Object Management Group

109 Highland Avenue  
Needham, MA 02494  
USA

Telephone: +1-781-444-0404  
Facsimile: +1-781-444-0320  
rfp@omg.org

UML Threat & Risk Model  
Request For Proposal

**V 0.5 5/09/2014**

OMG Document: gov/2014-05-01

Letters of Intent due: 15 August, 2014  
Submissions due: 7 November 2014

Objective of this RFP

In the broadest sense, organizations manage threats and risks in order to provide a systematic response to uncertainties. Multiple communities have developed data and exchange schema and interfaces for sharing information about threats, risks and incidents that impact important government, commercial and personal assets and privacy. While each of these schema and interfaces provides value for a specific community it is difficult to federate these multiple representations to arrive at broad-based, planning, simulation, assessment, situational awareness, forensics and to then enact the appropriate courses of action. Cyber related attacks have added a new dimension that stresses traditional mitigation strategies.

This RFP calls for a conceptual model for threats and risks that unifies the semantics of and can provide a bridge across multiple threat and risk schema and interfaces. The conceptual model will be informed by high-level concepts as defined by the Cyber domain, existing NIEM domains and other applicable domains, but is not specific to those domains. This will enable combined Cyber, physical, criminal and natural threats and risks to be federated, understood and responded to effectively.

For further details see Section 6 of this document.

# Introduction

## Goals of OMG

The Object Management Group (OMG) is a software consortium with an international membership of vendors, developers, and end users. Established in 1989, its mission is to help computer users solve enterprise integration problems by supplying open, vendor-neutral portability, interoperability and reusability specifications based on Model Driven Architecture (MDA). MDA defines an approach to IT system specification that separates the specification of system functionality from the specification of the implementation of that functionality on a specific technology platform, and provides a set of guidelines for structuring specifications expressed as models. OMG has published many widely-used specifications such as UML [UML], BPMN [BPMN], MOF [MOF], XMI [XMI], DDS [DDS] and CORBA [CORBA], to name but a few significant ones.

## Organization of this document

The remainder of this document is organized as follows:

Section 2 – *Architectural* *Context*. Background information on OMG’s Model Driven Architecture.

Section 3 – *Adoption Process*. Background information on the OMG specification adoption process.

Section 4 – *Instructions for Submitters*. Explanation of how to make a submission to this RFP.

Section 5 – *General Requirements* *on Proposals*. Requirements and evaluation criteria that apply to all proposals submitted to OMG.

Section 6 – *Specific Requirements* *on Proposals*. Problem statement, scope of proposals sought, mandatory requirements, non-mandatory features, issues to be discussed, evaluation criteria, and timetable that apply specifically to this RFP.

Appendix A – References and Glossary Specific to this RFP

Appendix B – General References and Glossary

## Conventions

The key words "shall", "shall not", "should", "should not", "may" and **"need not"** in this document should be interpreted as described in Part 2 of the ISO/IEC Directives [ISO2]. These ISO terms are compatible with the same terms in IETF RFC 2119 [RFC2119].

## Contact Information

Questions related to OMG’s technology adoption process and any questions about this RFP should be directed to *rfp@omg.org*.

OMG documents and information about the OMG in general can be obtained from the OMG’s web site: *http://www.omg.org*. Templates for RFPs (like this document) and other standard OMG documents can be found on the Template Downloads Page: *http://www.omg.org/technology/template\_download.htm*

# Architectural Context

MDA provides a set of guidelines for structuring specifications expressed as models and the mappings between those models. The MDA initiative and the standards that support it allow the same model, specifying business system or application functionality and behavior, to be realized on multiple platforms. MDA enables different applications to be integrated by explicitly relating their models; this facilitates integration and interoperability, and supports system evolution (deployment choices) as platform technologies change. The three primary goals of MDA are portability, interoperability and reusability.

Portability of any subsystem is relative to the subsystems on which it depends. The collection of subsystems that a given subsystem depends upon is often loosely called the *platform,* which supports that subsystem. Portability – and reusability – of such a subsystem is enabled if all the subsystems that it depends upon use standardized interfaces (APIs) and usage patterns.

MDA provides a pattern comprising a portable subsystem that is able to use any one of multiple specific implementations of a platform. This pattern is repeatedly usable in the specification of systems. The five important concepts related to this pattern are:

1. *Model* – A model is a representation of a part of the function, structure and/or behavior of an application or system. A representation is said to be formal when it is based on a language that has a well-defined form (“syntax”), meaning (“semantics”), and possibly rules of analysis, inference, or proof for its constructs. The syntax may be graphical or textual. The semantics might be defined, more or less formally, in terms of things observed in the world being described (e.g. message sends and replies, object states and state changes, etc.), or by translating higher-level language constructs into other constructs that have a well-defined meaning. The (non-mandatory) rules of inference define what unstated properties can be deduced from explicit statements in the model. In MDA, a representation that is not formal in this sense is not a model. Thus, a diagram with boxes and lines and arrows that is not supported by a definition of the meaning of a box, and the meaning of a line and of an arrow is not a model – it is just an informal diagram.
2. *Platform* – A set of subsystems/technologies that provide a coherent set of functionality through interfaces and specified usage patterns that any subsystem that depends on the platform can use without concern for the details of how the functionality provided by the platform is implemented.
3. *Platform Independent Model (PIM)* – A model of a subsystem that contains no information specific to the platform, or the technology that is used to realize it.
4. *Platform Specific Model (PSM)* – A model of a subsystem that includes information about the specific technology that is used in the realization of that subsystem on a specific platform, and hence possibly contains elements that are specific to the platform.
5. *Mapping* – Specification of a mechanism for transforming the elements of a model conforming to a particular metamodel into elements of another model that conforms to another (possibly the same) metamodel. A mapping may be expressed as associations, constraints, rules or templates with parameters that to be assigned during the mapping, or other forms yet to be determined.

OMG adopts standard specifications of models that exploit the MDA pattern to facilitate portability, interoperability and reusability, either through ab initio development of standards or by reference to existing standards. Some examples of OMG adopted specifications are:

1. *Languages* – e.g. IDL for interface specification [IDL], UML for model specification [UML], BPMN for Business Process specification [BPMN], etc.
2. *Mappings* – e.g. Mapping of OMG IDL to specific implementation languages (CORBA PIM to Implementation Language PSMs), UML Profile for EDOC (PIM) to CCM (CORBA PSM) and EJB (Java PSM), CORBA (PSM) to COM (PSM) etc.
3. *Services* – e.g. Naming Service [NS], Transaction Service [OTS], Security Service [SEC], Trading Object Service [TOS] etc.
4. *Platforms* – e.g. CORBA [CORBA], DDS [DDS]
5. *Protocols* – e.g. GIOP/IIOP [CORBA] (both structure and exchange protocol), DDS Interoperability Protocol [DDSI].
6. *Domain Specific Standards* – e.g. Model for Performance-Driven Government [MPG], Single Nucleotide Polymorphisms specification [SNP], TACSIT Controller Interface specification [TACSIT].

For an introduction to MDA, see [MDAa]. For a discourse on the details of MDA please refer to [MDAc]. To see an example of the application of MDA see [MDAb]. For general information on MDA, see [MDAd].

Object Management Architecture (OMA) is a distributed object computing platform architecture within MDA that is related to ISO’s Reference Model of Open Distributed Processing RM-ODP [RM-ODP]. CORBA and any extensions to it are based on OMA. For information on OMA see [OMA].

