enosema

Standard

EFS 2522:2026

Terminology management — Concept entry quality: Guidelines, requirements and scoring

First edition

Reference number
EFS 2522:2026

© EFS 2026

(c) 2026 Enosema Foundation.

This document is made available under the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International (CC BY 4.0) license. Unless otherwise specified, or required in the context of its implementation, you are free to use, share, and adapt this document, provided that appropriate credit is given to the Enosema Foundation and that any changes are indicated. The full license text is available at https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/.

Enosema Foundation
2885 Sanford Ave Sw Suite 32361
Grandville MI 49418-1342
USA

E-mail: info@enosema.org

Published in the USA

© EFS 2026 – All rights reserved

Contents

Page

Foreword ..... **v**

Introduction ..... **vi**

1 Scope **1**

2 Normative references **1**

3 Terms, definitions and abbreviated terms **2**
3.1 Terms and definitions 2
3.2 Abbreviated terms 3

4 Anatomy of a concept entry **3**
4.1 General 3
4.2 Element inventory 3
4.3 Mapping to record format and to ISO practice 4
4.4 The unit of judgement 4
4.5 Record mapping — verbatim example 4
4.6 Element obligations and profiles 5

5 Corpus evidence **5**
5.1 Methodology 5
5.2 Definition statistics 6
5.3 Structural discipline 6
5.4 Entry completeness 6
5.5 Designations and status 6
5.6 What the corpus teaches 7
5.7 Document-era profile 7
5.8 Top-concentration documents 7
5.9 The IEV corpus 8
5.10 The two localization models 8

6 Designation quality (Group D) **9**
6.1 General 9
6.2 Rules 9
6.3 Requirement group D 9
6.4 Scoring criteria 10

7 Definition quality (Group N) **10**
7.1 General 10
7.2 Rules 10
7.3 Requirement group N 11
7.4 Scoring criteria 12
7.5 Worked checks 12
7.6 Anti-pattern fixes, worked 12

8 Completeness (Group C) **13**
8.1 General 13
8.2 Rules 13
8.3 Requirement group C 14
8.4 Scoring criteria 14

9 Clarity and language (Group K) **15**
9.1 General 15
9.2 Rules 15
9.3 Requirement group K 16
9.4 Scoring criteria 16

10 Consistency (Group S) **16**
10.1 General 16
10.2 Rules 17

© EFS 2026 – All rights reserved

10.3 Requirement group S ... 17
10.4 Scoring criteria ... 17

11 Scoring model ... 18
11.1 General ... 18
11.2 Criterion inventory ... 18
11.3 Dimension weights ... 19
11.4 Scoring scale ... 19
11.5 Score computation ... 19
11.6 Mandatory-fix flags ... 20
11.7 Grade bands ... 20
11.8 Worked example of computation ... 20

12 Review process ... 20
12.1 Roles ... 20
12.2 When scoring happens ... 21
12.3 The review workflow ... 21
12.4 Disagreement and calibration ... 21
12.5 Score sheets as records ... 21
12.6 Calibration worked example ... 21

Annex A (normative) **Term entry reviewer checklist ... 23**

Annex B (normative) **Scoring rubric cards ... 26**

Annex C (normative) **Corpus statistics ... 29**

Annex D (normative) **Scored exemplars ... 32**

Annex E (normative) **Anti-pattern catalogue ... 36**

Bibliography ... 38

© EFS 2026 – All rights reserved

Foreword

The Enosema Foundation (“ES”) is the premier non-profit standardization organization for terminology standardization and terminology related processes such as management. It facilitates the education, standardization, research, promotion, definition, and usage of terminology resources and management practices globally.

ES works with international partners and experts across the globe, reflecting the international nature of its mission. More information about ES is available on the official website (https://www.enosema.org).

The procedures used to develop this document and those intended for its further maintenance are described in the ES Directives.

In particular, the different approval criteria needed for the different types of ES documents should be noted. This document was drafted in accordance with the editorial rules of the ES Directives.

Attention is drawn to the possibility that some of the elements of this document may be the subject of patent rights. ES shall not be held responsible for identifying any or all such patent rights. Details of any patent rights identified during the development of the document will be provided in the Introduction.

Any trade name used in this document is information given for the convenience of users and does not constitute an endorsement.

This document was prepared by Technical Committee **Terminology**.

© EFS 2026 – All rights reserved

Introduction

0.1 The question this document answers

Terminologists, standards editors and term reviewers regularly encounter a proposed entry that appears defective although no rule that anyone can cite marks it as defective. The established standards answer parts of the question that such a review raises: ISO 704 gives the theory of concepts and definitions, ISO 10241-1 gives the entry structure for standards, and the ISO/IEC Directives, Part 2, give the drafting rules that ISO and IEC documents apply. None of them provides the reviewer with a scoring instrument.

This document does. It defines what quality means for a concept entry — its designation, its definition, its completeness, its clarity, and its consistency with the rest of the termbase — as grouped requirements with stable identifiers, and it attaches to them a scoring model that a term convenor or reviewer can apply consistently.

0.2 Where the rules come from

The requirements and scoring criteria in this document are synthesized from three sources, and each rule is traceable to at least one:

— **International practice**. ISO 704 (principles and methods), ISO 1087-1 (vocabulary), ISO 10241-1 (terminological entries in standards), and the ISO/IEC Directives, Part 2 (drafting rules, clauses 15 and 16 in particular).

— **The corpus**. A sample of 4 662 localized concept entries drawn from 406 898 machine-extracted entries of the ISO Online Browsing Platform terminology, covering hundreds of source documents from 1983 to 2026 (clause Clause 5). The corpus shows what the international system actually produces: where it excels (source coverage, grammar annotation, genus-first discipline), and where it systematically fails (empty definitions in legacy documents, missing examples, definitional circularity). Requirements in this document are set so that a termbase built under them measures well against the corpus — and measurably better on the corpus's weak points.

— **Registration practice**. The ES concept management system requirements (EFS 2513), the relation vocabulary (EFS 2510), the interchange format (EFS 2516), and the register operation guide (EFG 2519), which place entry quality inside a governed, machine-readable, published system.

0.3 How to use the scoring

The scoring model of clause Clause 11 turns review judgement into a reproducible number. It is deliberately simple: five dimension groups (designation, definition, completeness, clarity, consistency), about thirty anchored criteria, each scored 0 to 3 against written descriptors, with fixed weights and grade bands. A term convenor reviewing a proposed entry uses the checklist (Annex A) to find what to look at and the rubric (Annex B) to decide the score; the entry's grade follows arithmetic, not taste.

Scoring serves three purposes:

— **Review**: a proposed entry below grade C returns to its author with the criteria that failed marked — review feedback becomes specific.

— **Monitoring**: a termbase's grade distribution over time shows whether quality is improving (EFS 2513, clause 11).

— **Publication gating**: a register may set a minimum grade for publication; the score sheet is the record that the gate was applied.

Scoring does not replace expert judgement. The anchors encode the judgement on which experts already agree; where a criterion cannot be decided mechanically, the rubric states that limitation, and the reviewer decides.

© EFS 2026 – All rights reserved

Terminology management — Concept entry quality: Guidelines, requirements and scoring

1 Scope

This document specifies quality for terminology concept entries: what a good designation is, what a good definition is, what a complete entry contains, what clarity requires, and what consistency across a termbase demands. It specifies grouped requirements with stable identifiers, a scoring model that measures entry quality against those requirements, and checklists for term convenors and reviewers.

It applies to:

— concept entries in ES terminology registers and termbases, in the record format of EFS 2516;

— entries drafted for standards and other publications under the ES Directives; and

— any termbase whose operator adopts this document.

This document does not specify:

— the management system around the entries (EFS 2513);

— the semantics or enumeration of concept relations (EFS 2510);

— the wire format of interchange (EFS 2516);

— how to operate a register (EFG 2519); or

— domain-specific terminology conventions, which domain registers declare as profiles on top of this document.

2 Normative references

The following documents are referred to in the text in such a way that some or all of their content constitutes requirements of this document. For dated references, only the edition cited applies. For undated references, the latest edition of the referenced document (including any amendments) applies.

ISO 704, *Terminology work — Principles and methods*.

ISO 1087-1[1)] , *Terminology work — Vocabulary — Part 1: Theory and application*.

ISO 10241-1, *Terminological entries in standards — Part 1: General requirements and examples of presentation*.

ISO 10241-2, *Terminological entries in standards — Part 2: Adoption of standardized terminological entries*.

ISO 12620[2)] , *Management of terminology resources — Data category specifications*.

ISO/IEC Directives, Part 2, *ISO/IEC Directives, Part 2, Principles and rules for the structure and drafting of ISO and IEC documents, https://www.iso.org/sites/directives/current/part2/index.xhtml*.

1) Withdrawn.

2) Withdrawn.

© EFS 2026 – All rights reserved

EFS 2504:2025, *Terminology management — Multilingual terminology*

EFS 2510:2026, *Terminology management — Concept systems and concept relations*

EFS 2513:2026, *Terminology management — Concept management systems — Requirements*

EFS 2516:2026, *Terminology management — Machine-readable terminology interchange*

EFG 2519:2026, *Terminology management — Concept registers — Operation guide*

W3C SKOS, *SKOS Simple Knowledge Organization System Reference*, W3C Recommendation, https://www.w3.org/TR/skos-reference/

ISO/IEC Directives, Part 1, *ISO/IEC Directives, Part 1, Procedures for the technical work*.

3 Terms, definitions and abbreviated terms

For the purposes of this document, the following terms and definitions apply.

ISO and IEC maintain terminology databases for use in standardization at the following addresses:

— ISO Online browsing platform: available at https://www.iso.org/obp

— IEC Electropedia: available at https://www.electropedia.org

3.1 Terms and definitions

For the purposes of this document, the following terms and definitions apply.

3.1.1
concept entry
term entry
structured record of one concept, comprising its designations, definition, notes, examples, sources, relations, and management metadata

3.1.2
designation
representation of a concept by a sign which denotes it

[NOTE: In this document, designations are classified per ISO 12620: expression, abbreviation, short form, initialism, symbol, formula, graphical, and their variants.]

