

# Middle Architecture Criteria

John BEVERLEY <sup>a,b,c,1</sup>, Giacomo DE COLLE <sup>a,b</sup>, Mark JENSEN <sup>b,d</sup>,  
Carter BENSON <sup>a,b</sup>, and Barry SMITH <sup>a,b,c</sup>

<sup>a</sup>*Department of Philosophy, University at Buffalo*

<sup>b</sup>*National Center for Ontological Research, University at Buffalo*

<sup>c</sup>*Institute for Artificial Intelligence and Data Science, University at Buffalo*

<sup>d</sup>*U.S. Customs and Border Protection*

**Abstract.** Mid-level ontologies are used to integrate terminologies and data across disparate domains. There are, however, no clear, defensible criteria for determining whether a given ontology should count as mid-level, because we lack a rigorous characterization of what the middle level of generality is supposed to contain. Attempts to provide such a characterization have failed, we believe, because they have focused on the goal of specifying what is characteristic of those single ontologies that have been advanced as mid-level ontologies. Unfortunately, single ontologies of this sort are generally a mixture of top- and mid-level, and sometimes even of domain-level terms. To gain clarity, we aim to specify the necessary and sufficient conditions for a collection of one or more ontologies to inhabit what we call a mid-level architecture.

**Keywords.** Methodological Issues, Mid-Level Ontology, Common Core Ontologies

## 1. Introduction

Ontologists distinguish between top-, mid-, and bottom-level ontologies [1]. *Top-level ontologies* (also known as “upper” or “foundational” ontologies) are composed of the most general terms and relational expressions, containing content concerning mereology, space, time, and so forth. *Bottom-level ontologies* (also known as “domain” ontologies) are composed of domain-specific content, where a domain is understood to be a collection of entities of interest to a certain community or discipline [2]. Such focus is reflected in terms that refer to entities delimited by use cases, disciplines, or scientific practice, such as occupations, proteins, cats, clouds, legal entities, and so on. Domain ontologies are often directly involved in structuring data and often associated with knowledge graphs [3]. *Mid-level ontologies* are composed of content that is more concrete and specific than what would be found among top-level ontologies, yet more abstract and general than what would be found in bottom-level ontologies [1].

Ontologies are distinct from ontology architectures (see **Figure 1**). An *ontology architecture* is, roughly speaking, a collection of one or more ontologies designed to represent entities at a single level of generality. The *top-level architecture* is a collection of one or more ontologies designed to be domain-neutral in the sense that the ontologies in question are “created to represent the categories that are shared across a maximally

---

<sup>1</sup>Corresponding Author: John Beverley, johnbeve@buffalo.edu.

broad range of domains” [2]. Example denizens of the top-level architecture include Basic Formal Ontology [4, 5] and TUpper [6], each of which is designed to represent entities and relationships across all possible domains of interest. The *domain-level architecture* is a collection of one or more ontologies designed to represent entities within some specified domain, using fine-grained terms and relationships among them. Example domain ontologies include Human Disease Ontology [7], Neurological Disease Ontology [8], and the Cyber Ontology [9].




Figure 1. Top, middle, and domain architecture layers.

The *mid-level architecture* (also called the “middle architecture”) is a collection of one or more ontologies designed to represent entities at a lower level of granularity than those in the top-level architecture, but not so fine-grained as ontologies in the domain-level architecture. Inhabitants of the top-level architecture are analogous to programming languages such as Python; those in the middle architecture to language libraries, such as Pandas or NumPy [1]. Just as developers leverage libraries to avoid having to start from scratch when writing software for a given domain, so ontologists operating at the domain level benefit by leveraging ontologies from the middle architecture. Example ontologies within the middle architecture include the Industrial Ontologies Foundry Core (IOFC) [10] and the Common Core Ontologies (CCO) suite [11].

While intuitive distinctions to draw, there are as yet no formal or semi-formal criteria for determining whether a given ontology falls into or out of the top-, mid-, or domain-level architecture, or indeed to none of these. Identifying such criteria is, moreover, no mere intellectual exercise. There is, for example, an on-going effort sponsored by the Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers Standards Association (IEEE) [12] aimed at identifying requirements for mid-level ontologies. In part to support that effort, we propose a set of individually necessary and jointly sufficient inclusion conditions for the middle architecture, showing how ontologies that satisfy these conditions warrant being counted as mid-level ontologies. Throughout, we highlight the Common Core Ontologies (CCO) [11] – a mid-level ontology suite widely-used in defense and intelligence domains – to illustrate specific aspects of our proposal drawing on the fact that CCO, once completed, will be evaluated against the IEEE Standards requirements.

## 2. Considerations of Scope

Several attempts have been made to provide criteria for delimiting what it is to be a collection of one or more ontologies forming a middle architecture [1, 11, 13, 14]. Each begins by reflecting on questions of ontology *scope* which is accordingly where we begin our investigations. The scope of an ontology is the collection of entities in a domain the ontology is meant to represent. For example, the scope of the Cyber Ontology concerns “entities relevant to the digitization, manipulation, and transfer of information using telecommunication networks, especially as they pertain to activities in cyberspace.” [9]

The scope of a given ontology may be understood along both vertical and horizontal axes. *Vertical scope* is composed of, on the one hand, the most general entities in an

ontology taxonomy – what we call the ‘upper bound’ – and, on the other, the least general entities – what we call the ‘lower bound’. In this parlance, an upper bound of a top-level ontology such as BFO might be characterized as: anything that exists, has existed, or will exist, reflected in the definition of the class *entity* [4]. Similarly, an example of the lower bound of BFO would be the class *object*, which has no further refinements within BFO, though it is used as a starting point for numerous BFO extension ontologies [15].

