

WS2 Working Note 20 October

Back to [Technical Modeling Framework](#)

Back to [start](#)

Cross references

DC Source can refer to a Resource.

Examples:

Bibliographic resource for Standard Reference to the individual element Reference to entries within enumerations

Conclusions:

We need a model of kinds of sources. Reference to places within the document or a definition within the document.

Issues:

How much depth we want This would increase the scope of what we need to do substantially.

For XML Schema: there be a namespace. For ISO document there would be a page number,

What about FIBIM draft terms.

Conclusions:

Provide some definition of what we mean by Source. Use TermOrigin and DefinitionOrigin as a means to point to those. Refine dct:source to refine for FIBO course types.

Action: come up with a list of reference types.

Send to EK who will look at what other people have done for those kinds of sources.

Bibliographic citations work is already done. Includes DBPedia (RDF Triples). Things like wikipedia, InvestorWords.com and so on.

Other initiatives have their own ontologies for citations. We should reuse what's already done on this.

Is there yet a single acknowledge way of doing this? There are multiples, but not clear if there's one more commonly used one we can use.

Also need to distinguish definitions that are "adapted".

Can create our own structure. This would include being able to flag a Definition Origin as 'adapted'.

Action: MB to provide a list of the reference types we currently use.

Consensus awaited on whether there is a consensus within the SemWeb community as to how they do this.

Tools? Would be seen as an OWL Annotation Property. Are there tools that look at certain tags at least for citation. Would identify what's currently being done on that.

Further Notes

Further Notes material: Using various SKOS note types (see note in spreadsheet.)

Question: isn't SKOS required to have SKOS Concepts?

Annotations can apply to anything since the reasoners ignore them. Only really matters if what we are talking about as a SKOS concept is using those semantic mapping relations.

Won't this break the metamodel?

In DC, most things relate to 'resource' e.g. Source can apply to any Resource. SKOS Notes (not relationships) can apply to any Resource. Only the Object Properties (mapping relations) are required to be of Concepts.

`rdfs:isDefinedBy` is this relevant here? Refers to a URI for a particular document at the document level (not the item level).

Use this or DC for the above bibliographic references? Only use this for the link to the URI for that document.

There is a bug in ODM about constraints of these. ODM says it has to be a URI but doesn't say what sort. Should be a URI that specifically refers to a specific document. This has to dereference as a document file (pdf, html, word etc.).

So would we use `rdfs:isDefinedBy`? No. EK uses as a reference to a source that you used to create the model.

Conclusions: we won't use `rdfs:isDefinedBy` we will use and extend the DC terms as previously noted.

Synonym

There is nothing in DC and SKOS ISO 1087 has something, BUT the synonyms are terms not concepts.

Write up how we would use it, how and why.

We use it as text. Alternate label: use skos:altLabel

What about ISO 11179 'near synonym' notion? Not in SKOS.

From:

<https://www.omgwiki.org/OMG-FDTF/> - **Financial Services DTF wiki**

Permanent link:

https://www.omgwiki.org/OMG-FDTF/doku.php?id=ws2_thursday_20_october

Last update: **2011/11/03 10:27**