# Adoption Process

## Introduction

OMG decides which specifications to adopt via votes of its Membership. The specifications selected should satisfy the architectural vision of MDA. OMG bases its decisions on both business and technical considerations. Once a specification is adopted by OMG, it is made available for use by both OMG members and non-members alike, at no charge.

This section 3 provides an extended summary of the RFP process. For more detailed information, see the Policies and Procedures of the OMG Technical Process [P&P], specifically Section 4.2, and the OMG Hitchhiker’s Guide [Guide]. In case of any inconsistency between this document or the Hitchhiker's Guide and the Policies and Procedures, the P&P is always authoritative. All IPR-related matters are governed by OMG's Intellectual Property Rights Policy [IPR].

## The Adoption Process in detail

### Development and Issuance of RFP

RFPs, such as this one, are drafted by OMG Members who are interested in the adoption of an OMG specification in a particular area. The draft RFP is presented to the appropriate TF, discussed and refined, and when ready is recommended for issuance. If endorsed by the Architecture Board, the RFP may then be issued as an OMG RFP by a TC vote.

Under the terms of OMG's Intellectual Property Rights Policy [IPR], every RFP shall include a statement of the IPR Mode under which any resulting specification will be published. To achieve this, RFP authors choose one of the three allowable IPR modes specified in [IPR] and include it in the RFP – see section 6.10.

### Letter of Intent (LOI)

Each OMG Member organisation that intends to make a Submission in response to any RFP (including this one) shall submit a Letter of Intent (LOI) signed by an officer on or before the deadline specified in the RFP's timetable (see section 6.11). The LOI provides public notice that the organisation may make a submission, but does not oblige it to do so.

### Voter Registration

Any interested OMG Members, other than Trial, Press and Analyst members, may participate in Task Force voting related to this RFP. If the RFP timetable includes a date for closing the voting list (see section 6.11), or if the Task Force separately decides to close the voting list, then only OMG Member that have registered by the given date and those that have made an Initial Submission may vote on Task Force motions related to this RFP.

Member organizations that have submitted an LOI are automatically registered to vote in the Task Force. Technical Committee votes are not affected by the Task Force voting list – all Contributing and Domain Members are eligible to vote in DTC polls relating to DTC RFPs, and all Contributing and Platform Members are eligible to vote in PTC polls on PTC RFPs.

### Initial Submissions

Initial Submissions shall be made electronically on or before the Initial Submission deadline, which is specified in the RFP timetable (see section 6.11), or may later be adjusted by the Task Force. Submissions shall use the OMG specification template [TMPL], with the structure set out in section 4.9. Initial Submissions shall be written specifications capable of full evaluation, and not just a summary or outline. Submitters normally present their proposals to the Task Force at the first TF meeting after the submission deadline. Making a submission incurs obligations under OMG's IPR policy – see [IPR] for details.

An Initial Submission shall not be altered once the Initial Submission deadline has passed. The Task Force may choose to recommend an Initial Submission, unchanged, for adoption by OMG; however, instead Task Force members usually offer comments and feedback on the Initial Submissions, which submitters can address (if they choose) by making a later Revised Submission.

The goals of the Task Force's Submission evaluation are:

* Provide a fair and open process
* Facilitate critical review of the submissions by OMG Members
* Provide feedback to submitters enabling them to address concerns in their revised submissions
* Build consensus on acceptable solutions
* Enable voting members to make an informed selection decision

Submitters are expected to actively contribute to the evaluation process.

### Revised Submissions

Revised Submissions are due by the specified deadline. Revised Submissions cannot be altered once their submission deadline has passed. Submitters again normally present their proposals at the next meeting of the TF after the deadline. If necessary, the Task Force may set a succession of Revised Submission deadlines. Submitters choose whether or not to make Revised Submissions - if they decide not to, their most recent Submission is carried forward, unless the Submitter explicitly withdraws from the RFP process.

The evaluation of Revised Submissions has the same goals listed above.

### Selection Votes

When the Task Force's voters believe that they sufficiently understand the relative merits of the available Submissions, a vote is taken to recommend a submission to the Task Force's parent Technical Committee. The Architecture Board reviews the recommended Submission for MDA compliance and technical merit. Once the AB has endorsed it, members of the relevant TC vote on the recommended Submission by email. Successful completion of this vote moves the recommendation to OMG's Board of Directors (BoD).

### Business Committee Questionnaire

Before the BoD makes its final decision on turning a Technical Committee recommendation into an OMG published specification, it asks its Business Committee to evaluate whether implementations of the specification will be publicly available. To do this, the Business Committee will send a Questionnaire [BCQ] to every OMG Member listed as a Submitter on the recommended Submission. Members that are not Submitters can also complete a Business Committee Questionnaire for the Submission if they choose.

If no organization commits to make use of the specification, then the BoD will typically not act on the recommendation to adopt it – so it is very important that submitters respond to the BCQ.

Once the Business Committee has received satisfactory BCQ responses, the Board takes the final publication vote. A Submission that has been adopted by the Board is termed an *Alpha Specification*.

At this point the RFP process is complete.

### Finalization & Revision

Any specification adopted by OMG by any mechanism, whether RFP or otherwise, is subject to Finalisation. A Finalization Task Force (FTF) is chartered by the TC that recommended the Specification; its task is to correct any problems reported by early users of the published specification. The FTF first collaborates with OMG's Technical Editor to prepare a cleaned-up version of the Alpha Specification with submission-specific material removed. This is the Beta1 specification, and is made publicly available via OMG's web site. The FTF then works through the list of bug reports ("issues") reported by users of the Beta1 specification, to produce a Finalisation Report and another Beta specification (usually Beta2), which is a candidate for Formal publication. Once endorsed by the AB and adopted by the relevant TC and BoD, this is published as the final, Formal Specification.

Long-term maintenance of OMG specifications is handled by a sequence of Revision Task Forces (RTFs), each one chartered to rectify any residual problems in the most-recently published specification version. For full details, see P&P section 4.4 [P&P].

# Instructions for Submitters

## OMG Membership

To submit to an RFP issued by the Platform Technology Committee an organisation shall maintain either Platform or Contributing OMG Membership from the date of the initial submission deadline, while to submit to a Domain RFP an organisation shall maintain either a Contributing or Domain membership.

## Intellectual Property Rights

By making a Submission, an organisation is deemed to have granted to OMG a perpetual, nonexclusive, irrevocable, royalty-free, paid up, worldwide license to copy and distribute the document and to modify the document and distribute copies of the modified version, and to allow others to do the same. Submitter(s) shall be the copyright owners of the text they submit, or have sufficient copyright and patent rights from the copyright owners to make the Submission under the terms of OMG's IPR Policy. Each Submitter shall disclose the identities of all copyright owners in its Submission.

Each OMG Member that makes a written Submission in response to this RFP shall identify patents containing Essential Claims that it believes will be infringed if that Submission is included in an OMG Formal Specification and implemented.

By making a written Submission to this RFP, an OMG Member also agrees to comply with the Patent Licensing terms set out in section 6.10.

This section 4.2 is neither a complete nor an authoritative statement of a submitter's IPR obligations – see [IPR] for the governing document for all OMG's IPR policies.

## Submission Effort

An RFP submission may require significant effort in terms of document preparation, presentations to the issuing TF, and participation in the TF evaluation process. OMG is unable to reimburse submitters for any costs in conjunction with their submissions to this RFP.

## Letter of Intent

Every organisation intending to make a Submission against this RFP shall submit a Letter of Intent (LOI) signed by an officer on or before the deadline listed in section 6.11, or as later varied by the issuing Task Force.