3.1.3
definition
representation of a concept by a descriptive statement which serves to differentiate it from related concepts

3.1.4
substitution test
check that a definition can replace the term in defining context without loss of meaning or grammaticality

3.1.5
genus
superordinate concept whose intension is presupposed by a definition and whose delimiting characteristics the definition supplies

3.1.6
essential characteristic
characteristic of a concept that is required by the concept's intension

© EFS 2026 – All rights reserved

3.1.7
delimiting characteristic
essential characteristic that distinguishes a concept from its coordinate concepts

3.1.8
entry score
weighted aggregate of the criterion scores of a *concept entry* (3.1.1), expressed on a scale of 0 to 100

3.1.9
grade
band to which an *entry score* (3.1.8) belongs, denoted A, B, C or D

3.1.10
requirement group
named set of requirements of this document bearing a common stable identifier prefix: D (designation), N (defiNition), C (completeness), K (clarity), S (consistency)

3.1.11
term convenor
reviewer responsible for the terminology quality of a register or document, applying the checklists and scoring model of this document

3.1.12
anti-pattern
recurring defect pattern observed in the corpus of clause Clause 5, catalogued with its detection rule and fix in Annex Annex E

3.2 Abbreviated terms

D/N/C/K/S	requirement groups of this document (see 3.1.10)
DIR2	ISO/IEC Directives, Part 2
OBP	ISO Online Browsing Platform
TC	technical committee

4 Anatomy of a concept entry

4.1 General

An entry is judged as a whole: a perfect definition in an incomplete entry is not a good entry. This clause fixes the element inventory of a concept entry, the obligations attached to each element, and the mapping to the machine-readable record, so that every later clause and criterion refers to a shared structure.

4.2 Element inventory

A concept entry comprises the following elements. The obligation column gives the baseline obligation of this document; registers may promote optional elements to mandatory in their domain profile.

Table 1

Element	Content	Obligation	Primary quality dimension
Identifier	Stable identifier and URN (EFS 2513 identifier scheme)	Mandatory	Completeness ©
Designation(s)	One preferred designation; admitted/ deprecated forms as applicable, each with term type and normative status	Mandatory (preferred)	Designation (D)

© EFS 2026 – All rights reserved

(continued)

Element	Content	Obligation	Primary quality dimension
Grammar information	Part of speech and applicable grammar features per designation	Conditional (mandatory where the language model requires it)	Designation (D)
Definition	One definition stating the intension	Mandatory	Definition (N)
Notes	Supplementary information that does not belong in the definition	Optional	Clarity (K)
Examples	Instances illustrating the concept	Optional	Clarity (K), Completeness ©
Sources	Origin of the concept and of the definition content	Mandatory	Completeness ©
Domain(s)	Subject field or fields of the concept	Mandatory (at least one)	Consistency (S)
Relations	Typed relations to other concepts per EFS 2510	Mandatory where they exist and are known	Consistency (S)
Lifecycle metadata	Registration status, acceptance dates, history	Mandatory	Completeness ©
Localizations	Localized concepts per language, with equivalence degrees	Per register policy (EFS 2504)	All dimensions

4.3 Mapping to record format and to ISO practice

The entry model maps one-to-one onto the machine-readable record of EFS 2516 (managed concept plus localized concepts), and onto the terminological entry of ISO 10241-1 and the term entry of DIR2, clause 16.2:

Table 2

This document	EFS 2516 record	DIR2 / ISO 10241-1
identifier + lifecycle metadata	managed concept `data`	entry number, entry status
designation(s) + grammar	localized concept `terms`	term entries (16.4)
definition	localized concept `definition`	definition (16.5.1)
notes / examples	localized concept `notes` / `examples`	notes (16.5.5) / examples (16.5.6)
sources	`sources`	source citation (16.7)
domain(s)	dataset assignment / tags	subject field
relations	`related` + n-ary relation files	`(not in DIR2; EFS 2510)`

A reviewer reads one structure whichever representation is in front of them; the scoring criteria of clause Clause 11 cite the elements of this clause by name.

4.4 The unit of judgement

The unit of judgement is the **entry**, not the element in isolation: criteria in the dimension groups address elements, but the entry score and grade (Clause 11) belong to the entry. This is deliberate — the corpus shows that defects cluster (an entry with an empty definition is also likely to lack notes and examples), and a per-element model would hide the compound failure that review needs to catch.

4.5 Record mapping — verbatim example

The anatomy in record form, for a minimal conforming entry (EFS 2516 format; managed concept document followed by its localized concept document):

```
---
id: ship-water-draught
data:
  identifier: ship-water-draught
```

© EFS 2026 – All rights reserved

```yaml
  uri: urn:example:ship:water-draught
  localized_concepts:
    eng: water-draught-eng
status: valid
date_accepted: '2026-01-15T00:00:00+00:00'
---
id: water-draught-eng
termid: ship-water-draught
data:
  language_code: eng
  terms:
  - type: expression
    designation: water draught
    normative_status: preferred
    grammar_info: [{noun: true}]
  definition:
  - content: vertical distance between the waterline and the lowest
    continuous point of the hull of a ship
  examples:
  - content: a vessel drawing 12 m cannot enter the inner harbour
  sources:
  - origin:
      ref: {source: ISO, id: ISO 19642, clause: 3.2.1}
      type: authoritative
status: valid
```

Figure 1

Every anatomical element has a home in the record: identifier and lifecycle metadata in the managed document; designation, grammar, definition, examples and sources in the localized document; relations on the managed document; domains as dataset assignment. A reviewer armed with this mapping can score any conforming record without a mapping table.

4.6 Element obligations and profiles

Registers declare a **profile** that adjusts obligations: a pedagogical register promotes examples to mandatory (C-3); a legal register promotes regional-variation notes; a machine-consumed vocabulary register demotes examples entirely. Profiles shall not demote mandatory elements of Clause 4 — the floor is the floor — but they may promote, and the promotion is itself a recorded profile decision (EFS 2513, 10.3).

5 Corpus evidence

5.1 Methodology

The evidence base of this document is a sample of the ISO Online Browsing Platform terminology extraction — 406 898 machine-generated concept files in the record format of EFS 2516, covering ISO and ISO/IEC/IEC documents from 1983 to 2026, bilingual (English, French), with one file per concept carrying its managed record and localized concepts.

From this population a random sample of 3 000 files was analysed, yielding 4 662 localized concept entries with designations. The sample statistics below are the empirical reference for the requirement groups: where the corpus performs well, this document sets its requirements at or above the corpus level; where the corpus systematically fails, the corresponding requirement is mandatory and the failure is catalogued as an anti-pattern (Annex Annex E).

The analysis script is deterministic (fixed sample seed) and is re-runnable against any termbase in the same record format, so the same statistics can be produced for an ES register and compared directly with the ISO baseline.

© EFS 2026 – All rights reserved

5.2 Definition statistics

Table 3

Measure	Corpus value	Reading
Median definition length	16 words	The working norm: intension stated in one to two sentences
Mean definition length	18,3 words	Right tail pulls the mean above the median
10th percentile	8 words	Very short definitions exist and are often legitimate (narrow concepts)
90th percentile	32 words	Beyond ~35 words, definitions usually hide a list that belongs in notes or a missing intermediate concept
Range	1 to 159 words	Both extremes are defects (see Annex E)
Empty definitions	1,2 %	Concentrated in documents of 1983–2012; a conversion and extraction legacy

5.3 Structural discipline

Table 4

Measure	Corpus value	Reading
Genus-first form (definition begins lowercase, no article)	80,3 %	The dominant and correct discipline — definitions begin with the genus, unpunctuated
Definition begins with an article	3,1 %	Anti-pattern AP-07 (Annex Annex E)
Definitional circularity (designation repeated in definition)	3,5 %	Anti-pattern AP-03; includes legitimate term-mention cases, so the true defect rate is somewhat lower
Requirements language in definitions (shall/ should/must)	0,5 %	Anti-pattern AP-05 — rare but serious when present

5.4 Entry completeness

Table 5

Measure	Corpus value	Reading
Source citation present	98,8 %	The corpus's strongest dimension: extraction carries document provenance on every entry
Grammar information present	98,9 %	Machine annotation of part of speech is near-universal
Notes present	34,1 %	Notes are the exception, not the norm
Examples present	2,9 %	Examples are rare: registers that value examples (pedagogical or safety-critical domains) must require them explicitly

5.5 Designations and status

Table 6

Measure	Corpus value	Reading
Normative status mix (sampled entries)	100 % preferred	The extraction pipeline retains preferred designations; a conforming termbase should also carry admitted and deprecated forms

© EFS 2026 – All rights reserved

(continued)

Measure	Corpus value	Reading
		when they exist, because consumers need them
Designation type	100 % expression	Abbreviations, symbols and short forms exist in the source standards but are under-represented in machine extraction; EFS 2516 records carry them as separate term entries

5.6 What the corpus teaches

Five lessons from the corpus set the shape of the requirement groups.

a) **The machine floor is high, and the requirements lock it in.** Source coverage (98,8 %) and grammar annotation (98,9 %) show that machine-enforced fields reach near-universality in practice. The corresponding requirements (C-1, C-2, D-4) are mandatory with no derogation.

b) **Incomplete entries fail silently.** Empty definitions (1,2 %) and missing examples (97,1 % absence) do not produce complaints; they produce silent misunderstanding. The completeness requirements therefore require explicit presence over implicit quality.

c) **Defects concentrate in legacy documents.** The empty-definition defects concentrate in documents from 1983–2012. A register that imports legacy corpora re-validates them rather than trusting the conversion (EFG 2519, clause 11).

d) **The median definition is short.** Sixteen words is the international working norm; the rubric anchors definition length accordingly (Clause 11), and verbosity reduces the score.

e) **Convention, not talent, produced the corpus discipline.** The 80,3 % genus-first rate of the corpus follows from drafting convention, and the requirement groups are written to be checkable in seconds, because a rule that requires minutes of review is not applied.

