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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.
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
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.