The LOI should designate a single contact point within the submitting organization for receipt of all subsequent information regarding this RFP and the submission. The name of this contact will be made available to all OMG members. LOIs shall be sent by email, fax or paper mail to the “RFP Submissions Desk” at the OMG address shown on the first page of this RFP.

A suggested template for the Letter of Intent is available at http://doc.omg.org/loi [LOI].

## Business Committee terms

This section contains the text of the Business Committee RFP attachment concerning commercial availability requirements placed on submissions. This attachment is available separately as OMG document omg/12-12-03.

### *Introduction*

OMG wishes to encourage rapid commercial adoption of the specifications it publishes. To this end, there must be neither technical, legal nor commercial obstacles to their implementation. Freedom from the first is largely judged through technical review by the relevant OMG Technology Committees; the second two are the responsibility of the OMG Business Committee. The BC also looks for evidence of a commitment by a submitter to the commercial success of products based on the submission.

### Business Committee evaluation criteria

#### Viable to implement across platforms

While it is understood that final candidate OMG submissions often combine technologies before they have all been implemented in one system, the Business Committee nevertheless wishes to see evidence that each major feature has been implemented, preferably more than once, and by separate organisations. Pre-product implementations are acceptable. Since use of OMG specifications should not be dependent on any one platform, cross-platform availability and interoperability of implementations should be also be demonstrated.

#### Commercial availability

In addition to demonstrating the existence of implementations of the specification, the submitter must also show that products based on the specification are commercially available, or will be within 12 months of the date when the specification was recommended for adoption by the appropriate Task Force. Proof of intent to ship product within 12 months might include:

* A public product announcement with a shipping date within the time limit.
* Demonstration of a prototype implementation and accompanying draft user documentation.

Alternatively, and at the Business Committee's discretion, submissions may be adopted where the submitter is not a commercial software provider, and therefore will not make implementations commercially available. However, in this case the BC will require concrete evidence of two or more independent implementations of the specification being used by end-user organisations as part of their businesses.

Regardless of which requirement is in use, the submitter must inform the OMG of completion of the implementations when commercially available.

#### Access to Intellectual Property Rights

OMG will not adopt a specification if OMG is aware of any submitter, member or third party which holds a patent, copyright or other intellectual property right (collectively referred to in this policy statement as "IPR") which might be infringed by implementation or recommendation of such specification, unless OMG believes that such IPR owner will grant an appropriate license to organizations (whether OMG members or not) which wish to make use of the specification. It is the goal of the OMG to make all of its technology available with as few impediments and disincentives to adoption as possible, and therefore OMG strongly encourages the submission of technology as to which royalty-free licenses will be available.

The governing document for all intellectual property rights (“IPR”) policies of Object Management Group is the Intellectual Property Rights statement, available at: http://doc.omg.org/ipr. It should be consulted for the authoritative statement of the submitter's patent disclosure and licensing obligations.

#### Publication of the specification

Should the submission be adopted, the submitter must grant OMG (and its sublicensees) a worldwide, royalty-free licence to edit, store, duplicate and distribute both the specification and works derived from it (such as revisions and teaching materials). This requirement applies only to the written specification, not to any implementation of it. Please consult the Intellectual Property Rights statement (http://doc.omg.org/ipr) for the authoritative statement of the submitter's copyright licensing obligations.

#### Continuing support

The submitter must show a commitment to continue supporting the technology underlying the specification after OMG adoption, for instance by showing the BC development plans for future revisions, enhancement or maintenance.

## Responding to RFP items

### Complete proposals

Submissions should propose full specifications for all of the relevant requirements detailed in Section 6 of this RFP. Submissions that do not present complete proposals may be at a disadvantage.

Submitters are encouraged to include any non-mandatory features listed in Section 6.

### Additional specifications

Submissions may include additional specifications for items not covered by the RFP and which they believe to be necessary. Information on these additional items should be clearly distinguished. Submitters shall give a detailed rationale for why any such additional specifications should also be considered for adoption. Submitters should note that a TF is unlikely to consider additional items that are already on the roadmap of an OMG TF, since this would pre-empt the normal adoption process.

### Alternative approaches

Submitters may provide alternative RFP item definitions, categorizations, and groupings so long as the rationale for doing so is clearly stated. Equally, submitters may provide alternative models for how items are provided if there are compelling technological reasons for a different approach.

## Confidential and Proprietary Information

The OMG specification adoption process is an open process. Responses to this RFP become public documents of the OMG and are available to members and non-members alike for perusal. No confidential or proprietary information of any kind will be accepted in a submission to this RFP.

## Proof of Concept

Submissions shall include a “proof of concept” statement, explaining how the submitted specifications have been demonstrated to be technically viable. The technical viability has to do with the state of development and maturity of the technology on which a submission is based. This is not the same as commercial availability. Proof of concept statements can contain any information deemed relevant by the submitter; for example:

“This specification has completed the design phase and is in the process of being prototyped.”

“An implementation of this specification has been in beta-test for 4 months.”

“A named product (with a specified customer base) is a realization of this specification.”

It is incumbent upon submitters to demonstrate the technical viability of their proposal to the satisfaction of the TF managing the evaluation process. OMG will favor proposals based on technology for which sufficient relevant experience has been gained.

## Submission Format

### General

* Submissions that are concise and easy to read will inevitably receive more consideration.
* Submitted documentation should be confined to that directly relevant to the items requested in the RFP.
* To the greatest extent possible, the submission should follow the document structure set out in "ISO/IEC Directives, Part 2 – Rules for the structure and drafting of International Standards" [ISO2]. An OMG specification template is available to make it easier to follow these guidelines.
* The key words "shall", "shall not", "should", "should not", "may" and **"need not"** shall be used as described in Part 2 of the ISO/IEC Directives [ISO2]. These ISO terms are compatible with the same terms in IETF RFC 2119 [RFC2119]. However, the RFC 2119 terms **"must"**, **"must not"**, **"optional"**, **"required"**, **"recommended"** and **"not recommended"** shall not be used (even though they are permitted under RFC2119).

### Mandatory Outline

*All submissions* shall use the following structure, based on the OMG Specification template [TEMPL]:

Section 0 of the submission shall be used to provide all non-normative supporting material relevant to the evaluation of the proposed specification, including:

* The full name of the submission
* A complete list of all OMG Member(s) making the submission, with a named contact individual for each
* The acronym proposed for the specification (e.g. UML, CORBA)
* The name and OMG document number of the RFP to which this is a response
* The OMG document number of the main submission document
* Overview or guide to the material in the submission
* Statement of proof of concept (see 4.8)
* If the proposal does not satisfy any of the general requirements stated in Section 5, a detailed rationale explaining why
* Discussion of each of the “Issues To Be Discussed” identified in Section 6.
* An explanation of how the proposal satisfies the specific requirements and (if applicable) requests stated in Section 6.

Section 1 and subsequent sections of the submission shall contain the normative specification that the Submitter(s) is/are proposing for adoption by OMG, including:

* Scope of the proposed specification
* Overall design rationale
* Conformance criteria for implementations of the proposed specification, clearly stating the features that all conformant implementations shall support, and any features that implementations may support, but which are not mandatory.
* A list of the normative references that are used by the proposed specification
* A list of terms that are used in the proposed specification, with their definitions
* A list of any special symbols that are used in the proposed specification, together with their significance
* The proposed specification itself

Section 0 will be deleted from any specification that OMG adopts and publishes. Therefore Section 0 of the submission shall contain no normative material, and any non-normative material outside section 0 shall be explicitly identified.

