VCoI Call Notes

*17 May 2021*

# Attendees

* Bobbin Teegarden
* Claude Baudoin
* Rob Nehmer
* Mike Bennett

# Agenda

* Process: Claude Baudoin presentation of draft BPMN model of process

# Meeting Notes

## Claude BPMN presentation

### Tooling

Heflo by Venki (Brazilian company since 2012).

Free use for own use – stored in cloud but you can export PDFs of the diagrams.

Teamwork: have to buy a suitable license, of which there are several.

These include the BCMN modeling plus execution – where you can orchestrate the process, and adapters to integrate with web systems, ERP, CRM systems, email sending as a task and so on.

Can trigger forms. User does not need to know they are using Heflo.

Supports swimlanes

e.g. Pool: OMG

Swimlanes: OMG SG, VCoI, System (repository for the SG’s Vocabular)

#### BPMN Support

BPMN version 2 (either 2.1 or 2.4.

Coloring added (color not part of the BPMN standard).

Everything

### Model Comments

MB: Swimlane in the middle should be the TF itself not the VCoI

However, that means we need separate entities within the SG:

* The submitter
* The person or TF responsible for maintaining that SG’s vocabulary, acronyms and references.

### Scope Questions

**Assumption:**

A Common single repository that everyone can access, for the vocabularies of all the SGs that are using the VCoI method. Then when there is an update then the SGs are all aware of other contextual meanings of a given term, abbreviation etc.

Top swimlane: something like ‘use the term’

Once accepted: ‘use term in document’ – pulling data from the vocabulary repository.

* Would add a new dashed line to reflect that

Want to keep the process fairly simple.

### RN comments:

Agree that there is a model that says that VCoI is to suggest this process but not directly involved except maybe at a concept ontology level (or the context ontology as discussed last week).

In terms of how presented – can be presented as an example of governance or of the process flows once the OMG SG has adopted. The SG can also adapt it to their specific purposes.

We don’t need to present one fully fleshed out process for all.

On the Repo – see the benefits of a common repo, but as we have noted this becomes an OMG-wide resource with a need for discussion that needs to go around this – lots of people all have their own ideas. Getting to the structure of a common vocab is likely to be a long and convoluted path.

#### Discussion

CB: Something to know: there is a sense in OMG that the WGs are going to become more formalized as ‘communities’ and that these will get the benefit of access of an OMG GitHub account to store stuff. This is a common place that would be blessed by either the Tech Director or the AB, as a place for people to put things they want to share. Would not need to be normative (communities can decide what to do) but if we decide to use that to store files (in whatever format) then there would be some measure of acceptance of this as the general agreed-upon way in which OMG folks share this data. By aligning with that, without being strictly normative we can say we are compliant with the way OMG is organizing its communities by depositing all electronic forms of our product into a space set up for us by OMG.

### VCoI Material

There is stuff for VCoI

* Context Ontology
* Metamodel (MVF etc)
* Annotations wishlist outcomes

That would be in our VCoI GitHub

Other stuff would be in the SG’s own GitHub

There is merit in a single repository, but the definitions, references and acronyms need to be put there by the SGs.

OMG standards already have overlaps in definitions of words e.g. Activity, for example between UML and BPMN. These are simple homonyms (homographs).

RN: We as a WG don’t have the power to implement that. Would need to be a proposal to someone higher up at OMG. Need to figure out how a group like us is able to put forward these ideas. We see the value in common vocabulary but don’t want to move in that direction without involving the rest of the OMG organization.

We don’t know yet.

CB: May be something that AB wants to review.

Is not a standard visible from outside but for internal OMG – so maybe AB is only an advisory, but Jason Smith as the CTO is the decision maker.

## Outcomes

We need something to present to Jason McColm Smith with concrete recommendations on central repository, tools etc.

Go to JMcS and say, from a governance stand point to what extent should we instruct SGs to use a common kind of repository, and get his advice on the best way to implement that governance.

Likely response: have you talked to the various TFs and do they agree?

So an initial action for June is to socialize this specifically with TFs.

### Action Plan:

Finalize to the extent it can be framed as a recommendation:

* The Process (BPMN model)
* The underlying repository metamodel (use of MVF, SKOS, RDF, OWL etc.
* The Annotations (from the ‘annotations wishlist’)
* The Framework (that ‘calculus’ of Contextual meaning)
* The Context Ontology – see ‘Ontology (1)’ in last week’s notes

### Framework

In terms of the Framework:

The SG (TF or SIG) owns the Concept Ontology for that Domain (the concept and their definition)

The VCoI defines

* How you use the Concept
* How to define Context (the Context ontology)

### Context Ontology

See 10 May 2021 notes:

* Ontology (1): Context ontology (the concepts that define Context for contextual word and abbreviation usage
  + Defined by VCoI
* Ontology (2): Domain Concept Ontology – the concepts owned by the TF or SIG

Context Ontology: concepts such as

* Organization
* Organization sub-unit
  + SG
    - TF
    - SIG
    - ?
* Documents
* And so on.

