appropriate changes in the text will change our vote to approval
- ABSTENTION (FOR THE REASONS BELOW):

JPN-TH001

Section Name

Annex B
 B.2.0.1 Verification method with respect to a theory as a reference
 Page 10, Paragraph 1, Line 2

The verification team shall

Comment

This sections is not applied if a user of this document doesn't use verification method with respect to a theory as a reference. Moreover it is not clear whether the user must apply both section B.2.1 and section B.2.0.1 or either of section B.2.1 or section B.2.0.1.

Recommended change

Change "The verification team shall" to "To conduct verification for the accuracy of the verification method with respect to a theory as a reference, the verification team shall"

Disposition

Accepted

JPN-TL002

Section Name

4.6.1 Non-title
 Page 6, Paragraph 1, Line 1
 The **verification procedure** shall include...

Comment

Previous disposition of comments JPN-E013 is not clear. In this sentence the subject is the verification, because a verification report is a component of the verification. In section 4.1.3 d), section 4.6 is one of the activities in verification.

Recommended change

Change "verification procedure" to "verification".

Disposition:

Accepted. Will also remove "The" from start of sentence to remain consistent with sub clause 4.5.

JPN-TL003

Section Name

Annex B
 B.5 Verification methods for discrimination threshold of an FSM Method
 Page 10 and Page 11
f), g) and h)

Comment

It is not clear whether we deal with the case which the minimum threshold, the maximum threshold or intermediate thresholds can't be determined.

Recommended change

Describe the above case in Notes explicitly.

Disposition:

Accepted. Item h) will be deleted

JPN-E004**Section Name**

1. Scope

Page 1, Paragraph 1, Line 4-8

Annex A A.2

Annex B

Comment

The order of the description of performance properties is different in Scope, Annex A.2 and Annex B. For example “applicability to Functional Domain” is a last item or section in Scope and Annex A.2, but it is not a last section in Annex B. If the appearance order of performance properties is same, it is easy to read this document.

Recommended change

Change the title number and section as follows:

- a) Title number of “Verification method for applicability (of an FSM Method) to Functional Domains” should be changed to B5.
- b) Title number of “Verification method for convertibility of an FSM Method” should be changed to B3.
- c) Title number of “Verification method for discrimination threshold of an FSM Method” should be changed to B4

Disposition:

Accepted

JPN-E005**Section Name**

3.3 accuracy of an FSM Method

Page 2

the ability of an **FSM** to give responses close to **a true value**

Comment

This definition is for FSM Method. Moreover in accordance with the definition 3.2 “a true size” is more desirable than “a true value”.

Recommended change

Change the definition to “the ability of an FSM Method to give responses close to a true size”

Disposition:

In both 3.2 the expression ‘true size of the object being measured’, and in 3.3 the expression ‘true value’, will both be replaced by ‘true value of the functional size of the object being measured’

JPN-E006**Section Name**

4.1.2 Non-title

Page 3

Title number

Comment

The clause number is mistaken.

Recommended change

Change "4.1.2" to "4.1.4".

Disposition:

Accepted

JPN-E007**Section Name**

4.1.3 Verification shall consist of the following activities:

Page 3

- c) verification is conducted (Refer clause **4.4**: Conduct the verification);
- d) a verification report is produced (Refer clause **4.5**: Compile the verification output)

Comment

The referred clause number is mistaken.

Recommended change

Change "(Refer clause 4.4: Conduct the verification)" to "(Refer clause 4.5: Conduct the verification)". Change "(Refer clause 4.5: Compile the verification output)" to "(Refer clause 4.6: Compile the verification output)".

Disposition:

Accepted – refer AUS-TH002

JPN-E008

Section Name

Figure 1

Page 4, Box 4.3.3, **participants**

Verification sponsor and verification team

Comment

In the context 4.3.3, participants should be composed of verification sponsor, verification team and owner of the method. This structure is similar to participants in Box 4.3.3

Recommended change

Verification sponsor, verification team and owner of the method

Disposition:

Accepted

JPN-E009

Section Name

Figure 1

Page4, **Box No. 4.3.5, 4.4-a, 4.4-b, 4.4-c, 4.4-d and 4.5.1, and activities 4.5 and 4.6**

Comment

'Section No' is mistaken. In Figure1 it should be changed in accordance with the 'Section No'.