*Horizontal scope* reflects the intended breadth of coverage of an ontology. To illustrate, note that domain-level ontologies are often designed to include terms, definitions, and relationships that track as closely as possible entities in the relevant domain. They are often built for specific purposes, such as providing semantic connections across local data; and are often optimized for efficient information extraction [16]. In consequence, domain ontologies often exhibit clear horizontal scope, insofar as they are circumscribed by the domain itself. One would not expect terms representing airplanes or soccer matches within the purview of, say, the Cyber Ontology.

BFO provides an example of horizontal scope, namely, everything that exists. This is characteristic of top-level ontologies which satisfy the ISO/IEC 21838-1 Top-Level Ontologies Part 1: Requirements [2]. Consequently, expansion of a top-level ontology with maximal horizontal scope to include new terms makes no difference to the horizontal scope, as it cannot be broader.

When a domain ontology extends downwards from a higher-level ontology containing more abstract and general terms, the domain ontology should at least exhibit clear horizontal *and* upper bounds. If the domain ontology is sufficiently fine-grained, it should exhibit a clear lower bound as well. For example, the Occupation Ontology (OccO) [17] is a domain ontology developed to integrate data concerning occupation classification codes, such as the UK National Statistics Standard Occupational Classification (UK SOC) [18], and the European Skills, Competences, Qualifications and Occupations (ESCO) of the European Union 2010 [19]. Because OccO adopts BFO and its design principles, OccO contains a clearly defined upper bound drawn from BFO. Because the scope of OccO is circumscribed to fit the corresponding classification codes, it also exhibits clearly defined horizontal bounds. Lastly, given that OccO is not intended to be developed below the level of generality needed to represent occupation codes, this ontology also contains clear lower bounds.

By way of another illustration, when domain ontologies are developed to directly reflect database structures representing a given domain, they often exhibit clear horizontal, upper, and lower bounds reflected by the boundaries of the database structure itself. For example, a relational database representing usernames and passwords that is transformed into a corresponding ontology may have bounds identifiable in the column headers and rows extracted from the database. Many ontologies developed following the so-called ‘bottom-up strategy’ exhibit upper, lower, and horizontal bounds, insofar as they are primarily designed to represent exactly one clearly circumscribed domain [20].

### **3. Middle Architecture**

We maintain that the middle architecture consists solely of mid-level ontologies. Vertical and horizontal scope provide lines along which to identify necessary and sufficient criteria characterizing an architecture of this type.

### 3.1 The Top-Level Ontology Constraint

Ontologies inhabiting the middle architecture are ‘middle’ with respect to some top-level architecture. There are numerous top-level ontologies; we leverage criteria for inclusion into the top-level architecture from ISO/IEC 21838-1 Top-Level Ontologies Part 1: Requirements. That is, an ontology satisfying these requirements counts as a citizen of the top-level architecture. Ontologies on this level are designed “to represent categories that are shared across a maximally broad range of domains”, where “categories” are general classes shared across many different domains [8].


Any inhabitant of the middle architecture must extend from a top-level ontology thus defined. Importantly, requiring that an ontology inhabiting the middle architecture extend from some ISO/IEC top-level ontology does not require that any *specific* top-level ontology be used, only that relevant mid-level ontologies extend from *some* top-level ontology satisfying ISO/IEC 21838-1. We codify this as a constraint:

**TLO** Ontologies inhabiting the middle architecture level extend from at least one ontology satisfying the requirements specified in ISO/IEC 21838-1.

**TLO** effectively enforces an upper bound for ontologies in the middle architecture. For example, the CCO suite is comprised of 11 ontologies<sup>2</sup> (see **Figure 2**) and each extends from one or more classes in BFO. The most general classes in each of these extensions of BFO are collectively the upper bound for CCO [11, 21], reflected in classes such as *agent* and *artifact*.

Three points are worth emphasizing: First, by **TLO** a putative mid-level ontology that extends from a top-level ontology which does not satisfy the requirements of 21838-1,<sup>3</sup> cannot inhabit the middle architecture. We are *not*, however, asserting that the ontology in question cannot *be* a mid-level ontology. All residents of the middle architecture are mid-level ontologies, but not all mid-level ontologies need inhabit the middle architecture.

Second, **TLO** does not on its own exclude inhabitants of the middle architecture that extend from *multiple* top-level ontologies, as long as at least one of the parent ontologies satisfies the requirements in 21838-1.<sup>4</sup> Third, an immediate corollary is that no middle architecture ontology can introduce content to cover some portion of a domain that is outside the horizontal scope of its top-level ontology.



**Figure 2.** Basic Formal Ontology and the Common Core Ontologies Suite

<sup>2</sup>Numerous CCO extensions exist, such as the Modal Relations Ontology (MRO) [11]. These are not, however, intended to be or to be part of some mid-level ontology suite.

<sup>3</sup>Similarly, we acknowledge there are top-level ontologies that do not inhabit the top architecture; we are only committed to any inhabitant of this architecture being a top-level ontology.

<sup>4</sup>We return to this point at the close of 3.4.

