VCOI Call Notes

*21 September 2020*

# Attendees

* Mike Bennett
* Claude Baudoin
* Robert Nehmer
* Frederic de Vaulx
* Robert Stavros (Jackrabbit, 569992)
* Ian Stavros (Jackrabbit - 643024)
* Richard Robinson
* Bobbin Teegarden

## Apologies

* Cory Casanave

# Agenda

See email

* Structure and outputs
* Have a go at an ontology for the concepts

# Meeting notes

## Definitions Comment

### Two usage scenarios

#### One:

NS: One possibility is to have the OMG as a whole agree on a concept (word definition) to use

CB: That also depends on where that is used – identify where the term is used or was introduced

Relates to ‘long linear’ documents that are hard to maintain. Better to create documents originated from data. Hence the wiki idea (NS). Use backlinks to find out where everything is.

Hard to formulate queries for here something is referenced. Needs some grasp of semantics e.g. the string ‘IT’ is problematic. See e.g. legal sources that index every word, including ‘common English definition’.

Can do better than this with pattern matching in e.g. Perl, to deal with ‘it’ embedded within a word.

What of use of a URI – suppose the URI pulls in the term and puts the definition in place from the source at the URI.

The original example: Metadata. What about if the OMG as a whole decides to settle on a given definition – need also to be able to recognize how it is defined in other documents, with otentially divergent meanings.

Can identify the definition for a term but some documents mean the term (word) to mean something different. Which brings us to

#### Two:

Where one word has more than one concept that it refers to i.e. Source 1 and Source 2 with different definition. So ‘source’ needs some kind of marker.

e.g. in software engineering, have 2 functions called ‘split’ in different packages, so when you refer to them you have to disambiguate using package names, or more broadly, namespaces (including URI as namespace e.g. in ontologies). This also raises the modularization design question, as generally understood.

This brings us back to where we started, i.e. the notion of Context and how communities use terms in their own specific context. ‘In this case, for this community, for this use, this is the definition’.

(Context + one or a bundle of concepts)

### Two treatment of Context

Simple one: the context in which this word is to be used (this purpose, this TF, this document etc.)

Less simple one: for a borrowed term – the context in which that term was originally defined.

Wiki-like disambiguation – always talks to the 2nd of those.

e.g.

Ontology (1) see Operational ontology

Ontology (2) See reference ontology

If we maintain more than one of these, need some kind of suffix in the title of the page, assuming we are outputting to one wiki page per word.

This design idea applies to Delivery Mechanism (30 – Nic’s one papge per word representation.

In DM3, also have a page for acronyms, with redirection to

* Term
* Reference

Depending on the nature of the acronym.

On Two above, example is if you have a great definition from a legal source – say Legalpedia.com. Want (the TF decide to) take the LegalPedia.com definition

Need to determine how we would handle copy by reference versus copy by value etc.

## 3rd Party Definitions

The TF can agree to use a 3rd party concept / word and definition. Then has Maintenance Issues

### Maintenance

How to handle when the 3rd party makes changes

Need to have a way to track when these change

Also track places in our existing document base that may be impacted by changes.

This amounts to a Concordance for these references. Simplest is a URI with the definition. Need to be able to know

* When the URI has change
* When the URI becomes inactive
* When the definition under that URI has changed

Permalinks – would resolve (2) above. But just having one of these it may still point to a non permanent page that is taken down.

This the context of the definer rathe than the context of the usage of the term.

BT: FIBO has to have figured this out – EK has extensive metadata for these.

### Provenance

FIBO provenance metadata:

* Term Origin
  + e.g. FIBIM
* Definition Origin
* Adapted From

#### FIBO Term Origin

Term originally might have been the name of some data element or message element. The ontology would have a name reflecting the real thing not the data element, where these diverge.

FIBO term would be the term for the actual thing, with Term Origin = (source e.g. FIBIM ) + original term name.

FIBO annotations were extended SKOS (e.g. SKOS note) and DC.

Also had

* Explanatory Note
* Editorial note
* Scope Note
* etc

### Semantics of provenance

Prov-O ontology.

Prov-O is not approved for use with FIBO.

We are still trying to find out why that is.

## Process

Suggest that documents have meta tags that identify the concepts they are taking about

So in Delivery Mechanisms we have:

1. Table – Term, Definition, synonyms etc.
2. Document insert table (word template)
3. Wiki page per word / term / acronym

Then

* Tags for use in documents referencing a unique URI for the concept

### URI for concept

We want to have this either way.

In (1) it needs to be a # for the line

In (3) it is the wiki page URI/URL

What if:

We did (3) for the URI

Then do a Wiki table with the details (one page for all the definitions) with URI link to those pages for more info; (that also the q about what level of detail to include)

#### Discussion on this proposal

We would have to clearly state who that definition is relevant for. Some term generic, wider application, others including dialectical variations, relevant for certain readers. Reader needs to know what that definition is meant for.

Might have broader and narrower to help set the context e.g. Loan.

THEN each page can be shared more widely IFF it contains within it, more contextual disambiguation.

### Recall Context:

* Context 1: the usage context (the TF or SIG)
* Context 2: the origin context

Then Context (2) is part of that page

The table is in Context (1) the using TF.

Will this fly?

Then

Context <> Community. We say ‘This context as defined by this community’.

Also rather than wiki, say URI. Every definition (concept) associated with a URI. May be expressed in a Wiki page, or HTML, or SPARQL end point or something else.

Focus on: URI

Then punt implementation to a separate matter.

For now,

* Retain the URIs,
* Identify the information to be maintained against each URI (e.g. original context)
  + Then later think about this looking like a wiki page

So assume this is in some kind of data structure (can be RDB, can be RDF etc.)

Then Term ⬄ URI

But Term ⬄ multiple URIs for multiple Concepts

THEN

Concept Library is where the unique URIs reside NOT the words.

(rather than have a page per word)

THEN we can have a small, coherent ontological diagram for the concept

* Parent concept(s)
* Differentiating characteristics

(restrictions, properties etc.)

## AoB

Wiki is up and running

Notes will go there

**Actions:** Process suggestion to OMG to add tags to documents.

* Are we ready to do that now and fill in the details later?
* If so, CB or NS can alert them to the idea now.
  + NS takes this action
  + Agenda item for Process Sub-Committee (PSC)

**Clarified:** the action above is not about adding tags we are still thinking about in this work. The action is the simpler matter of how to find documents from a previous OMG meeting, knowing only the topic and dates but not the document number of exact title. This was a issue in tracking down the document in which issues were asserted about Prov-O. Some of the discussion above about whether we are ready to do that now, were based on a misunderstanding of this action.

Also need abstract overview to stick in the database – not just the tags.

Include some rules about the completeness of the description. So people can select the relevant tags from a list from a set of OMG related concepts they may want to refer to.

OMG / Jason may have ideas on this as well.