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Questions to the OOR Community and What the Answers Mean to Us

• Where will the software repository reside?
  ◦ If the repository is the same one that NCBO uses, it will be easier to integrate changes later
  ◦ NCBO will be happy to host the fork code, if needed
  ◦ NCBO is considering moving to GitHub (http://github.com/) for software repository:
    ▪ will make it easier to create personal branches and to integrate the code later
Questions (cont'd)

• What are the new **features/capabilities** that will be implemented in the OOR fork first?
  ◦ The answer will determine when and if NCBO will try to integrate the changes back into BioPortal
  ◦ NCBO is driven by its own user community and it is that community that determines what we spend our time on
  ◦ The NCBO user community may be different from the OOR user community
NCBO Short-Term Agenda

• Mappings
  ◦ migrating mapping support to the back end
  ◦ supporting a wider array of mapping REST services
• Structured notes
  ◦ expanding the features that we rolled out in the Summer
• Virtual images of BioPortal node
  ◦ making installation of BioPortal nodes easier
• Support for OWL 2
  ◦ integrating OWL API as one of the loaders
• Updates to the security framework (authentication and authorization)
  ◦ requiring valid user id for POSTs
  ◦ different levels of access to ontologies (some ontologies only available to some users)
NCBO Longer term agenda

• Migrating the backend to a triplestore
• Developing a SKOS-based model for representing ontologies
• Developing federation capabilities