5.7 Document-era profile

Structural defects concentrate by document era. The sampled entries group into three eras with sharply different profiles:

Table 7

Era	Example source documents	Empty-definition rate	Article-head rate	Legacy (1983–1997)
ISO 5843 series, ISO 5702	2,7 %	4,8 %	Transitional (1998–2014)	ISO 6707-1 (2004), ISO 921 (1997)
1,6 %	3,4 %	Modern (2015–2026)	ISO 10286 (2021), ISO 24765, IEC/IEEE 81000 series	0,4 %

The pattern is monotonic: structural discipline improves with every era, consistent with the growing adoption of ISO 10241-1 drafting rules and machine-first extraction. The implication for registers is direct — imports of legacy content carry a predictable defect load and require era-aware validation effort.

5.8 Top-concentration documents

Documents contributing the most sampled entries, with their defect character:

Table 8

Document	Sampled entries	Character
ISO 10303-2:2024	46	Modern; clean structure; low example density

© EFS 2026 – All rights reserved

(continued)

Document	Sampled entries	Character
ISO/IEC/IEEE 24765:2017	31	Modern systems/software vocabulary; notes-rich (58 %)
ISO/IEC 2382:2015	24	Modern IT vocabulary; bilingual discipline strong
ISO 5127:2017	17	Documentation vocabulary; example usage highest in corpus
ISO 6707-1 (editions 2004/2017/2020)	39 across editions	Shows era progression within one vocabulary family

These profiles are also a recommendation of reading order for reviewers calibrating on real material: ISO 5127 for example practice, ISO 24765 for note practice, the ISO 5843 series for what to avoid.

5.9 The IEV corpus

A second corpus — the International Electrotechnical Vocabulary (IEV, IEC 60050, maintained by IEC TC 1) — provides the multilingual counterpoint: 22 229 concepts in the Glossarist record format, of which a 2 000-concept sample was analysed. The IEV is the deepest multilingual terminology register in operation, and its profile differs from the ISO corpus in two decisive ways.

Multilingual breadth. IEV concepts carry a median of eleven languages each (mode 11; range 2–19), against the ISO corpus's two (English, French). Language coverage per concept is the IEV's own quality dimension: an entry's value scales with the number of communities it serves.

The term-only localization model. IEV's definitions live in the authoritative languages — English and French definitions are present on 100 % of sampled entries — while every other language localizes the **designations only**: German, Spanish, Chinese, Arabic, Italian and Polish localizations carry terms (with normative status, and grammar where the language model requires it — German 97 %, French 98 %, Polish 30 %) but no definitions. Russian shows the only partial pattern (7 % carry definitions).

Table 9

Language	Role in the IEV	Definitions	Notes (eng/fra)	eng
authoritative, definitions	100 %	32 %	fra	authoritative, definitions
100 %	32 %	deu	terms + grammar	0 %
—	spa / zho / ara / ita / pol / rus	terms	0–7 %	—

Definition length in the IEV runs slightly longer than the ISO corpus (English median 18 words, p90 36), and notes density matches the ISO corpus (32 %); examples are rarer still (under 1 %).

5.10 The two localization models

The ISO corpus and the IEV corpus together demonstrate that two legitimate localization models coexist in international practice:

— **definition-bearing model** — each localization carries its own definition, with equivalence degrees recorded per EFS 2504 (the model assumed by Group C of this document); and

— **term-only model** — the authoritative-language definition serves all localizations, which carry designations (with grammar and status) but no definitions.

Neither model is defective. A register shall declare which model it operates, and completeness is judged against the declared model: under the term-only model, the absence of a localized definition is not a completeness defect, and the quality burden concentrates on the authoritative-language definition and on the fidelity of

© EFS 2026 – All rights reserved

the localized designations (grammar, status, and the ISO 24229 conversion-system fields of EFS 2504 for any converted forms).

This distinction refines criterion C-5 and requirement C-R8: their obligations apply to **definition-bearing** localizations; term-only localizations conform by designation completeness.

6 Designation quality (Group D)

6.1 General

A concept can carry several designations, but one is **preferred**: the form that consumers should use and that definitions, publications and indexes lead with. Designation quality is about choosing that form well, annotating it fully, and being honest about admitted and deprecated alternatives.

6.2 Rules

D-R1 The preferred designation shall denote exactly the concept the entry defines: reviewing the designation alone, a domain expert should not expect a different intension (ISO 704).

D-R2 The preferred designation shall follow the morphological and orthographic conventions of the entry language, including singular form for countable nouns (DIR2, 16.4.4), established order of modifiers, and current spelling.

D-R3 Term type shall be recorded per ISO 12620 (expression, abbreviation, short form, initialism, symbol, formula, graphical) and normative status shall be recorded (preferred, admitted, deprecated) per DIR2, 16.4.1.

D-R4 Grammar information shall be recorded for the designation: part of speech, and gender/number/plural forms where the language model of the register requires them. In the corpus, 98,9 % of entries carry grammar information; a conforming termbase matches this (EFS 2516 record, `grammar_info`).

D-R5 An abbreviation may be preferred only where it is at least as understood in the domain as the full form, and the full form shall be recorded as an admitted designation of the same concept.

D-R6 A deprecated designation shall remain in the entry with its status, never deleted, and where a replacement exists the entry or relation set shall state it (EFS 2510 lifecycle relations).

D-R7 Designations shall not contain requirements language, quantifiers, or document references; they designate, they do not prescribe.

D-R8 Designations within one termbase shall be consistent in form for coordinate concepts: a register that expresses one criterion of subdivision as "… by mass" should not express its coordinate as "… according to power" (see Group S).

6.3 Requirement group D

Table 10

ID	Requirement	Sources
D-1	The entry shall carry exactly one preferred designation; further designations shall carry status `admitted` or `deprecated`.	D-R3, DIR2 16.4.1
D-2	The preferred designation shall denote the concept defined by the entry's definition; a designation whose ordinary domain reading conflicts with the definition shall not be preferred.	D-R1, ISO 704
D-3	Designations shall be grammatically correct for the entry language, in singular form for countable nouns, with recorded grammar information.	D-R2, D-R4, DIR2 16.4.4
D-4	Term type and normative status shall be recorded for every designation, using ISO 12620 term types.	D-R3, ISO 12620

© EFS 2026 – All rights reserved

(continued)

ID	Requirement	Sources
D-5	Where an abbreviation is preferred, the full form shall be present as an admitted designation.	D-R5
D-6	Deprecated designations shall be retained with their status and replacement information, not deleted.	D-R6, EFS 2513 7.5.3
D-7	Designations shall be free of requirements language, quantifiers and document references.	D-R7, DIR2

6.4 Scoring criteria

The designation criteria scored in Clause 11:

dc1 Preferred designation aptness (D-1, D-2) — does the form denote the concept, at the right conceptual level?

dc2 Grammatical correctness (D-3).

dc3 Annotation completeness (D-4): term type, status, grammar present for all designations.

dc4 Form discipline (D-5, D-7): abbreviation handling, no requirements language, singular discipline.

EXAMPLE Working example — a good designation set for a concept in a shipping register:

```
terms:
- type: expression
  designation: air draught
  normative_status: preferred
  grammar_info: [{noun: true}]
- type: abbreviation
  designation: air draught  # marked as full form of the abbreviation below
  normative_status: admitted
- type: abbreviation
  designation: AD
  normative_status: admitted
```

Figure 2

The full form is admitted while the abbreviation carries usage; both are recorded; the deprecated case (for example a pre-standardization “air height”) would appear with `normative_status: deprecated` and a pointer to the preferred form, never silently removed.

7 Definition quality (Group N)

7.1 General

The definition carries the entry. Every other element — designations, sources, relations — attaches to the claim that the definition makes. This clause states the rules of definition writing as practiced by ISO 704 and enforced by DIR2, 16.5.1, and groups them into requirements.

7.2 Rules

N-R1 **One concept, one definition.** An entry carries a single definition in each language. Multiple senses are multiple concepts with separate entries linked by relations, never a forked definition (DIR2, 16.5.1 note; ISO 10241-1).

© EFS 2026 – All rights reserved

N-R2 **Genus first.** The definition states the superordinate concept (genus) first, then the delimiting characteristics that distinguish the concept from its coordinate concepts (ISO 704; the corpus shows this as the dominant discipline at 80,3 %).

N-R3 **The substitution test.** The definition shall be substitutable for the term in a defining context without loss of meaning or grammaticality. Where substitution fails, the definition is defective even if it sounds right.

N-R4 **No circularity.** The definition shall not use the designation itself, a grammatical variant of it, or a derivative of it, as a defining element. The corpus circularity heuristic flags 3,5 % of entries; review must judge each flag, since legitimate term-mentions (e.g. naming the thing the concept is about) are not circularity.

N-R5 **No requirements language.** Definitions describe; they do not prescribe. `shall`, `should`, `must`, and negated ability forms do not belong in a definition (DIR2). The corpus shows 0,5 % violations — each one serious.

N-R6 **No articles at the head.** A definition does not begin with “A”, “An” or “The” (DIR2, 16.5.1; corpus: 3,1 % violations).

N-R7 **Self-containedness.** The definition shall be understandable within the register: concepts used in the definition shall either be defined in the register or be ordinary language of the domain. Definitions that resolve only by chasing references are defective (references may support, not substitute).

N-R8 **One sentence discipline.** A definition is one declarative sentence. Beyond two sentences, the content belongs in notes; beyond roughly 35 words, the reviewer should check for a hidden list or a missing intermediate concept (corpus p90: 32 words).

N-R9 **No negation-defining.** A definition states what the concept is, not (primarily) what it is not; negation may delimit against one nearby coordinate concept where that delimitation is essential.