The main submission document and any models or other machine-interpretable files accompanying it shall be listed in an inventory file conforming to the inventory template [INVENT].

The submission shall include a copyright waiver in a form acceptable to OMG. One acceptable form is:

“Each of the entities listed above: (i) grants to the Object Management Group, Inc. (OMG) a nonexclusive, royalty-free, paid up, worldwide license to copy and distribute this document and to modify this document and distribute copies of the modified version, and (ii) grants to each member of the OMG a nonexclusive, royalty-free, paid up, worldwide license to make up to fifty (50) copies of this document for internal review purposes only and not for distribution, and (iii) has agreed that no person shall be deemed to have infringed the copyright in the included material of any such copyright holder by reason of having used any OMG specification that may be based hereon or having conformed any computer software to such specification.”

Other forms of copyright waiver may only be used if approved by OMG legal counsel beforehand.

## How to Submit

Submitters should send an electronic version of their submission to the *RFP Submissions Desk (rfp@omg.org)* at OMG Headquarters by 5:00 PM U.S. Eastern Standard Time (22:00 GMT) on the day of the Initial and Revised Submission deadlines. Acceptable formats are Adobe FrameMaker source, ISO/IEC 26300:2006 (OpenDoc 1.1), OASIS DocBook 4.x (or later) and ISO/IEC 29500:2008 (OOXML, .docx).

Submitters should ensure that they receive confirmation of receipt of their submission.

# General Requirements on Proposals

## Requirements

### Use of modelling languages

Submitters are encouraged to express models using OMG modelling languages such as UML, MOF, CWM and SPEM (subject to any further constraints on the types of the models and modeling technologies specified in Section 6 of this RFP). Submissions containing models expressed using OMG modeling languages shall be accompanied by an OMG XMI [XMI] representation of the models (including a machine-readable copy). A best effort should be made to provide an OMG XMI representation even in those cases where models are expressed via non-OMG modeling languages.

### PIMs & PSMs

Section 6 of this RFP specifies whether PIM(s), PSM(s), or both are being solicited. If proposals specify a PIM and corresponding PSM(s), then the rules specifying the mapping(s) between the PIM and PSM(s) shall either be identified by reference to a standard mapping or specified in the proposal. In order to allow possible inconsistencies in a proposal to be resolved later, proposals shall identify whether it's the mapping technique or the resulting PSM(s) that shall be considered normative.

### Complete submissions

Proposals shall be *precise* and *functionally complete*. Any relevant assumptions and context necessary to implement the specification shall be provided.

### Reuse

Proposals shall reuse existing OMG and other standard specifications in preference to defining new models to specify similar functionality.

### Changes to existing specifications

Each proposal shall justify and fully specify any changes or extensions to existing OMG specifications necessitated by adopting that proposal. In general, OMG favors proposals that are upwards compatible with existing standards and that minimize changes and extensions to existing specifications.

### Minimalism

Proposals shall factor out functionality that could be used in different contexts and specify their models, interfaces, etc. separately. Such minimalism fosters re-use and avoids functional duplication.

### Independence

Proposals shall use or depend on other specifications only where it is actually necessary. While re-use of existing specifications to avoid duplication will be encouraged, proposals should avoid gratuitous use.

### Compatibility

Proposals shall be compatible with and usable with existing specifications from OMG and other standards bodies, as appropriate. Separate specifications offering distinct functionality should be usable together where it makes sense to do so.

### Implementation flexibility

Proposals shall preserve maximum implementation flexibility. Implementation descriptions should not be included and proposals shall not constrain implementations any more than is necessary to promote interoperability.

### Encapsulation

Proposals shall allow independent implementations that are substitutable and interoperable. An implementation should be replaceable by an alternative implementation without requiring changes to any client.

### Security

In order to demonstrate that the specification proposed in response to this RFP can be made secure in environments that require security, answers to the following questions shall be provided:

* What, if any, security-sensitive elements are introduced by the proposal?
* Which accesses to security-sensitive elements should be subject to security policy control?
* Does the proposed service or facility need to be security aware?
* What default policies (e.g., for authentication, audit, authorization, message protection etc.) should be applied to the security sensitive elements introduced by the proposal? Of what security considerations should the implementers of your proposal be aware?

The OMG has adopted several specifications, which cover different aspects of security and provide useful resources in formulating responses. [SEC] [RAD].

### Internationalization

Proposals shall specify the degree of internationalization support that they provide. The degrees of support are as follows:

a) Uncategorized: Internationalization has not been considered.

b) Specific to <region name>: The proposal supports the customs of the specified region only, and is not guaranteed to support the customs of any other region. Any fault or error caused by requesting the services outside of a context in which the customs of the specified region are being consistently followed is the responsibility of the requester.

c) Specific to <multiple region names>: The proposal supports the customs of the specified regions only, and is not guaranteed to support the customs of any other regions. Any fault or error caused by requesting the services outside of a context in which the customs of at least one of the specified regions are being consistently followed is the responsibility of the requester.

d) Explicitly not specific to <region(s) name>: The proposal does not support the customs of the specified region(s). Any fault or error caused by requesting the services in a context in which the customs of the specified region(s) are being followed is the responsibility of the requester.

## Evaluation criteria

Although the OMG adopts model-based specifications and not implementations of those specifications, the technical viability of implementations will be taken into account during the evaluation process. The following criteria will be used:

### Performance

Potential implementation trade-offs for performance will be considered.

### Portability

The ease of implementation on a variety of systems and software platforms will be considered.

### Securability

The answer to questions in section 5.1.11 shall be taken into consideration to ascertain that an implementation of the proposal is securable in an environment requiring security.

### Conformance: Inspectability and Testability

The adequacy of proposed specifications for the purposes of conformance inspection and testing will be considered. Specifications should provide sufficient constraints on interfaces and implementation characteristics to ensure that conformance can be unambiguously assessed through both manual inspection and automated testing.

### Standardized Metadata

Where proposals incorporate metadata specifications, OMG standard XMI metadata [XMI] representations should be provided.

# Specific Requirements on Proposals

## Problem Statement

### General Overview

This RFP addresses the emerging semantic interoperability problems seen around threat and risk management and assessment:

Threat actors have become increasingly more advanced and sophisticated in their techniques and strategies. The campaigns of these threat actors are long term, multi-phased and combine physical and cyber tactics directed at multiple targets. Intentional threats from threat actors can be combined with natural threats. Threat activities are described by multiple patterns, applied to multiple forms of observation (including automated sensors and human observations)

Systematic offline assessment of risks for a given system and organization, selecting and implementing a proactive mitigation strategy, and performing dynamic monitoring, assessing and reaction to imminent and ongoing attacks involves analysis and management of large collections of data.

Monitoring for threat activities involves monitoring large sets of indicators and analysis of data over a significant periods of time.

Various communities have started addressing these issues by developing ecosystems[[1]](#footnote-1) for threat information sharing. While non-cyber domains (specifically the intelligence and related communities) have a rich history of threat analysis and information sharing, the massive proliferation of automated machine-speed attack capabilities is putting heavy strains on traditional threat and risk evaluation and mitigations techniques. At the same time, different communities (such as IT/cyber, law enforcement, emergency management, business architecture, etc.) are developing different approaches to address this challenge. As a result, different taxonomies, models, and protocols have emerged that address the specific needs of the respective community yet create stovepipes for the overall ecosystem.

**Threat actors do not respect community boundaries, they exploit them.** What is needed is a broad-based solution that federates a wide range of threat and risk concerns to arrive at the appropriate courses of action and mitigation strategies.

