FIBO Potential Submitters Meeting Notes

Meeting held at OMG Reston Wednesday 20 March 2013

## Attended:

(from FDTF sign-in sheets – no registration taken for this meeting)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| M Bennett | EDM Council |
| David Frankel | David Frankel consulting |
| Wesley Moore | Wells Fargo |
| Patrick Greenfield | Wells Fargo |
| Jim Odell | Thematix |
| Elisa Kendall | Thematix |
| Corby Dear | Bloomberg |
| Elie Abi-Lahoud | UCC, GRCTC |
| David Saul | State Street |
| Tricia Balfe | Nomos Software |
| Tim Anderson | No Magic Inc. |
| Anthony Videtto | State Street |
| Mark Crawford | SAP |
| Donald Chapin | Business Semantics |
| John Hall | Model Systems |
| Pete Rivett | Adaptive |
| Bobbin Teegarden | Independent |
| Jan Davis | Mortgage Bankers Association |
| Harsh Sharma | Citi |
| John Gemski | Golden Source |
| Jefferson Braswell | Tahoe Blue |
| Bill Freeman | Independent |

# Notes and Agreed Actions

The following sections of the draft specification require review and additional work:

1. Annotation Metadata (in Architecture section)
   * Including human readable labels, synonyms
2. ODM Implementation (in Architecture section)
3. Conformance

# Work Program

See next section for details about these activities.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Subject** | **Action** | **Who** |
| 1. **Annotation Metadata** | |  |
| *1.1 OMG AB Spreadsheet* | |  |
|  | Review annotation metadata against AB/12-02-02 | PR /EK / MB |
| *1.2 Human readable names* | |  |
|  | Decide on use of SKOS prefLabel annotation and apply this for all | MB / PR |
| *1.3 Synonyms* | |  |
|  | Decide on precise annotation to use e.g. altLabel and render existing synonyms in this annotation | DF MB / PR |
| 1.2 & 1.3 | Provide feedback on these decisions | DF |
| *1.4 Provenance Annotations* | |  |
|  | Look at W3C Provenance specification and determine what terms should be used or specialized as FIBO annotations, and whether these should replace our own Term Origin and Definition Origin set of terms; update the specification section to reflect this | E A-L / MB / PR / EK / DF |
| 1. **ODM Implementation** | |  |
| 2.1 | Change version reference in specification, to formally published ODM 1.1 document number | MB |
| 2.2 | Obtain formal reference for the ODM 1.1 constructs used in FIBO as of May 20 (cut-off date May 13 so we can do this) | EK / MB |
| 1. **Conformance** | |  |
| 3.1 | Create a spreadsheet of all the possible business application areas in which we would need to consider conformance points | HS to instigate  BF / E A-L / HS |
| 3.1 | Identify the technical deployment scenarios for which conformance may be considered i.e. Owl v conventional; agent based programs, big data etc. | MB, All |
| 3.3 | Review and implement DF comments | MB |
| 3.4 | Review final draft of Conformance Section and Informative Annex on creating applications from the FIBO BCOs | MB / DF / all |

# Notes on the Actions Above

## Annotation Metadata

### AB Spreadsheet

This part of the specification was written before the OMG document (spreadsheet) AB/2013-02-02 which contains some of the same material. Therefore we need to identify what is to be covered in that document or its equivalent at the time of submission of the May 20 draft, and remove that from the FIBO specification, replacing it with cross reference to the above document.

It is likely that some items will remain as part of FIBO; if not, that section is to be removed altogether.

### Human Readable Annotations

This was not addressed in the existing EA file, in which the primary label for each class and object property is given in “human readable” format (i.e. no camel casing). In the conversion to OWL, Adaptive has transformed the class and property names to camel casing as required for OWL model conformance, and have rendered the existing human readable names as rdfs:label elements. This means that the human readable names are not lost.

In the next iteration, we need to consider whether rdfs:label is the right construct to use. A more appropriate one would be the SKOS prefLabel, but this has not been formally decided.

The specification needs to be updated to add whatever is decided on this.

Note that for UML rendition of the models for review by business SMEs, it is still necessary to re-render the human readable names as the UML names. For other presentation tools e.g. Adaptive, and any future OWL-based business readable diagram formats when these exist, it will be necessary to read the annotation which contains the intended human readable label, and render this and only this on diagrams presented to business stakeholders for review and validation.