N-R10 **Notes and examples are not definition.** Content that is true of the concept but not delimiting belongs in notes; instances belong in examples (DIR2, 16.5.5, 16.5.6). The corpus puts notes in 34,1 % of entries and examples in 2,9 % — the absence of examples is the corpus’s own judgment call, and registers may profile examples as mandatory where pedagogy or safety warrants.

N-R11 **Bilingual fidelity.** Where a localization exists, its definition states the intension of the concept in that language, with the equivalence degree and note per EFS 2504. A translation that subtly shifts the intension without an equivalence note is a defect in both the localization and the entry.

7.3 Requirement group N

Table 11

ID	Requirement	Sources
N-1	An entry shall carry exactly one definition per language; multiple senses are separate entries.	N-R1, DIR2 16.5.1
N-2	The definition shall state the genus first and then the delimiting characteristics.	N-R2, ISO 704
N-3	The definition shall pass the substitution test.	N-R3
N-4	The definition shall not be circular in the designation of the concept or its grammatical derivatives.	N-R4
N-5	The definition shall not contain requirements language.	N-R5, DIR2
N-6	The definition shall not begin with an article and shall be a single declarative sentence.	N-R6, N-R8
N-7	The definition shall be self-contained within the register’s scope.	N-R7
N-8	Delimiting content shall not be displaced into notes; notes shall carry only non-delimiting supplementary content.	N-R10, DIR2 16.5.5

© EFS 2026 – All rights reserved

(continued)

ID	Requirement	Sources
N-9	Localizations shall state the intension in the localization language with the recorded equivalence degree and note where applicable.	N-R11, EFS 2504

7.4 Scoring criteria

The definition criteria scored in Clause 11:

nc1 Intension sufficiency (N-2, N-7): the definition states enough delimiting characteristics to distinguish the concept from its coordinates.

nc2 Substitution test (N-3).

nc3 Formal discipline (N-4, N-5, N-6): circularity, requirements language, article discipline, single sentence.

nc4 Economy (N-8): the definition says what is delimiting and nothing else; notes and examples carry the rest.

nc5 Localization fidelity (N-9).

7.5 Worked checks

Substitution test, applied:

Table 12

Term	Definition
`air draught`	maximum vertical distance between the waterline and the highest point of a ship

Substitution: “The radar measures the **maximum vertical distance between the waterline and the highest point of a ship** of the vessel.” — grammatical, meaning preserved: passes.

Circularity, applied to a defective case:

Table 13

Term	Definition
`terminological entry`	entry in a terminology collection that contains the terminological data of one concept

The definition defines “entry” by “entry” — circular: fails N-4. A conforming definition grounds the genus outside the term (“structured record of one concept …”).

7.6 Anti-pattern fixes, worked

Each anti-pattern of Annex Annex E with its definition-level fix applied, as reviewer-facing before/after pairs.

Circular (AP-03) — before:

Table 14

Term	Definition
`register manager`	manager of the register who manages the register’s records

After:

Table 15

Term	Definition
`register manager`	party responsible for the operation of a register, including the integrity of its records and the execution of its registration procedures

© EFS 2026 – All rights reserved

The genus moves outside the term (“party”), and the delimiting characteristics name the responsibilities instead of re-using the designation.

Requirements language (AP-05) — before:

Table 16

Term	Definition
safety valve	valve that shall open automatically when the set pressure is exceeded

After:

Table 17

Term	Definition
safety valve	valve designed to open automatically when the set pressure is exceeded

“Designed to” states the characteristic without prescribing conduct; the prescription belongs in the normative text of the product standard.

Overflow (AP-08) — before:

Table 18

Term	Definition
release lifecycle	the sequence of stages through which a release passes from first proposal through drafting, internal review, public review, ballot, correction handling, publication, maintenance, and eventual retirement, where each stage has entry and exit criteria recorded by the control body

After: the definition keeps the intension; the enumeration becomes a sequential n-ary relation (EFS 2510, 7.4) and the criteria note becomes a note:

```
definition:
- content: sequence of stages through which a release passes from
  first proposal to retirement
notes:
- content: Stage entry and exit criteria are recorded by the control
  body per the register charter.
```

Figure 3

And the stages themselves — proposed, drafted, reviewed, published, retired — live in a `sequential_relation` file ordered by the criterion “process step order”, exactly as EFS 2510, 7.4 prescribes. The definition is back inside the working band, the enumeration is machine-checkable, and the entry now participates in the graph instead of narrating it.

8 Completeness (Group C)

8.1 General

Completeness asks: does this entry carry everything a consumer needs to **use** the concept with confidence — to cite it, to validate it against data, to translate it? The corpus gives the machine floor (sources 98,8 %, grammar 98,9 %) and shows the gaps (empty definitions 1,2 %, examples 2,9 %). The requirement group sets the floor for a conforming register above the corpus where the corpus fails.

8.2 Rules

C-R1 The entry shall carry the elements declared mandatory in Clause 4: identifier with URN, preferred designation, definition, at least one domain, sources, and lifecycle metadata.

© EFS 2026 – All rights reserved

C-R2 The definition shall be present and non-empty. The corpus's 1,2 % empty definitions are all defects: an entry without a definition is a pointer without a referent.

C-R3 Sources shall cite the origin of the concept and of the definition content: document, clause where applicable, and link where the source is resolvable. The corpus's near-universal source coverage is the standard; entries without sources are defects (contrast with the conversion-era corpus, where only extraction guarantees them).

C-R4 Examples shall be present where the register profile requires them, and otherwise where the concept is commonly misunderstood or where instances materially aid use. The corpus's 2,9 % example coverage is a baseline, not a target.

C-R5 Notes shall be present where the concept is subject to recurring misunderstanding, boundary questions, or regional variation. A note is the correct place for information that is true and useful but not delimiting (N-R10).

C-R6 Domain assignment shall state the subject field(s) of the concept, using the register's domain vocabulary.

C-R7 Lifecycle metadata shall be complete: registration status, acceptance date, and the history of record changes (EFS 2513, 7.2).

C-R8 Localizations shall be complete per register policy: each declared localization present, each carrying the equivalence degree and, where the degree is not `full`, the equivalence note (EFS 2504).

C-R9 Relations known to the concept owners shall be present: a concept imported from another register carries its mapping relations; a concept with known coordinates carries its placement (EFS 2510; EFS 2513, 7.1.3).

8.3 Requirement group C

Table 19

ID	Requirement	Sources
C-1	The entry shall carry identifier with URN, preferred designation, non-empty definition, domain(s), sources, and lifecycle metadata.	C-R1, C-R2, C-R3, C-R6, C-R7
C-2	Sources shall be cited for the concept origin and the definition content.	C-R3
C-3	Examples shall be present per register profile or where the concept warrants them.	C-R4
C-4	Notes shall be present where misunderstanding is foreseeable.	C-R5
C-5	Declared localizations shall be present and complete per the declared localization model (definition-bearing: equivalence degrees and notes per EFS 2504; term-only: designations with grammar and status, authoritative definition serving all).	C-R8
C-6	Known relations and mappings shall be recorded.	C-R9

8.4 Scoring criteria

The completeness criteria scored in Clause 11:

cc1 Mandatory element presence (C-1).

cc2 Source quality (C-2): not only present but precise — document, clause, resolvable link.

cc3 Illustrative content (C-3, C-4): examples and notes where they aid use.

cc4 Localization completeness (C-5).

cc5 Relation and mapping completeness (C-6).

© EFS 2026 – All rights reserved

EXAMPLE Completeness, contrasting two entries for the same concept family:

```
# complete entry (abridged)
id: ship-draught
terms: [{designation: draught, normative_status: preferred, type: expression}]
definition: [{content: vertical distance between the waterline and the
              lowest point of a ship}]
sources: [{origin: {ref: {source: ISO, id: ISO 19642}, clause: 3.2.1}}]
domains: [shipping]
examples: [{content: "a vessel with a draught of 12 m cannot enter the
            inner harbour"}]
```

Figure 4

```
# incomplete entry (same register, defective)
id: air-draught
terms: [{designation: air draught, normative_status: preferred, type: expression}]
# definition: MISSING
# sources: MISSING
# domains: MISSING
```

Figure 5

The second entry fails C-1 on three elements; under the rubric it scores cc1 = 0 and cannot achieve a grade above D regardless of the quality of its designation — completeness failures gate (Clause 11).

9 Clarity and language (Group K)

9.1 General

Clarity is the reader-facing dimension: whether a competent outsider — a translator, an engineer from another field, a new committee member — can understand and correctly apply the entry without access to its drafting history. Clarity failures are rarely rule-violations; they are communication failures, which is why this group's requirements are stated as obligations on the **reader's experience**.

9.2 Rules

K-R1 **Plain domain language.** The definition and notes use the ordinary technical language of the domain; constructions that only a drafting insider can parse (nested noun stacks, undefined shorthand) are defects.

K-R2 **One reading.** Each sentence of the definition and notes has exactly one reasonable reading. Pronouns without clear antecedents, ambiguous attachment ("system for ships and ports that operate"), and equivocal quantifiers are defects.

K-R3 **Units are stated.** Where the concept involves measurable extent, the applicable unit system or reference frame is stated or unambiguous from the domain (per the applicable ISO 80000 part).

K-R4 **Abbreviations are expanded at first use.** Any abbreviation used inside the definition, notes or examples is expanded at its first use within the entry, unless it is more standard in the domain than its expansion.

K-R5 **Reference discipline.** Concepts referenced from the definition or notes are cited by their identifiers or by document + clause; vague pointers ("see above", "the relevant standard") are defects.

K-R6 **Language correctness.** The entry language is used correctly: spelling per the register's language convention, agreement, and terminological register consistent with the register's stated audience (register of the designations per ISO 12620 data categories).

K-R7 **Notes carry context, not argument.** Notes explain scope, boundaries, regional differences, and points of caution; they do not argue the case for the definition or narrate its drafting history.

© EFS 2026 – All rights reserved

K-R8 **Examples are concrete and correct.** An example is a real or realistic instance of the concept, checkable against the definition; an example that contradicts the definition or extends it into a different concept is a defect.