In planning for and analyzing threats and risks we need to understand and share information for planning, contingencies and forensics. Simulations then add to our capability to evaluate other threats, risks and courses of action. All of these concerns should then be federated in a broad-based threat and risk model.

### Risk Management

In the broadest sense, organizations manage risks in order to provide a systematic response to uncertainties. Many organizations conduct their business within regulatory frameworks that obligate them to safeguard certain assets in accordance with standards and threat and risk assessment. Risk Management is identified as one of the key project management processes. According to ISO/IEC 15288:2008, the Risk Management Process is conducted to identify, assess and mitigate hazards resulting from any uncertain event that may occur and result in adverse consequences to system cost, schedule and technical characteristics and thereby affect stakeholders.

Typical Risk Management Outcomes include:

1) Risk management plan.

2) Risks identified, categorized, prioritized and status allocated.

3) Appropriate risk management strategies defined.

4) Action taken to mitigate or avoid the impact of risk.

Several conceptual frameworks have been developed that describe the elements of threat and risk analysis. These frameworks allow organizations to define the risks in terms of their dimensions, e.g. technical, programmatic, organizational, financial, information quality and within these dimensions, to select the method for expressing risks in suitable terms.

Methodologies for risk management describe activities that identify risks to predict what could go wrong and would adversely affect the system and the organization. This usually involves identifying the initiating events associated with each risk in each risk category. Risk identification then proceeds by defining the interrelationships between sources of risk where there is any coupling. This may be based on project/product histories, checklists, questionnaires and expert analysis. Risk assessment methodologies describe how to conduct a frequency analysis of initiating event occurrence to identify the likelihood of risk occurrence. A risk assessment methodology would also describe steps to evaluate the impact of the risks and define their possible adverse consequences. Risk management involves prioritization of the risks in terms of their likelihood and possible impact. An organization would usually define a threshold of tolerability for each risk category.

Successful risk assessment is based upon detailed understanding of the operational environment of the system and the organization.

Multiple communities have developed protocols, including data and exchange schema and interfaces for sharing information about threats, risks and incidents that impact important government, commercial and personal assets and privacy. While each of these schema and interfaces provides value for a specific community it is difficult to federate these multiple representations to arrive at broad-based, planning, simulation, assessment, situational awareness, forensics and to then enact the appropriate courses of action. Cyber related attacks have added a new dimension that stresses traditional mitigation strategies.

However, several comparative studies of the existing risk analysis methodologies and frameworks have concluded that the existing methodologies, even if based on similar principles, differ in their knowledge bases (assets, threats, vulnerabilities, ...) or type of results (quantitative or qualitative). This makes the risk assessments difficult or impossible to compare when different methods have been used. This makes is difficult to exchange threat and risk related information between multiple communities.

### This RFP

This RFP proposes the development of a conceptual model for threats and risks that is intended to provide a “pivot point” across multiple existing and evolving threat and risk sharing schema and interfaces. This conceptual model will be informed by the existing standards and best practices such that the information that needs to be shared across communities can be federated together and presented to planners, analysis and others – thereby protecting assets in a coherent framework.

By defining a comprehensive conceptual model, such a model will allow the creation of a generic mapping from the domain specific models to and from the conceptual model. This in turns enables the ability to create semantically consistent mapping across communities and domains.

### Specific Use Cases

In support of the overall scope, the following use cases will guide the development of the specification. While a solution is not required to satisfy all, or even any specific use case, it will be evaluated on how many different use cases it actually can address. Use cases and detail is being developed by the community on: https://github.com/omg-threat-modeling/phase1

## Scope of Proposals Sought

The purpose of this initiative is to develop a conceptual computation independent model (CIM) as a conceptual model to represent a broad, semantically aligned view of the threat and risk landscape. Most communities have their own preferred formats and mechanisms for representing and sharing information about threat. The conceptual model will be mapped to platform specific representations to drive semantic interoperability across multiple formats supporting cross-domain mission and use-case requirements. This cross-domain capability will then provide a framework that will aid in planning, simulation, assessment, situational awareness and integrated threat/risk response.

### Types of threats and risks which are in scope

Specifically, the following capabilities MUST be addressed:

1. Ensure that the conceptual threat/risk model can be applied to different domains, specifically:
   1. Cyber/information and communication systems and assets
   2. Physical systems and assets, including embedded and manufacturing
   3. Electromagnetic spectrum assets
2. Ensure that model can be applied the following communities and systems:
   1. Private sector, including
      1. Information systems
      2. Facilities management
      3. Financial systems
      4. Material flown and logistic underpinnings
   2. Law enforcement at the national, state, local, and international level
   3. General emergency management
3. Ensure that the Threat and Risk Model can be applied to actor-less threats, specifically those representing natural threats
4. Considerations across the threat/risk life-cycle
   1. Identifying and planning for risks at the enterprise level
   2. Contingency planning
   3. Simulation
   4. Forensics

Additionally, the following applications SHOULD be addressed:

1. Capabilities to account for the following threat domains or communities
   1. Chemical threats
   2. Biological and medical threats
   3. Radiological threats
   4. Nuclear threats
   5. Economic threats
2. Ensure that the following additional communities can leverage the model:
   1. Military communities and systems
   2. Intelligence communities and systems
   3. Pandemic emergency management

### Level of detail

Any of the above threats and risks can be represented at various levels of detail and granularity. The purpose of this RFP is not to capture every possible concept and property of all of the above domains, as that would be both overwhelming and redundant. The models defined in RFP responses should cover the high-level concerns of these domains such that summary level and cross-domain information sharing is actionable and enabled. The concepts defined should provide a foundation for further elaboration by specific communities. Where detail is not included, mechanisms should be provided to reference more detail in domain specific specifications.

For example, while the cyber threat domain is new and critical, more detail is expected for cyber concepts that will be be expected to share with the cyber community. However extremely fine-grain and technology specific information is captured in current specifications and is not expected to be replicated.

The level of detail and degree of abstraction across domains is a judgement call on the part of submitters, submitters will be asked to discuss their design choices.

### Informative specifications and schema


As there has been substantial work in specific domain with regard to threats and risks, the proposed models should be informed by existing specifications for defining the conceptual model and as a mapping target. These informative specifications include but are not limited to:

* STIX/Cybox/TAXII – The STIX/Cybox/TAXII set of specifications has been developed in a community effort to represent information sharing structures for Cyber attacks.
* NIEM Suspicious activity reports (SAR) – NIEM “SAR” provides for information sharing in the law enforcement and terrorism prevention about incidents of interest related to existing or suspected threats.
* OMG Structured Assurance Case Metamodel (SACM) and related risk models.
* The Emergency Data Exchange Language (EDXL) Standards from Oasis.
* •ISO/IEC 13335
* •ISO/IEC 15408
* •ISO/IEC 15443
* •ISO/IEC 27001
* •EBIOS (France)
* •HTRA (Canada)
* •NIST SP-800-30 (US)
* •Octave (SEI CMU)
* Microsoft Threat Analysis

### Conceptual models and mappings

The approach being requested in this RFP is based on utilizing a “conceptual model”, expressed in high-level UML, to capture the concepts relevant to threats and risks across multiple domains and communities. The conceptual model should then be able to be used to “semantically ground” the specific exchange specifications such that the concepts shared between different exchange representations may be understood and mapped. As each of these exchange standards is designed with specific structures, design choices and technologies in mind – the conceptual model should be free of such commitments. The conceptual model will then be “mapped” to each representation (PIM or PSM) to be federated. PIM or PSM models may be expressed in UML, XML or ontological languages.

