VCoI Call Notes

*28 June 2021*

# Attendees

* Mike
* Claude
* Rob

# Agenda

* Plans for Q3

# Meeting Notes

## Challenge

How to better wrap in the activities others are doing in a similar space.

For example:

* Nick's Wiki stuff
* Ontology PSIG - knowledge representation

Both of these things should be able of being framed in the broader VCoI calculus.

For example Vocabulary and Ontology can be seen as 2 extremes on the same continuum, while VCoI distinguishes them.

Would have been able to have time for a VCoI segment at Ontology PSIG if this had been arranged. May have been able to get valuable feedback on VCoI.

We did present VCoI at Ontology PSIG in maybe Sept?

Also EK and PR continue to recommend the use of the (still draft) MVF (meta vocabulary facility) standard.

MB: with MVF, as with SKOS, as with Annotations Wishlist etc. is that we at VCoI want to derive and present and understanding how HOW to use these pieces. Just saying 'Use MVF' is the answer to the wrong question.

This gives us an…

## Agenda for Q3 Calls

Provide the choices for:

* How to frame the concept ontologies
	+ For Blockchain, Gov, Finance
* How to use the MVF, SKOS etc.

i.e. 'these are the choices we have made for the ontologies', with ramifications for how to provide the concept ontology for a given TF. Then show how to represent these items using the relevant constructs of MVF and the rest. Then those others can engage us at that level.

We should provide a straw man that implements som of the VCoI principles so people can see what we are trying to do

To do that:

Take the 3 or so vocabularies we have been working with:

* Create the CO that would support those vocabularies
* Add some things from the Digital Currency work

AS we build out a CO it may hopefully become obvious what it need to look like.

Actually: Digital Currency is a good one, as we have a lot of conceptual abstractions for 'money' that are not in FIBO and would not be appropriate for operational / standardized FIBO.

That would be a good place to

* Show what a CO would be
* Show where it interacts / overlaps / doesn't overlap with more operational FIBO concepts
* How it relates to the 'Context' treatment in VCoI AND the Context Ontology

Reminder (see 17 May notes):

* Ontology (1): the VCoIs own ontology for;
	+ Concepts that make up the components of Context
	+ Concepts that are referred to in References
* Ontology (2): The Conceptual Ontology (maintained by the TF)

Where:

1. Is ‘Context Ontology’
2. Is ‘Domain Concept Ontology’

We then figured out:

Ontology (1) applies to all 3 output forms:

* Terms and Definitions
* Abbreviations
* References

i.e. the same concepts in play to define the 'context of' a (Term; Abbreviation), are also in play to describe references (e.g. organizations, publications, time, standards etc.)

See list from 17 May:

* + Task Force (people, org),
	+ Document,
	+ other orgs,
	+ time / event etc.;
	+ Process, governance (also References);
	+ Rules (market practice, statutory, standards-setting etc.).
		- Standards setting rules also == Process (OMG Process)
		- Or even W3C, ERC, or other Stds groups rules and process

### Q3 Deliverables Scope

For Q3 we have 2 possible things on the CO side:

* Straw man ontology for a Domain topic (e.g. Money)
* Our own ontology(1) for Context

Perhaps:

* Start on Ontology (1) and identify overlap e.g. People, org, time, with possible 'starter kits' for Ontology (2);
* Then: do an ontology (2) for Money / Finance, using some of the building blocks and the basic FO framework from Ontology (1).

That will give us a nice distinction between kinds of ontology, e.g. Organization, as a Thing versus organization data surrogates e.g. LEI.

This will help us flesh out the distinction between a data-facing ontology for e.g. organization data versus the real-world concept ontology for those things.

Then: the Context ontology will include categories that are not instantiated in any particular conceptual ontology that FDTF, GovDTF, BC-PSIG etc. are using yet. May not yet have a vocabulary that fills the slot for that (for a given) usage context. We should allow that to happen. Not yet got a v rich vocab from any of the example groups right now. Fill it out from this group – with digital currency as a good use case.

We can provide a rich palette from which people can select both kinds of thing – real world stuff and data stuff that stands in for that – so it becomes clearer when a choice is being made and why.

### Q3 Sessions Structuring

We have a choice:

* Alternate between things
* Work in a linear manner on the ontology(ies) and let the syntactical stuff and the output deliverables fall into place

**Outcome:** we feel the 2nd is a better way to proceed.

May also end up with a palette of syntactical tools that would apply depending on what a given group was working on.

As an example some groups may find themselves choosing SBVR versus SKOS versus something else for a given. Or SBRM for the same general kind of thing? If that existed.

#### Aside: Underlying question

Underlying question lurking behind this. What is needed for SBRM?

Could define:

* What is a business reporting model?
	+ - E.g. what are the components of (a given kind of e.g. Annual) Report
* Then the components and the relationships among them could be defined

But that's what XBRL tries to do, and what the XBRL Abstract Model was aiming to standardize and ontologicalize. See e.g. Scott Thies document on taxonomy creation, that addresses these questions. Clarifies what the standard is trying to get at. Can go into a taxonomy and create an ontology for that.

So there's a chance that Abstract XBRL and SBRM are aiming at the same or similar requirements? Also earlier discussions on defining what XBRL actually is.

#### /aside

Was SBRM mentioned in this QM?

No – was removed from agenda for BMI on the Monday. Expecting submission in Sept, nothing to present this time. A little surprising not to have an interim update.

#### Aims and Scope: VCoI, SBRM, Abstract XBRL

There is a similarity with this group and SBRM on being able to articulate what an ontology should be like and how to arrive at one.

Similar to XBRL on Dimensions. Here we talk about the 'context dimensions' that hold the concepts that the TFs would create their ontologies about (the Ws). Same as earlier work with the FIBO Concept ontology (initially in FND WG, then in the Semantic Shed and at VMBO conferences) whereby we aimed to make the FIBO Standard operational ontology consistent with the FIBO CO framework. See also the recent use of ODPs in FIBO (Elisa's recent FIBO work) as a way of aligning an operational ontology with a CO.

We are closer to being able to do that in the simpler Ontology (1) for the things that make up the Context. See the things coming out of the TFs and SIGs we are interfacing.

## Next Week Agenda

Let's look at:

* What is the group of 'contexts' that we want to represent this quarter?
* Then articulate the CO for those.
* Then when moving onto the Domain COs, where we may want to add other things, provide a framework.

**Challenge:** We need start extracting stuff in these notes in a more persistent store of information (the wiki).

**Also:** Take the slide deck we did for the Q2 meeting with the sections, including Process and Structure.

RN: Take that deck as the starting point for a persistent structure on the wiki.

### Slide Deck:

The Q2 (GovDTF) one replaces the 'working deck' with more detail on the OMG Proposition.

 - Mike to do this before next week:

* Post the latest VCoI Deck to the wiki
* Create wiki structure based on this as a framework (relevant parts)
* Put details from the calls etc. on the wiki within that framework (e.g. Ontology (1) v Ontology (2))

**Next week Agenda:** start on the Contexts and References (ontology (1)) Context Ontology.