Concept Inactivation

Concept inactivation values

Depending on the reason for inactivation, a specific Inactivation reason has to be selected.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inactivation reason</th>
<th>Association type</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Ambiguous                    | Possibly equivalent to                  | • The concept has been made inactive because it is inherently ambiguous. This may be because of an incomplete fully specified name or because it has several associated terms that are not regarded as synonymous or partially synonymous  
• The possibly equivalent target is an active concept that represents one of the possible meanings of the inactive concept  
• Multiple rows may be used to refer to each of the possible replacement targets for the ambiguous concept  
• Previously referred to as May Be A |
| Component moved elsewhere    | Moved to association reference set (foundation metadata concept) | • Applies to a component that has been moved to, or is pending a move to another namespace  
• The target component identifies the target namespace, not the new component |
| Duplicate component          | Same as association reference set (foundation metadata concept) | • The concept has been made inactive because it has the same meaning as another concept  
• The target component identifies the active component that this component duplicates |
| Erroneous component          | Replaced by association reference set (foundation metadata concept) | • The concept has been made inactive because it contains an error  
• The target component identifies the active component that replaces this component |
| Limited component            | No longer in use and no requirement to retain | NA |
| Outdated component           | Replaced by Association reference set (foundation metadata concept) | • The concept has been made inactive because it is an outdated concept that is no longer used |
| Non-conformance to editorial policy | No association required                          | • Applies to a concept which does not adhere to the Editorial guidelines |

Inactivation of duplicate concepts

Prior to inactivation

• Check to see if the two concepts are true duplicates, i.e. semantically equivalent.  
• Decide if the semantic meaning of the two concepts is the same.  
• Review ancestors and descendants (if any) of the concept. Are they inconsistent with what is implied by the FSN? If so, inactivate the concept.

Inactivation

• Keep the more specific FSN and keep the concept ID.  
  • Note: Implementers do not see the modeling. Hence there should be more weight in the meaning of the FSN, rather than the underlying modeling.  
• If appropriate, add the inactivated FSN as a synonym for retained concept.  
• Add the synonyms from the inactivated concept, where they are semantically equivalent,  

Consider

• Inactivating the concept with fewer subtypes. This will simplify the process and minimize the amount of rework required.  
• If needed, the retained FSN should be reworded to align with current policy. If required, modeling should also be corrected.
Inactivated concept

- Add the inactivated descriptions as synonyms (if the meaning is the same) to the retained concept.
- The inactivated concept should be marked as *ambiguous* if it has an unclear meaning.

⚠️ Inform the requestor (if there is a request), as soon as possible, as to which concept is inactivated.