Specifications may utilize, extend or define UML profiles to express the conceptual and mapping semantics. Submissions may use the SIMF (Semantic Information Modeling for Federation) specification if it is sufficiently defined at submission time. Such profiles will then be used to define and map the threat/risk models.



The graphic, above, illustrates the expected scope of this RFP. Note that later RFPs may extend the scope.

#### Wide and thin conceptual model

The “wide and thin” conceptual model(s) should cover threats and risks in general, as well as related concepts. These models should be informed by all of the domains listed in section 6.2.1 and be able to represent summary and cross-domain information of interest.

#### Cyber domain

Additional conceptual level granularity and detail is to be provided for the Cyber domain. The primary input to this level is expected to be the high-level concepts of the Cyber domain (e.g. as defined in STIX/Cybox/TAXII), however submitters are free to utilize other specifications. Informal mappings to STIX/TAXII/Cybox and SAR are to be provided as non-normative proofs of concept.

#### NIEM Representation

NIEM EIEMs, reference models and/or IEPDs are to be defined that provides for a NIEM specific representation of the complete conceptual model such that NIEM implementations will be able to share threat/risk information from multiple sources. The NIEM representation shall utilize existing NIEM reference models as applicable.

### Follow on efforts

This RFP is part of a multi-phased initiative that will later leverage the risk/threat conceptual model to drill down into other domains of interest with more detail.

Follow-on efforts are expected to extend the level of granularity and mapping of other exchange formats.

More information about the Threat Model work in progress can be found at:

* <https://github.com/omg-threat-modeling/phase1>

## Relationship to other OMG Specifications and activities

### Relationship to OMG specifications

The following specifications may be related to the UML Profile for Threat Information Sharing:

* Unified Modeling Language (UML 2.4) - ptc/2010-11-16 and ptc/2010-11-14. UML provides an extensible and accepted modeling framework.
* Object Constraint Language (OCL) - <http://www.omg.org/spec/OCL/2.3/Beta2/>. OCL provides a language for specifying constraints in models.
* Unified Profile for DoDAF/MODAF (UPDM) 2.0 ( <http://www.omg.org/spec/UPDM/>). UPDM is the UML representation of the defense architectural standards DoDAF and MoDAF.
* Meta Object Facility (MOF 2.4) - <http://www.omg.org/spec/XMI/2.4/Beta2/>. MOF provides a framework for meta-modeling in which the abstract syntax of UML and other modeling languages is described.
* XML Metadata Interchange (XMI®) - http://www.omg.org/spec/MOF/2.4/Beta2/ <http://www.omg.org/spec/XMI/2.4/Beta2/>. XMI provides a XML interchange format for MOF models.
* Query/View/Transformation - QVT (http://www.omg.org/spec/QVT/1.1/): QVT is the OMG standard for expressing model transformation rules.
* MOF Models to Text Transformation Language - <http://www.omg.org/spec/MOFM2T/1.0/>. Model to text provides a way to specify transformation of models to textual representations.
* CWM – Common Warehouse Metamodel (formal/2003-03-02) defines a meta model for common data modeling schema
* SBVR - Semantics of Business Vocabulary and Business Rules (<http://www.omg.org/spec/SBVR/1.0>) specifies a model for defining business vocabulary and rules
* Shared Operational Picture Exchange Services, (SOPES) Information Exchange Data Model (IEDM) - http://www.omg.org/spec/SOPES/Model Driven Message Interoperability (MDMI) - <http://www.omg.org/spec/MDMI/1.0/>. MDMI provides a standard for financial message definition and mapping.
* Ontology Definition Meta Model (ODM) – <http://www.omg.org/spec/ODM/1.0/>. ODM provides MOF and UML representations of multiple ontology languages including OWL, RDF/S and Common Logic.
* Structured Assurance Case Metamodel (SACM) - <http://www.omg.org/spec/SACM/>. Assurance cases include many concepts overlapping with threats and risks.
* Financial Industry Business Ontology (FIBO) – Fibo provides a conceptual ontology that includes concepts of financial risk. <http://www.omgwiki.org/OMG-FDTF/doku.php>
* IEF Specifications <http://www.omgwiki.org/mars/doku.php?id=ief>
* BMM – BMM provides concepts for means and ends that may be appropriate for risks. <http://www.omg.org/spec/BMM/>

Most of the above specifications have an active standards process and submitters should consult the OMG web site for possible revised versions of these specifications. Use of newer versions of specifications is encouraged but not required.

#### UML and OCL

GRA-UML will be based on UML and GRA-UML will contain UML profiles using OCL constraints, where applicable.

<http://www.omg.org/spec/UML/>

#### QVT

Transformations specified in GRA-UML may be specified in QVT where practical.

<http://www.omg.org/spec/QVT/>

#### UML Profile for NIEM (NIEM-UML) - <http://www.omg.org/spec/NIEM_UML/1.0/Beta1/>

#### UPDM

Submitters may consider leveraging UPDM. As the normative representation of DoDAF-2 in UML UPDM represents an architectural framework that is expected to be used across government.

<http://www.omg.org/spec/UPDM/>

### Relationship to other OMG Documents and work in progress

#### Information Meta Model (IMM) – (<http://www.omg.org/techprocess/meetings/schedule/IMM_RFP.html>). IMM will include a meta model for XML schema that can be used with a QVT mapping for GRA.

#### UML Profile for NIEM (NIEM-UML) 3.0- <http://www.omg.org/cgi-bin/doc.cgi?gov/2014-3-1>

#### Semantic Information Modeling for Federation (SIMF) – provides a foundation for conceptual modelling and mapping:

#### <http://www.omgwiki.org/architecture-ecosystem/doku.php?id=semantic_information_modeling_for_federation_rfp>

## Related non-OMG Activities, Documents and Standards

### Threat-Related Activities

#### STIX: <http://stix.mitre.org>

#### IETF IODef: <http://www.ietf.org/rfc/rfc5070.txt>

#### OpenIOC: <http://www.openioc.org/>

#### OASIS Common Alerting Program & EDXL: <https://www.oasis-open.org/committees/download.php/17227/EDXL-DE_Spec_v1.0.html>

#### EMAP Emergency Management Standard: <http://www.emaponline.org/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=118&Itemid=110>

#### Security Fabric Alliance: <http://sfsig.omg.org/index.htm>

#### NIEM Related Domain IEPDs: <http://www.NIEM.GOV>

### Risk Related Activities

#### ISO: <http://www.iso.org/iso/home/standards/iso31000.htm>

#### NIST: <http://csrc.nist.gov/groups/SMA/fisma/framework.html>

#### OCTAVE: <http://www.cert.org/resilience/products-services/octave/>

## Mandatory Requirements

### Conceptual models

Submissions shall define modular UML models to specify the concepts required to represent information about threats and risks. This conceptual model shall capture the intended meaning of threat & risk related concepts such that it may be used as a reference for the use of those concepts in specific exchanges and data stores. The conceptual model should not assume any particular technology, domain, representation, vocabulary, structure of information or schema that exchange or store these concepts. It shall be a model of the concepts representing real-world entities, not of a data representation.

### Threat and Risk concepts

The conceptual models shall include concepts of “threats” and “risks” required to understand threats. Proposals shall use standard terminology when applicable. References to existing standards shall be provided to facilitate mappings and avoid ambiguity.

