

## Disposition: Deferred

### OMG Issue No: 10844

**Title:** Figure D.3 notation

**Source:**

NIST (Mr. Conrad Bock, conrad.bock@nist.gov)

**Summary:**

In Annex D, in Figure D.2, the instance names should be underlined. Some of the association end names are so far from the ends of the lines that it's hard to tell which they are referring to.

**Resolution:**

**Defer to RTF**

## Disposition: Deferred

### OMG Issue No: 10846

**Title:** Annex D.4 sets

**Source:**

NIST (Mr. Conrad Bock, conrad.bock@nist.gov)

**Summary:**

Annex D.4, under Figure D.4 should have another constraint that prevents two instances of `NAryProperty` from having the same values for the properties of the `Nary`. Otherwise, it could represent a bag of property values, which OWL properties cannot

**Resolution:**

**Defer to RTF**

## Disposition: Deferred

### OMG Issue No: 10849

**Title:** Figure 16.1 incomplete

**Source:**

NIST (Mr. Conrad Bock, conrad.bock@nist.gov)

**Summary:**

Figure 16.1 (Key Aspects of UML Class Diagram) is missing the multiplicities on general/specific, and the subsetting between ownedEnd and memberEnd.

**Resolution:**

**Defer to RTF**

## **Disposition: Deferred**

### **OMG Issue No: 10850**

**Title:** Formal structure

**Source:**

NIST (Mr. Conrad Bock, conrad.bock@nist.gov)

**Summary:**

Under Figure 16.1, the first sentence refers to "formal structure". Should explain what this is. Is it the metamodel?

**Resolution:**

**Defer to RTF**

## Disposition: Deferred

### OMG Issue No: 10853

**Title:** Associations

**Source:**

NIST (Mr. Conrad Bock, conrad.bock@nist.gov)

**Summary:**

In Section 16.2.1 (UML Kernel), the discussion around Tables 16.2 through 16.4 seems to be about relational implementations, rather than UML modeling in the sense that is important to OWL. My suggestion is to replace Tables 16.3 and 16.4 with the tabular forms of the metamodel, as in 16.2. The paragraph above Table 16.3, first sentence, modeling associations does not depend on the implementation of classes (the "implementation" usually refers to how the model is translated to a platform). Same comment on the second sentence, which says Table 16.2 is an implementation, when it is only a tabular form of the metamodel. The second sentence refers to the disjoint union of attributes, but there's nothing like this in UML.

**Resolution:**

**Defer to RTF**

## Disposition: Deferred

### OMG Issue No: 10863

**Title:** Distinct associations, ownedAttribute associations

**Source:**

NIST (Mr. Conrad Bock, conrad.bock@nist.gov)

**Summary:**

In 16.2.2 (Class and Property - Basics), in the paragraph below Table 16.6, there is the sentence " Note that UML ownedAttribute M2 associations are distinct, even if ownedAttributes have the same name associated with different classes." What are "M2 owned attribute associations"? In the case of M1 properties, properties with the same name may be on different classes, but if they inherit from the same base class where a property of that name is introduced, then they are the same property from OWL's point of view. There is usually no need to translate to unique OWL properties, just restrictions. See next issue.

**Resolution:**

**Defer to RTF**

## Disposition: Deferred

### OMG Issue No: 10864

**Title:** Distinct associations, restrictions

**Source:**

NIST (Mr. Conrad Bock, conrad.bock@nist.gov)

**Summary:**

In 16.2.2 (Class and Property - Basics), in the paragraph above Table 16.7, says the OWL properties "arising" (I assume due to translation) from a UML model are distinct, that OWL restrictions aren't in the translation. UML can redefine properties in subtypes of the classes where the property is introduced, which is equivalent to restriction. The method employed in the chapter is not adequate.