### 3.2 The Delimiting Constraint

Upper bounds and horizontal scope from **TLO** provide useful, but weak, structure to inhabitants of the middle architecture. Adding more substance to **TLO**, we maintain that middle architecture ontologies should themselves be composed of content that is defined using terms and relational expressions from the top-level referenced in **TLO**. This should be no surprise, as implemented ontologies that import a top-level ontology often do so in the interest of creating child classes or properties based on those in the top-level.

Additionally, we maintain that middle architecture ontologies must *only* be composed of content based on the top-level referenced in **TLO**. This is less contentious than it sounds if we remember to keep separate *ontologies as intended semantics covering some domain* from *implementations of ontologies*. A given ontology may be implemented in one or more formal languages, where an implementation is meant to reflect the intended interpretation of that ontology.<sup>5</sup> Formal language options for implementations include the Common Logic Interchange Format (CLIF) [23] and the Web Ontology Language (OWL2) [24]. While some researchers suggest ontologies are equivalent to their implementations, i.e. by claiming ontologies *are* formal theories [1, 25, 26], such claims lead rather quickly to puzzles. An OWL2 implementation of an ontology intended to represent the Allen Interval Algebra [27] will be unable to do so owing to OWL2's constraint on non-simple properties; in contrast, an implementation of the ontology in the more expressive CLIF might capture such an intended interpretation. Importantly, each would be an implementation *of* the same ontology. As we understand here, ontologies are closer to the intended semantics regarding some domain rather than files stored in repositories or inboxes.

To illustrate why this matters, note that ontologies within the Open Biological and Biomedical Ontologies Foundry (OBO) [28] leverage BFO as a top-level starting point for definitions of terms and relational expressions. In response to user needs, BFO has changed over the decades resulting in some OBO ontologies using different versions of BFO. Implementations of BFO have changed,<sup>6</sup> its intended horizontal scope has not.

Our assumption then is that ontologies in the middle architecture exhibit intended semantics that are based on and only based on the intended semantics of the top-level they import. Of course, implementations of ontologies leveraging BFO as a top-level sometimes include classes and properties that are, shall we say, siblings of the most general BFO class *entity*. This should not, however, by itself rule out a putative mid-level ontology with this feature from membership in the middle architecture. That determination is made with respect to the intended semantics of the mid-level ontology. This discussion justifies the following constraint any ontology in the middle architecture layer must satisfy:

**DELIMIT** Ontologies inhabiting the middle architecture are composed of all and only content ultimately extended from the upper bound referenced by **TLO**.

To further clarify what we mean by ‘ultimately extended’ with respect to an ontology implementation in OWL2, CCO contains the class *measurement unit* which is not an immediate owl:subClassOf of *generically dependent continuant* in BFO but is a

---

<sup>5</sup>Compare [22] in which ontologies are described as *documents* that are “realized in” *document versions*.

<sup>6</sup>BFO 1.0 was released in 2001; BFO 1.1 in 2007; BFO 2.0 in 2015; BFO2020 in 2020

*generically dependent continuant* and so linked to *entity* in BFO through a series of owl:subClassOf relations.

Commitment to **DELIMIT** should not suggest that the classes comprising the upper bound of a mid-level ontology must always extend from the least general classes of the top-level ontology from which it extends. For example, **DELIMIT** might be satisfied by an ontology in the middle architecture representing time by extending the BFO class *one-dimensional temporal region* rather than its sole child class *temporal interval*. Despite these qualifications, **TLO** and **DELIMIT** are together sufficient to undermine at least one natural strategy for specifying a lower bound for a mid-level ontology. It has been suggested that one might provide a firm cutoff for the lower bound of mid-level ontologies by leveraging a principle like the following [13]:

- (\*) For a given ontology element  $e$ , natural number  $n > 1$ , and distinct domain-level ontologies  $o_1 \dots o_n$ : If  $e$  is appropriately reused in  $o_1 \dots o_n$  then the primary residence of  $e$  should be a more general ontology imported by  $o_1 \dots o_n$ .

(\*) is, in certain circumstances, a useful principle. Consider that the term ‘infection’ is plausibly used across all infectious disease ontologies. Housing an *infection* term in, say, a domain ontology whose scope is influenza would require other infectious disease ontologies to import *infection* from that influenza ontology. Better to have an ontology, such as the Infectious Disease Ontology (IDO) [29], as the home of *infection*, alongside other terms commonly used across multiple infectious disease domain ontologies. (\*) justifies such a decision. The thought is that (\*) can be extended to provide a dividing line between domain-level and mid-level ontologies, and this could perhaps provide a foundation for a lower bound for the middle architecture.

However, (\*) conflicts with **TLO** and **DELIMIT**, as domain ontologies that extend from the same top- or mid-level ontology may represent the same domain in slightly different, but importantly similar ways. For example, a domain ontology intended to represent car accidents represents a domain that overlaps with an ontology representing car insurance. Both ontologies may plausibly include a class *Honda Civic*. But this should not entail that *Honda Civic* is a class that belongs in a mid-level ontology. Similarly, a domain ontology representing strategies for recycling vehicles might also have need for *Honda Civic* within its scope. But three domain ontologies using *Honda Civic* should not force this class into the mid-level. One might still be tempted to claim that for some sufficiently large  $n$ , reuse across  $n$  domain ontologies warrants inclusion in a mid-level ontology. However, because middle architecture ontologies can be extended by overlapping but distinct domain-level ontologies in potentially *infinite* ways, leveraging (\*) – even for some large  $n$  – to provide a firm cutoff between the middle and domain architecture levels runs the risk of collapsing them into one.

