VCoI Call Notes

*26 July 2021*

# Attendees

* Mike
* Claude
* Rob
* Bobbin

# Agenda

* Review potential SKOS implementation requirements / guidelines

# Meeting Notes

## SKOS Updates and Resources

### Scene setting

See Sections 2 and 3 in the wiki:

1. Content Requirements
2. Metamodel

### TQ Article:

<https://www.topquadrant.com/best-approaches-for-using-and-extending-fibo-vocabulary/>

### Claude article:

SKOS overview for VTG 2021-07-22.pptx

Existing 'working' Slides have more detail on Sections 2 and 3 than wiki – Wiki to be updated.

#### Claude's Deck

**Slide 3**

Broader etc. – v Transitive – come back to this (Taxonomies types)

RelatedMatch – up to the designer

- goes in our Guidelines

Related – in the scheme

Xxx Match – across concept schemes

Geonames – is an ontology; expressed as a Vocabulary (sub-set of what's in there)

### Style questions

Naming? Singular v Plural – plural in SKOS primer (!)

OWL usually uses singular

SKOS does not define – so this would go into our Guidelines

- nothing normative in SKOS on this

Does have the non use of capitals as per ISO 704. Likewise the ban on definite and indefinite articles in a term name.

Use ISO 704 on that

ANSI Z39.19

### Tools

There is also a Protégé plugin

Different capabilities in different tools eg. export, display, edit capabilities

Unilexicon (used by AI group)

Can output indented spreadsheet

## MVF v SKOS

MVF aims to address some of the perceived weaknesses with SKOS.

On the down side it doesn't exist. Yet.

Progress may or may not have been held via some theological disputes.

OR it might even be ready for adoption at the next OMG QM.

If adopted, we would start to see some tools.

Not yet an ecosystem of tools, or use cases to drive those as we have with SKOS.

Focus on model annotation is good – does it really need to also do what SKOS does or can't they just play nice with each other

## SKOS in comparison

It is machine readable and human readable

Key thing: Fundamental object is the Concept, where Term is secondary

- fits with ISO 704 / SBVR etc. Speech Community v Semantic Community.

- MVF also recognizes this distinction

SKOS: Different primary labels in the same language need to be in different Concept Schemes.

So: Concept Scheme corresponds to Speech Community.

(not so ideal from a labeling PoV but once you understand it it is fine)

e.g. 'Activity' in UML and in BPMN – treat UML and BPMN as SKOS Concept Schemes

then 'Activity' label corresponds to 2 different Concepts. Conversely can also have same concept for different words.

Concept v Terms = Context Dependent

**In VCoI calculus:** Concept Scheme = Context

### Broadness / narrowness

**Slide 3**

MB recommended sets of extensions of this – to do another time

### Abstractnesss

BT: How it relates to more or less abstract?

What you mean by 'abstract' – may or may not be limited to Generalization.

In FIBO they generate SKOS relations for the Ontology where they generate broader from rdfs;subClassOf

So in FIBO it only reflects Generalization.

So abstract is one (or more) of the kinds of broader/narrower

Is Abstraction always Generalization or not?

Not sure – will have to think of some examples.

#### Human language examples:

Indo-European root word for 'fire' is Ignis

Used in traditional medicine to describe what we now know as kinds of enzymatic reaction.

Can reframe as a more abstract notion: Ignis = any chemical reaction.

#### Metaphor?

Metaphor may be another kind of abstraction that is not generalization?

Meanwhile:

If A is an abstraction of B you can claim B is a specialization of A but not vv – it may not necessarily be at a lower level of abstraction.

River v Body of water - but is body of water more abstract?

**Generalization:** all bodies of water

**Metaphorical:** time as a steam

UML model is an abstraction of a piece of software but the software is not a kind of model.

**Conclusion:** Models are necessarily abstractions.

So there are at least 2 kinds of abstraction one of which is generalization.

## Next Week

Go over the kinds of broader relations in SKOS and recommendations.

Meanwhile: we would like to find out why Elisa (specifically) feels there are shortcomings with SKOS.

Insufficient v insufficient for what?

**Ambition:** guidelines for SKOS and for using MVF for the things that SKOS does not do (if we needed to do those things).

Also how to use the kinds of broader and narrower in a pragmatic business setting. If a relationship serves a purpose we should not be stopping people doing that. See Heather Hedden on this. The Accidental Taxonomist – recommended reading.

Heddon also has a blog.

<https://accidental-taxonomist.blogspot.com/>