Panel , “web business rules and events“

Panel: **Benjamin Grosof (Vulcan) , Paul Vincent (Tibco), Mark Proctor (Red Hat), Donald Chapin (Business Semantics Ltd) ,Juergen Angele (Ontoprise)**

Moderator: John Hall

John: Introduces people and rules for asking questions

Q: Why does SBVR have to be translated into Semantic Web technology?

Donald: SBVR is for business people, optimised for their way of conceptualizing problems. Semantic web is optimised for performance and tools.

Ben: Only partially aggrees. Other functions are aspects like software engineering integration.

Juergen: also partially disagrees. OWL is not the semantic web, is only part of the picture.

Mark: SBVR is more applied and use case driven.

Q: For Juergen. How did translation from natural language into FLogic work?

Juergen: Tools supported but mostly manual process.

Comment from audience: SBVR cointains vocabulary langauge as well, and this addresses some problems with OWL: combination of ontology and rule language.

Q: ? (related to SQL) ??

Paul: Lots of discussions between rules based and query based application. There is a lot of similarity between both. Different application scenarios: stream processing vs processing of complex applications.

Q Said: A lot of semantic meta data of events are ignored in applications.

´Paul: Development methodologies are not very mature for comprehensive event processing.

Mark: JBoss is working on including temporal logic into their product to improve event handling. Invitation to participate in research.

Donald: Highlighted the need for correct semantic event processing, events have to be seen in context.

Ben: Important: what are the semantics oft the event. In particular, what is the information context of an event. Must be a model more abstract than for instance an event object in J2EE or .NET.

Q: ??

Donald: Referes to an ISO ??? framework for natural language processing, contains some support for temporal reasoning.

Mark: The vocabulary needed to describe time aspects is very small.

Comment: a full model defining time logic is needed

Ben: but don‘t reinvent the wheel

John: ...

Comment: time is only a small part of a bigger problem, the lifecycle.

Q: How can ontologies be used to integrate different processes like product and software engineering

Juergen: thats not easy. Advantage of ontology ist that it is executable – prototyping aspects

Ben: that´s perhaps out oft he scope of this discussion here

Mark: recalls experience with CISCO – developed huge unmaintainable ontology that was not very useful, open source solutions not ready to support real , large solutions

Q (Jens): Is there an event model fort he web and is this RSS

Paul: good point, RSS is a good candidate but not really about events but for content distribution.

Comment (Jens): RSS is access with a pull, ist not pushed.

Q: Is modelling of events the same as modelling human knowledge?

Paul: ??

Ben: Web is currently request driven protocol not suitable for update. We need protocol first for simple events.

Donald: We need to support events in content (like pages), and also custom events.

Juergen: metric would be useful to measure content improvement.

Comment: rules change global experience ?? time as new dimension

Mark: OpenSync ? as a global monster ontology.

Comment: context dependency of knowledge in time

Comments (Jens): simplicity must be a major design goal

Ben: .. and used for validation of research. Most rule standards fail this.

Paul: OMG introduced a document on events, not yet on RFP level. Recently scope has been dramatically reduced.

Q: Ist important to distinguish between events that may not happen. #

John: .. like lightning that might happen

Paul: this must be solved by modeling events (including hypotetical events)

Paul: difference between concept and occurence

Paul: risk information would be derived by description of event from contextual data

Juergen: this is in distingtion between TBox (conceptual) and ABox (concrete)

Q: Status of ECA ruels for semantic web data

Ben: event has attributes (source, time) and control aspect, events are parts of conditions and there is machinery to optimise this. One such mechanism is CEP.

Paul: Event Processing Society set up at Stanford, meets anually, vendors and other interested parties. Oppurtunity for universities – please contact Alan Lamberk ? at TIBCO

Q: ??

Donald: ??

Paul: originally defining an event ontology was part oft he SBVR effort, but this had been taken out

Q: if a rule fires and this triggers data reduction is this an event

Paul: yes

Mark: to maintain truth maintanance systems is a complex task and more work should be done here#

Q: what happended to research on event agents (Microsoft Research)?

Donald: still around .. ??

Q: Overwelming number of standards, what happens then?

Paul: many groups working on standards realised that they need rules. One oft he ideas of W3C RIF was to provide an universal platform for these rules. He is not optimistic that this will happen.

Ben: Some people from the XBRL community not realise that they need support in developing standards, the main problem is communication between communities.

Juergen: outcome is open

Q: lot of interoperation problems between lots of standards

Paul: ??

Mark: everybody will use DROOLS

Donald: currently work done in the OMG on translating SBVR and RDF to bring different worlds together

Juergen: agrees that there are a lot of efforts to bring different worlds together, like Ontoprise toolset mapping RDF and content maps

Ben: Most important fact is defining a clear semantics to production rules, and then add other things like events .. that can be broken down into simpler arefacts