It is unclear how to identify a defensible lower bound for ontologies within the middle architecture. While rules of thumb have been suggested – such as limiting the number of subclasses extending from upper bound classes of a given mid-level ontology to no more than three [13] – such rules often reveal themselves as arbitrary, and thus as subject to frequent changes and to forking across different user communities. They are thus not capable of providing the sort of constraint we are seeking. Rather than attempting to identify a firm cutoff, we propose instead relying on the broad consensus often exhibited by mid-level ontology content. While there can be disagreement over whether a given class should be included in a mid-level ontology, there is often much less disagreement than might initially appear. For example, for every contentious,

potentially borderline class or relation in CCO implementations - such as *flywheel* or *is\_first\_cousin\_of* - there are numerous uncontentious classes - such as *agent*, *artifact*, *information content entity*, *measurement*, and *is\_about* [30]. We should not take the lack of a firm cutoff for what should and should not be included in a mid-level ontology to undermine the project of identifying criteria for the middle architecture. There is enough agreement on what should be included in and excluded from mid-level ontologies and further constraints can be defended to characterize the middle architecture.

### 3.3 The Orthogonality Constraint

While there are examples of mid-level ontologies [31] intended to be implemented solely as single artifacts, we should not expect all inhabitants of the middle architecture to be similarly structured. We should permit, under certain conditions, collections of ontologies to inhabit the middle architecture, even when no single member would.

Collections of adjacent domain ontologies often share enough content in common to warrant the creation of a *reference ontology* [4]. As understood here, reference ontologies exist outside of the top-level architecture and are designed to contain content that is intended to be reused in multiple domain ontologies. As an example, creation of IDO [29] spurred development of extension ontologies covering brucellosis [32], influenza [33], and coronavirus [34], among others. Domain ontologies grouped by pathogen, e.g. parasite, bacteria, fungus, virus, share a significant amount of content in common, warranting the creation of reference ontologies, such as the Virus Infectious Disease Ontology (VIDO) [35] which acts as an intermediary between IDO and its virus extension ontologies. Accordingly, VIDO is a reference ontology while, say, the Coronavirus Infectious Disease Ontology (CIDO) [34] is a domain-level ontology extending from it.

Reference ontologies provide the lines along which to make sense of how collections of ontologies might together inhabit the middle architecture level. At a minimum, inhabitants of the middle architecture – whether unified ontologies or collections – should be composed of reference ontologies. We go further, however, in maintaining that denizens of the middle architecture may *only* be composed of reference ontologies. Such a constraint excludes collections of reference ontologies combined with a collection of domain ontologies from membership. For example, the result of combining CCO and CIDO would be an ontology outside the middle architecture because it would fail to satisfy **REFERENCE**.

**REFERENCE** is motivated in part by the need to minimize *scope creep*. Scope creep typically emerges when an ontology intended to represent some specific domain is constructed with insufficient foresight, so that it later needs to be expanded beyond that domain. For example, the Credential Transparency Description Language (CTDL) [36] is an ontology whose scope covers academic and occupational credentials, certificates, badges, and the like. Success in applying CTDL led to its developers finding a need to add to the ontology content outside the initial domain, such as *organization*, *facility*, and *customer*. CTDL was not developed with an eye towards interoperability with other ontologies or the indeed the degree to which it would still be viable when new types of data are added to the pool that the ontology was initially designed to represent. Instead of reusing such content from existing ontology efforts, the developers minted new elements that creep beyond CTDL scope.

Extending from existing higher-level ontologies helps avoid scope creep when horizontal scope is inherited by extension ontologies. In this respect, **TLO** and **DELIMIT** are constraints that aim to block such scope creep within the context of the middle architecture. To that end, we should not permit inhabitants of the middle architecture to be composed of reference ontologies exhibiting overlapping scope:

**ORTHOGONALITY** Ontologies inhabiting the middle architecture are composed of all and only reference ontologies none of which exhibit overlapping scope with any other.<sup>7</sup>

As a limit case, **ORTHOGONALITY** can of course be satisfied by a single reference ontology. More generally, **ORTHOGONALITY** may be satisfied by a collection of one or more reference ontologies that are, for example, together designed to cover the scope of the top-level ontology they import but without overlap. For example, as indicated earlier, CCO is composed of 11 modules which together are designed to exhaust the scope of BFO. Each module of CCO was developed and is maintained as a reference ontology covering some broad domain of interest, such as information or artifacts.<sup>8</sup>

### 3.4 Exhaustive Constraint

**TLO** requires leveraging a top-level ontology respecting 21838-1 and **DELIMIT** circumscribes the breadth of inhabitants of the middle architecture. Middle architecture ontologies should exhibit a tight connection with the top-level ontologies from which they extend by inheriting the horizontal scope of the top-level ontology they import. However, such a commitment may conflict with definitions of mid-level ontology as ontologies “that represent relatively general categories common to many domains of interest.” [19] Words of estimation such as “relatively general” and “many” are, of course, notoriously underspecified and would provide a weak foundation on which to construct coherent criteria for the middle architecture. More defensible characterizations treat ‘mid-level ontology’ as a status relative to ontologies representing some broad user community or perhaps scientific field, such as biomedicine. On this proposal, one community may use a ‘mid-level ontology’ that extends from a top-level ontology that itself is extended to a distinct “mid-level ontology” in another broad area of interest. Indeed, such ‘mid-level ontologies’ may even satisfy **TLO**, **DELIMIT**, and **ORTHOGONALITY**.

