Technical Model Framework – workstream Notes

Thursday 24 May 2012

Session verbatim working notes.

Two topics covered:

1. Hashes v Slashes for URIs
2. What’s generated for the electronic Files deliverables: Proposal is to generate XMI for ODM not XMI for UML – this is not what was previously discussed, so discussed this today.

# URI element Level – Hashes v Slashes

## Business v Operational ontology

Operational ontology: hashes

**Action:** Mark up FIBO conceptual ontology to identify what to use

### Options

* Option 1: some annotation showing what is or is not extracted for the OO
* Option 2: somehow does it automatically.

What are the options above? Do we need to add some annotation in the BCO to support this kind of transformation?

### Discussion

Actually a lot of freedom for vendors to do all sorts of things, e.g. generate whole ontology, generate or not generate particular elements. Along with that would be an option to say "when you generate it, generate it with [hashes / slashes / other possible options].

### Proposal

Offer full possibility of options. There is going to be a URI for each element.

So we either:

a. replace the slash with a hash

b. have flexibilty as to what the content of the URI is

c.

That is:

* If it's FIBO it has this URI (with a slash)
* If it's in a tool, I can have whatever I want it to be as I'm not aligning or conforming with the standard...

### Possible Issues

If autogenerating hashes from slashes, and that ontology has a reference to another ontology, there becomes a problem of maintaining those references in a suitable form. It becomes non obvious which is to be converted when you are generating.

So if you create a new sub-class which is in the OO as a hash, and the parent is a slash, is this a problem? No.

**Scenario:** suppose we want to generate a family of 5 OOs. Reference to a future ontology you are going to generate, say Ontology B, will have the operational ontology URIs. Not trivial.

If you always generate the ontologies in a defined order, does this problem go away? No.

Other experience on this: Need some form of defining mapping between the URIs - a common problem with collaborative work on ontologies.

### Consensus

**Consensus:** OOs are a huge new area we need to research into between OMG and EDMC, and there is a lot more to figure out - we need to have control over the standard - 2 gold standards in FIBO: The BCO and the OO. Need to retain control on both of these, and have the sort of due diligence that only a standards group can provide on both OOs and BCOs. Anyone can then import that OO and do whatever they want with it, but a core OO would be part of the standard, and so needs to stand up to the rigor that the BCO already stands up to.

### Proposal

SO: Proposal on the table is to propose to the OMG and the EDMC that we will have a track which will formalize the whole operational ontology position.

### Consensus:

Slash for BCO

Implications for OO are unclear but we don't have to commit to that today

When we start formal work on a formal standard for OOs, then the question of preferred namespaces becomes one for the OO task force.

### Resolution

We will pick this up in Cambridge, and set up an OO task force.

We should also consider what would actually break or perform non optimally in a given scenario.

### DOLCUMENT IMPLICATION:

Another section in our Conformance Points material!!

* Conformance point 1: FIBO conformance with the official FIBO URIs, which are slashes
* Conformance point 2: Operational ontology with #s instead - can define this as a separate conformance point.

Add an erratum for this?

**Problem:** that ontology has links to other ontologies, e.g. DC uses slash, SKOS uses hash.

Clone ontologies in Shared Semantics: keep the URIs as they are in all cases.

## Display Considerations

Displaying of BCOs uses slashes.

Vendors could identify how to implement this.

Do what's best for each view and let the vendor worry about the details.

Align with W3C best practices in order to support the SemWeb tools e.g. Protege.

NB Protege is fine with these.

What happens when you generate the RDF XML out of Protégé?: it retains the slashes.

(default is hashes, but you can force the slashes)

See New Entity Options button e.g. "start with" and "Followed by" #, / or :

Can work out automatically.

### comment

However we might get into trouble elsewhere?

Define trouble:

a. something doesn't work

b. performance e.g. 2 web accesses rather than one.

If you use slashes then for content negotiation it's not covered in the current recipes guide but it is in the CoolURI approach. Allows the HTML to come back directly rather than returning a 303 code which tells you to access this other URL to get what you want.

Return a table with the terms, definitions and synonyms as a return from this. So that's doable, but then you end up not getting the detailed information for the term itself.

e.g. you would get back Corporation OR you would get back the whole document.

To get web based information about anything in the conceptual ontology you won't be able to…

# XMI Electronic Files

The proposal on the table is that what is generated for the formal OMG submission is not XMI for UML but XMI for ODM.

This has not previously been discussed. The specification assumes that XMI for UML tools will be produced. Therefore we need to:

1. Validate that the ODM XMI meets the requirements of the users; and
2. Identify the changes that need to be made to the specification because this proposed change wasn’t mentioned earlier and no comments were made on diagrams / text which now becomes incorrect in the context if what we are now doing.

We need to identify both the business implications, and the implications for editing of the specification, as a result of this change.

## Discussion

The XMI files are XMI files for the ODM Metamodel.

* We are not producing tool-neutral XMI (equivalent to the EA XMI output from EA) as previously discussed.
* We only produce ODM XMI. And OWL.

### Proposal

Tool-neutral XMI for the model content is out of scope for FIBO as no potential business user is asking for it or would have a use for it.

**Tool support:** are there many tools that can consume this ODM XMI?

Q: What about people who want to import into some other UML tool or some tool like MS-XML to get it into a database?

A: People can do this if they have the ODM spec so this should not be an issue (?)

Q: Is there a schema or DTD we can use to exploit these ODM XMI files?

A: No.

OWL that's produced is in RDF/XML format.

### Consensus

**Consensus:** is the ODM XMI the only format that people will want to consume? Yes.

Any tool that can consume ODM can consume this.

Any tool that can consume UML cannot. Or can they? Anyone?

**Outcome:** The proposal seems to be acceptable. However, there will be changes to the specification.