

Session Notes Thursday 18 August

OWL versus UML Packages

MB reiterates: no dependency between UML Packages and OWL Ontologies

Some questions: Is the UML Package to be part of the published standard?

Would hope that we standardize in a series of specifications those things that are relevant to FIBO, and that these are standardized independently so that they can evolve independently.

Evaluation Criteria for the ontology components - will be discussed at the September 2011 Quarterly Meeting.

If UML is considered part of the standard set of artifacts that we are delivering to the OMG. Then this should be very modularized.

Each of the sets of terms will evolve independently.

Examples: Swaps may evolve independently from say Bonds, and the Global Terms material e.g. legal grammar.

SO:

Use Cases for UML Tool and Packaging

Recommend these are in separate models and separate files.

These can be brought together for some overall purpose.

Consensus / discussion Can these be wholly independent? Need precise guidelines on how these can be related to each other.

Some models will be independent of others.

Concerns: Need a degree of precision about how they are related.

The hierarchy should have some architecture.

Use Cases 1. Import and export 2.

Sizing

be able to standardize the business conceptual model and how to derive operational ontologies from that.

There are a couple considerations in this@: 1. metadata that we need. 2. transformation rules.

The transformation rules might be presented as an ontology. This might be possible. So there may

be a masking map which is really just another ontology, a very light ontology consisting of those rules.

Consensus? Yes.

From:

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

Permanent link:

https://www.omgwiki.org/OMG-FDTF/doku.php?id=thursday_18_august&rev=1313691807

Last update: **2011/08/18 14:23**