Four points in response. First, such a position does not adequately distinguish reference ontologies from mid-level ontologies. Given that so many in our community use these expressions in overlapping and imprecise ways, providing clear definitions of these separate meanings will be of considerable utility. Second, indexing ‘mid-level ontologies’ to some collection of domain ontologies of interest to a broad community further muddies the waters. Consider that the Supply Chain Reference Ontology (SCRO) extends from the Industrial Ontologies Foundry Core (IOFC), where the latter is described as a mid-level ontology with respect to industrial manufacturing and services [38]. IOFC developers minted ontology content representing classes of agents, artifacts,

---

<sup>7</sup>Cp. [37] where it is argued that OBO Foundry ontologies should have orthogonal scope.

<sup>8</sup>Note that because reference ontologies live outside the top-level architecture, **REFERENCE** entails inhabitants of the middle architecture cannot be collections of top-level ontologies.

information, and so on, many of which were outside IOFC’s scope. This issue is not peculiar to IOFC; one should expect scope creep to arise for any such ‘mid-level ontology’ indexed to a broad community of interest. Third, and related, a natural antidote to the preceding would be to place content representing artifacts, information, and so on in a ‘more general’ mid-level ontology. But with enough broad communities of interest there will invariably emerge ‘mid-level ontologies’ that collectively exhaust the horizontal scopes of top-level ontologies respecting 21838-1. Avoiding scope creep will then ultimately involve the creation of one or more ‘most general’ mid-level ontologies, which will be those that inherit the horizontal scope of the relevant top-level. In other word, the creation of ‘mid-level ontologies’ indexed to communities of interest coupled with the need to address scope creep will lead naturally to mid-level ontologies that exhaust the horizontal scope of their top-level. Lastly, our criteria target the *middle architecture*, which does not exhaust mid-level ontologies. Groups may use ‘mid-level ontology’ as indexed solely to their community; they will not, however, inhabit the middle architecture.

For these reasons, we maintain that inhabitants of the middle architecture should inherit such horizontal scope. Consequently, because 21838-1 requires top-level ontologies to have maximal horizontal scope, inhabitants of the middle architecture must have maximal horizontal scope. Perhaps more contentious, inhabitants of the middle architecture should also be designed to exhaust that scope by introducing more specific ontology content. As a first pass:

- (\*\*) Ontologies inhabiting the middle architecture contain at least one subclass for each class of lowest generality referenced by **TLO**.

(\*\*) is a straightforward way to enforce middle architecture ontologies cover the horizontal breadth of the relevant top-level ontology. For example, BFO classes such as *function* and *history* are extended in CCO to *artifact function* and *artifact history*, respectively. Importantly, (\*\*) does not require that middle architecture ontologies create subclasses for *all* of the classes contained in the relevant top-level. For example, (\*\*) does not required that CCO include an immediate subclass of *entity*.

Unfortunately, (\*\*) is too strong. To see why, note that it would rule out putative mid-level ontologies that do not create subclasses for, say, subclasses of *spatial region*. In general, subclasses of BFO’s *spatial region* are rarely, if ever, introduced correctly [39]. Child classes of *spatial region* in BFO provide, to our minds, examples of classes that should not necessarily be extended by all mid-level ontologies. Indeed, while CCO currently includes subclasses for *one-dimensional spatial region* [11], for example *zenith* and *nadir*, we maintain these subclasses should be deprecated or moved elsewhere. More generally, it seems plausible that some 21838-1 top-level ontology will include classes that should not be extended by inhabitants of the middle architecture level. Consequently, (\*\*) is too strong.

There is nevertheless a path forward that leverages more substantially requirements outlined in 21838-1 [2]. Any top-level ontology satisfying this standard must provide resources for representing data concerning the *breadth areas* listed in **Table 1**.

**Table 1.** 21838-1 Breadth Areas for top-level ontologies.

Space and Time	Qualities and other Attributes
Actuality and Possibility	Quantities and Mathematical Entities

Classes and Types	Processes and Events
Time and Change	Constitution
Parts, Wholes, Unity, and Boundaries	Causality
Space and Place	Information and Reference
Scale and Granularity	Artifacts and Socially Constructed Entities
Mental entities, imagined entities, fiction, mythology, and religion	

These breadth areas provide guidance to those who intend to develop or evaluate top-level ontologies with respect to the range of types of data they can represent. We may leverage these guidelines to provide a further constraint on ontologies inhabiting the middle architecture more flexible than (\*\*):

**EXHAUST** Ontologies inhabiting the middle architecture level are composed of all and only content extended from each breadth area referenced by **TLO**.

Note, satisfying (\*\*) is one way to satisfy **EXHAUST**, though not the only way. One wrinkle, however, is that strictly speaking, top-level ontologies satisfying 21838-1 need not in every case “include classes or types that cover one or more of the areas identified” [2]. In cases where a putative top-level ontology does not do so, it must document how it will address such coverage, perhaps by referencing other, external ontologies that extend the top-level. One reading of this concession would undermine the point of introducing **EXHAUST**. On this reading, a top-level ontology may satisfy breadth areas by claiming that one or more extensions of the top-level ontology includes ontology content that covers each breadth area.

