VCoI Call Notes

*23 August 2021*

# Attendees

* Mike Bennett
* Rob Nehmer
* Bobbin Teegarden
* Claude Baudoin (telephone)

# Agenda

* The GovDTF Example Terms

# Meeting Notes

## MVF Updates

MVF – still in draft but coming.

Also includes codes and schemes.

## Terms Walk Through

### Policy:

For any construct we need:

* Look first at SKOS
* If not in SKOS
  + Identify extensions for SKOS
  + Identify corresponding MVF pieces
    - Can implement in SKOS extensions in the mean time

Current trajectory: make it a set of recommendations on how to use the standards (rather than a standard).

Target / Use case / requirement:

* Someone wants a definition for a term
  + E.g. to take a conference, some decision makers in industry / lawmakers
  + As a definitive statement from a given TF / SIG
  + As a definitive statement from 'The OMG'
* Definition / Abbreviation / Reference to put in a formal specification
  + The 3 spec sections
  + From another TF or the same TF
* For wiki pages / general reference

### So to the terms…

#### Common Statistical Production Architecture

We have:

**Process Steps:**

*Identify Term*

The Term: Common Statistical Production Architecture

Where it goes:

Skos:label

*Identify Concept*

Concept…

Where does that go in the SOKS usage:

Skos:concept

*Identify Usage Context*

Usage context in this example: GovDTF external usage.

How do we represent / store that context?

SKOS: concept\_scheme

Is this really a Context? Or is it the usage of the context?

Shape shifting: based on the context.

The meaning of the word shifts based on the context.

We are defining that context.

In the context of OMG and the GovDTF, here is its meaning.

Another possible layer of context: What does GovDTF want to do with it?

e.g. appear at a conference; present a definition to a lawmaker etc.

How do we know?

If they came back asking for another meaning – put another entry to include that other meaning.

Alternatively, if not well specified – it is too underspecified for us to apply this approach. Maybe they want it to be ambiguous.

What we want to do in this process is to nail down the meaning in a specific context e.g. RFI or RFP, overall TF usage or some thing in between.

This means there will be broader and narrower contexts in which we might apply a concept to a term.

For this exercise: rather than try to guess all the possible contexts for this term, we want to define a few contexts and identify how to model.

#### Working through this example:

"Abstract. The Common Statistical Production Architecture (CSPA) is

a reference architecture for the statistical industry. In particular, CSPA

aims at documenting statistical services in a standard way, in order to

ease their exchange and reuse between statistical institutes. This paper

describes a suggested formalization of some parts of the CSPA specifica-

tion using OWL. This work led to propose some adjustments that could

improve the consistency and clarity of the specification"

*Concept:*

There is a PDF of an article describing an ontology

<http://ceur-ws.org/Vol-1654/article-06.pdf>

Has this otology been adopted by e.g. the BLS people who are 'customers' for the GovDTF supplied definitions.

This would be an issue for GovDTF.

As such, this feeds into Methodology in terms of 'What they want'.

Example things to tell the user (guidelines):

1. Look for a suitable ontology already out there
   1. As a published standard?
   2. As described in some academic paper (see link above); for which:
      1. IS the ontology itself available
      2. Is it in the right formalism for defining a concept
   3. What community of practice originates the concept you are after
      1. As written definition
      2. As formal ontology

Communities of Practice – what guidelines?

For some concepts, there is a clear community of practice

For others there may not be.

For some there may be several

e.g. Real Estate, Energy, Blockchain etc.

### Guidelines for the TF:

There is no expectation to come up with 'the ontology' for a given concept or set of concepts, but rather, which ontological resource (or definitional resource) best formally represent the meanings of the concepts as you want to convey them.

#### Communities of Practice

- order of precedence:

* Global
* Country specific (e.g. US, Canada, EU etc.)

If the Usage Context = an OMG Task Force then Global > National

If the TF wanted to come up with specifically US definitions (e.g. to take to US lawmakers) then US > International

So there is a bunch guideline to write on how he TF selects the 'Origin Context' of the terms. Hat 's the source of the term.

**For Source context:** use Prov-O to represent that.

Community of Practice is very specific

(won't always be the case – need a process wrinkle for specific non specific).