(we haven’t built that yet)

These are the concepts needed to build out and define the contexts that are:

* The context of a word usage (that in which that *term* refers to that *Concept*)
* The context in which an *Abbreviation* dereferences to a given *Term* (set of words)

Doing our Context ontology will help that since it will be:

* A concept ontology (things not strings about things)
  + In DL
  + Serializable in OWL
  + Sit on top of RDF
  + Etc.
* Will have a TLO

That will help SGs understand the nature of a Domain Concept Ontology that they would maintain.

That’s what I think we need to do next in order to have something to present to Jason.

### Timelines

Options:

**Option 1**

* June: socialize with the TFs and SIGs – get the feedback that Jason is sure to ask for
* Between June and Sept: finalize the thing

**Option 2:**

* Go straight in with it in June

RN: we can already rely upon the backing of FDTF, BC-PSIG, GovDTF

#### Alternatives:

Bring it also to MARS, AI PTF, others

BT: we should also take into account any comments from Elisa and ensure these are included.

#### Potential comment: (FAQ)

A lot of these terms are already defined in standards, are we reinventing the wheel?

* No; these exist and we would want to make sure they are in ‘the system’

Recall we should NOT be put into the position of populating the initial vocabulary. The individual SGs should do that as an initial process.

### Process Summary

So there are 2 processes:

* On-boarding (first use): Already existing Terms, Abbreviations, References
* Future ones that come through (the process we are looking at today)

So there is an ‘on boarding’ element to the roll-out.

The community would need to do the initial population of the system.

This is a good reason to present this proposal to Jason. In the absence of that, a default position is to only bring this back to those TFs and SIGs that have specifically asked for our help. Others can make their own plans.

But first we should try the Jason route.

What we want to avoid is this idea that there is ‘one OMG definition’ for a given term.

Instead, we can define when there are separate, contextual meanings of a word (like Actor etc. but also deal with the Metadata example where lots of specs had subtly and unnecessarily divergent definitions for the same concept.

#### Summary: the 2 processes above:

* **Onboarding:** what they already know
* **New:** conceptual variations (like ‘algorithmic governance’)

These are very distinct processes.

May already have terms defined by ISO but that term may not necessarily add value to a group that needs a new, up to date and more specific definition for a new-ish term.

### Add to triaging process:

New term:

* Is it the same as an existing concept?
* Is it a refinement of an existing concept?
* It is a narrower\* use of the same Words for an existing broader meaning of the same word

RN: Clarification: part of this is realizing that there is that variation there. Want the system to be able to allow that.

Recall the original use case (we now have multiple possible use cases): wanted to attract government people to work with OMG; they would look for more business domain (government) facing definition as distinct from very precise and well-defined contextual definitions like we see in OMG specs.

#### Narrower Usages

\* Narrower or contextually different e.g. business-facing definition versus standards document

Example: Mathematical concepts see e.g. BLS (Dan Gilman) contributions in Statistics WG): they discuss aggregation problems, where certain aggregations don’t make any sense when you add the numbers about them because you are mixing figures about things that are not of like type.

So for example the definition for how you calculate a given aggregate metric needs to be addressed

There: Context is quite narrow (specific)

Therefore the Context ontology needs to accommodate those kinds of specificity.

RN: Also need to understand the broader context for statistical data e.g. how data is collected, what it is measuring etc. before you can aggregate it for calculations or models.

So there is a whole lot more dimensions to the Context Ontology. May want input from the WG (e.g. in this case the Statistics WG) to complete that part of the Context Ontology.

Since mathematics is a common language, any feedback from e.g. Statistics, may also be relevant to Retail, Robotics etc. as they also use mathematics. These will be kinds of context beyond what this small VCoI group tends to discuss. To be OMG-wide we would do well to talk to those groups – both to get their feedback and to understand whether and how they can contribute to the ‘Context Ontology’ side to it.

**Conclusion:** use June QM to reach out to and get feedback from other SGs.

If we can get them interested in this, we can get their help in defining these more specific context parameters.

Maybe also talk to Jason in the meantime but let him know this is what we are doing.

**Fallback:** as long as Gov, Blockchain and Finance are interested we can proceed. Gives us a critical mass from which to potentially roll this out to other SGs.

## Next Steps

* Talk to Jason, let him what we are doing and how far along we are
* Socialize with other TFs at June QM
  + How to plan this e.g. an evening / open session
  + Or something offline from the main meeting
    - As XBRL does at their events
    - i.e. ask for 30 min on one of their recurring calls
  + So ping them before June
    - Suggest alternative of a special call for this, for those in that SG who are interested

### To do this:

Summarize

* What we have figured out already
* What we are still figuring
  + E.g. MVF, SOS, RDF etc. to use
  + How to use those parts
  + What the overall Context v concept repository looks like
  + Annotation metadata

Any further thoughts?

No

## Next meeting

Next week.

Agenda: Work on the summarizing document