But if a given mid-level ontology is claimed to satisfy **EXHAUST** yet is referenced as how the top-level ontology it imports satisfies breadth areas then it seems either the top-level ontology never satisfied those area or the mid-level ontology is part of the top-level ontology. For example, BFO does not include the class *artifact*, but CCO does. So one may worry that to satisfy coverage of “artifacts and socially constructed entities” BFO must either include within its purview *artifact* or abdicate its status as a top-level ontology to satisfy the requirements set forth in 21838-1. These requirements, however, allow external ontologies to play this role, providing that the relevant classes are themselves linked to BFO – here by means of the CCO class *artifact*. This is the way BFO deals with information artifacts in ISO/IEC 21838-2, namely by pointing to the Information Artifact Ontology and to the treatment of information artifacts therein in terms of the BFO class *generically dependent continuant*. To satisfy breadth areas, a given top-level ontology must demonstrate how it is extended by other ontologies to represent breadth areas or justify how it will be so extended in the future. Documenting how BFO is extended in CCO by, say, *artifact* is a way to demonstrate how general, abstract, classes in BFO can be and are extended to cover breadth areas. There is no conflict between **EXHAUST** and the ways in which breadth areas may be demonstrated with respect to top-level ontologies.

Observe **TLO**, **DELIMIT**, **ORTHOGONALITY**, and **EXHAUST** entail that collections of reference ontologies that inhabit the middle architecture cannot be collections of reference ontologies that extend different top-level ontologies satisfying the requirements of 21838-1. Consider a collection of two or more reference ontologies that extend from two or more top-level ontologies satisfying 21838-1. By **EXHAUST**,

the reference ontologies must contain at least one subclass for each breadth area of *each* top-level ontology referenced by **TLO**. Because the top-level ontologies exhibit overlapping scope, so will the reference ontologies, violating **ORTHOGONALITY**.<sup>9</sup>

#### 4. Applying the Criteria

**Table 2** summarizes our constraints, which provide jointly sufficient conditions for an ontology to inhabit the middle architecture. In other words, all ontologies in the middle architecture are mid-level ontologies, but we do not maintain that all mid-level ontologies inhabit the middle architecture. It is worthwhile to evaluate potential candidate mid-level ontologies.

**Table 2.** Four jointly sufficient constraints for the middle architecture.

<b>Constraint</b>	<b>Explanation</b>
<b>TLO</b>	Ontologies inhabiting the middle architecture level extend from at least one ontology satisfying the requirements specified in ISO/IEC 21838-1.
<b>DELIMIT</b>	Ontologies inhabiting the middle architecture are composed of all and only content ultimately extended from the upper bound referenced by <b>TLO</b> .
<b>ORTHOGONALITY</b>	Ontologies inhabiting the middle architecture are composed of all and only reference ontologies none of which exhibit overlapping scope with any other.
<b>EXHAUST</b>	Ontologies inhabiting the middle architecture are composed of all and only content extended from each breadth area referenced by <b>TLO</b> .

We have used CCO as our running example, so it should be no surprise that it satisfies each of the constraints. The 11 ontologies comprising the CCO suite are disjoint reference ontologies, thus satisfying **ORTHOGONALITY**. CCO adopts BFO as a top-level ontology, thus satisfying **TLO**; extends ultimately from BFO to exhaust the breadth of coverage areas, satisfying **EXHAUST**; but does not include among the 11 modules any class that extends outside the scope of BFO, thus satisfying **DELIMIT**. By these constraints CCO inhabits the middle architecture and is thus a mid-level ontology.

The Ontology for Biomedical Investigations (OBI) [40] was developed as a result of efforts from different communities involved in the OBO Foundry. Accordingly, OBI reused ontologies developed for many domains of interest across in the OBO community. OBI adopts BFO as a top-level, thus satisfying **TLO**; it is a single reference ontology, thus satisfying **ORTHOGONALITY**; and it does not include any class that extend beyond the scope of BFO, thus satisfying **DELIMIT**. OBI does not, however, cover all breadth areas identified in 21838-1 and leveraged in **EXHAUST**. For example, the scope of OBI is not intended to cover imagined entities, fiction, mythology, and religion. Hence, according to our constraints OBI does not inhabit the middle architecture level. This is as it should be, as OBI's developers do not view it as a mid-level ontology.

The Core Ontology for Biology and Biomedicine (COB) [41] aims to collect common terms across the wide expanse of OBO Foundry ontologies that are used in definitions of a significant fraction of terms in other OBO ontologies. In that respect, the motivation for COB aligns with that of mid-level ontology suites. COB is composed of

<sup>9</sup>The present criteria do not rule out inhabitants of the middle architecture extending from two or more top-level ontologies satisfying 21838-1.

a single reference ontology, thus trivially satisfying **ORTHOGONALITY**. COB also adopts only classes taken from BFO, thus satisfying **TLO**. Arguably, the intended semantics of COB does not extend beyond those of BFO, and so COB satisfies **DELIMIT** as well. This is so even though COB does not import the class *entity* from BFO which designates the upper bound of BFO in its implementations. Additionally, given its restriction to OBO Foundry ontologies, COB also does not satisfy **EXHAUST**.

IOFC [10] was developed to provide terminological integration for BFO-compliant ontologies covering the domains of industrial manufacturing, service, and maintenance. Because IOFC adopts BFO as a top-level ontology, it satisfies **TLO**. Moreover, IOFC is a single reference ontology, thus satisfying **ORTHOGONALITY**, and does not extend outside the scope of BFO, thus satisfying **DELIMIT**. As with OBI, however, IOFC does not satisfy **EXHAUST** given the limitations of its scope to industrial manufacturing. IOFC does not cover the actuality and possibility breadth area. Hence, IOFC does not inhabit the middle architecture level.