**Resolution:**

**Defer to RTF**

## Disposition: Deferred

### OMG Issue No: 10865

**Title:** Identifiers

**Source:**

NIST (Mr. Conrad Bock, conrad.bock@nist.gov)

**Summary:**

In 16.2.2 (Class and Property - Basics), in the paragraph below Table 16.7, the first sentence says the translation assumes that a single name identifies each instance of the class. It isn't necessary to assume this, since UML does not assume a relational semantics. The notion of identity is primitive in UML and applies even to instances of classes that have no attributes or attribute values. The rest of the paragraph may apply to relational implementations, but is not a general solution. It also assumes that the property names of classes are always different, but distinct classes can have the same properties in UML. (BTW, fourth sentence, "values" -> "names")

**Resolution:**

**Defer to RTF**



## Disposition: Deferred

### OMG Issue No: 10866

**Title:** Associations

**Source:**

NIST (Mr. Conrad Bock, [conrad.bock@nist.gov](mailto:conrad.bock@nist.gov))

**Summary:**

In 16.2.2 (Class and Property - Basics), in the paragraph below Table 16.7, gives the wrong translation to OWL for UML associations. UML associations have properties at end, and these are often navigable. Binary associations in UML translate to two inverse properties, using these property names, not the association name. See the UML profile for OWL for the translation options for associations, and the third paragraph in 16.2.3.

**Resolution:**

**Defer to RTF**

## Disposition: Deferred

### OMG Issue No: 10867

**Title:** Subproperties and redefinition

**Source:**

NIST (Mr. Conrad Bock, [conrad.bock@nist.gov](mailto:conrad.bock@nist.gov))

**Summary:**

In 16.2.2 (Class and Property - Basics), in the paragraph below Table 16.8, the second sentence, in parentheses, says that subproperties translate to redefinition. The translation is only to subsetting. Also the wording in parenthetical remark conflates association generalization with property subsetting. Same comment about the last sentence of this paragraph, which omits property subsetting. Same comment about the translation given in the next paragraph. UML associations, even binary ones, can have more than one property, and each property can be subsetting if the association as a whole is specialized, but they don't all need to be.

**Resolution:**

**Defer to RTF**

## Disposition: Deferred

### OMG Issue No: 10871

**Title:** Association member ends

**Source:**

NIST (Mr. Conrad Bock, [conrad.bock@nist.gov](mailto:conrad.bock@nist.gov))

**Summary:**

In 16.2.2 (Class and Property - Basics), third paragraph under Figure 16.3 describes UML member ends incorrectly. The second sentence says that the classes Staff and Enrolled are member ends, but member ends are classes, not properties.

**Resolution:**

**Defer to RTF**

## Disposition: Deferred

### OMG Issue No: 10872

**Title:** Table 16.9 and Naries

**Source:**

NIST (Mr. Conrad Bock, [conrad.bock@nist.gov](mailto:conrad.bock@nist.gov) [conradb@cme.nist.gov](mailto:conradb@cme.nist.gov))

**Summary:**

In 16.2.2 (Class and Property - Basics), Table 16.9 replace the "Parts" header with "Properties". The Reification property isn't necessary, because AssociationClass is both a class and association, there is no separate reification of the association (this is necessary in OWL DL, however, and even in OWL Full, some extension is needed for a subclass of Property and Class to correspond to a UML Association Class). The text below the table uses the term "implements" which doesn't apply (these are platform-dependent models), and introduces the reified association, which doesn't exist in UML.

**Resolution:**

**Defer to RTF**

## Disposition: Deferred

### OMG Issue No: 10873

**Title:** Translation of binary associations

**Source:**

NIST (Mr. Conrad Bock, [conrad.bock@nist.gov](mailto:conrad.bock@nist.gov))

**Summary:**

In 16.2.3 (More Advanced Concepts), third paragraph, next to last sentence, the domain of the OWL property is the class at the non-navigable end. This is because the ends of associations in UML are placed opposite the class they navigate from.

**Resolution:**

**Defer to RTF**

## Disposition: Deferred

### OMG Issue No: 10874

**Title:** UML Thing 2

**Source:**

NIST (Mr. Conrad Bock, [conrad.bock@nist.gov](mailto:conrad.bock@nist.gov))

**Summary:**

In 16.2.3 (More Advanced Concepts), fourth paragraph, last sentence, it's clear what the tool sets would do with it: provide Thing for modelers to explicitly assign as the end of a class, and use it as the default end class when none is given.