### Synonym

Synonym is the 3rd most important term in the original EDM Council brief for FIBO (“Term, Definition, Synonym”).

Synonyms are applied in the existing EAP model using tagged values for both classes and object properties (unfortunately EA does not support tagged values in attributes, meaning that we have not been able to identify synonyms for datatype properties).

This tagged value does not correspond to something in ODM. We did not finalize the FIBO specification thinking on how these should be rendered. We agreed that rdfs:Label is too broad to be used for what are explicitly given by SME reviewers as synonyms.

Action is to determine what construct to use for synonyms, and for MB to then re-render the material in the existing EA model to use this annotation. Alternatively, is Adaptive is able to capture the EA UML Tagged Values and transform these to the chosen construct on transformation of the model, that would be great.

### Provenance

The existing provenance metadata was developed on the Thursday workstream calls by the FIBO submission team. We used Dublin Core Source as the base term which was extended to provide annotations for the provenance of definitions and origins, which is material currently maintained in the UML Notes fields of the existing model under a textual annotation.

Note that provenance is not mapping – similar terms will be considered in future for mapping to existing standards terms and definitions (but are not provenance); here the aim is simply to capture where we got the term or definition from in the first place.

There is a W3C standard on provenance. When we last looked, this seemed to deal with provenance at the level of data i.e. OWL Individuals and the like. However, this may be more comprehensive and we should look at it again in its current state.

## ODM Implementation

The FIBO EA models originally used an early draft of ODM and added its own features to support visual rendition of constructs in business-facing diagrams. Subsequent work on ODM includes the provision of base classes which can be used for the same purposes (principally disjoints and relationship inverses). We have therefore been updating the profile usage in FIBO to use the “latest” ODM.

However, the version of the ODM profile which we now use is not the published Version 1.0 but rather a draft of Version 1.1, which has not yet been published.

We have also taken advantage of the support of ODM 1.1 for certain features of OWL 2 (some of which we were informally but incorrectly using already, such as the use of an OWL Property Chain design pattern).

It now looks likely that ODM 1.1 will not have been formally published when we put forward our draft of FIBO Foundations on May 20. Therefore we need to update the FIBO Foundations specification to:

* Replace the “temporary” reference to ODM 1.1 with a reference to ODM 1.0
* Add a reference to some formally identified way of referring to the ODM 1.1 material as it currently stands, i.e. what ballots etc. are in place by that time
* We also need to ensure that from the ODM activities, the constructs we need in FIBO Foundations from ODM 1.1 are in their final state
  + (and capture any changes from what was in place in May 2012 when we last updated the ODM usages tables in the FIBO Foundations Architecture section).

## Conformance

David Frankel has carried out a review of the Conformance section as it stands, and has send comments to MB for processing.

This section has gone through several iterations:

* Iteration One: conformance not considered as a thing for use of a conceptual model. Conformance points defined only for:
  + Conformant business representation of the model content (diagrams and tables)
  + Conformant extension of the model as a Business Conceptual Ontology (semantics)
* Iteration Two: in addition to the above, tried to consider what would be a “conformant” implementation in each of the possible technologies in which such a conceptual ontology might be implemented:
  + Conformant Operational Ontologies in OWL
  + Conformant Conventional (Relational Database; UML Class) implementations
  + More general principles covering both of these along with SBVR and the like
* Iteration Three: removed the above into a non normative annex as we were not able to render the general principles as something that could be formally defined and policed adequately.
  + Some of these may be moved back into the normative Conformance section once more experience in creating both Operational Ontologies and conventional solutions leads to repeatable, enforceable implementations

As a group we need to revisit this section.

Agreed actions:

1. Come up with a list of application categories at the business level e.g.
   1. Regulatory
   2. Open symbology
   3. Etc.
2. Come up with a list of architecturally defined application scenarios e.g.
   1. OWL Operational Ontologies
   2. Model driven development
   3. Integration / mapping
   4. Metadata management
   5. Agent based programming
   6. Hadoop / big Data Architectures

This is a non normative annex so we can extend this to other business areas, other applications as we see fit. Agreed to look at the business areas first, then look at the technical applications.