VCOI Call Notes

*30 Nov 2020*

# Attendees

* Mike Bennett
* Rob Nehmer
* Claude Baudoin

# Agenda

* Presentation Formats
* Other vocabulary and concept initiatives to look at
* AoB and next meeting

# Meeting Notes

## Demo of prototype from FIBO

MB produced a spreadsheet to trial the idea of presenting ontology content using columns indentation to represent subclass relationships.

### Issues to note

Verbs omitted

Multiple inheritance

* Shown as italicized for the copies for now

Top of each is a ‘See elsewhere’

### Comments

Multiple inheritance – not supported in many systems, which leads to many people trying to impose single inheritance

In conceptual model it is critical that we do have a polyhierarchical taxonomy.

Would remove these for implementations (database, file structure) but not restrict how we think about things to being monohierarchical.

This presume restriction is frequently assumed for no good reason. Maybe people are thinking in terms of folder structure i.e. monohierarchical.

But of course you can use shortcuts in a file system (or alias in Linux) so even there it’s possible.

Still a problem for the spreadsheet viewing.

If what we want to show is the parent of a thing this is not an issue, but if we need to show all the children then we need to figure out where to show this.

Another issue that arises is how to identify when you have two entries are the same thing versus when these are two separate word entries that are heteronyms and refer to different concepts.

## Other Potential Approaches and Formats

### Mind Mapping

Mind Mapping (also monohierarchical) but if you have the ability to put arrows across the hierarchies then you can deal with this. It’s also clearer since you need to follow the arros to find the subsequent sub classes of that item. So a MM is more visually helpful than a spreadsheet.

Also it’s hard to send someone a MM and know they have the tool to read it. Unless there were a common standard for MMs which seemingly there isn’t. There are de facto standards like Mind Manager that other tools can read.

There are also open source tools to read MMs (but in what format?). But there is no guarantee of round tripping compatibility. Rather like with XMI but without the benefit of a common standard.

## Current Status

So in the current state of things, the tooling and its limitations interferes with the conceptual work.

Since we are a standards organization, can’t we contribute something to this? Like a metamodel of taxonomy concepts, so tool vendors could interchange these things.

* OWL and RDF – solves part of that
* SKOS – solves another part of this (sufficient?) but less widespread.
* Dean Allemang has a script that converts FIBO OWL to SKOS. This may depend some FIBO-specific features of the range of allowable choices in OWL ontology architectures.
* MVF

There is something that needs to happen…

We could come up with a standard that embodies the VCOI Calculus and uses RDF, OWL and SKOS and MVF within that.

Is this something to pursue?

Would need to be done with the ontology PSIG.

* Talk to Evan about being on the QM agenda.
* Need to O-PSIG to be on board with this
	+ Need to promulgate via some other TF
		- E.g. ADTF (where MVF lives)
	+ Could bring it to that point

Also (MB) was just on a call with someone in the DLT / SSID space

## Other Initiatives and Potential Formats

### ToIP Foundation Update

OCA Architecture – layered schema architecture.

‘Semantics’ WG on that.

Is it too soon to think about a common standard? How much further along do we need to be?

QB: Never too soon – may be others thinking along the same lines, or doing things that would interfere, duplicate or interact with what we are doing.

So we should socialize early the idea of what we are doing.

### M Language

M Language – seems not to be open source, and seems to replicate stuff we’ve already been doing elsewhere. Seems to have limited original intellectual contribution. Adds a superscript to a word to identify the context-specific usage of that word in that location. That is, you are using a given string or literals to indicate the location of a word with a concept (that is what the superscript does).

E.g. See1 versus See2

That’s what it does.

This systematizes the resolution of the homonym problem.

Can use the superscript approach to map to a normal dictionary like Oxford since dictionaries always set out each contextual usage of a word. More specialized ones like government depts etc. are just specialized of what a dictionary does.

## AoB

Are we going to present at this Quarterly Meeting?

Need to figure that out here before proposing at e.g. FDTF Monthly Call tomorrow.

We have a spare hour.

We can present at BC-PSIG as well using their examples from RFI and RFP (and the SBVR stye from the earlier RFI, borrowed from FIBO).

What we have to present? Something to socialize (‘Early and often’) as potential future RFP material.

MB: have slides for the earlier theory

This last 2 – 3 weeks we have come to some useful stable positions on some of these things

* Possible directions / opens to share and get feedback from our potential user base
	+ Just a method with some encouragement
	+ A fully fledged set of machinery
	+ A set of formats but not specifying the implementations (programs)
	+ A pathway from a simple starting place to the more complete place
* Show prototypes we have so far
	+ The GovDTF 11 terms spreadsheet
	+ The FIBO indentation prototype

We want to get feedback from the SGs about what they would be interested in and what corresponding resource availability they can bring to this.

* Multiple presentations?
* Or multiple occurrences of the same presentation?
* Or tailored presentations?

The same slide deck may end up being 2 different OMG documents (need disambiguation; showing why this is important). References is also part of this so yes.

* BC-PSIG – have examples from RFI / RFP
* FDTF – talk about tomorrow/ Examples from FIBO.
* O-PSIG – wait to hear; potentially both.

MB to mail Evan today.

# Next Meeting

No call next week.