**Resolution:**

**Defer to RTF**

## Disposition: Deferred

### OMG Issue No: 10875

**Title:** Individuals

**Source:**

NIST (Mr. Conrad Bock, [conrad.bock@nist.gov](mailto:conrad.bock@nist.gov))

**Summary:**

In 16.2.3 (More Advanced Concepts), fifth paragraph, the first sentence draws a conclusion ("therefore") without any justification. Individuals in OWL are all classified by Thing, whether or not this is explicitly recorded. It's just syntactic sugar to omit it. In UML, instance specifications can be classified by Thing in the model library and have the same semantics as OWL individual.

**Resolution:**

**Defer to RTF**

## Disposition: Deferred

### OMG Issue No: 10876

**Title:** Disjoint

**Source:**

NIST (Mr. Conrad Bock, [conrad.bock@nist.gov](mailto:conrad.bock@nist.gov))

**Summary:**

In 16.2.3 (More Advanced Concepts), sixth paragraph, parenthetical remark should note that with UML Thing the same is true in UML).

**Resolution:**

**Defer to RTF**



## Disposition: Deferred

### OMG Issue No: 10877

**Title:** Classes of classes

**Source:**

NIST (Mr. Conrad Bock, [conrad.bock@nist.gov](mailto:conrad.bock@nist.gov))

**Summary:**

In 16.2.3 (More Advanced Concepts), seventh paragraph, the second sentence implies classes are not instances in OWL DL, but even in DL, OWL Class is a class of classes, by definition. For example, an ontology of animals might have the class Dog, which is an instance (of OWL Class) and a class (of Fido, Rover, and other individual dogs). The third sentence should be moved to be the second, and start with "however", because it is an exception to the first sentence. After "declaration" should be replaced with "a common superclass".

**Resolution:**

**Defer to RTF**

## Disposition: Deferred

### OMG Issue No: 10879

**Title:** Mandatory properties

**Source:**

NIST (Mr. Conrad Bock, [conrad.bock@nist.gov](mailto:conrad.bock@nist.gov))

**Summary:**

In 16.2.3 (More Advanced Concepts), under the XML example, third paragraph, I assume "may not" should be "must". The property must have values for every individual

**Resolution:**

**Defer to RTF**

## Disposition: Deferred

### OMG Issue No: 10884

**Title:** Derivation

**Source:**

NIST (Mr. Conrad Bock, [conrad.bock@nist.gov](mailto:conrad.bock@nist.gov))

**Summary:**

In 16.2.3 (More Advanced Concepts), under the XML example, the paragraph starting "UML allows a property", UML derivation means derivation from values of properties, not from generalizations of the classes that are the domain of those properties.

**Resolution:**

**Defer to RTF**

## Disposition: Deferred

### OMG Issue No: 10885

**Title:** Table 16.10

**Source:**

NIST (Mr. Conrad Bock, [conrad.bock@nist.gov](mailto:conrad.bock@nist.gov))

**Summary:**

In 16.2.3 (More Advanced Concepts), Table 16.10, the names of classes are capitalized in UML. The UML element corresponding to OWL subproperty is property subsetting. N-aries and association classes are not well-supported in OWL, so don't belong in a table of common features (see other issues on n-aries and association classes).

**Resolution:**

**Defer to RTF**

## Disposition: Deferred

### OMG Issue No: 10886

**Title:** Table 16.11

**Source:**

NIST (Mr. Conrad Bock, [conrad.bock@nist.gov](mailto:conrad.bock@nist.gov))

**Summary:**

In 16.2.3 (More Advanced Concepts), Table 16.11, the last row (classes as instances), is supported in OWL Full, and even in DL (OWL Class is a class of classes, by definition). For example, an ontology of animals might have the class Dog, which is an instance (of OWL Class) and a class (of Fido, Rover, and other individual dogs). This table should be in Section 16.6 (In UML but not OWL).

