VCoI Call Notes

*13 Sept 2021*

# Attendees

* Claude Baudoin
* Mike Bennett
* Rob Nehmer

# Agenda

* Review status
* Working through example terms

# Meeting Notes

## Status

Have not really defined what it is we are expecting people to implement.

We have discussed how to use the various standards but what does a person do about declaring the meaning of a concept, e.g. alerting other groups of a given usage etc.

Concerned we are no closer to giving people practical initial guidance that can be incrementally improved. Need to be more agile.

Can we come up with a simple 5-pager to start with?

People are not informed of the -ve consequence of not defining a vocabulary or the +ve consequences of doing so.

### Ambitions

If we had enough time, one could work through the materials from the past few months and summarize as a usable short initial guidance paper would look like.

Could then start to socialize it.

Most of us have been more rigorous than an agile initial document would indicate.

Need only say a few simple things e.g.:

* Controlled Vocabularies; types of these include
	+ Taxonomy
	+ Ontology
	+ Dictionary
* People use these but
	+ Need to be de-duplicated
	+ Clashed and overlaps
* So need some controlled vocab for your domain of interest
	+ Some concept resource e.g.:
		- Glossary
		- Taxonomy
		- Ontology
* Need to adhere to the principles
	+ Principle of Term v Concept (ISO 1087)
	+ These are linked via Context
		- That's the new piece
	+ Contexts are sets of Concepts
* Materials need to be human and machine readable
	+ Machine readable representations exists
	+ Needs to be one (which ever you choose)
	+ Candidates include
		- SKOS
		- MVF
		- OWL
		- SBVR
	+ Stay tuned for recommendations and preferences
		- And maybe pros and cons of the choices

#### Then:

Having explained those principles (esp. primacy of the Concept)

And that OMG needs a common repository for this – a catalog of existing vocabularies

Something like OOR but for a range of formats.

This would give something for those groups that have not created any sort of vocabulary, to create something at a first level.

Later formalities, process, metamodel, annotations can be layered on from that, such that these TFs can evolve what they have. With minimal re-work.

Also those TFs can review succussive versions of the VCoI document based on their real experience in applying this.

So that's the proposal on the table.

#### Summary

Define the core notions e.g. Concept, Term, Language or Term, Context, Concept etc.

Additional recommendations can follow, e.g. on different spoken languages.

### Reactions

#### Mike

* Like the basic idea
* We would need to better emphasize the centralize of the Context and how to treat it

#### Rob:

(Note new timings impact availability on this time slot; can move but not on Mondays)

Like Claude's suggestion but the risk is we are perpetuating this meeting without an output. Good to put something out that we can see people's reactions to.

May also consider whether, for other major constituencies (e.g. FDTF, GovDTF, BC-PSIG AI PTF), what is the things we need from those groups to proceed; what kind of reaction are we looking for out of those groups to determine if VCoI is contributing anything. That is, is there an ultimate consumer for which this represents value.

CB: This would give a means to get feedback.

RN: What about reaction from other remaining groups on OMG (rather than above list of 'tame' TFs)

That would give us an indication of whether this is viable. For example, of some TFs might not support the use of the Concept Ontology, but others still might.

Either:

* At some point, we should expect to no longer need to meet weekly – e.g. we would only need to maintain the Ontology (1) which would need only very occasional additions once it's completed
* OR – we determine that there is no uptake and we take the tent down

Domain TFs are more likely to be where this treatment is needed – may be less of interest in Platform TFs where the terminology is all locked down by the relevant metamodels.

A potential result after the 1st deliverable, is to ask the co-chairs to a 2h session during the week of each QM (e.g. 5 – 7 one evening) to spend 10 min telling us

* where they are with the vocabulary
* whether they are using the VCoI stuff
* What needs to change in the VCoI guidance
* What needs to be added
* Potential updates to the Ontology(1) if needed

That is, a quarterly review of where groups stand on defining their vocabulary.

MB has an idea…

By re-framing this in terms of the cross-TF liaison requirement, it is simpler to define the agenda for how TFs are defining their stuff. With the VCoI addition that when you define a contextual relationships (speech community to semantic community) then you have to more formally deal with Context as a set of Concepts. That's the VCoI add.

Since we already dealt with Context we can include in the 5 pager the 1st 2 iterations of what would have been 2 iterations if we started at the beginning i.e. if this were a spiral:

* Turn 1: Term v Concept (with Context as a string literal) (ISO 1087 / SBVR / SKS)
* Turn 2: Formalize the Context as a set of Concepts (Ontology (1) from VCoI)
* Turn 3: process and metamodel for dealing with this; meeting the requirements to
	+ have a CV
	+ Make it shareable with others
	+ Make it machine and human readable

So we tell them not what but how concepts and contexts to define;

Can organize themselves internally however they want

 - so no need for detailed process workflow representation

Can later come up with a more common share coordination mechanism across the OMG, using principles of KM for groups to share with one another

* The state of the vocabulary
* The means to share these formally

## Plans

What do we need for Sept meeting?

* We did not plan a stand-alone session
* There is now no GovDTF meeting to present at
* The combined FDTF/BC-PSIG call is an option but that is also filling up
* We *could* now advertise a stand-alone session as VCoI

Describe the outline of the guidance page we will produce for the December QM, setting out:

"The principles of vocabulary creation and management across the OMG"

If this were a physical meeting, this would be the 5 – 6 slot on some suitable day. Actually better 5:15 – 6:30 to give a moving break after the end of an afternoon session (1 – 5).

Verdict: we may as well do 5:15 – 6 on a given day anyway. Regardless of who turns up this will be valuable time. Can be mainly discussion and the half dozen or so basic principle slides. Use the slot to show we exist and also talk to the pragmatic, cross-OMG ambition. Also to learn where each TF is on, where they are in defining their vocabulary, ontology etc. at present. That will help fine tune how to move things forward.

As a minimum it could take the place of the usual one.

Options: exclude Wed. Tuesday is freed up given there is no Chair's Dinner.

Wednesday has a 6 – 8 get-together per the usual thing.

Monday and Thursday also available.

If someone were still on West Coast time we might have to re-think the time slot (unless it ends up landing in their lunch time slot).

#### Resolution

Let's do Tuesday 5:15 – 6:30

 - but check if anyone has that blocked out in the West Coast.

(but FDTF and BC-SIG times not yet updated so read those as though we have moved Blockchain PSIG by 3 hours; but now FDTF will meet jointly with Blockchain PSIG so there is no Tuesday morning FDTF).

Others to talk to that are bound to have large vocabulary issues:

* C4I DTF (meets Tuesday until 5pm ET)
* Healthcare
* Retail (ARTS)
* MANTIS

MB to check confirm the exact time and set up the new calendar.

There is already a VCoI agenda page, so the calendar link is already defined.