9.3 Requirement group K

Table 20

ID	Requirement	Sources
K-1	The entry shall be comprehensible to a competent domain outsider: plain domain language, one reading per sentence.	K-R1, K-R2
K-2	Measurable concepts shall state or make unambiguous the applicable units or reference frame.	K-R3
K-3	Abbreviations used in the entry shall be expanded at first use, unless domain-standard.	K-R4
K-4	References from the entry shall be precise (identifier, or document plus clause).	K-R5
K-5	The entry shall observe the language correctness and register conventions of the entry language.	K-R6
K-6	Notes shall carry contextual content and not argument or history.	K-R7
K-7	Examples shall be concrete, correct, and consistent with the definition.	K-R8

9.4 Scoring criteria

The clarity criteria scored in Clause 11:

kc1 Outsiderness (K-1): can a competent outsider apply the entry without the drafting history?

kc2 Ambiguity absence (K-1, K-2): one reading, units resolved.

kc3 Reference discipline (K-3, K-4).

kc4 Note and example quality (K-6, K-7).

EXAMPLE Clarity revision — the same content before and after:

Table 21

Unclear	Clear
system for the remote monitoring and control of ships and port installations based on a standardized protocol framework and relevant standards	system for the remote monitoring and control of ships and of port installations, operating over the protocol framework defined in ISO 20141

The unclear form stacks nouns, attaches “based on” ambiguously, and points at “relevant standards”. The clear form names each controlled object, cites the protocol framework precisely (K-4), and reads one way (K-1).

10 Consistency (Group S)

10.1 General

Consistency is the termbase-level dimension: an entry can be internally excellent and still clash with its neighbours. Group S requirements are evaluated against the termbase, not the entry alone, and they are the dimension that term convenors own most directly.

© EFS 2026 – All rights reserved

10.2 Rules

S-R1 **Coordinate parallelism.** Coordinate concepts (same parent, same criterion of subdivision) are expressed in parallel grammatical form and use parallel designation patterns; a coordinate set that mixes patterns signals either a wrong placement or a missing criterion (ISO 704 concept-system discipline; EFS 2510, clause 4).

S-R2 **Definition harmony.** Definitions of coordinate concepts share the genus formulation: the same superordinate concept is named by the same term, and delimiting characteristics are stated in comparable terms. Divergent genus naming within one coordinate set is a defect.

S-R3 **Relation correctness.** The entry's relations use the vocabulary of EFS 2510 with correct direction, consistent with the entry's placement; hierarchical relations are acyclic (EFS 2510 constraint ac3) and coordinate sets satisfy the delimiting characteristic rule (EFS 2510 ac5).

S-R4 **Domain tagging discipline.** The domain(s) of the entry use the register's domain vocabulary; a concept tagged outside its domain or tagged with a non-existent domain breaks dataset organization and search.

S-R5 **Cross-register mapping honesty.** Mappings to other vocabularies use the mapping relation types and name the external vocabulary (EFS 2510); an `exact_match` asserted where only `close_match` holds corrupts downstream alignment.

S-R6 **Terminological family harmony.** Related entries of a family (derivations, partitives, processes and their products) use consistent word-building and parallel definitions, so that the family reads as a system (ISO 704).

S-R7 **Status coherence.** Where one concept in a coordinate set is superseded or deprecated, the reviewer checks whether the whole set's status is coherent with the system's evolution; a mixed-status coordinate set with unchanged criterion is a warning.

10.3 Requirement group S

Table 22

ID	Requirement	Sources
S-1	Coordinate sets shall be expressed in parallel form and share the genus formulation of their definitions.	S-R1, S-R2
S-2	Relations shall use the adopted vocabulary with correct direction and shall satisfy the structural constraints of EFS 2510.	S-R3
S-3	Domains shall be drawn from the register's domain vocabulary.	S-R4
S-4	Cross-register mappings shall be honest to the assessed degree and name the external vocabulary.	S-R5
S-5	Terminological families shall be internally consistent in word formation and definition structure.	S-R6
S-6	Lifecycle status shall be coherent across coordinate sets.	S-R7

10.4 Scoring criteria

The consistency criteria scored in Clause 11:

sc1 Coordinate parallelism and genus harmony (S-1).

sc2 Relation correctness (S-2).

sc3 Domain discipline (S-3).

sc4 Mapping honesty (S-4).

sc5 Family harmony and status coherence (S-5, S-6).

© EFS 2026 – All rights reserved

EXAMPLE Coordinate parallelism — a conforming set and a defective set:

Table 23

Conforming (parallel)	Defective (divergent)
water draught: vertical distance between the waterline and the lowest point of a ship **air draught**: vertical distance between the waterline and the highest point of a ship **length overall**: distance between the foremost and aftermost points of a ship	**water draught**: vertical distance between the waterline and the lowest point of a ship **air draught**: the height of the ship above the waterline

The defective set breaks genus harmony — “distance between …” versus “the height of …” — and states the air draught by delimitation against the wrong reference; a reviewer flags S-1 and proposes the parallel form.

11 Scoring model

11.1 General

The scoring model turns the requirement groups into a number and a grade. It is designed for reproducibility: two reviewers scoring the same entry should arrive at grades within one band, and the score sheet records enough anchors that any difference is explainable.

11.2 Criterion inventory

Each dimension group contributes criteria scored 0–3. The criteria cite their requirement IDs; the anchors are defined in Annex Annex B.

Table 24

Criterion	What is scored	Requirements	Weight within dimension
dc1	Preferred designation aptness	D-1, D-2	35 %
dc2	Grammatical correctness	D-3	25 %
dc3	Annotation completeness (type, status, grammar)	D-4	25 %
dc4	Form discipline (abbreviation, singular, no requirements language)	D-5, D-7	15 %
nc1	Intension sufficiency (genus, delimiting characteristics, self-containedness)	N-2, N-7	35 %
nc2	Substitution test	N-3	25 %
nc3	Formal discipline (circularity, requirements language, article, one sentence)	N-4, N-5, N-6	25 %
nc4	Economy (definition vs notes/examples separation)	N-8	15 %
cc1	Mandatory element presence	C-1	40 %
cc2	Source quality	C-2	25 %
cc3	Illustrative content (examples, notes where warranted)	C-3, C-4	20 %
cc4	Localization completeness	C-5	15 %
kc1	Outsiderness	K-1	40 %
kc2	Ambiguity absence (incl. units)	K-1, K-2	30 %
kc3	Reference discipline	K-3, K-4	15 %
kc4	Note and example quality	K-6, K-7	15 %
sc1	Coordinate parallelism and genus harmony	S-1	30 %

© EFS 2026 – All rights reserved

(continued)

Criterion	What is scored	Requirements	Weight within dimension
sc2	Relation correctness	S-2	30 %
sc3	Domain discipline	S-3	15 %
sc4	Mapping honesty	S-4	15 %
sc5	Family harmony and status coherence	S-5, S-6	10 %
cc5, kc5	*	*	(folded into cc4, kc4 in the default profile)
NOTE Where a register profile promotes localization completeness (cc5) or language-register correctness (kc5) to standalone criteria, the profile states the re-weighting; the default profile folds them into cc4 and kc4 respectively.			

11.3 Dimension weights

Table 25

Dimension	Weight	Rationale
Definition (N)	35 %	The definition is the entry; its defects mislead every consumer
Designation (D)	20 %	The consumer-facing form; wrong at the cost of communication
Completeness ©	20 %	Missing elements silently break use and citation
Clarity (K)	15 %	The outsider's experience; defects are usually repairable
Consistency (S)	10 %	Termbase-level; evaluated against the register and often re-verified at review rather than at first scoring

11.4 Scoring scale

Each criterion is scored on an anchored 0–3 scale:

Table 26

Score	Label	Anchor meaning
3	Exemplary	The criterion is fully met; the element could serve as an example in this document's annexes
2	Good	Fully met in substance; at most trivial cosmetic deviations
1	Minor defect	Substantively met but with a defect a reviewer must name; fix is cheap and obvious
0	Fail	The criterion is not met, or cannot be assessed because a mandatory element is absent

A criterion that does not apply to an entry (for example mapping honesty on a concept with no cross-register mappings) is marked **n/a** and excluded from that dimension's mean.

11.5 Score computation

For each dimension group:

— dimension score = Σ (criterion score × criterion weight) over the non-n/a criteria, normalized to 0–100.

The entry score:

— entry score = Σ (dimension score × dimension weight);

— entry score is rounded to the nearest integer.

© EFS 2026 – All rights reserved

11.6 Mandatory-fix flags

Certain failures are not absorbable by good scores elsewhere. A flag is raised — and the grade capped at D regardless of the entry score — when any of the following holds:

— the definition is absent or empty (C-1, N group gate);

— the definition contains requirements language (N-5);

— the definition fails the substitution test outright (N-3, judged against the anchors, not by taste);

— a mandatory element is missing (C-1), including sources on a published entry (C-2);

— the designation is preferred while its ordinary domain reading contradicts the definition (D-2);

— a relation used does not exist in the adopted vocabulary (S-2, EFS 2510 ac1).

The score sheet records the flag and the criterion that raised it.

11.7 Grade bands

Table 27

Grade	Score	Meaning
A	85–100	Exemplary: usable as a reference entry; register may feature it
B	70–84	Good: publishable; minor findings recorded for the next review
C	55–69	Acceptable: publishable with named findings; a re-score after fixes is recommended
D	0–54, or any mandatory-fix flag	Not publishable: returns to the author with the failed criteria marked

Registers set their own publication gate; this document's recommended default is grade B for new entries in a public register, grade C minimum for entries in an internal or legacy register under remediation (EFG 2519, clause 12).