**Resolution:**

**Defer to RTF**

## Disposition: Deferred

### OMG Issue No: 10887

**Title:** Table 16.12, Thing

**Source:**

NIST (Mr. Conrad Bock, [conrad.bock@nist.gov](mailto:conrad.bock@nist.gov))

**Summary:**

In 16.2.3 (More Advanced Concepts), Table 16.12, the first row (Thing) should be qualified by the fact that OWL is using syntactic sugar for global properties and autonomous individuals, and that the standard UML model library given in ODM enables UML to support these features. This table should be in Section 16.5 (OWL but not UML).

**Resolution:**

**Defer to RTF**

## Disposition: Deferred

### OMG Issue No: 10888

**Title:** Table 16.12, AllValuesFrom

**Source:**

NIST (Mr. Conrad Bock, [conrad.bock@nist.gov](mailto:conrad.bock@nist.gov))

**Summary:**

In 16.2.3 (More Advanced Concepts), Table 16.12, the second row (AllValuesFrom), AllValuesFrom is directly supported in UML as property subsetting.

**Resolution:**

**Defer to RTF**

## Disposition: Deferred

### OMG Issue No: 10889

**Title:** Table 16.12, classes as instances

**Source:**

NIST (Mr. Conrad Bock, [conrad.bock@nist.gov](mailto:conrad.bock@nist.gov))

**Summary:**

In 16.2.3 (More Advanced Concepts), Table 16.12, class as instances appears in both this table and Table 16.11.

**Resolution:**

**Defer to RTF**



## Disposition: Deferred

### OMG Issue No: 10890

**Title:** Table 16.12, disjoint

**Source:**

NIST (Mr. Conrad Bock, [conrad.bock@nist.gov](mailto:conrad.bock@nist.gov))

**Summary:**

In 16.2.3 (More Advanced Concepts), Table 16.12, last row. UML supports declaring disjoint classes.

**Resolution:**

**Defer to RTF**

## Disposition: Deferred

### OMG Issue No: 10891

**Title:** Inferring subsumption

**Source:**

NIST (Mr. Conrad Bock, [conrad.bock@nist.gov](mailto:conrad.bock@nist.gov))

**Summary:**

In Section 16.5.1 (Predicate Definition Language), first sentence, UML can support subsumption reasoning also, see <http://www.inf.unibz.it/~calvanese/papers-html/AIJ-2005.html>

**Resolution:**

**Defer to RTF**

## Disposition: Deferred

### OMG Issue No: 10892

**Title:** Boolean combination

**Source:**

NIST (Mr. Conrad Bock, [conrad.bock@nist.gov](mailto:conrad.bock@nist.gov))

**Summary:**

In Section 16.5.1 (Predicate Definition Language), third sentence, UML supports the equivalent of unionOf.

**Resolution:**

**Defer to RTF**

## Disposition: Deferred

### OMG Issue No: 10893

**Title:** Names, unique names

**Source:**

NIST (Mr. Conrad Bock, [conrad.bock@nist.gov](mailto:conrad.bock@nist.gov))

**Summary:**

In Section 16.5.2 (Names), the first two paragraphs imply that UML assumes unique names. M1 instance specifications in UML can have different names, but refer to the same M0 individual. They can also have the same name and refer to different M0 individuals. The third paragraph implies UML does not have name management (given the title of Section 16.5), which of course it does in namespaces.

**Resolution:**

**Defer to RTF**

## Disposition: Deferred

### OMG Issue No: 10894

**Title:** Names, UML namespaces

**Source:**

NIST (Mr. Conrad Bock, [conrad.bock@nist.gov](mailto:conrad.bock@nist.gov))

**Summary:**

In Section 16.5.2 (Names), next to last paragraph, namespaces are supported at all metalevels in UML/MOF.

**Resolution:**

**Defer to RTF**

## **Disposition: Deferred**

### **OMG Issue No: 10895**

**Title:** Other OWL

**Source:**

NIST (Mr. Conrad Bock, [conrad.bock@nist.gov](mailto:conrad.bock@nist.gov))

**Summary:**

In Section 16.5.3 (Other OWL Developments), should refer to OWL 1.1.

