WOP 2018 notes: Session on improving the portal

October 9, 2018

Outline

Get clear about, what is a pattern? *Community*

We wish for the community to be very open.

- ▶ Drafts and unverified ideas are welcomed
- ▶ Precise and systematic submissions are of course valued
- ▶ Existing libraries (OTTR template library as example) must be acknowledged – should not be redone (wasteful) and should be indexed, even if this means pointing outward.

This obviously needs to go along with *recommendations*. We can provide principles and recommendations for submissions. If you submit something in category *semantically precise*, then we will try to apply a predictable list of tests and document the outcome. If you submit a hand-drawn sketch, we will present it appropriately and not reject outright as "not OWL".

We want a (at each *pull request*) some auto-build of the portal content, built from content included in each submission. This needs to use metadata – if you don't include it, you won't get listed.

Get Quality Assurance in order.

We need some reputable, working assurance method.
Questions include

- is it documented?
- is it fit for purpose?
- is it in use (point to examples)

Can we get rank metrics for patterns (analogy: *page rank* as in Google)?

- according to popularity
- according to ...
- according to ...

In various cases ODPs will be proprietary since owned by private enterprises.

Submissions practical support. *Infrastructure* and *Community*

Can't we borrow from existing, working (open source) collaborative software projects?

- ▶ use GitHub
- ▶ democratise
- ▶ revision control
- ▶ issues management
- ▶ easily secure attribution to the originators

We will wish to have some tooling (client-side or server-side) to make accessible, visualise/display, etc. the patterns in the library. E.g. with OTTR this is already largely implemented, but that won't apply to informal/early/informal content.

Categorisation of ODPs in the portal. *Tooling*, and *Formalisation*

Need: Categorise any template you produce so that potential users can find it and evaluate whether it's suitable for them.

This will help in finding which ODP–ODP relationships are applicable, including *specialisation*, *parthood*, and others (e.g. as discussed in Daniel Lupp's presentation)

Examples.

- Is this a semantic ODP?
  - Yes: Then *specialisation*, etc. (semantic relationships) apply
  - No: Then other considerations apply, e.g. are you reusing respectable metadata vocabularies
- Do you target a particular upper ontology (BFO, DUL, ISO 15926, ...)? Only relevant for semantic ODPs.
  - Yes: Then the template needs to be verified for compliance. The submission should also give some info/pointers re. how it might be applied with other upper ontologies
  - No: Please explain yourself.

More on *Infrastructure*

- ▶ find pattern that fit my requirement
  - ▶ recommendation system
  - ▶ search system
- ▶ query by example
  - ▶ pattern similarities
- ▶ faceted search
- ▶ online tutorials

How to use. *Community*

- We must define clearly, for our community, what an ODP is. Make this into a minimal, easy to check threshold for acceptability of submissions
- track use of patterns
- what the difference between a
  - small ontology
  - ODP, and
  - a best practice description
- "Content ODP" (category in current Portal): There are many of these, but they are typically not "semantic", and not broadly applicable

Tools and existing services

- Ranking! Think Google or popularity-based aka Stack overflow
- Adopt multiple stages of submission:
  - unimplemented (conceptual)
  - implemented (restricted to a specific language)
    - if so, require just one way to implement? in a specific language (RDF)?
- community decides on mandatory and additional requirements that ODP's must comply with.