VCOI Call Notes

*16 November 2020*

# Attendees

* Mike
* Claude
* Rob
* Bobbin

# Agenda

* Analyze Blockchain PSIG recent requirements and activities (RFI ad RFP), as indicative of what a TF or SIG needs

# Meeting Notes

## Blockchain PSIG Findings

For the document inserts for the BC-PSIG DSSID RFI we found ourselves creating the same 3 deliverables we have identified as one of the kinds of output from a TF or SIG Vocabulary thing.

These are:

* References
* Glossary
	+ Terms and Definitions
	+ Acronyms and Abbreviations

### Finding:

We needed to retain more information to generate these, than are in the outputs themselves. For example term origin, but also in cases where we needed to adapt a term, the fact that it was ‘adapted from’ a specific source (just as did for FIBO terms and definitions).

What we are simulating here:

What there would be if there were on the Blockchain content somewhere, a list such as defined in the VCOI, and the RFI would have used a relevant sub-set of the componentsin that list, to create the entries necessary, and in the form required for the RFI document format.

So what are we looking for e.g.:

* A mechanism of how we would set that up
	+ This as a use case for a TF who would use the VCOI methods
* The required metadata elements
	+ And their content

You would have some centralized thing belonging to the SIG or TF. Then any new product, you would add some entries for the new stuff and reference in the RFPs and RFIs etc.

If there were 2 definitions that were genuinely different concepts (used in different contexts) then you would maintain both. If there were a new use of the same word for the same concept, we would want to update it if the existing one is out of date – see below.

### Ideal

RN: If the OMG arrangements were such, one would take the template, go to the relevant TF or SIG site for the terms, acronyms, references, and simply adopt (ideally as an automated pull-in) for those.

Might require some conversion process as part of that. That would a cool thing to standardize. Would make RFI and RFP completion a lot less tedious.

So there are two stages to getting there:

* Having some centralized resource for these tings
* Having some means to automate getting content from that resource into the required places
	+ RFPs, RFIs, even RFC Spec (that’s for the submitters to think about)
	+ Wiki pages as previously discussed

Also, where we just said:

* + “(that’s for the submitters to think about)”

#### How this could work:

RFCs: would be nice for have it that RFC submitters have access to the TF or SIG ‘Vocabulary’.

Where ‘Vocabulary’ = all 3 things this VCOI is dealing with (‘ARIAS’ – see below)

RFPs: can even suggest or encourage, or enable, or even enforce(?) that the RFP sets out the concepts we refer to by the words, such that responders copy paste that into their RFP Response and:

* Add new things that they want to define that weren’t in the RFP
* If they object to or have a more up to date or more precise definition for a concept that IS in the RFP, they can formally identify this, update it, flag,
	+ Then the TF or SG can update their resource accordingly.

### The Centralized resource:

Where one TF or SIG wants to borrow a definition from something in another TF or SIG, they need to be able to reference that and identify that they did so.

If these are all

* Available on that TF or SIG Wiki
* Made available in a consistent way
	+ Consistent metadata
	+ Consistent URI to Word / Term / Concept / Acronym etc. relation
		- i.e. the way you would find a thing in GovDTF would be the same as the way you would find it in Blockchain PSIG

e.g. if you know you are looking for the Blockchain PSIG’s definition of ‘Blockchain’ you would know to look for:

* The SIG or TF name as part of the URI (that’s the wiki fragment ‘BC-PSIG’)
* The word itself in the word list
	+ Word not concept
	+ Then links to the concept locally

#### A Wrinkle:

Suppose that GovDTF thought we had defined DDS but we were not the originator.

THEN we would need to put in the Blockchain Vocab refs we find useful but are external. Give the appropriate linkage to the ‘real’ (canonical) vocabulary entry at the source.

If there are sole sources.

Instead to having to scroll through tons of vocabs, have the reference links that would bring you to the source.

2 scenarios:

* We define 2 kinds of ‘Context’
	+ The context of usage (This word in this document) = for a Word
	+ The context of origin of the definition = for a Concept

We need for any external word / definition / concept pair:

* The Context of the originator. This might (already) be
	+ An external Community of Practice e.g. Statistics something, or US Government (e.g. Federal Register) etc.
	+ Anther OMG sub-group

In the case it’s another OMG group, we need to have the ‘context’ of that origin. Therefore

* We can use that in a semi-automated way to achieve the above.