**Resolution:**

**Defer to RTF**

## Disposition: Deferred

### OMG Issue No: 10897

**Title:** Complex Objects

**Source:**

NIST (Mr. Conrad Bock, [conrad.bock@nist.gov](mailto:conrad.bock@nist.gov))

**Summary:**

In Section 16.6.2 (Complex Objects), the first two paragraphs and the last omit the critical aspect of connectors, that they provide a model of the interconnections of objects that are all related to the same other object. For example, the engine in a car powers the wheels and is controlled by the driver. See  
[http://www.jot.fm/issues/issue\\_2004\\_11/column5](http://www.jot.fm/issues/issue_2004_11/column5)

**Resolution:**

**Defer to RTF**

## Disposition: Deferred

### OMG Issue No: 10898

**Title:** Keywords

**Source:**

NIST (Mr. Conrad Bock, [conrad.bock@nist.gov](mailto:conrad.bock@nist.gov))

**Summary:**

In Section 16.6.4 (Keywords) keywords are confused with stereotypes. Keywords don't extend, stereotypes do. Keywords are just an element of notation.

**Resolution:**

**Defer to RTF**



## Disposition: Deferred

### OMG Issue No: 10899

**Title:** Profiles

**Source:**

NIST (Mr. Conrad Bock, [conrad.bock@nist.gov](mailto:conrad.bock@nist.gov))

**Summary:**

In Section 16.6.5 (Profiles), third paragraph says that profiles not necessary because of metalevel separation. They are used as an alternative way to extend M2 classes with subclasses, in particular, where the subclasses are defined at M1, even though they have the effect of being at M2.

**Resolution:**

**Defer to RTF**

## Disposition: Deferred

### OMG Issue No: 10900

**Title:** UML to OWL, OWL-DL

**Source:**

NIST (Mr. Conrad Bock, [conrad.bock@nist.gov](mailto:conrad.bock@nist.gov))

**Summary:**

Section 16.3 (UML to OWL), third sentence, says the mapping is only to OWL-DL. Why not OWL Full?

**Resolution:**

**Defer to RTF**

## Disposition: Deferred

### OMG Issue No: 10901

**Title:** UML to OWL, Table 16.10

**Source:**

NIST (Mr. Conrad Bock, [conrad.bock@nist.gov](mailto:conrad.bock@nist.gov))

**Summary:**

Section 16.3 (UML to OWL), third paragraph, first sentence, says the mapping is based on Table 16.10. The section containing that table has a lot of errors about UML. It would be better to base the mapping on the profile (Chapter 14), which has had much more review from the UML perspective

**Resolution:**

**Defer to RTF**

## Disposition: Deferred

### OMG Issue No: 10902

**Title:** Object identification in UML

**Source:**

NIST (Mr. Conrad Bock, [conrad.bock@nist.gov](mailto:conrad.bock@nist.gov))

**Summary:**

Section 16.3.1 (Naming Issues), second paragraph says UML (packageable) elements are identified by name. UML packageable elements can be anonymous, and they still have identity. The notion of identity is primitive in UML and applies even when no names are used.

**Resolution:**

**Defer to RTF**

## Disposition: Deferred

### OMG Issue No: 10904

**Title:** N-aries. Section 16.3.6

**Source:**

NIST (Mr. Conrad Bock, [conrad.bock@nist.gov](mailto:conrad.bock@nist.gov))

**Summary:**

Section 16.3.6 (Association Classes and N-ary Associations), second paragraph, says the translation treats association classes and n-aries the same way. Association classes are not the same as n-aries, see issues filed on n-aries in 16.2.2 (Class and Property - Basics).

**Resolution:**

**Defer to RTF**

## Disposition: Deferred

### OMG Issue No: 10905

**Title:** Multiplicity

**Source:**

NIST (Mr. Conrad Bock, [conrad.bock@nist.gov](mailto:conrad.bock@nist.gov))

**Summary:**

Section 16.3.7 (Multiplicity), the translation can also be to OWL FunctionalProperty or InverseFunctionalProperty if the multiplicity is 1.

**Resolution:**

**Defer to RTF**

## Disposition: Deferred

### OMG Issue No: 10906

**Title:** navigableOwnedEnd

**Source:**

NIST (Mr. Conrad Bock, [conrad.bock@nist.gov](mailto:conrad.bock@nist.gov))

**Summary:**

The introduction to Section 16.3.5 (Binary Association To Object Property) accounts for navigableOwnedEnd, but the introduction to Section 16.3.8 ( ) Association Generalization) does not.

