Object Management Group

109 Highland Avenue  
Needham, MA 02494  
USA

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

UML Profile for NIEM 3 (NIEM-UML)  
Request For Proposal

OMG Document: gov/2014-03-01

Letters of Intent due: *19* *May* 2014  
Submissions due: *18 August 2014*

Objective of this RFP

This Request for Proposal (RFP) solicits proposals related to developing the next major revision of the OMG Unified Modeling Language (UML) Profile for the National Information Exchange Model (NIEM) Specification, which is commonly referred to as NIEM-UML. The revision addresses alignment to the newest version of NIEM, i.e. NIEM Version 3. Specifically, it addresses changes to the NIEM content model and the technical architecture.

NIEM-UML allows modelers and developers to produce NIEM model packages conforming to the NIEM Naming and Design Rules (NDR) and the Model Package Description (MPD) Specification. The profile was created to broaden NIEM adoption by facilitating the separation of concerns between community business needs and XML Schema specific technology implementations. The OMG adopted the UML Profile for NIEM (based on NIEM Version 2.1) in December 2013. The profile has been successfully implemented in both commercial and open source development platforms.

Due to the extensive changes to NIEM between Versions 2.1 and 3*,* revisions are outside the scope of a Revision Task Force (RTF).This RFP for a major revision solicits proposals for the following:

* UML profiles for modeling NIEM MPDs; a logical profile that will enable the development of Platform Independent Models for NIEM content and a second profile that models MPD metadata and provides the parameters required to transform the logical model to NIEM-conformant XML schema and MPD specifications (the Platform Specific Model).
* A transformation from UML models that conform to the NIEM profiles (described above) to NIEM-conformant MPD artifacts.
* Optionally, a transformation from a NIEM-conformant XML schema set (as defined by the NIEM NDR) to a UML model that conforms to the profile(s).
* A UML representation of the NIEM controlled vocabularies (reference namespaces) from which MPDs are constructed. This UML representation must conform to the profiles mentioned in the first bullet point.

# 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

As noted in the objective, the revision to the UML Profile for NIEM addresses alignment with NIEM 3 and the latest and current content within NIEM. To maintain alignment between the NIEM-XML schemas and NIEM-UML, the existing UML Profile for NIEM, Version 1.0 must be updated to reflect NIEM Version 3 content changes and technical architecture enhancements.

The NIEM 3 release process was executed in response to community requirements and to simplify the model’s technical architecture. The release focused on 3 areas of improvements or updates, (1) NIEM Core content, (2) NIEM Domain content and (3) technical architecture enhancements.

NIEM Core content was modified to provide new and updated content based on community input. In addition, seven domains took advantage of the release process to provide content changes. Technical architecture enhancements were also implemented which includes:

* (Type) Augmentation: NIEM 3 makes type augmentation easier to understand and implement within information exchange through use of augmentation points
* Code List Independence: Allows the NIEM community to use and maintain up-to-date code lists without waiting for a future major release
* Reference & Content-bearing Elements: NIEM 3 significantly reduces complexity and duplication of NIEM elements by allowing a single element declaration to serve as a reference element or a content-bearing element

**NIEM Data Model Architecture**

As shown in Figure 1, NIEM Data Model Architecture, the NIEM architecture consists of two sets of vocabularies - NIEM Core and the individual NIEM domains. NIEM Core includes data components that are commonly understood across all business domains. The individual NIEM domains contain domain-specific data components. These vocabularies are specified in NIEM “reference schemas”.




Figure 1: NIEM Data Model Architecture

**Model Package Descriptions (MPDs)**

An important concept to NIEM is a Model Package Description (MPD). According to the MPD Specification [NIEM-MPD], there are five classes of MPDs:

1. NIEM Release
2. Domain Update
3. Core Update
4. Enterprise Information Exchange Models (EIEM)
5. Information Exchange Package Documentation (IEPD)

A NIEM release contains a full set of harmonized reference schema documents that coherently define and declare all content within a single version of NIEM.

A domain update contains a reference schema document or document set issued by one or more domains that constitutes new content or an update to content that was previously published in a NIEM release.

A core update applies changes to a given NIEM core schema document or document set.

An Enterprise Information Exchange Model (EIEM) constitutes a NIEM-conformant schema document set that defines and declares data components to for consistent reuse in the IEPDs of an enterprise.