It should be noted that:

* Defensive, offensive, or other actors typically do not have insight into the plans or strategies of the respective other actors. As such, model implementations will in those cases be incomplete and rely on estimates and assumed parameters.
* There are non-actor threats (such as natural disasters) that will not be associated with any coherent intentions or plans. As such the model must be able to support such situations.
* Bystanders and inadvertent actors may perform actions that result in actual behavior that provides benefits to any other actor (offensive or defensive). Such actions are understood to be non-intentional.
* The focus of risks would be those that go beyond the normal course of business and expose the enterprise to increased risk due to vulnerabilities.

Proposals shall include and define threat and risk concepts including but not limited to:

* Asset
* Campaign
* Cause
* Effect
* Exploit Target
* Goal
* Hazard
* Impact
* Incident
* Incident
* Indicators
* Likelihood
* Mitigation
* Observable
* Observation
* Observation metadata
* Procedures
* Risk
* Safeguard
* Severity
* Strategy
* Tactics
* Techniques
* Threat
* Threat actor
* Threat source
* Undesired event

Note that proposals are required to cover the above enumerated list in the conceptual model but are not required to use the same terms. Where differing terms are used, submissions shall explain how their terms and concepts relate to the above.

The concepts of threats should include those classifications defined in section 6.2.1.

### Risk Assessment concepts

The conceptual model shall include concepts related to systematic identification of risks and assessing their likelihood and severity. The proposals shall include concepts related to prioritization of risks.

The proposals shall include concepts related to the mapping of risks, hazards and undesired events to descriptions of systems for the purpose of systematic hazard analysis and justifiable identification of risks.

The proposals shall describe concepts related to exchange of risk indicators, including patterns for systematic identification of risks.

### Mitigation and courses of action

The conceptual models shall include concepts of “course of action” and mitigation of threats and risks.

Coincident with understanding any threat or risk is taking steps to mitigate the specific threat and mitigate similar risks in the future. The conceptual models shall include corrective concepts for deterring, protective, detecting, monitoring, limiting, preventive and recovery strategies and courses of action.

### Risk and threat planning

The conceptual model shall include concepts for understanding, planning for and mitigating risks, threats and their contingencies at the governmental and enterprise level.

### NIEM Representation and mapping

Submissions shall define a normative NIEM-UML PIM representation sufficient to capture the concepts as defined in the conceptual models as defined above. This NIEM-UML representation shall be mapped to the conceptual models such that the meaning of each threat/risk relevant NIEM element is described in the conceptual model. The mapping should be sufficiently expressive and executable such that any set of instances represented in or logically mapped to the conceptual model shall be able to be represented in NIEM (Understanding that choices and rules will have to be made). Further, any instance of the NIEM specification shall be able to be logically mapped to the conceptual model.

### STIX/TAXII/Cybox mapping

Submissions shall define a non-normative mapping to the subset of STIX/TAXII/Cybox that corresponds with the conceptual model. This non-normative mapping is intended to show that the conceptual model is sufficient to represent high-level STIX/TAXII/Cybox concepts but is not required to be a formal mapping as is defined for NIEM. Submissions MAY define a formal and executable mapping to and/or from STIX/TAXII/Cybox.

### Common requirements

All models shall utilize UML as a foundation and shall utilize or define one or more profiles and mapping specifications, as needed, sufficient to support the conceptual modelling and mappings as described in the sections above. Submitters are encouraged to use or define such profiles such that the conceptual models are intuitive and stakeholder friendly.

Concepts that are required for understanding threats or risks should, as much as possible, be defined in a modular fashion such that these concepts may be reused for other purposes that share the need for the same concepts. NIEM and other reference models shall be used as a reference for such cross-domain concepts.

## Non-mandatory features

### Optional mappings

Submissions MAY provide high-level non-normative mappings to support the following Platform Specific Models, or logical models for the following protocols or communities:

* 1. Develop a Platform Specific Model (high-level mapping) to all of STIX/Cybox/TAXII
  2. OASIS Common Alerting Program & EDXL
  3. Others as deemed important by submitters

Note: The goal for this optional requirement is to lay the conceptual, semantic foundation for developing a comprehensive, “in-depth” mapping algorithm for each of the communities/protocols at a later time. At the same time, these high-level mappings MAY be fully functional: while these high-level mappings may be restricted to the most needed concepts, elements, and attributes, they may result in meaningful semantic interoperability between the logical models and the conceptual model.

### Optional support for conceptual modelling and mapping

Submissions MAY define UML profiles and associated QVT (or other ways to express mapping logic) for conceptual modelling and the mapping of those models to specific schema. Submitters are encouraged to follow the progress of and use as appropriate SIMF, ODM, MDMI, semantic web and other efforts to help define conceptual models and mappings.

### Optional MOF representation

Submissions may define MOF model that utilizes the conceptual model and provides an XMI representation of Threats and Risks.

## Issues to be discussed

### Simulation

Submissions shall discuss how the models can be used for simulation. The intent is the use of complex simulation systems (e.g. Monte Carlo methods) to test multiple scenarios as parameterizable threats and risks. Output for these simulations should allow identifying most effective defensive strategies.

### Applicability

Submissions shall discuss the applicability of their approach to possible future efforts to embrace other domains, specifications or levels of detail related to threats and risks.

### Design choices

Submissions shall discuss their design choices for level of detail.

## Evaluation Criteria

### Situational Awareness

Submissions shall be evaluated based on their ability to support broad-based situational awareness about threats and risks and represent appropriate courses of action.

### Enterprise planning, assessment and architecture

Submissions shall be evaluated based on their applicability to support the planning and assessment of for risks, threats and mitigations.

### Completeness

Submissions shall be evaluated based on the completeness of the representation of threat and risk concepts

### Fidelity

Submissions shall be evaluated based on their proof of fidelity with existing threat and risk specifications and best practices.

### Extensibility

Submissions shall be evaluated based on the ability of their approach to be extended to other domains and more detailed levels of granularity in future efforts.

### Fit for purpose as defined by use cases

Submissions shall be evaluated based on their ability to support the use cases defined in section 6.1.2.

### Understandability

Submissions shall be evaluated based on the ability of non-technical stakeholders to understand the conceptual models and for technologists to understand the relationship of those models to their technology frameworks and representations.

## Other information unique to this RFP

None

## IPR Mode

The IPR Mode for this initiative will be Non-Assert Covenant

Every OMG Member that makes any written Submission in response to this RFP shall provide the Non-Assertion Covenant found in Appendix A of the OMG IPR Policy [IPR].

## RFP Timetable

The timetable for this RFP is given below. Note that the TF or its parent TC may, in certain circumstances, extend deadlines while the RFP is running, or may elect to have more than one Revised Submission step. The latest timetable can always be found at the OMG *Work In Progress* page at <http://www.omg.org/schedules> under the item identified by the name of this RFP.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Event or Activity | Planned Date |
| Release of RFP Draft for Review and Comment | May 2nd, 2014 |
| Complete DRAFT RFP | May 12th, 2014 |
| RFP final review and comment | May 15th, 2014 |
| RFP placed on OMG document server | May 16th, 2014 |
| Approval of RFP by Architecture Board  Review by TC | June 19th, 2014 |
| TC votes to issue RFP | June 20th, 2014 |
| LOI to submit to RFP due | August 15th, 2014 |
| Initial Submissions due and placed on OMG document server (“Four week rule”) | November 7th, 2014 |
| Initial Submission presentations | December 8th, 2014 |
| Voter registration closes | January 2nd, 2015 |
| Preliminary evaluation | January 16th, 2015 |
| Revised Submissions due and placed on OMG document server (“Four week rule”) | February 20th, 2015 |
| Revised Submission presentations | March 23rd, 2015 |
| Final evaluation and selection by TF  Recommendation to AB and TC | March 23rd, 2015 {If vote to vote can be obtained} |
| Approval by Architecture Board  Review by TC | March 26th, 2015 |
| TC votes torecommendspecification | May, 2015 |
| BoD votes to adopt specification | June, 2015 |

# Appendix A References & Glossary Specific to this RFP

## A.1 References Specific to this RFP

None other than those specified above.

