

- How catholic should we try to be?
- UCUM treats angle as a dimension; SI does not.
- Should we *take a stance* on disagreements like this, or *rise above them* and express both options?

- IKL used *name-conversion axioms* to relate names to 'frameworks' (organized systems or conventions of use, externally defined vocabularies). We can re-use this.
- e.g.
(= 'SI+dimension' (frameworkName UCUM 'dimension'))
- This relies on CLIF ability to quantify over quoted names. Other formalisms may need to rely on text-based conventions, eg XML namespaces.
- Typical usage in OWL/RDF would use an XML QName prefix:
 ucum:dimension
which is an abbreviation for something like
 <http://aurora.regenstrief.org/~ucum/ucum/vocab#dimension>

- We have already made alterations to eg the VIM model. How much latitude do we wish to take with existing models?
I suggest being *conservative* with regard to conceptual changes (eg splitting concepts) but *liberal* with regard to including options (SI, UCUM, Rockwell hardness, Tare weight,...), and incorporating *mappings* wherever possible. (SI dimensions map into UCUM dimensions)