The authors of the present article are members of the Buffalo Toronto Ontology Alliance (BoaT) and have worked with members of the Toronto Virtual Enterprise (TOVE) community to align ‘their respective suites of ontologies’ [42] The Toronto Virtual Enterprise (TOVE) project [43] aims to promote data-driven city policy making by integrating disparate datasets. To our knowledge, no single ontology or combination of ontologies in the TOVE suite is intended to count as a mid-level. Given the breadth covered by TOVE ontologies – spanning a range of domains such as activities, resources, and time – it is instructive to explore the extent to which a collection of TOVE ontologies may inhabit the middle architecture level. The most general TOVE ontologies are properly modularized reference ontologies which avoid overlapping scope, and so satisfy **ORTHOGONALITY**. Nevertheless, the ontologies do not as of the present adopt any top-level ontology, and thus do not satisfy **TLO**, **DELIMIT**, or **EXHAUST**. Given the breadth of coverage and careful engineering, some combination of the highest-level TOVE ontologies would plausibly inhabit the middle architecture, when they are properly arranged under a top-level ontology satisfying 21838-1.

## 5. Conclusion

Ontologies can be characterized along levels of generality. The purpose of a well-developed mid-level ontology is to provide a foundation of ontology elements more concrete than a top-level ontology but more general than any domain ontology. A mid-level ontology should offer a connection between inhabitants of the top and bottom architectures, and so – we maintain - facilitate the development of ontologies following the so-called “middle-in strategy” [26]. Given the recent interest in mid-level ontologies by established groups such as the IEEE [16], providing criteria for their identification will set standards for future ontology development. We have thus introduced jointly sufficient criteria characterizing the middle architecture, while arguing criteria such as (\*) and (\*\*) are implausible. As we defend, inhabiting the middle architecture requires consisting of one or more reference ontologies having no overlapping scope, which extend from and exhaust the breadth of a 21838-1 top-level ontology.

## Acknowledgments

Thanks to participants of the *2023 University at Buffalo Fall Ontology Sprint* for feedback on early versions of the criteria: Alec Sculley, Ji Soo Seo, Federico Donato, Sean Kindya, Giorgio Ubbialo, James Egan, Adam Taylor, Hector Guzman-Orozco, Michael Rabenberg. Many thanks to the *IEEE P3195 Mid-Level Ontology and Extensions Working Group* for discussion of these criteria: Alan Ruttenberg, Brian Haugh, Alex Cox, Neil Otte, Cameron More, Austin Leibers, Eric Merrell, Tim Prudhomme, Jonathan Vajda, Steven Wartik, and Jim Schoening.

## References

- [1] Leo. Ontological Architectures. Chapter 2. R. Poli et al. (eds.), *Theory and Applications of Ontology: Computer Applications*, 27 DOI 10.1007/978-90-481-8847-5\_2, Springer Science. 2010.
- [2] ISO/IEC 21838-1:2021. "Information Technology — Top-Level Ontologies (TLO) — Part 1: Requirements." Accessed Feb 19, 2024.
- [3] Peng C, et. al. Knowledge Graphs: Opportunities and Challenges. *Artif Intell Rev.* 2023 Apr 3:1-32. doi: 10.1007/s10462-023-10465-9. Epub ahead of print. PMID: 37362886; PMCID: PMC10068207.
- [4] Arp R., Smith B., Spear A., *Building Ontologies with Basic Formal Ontology*, 2015, MIT Press
- [5] ISO/IEC 21838-2:2021. "Information Technology — Top-Level Ontologies (TLO) — Part 2: Basic Formal Ontology." Accessed Feb 19, 2024.
- [6] ISO/IEC 21838-2:2021. "Information Technology — Top-Level Ontologies (TLO) — Part 4: TUpper."
- [7] Schriml LM, et. al. The Human Disease Ontology 2022 update. *Nucleic Acids Res.* 2022 Jan 7;50(D1):D1255-D1261. doi: 10.1093/nar/gkab1063. PMID: 34755882; PMCID: PMC8728220.
- [8] Jensen M, et. al. (2013) "The neurological disease ontology", *J Biomed Semantics*, 4:42. doi: 10.1186/2041-1480-4-42.
- [9] IEEE Cyber Ontology Working Group, "Cyber Ontology Releases," IEEE Open Source. [Online]. Available: <https://opensource.ieee.org/cyber-ontology-working-group/cyber-ontology-releases>.
- [10] Drobñjakovic, M., et. al., *The Industrial Ontologies Foundry (IOF) Core Ontology, Formal Ontologies Meet Industry (FOMI) 2022*, Tarbes, FR, [https://tsapps.nist.gov/publication/get\\_pdf.cfm?pub\\_id=935068](https://tsapps.nist.gov/publication/get_pdf.cfm?pub_id=935068)
- [11] CUBRC. white Paper—An Overview of the Common Core Ontologies, 2019.
- [12] "IEEE 3195-11025," IEEE Standards. [Online]. Available: <https://standards.ieee.org/ieee/3195/11025/>.
- [13] Comments for INCITS SubGroup on MLO CCO · Wiki · cco / CommonCoreOntologies · GitLab. (2020, December 18). GitLab. <https://opensource.ieee.org/cco/CommonCoreOntologies/-/wikis/Comments-for-INCITS-SubGroup-on-MLO-CCO>
- [14] Donohue, Brian et al. "A common core-based cyber ontology in support of cross-domain situational awareness." *Defense + Security* (2018).
- [15] Otte J, Beverley J, Ruttenberg A. BFO: Basic Formal Ontology. *Applied Ontology*. 2022. 17(1):17-43.
- [16] Keet, C.M. (2018). *An Introduction to Ontology Engineering*, ch. 7.
- [17] Beverley, J., et. al. (2023). *The Occupation Ontology (OccO): Building a Bridge between Global Occupational Standards*. Proceedings International Workshop on Ontologies for Services and Society, July 17–20, 2023, Sherbrooke, Canada
- [18] "Standard Occupational Classification." UK National Statistics, Accessed 6 June 2023, <https://www.ons.gov.uk/methodology/classificationsandstandards/standardoccupationalclassificationosc>
- [19] "What is ESCO?" The European Skills, Competences, Qualifications, and Occupations of the European Union, Accessed 6 June 2023, <https://esco.ec.europa.eu/en/about-esco/what-esco>.
- [20] De Colle, Giacomo, et. al. *Ontology Development Strategies and the Infectious Disease Ontology Ecosystem*. Proceedings of the International Conference on Biomedical Ontologies 2023.
- [21] CUBRC. white Paper—Best Practices of Ontology Development, 2016.
- [22] Neuhaus, Fabian. "What is an Ontology?" *ArXiv* abs/1810.09171 (2018): pg. 18.
- [23] ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 32 Data management and interchange. ISO/IEC 24707:2007. <https://www.iso.org/standard/39175.html>. Accessed 19 Feb. 2023.
- [24] Motik, Boris, et al. "OWL 2 Web Ontology Language: Structural Specification and Functional-Style Syntax." W3C Recommendation, vol. 27, no. 65, 2009, p. 159.
- [25] Grüninger, Michael et al. "Ontology Verification with Repositories." *Formal Ontology in Information Systems* (2010).