## A.2 Glossary Specific to this RFP

The following definitions are informative and may be redefined by submissions.

* **Risk**: A measure of the extent to which an entity is threatened by a potential circumstance or event, and typically a function of: (i) the adverse impacts that would arise if the circumstance or event occurs; and (ii) the likelihood of occurrence.
* **Threat**: any potential event or act, deliberate, accidental or natural hazard, that could cause injury to employees or assets, and thereby affect service delivery adversely. **Conceptual Model**: A model of the concepts relative to a domain of interest. A conceptual model models the “real world”, not data.

# Appendix B General Reference and Glossary

## B.1 General References

The following documents are referenced in this document:

[BCQ] OMG Board of Directors Business Committee Questionnaire, *http://doc.omg.org/bcq*

[CCM] CORBA Core Components Specification  
*http://www.omg.org/spec/CCM/*

[CORBA] Common Object Request Broker Architecture (CORBA)  
*http://www.omg.org/spec/CORBA/*

[CORP] UML Profile for CORBA,  
*http://www.omg.org/spec/CORP*

[CWM] Common Warehouse Metamodel Specification  
*http://www.omg.org/spec/CWM*

[EDOC] UML Profile for EDOC Specification  
*http://www.omg.org/spec/EDOC/*

[Guide] The OMG Hitchhiker's Guide  
*http://doc.omg.org/hh*

[IDL] Interface Definition Language Specification  
*http://www.omg.org/spec/IDL35*

[INVENT] Inventory of Files for a Submission/Revision/Finalization  
*http://doc.omg.org/inventory*

[IPR] IPR Policy  
*http://doc.omg.org/ipr*

[ISO2] ISO/IEC Directives, Part 2 – Rules for the structure and drafting of International Standards   
*http://isotc.iso.org/livelink/livelink?func=ll&objId=4230456*

[LOI] OMG RFP Letter of Intent template  
*http://doc.omg.org/loi*

[MDAa] OMG Architecture Board,"Model Driven Architecture - A Technical Perspective*"  
http://www.omg.org/mda/papers.htm*

[MDAb] Developing in OMG's Model Driven Architecture (MDA)  
*http://www.omg.org/mda/papers.htm*

[MDAc] MDA Guide  
*http://www.omg.org/docs/omg/03-06-01.pdf*

[MDAd] MDA "The Architecture of Choice for a Changing World  
*http://www.omg.org/mda*

[MOF]Meta Object Facility Specification  
*http://www.omg.org/spec/MOF/*

[NS] Naming Service  
http://www.omg.org/spec/NAM

[OMA] Object Management Architecture  
*http://www.omg.org/oma/*

[OTS] Transaction Service  
*http://www.omg.org/spec/OTS*

[P&P]Policies and Procedures of the OMG Technical Process  
*http://doc.omg.org/pp*

[RAD] Resource Access Decision Facility  
*http://www.omg.org/spec/RAD*

[ISO2] ISO/IEC Directives, Part 2 – Rules for the structure and drafting of International Standards   
*http://isotc.iso.org/livelink/livelink?func=ll&objId=4230456*

[RM-ODP]  
ISO/IEC 10746

[SEC] CORBA Security Service  
*http://www.omg.org/spec/SEC*

[TEMPL] Specification Template *http://doc.omg.org/submission-template*

[TOS] Trading Object Service  
*hptp://www.omg.org/spec/TRADE*

[UML] Unified Modeling Language Specification, *http://www.omg.org/spec/UML*

[XMI] XML Metadata Interchange Specification, *http://www.omg.org/spec/XMI*

## B.2 General Glossary

***Architecture Board (AB)***  - The OMG plenary that is responsible for ensuring the technical merit and MDA-compliance of RFPs and their submissions.

***Board of Directors (BoD)*** - The OMG body that is responsible for adopting technology.

***Common Object Request Broker Architecture (CORBA)*** - An OMG distributed computing platform specification that is independent of implementation languages.

***Common Warehouse Metamodel (CWM)*** - An OMG specification for data repository integration.

***CORBA Component Model (CCM)*** - An OMG specification for an implementation language independent distributed component model.

***Interface Definition Language (IDL)*** - An OMG and ISO standard language for specifying interfaces and associated data structures.

***Letter of Intent (LOI)*** - A letter submitted to the OMG BoD’s Business Committee signed by an officer of an organization signifying its intent to respond to the RFP and confirming the organization’s willingness to comply with OMG’s terms and conditions, and commercial availability requirements.

***Mapping*** - Specification of a mechanism for transforming the elements of a model conforming to a particular metamodel into elements of another model that conforms to another (possibly the same) metamodel.

***Metadata*** - Data that represents models. For example, a UML model; a CORBA object model expressed in IDL; and a relational database schema expressed using CWM.

***Metamodel*** - A model of models.

***Meta Object Facility (MOF)***- An OMG standard, closely related to UML, that enables metadata management and language definition.

***Model***- A formal specification of the function, structure and/or behavior of an application or system.

***Model Driven Architecture (MDA)*** - An approach to IT system specification that separates the specification of functionality from the specification of the implementation of that functionality on a specific technology platform.

***Normative*** – Provisions to which an implementation shall conform to in order to claim compliance with the standard (as opposed to non-normative or informative material, included only to assist in understanding the standard).

***Normative Reference*** – References to documents that contain provisions to which an implementation shall conform to in order to claim compliance with the standard.

***Platform*** - A set of subsystems/technologies that provide a coherent set of functionality through interfaces and specified usage patterns that any subsystem that depends on the platform can use without concern for the details of how the functionality provided by the platform is implemented.

***Platform Independent Model (PIM)*** - A model of a subsystem that contains no information specific to the platform, or the technology that is used to realize it.

***Platform Specific Model (PSM****)* - A model of a subsystem that includes information about the specific technology that is used in the realization of it on a specific platform, and hence possibly contains elements that are specific to the platform.

***Request for Information (RFI)*** - A general request to industry, academia, and any other interested parties to submit information about a particular technology area to one of the OMG's Technology Committee subgroups.

***Request for Proposal (RFP)*** - A document requesting OMG members to submit proposals to an OMG Technology Committee.

***Task Force (TF)*** - The OMG Technology Committee subgroup responsible for issuing a RFP and evaluating submission(s).

***Technology Committee (TC)*** - The body responsible for recommending technologies for adoption to the BoD. There are two TCs in OMG – the *Platform TC* (PTC) focuses on IT and modeling infrastructure related standards; while the *Domain TC* (DTC) focuses on domain specific standards.

***Unified Modeling Language (UML)*** - An OMG standard language for specifying the structure and behavior of systems. The standard defines an abstract syntax and a graphical concrete syntax.

***UML Profile*** - A standardized set of extensions and constraints that tailors UML to particular use.

***XML Metadata Interchange (XMI)*** - An OMG standard that facilitates interchange of models via XML documents.

1. An ecosystem in this context is a community of stakeholders combined with their supporting technologies and practices [↑](#footnote-ref-1)