An Information Exchange Package Documentation (IEPD) (i.e. information exchange) defines one or more information exchanges. An IEPD may include portions of a NIEM Core schema document (and updates), portions of NIEM Domain schema documents (and updates), enterprise-specific or IEPD-specific extension schema documents, and declares at least one IEP Conformance Target within its MPD Catalog.

**Conformance**

MPDs are considered “conformant” if they adhere to a set of normative rules. Conformance is codified in the NIEM Conformance Specification[[1]](#footnote-1) [NIEM-Conformance].

NIEM defines various conformance targets as the classes of artifacts to which sets of NIEM normative rules apply. The three most basic NIEM conformance targets are:

* Conformant instance XML document - An XML document that is an instance of a conformant schema document set and must conform to all applicable rules in the NIEM Naming and Design Rules [NIEM-NDR].
* Conformant schema document set - A collection of XML Schema documents that together are capable of validating a conformant instance XML document. A conformant schema document set must conform to all applicable rules in the NIEM Naming and Design Rules [NIEM-NDR].
* Conformant Model Package Description (MPD) – An archive that contains a conformant schema document set of one MPD class, and that conforms to the rules specified in the NIEM Model Package Description Specification [NIEM-MPD] that apply to its MPD class.

The NIEM Conformance Specification requires adherence to additional NIEM normative specifications including (1) the NIEM Conformance Target Attribute Specification[[2]](#footnote-2) (CTAS) [NIEM-CTAS], (2) the NIEM Naming and Design Rules (NDR)[[3]](#footnote-3) [NIEM-NDR], and (3) the NIEM Model Package Description (MPD) Specification[[4]](#footnote-4) [NIEM-MPD].

## Scope of Proposals Sought

### In Scope

Creation and use of the UML Profile for NIEM, Version 1.0 (aligned to NIEM 2.1) has demonstrated that the information needed to generate a NIEM-conformant MPD can be specified in a properly profiled UML model. The NIEM community can significantly benefit from further expansion of this model-driven approach to construct MPDs in alignment to NIEM Version 3 and the associated normative specifications supporting the model.

To maintain this separation of concerns, as visualized in Figure 3, proposals should provide support for:

* A PIM profile providing stereotypes to enable NIEM business modelers to model MPDs agnostic of technology, i.e. XML schema.
* A MPD profile providing stereotypes for NIEM specific packaging and technology choices.
* A PSM profile providing stereotypes that enable NIEM technical modelers – or NIEM schema modelers – to model the technical aspect, i.e. XML schema specifics, of an MPD.
* Transformations that ingest models specified using the PIM and MPD profiles to provision NIEM-conformant XML schema and MPD artifacts leveraging the PSM profile.
* The ability to generate a conformant MPD from any UML model that applies the UML Profile for NIEM properly.
* The ability to create an equivalent profiled UML model from a NIEM-conformant MPD (if the optional reverse engineering requirement is implemented).




Figure 3: NIEM Components Mapped to UML Constructs

### Out of Scope

Constraint schemas and IEP validity constraints specific to creating RelaxNG, Schematron and XPath rule-sets are not in scope for the UML Profile for NIEM.

## Relationship to other OMG Specifications and activities

### Relationship to OMG specifications

It is expected that submitters will leverage, to the extent possible, the following OMG formal or beta specifications for potential reuse of models, mappings, interfaces, and potential dependencies on pervasive services and facilities.

