

RSpecs: Alternative View

Max Ott – max.ott@nicta.com.au

**Presented by Aaron Helsing –
ahelsing@bbn.com
March 16, 2011
www.geni.net**

- Need to separate object model from semantic meaning of a specific resource
- Object model should be fairly stable
 - Baked into most software components
 - Defines wire format
 - Change is bad - requires wide-spread modifications
- Semantic meaning (ontologies) captures characteristics and dependencies of our resources
 - Will change regularly
 - Change is a good - indicator of a vibrant community

- Object model: Named & typed entity/object/component with named & typed properties and relations to other entity
 - Will also need an object life-cycle to be useful
 - Object references, names, and types are just URIs
 - Any wire format is fine as long as it is consistent (domain independent)
 - However, there are plenty of existing standards to choose from
- Meaning of names and types defined separately
 - Can be simple tables with free-form descriptions
 - Can be formally defined (e.g. OWL)

- Why re-invent the wheel when you can stand on the shoulders of giants?
 - Yes, it takes a while to appreciate the subtleties
 - But these standards and frameworks were developed by folks who know a lot more about describing resources than we do
- NDL (based on ISO standard) defined in OWL (W3C standard). Serialization using RDF/XML (W3C standard).

- Move Forward
 - Will help define a common ontology for wireless resources
 - Will support Iliia's effort to maintain a translator from whatever format is 'forced' on us to a formally consistent one.