

2009-08-21

From: Baba Piprani, Canada

To: WG2 Members of the Study Group Meeting in Wuhan, Aug 2009.

Status: WG Expert Contribution. This does NOT represent the Canadian NB position .

Action: Input to Wuhan Study Group meeting, Aug 2009

Note1 : This paper has been hastily prepared in between my physiotherapy sessions while on the mend recovering from my injury suffered in Korea, and did not leave me time to consult or circulate it with other Canadian delegates. I will be expanding on this for the Nov meeting.

Note 2: I regret I am unable to personally participate in the Wuhan 2009 meeting, and was not able to produce concrete proposals....my foot is operating at 30% capacity as per the recent physiotherapy assessment (better than 0% in Korea), and still limited in my movements

-----

Ref: 19763 all parts and Keith's Paper WG2 N1293

I am quite concerned that world experts are able to raise questions regarding "whether the relevant meta-classes in Parts 3, 5, etc are subclasses or instances of the meta-classes in Part 2 that represent models and model components." [WG2 N1293]. This tells me that 19763-2 needs more work, in particular, the addressing of data part as has been pointed out repeatedly in WG2 N1293.

Interoperability of metamodels, utilizing metamodels including models processes vs. services poses another question. Open-edi was able to address a limited but standardized data attribute set in the schema and a defined service. It was up to the parties involved to formulate their processes to support that service.

The initial version of 19763-2 was unable to address the process part as was stated in Sydney 2008. With the introduction of 19763-5 and 19763-7 we are now positioning Processes and Services (open scope and not predefined like open-edi) under 19763-2 and expect interoperability via re-use and all the associated "good things" that are postulated in the Services Oriented Architecture and BPM.

The attached paper submitted to the Portugal Nov 2009 Object Role Modelling Workshop titled "Towards a Common Platform to Support Business Processes, Services and Semantics" raises a serious question on these "promises" of re-usability and operating without a data semantic

platform---which is being alluded to by Keith Gordan in WG2 N1293, and which I heartily support (actually the theme of my paper).

I believe we need to seriously look at a “forest level” view of our models (as has been repeatedly stated by Horiuchi-san and many others), particularly concerning 19763 and 11179. It is quite natural to lose sight of the big picture at the tree level.

Perhaps I would like to clarify Keith’s view on modeling say the process model variants or the data model variants. Instead, I do see a standardized metamodel that addresses the semantics of “semantic interoperability” (as opposed to railway syntax interoperability)---via the processes, services, and data (but certainly not addressing the variants).

The slippery-slope question arises as to what is then a standardized metamodel? I see this as the artifacts needed for affecting interoperability in the given order of “services---processes---data”, and throw in Goals as an adjunct (since there could be disparate non-overlapping goals for organizations using a similar set of services). Perhaps a good Modelling Opportunity for the WG2 experts for input into the London meeting....

Another serious concern I have is the possible misuse of 19763-4, where mappings can be produced between metamodels and metamodels as contrast to the metmodels mapping to a global metamodel for semantic equivalence. One could go into proliferation of metamodels this way. See my paper submitted to the Portugal Nov 2009 Object Role Modelling Workshop titled “A Model for Semantic Equivalence Discovery for Harmonizing Master Data” and the previously submitted WG2 N1067 “Using ORM in an Ontology Based Approach for a Common Mapping Across Heterogeneous Applications”. We could be going into a many-to-many mapping scenario for metamodels and never get to where we want to go.

Thank you,

Baba Piprani, on the mend....

Note: The views expressed in this contribution are that of a Working Group Expert and do not represent the National Body position.

....