* Unified Modeling Language (UML) for NIEM, Version 1.0 - <http://www.omg.org/spec/NIEM-UML/1.0>. The UML Profile for NIEM (aligning to Version 2.1) provides modeling capabilities for NIEM-conformant model packages.
* Unified Modeling Language (UML), Version 2.5 - <http://www.omg.org/spec/UML/2.5/Beta2/>. UML provides an extensible and accepted modeling framework.
* Object Constraint Language (OCL), Version 2.4 - <http://www.omg.org/spec/OCL/2.4>. OCL provides a language for specifying constraints in models.
* Meta Object Facility (MOF), Version 2.4.2 <http://www.omg.org/spec/MOF/>. MOF provides a framework for meta-modeling in which the abstract syntax of UML and other modeling languages is described.
* MOF 2 XML Metadata Interchange (XMI) Mapping, Version 2.4.2- <http://www.omg.org/spec/XMI/>. XMI provides a XML interchange format for MOF models.
* MOF 2 Query/View/Transformation (QVT), Version 1.1 - <http://www.omg.org/spec/QVT/1.1/>. QVT is the OMG standard for expressing model transformation rules.
* MOF Model to Text Transformation Language (MOFM2T), Version 1.0- <http://www.omg.org/spec/MOFM2T/1.0/>. Model to text provides a way to specify transformation of models to textual representations.
* Semantics of Business Vocabulary and Business Rules (SBVR), Version 1.2 - <http://www.omg.org/spec/SBVR/1.2/>. Specifies a model for defining business vocabulary and rules.
* Ontology Definition Meta Model (ODM), Version 1.1 – <http://www.omg.org/spec/ODM/1.1>. Provides MOF and UML representations of multiple ontology languages including OWL, RDF/S and Common Logic*.*
* Unified Profile for DoDAF/MODAF (UPDM), Version 2.1 - <http://www.omg.org/spec/UPDM/2.1/>. UPDM is the UML representation of the defense architectural standards DoDAF and MODAF. UPDM may be considered for usability with NIEM-UML

**(6.3.1.1)** UML Profile for NIEM

* NIEM-UML is requested to leverage the UML Profile for NIEM, Version 1.0 (aligned to NIEM 2.1) as the baseline for aligning to NIEM 3.

**(6.3.1.2)** UML and OCL

* NIEM-UML is requested to use UML and contain UML profiles that leverage OCL constraints.

**(6.3.1.3)** QVT

* Transformations specified in NIEM-UML may be specified in QVT where practical.

**(6.3.1.4)** SBVR

* As NIEM utilizes a controlled vocabulary and defines rules, SBVR may be considered as input to representation of NIEM vocabulary and rules.

**(6.3.1.5)** ODM

* ODM may be used for optional requirement 6.6.1 to provide a platform specific model based on RDF-Schema. ODM may also be considered for the representation of the vocabularies contained in NIEM reference namespaces.

**(6.3.1.6)** UPDM

* UPDM may be considered for usability with NIEM-UML. As the normative representation of DoDAF-2 in UML UPDM represents an architectural framework that is expected to be used across government.

## Related non-OMG Activities, Documents and Standards

NIEM-UML represents collaboration between the OMG and NIEM communities. The normative specifications produced under the NIEM governance process represent the authoritative requirements for the UML Profile for NIEM 3. These documents include:

* [NIEM-Conformance] NIEM Conformance Specification Version 3.0,

*https://reference.niem.gov/niem/specification/conformance/3.0*

* [NIEM-CTAS] NIEM Conformance Target Attribute Specification Version 3.0, [*http://reference.niem.gov/niem/specification/conformance-target-attribute/*](http://reference.niem.gov/niem/specification/conformance-target-attribute/)*3.0*
* [NIEM-MPD] NIEM Model Package Description Specification Version 3.0, [*http://reference.niem.gov/niem/specification/model-package-description/*](http://reference.niem.gov/niem/specification/model-package-description/)*3.0*
* [NIEM-NDR] NIEM Naming and Design Rules (NDR) Version 3.0, *http://reference.niem.gov/niem/specification/naming-and-design-rules/3.0*
* [NIEM-RN] NIEM Reference Namespaces Version 3.0, *http://release.niem.gov/niem/3.0/*

## Mandatory Requirements

### NIEM Profiles

**(6.5.1.1)** Proposals shall specify a PIM profile constrained to limit the set of representable constructs to those allowed by the NIEM specifications.

**(6.5.1.2)** Proposals shall specify a MPD profile to specify the MPD metadata, content and technology choices required to parameterize the QVT transformations.

**(6.5.1.3)** Proposals shall specify a PSM profile providing stereotypes that enable NIEM technical modelers – or NIEM schema modelers – to model the technical aspect, i.e. XML schema specifics, of an MPD.

**(6.5.1.4)** Proposals shall specify QVT transformations from UML models using the PIM, MPD and PSM profiles to the set of artifacts required in a conformant MPD.

**(6.5.1.5)** Proposals shall utilize the PIM, MPD and PSM profiles to model at least one existing NIEM IEPD and demonstrate the resulting transformation to a NIEM-conformant IEPD.

