VCOI Call Notes

*25 Jan 2021*

# Attendees

* Ian Stavros
* Robert Stavros (Jackrabbit, 556992)
* Rob Nehmer
* Mike Bennett
* Bobbin Teegarden

# Agenda

See slide deck:

* Level Setting for the VCoI WG
* Deliverables Overview
  + Concept Models
  + Vocabulary Deliverables (by context)
  + Context treatment
  + Definitions (by Concept)
  + Maintenance Tools and Techniques

# Meeting Notes

## Level Setting

MB present slide deck summarizing what we have determined so far, and refocusing on what we are to deiver within the OMG ecosystem in the first instance.

See slide deck: 20210125 VCoI WG Status and Program.pptx

## Q and A

### What is Context?

SP:

Are we saying that Context is the same a Mediating Thing.

See it as a ‘Relative Thing’

e.g. Party n Role, Actor, things that have different start and end from the main thing itself

Broadest sense: Contextually Defined Thing

So therefore:

The context in which the RT is defined is (Mediating Thing OR some single concept)

Mediating Thing is always Context but some contexts are just a single Concept

What if we define Context as a thing in the ontology?

* It would be a relative thing
* The thing playing the role would be ANY thing (Thing)
* The context in which it plays the role of Context, is that of that model itself

Context is a role in relation to your model.

If you did want to stand that up you would do so in a different model – since the model itself is the context. So it is effectively at a different meta-level.

SP needs an object called context.

Unless you are using a single context (e.g. the present, or this party), your context is always a Mediating Thing.

If we ALWAYS define Context as being a nexus of al or many of the kinds of concept, then the idea of a single-concept context goes away.

### The Ws

SP: Add: How much

This applies to all of the other questions; you haven’t answer the other W questions adequately unless have quantified if.

e.g.

* Who – e.g. cleaners. Not answered full unless you have said how many
* Where – how much of the office do they clean (what do they clean)
* When – e.g. at night; how many nights, which nights, how many weeks
* Why – does not have an obvious ‘how much’ question. Strength of the Why (motivation); how much it matters to you - strength of the Why

To what extent does the quantification requirement influence the intended concept that a word refers to.

The question isn’t answered unless you have said how much of it you are doing in that context.

MB: what influence that has on meaning?

### Disambiguation

CB: disambiguation pages in Wikipedia

* These tell you what is the context of a particular definition
* They only do that in a very informal way
  + Typically as examples, inks to specific pages, natural language reflection of the context

But when you go to the pages of those concepts, those do have category tags, which are a more formal definition of the context of the definition .These themselves are organized in a hierarchical structure (taxonomy)

e.g. category:NameOfCatetorgy

which is a hyperlink to a category page, which may itself have a category tag.

The structure of the category pages form a taxonomy. Of concepts (not terms). These are used to say that this age that defines the term XYZ does to in the context of Category ABC.

Not as formal as it could be – anyone can attach whatever category they want. Without approval (crowd-sourced)

Can also attach multiple inheritance (polyierarchy).

So this creates a parallel universe of concepts in a messy way.

#### Wikipedia Context Exploration Outcome

So: find a way of doing that within the more formal MVF metamodel

Then create something users can use the same way as Wikipedia.

Crowdsourced: editors, with privileges.

So we would need the TFs to also have some kind of oversight, to sustain crowdsourcing.

The categories are also crowd sourced. Again messy, like the terms.

You add a category to a Wikipedia page by putting [[Category:XYZ]] in the page.

as a result, the page has a hyperlink to the category page. And then that page can itself contain a category tag [[Category:ABC]], which creates a hierarchy, where XYZ is a subcategory of ABC

What we could do: have less messy ontology, with messier crowd-sourced vocabulary?

**Action:** Consider the above

### AoB

SP: Mapping relations – no way of doing in RDF

(MB: can do as Relative Things; this was where we needed the gUFO approach of archetypes so people know how to do this in a consistent way)

It would be great if there were a way of using richer model constructs, including AssClass – would make the models easier to interpret.

Similar in UML – for the use of mereological Composition and Aggregation.

Good to do something like UML but with richer relations than are in UML.

MB to send links for these things

**Action:** Send these as open reference in the wiki rather than just as email.

e.g. also the 6 kinds of taxonomic relation (mentioned last week)