**Resolution:**

**Defer to RTF**

## Disposition: Deferred

### OMG Issue No: 10907

**Title:** Enumeration literals

**Source:**

NIST (Mr. Conrad Bock, [conrad.bock@nist.gov](mailto:conrad.bock@nist.gov))

**Summary:**

The introduction to Section 16.3.4 (Attribute to Property) accounts for enumeration literals that are instances of classifiers, but the introduction to Section 16.3.9 (Enumeration) does not.

**Resolution:**

**Defer to RTF**



## Disposition: Deferred

### OMG Issue No: 10908

**Title:** Individuals, mapping

**Source:**

NIST (Mr. Conrad Bock, [conrad.bock@nist.gov](mailto:conrad.bock@nist.gov))

**Summary:**

Section 16.4.1.1 (Mapping for Individuals), first sentence says the profile (Chapter 14) represents individuals as a singleton class. This is incorrect. The profile models individuals as instance specifications. To give property values to the individual, the profile uses a singleton class. Section 16.4.1.1 incorrectly concludes that individuals should not be mapped, which affects 16.4.1.2 (Mapping for Enumerated Classes) and Section 16.4.13 (Annotation Properties to Comments).

**Resolution:**

**Defer to RTF**

## Disposition: Deferred

### OMG Issue No: 10909

**Title:** complementOf and disjointWith

**Source:**

NIST (Mr. Conrad Bock, [conrad.bock@nist.gov](mailto:conrad.bock@nist.gov))

**Summary:**

Section 16.4.1.3 (Mapping for complementOf and disjointWith) says UML has constructions for complementOf and disjointWith in the PowerTypes package. It actually has constructs for unionOf and disjointWith. Section 16.4.1.3 says no mapping is given because the OWL constructs are pairwise, but OWL unionOf and disjointWith are not pairwise, they can apply to any number of classes.

**Resolution:**

**Defer to RTF**

## Disposition: Deferred

### OMG Issue No: 10910

**Title:** Multiple Domains or Ranges for Properties

**Source:**

NIST (Mr. Conrad Bock, [conrad.bock@nist.gov](mailto:conrad.bock@nist.gov) [conradb@cme.nist.gov](mailto:conradb@cme.nist.gov))

**Summary:**

Section 16.4.1.4 (Multiple Domains or Ranges for Properties) says that multiple domains or ranges for properties is equivalent to the intersection of the domains and ranges. UML properties have at most one type, and intersection can't be represented in UML without the profile (Chapter 14). How is this translated?

**Resolution:**

**Defer to RTF**

## Disposition: Deferred

### OMG Issue No: 10911

**Title:** Ontology Properties

**Source:**

NIST (Mr. Conrad Bock, [conrad.bock@nist.gov](mailto:conrad.bock@nist.gov))

**Summary:**

Section 16.4.3.2 (Ontology Properties to Comments) should use dependencies for some of the translations. See the profile (Chapter 14).

**Resolution:**

**Defer to RTF**

## Disposition: Deferred

### OMG Issue No: 10912

**Title:** Anonymous Classes

**Source:**

NIST (Mr. Conrad Bock, [conrad.bock@nist.gov](mailto:conrad.bock@nist.gov))

**Summary:**

Section 16.4.4.3 (Anonymous Class to Class) can translate blank nodes to anonymous classes in UML.

**Resolution:**

**Defer to RTF**

## **Disposition: Deferred**

### **OMG Issue No: 10913**

**Title:** Universal Superclass

**Source:**

NIST (Mr. Conrad Bock, [conrad.bock@nist.gov](mailto:conrad.bock@nist.gov))

**Summary:**

Section 16.4.5.2 (Universal Superclass) should also refer to Annex A.