### NIEM Vocabularies

**(6.5.2.1)** Proposals shall include UML models of the NIEM Version 3 reference schema namespaces [NIEM-RN] (or vocabularies) using the PIM; each UML model shall contain a package representing a NIEM namespace.

### NIEM Conformance and Reuse

**(6.5.3.1)** Proposals shall, wherever practical, reuse elements from the UML Profile for NIEM Version 1.0 PIM profile and provide for forward compatibility of models developed based on the profile.

**(6.5.3.2)** Proposals shall discuss the relationship between the UML Profile for NIEM, Version 1.0 (aligned to NIEM 2.1) and the UML Profile for NIEM Version 3 and the conversion process users would be expected to follow.

**(6.5.3.3)** Requirements outlined in sections 6.5.1 through 6.5.3 shall conform to normative NIEM specifications referenced in section 6.4.

## Non-mandatory features

**(6.6.1)** Proposals may include a provisioning profile and mapping to other exchange formats such as RDF Schema (<http://www.w3.org/standards/techs/rdf#w3c_all>).

**(6.6.2)** Proposals may specify a “reverse engineering” OMG-QVT mapping from a NIEM-conformant MPD to UML models that conform to the NIEM-UML profiles.

**(6.6.3)** Proposals may specify a transformationfrom the UML Profile for NIEM, Version 1.0 (aligned to NIEM 2.1) and the UML Profile for NIEM Version 3 conformant models.

## Issues to be discussed

**(6.7.1)** Proposals shall discuss the relationship of NIEM-UML with other on-going and related NIEM standards, the existing NIEM specifications and the NIEM process.

**(6.7.2)** Proposals shall discuss the relationship of NIEM-UML with other on-going exchange standards efforts, including but not limited to the Structured Threat Information Expression (STIX) and EDXL.

**(6.7.3)** Proposals shall discuss their relationship with other relevant standards including but not limited to the Unified Profile for DoDAF/MODAF (UPDM) 2.1.

These issues will be considered during submission evaluation. They should not be part of the proposed normative specification. Place your responses to these Issues in Section 0 of your submission.

## Evaluation Criteria

**(6.8.1)** Proposals will be evaluated based on alignment with NIEM 3 specifications.

**(6.8.2)** Proposals will be evaluated based on the usability and intuitive representation of NIEM models.

**(6.8.3)** Proposals will be evaluated based on the ability of the specification to support technologies other than XML schema.

**(6.8.4)** Proposals shall be evaluated based on their reuse and integration with other existing standards including the Unified Profile for DoDAF/MODAF (UPDM) 2.0, and their ability to incorporate other interchange standards and approaches such as STIX and EDXL.

**(6.8.5)** Proposals will be evaluated based on the fidelity of the reverse engineering from NIEM-conformant XML schema to MPD specifications in NIEM-UML.

**(6.8.6)** Proposals will be evaluated based on their ability to support the testing of a model for consistency with NIEM.

## IPR Mode: Non-Assertion 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 | Date |
| Letter of Intent (LOI) deadline | 19 May 2014 |
| Initial Submission deadline | 18 August 2014 |
| Voter registration closes | 08 September 2014 |
| Initial Submission presentations | 15 September 2014 |
| Revised Submission deadline | 23 February 2015 |
| Revised Submission presentations | 23 March 2015 |

# Appendix A References & Glossary Specific to this RFP

## A.1 References Specific to this RFP

[NIEM-Conformance] NIEM Conformance Specification Version 3.0,

*https://reference.niem.gov/niem/specification/conformance/3.0*

[NIEM-CTAS] NIEM Conformance Target Attribute Specification Version 3.0, [*http://reference.niem.gov/niem/specification/conformance-target-attribute/*](http://reference.niem.gov/niem/specification/conformance-target-attribute/)*3.0*

[NIEM-MPD] NIEM Model Package Description Specification Version 3.0,

[*http://reference.niem.gov/niem/specification/model-package-description/*](http://reference.niem.gov/niem/specification/model-package-description/)*3.0*

[NIEM-NDR] NIEM Naming and Design Rules (NDR) Version 3.0, *http://reference.niem.gov/niem/specification/naming-and-design-rules/3.0*

[NIEM-RN] NIEM Reference Namespaces Version 3.0, *http://release.niem.gov/niem/3.0/*

## A.2 Glossary Specific to this RFP

***Artifact*** - A single file with a defined purpose or a set of files logically grouped for a defined purpose.

***Association*** - Establishes a relationship between objects, along with the properties of that relationship; provides a structure that does not establish existence of an object but instead specifies relationships between objects.