Recommended change

Change Box No. 4.3.5 to 4.4, No. 4.4-a to 4.5-a, No. 4.4-b to 4.5-b, No. 4.4-c to 4.5-c, No. 4.4-d to 4.5-d and No. 4.5.1 to 4.6.1. Change 4.4 in activities to 4.5 and 4.5 in activities to 4.6 too.

Disposition:

See disposition of JPN-E007 and AUS-TH002

JPN-E010

Section Name

All titles and sections of Annex A, B and C

Page 7-14.

Comment

Title number and section number are not printed correctly.

Recommended change

Change font and style correctly.

Disposition:

Accepted. The error was due to conversion to a PDF file.

JPN-E011

Section Name

A2.2.1 Statement of accuracy by reference to an external criterion

Page7, b) the conditions under which the correlation between the results of the FSM Method and **the external criterion** can be, or ...

Comment

Correlation between values should be calculated. See A2.2.1 c)

Recommended change

b) the conditions under which the correlation between the results of the FSM Method and the values of the external criterion can be, or ...

Disposition:

Accepted

JPN-E012**Section Name**

A.2.4 Test relating to discrimination threshold of an FSM

Page 8, Paragraph 1

b) the verification method to be used for the verification test

Comment

This statement is a repeated requirement with A1 d) “state the verification method to be used for the verification test”.

Recommended change

Delete the sentence.

Disposition:

Accepted

JPN-E013**Section Name**

B.2.0.1 Verification method with respect to a theory as a reference

Title number**Comment**

Title number is not correct.

Recommended change

Change B2.0.1 to B2.2.

Disposition:

Accepted

JPN-E014**Section Name**

B.5 Verification methods for discrimination threshold of an FSM Method

Page 10, Paragraph 1, **f**)

Comment

The statement is duplicate.

Recommended change

Modify f) in B5 as follows.

f) determine the minimum threshold by

f-1) identifying the smallest change in the FURs for which the FSM Method recognises a change in the value of the functional size, or

f-2) moving upwards from zero, identify the largest change in the FURs before which the FSM Method recognises a change in value of the functional size.

Disposition:

Accepted

JPN-E015**Section Name**

B5. Verification methods for discrimination threshold of an FSM Method
Page 11, Paragraph 1, g)

Comment

The statement is duplicate.

Recommended change

Modify g) in B5 as follows.

g) determine the maximum threshold by

g-1) identifying the largest change in the FURs for which the FSM Method recognises a change in the value of the functional size, or

g-2) moving downwards from infinity, identify the smallest change in the FURs before which the FSM Method recognises a change in value of the functional size.

Disposition:

Accepted

United States

As the "responsible TAG" for the subject matter of the subject document, the US TAG for JTC1/SC7 (the "SC7 TAG") has reviewed the document, and recommends that the US National Body vote on the SC7 Letter Ballot should be DISAPPROVE with Comments as given in the Attachment <US_onN2433> to this E-Mail.

This recommendation is based on action by the SC7 TAG as follows: The subject document was reviewed by a group of SC7 TAG experts at their meetings on 18-19 April 2001, and a proposed USNB response was developed. That proposed response was presented to the SC7 TAG at its meeting on 20 April and was approved by all members present there. The proposed US position was then submitted to the entire SC7 TAG for a default ballot. There were no objections raised on that SC7 TAG ballot.

USA-001 (G) The USNB commends the Project Editor, and the individuals who assisted him, on the publication of this draft.

Disposition:
None

USA-002 (TH) Overall Document
Comment: The USNB continues to strongly disagree with the testing of statements not made by an FSM Method. It serves no point to test a method for something it does not do, nor claims to do. The USNB understands the Editor's concern that current software size methods in the marketplace do not state such performance properties as are described in this Technical Report. However, these methods are not FSMs; it is our view that, as these methods evolve towards ISO conformance, they will include statements of such performance properties that are relevant to them. The USNB believes that this position is reinforced by the multiple references in the Introduction to testing statements made by a method.

RS: Remove references to testing performance properties not made by an FSM Method.

Disposition:
Rejected. The lack of a claim within a method does not mean that it does not exhibit a particular performance property, although it may mean that the method has not been tested for that property. eg. All measurement methods will be accurate to some extent.