Source: United Nations Economic Commission for Europe

Very unique term: 'Common Statistical Production Architecture'

Thee have a v different treatment to commonly used words of uses of words with different definitions

e.g. Ledger, Currency, metamodel, model, broker etc.

#### Process Model

There is branch (to add to the Process model)

(a diamond icon)

**Question:** Is this a unique set of words we want 'the' source definition for?

If Yes: Process 1 (go direct to that source)

If No: Process 2: Identify and agree on a suitable source

* Community of practice
* Pubicatiojns
* Documentaiton
* Global v national etc. as above

In this case:

(Yes)

-> the simple Process 1.

#### Concept:

**Is in Ontology (2):** The ontology owned by the TF.

The material researched above is Ontology (2)

**In ontology (1)** the Context ontology:

Just a term, relating to a concept scheme

#### 2 uses of Context:

1. Who uses it? (who what when where etc.)
2. Who originated it?
   1. Origination Context is always a Who
   2. Some specific Reference
      1. Go to References

In a specialized thing like this (sub-Process 1), as a one-off, the origination context is also the context in which the conceptual ontology was built.

Real:

All models have a context and contain the elements of context

Ontology (1) is the building blocks what 'the context' in which a term is used.

In Sub process (1) above, a term only invented with this definition, the Origination Context is also the only context in which the term is defined.

We would never need to say 'In the context of GovDTF, the term XYZA Means (definition) since there is NO OTHER usage of that term XYZA

Do we need to change Ontology (1)

(no)

Then it goes to the User Group.

Proposed changes might fall out of a discussion in that TF.

Who – is that a specific context that is unique

### Clarify:

In today's work we take notes on how to improve Ontology (1) but that is NOT the deliverable process.

#### Common Statistical Production Architecture

So the CSPA term:

Ontology (1) has

'Organization'

'Organizational sub unit'

Task forces (both for other orgs and for OMG)

Org: ????

*Kind of Thing:*

CSPA: is an 'Architecture'

- add Architecture to Ontology (1)

Organization: United Nations Economic Commission for Europe

#### Questions

Do we need to add a place for definitions for instances of things in Ontology (1)

Eg.

CSPA = "A reference architecture for the statistical industry aiming at promoting collaboration between"

- definitely not.

That is an Abbreviation CSPA

The above text is a Description for the Term.

The TF would add any links they felt were relevant to the specific instance of the abbreviation 'CSPA'

They might way 'all we want is a definition' we don't need a description of the owning org or of the detailed comments, they just need to know it is owned by some identifiable entity.

- otherwise we would never finish the metamodel. So no 'Description'. Can always use SKOS Notes themselves in whatever way they want to.

So ontology (1) does not go beyond the entities, organs, architectures etc.

Go to the OWL ontology for the Concept

That has descriptions inside it.

The 'Architecture' defined here has conceptual logical and implementation levels.

#### Conclusion on CSPA

This is not a Term at all but a Reference.

For a whole Architecture.

This is 'a reference for' that is, it is not a definition of the meaning of a term, it is the term for a thing (in this case an Architecture) = Reference.

So in the process we are missing some cross-thread steps i.e. this thing you started looking at as a Term needing a Definition was actually a description of a Thing = go to Reference

- add a cross walk to the process here.

### Comparison:

Earlier we looked at kinds of 'Law'

Where identifying a specific Law could be represented in the ontology but the identification of the Law was not a definition of the acronym.

### Meanwhile: Ontologies

Ontology 1: do we have all the concepts they need?

Versus the specific TF Context in which they are going to be applying the specific item.

For instance:

Whereas for Term, this was more of a Reference;

For Abbreviation: we would always want to provide the contextual mapping of the abbreviation.

So at front end of process:

For a thing that exists reference) we (the TF) should be able to directly reference the existing that contains the concept.

### Outcomes

Is Ontology (01) defining 'what is an Abbreviation', 'what is a reference' etc.

Then it goes to the TF

So e.g. Law, Architecture etc. are singletons, so all they need is a label and a URL pointer to it.

Ontology 02 for the TF is the actual label and pointer.

### Next time

Pick the next one and crack on. Continue learning things out of this.

Aim for Q4 to :

* Formalize ontology 01
* Initial draft of the TF Guidelines
* Clean up the Process model