***Augmentation*** - A block of additional data added to an object type to carry additional data beyond that of the original object definition.

***Business Information Exchange Component (BIEC)*** - A NIEM-conformant XML schema data component definition or declaration (for a type, element, attribute, or other XML construct) reused, subsetted, extended, and/or created from NIEM that meets a particular recurring business requirement for an information sharing enterprise.

***Conformance*** - The requirement that those who participate in NIEM by contributing data components or creating and sharing IEPD artifacts are following the agreed-upon procedures for doing so and that all documentation meets minimum criteria and the NIEM Naming and Design Rules [NIEM-NDR] where applicable.

***Conformance Target*** - A class of artifact, such as an interface, protocol, document, platform, process or service that is the subject of conformance clauses and normative statements. There may be several conformance targets defined within a specification, and these targets may be diverse so as to reflect different aspects of a specification.

***Conformant Document*** - a document that uses the conformance targets attribute defined by this specification to express a claim that it conforms to specific conformance targets.

***Constraint Schema Document*** - A schema document, which imposes additional constraints on NIEM-conformant instance XML documents. A constraint schema document or document set validates additional constraints imposed on an instance XML document only after it is known to be NIEM-conformant (i.e., has been validated with a reference schema document set, or schema document subset, and applicable extension schema documents). Constraint schema document validation is a second-pass validation process that occurs independently of and after conformance validation. A constraint schema document need not validate constraints that are applied by other schema document.

***Constraint Schema Document Set*** - A set of related constraint schema documents that work together, such as a constraint schema document set built by adding constraints to a schema document subset.

***Controlled Vocabulary*** - Controlled vocabulary means the structure and semantics that compose NIEM have agreed upon meaning across the NIEM community. The vocabulary can be drawn upon to standardize exchange content; in doing so there are specific constraints on how and when to extend the vocabulary. The NIEM controlled vocabulary is currently expressed as word documents, XML Schemas and XLS mapping documents.

***Core Update*** - An MPD that applies changes to a given NIEM core schema document or document set. A core update never replaces a NIEM core; instead, it is used to add new schema documents, new data components, new code values, etc. to a particular NIEM core. In some cases, a core update can make minor modifications to existing core data components.

***Domain Update*** - An MPD that contains a reference schema document or document set issued by one or more domains that constitutes new content or an update to content that was previously published in a NIEM release. Domain updates are published to the NIEM Publication Area at <http://publication.niem.gov/niem/> and available for immediate use within IEPDs.

***Enterprise Information Exchange Model (EIEM)*** - An MPD that contains a NIEM-conformant schema document set that defines and declares data components to be consistently reused in the IEPDs of an enterprise. An EIEM is a collection of BIECs organized into a schema document subset and one or more extension schema documents. Constraint schema documents and non-NIEM-conformant external standards schema documents with type adapters are optional.

***Extension Schema Document*** - A NIEM-conformant schema document that adds domain or application specific content to the base NIEM model.

***External Schema -*** Any XML schema document that is not a NIEM-supporting schema and that is not NIEM-conformant.

***Information Exchange Package (IEP)*** - A description of specific information exchanged between a sender and a receiver. The information exchange package is usually coupled with additional documentation, sample XML instances, business rules, etc. to compose an IEPD. IEP may sometimes be referred to as an exchange package.

***Information Exchange Package (IEP)*** - An XML document that satisfies all the validity constraints for its class as defined by a NIEM IEPD.

***Information Exchange Package (IEP) Conformance Targets*** - A class or category of IEPs, which has a set of one or more validity constraints and a unique identifier. Every IEP is an instance of one or more IEP Conformance Targets.

***Information Exchange Package Documentation (IEPD)*** - An MPD that defines one or more (generally recurring) XML data or information exchanges.

***Major Release*** – A NIEM release in which the NIEM Core reference schema document has changed since previous releases. The first integer of the version number indicates the major release series; for example, versions 1.0, 2.0, and 3.0 are different major releases.

***Metadata*** - Describes data about data, that is, information that is not descriptive of objects and their relationships, but is descriptive of the data itself.

