

## **OMG Ontology PSIG Position Paper**

Elisa Kendall - Sandpiper Software

Roy Bell - Raytheon Company

Roger Burkhart - John Deere & Company

Manfred Koethe - 88 Solutions

**Hugues Vincent - Thales** 

Evan Wallace - National Institute of Standards & Technology (NIST)



## Background

- ∞ OMG's primary charter includes
  - Promoting frameworks for compatible and independent development of applications
  - Enabling coordination among applications across heterogeneous networked systems in a multinational, multilingual environment
  - Adopting a core of commercially available specifications of these frameworks, and
  - Promoting international market acceptance and use
- ∞ OMG's Ontology Definition Metamodel (ODM) standard was adopted in 2006, finalized in 2008, now in revision to fix usability issues, update to support OWL 2



## Challenges

- No independent specification of the common elements of RDF vocabularies & OWL ontologies that connect them to the web
  - Some elements, including documents, local names, namespaces, namespace definitions, and IRIs, could be collected in a common specification that both languages reference
  - Common specification for literals and built-in datatypes (& facets), rather than embedding them in the OWL 2 syntax specification
- Namespace organization in RDF is tangled & made it impossible for separation of an RDF metamodel from an RDF Schema metamodel in the ODM
  - Definition of rdfs:Resource & rdfs:Literal in the RDF Schema namespace, but rdf:Property in the RDF namespace
  - Containers and collections a circular relationship between independent metamodels for RDF and RDF schema would be required to maintain namespace separation, which is not permitted in UML
- ∇ocabulary & ontology alignment & mapping is high priority for mapping the semantics of UML & domain specific language models.
- Named graphs & related capabilities defined in "Named Graphs, Provenance and Trust" should be considered seriously



#### **Need for Standard Interfaces / APIs**

- ∞ Currently, there are a number of APIs for accessing RDF/S & OWL data / KBs
  - Jena, Sesame/Sail, DIG
  - OWL API, OWLlink
- They provide varying degrees of language coverage, varying completeness, varying levels of robustness, error handling, explanation support
- □ Lack of a real standard, no common way of describing IRIs, documents, local names, namespaces, or additional services from an API perspective
- ∞ Lack of coverage for RIF
- ⊙ Organizations building tools to bridge the UML & Semantic Web standards must use multiple, often competing APIs with conflicting jar files, for example

# OMG RFP: API4KBs Issued Yesterday (6/25/2010)

- ∞ Championed by Thales Group for SemEUsE project
- ∞ Calls for a single, standard set of interfaces for accessing KBs, with a shared layer for accessing IRIs, documents, & other common infrastructure
- ∞ Support for
  - OWL 2 DL, profiles, OWL 2 Full, & RDFS is required
  - Common Logic, SBVR, RIF, others is optional (more is better)
- ∞ Requests a Platform Independent Model (PIM) & 3 Platform Specific Models (PSMs) for Java, WSDL & REST, others optional but welcome



## Target functionality

- ∞ Parsing, error checking
- ∞ KB manipulations : load, query/retrieve, update
- ∞ Reasoner queries: expressivity of KB, reasoning capabilities
- ∞ Additional reasoner tasks, e.g., explanation and additional error handling
- ∞ Primary concerns: plug-in, modular architecture (e.g., OSGi), common veneer



### Help wanted

- - OWL API developers & users
  - Jena, Sesame, Mulgara developers
  - Others interested in KBs for Rule Bases
  - Discussions initiated at SemTech, OWLED, here
- ∞ OMG membership is preferred but not required
- ∞ Letters of Intent due 30 January 2011, initial submissions in March 2011
- ∞ Contact Evan Wallace or Elisa Kendall if interested