

# 2018-01-30 Meeting notes

## Date

30 Jan 2018

## Attendees

- [Dennis Wisnosky](#)
- [Rob Nehmer](#)
- [Mike Bennett](#)
- [Cory Casanave](#)
- [marcello.cecchi@ucc.ie](mailto:marcello.cecchi@ucc.ie)
- [John Gemski](#)
- [Bobbin Teegarden](#)

## Agenda

- 1) Use Case reminder
- 2) Where we are on our road map.
- 3) Open Action Items
- 4) JIRA Issues Review - <https://jira.edmcouncil.org/projects/FND/issues/FND-48?filter=allopenissues>
- 5) Todays content discussion.
  - SMIF OWL-UML
  - SKOS
  - RDF/S
- 6) For next week.



## Proceedings:

20180130 FIBO FND FCT

Cory to MB Please don't say the upper level abstractions are not appropriate for an operational ontology. It all depends. MB agrees.

MB 3 different kinds of use cases. 1) Integration. 2) AI and machine learning 3) inferencing. FIBO defines the kind of ontology that is good for the maximum number of use case.

Cory in Ontolog it is clear that the lack of making this distinction is problematic.

CCM ingest from GitHub closer to working.

IRI policy scenario 3 from Jacobus looks good. Scenario 3: add /source/ to git source Make git IRIs look like <https://spec.edmcouncil.org/fibo/source/FND/whatever>. Makes them clearly distinguishable from the published version, no danger of mixing axioms with same IRI but from different ontology files (source + published version). Can be made to work with FYN like <https://spec.edmcouncil.org/fibo/ontology/FND/Business/Policy/> (which points to the published master/latest version) but would then look like <https://spec.edmcouncil.org/fibo/source/FND/Business/Policy/> which then would point straight to the RAW file in git.

This would make it very clear for everyone with which version you're working: the source version or the published version.

Cory Casanave: <http://docs.oasis-open.org/semantic-ex/ro-soa/v1.0/pr01/see-rosoa-v1.0-pr01.pdf>

FND priorities: Loans concepts coagulation, Name collisions, Legacy maintenance. Cory putting a link into the SOA reference onto from OASIS that can help. MB can't help.

CC purpose was to use commonly accepted definition of Service and Services. Inference Issue re facility and/or service providing 1 or more capabilities. Max: A facility can be a service. CC A facility may enable a capability. Not provide a capability.

MB Are Facility and Service coextensive? Legacy Facility was a parent to Credit Facility for Loans.

Big argument about definition of facility. Definition on slide 21. Four facets. MB Take written definition literally and we have 12 categories if things. Does not make much sense for FIBO. How to decide on a coherent set theoretic definition.

Slide 23 shows facility semantics.

DW: In classic BPR an Activity delivers a Capability provided by a Service. This refers to the series of slides linking these terms ending with slide 29 on Capability.

Slide 31 on Site and Venue which are near synonyms.

## Decisions:

## Action items