***Micro Release*** - A NIEM release in which neither the NIEM Core nor the domain reference schema documents have changed from the previous major or minor release, but one or more new reference schema documents have been added (without impact to domain or Core schemas). A third digit greater than zero in the version number indicates a micro release (for example, v2.1.1 note that this release does not exist as of this date).

***Minor Release*** - A NIEM release in which the NIEM Core has not changed from previous releases in the series, but at least one or more domain reference schema documents have changed. A second digit greater than zero in the version number indicates a minor release (for example, v2.1). Note also that major v2.0 and minor v2.1 are in the same series (i.e., series 2) and contain the same NIEM Core schema document.

***Model Package Description (MPD)*** - An archive of files that contains one and only one of the five classes of NIEM Information Exchange Models (IEM), as well as supporting documentation and other artifacts. An MPD is self-documenting and provides sufficient normative and non-normative information to allow technical personnel to understand how to use and/or implement the IEM it contains.

***MPD Catalog (i.e. mpd-catalog)*** - An mpd-catalog is a multi-purpose XML file required by all MPDs containing metadata that describes an MPD's:

* Unique identification
* Basic characteristics and properties
* Key artifacts and directory structure
* Lineage and relationships to other MPDs
* [IEP conformance targets]

***NIEM-conformant Schema*** - An XML Schema document that is a reference schema, subset schema, an extension schema, or an exchange schema.

***NIEM Core*** - Refers to the NIEM data model containing all components that are determined to be relevant and semantically agreed upon by some or all participating domains. NIEM Core could be said to contain all reusable components that are not domain-specific and are governed by NIEM processes and policies regarding promotion and maintenance of those components.

***NIEM Domain*** - A business domain that is assigned a NIEM namespace, has responsibility to act as an authoritative source and steward for domain-specific data, and is able to propose promotions of data to the NIEM Core namespace.

***Reference Namespaces*** - The “NIEM Reference Namespaces” are the manifestation of the NIEM controlled vocabulary. While physically they consist of a set of interdependent XML Schemas, logically they are the canonical definition of real-world concepts and relationships that exist in the several NIEM domains.

***Reference Schema Document*** - An XML Schema document that meets all of the following criteria:

* It is a conformant schema document.
* It is explicitly designated as a reference schema document. This may be declared by an MPD catalog or by a tool-specific mechanism outside the schema document.
* It provides the broadest, most fundamental definitions of components in its namespace.
* It provides the authoritative definition of business semantics for components in its namespace.
* It is intended to serve as the basis for components in IEPD and EIEM schema documents, including subset, constraint, and extension schema documents.

***Reference Schema Document Set*** - A set of related reference schema documents, such as a NIEM release.

***Release*** - A reference schema document set published by the NIEM Program Management Office (PMO) at http://release.niem.gov/ and assigned a unique version number. Each schema document in the set defines data components for use in NIEM information exchanges. Each release is independent of other releases, although a schema document may occur in multiple releases. A release is of high quality, and has been vetted by NIEM governance bodies. A numbered release may be a major, minor, or micro release.

***Subset Schema Document*** - An XML schema document that meets all of the following criteria:

* It is built from a reference schema document set where one or more reference schema documents has been substituted by a its corresponding subset schema document.
* It is built from a reference schema document by applying subset operations to the XML schema statements in a reference schema document.
* It is explicitly designated as a subset schema document. This may be declared by an MPD catalog or by a tool-specific mechanism outside the subset schema document.
* It has a target namespace previously defined by a reference schema document. That is, it does not provide original definitions and declarations for schema components, but instead provides an alternate schema representation of components that are defined by a reference schema document.
* It does not alter the business semantics of components in its namespace. The reference schema document defines these business semantics.
* It is intended to express the limited vocabulary necessary for an IEPD or EIEM and to support XML Schema validation for an IEPD.

***XML Catalog*** - XML documents that describe a mapping between external entity references and locally-cached equivalents and is applicable to all MPDs.

# 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. <http://reference.niem.gov/niem/specification/conformance/> [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. <http://reference.niem.gov/niem/specification/conformance-target-attribute/> [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. <http://reference.niem.gov/niem/specification/naming-and-design-rules/> [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. <http://reference.niem.gov/niem/specification/model-package-description/> [↑](#footnote-ref-4)