11.8 Worked example of computation

An entry scores: D = (dc1 3×0,35 + dc2 2×0,25 + dc3 3×0,25 + dc4 2×0,15) = 2,65 → 88; N = (nc1 2×0,35 + nc2 3×0,25 + nc3 2×0,25 + nc4 1×0,15) = 2,15 → 72; C = (cc1 3×0,40 + cc2 2×0,25 + cc3 1×0,20 + cc4 2×0,15) = 2,30 → 77; K = (kc1 2×0,40 + kc2 2×0,30 + kc3 3×0,15 + kc4 2×0,15) = 2,20 → 73; S = sc2 n/a → (sc1 2×0,30 + sc3 3×0,15 + sc4 3×0,15 + sc5 2×0,10) = 2,25 → 75 over re-normalized weights.

Entry score = 88×0,20 + 72×0,35 + 77×0,20 + 73×0,15 + 75×0,10 = 17,6 + 25,2 + 15,4 + 10,95 + 7,5 = 76,65 → **77 → grade B**.

No flags raised: the entry is publishable with findings (nc4 economy, cc3 examples).

12 Review process

12.1 Roles

Two kinds of reviewer apply the scoring model:

— **term convenor**: owns a register or a document's terminology; decides grade outcomes, arbitrates criterion disagreements, and owns the disposition of findings; and

— **reviewer**: performs criterion scoring on proposed or sampled entries and drafts the findings.

© EFS 2026 – All rights reserved

12.2 When scoring happens

a) **At proposal review**: every proposed entry is scored before the control-body decision (EFS 2513, 7.1.3; EFG 2519, clause 7). The proposal's score sheet attaches to the proposal thread.

b) **At periodic review**: a sample of published entries is re-scored (EFS 2513, 11.2), sized to detect drift (the sample of the corpus analysis of clause Clause 5 is the model: hundreds of entries give stable medians).

c) **On import**: entries imported from legacy or third-party corpora are scored before acceptance; the corpus evidence of clause Clause 5 predicts where imports fail (empty definitions, missing examples).

12.3 The review workflow

a) **Pre-check**: completeness gate first (cc1): an entry missing mandatory elements is returned immediately with the missing elements named, without criterion scoring (the flags of 11.6 make this arithmetic, not judgement).

b) **Criterion scoring**: the reviewer walks Annex A's checklist in order (designation → definition → completeness → clarity → consistency), scoring each criterion against the anchors of Annex Annex B. Findings are written per failed criterion, quoting the entry's own words.

c) **Flags check**: the mandatory-fix flags are checked; any flag caps the grade.

d) **Score computation**: per Clause 11; the score sheet is produced (template in Annex Annex B).

e) **Disposition**: the term convenor decides: accept (grade B or A, findings recorded), accept-with-findings (grade C, findings become improvement items per EFG 2519 clause 12), or return (grade D, with the failed criteria as the fix list).

f) **Re-score**: a returned entry is re-scored on resubmission; the score sheets of both rounds are retained (EFS 2513, 10.3).

12.4 Disagreement and calibration

Where two reviewers differ by more than one band, the term convenor arbitrates against the anchors, and the outcome is recorded in the register's calibration notes. Registers that score continuously should run an annual calibration exercise: the same ten entries scored by all reviewers, differences discussed, anchors amended only by decision record (EFG 2519, Annex B).

12.5 Score sheets as records

Score sheets are controlled records (EFS 2513, 10.3): they carry the entry identifier, the criteria scores, flags, the computed grade, the reviewer(s), the date, and the disposition. The register's grade distribution — the set of score sheets over time — is the primary input to the monitoring metrics of EFG 2519, clause 11.

12.6 Calibration worked example

Two reviewers, one entry, the disagreement pattern that calibration exists for:

Table 28

Criterion	Reviewer 1	Reviewer 2	Arbitration
nc1 intension	2	3	3 — the delimiting characteristic the second reviewer wanted is in the notes; the definition correctly stays minimal (N-R10). Anchor clarification recorded: notes-delimited content does not reduce nc1.

© EFS 2026 – All rights reserved

(continued)

Criterion	Reviewer 1	Reviewer 2	Arbitration
kc4 notes quality	1	2	1 — the note argues the definition's case ("this term is preferred because…"); K-6 violation. Anchor clarification recorded: advocacy notes score 1 regardless of usefulness.
sc4 mapping honesty	2	2	2 — agreed.

Dimension impact: N differs by $1 \times 0{,}25 \times (1/1)$ → normalized 25 points → grades B vs A. The arbitrated entry scores A; the two anchor clarifications are written into the register's calibration notes and apply from the next scoring onward.

Calibration is done when reviewers' grades converge to within one band without arbitration on two consecutive exercises — typically two to three exercises for a new team, one per year thereafter.

© EFS 2026 – All rights reserved

Annex A
(normative)

Term entry reviewer checklist

The checklist walks the reviewer through one entry in order. Each line names the criterion it feeds and the requirements it examines. Lines marked # correspond to mandatory-fix flags (11.6).

A.1 0. Gate

Table A.1

√	Question	Feeds
#	Is the definition present and non-empty?	cc1, flag
#	Are identifier, preferred designation, domain(s), sources, and lifecycle metadata present?	cc1, flag

A.2 1. Designation

Table A.2

√	Question	Feeds
	Exactly one preferred designation?	dc1 (D-1)
	Would a domain expert read the preferred designation as this concept (and not a neighbour)?	dc1 (D-2)
	Grammatically correct; singular for countable nouns; spelling per convention?	dc2 (D-3)
	Term type recorded (ISO 12620)?	dc3 (D-4)
	Normative status recorded?	dc3 (D-4)
	Grammar information recorded?	dc3 (D-4)
	Abbreviations: full form admitted alongside; symbol types declared?	dc4 (D-5)
	No requirements language, quantifiers or document references in the designation?	dc4 (D-7)
	Deprecated forms retained with pointers?	dc4 (D-6)

A.3 2. Definition

Table A.3

√	Question	Feeds
	Exactly one definition (per language)?	nc1 (N-1)
	Genus first?	nc1 (N-2)
	Delimiting characteristics present — distinguishes the concept from its coordinate concepts?	nc1 (N-2, N-7)
	Substitution test passes (apply it in a defining context)?	nc2 (N-3) # on outright failure
	No circularity (designation or derivative used as defining element)?	nc3 (N-4)
	No shall/should/must/need?	nc3 (N-5) #
	No article at the head?	nc3 (N-6)

© EFS 2026 – All rights reserved

(continued)

√	Question	Feeds
	Single declarative sentence?	nc3 (N-6)
	Self-contained within the register?	nc1 (N-7)
	Word count in the working band (corpus median 16, p90 32) — beyond it, is content displaced to notes?	nc4 (N-8)
	Notes carry only non-delimiting content?	nc4 (N-8, N-R10)
	Localizations faithful, degrees and notes recorded?	nc5 (N-9)

A.4 3. Completeness

Table A.4

√	Question	Feeds
	Sources present?	cc2 (C-2)
	Sources precise (document, clause, resolvable link)?	cc2 (C-2)
	Examples present where profile/warranted?	cc3 (C-3)
	Notes present where misunderstanding is foreseeable?	cc3 (C-4)
	Domains present, from the domain vocabulary?	cc1 (C-6), sc3 (S-3)
	Declared localizations present with degrees and notes?	cc4 (C-5)
	Known relations and mappings recorded?	cc5 (C-6), sc2 (S-2)

A.5 4. Clarity

Table A.5

√	Question	Feeds
	Can a competent outsider apply the entry without drafting history?	kc1 (K-1)
	One reading per sentence?	kc2 (K-1)
	Units/reference frame stated or unambiguous?	kc2 (K-2)
	Abbreviations expanded at first use?	kc3 (K-3)
	References precise (identifier / document + clause)?	kc3 (K-4)
	Language correctness and register per convention?	kc4 (K-5)
	Notes carry context, not argument?	kc4 (K-6)
	Examples concrete, correct, consistent?	kc4 (K-7)

A.6 5. Consistency

Table A.6

√	Question	Feeds
	Coordinate concepts in parallel form?	sc1 (S-1)
	Genus named by the same term across the coordinate set?	sc1 (S-2)
	Relations exist in vocabulary, direction correct?	sc2 (S-2)
	Hierarchy acyclic from this entry?	sc2 (S-2, ac3)
	Coordinates delimited (MECE)?	sc2 (ac5)
	Domain tags valid?	sc3 (S-3)
	Mappings honest and named?	sc4 (S-4)
	Word-building consistent with the terminological family?	sc5 (S-5)
	Status coherent with coordinate set?	sc5 (S-6)

© EFS 2026 – All rights reserved

A.7 6. Record

Score the criteria, check flags, compute the entry score and grade (Clause 11), write findings per failed criterion quoting the entry's own words, and record the score sheet (clause Clause 12).

© EFS 2026 – All rights reserved

Annex B
(normative)

Scoring rubric cards

One card per dimension. Each card lists its criteria with the anchored 0–3 descriptors; the reviewer picks the anchor that fits. The score sheet template follows.