Now we can talk about stages of implementation of this material and initiative (and of the Vocabulary itself).

Can use Blockchain as a pilot on that. Looking at external links, the TF or SIG itself deciding upon:

* What words we want to define
* What concepts we are interested in
* What sources we (the TF or SIG) regard as appropriate for the source for those

For instance with future RFPs and other work. Have to define certain things anyhow.

Another example is the FDTF work on ontology and semantics. What sort conceptual resource were needed.

We (each sub-group) might at each meeting spend time working on concepts, terms and definitions, desired sources and so on.

**Conclusion:** We need to support the above

#### By-product

These will necessarily be times when

* Two Sub-groups\* might want to define the same word in different ways (for the same or a similar concept not just a heterograph)
* Two groups may have a specialized distinct meaning (refinement of the concept) for a given word or term, in a given usage Context e.g. ‘protocol’
	+ So then the Context needs to capture that refinement
	+ In principle, could define each narrower definition by its differentiae
		- In practice that would not happen
		- In theory someone could go along later and pull those distinctions into a conceptual ontology
	+ Even without that: SKOS broaderThan can be used to identify that there *is* a narrower concept even before anyone has got round to specifying the narrowness
		- Identify v specify when there is narrower (or broader) concept referenced by the word

e.g. the word ‘Protocol’ more or less means the same thing but with different nuances, e.g. in healthcare, MARS, others. Could regard this as 3 meanings. Versus an exception to the common understanding of the word.

e.g. ‘Protocol is a set of rules for a conversation’

Defines rules for transactions based on the exchange of information.

Similar to ‘Ontology’ definitions:

Gruber – v general definition, v OWL ontologists’ more specific definitions (e.g. ‘OWL file’)

\* Sub-group = TF or SIG

### What we end up with

A nice ecosystem of Sub-groups sharing and propagating:

* Concepts that they care about and define
* Words by which to refer to those concepts

The concepts have Context of origin.

Other TFs can choose to do 2 things:

* Use the same word the same way
* Use the Concept and refer to it by whatever word they locally find appropriate

Basically a Marketplace of words and concepts.

A marketplace of

* Terms
* Concepts (with origin of the definition of the concept)
* Acronyms and abbreviations
* Specialist Symbols (and abbreviations in this sense)
* References
	+ Documents, specs, laws, published papers

i.e. all of the subject matter of this ‘stuff’ – broadly ‘Vocabulary’; (but which includes references)

### ARIAS

In general we have terms and definitions, abbreviations etc., and references. Each with their own distinct metadata requirements, cross reference among them, and some common requirements e.g. TF ownership, Context of origin and so on.

CB: Let's make a meta-acronym:

**ARIAS** = Abbreviations, References, Initialisms, Acronyms, and Symbols

Is ARIAS a Backronym? – what does backronym mean (2 possible meanings (concepts) there; so we need to dogfood that).

**Backronym:** ‘an existing word turned into an acronym by creating an apt phrase whose initial letters match the word’

**Action:** We need to start our own ARIAS for the VCoI WG.

Is a WG a (‘Sub-group = TF or SIG’) or not? No, as they do not have an existence in the P&P.

 - Bit of a gap in the P&P there. Consensus to date in OMG discussions has been to leave it alone. Not impose unneeded rules.

 - makes more sense to have the ability to define ARIAS, at the level of ‘a thing with a wiki’.

Maybe we need to become a SIG?

### Metadata Requirements

**Vocabulary** – needs certain metadata

* Draw upon
	+ OMG Specification Metadata
	+ FIBO Annotation Vocabulary
		- Term Origin
		- Definition Origin
		- AdaptedFrom
		- (term adapted from)
	+ Maybe others eg. DC, SKOKS, Prov-O?

**Acronisms** (Initialisms, Acronyms, and Symbols) (MB made-up word for this heading)

Might or not need another kind of metadata – let’s look at the requirements in the spreadsheets etc.

**References** – their own kinds of metadata

* This answers itself – already identified in academia: Chicago manual, APA, IEEE etc. all have their own way of disposing the same element in different textual order but the elements are the same.
* There is a common format for this on the web – we should just use that! (XML I think)
	+ Agreed – we will just crib from this
* it's called EasyBib

<https://www.easybib.com/>