- [26] Nicola Guarino, et. al.. What is an ontology? In Handbook on ontologies, pages 1–17. Springer, 2009
- [27] Allen, James F.. “Maintaining knowledge about temporal intervals.” *Commun. ACM* 26 (1983): 832-843.
- [28] Smith, B., et. al. The OBO Foundry: Coordinated evolution of ontologies to support biomedical data integration. *Nature Biotechnology*, 2007, 25(11), 1251–1255. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nbt1346>
- [29] Babcock S, Beverley J, Cowell LG, Smith B. (2021) The Infectious Disease Ontology in the age of COVID-19. *J Biomed Semantics*. 12(1). doi: 10.1186/s13326-021-00245-1.
- [30] Smith, Barry; Ceusters, Werner. (2015). “Aboutness: Towards Foundations for the Information Artifact Ontology”. In *Proceedings of the Sixth International Conference on Biomedical Ontology (ICBO)*.
- [31] Niles, I., & Terry, A., The MILO: A General-purpose, Mid-level Ontology, Proceedings of the International Conference on Information and Knowledge Engineering, 2004.
- [32] Lin Y, Xiang Z, He Y. (2011) Brucellosis ontology (IDOBRO) as an extension of the infectious disease ontology. *J Biomed Semant*. doi: 10.1186/2041-1480-2-9.
- [33] Luciano J, Schriml L, Squires B, Scheuermann R. (2008) The Influenza Infectious Disease Ontology (I-IDO). The 11th Annual Bio-Ontologies Meeting, ISMB.
- [34] He Y, et al. (2022) A comprehensive update on CIDO: the community-based coronavirus infectious disease ontology. *J Biomed Semantics*. 13(1):25. doi: 10.1186/s13326-022-00279-z.
- [35] Beverley J, et. al. Coordinating virus research: The Virus Infectious Disease Ontology. *PLoS One*. 2024 Jan 18;19(1):e0285093. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0285093. PMID: 38236918; PMCID: PMC10796065.
- [36] "Credential Transparency Description Language (CTDL) Handbook." Credential Engine, Accessed 6 June 2023, <https://credreg.net/ctdl/handbook#credential>.
- [37] Smith, B. *et al.* The OBO Foundry: coordinated evolution of ontologies to support biomedical data integration. *Nat Biotechnol* 25, 1251–1255 (2007). <https://doi.org/10.1038/nbt1346>
- [38] Supply Chain Reference Ontology (SCRO). Beta Release. Industrial Ontologies Foundry. <https://github.com/iofoundry/ontology/blob/master/supplychain/README.md>
- [39] Immaterial entity. 2012. Issue #21. BFO-ontology/BFO. GitHub. <https://github.com/BFO-ontology/BFO/issues/21>
- [40] Brinkman, R. et. al. 2010. Modeling biomedical experimental processes with OBI. *Journal of Biomedical Semantics*, 1(S1), S7. <https://doi.org/10.1186/2041-1480-1-S1-S7>
- [41] OBO Foundry. (n.d.) Core Ontology for Biology and Biomedicine (COB). GitHub. Available at: <https://github.com/OBOFoundry/COB>.
- [42] Fox Mark S., et. al. An Organization Ontology for Enterprise Modelling, Accessed 3/1/2024, <http://www.eil.utoronto.ca/wp-content/uploads/enterprise-modelling/papers/org-prietula-23aug97.pdf>
- [43] Buffalo Toronto Ontology Alliance (BoaT) - Collaborative Ontology Initiative. (n.d.). *Urbandatacentre.com*. Retrieved March 4, 2024, from <https://urbandatacentre.com/boat>