# Volunteership Service to IAOA Education Committee

**Report 1**: 23MAR2018
**Approx. time-spent**: 3.5 hours
**By** Robert Rovetto, member of IAOA Education Committee
rrovetto@terpalum.umd.edu (preferred email); rrovetto[at]buffalo[dot]edu

**Summary**: Below are some additions and edits made to the wiki, questions, and suggestions for development. IAOA Education Wiki: <http://iaoaedu.cs.uct.ac.za/pmwiki.php?n=Main.HomePage>

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| ***#*** | **Change made to Wiki (Term List page[[1]](#footnote-1))** | **Reason** |
| *1* | *Added*: CycCorp, DOLCE, GFO, UFO, KRR Lattice, YAMATO | To include others since only one was listed. |
| *2* | *Added*: Foundational or General Ontology | Because these are terms found in the literature.I think ‘General Ontology’ predates others; I also think it more accurately captures the idea of a foundational or top-level ontology.‘Top-level ontology’ suggests a certain level-based approach, but not all ontology developers or IT persons use the concept of levels. So ‘General/Generic/Foundational Ontology’ may subsume ‘Top-level ontology’, and is therefore a more accurate term for the most abstract ontologies. |
| *3* | *Added definition* to Controlled Vocabulary term | To add more definitions/views. This definition comes from a book on controlled vocabularies. |
| *4* | *Added*: Task Ontology | It has been described in the literature |

Please feel free to confirm if the above are the correct terms (e.g. unsure about ‘CycCorp’ & ‘KRR Lattice’)

## Suggestions for Development of the Term List

1. Establish a format for the Term List and their groupings
2. *State the following as principles on the term list About page*:

P1: The terms—the text string, alone—listed in the Term List are not exclusively associated with one or more particular ontology or organization.

P2: The terms list is open-ended. Given the multidisciplinary nature of Applied Ontology and the often highly abstract nature of the concepts and terms employed, new terms that are not previously used may either be created or included.

Comment: A general point to communication should be the neutrality and inclusiveness of the term list. Comment on P1: if there are terms that are necessarily unique to a given ontology or organization, then it should be stated, and it should be stated why.

1. *A potential system of term organization:*
* Develop a spreadsheet or database to view terms with their various definitions, the sources of the definitions, and associated discipline to those sources/definitions.

Attached is a sample spreadsheet for this.

* For each term, list the **definitions**, any variants/versions of the definition, the **sources of defintion**, and the **disciplines**
	+ Disciplines will be the most imprecise because some disciplines are themselves multidisciplinary or have fuzzy scope/boundaries (if not arbitrary).

## Questions for Term List development:

1. Since Applied Ontology is multidisciplinary (as the Term List About page says)…

**Is there a scope or constraint to the term/definition list?**

**Shall the Term List include...**

* 1. only definitions actually used in specific applied ontologies (e.g. Cyc, DOLCE, GFO, etc.), or in applied ontology literature (papers, books, summits, etc.)?

If so, then this means no definitions from semantic web, philosophy or other papers. Rather, only definitions displayed in applied ontology publications, discussion groups, etc.

* 1. all definitions of a term used in applied ontologies, and from certain disciplines?

The scope being something like: [semantic web, AI, NLP, comp sci., philosophy, … ]

* 1. all definitions of a term used in specific applied ontologies, regardless of discipline?

The scope being open-ended: (…)

**…?**

Do any of these—a to c—mean we have to review all applied ontologies for their definitions?

1. **Do we want dashes (‘-‘) or parentheses for abbreviations included in terms, rather than just the full names?**

Example: Dashes were included next to the names of the ontology listed. I followed suit, but does the term name of an ontology actually include dash?

Consider, term options for UFO:

1. ‘Unified Foundational Ontology – UFO’
2. ‘Unified Foundational Ontology (UFO)’
3. ‘Unified Foundational Ontology’
4. ‘UFO’

At least 3 is certain. 4 is least certain because there might be another ontology with the same acronym.

**Suggested Answer:** Seems we can either ask the developers of each ontology which term they have indicated in their publications and which they prefer for their ontology; or we can simply prescribe it.

## Comment

I believe that a benefit of having a term list, one that systematically lists term definitions and sources, is that viewers/users/potential-ontology-developers, can cite it, saying “I’m using this term with this particular definition” or can create their own definition of a given term or create a new term. They can then, say, submit it to the list.

1. http://iaoaedu.cs.uct.ac.za/pmwiki.php?n=IAOAEdu.TermList [↑](#footnote-ref-1)