In addition, there are currently three organizations which have been recognized as PAS submitters, and each one plans to submit to ISO their Functional Size Measurement method. Currently one of these PAS submitters has already submitted its measurement method for a PAS vote, and the other two are expected to do so soon. Furthermore, another method was accepted at SC7 in 2000 as a New Work Item. Each of these four methods are being submitted as being conformant to ISO 14143-1, and could therefore be considered as FSM Methods. However, none of these methods actually make a statement about measurement performance properties, even though this is valuable information for the users of the results of FSM. It is therefore appropriate in this Part of ISO 14143 to make reference to testing performance properties not made by an FSM.

USA-003 (E) Overall Document
Comment: Formatting, fonts, spacing, placement of paragraphs and notes is inconsistent and problematic throughout the document

RS: Reformat the document per the ISO/IEC JTC1 Part 3 (directives for formatting)

Disposition:
Accepted

USA-004 (TL) Scope, Note 2

Comment: It is understood that notes should assist in the understandability of normative clauses, however, this note (particularly the verbage following the bulleted points) creates confusion. It is unclear what these sentences are intended to convey.

RS: Either reword the note to remove obscurity in wording, or remove the note entirely.

Disposition:

Accepted. The third sentence of the paragraph following the note will be deleted.

USA-005 (TH) 2 Normative References

Comment: It is not apparent why the term "Functional Domain" is used throughout the document when the normative reference cited is TR 12182: Categorization of Software, rather than 14143-5: Determination of Functional Domain. The term "Functional Domain" is referenced at least 35 times in this document

RS: Replace the normative reference 12182 with 14143-5

Disposition:

Accepted.

USA-006 (TL) 3.1 verification method

Comment: Currently the text reads: "a method which tests an FSM Method by examination and provision of objective evidence that sponsor's specified requirements on performance properties have been fulfilled" which doesn't appear to be grammatically correct.

RS: Reword to: "a method that tests the claim(s) made by an FSM Method and provides objective evidence to the extent to which the claim(s) are met"

Disposition:

Rejected: verification method can be used to test performance properties whether or not statements or claims have been made on a performance properties. Such methods are applicable independently of claims. Such methods can be used by any users of a method interested in knowing something about a performance property of a measurement method. In order to improve grammar, the definition will be reworded to:

"a method that tests an FSM Method, and provides objective evidence of the extent to which a particular performance property is exhibited"

USA-007 (TH) 3.8 repeatability of results of an FSM Method

Comment: same conditions of measurement: examples cited need to indicate whether these are exclusive requirements (i.e., each example is stand alone and should be separated by an "or") or inclusive (i.e., the examples should be joined by "and"). In other words, do same conditions of measurement mean: the same set of FURs AND same documentation for each set of FURs AND same measurers ? It is very unclear.

RS: Define the term "same conditions of measurement" explicitly with its own definition. This is almost identical to the term "Context of Use" defined in the draft 9126-4 Quality of Use Metrics

Disposition:

Accepted. The format to describe it will be the same format as in the 'ISO International vocabulary of basic and general terms in metrology'.

USA-008 (TH) 3.9 reproducibility of results of an FSM Method

Comment: This clause cites examples of changed conditions of measurement -- what constitutes changed conditions (see also USA-007)? This needs to be unambiguous and repeatable

RS: Add a definition for "Changed conditions of measurement" to section 3.

Disposition:

Accepted. The format to describe it will be the same format as in the 'ISO International vocabulary of basic and general terms in metrology'.

USA-009 (TL) 3.10 verification sponsor

Comment: Throughout the document, there are references to sponsor and verification sponsor that appear to be interchangeable. Ensure that the same term is used throughout if the definition is intended to be the same.

RS: Make document and all occurrences consistent or add another term in the definitions section

Disposition:

Accepted – to be standardized to ‘verification sponsor’.

USA-010 (E) 4.1.7

Comment: Term "owner" should be "owner of the FSM Method" in all cases

RS: Change all occurrences of "owner" in the document to the term "owner of the FSM Method"

Disposition:

Accepted in part. Where the concept of the “owner of the FSM Method” has already been introduced in a sentence, the word “owner” will be used for additional references.

END OF DOCUMENT