Dictionary System Committee, X3H4 92/0xx), April 8, 1992.
5. ISO/IEC 11179, "Information Technology – Specification and Standardization of Data Elements," ftp://sdct-sunsrv1.ncsl.nist.gov/x3l8/11179.
6. dpANS X3.285, "Metamodel for the Management of Sharable Data," ftp://sdct-sunsrv1.ncsl.nist.gov/x3l8/x3l8docs/x3.285.
7. Draft Technical Report, "Concept of Operations for a Data Element Registry," ftp://sdct-sunsrv1.ncsl.nist.gov/x3l8/x3l8docs/drconops.rtf.
8. Defense Information Infrastructure SHADE Capstone Document, Version 1.0, July 11,1996.

Notes

1. Http://www-datadmn.itsi.disa.mil provides information on current DoD data standardization policy, including access to the most current update of the DoD Data Model.
2. Official policy requires data models that are based on the structure of the DoD model, but the policy is not specific as to the detail required. Standards constructed using standard naming conventions and representations can theoretically be approved without imposing the rigidity of a standard model. Unfortunately, all functional areas with which we are familiar (four out of more than a dozen) have interpreted both written and verbal guidance from DoD to require detailed standard models. Furthermore, we have witnessed potential standards submitted without detailed compatibility turned down as standards in two functional areas.
3. The term *coupling* refers to the situation in which one module in a system shares internal information with another module to the extent that modification to either automatically requires modification to both. In programming, global variables used in multiple procedures "couple" the procedures together for maintenance purposes. We can say that data coupling occurs when disparate modules directly access a database structure. In such cases, changes to the database required in support of one module affect all other modules that access the same data. With modular encapsulation, change can be limited to the interface level, which reduces the degree of maintenance required.
4. To be fair, the two-digit year standard was not so "badly chosen" at its origin. With memory space at a premium, it was a good idea at the time. But "time" is the operative word here. Over time, good standards can become bad standards. Forcing data standardization into the bowels of otherwise disparate systems makes the inevitable correction process much more difficult.
5. Specialized languages, human and computer, may be more useful for specialized purposes (encapsulated purposes). They will still require translation into a more generalized "standard" if communication with outside people (or systems) is required.
6. "Ain't" is a well-understood, generalized representation for a concept whose more preferred representations are "am not," "are not," and "is not." As a generalization, ain't is a more "standard" term than any of its substitutes.
7. The development of human language constructs is not top down, either. The only known human language constructed from the top down is Esperanto. Although there is an Esperanto language authority, there are no native Esperanto speakers, and adoption of Esperanto has gone essentially nowhere. To adopt standards that are not already in general use in some form is likely to achieve the same lack of success.