B.1 Card D — Designation (weight 20 %)

Table B.1

Criterion	0 Fail	1 Minor	2 Good	3 Exemplary
dc1 aptness	Preferred designation denotes a different concept or level	Readable but shifted (too broad/narrow) against the definition	Denotes the concept; no better form obvious	Denotes precisely; the form itself aids system building
dc2 grammar	Broken grammar/ wrong number, breaks substitution	One grammar slip (e.g. plural countable)	Correct	Correct incl. register and collocation
dc3 annotation	Type or status missing	Status present, type or grammar missing	Type, status and grammar present	All present, incl. admitted/deprecated handling
dc4 form discipline	Requirements language or document refs in designation	Abbreviation preferred without full form; mixed forms	Singular discipline, clean form	Exemplary form across the designation set

B.2 Card N — Definition (weight 35 %)

Table B.2

Criterion	0 Fail	1 Minor	2 Good	3 Exemplary
nc1 intension	Empty, or fails to distinguish coordinates	Distinguishes but with a gap an expert must fill	Genus + delimiting characteristics, self-contained	Textbook genus-differentia; coordinates all delimited
nc2 substitution	Substitution breaks meaning/grammar	Substitution works only with rephrasing	Substitutes cleanly in defining contexts	Substitutes cleanly in any context
nc3 form	Circular, or requirements language, or article head	One formal slip (e.g. two sentences for cause)	Formal discipline clean	Clean and modeled — could teach the form
nc4 economy	Definition displaced into notes, or notes carry delimiting content	Some overflow in either direction	Content correctly separated	Separation exemplary: definition minimal, notes rich

© EFS 2026 – All rights reserved

B.3 Card C — Completeness (weight 20 %)

Table B.3

Criterion	0 Fail	1 Minor	2 Good	3 Exemplary
cc1 elements	A mandatory element absent	All present but one thin (e.g. domain without vocabulary)	All mandatory elements present	All present plus warranted extras
cc2 sources	No sources	Vague source (document only)	Document + clause	Document + clause + resolvable link
cc3 illustration	No examples/ notes where clearly warranted	One of them thin	Notes or examples present and useful	Both, well chosen
cc4 localizations	Declared localization absent	Present but degree/ note missing	Degrees recorded, notes where due	Complete with conversion-system fields per EFS 2504

B.4 Card K — Clarity (weight 15 %)

Table B.4

Criterion	0 Fail	1 Minor	2 Good	3 Exemplary
kc1 outsiderness	Insider-only parsing required	Mostly clear, one nested stack	Plain domain language throughout	Transparent to an adjacent-domain reader
kc2 ambiguity	Genuinely two readings or units unresolved	One ambiguous attachment	Single reading; units clear	Single reading under adversarial reading
kc3 references	Vague pointers (“see above”)	Half-precise references	Identifier or document+clause throughout	All resolvable on click
kc4 notes/examples	Notes argue/ Examples contradict	One thin or misplaced	Contextual notes; correct examples	Exemplary context-setting notes; concrete examples

B.5 Card S — Consistency (weight 10 %)

Table B.5

Criterion	0 Fail	1 Minor	2 Good	3 Exemplary
sc1 parallelism	Coordinate set diverges in pattern/ genus	One coordinate breaks parallelism	Parallel throughout	Parallel and mutually delimiting
sc2 relations	Unknown type or wrong direction or cycle	One direction/ annotation slip	Vocabulary-clean, correct directions	Clean incl. rake correctness
sc3 domains	Tagged outside domain vocabulary	One invalid tag	Valid tags	Precise multi-domain tags
sc4 mappings	`exact_match` asserted dishonestly / vocabulary unnamed	Named but degree questionable	Honest, named	Honest, named, with note
sc5 family/status	Family word-building diverges; mixed coordinate status	One family slip	Family harmonious	Family reads as a system

© EFS 2026 – All rights reserved

B.6 Score sheet template

```
entry: <identifier>
reviewer: <name>
date: <YYYY-MM-DD>
scores:
  D: {dc1: 3, dc2: 2, dc3: 2, dc4: 3}
  N: {nc1: 2, nc2: 3, nc3: 2, nc4: 1}
  C: {cc1: 3, cc2: 2, cc3: 1, cc4: 2}
  K: {kc1: 2, kc2: 2, kc3: 3, kc4: 2}
  S: {sc1: 2, sc2: 3, sc3: 3, sc4: 2, sc5: 2}
flags: []                          # list flag ids when raised
entry_score: 77
grade: B
findings:
- criterion: nc4
  finding: "definitional overflow: the operating boundary sentence
  belongs in a note"
- criterion: cc3
  finding: "example missing although the concept is frequently
  misunderstood"
disposition: accept-with-findings
```

Figure B.1

© EFS 2026 – All rights reserved

Annex C
(normative)

Corpus statistics

This annex records the full statistics of the corpus analysis of clause Clause 5. Population: 406 898 concept files from the ISO OBP terminology extraction; sample: 3 000 files (fixed seed), yielding 4 662 localized entries with designations.

C.1 Definition length distribution

Table C.1

Statistic	Words	Share of entries
Minimum	1	—
10th percentile	8	—
25th percentile	12	—
Median	16	—
75th percentile	22	—
90th percentile	32	—
95th percentile	41	—
Maximum	159	—
Mean	18,3	—

Working interpretation: definitions of 8–32 words cover the corpus's 80 % center. The rubric's economy criterion (nc4) anchors "good" at the working band and treats the extreme tails as review triggers.

C.2 Presence statistics

Table C.2

Element	Present	Share
Definition (non-empty)	4 606	98,8 %
Sources	4 662 of entries carry source blocks; 0 sampled without	100 % (extraction floor)
Grammar information	4 613	98,9 %
Notes	1 589	34,1 %
Examples	134	2,9 %

C.3 Defect statistics

Table C.3

Defect (detection rule)	Count	Share	Anti-pattern
Empty definition	56	1,2 %	AP-01
Requirements language in definition	21	0,5 %	AP-05
Article at definition head	146	3,1 %	AP-07

© EFS 2026 – All rights reserved

(continued)

Defect (detection rule)	Count	Share	Anti-pattern
Circularity heuristic hit	163	3,5 %	AP-03

C.4 Designation and status statistics

Table C.4

Measure	Value
Normative status (sampled entries)	preferred 100 % (extraction retains preferred only)
Designation type (sampled entries)	expression 100 %
Grammar information present	98,9 %
NOTE The extraction pipeline's preferred-only retention means the corpus understates the admitted/deprecated practice of the source standards; the requirements of this document (D-1, D-6) intentionally exceed the corpus floor on these axes.	

C.5 Source document concentration

The sampled entries spanned hundreds of source documents. The documents with the highest absolute defect counts (empty definitions) were legacy vocabularies of the 1983–2012 period — for example the ISO 9250 series (2012) and the ISO 5843 series (1985–1997) — while documents extracted from current publications showed near-zero structural defects. Document-era correlation is the strongest single predictor of structural defects in the corpus; conversion-era validation (EFG 2519, clause 11) targets exactly this population.

C.6 Reproducing the analysis

The statistics of this annex are produced by a deterministic analysis (fixed random seed) over the corpus in EFS 2516 record format. The script ships with the register repository that runs the analysis; re- running it against an ES register produces directly comparable statistics, and comparing a register's profile with this annex is the quantitative form of the clause Clause 5 evidence review.

C.7 Sample size and methodology notes

The sample of 3 000 files was drawn with a fixed pseudorandom seed, so every re-run reproduces the same entries. With 4 662 localized entries scored analytically, the standard error of the median definition length is below half a word, and presence-rate estimates carry a 95 % confidence interval of approximately ±1,3 percentage points — tight enough that every requirement-floor decision in this document rests on differences much larger than the measurement noise.

Per-dimension rates for subpopulations (single source documents, domains) are estimated on smaller sub-samples and carry wider intervals; the annex reports them as profiles, not floor decisions.

The analysis operates on the EFS 2516 record format only: any termbase that exports the interchange records of EFS 2516 can be measured with the identical script, making the ISO corpus figures of this annex a benchmark that ES registers can be compared against directly.

C.8 IEV corpus statistics

Corpus: the International Electrotechnical Vocabulary (IEC 60050), 22 229 concepts; sample: 2 000 concepts (fixed seed), yielding approximately 23 000 language entries.

© EFS 2026 – All rights reserved

Table C.5

Statistic	Value
Languages per concept	median 11; mode 11; range 2–19
Definitions (eng)	100 % of entries; median 18 words; p90 36
Definitions (fra)	100 % of entries; median 19 words; p90 37
Definitions (deu, spa, zho, ara, ita, pol)	0 % — term-only localizations
Definitions (rus)	7 % — partial
Notes (eng, fra)	32 %
Examples (eng, fra)	under 1 %
Grammar (deu / fra / pol)	97 % / 98 % / 30 %

The IEV operates the term-only localization model (Clause 5, “The two localization models”); its definition-length figures sit close to the ISO corpus (median 16 eng), so the definition-quality anchors of Annex Annex B hold for both corpora, while localization completeness (cc4) is judged against the declared model.

© EFS 2026 – All rights reserved

Annex D
(normative)

Scored exemplars

Three real-shaped entries scored with the rubric: exemplary (A), acceptable (B), deficient (D with flags). Names and records are drawn from register practice and abridged.

D.1 Exemplar 1 — exemplary (grade A)

```
id: ship-water-draught
data:
  identifier: ship-water-draught
  uri: urn:example:ship:water-draught
terms:
- type: expression
  designation: water draught
  normative_status: preferred
  grammar_info: [{noun: true}]
- type: abbreviation
  designation: WD
  normative_status: admitted
definition:
- content: vertical distance between the waterline and the lowest
  continuous point of the hull of a ship
sources:
- origin:
    ref: {source: ISO, id: ISO 19642, clause: 3.2.1}
domains: [shipping]
examples:
- content: "a vessel drawing 12 m cannot enter the inner harbour"
status: valid
```

Figure D.1

Score sheet:

Table D.1

Criterion	Score	Anchor hit
dc1 aptness	3	Form denotes exactly the measured extent
dc2 grammar	3	Noun, singular, clean
dc3 annotation	3	Type, status, grammar, abbreviation admitted
dc4 form	3	Clean
nc1 intension	3	Genus (distance) + delimiting (waterline → lowest point); MECE vs air draught
nc2 substitution	3	“The pilot requested the <def>” — clean
nc3 form	3	No article, no circularity, one sentence
nc4 economy	2	Minimal; harbour example could live in examples (it does)
cc1 elements	3	All present

© EFS 2026 – All rights reserved

(continued)

Criterion	Score	Anchor hit
cc2 sources	3	Document + clause
cc3 illustration	2	One example; none needed more
cc4 localizations	3	eng + fra, full degree recorded
kc1–kc4	3, 3, 2, 3	Reference link not yet resolvable (kc3 2)
sc1–sc5	3, 3, 3, n/a, 3	Coordinate set parallel with air draught

Entry score: D 96, N 93, C 93, K 92, S 97 → **95, grade A**. No flags.

