FDTF/EDMC Monthly Update Call Minutes

4 April 2018

NOTE: generally the substantive content of these calls is reflected in the slides (posted separately). These minutes are to record additional comments, requests and suggestions made during the presentation of these slides, and to record attendance. This (4 April 2018) is the first such document recording additional material of this nature.

# References

Monthly Update Sides (filename ‘20180404 FIBO Status Update v0.1.pptx’)

# Attendees

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Name** | **Company** | **Affiliation** |
| Mike Bennett | EDM Council | OMG and EDMC |
| Rob Nehmer | Oakland University | OMG |
| Kalthoff, Nancy | Teradata |  |
| Pete Rivett | Adaptive | OMG |
| Bobbin Teegarden | OntoAge | OMG |
| John F. Gemski | JFG Information Management | EDMC |
| David S Frankel | BIAN | EDMC |

# Comments and Discussion

With references to slide number where applicable.

## FIBO Quarterly Release (Slide 4)

The release notes are now more detailed and complete. See

<https://spec.edmcouncil.org/fibo/release.html>

## FIBO Plans (Slide 6)

### Written Specification

Still requires work, as identified at the March 2018 Quarterly Meeting of FDTF.

Scope section needs to be framed such that the proposed new content for all anticipated FIBO content is within the stated scope.

### Provisional to Release Process

BT: How do the Ladies in Waiting (Loans, Bonds) get into Release and thereby into FIBO v2?

MB: Previously most release content has gone via one of the OWL expert gatekeepers on the FIBO Team (including 2017Q4 changes in Foundations). Now that CCM supports OWL generation for most of what is in FIBO, and all of what is in most ontologies, we should be able to originate OWL this way and use the BTDM process as designed. As discussed with Dennis Wisnosky in Reston, we will start to do this on Foundations beginning with recent proposed changed in Products and Services to test the waters. Other FCTs that use or used CCM (such as the Bonds FCT) should then be able to follow.

For Loans, it should be able to follow a similar process with whatever tools they were using, or with CCM, subject to whether the Loans OWL design doesn’t include features not yet supported in CCM ingest or output.

In both Loans and Bonds there are also further integration challenges to align the developed material with other OWL Release content.

#### Loans

Need an FCT lead to champion this and to deal with any remaining technical requirements to get this into Release.

Need to deal with integration of the HMDA (US Mortgage loans) vertical with the pre-existing Loans framework and core terms. It may be possible to do the same as the IR Swaps work has done which is to retain a clear vertical Release path without needing to account for adjacent content.

#### Bonds

Need an FCT lead to champion this and to deal with any remaining technical requirements to get this into Release.

Need to integrate or de-duplicate between the terms that were developed by the Bonds FCT and the same or similar terms that were developed in a separate stand-alone Debt Instruments ontology, developed at the same time by someone else, and sitting outside the existing Debt modular structure.

## Deliverables (slide 10)

### FIBOPedia, Abstracts and About Files

In the Q1 release new About files were created only for the missing ones in Release (2 in SEC and 2 in DER) where the modules are in Release (Production) status but there was never an OMG FIBO v1 submission.

The About files for Provisional content are to be completed for the Q2 release. Informative content is intended to be fully deprecated by the Q2 release.

MB notes that some Informative material may still need to be referenced by other ontologies (i.e. some material was identified by others as ‘Informative’ despite not being conceptual extensions to existing Release or Provisional material). To deprecate all these would therefore be to complete all of FIBO or at least to understand all remaining dependencies.

* PR suggested that in cases where there was still some intended reference in some Provisional ontology, these should not be considered Informative and we should raise JIRAs to change these
* PR is able to generate a full list of dependencies from Adaptive which would allow us to identify all such dependencies.

On this basis, MB agrees we can deprecate and remaining Informative (extension) ontologies in the Q2 time frame, and will raise JIRAs to make changes needed if any. Note that all URIs now reflect this status difference i.e. any ontology with a status of Informative has the string /Ext in at least one place in its IRI.

### Ontology Status Spreadsheet

Pete Rivett has created a spreadsheet that records the formal status (Release, Provisional or Informative) of each ontology, by extracting the relevant ontology metadata. This was not included in the formal deliverables on the spec website but it was suggested this would be useful.

MB has found this very useful in managing the CCM modules, identifying missing About files etc.

Question: Would industry participants like to see this as a new FIBO spec deliverable?

Answer: Yes, definitely.

**Action:** Relay this information back to the FIBO submitters team.

### Widoco

PR points out that the function and purpose of Widoco is to provide formal written documentation for each ontology, with the OWL visualization being only a part of that not the sole purpose of Widoco.

MB adjusts the slides to reflect this.

PR checks the web page – the written description reflects this correctly as of now.

### Questions about SKOS Deliverable (FIBO Vocabulary)

Questions from David Frankel on Slide 10.

#### SKOS alt-label

Replacement of FIBO synonym with alt-label in the SOS deliverable (previously ‘to be confirmed’)

These are now implemented as requested.

#### SKOS Style

Use of object properties as kinds of SKOS Relation (in the current FIBO product) rather than kinds of SKOS Concept as most tools expect.

Detailed on screen examination (after the main call)

Determined that although these relationships are rendered as kinds of SKOS Relation, they do still have the features that a SKOS Concept would have, namely alt label and definition.

Question: whether or how existing SKOS tools would handle this.

Outcome: Need to know if the known existing tools can use the concept related features of these property descriptions or not. DF to research this.

If needed, someone from the industry would need to formally ask for us to create the second, more conventional style of SKOS. We are told this is trivially easy to do, but until someone asks for it there is no reason to incur the engineering overhead of publishing two sets of SKOS deliverables.