**Creating Protégé Implementation of Top 25 Maintenance Terms  
  
DISCUSSION POINTS  
  
1) MNT: Maintenance\_Plan\_Specification**

-       Formal Definition: Def. An IAO:Plan\_Specification containing MNT:Maintenance\_Strategies and MNT:Maintenance\_Standard\_Work\_Procedures for a MNT:Maintainable\_Item over its UNK:Lifecycle

-       Question:MaintenanceStandardWorkProcedure specification is a PlanSpecification. Is it possible for a PlanSpecification to part of another PlanSpecification?

**2) MNT: State\_Of\_Failure\_Component and MNT:State\_Of\_Failure\_Machine**

-       Formal Definition: Def. A IOF:State in which some IOF:component endures and does

not meet a requirement

-       Question: How do we represent, “endures and does not meet a requirement” in protégé?

**3) MNT: Maintenance\_Action**

-       Formal Definition: Def. A BFO:Process to perform work on an IOF:Component according to a MNT:Maintenance\_Work\_Order\_Specification

-       Question: How do we represent, “perform work on an IOF:Compoent according to…”

**4) MNT: Failure\_Cause**

-       Formal Definition: Def. A BFO:Occurrent that has led to a MNT:State\_Of\_Failure\_Machine or MNT:State\_Of\_Failure\_Component

-       Questions This definition Is almost identical to the definition for FailureMechanism. How should we differentiate these?

**5) MNT: Failure\_Menchanism**

-       Def: A BFO:Process that results in MNT:State\_of\_Failure

-       Question: Attempting to represent this using the following in protégé causes a reasoner error because StateOfFailure is a process, not a disposition

o   subclassOf BFO:process, subclassOf RO:realises some StateOfFailureComponent or realises some StateOfFailureMachine

In this case, is StateOfFailure better represented as a disposition?