**Resolution:**

**Defer to RTF**

## Disposition: Deferred

### OMG Issue No: 10914

**Title:** Constructed Classes

**Source:**

NIST (Mr. Conrad Bock, [conrad.bock@nist.gov](mailto:conrad.bock@nist.gov))

**Summary:**

The introduction to Section 16.4.6 (Constructed Classes) refers to OWL "difference". I assume this is supposed to be complementOf. The introduction to the section says intersection can be mapped to subclass relationships, but this isn't true, at least not without the profile, see intersection in Chapter 14. It also says union can be translated to subclass relationships, but doesn't mention UML generalization sets and isCovering, see Section 16.3.10 (Powertypes).

**Resolution:**

**Defer to RTF**

## Disposition: Deferred

### OMG Issue No: 10915

**Title:** Range Restriction Restriction Classes

**Source:**

NIST (Mr. Conrad Bock, [conrad.bock@nist.gov](mailto:conrad.bock@nist.gov))

**Summary:**

The introduction to Section 16.4.8 (Range Restriction Restriction Classes) refers to properties "behaving". Properties are static, they don't "behave".

**Resolution:**

**Defer to RTF**



## Disposition: Deferred

### OMG Issue No: 10916

**Title:** Range Restriction Restriction Classes

**Source:**

NIST (Mr. Conrad Bock, [conrad.bock@nist.gov](mailto:conrad.bock@nist.gov))

**Summary:**

The introduction to Section 16.4.8 (Range Restriction Restriction Classes) says the translation is to a comments. But AllValuesFrom translates directly to redefinition of property types, see the profile (Chapter 14).

**Resolution:**

**Defer to RTF**

## Disposition: Deferred

### OMG Issue No: 10917

**Title:** Properties in OWL

**Source:**

NIST (Mr. Conrad Bock, [conrad.bock@nist.gov](mailto:conrad.bock@nist.gov))

**Summary:**

The end of Section 16.4.9 (Properties in OWL) refers to multiple domains being equivalent to the domain being an intersection. This does not translate to UML, see issue on Constructed Classes

**Resolution:**

**Defer to RTF**

## Disposition: Deferred

### OMG Issue No: 11099

**Title: Constraints in the RDF Metamodel Chapter (10) should be specified in OCL**

**Source:**

Sandpiper Software, Inc. (Mrs. Elisa F. Kendall, [ekendall@sandsoft.com](mailto:ekendall@sandsoft.com))

**Summary:**

Text based descriptions of constraints provided in chapter 10 with the RDF metamodel should be specified in OCL.

**Defer to RTF**

## Disposition: Deferred

### OMG Issue No: 11100

**Title:** Constraints in the OWL Metamodel Chapter (10) should be specified in OCL

**Source:**

Sandpiper Software, Inc. (Mrs. Elisa F. Kendall, [ekendall@sandsoft.com](mailto:ekendall@sandsoft.com))

**Summary:**

Text based descriptions of constraints provided in chapter 11 with the OWL metamodel should be specified in OCL.

**Defer to RTF**

## Disposition: Deferred

### OMG Issue No: 11102

**Title:** Mapping from Common Logic to OWL should be revised

**Source:**

Sandpiper Software, Inc. (Mrs. Elisa F. Kendall, [ekendall@sandsoft.com](mailto:ekendall@sandsoft.com))

**Summary:**

The mapping from RDFS and OWL to CL should be revised to reflect metamodel changes in CL due to finalization of ISO 24707.

**Defer to RTF**

## Disposition: Deferred

### OMG Issue No: 11320

**Title:** Thing in the Profile

**Source:**

NIST (Mr. Conrad Bock, [conrad.bock@nist.gov](mailto:conrad.bock@nist.gov))

**Summary:**

Thing in the Profile. The UML Profile (Chapter 16) should use Annex A Thing instead of an anonymous class to model owl:Thing. Search on "Thing" (case sensitive) in the profile.

**Defer to RTF**

## Disposition: Deferred

### OMG Issue No: 11321

**Title:** RDFSContainer-MembershipProperty

**Source:**

NIST (Mr. Conrad Bock, [conrad.bock@nist.gov](mailto:conrad.bock@nist.gov))

**Summary:**

In Annex A, RDFSContainer-MembershipProperty should be moved to the UML Profile chapter as a stereotype based on UML:Property.

**Defer to RTF**