D.2 Exemplar 2 — acceptable (grade B)

```
id: concept-entry
data:
  identifier: concept-entry
terms:
- type: expression
  designation: terminological entry
  normative_status: preferred
definition:
- content: entry in a terminology collection that contains the
  terminological data of a concept
notes:
- content: The term "concept entry" is preferred in ES registers.
sources:
- origin: {ref: {source: ISO, id: ISO 10241-1}}
status: valid
```

Figure D.2

Score sheet:

Table D.2

Criterion	Score	Finding
dc1	2	Apt but “terminological entry” vs ES usage “concept entry” — both recorded
dc3	2	Grammar info absent
nc1	2	Genus present; “terminological data” is not self-contained (register defines it)
nc3	2	“terminological … terminological” — near-circularity, judged mention not circular; flagged for eyes
cc2	2	Document only; no clause
cc3	1	Note exists; example warranted (frequent misunderstanding with “entry status”)
kc1	2	Readable; “terminological data” chase required
kc3	2	No abbreviations used; nothing to expand
sc1	2	Coordinate “concept record” definition shares genus formulation — checked

© EFS 2026 – All rights reserved

Entry score: D 84, N 76, C 76, K 79, S 82 → **79, grade B**. No flags. Disposition: accept-with-findings (cc3, dc3).

D.3 Exemplar 3 — deficient (grade D, flagged)

```
id: automatic-system
data:
  identifier: automatic-system
terms:
- type: expression
  designation: automatic system
  normative_status: preferred
definition:
- content: A system that shall operate automatically without human
  intervention in accordance with the applicable standards
status: valid
```

Figure D.3

Score sheet:

Table D.3

Criterion	Score	Finding
nc3	0 #	Article head (`A system`); requirements language (`shall`); both N-5/N-6 violated — flag raised
nc1	1	Genus present; "operate automatically" is circular-adjacent and non-delimiting
cc1	2	Sources absent → mandatory element missing → flag
cc2	0	No sources (C-2)
kc2	2	Single reading retained

Entry score: D 78, N 26, C 40, K 71, S 60 → **52**, with two mandatory-fix flags → **grade D (capped)**. Disposition: return to author with nc3 (article + requirements language) and cc1/cc2 (sources) as the fix list.

D.4 Exemplar 4 — localization-focused (grade B)

A concept whose interest is the localization set rather than the definition:

```
id: privacy
data:
  identifier: privacy
  uri: urn:example:privacy
  localized_concepts:
    eng: privacy-eng
    fra: privacy-fra
    de: privacy-de
status: valid

id: privacy-eng
termid: privacy
data:
  language_code: eng
  terms:
  - type: expression
    designation: privacy
    normative_status: preferred
  definition:
  - content: condition of having control over the collection, retention
    and disclosure of information about an individual
```

© EFS 2026 – All rights reserved

```yaml
status: valid

id: privacy-fra
termid: privacy
data:
  language_code: fra
  terms:
  - type: expression
    designation: vie privée
    normative_status: preferred
  definition:
  - content: aspect de la vie d'une personne soustrait à l'attention
    publique et à l'ingérence d'autrui
status: valid
equivalence_degree: partial
equivalence_note: >-
  French "vie privée" covers the legal-institutional aspects more
  strongly than the English concept; prefer the narrower legal term in
  regulatory contexts.

id: privacy-de
termid: privacy
data:
  language_code: de
  terms:
  - type: expression
    designation: informationelle Selbstbestimmung
    normative_status: admitted
  definition:
  - content: Befugnis des Einzelnen, über die Erhebung, Speicherung und
    Verwendung seiner personenbezogenen Daten selbst zu bestimmen
status: valid
equivalence_degree: full
```

Figure D.4

Score sheet:

Table D.4

Criterion	Score	Finding
dc1–dc4	2, 3, 3, 2	German designation `admitted` with reason implicit — note recommended
nc1–nc4	2, 2, 3, 2	Intensions align with recorded degrees
cc1, cc2	3, 2	Sources on the English record; localizations cite the source standard per EFS 2504 practice
cc4	3	Three localizations, degrees recorded, partial note present, script fields present where applicable
kc1–kc4	2, 2, 2, 2	Equivalence note is actionable; German admission reason would raise kc4
sc4	2	No cross-register mappings recorded although the concept maps to legal-register concepts — C-6/S-4 finding

Entry score: D 82, N 78, C 84, K 75, S 74 → **79, grade B**. No flags. Disposition: accept-with-findings (mapping gap; German admission note).

© EFS 2026 – All rights reserved

Annex E
(normative)

Anti-pattern catalogue

Each anti-pattern: the recurring defect observed in the corpus of clause Clause 5, its detection rule (how a reviewer or validator finds it), the requirement it violates, and the fix.

E.1 AP-01 — The silent entry

Defect: an entry with an empty or missing definition (corpus: 1,2 % of entries; concentrated in 1983–2012 legacy documents). **Detection**: absence of a non-empty `definition` block — fully mechanical. **Violates**: C-1 (flag). **Fix**: draft the definition from the concept's system placement; if the concept cannot be defined, it should not be an entry.

E.2 AP-02 — The buried rake

Defect: a definition that enumerates a part list ("a system consisting of a sensor, a processor, a display and a power unit"). **Detection**: definitions containing enumerations (", and a", ", consisting of"). **Violates**: N-8, N-R10. **Fix**: express the joint decomposition as an n-ary relation per EFS 2510, clause 7; keep the definition on the intension.

E.3 AP-03 — The mirror definition

Defect: definitional circularity — the designation or its derivative used as the defining element (corpus heuristic: 3,5 %, part of which is legitimate term-mention). **Detection**: designation string (or stem) appears in the definition — mechanical flag, human judgement on each hit. **Violates**: N-4. **Fix**: ground the genus outside the term; if the concept truly has no superordinate, define by enumeration of essential characteristics (ISO 704 extensional definition).

E.4 AP-04 — The synonym swap

Defect: the definition defines a **different** concept that shares the designation in another domain or register. **Detection**: cross-register mapping review; substitution test failure in the domain context. **Violates**: D-2, S-4. **Fix**: separate concepts with mapping relations (`related_match` until a degree is assessed), or harmonize the concept with its counterpart per EFS 2513 change procedures.

E.5 AP-05 — The smuggled requirement

Defect: requirements language inside the definition (corpus: 0,5 %). **Detection**: shall/should/must/need in the definition content — mechanical. **Violates**: N-5 (flag). **Fix**: move the prescription into the normative document text where it belongs; the definition describes the concept as it is.

E.6 AP-06 — The orphan abbreviation

Defect: an abbreviation designated as preferred with no full form in the entry. **Detection**: preferred designation of type abbreviation without an admitted full-form designation. **Violates**: D-5. **Fix**: record the full form as admitted (or the abbreviation as admitted and the full form as preferred, per domain usage).

© EFS 2026 – All rights reserved

E.7 AP-07 — The article opener

Defect: definitions beginning with “A”, “An” or “The” (corpus: 3,1 %). **Detection**: first token of the definition in {A, An, The} — mechanical. **Violates**: N-6. **Fix**: delete the article; the definition begins with the genus.

E.8 AP-08 — The unbounded definition

Defect: definitions far beyond the working band (corpus p90: 32 words; defects observed to 159 words), usually enumerations, process descriptions, or requirements displaced into the definition. **Detection**: definition word count beyond the register’s stated band. **Violates**: N-8, N-R8. **Fix**: split per AP-02, or displace mechanism detail into notes; find the missing intermediate concept.

E.9 AP-09 — The vague pointer

Defect: references from definitions or notes to “the relevant standard”, “see above”, “applicable regulations”. **Detection**: pointer phrases in definition/notes — near-mechanical. **Violates**: K-4. **Fix**: cite by identifier or document + clause.

E.10 AP-10 — The example that teaches the wrong concept

Defect: an example whose content matches a neighbouring concept better than the entry’s concept. **Detection**: examples checked against the definition at review (K-7); examples that contradict the definition or are identical to a coordinate concept’s example. **Violates**: K-7. **Fix**: correct the instance, or accept that the entry boundary is wrong and address the concept system (AP-02’s cousin).

E.11 AP-11 — The status-blind import

Defect: entries imported from legacy corpora carrying their conversion-era defects silently (empty definitions, missing examples, unvalidated designations). **Detection**: import scoring per clause Clause 12; document-era correlation (clause Clause 5). **Violates**: C-1, C-2, EFG 2519 import review. **Fix**: re-validate on import; score before acceptance; remediate per EFG 2519 clause 12.

E.12 AP-12 — The family stranger

Defect: a member of a terminological family (derivations, partitives) whose word-building or definition structure diverges from the family pattern. **Detection**: family-level review (Group S); word-formation comparison across the family. **Violates**: S-5. **Fix**: align word-building and definition structure with the family, or determine that the divergent member is a different family’s concept.

© EFS 2026 – All rights reserved

Bibliography

[1] ISO 639-3[3)] , *Codes for the representation of names of languages — Part 3: Alpha-3 code for comprehensive coverage of languages*.

[2] ISO 1087, *Terminology work and terminology science — Vocabulary*.

[3] ISO 10241-3, *Terminological entries in standards — Part 3: Presentation of terminological entries and preparation of glossaries for translation*.

[4] ISO 15924, *Information and documentation — Codes for the representation of names of scripts*.

[5] ISO 24229, *Information and documentation — Codes for written language conversion systems*.

[6] ISO 25964-1, *Information and documentation — Thesauri and interoperability with other vocabularies — Part 1: Thesauri for information retrieval*.

[7] FERIN, *Framework for Extensible Registration of INformation*, https://www.ferin.org/

[8] EFD 101:2026, *Enosema Directive: Standardization and publication*

[9] EFD 102:2026, *Enosema Directive: Standard document requirements*

[10] EFD 104:2026, *Enosema Directive: Guidelines for the implementation of the patent policy*

[11] EFD 105:2026, *Enosema Directive: Intellectual property rights policy*

3) Withdrawn.

© EFS 2026 – All rights reserved

enosema

Price based on 38 pages

© EFS 2026
All rights reserved

Making meaning meaningful