

SWIM-INFO-015 Out-of-scope or no correspondence

Page Table of Content

- Requirement
- Guidance
 - Out-of-scope declaration
 - No semantic correspondence declaration
 - Verification Support
 - Completeness
 - Examples

Requirement

Title	Out-of-scope and no semantic correspondence established declarations
Identifier	SWIM-INFO-015
Requirement	A semantic correspondence declaring that a concept in an information definition is out-of-scope of the AIRM or that no semantic correspondence has been established shall provide a rationale.
Rationale	An out-of-scope declaration is not verifiable without information about the rationale.
Verification	Completeness
Examples/Notes	<p><i>Note:</i> The following were used in SESAR related work as rationales for an out-of-scope declaration:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• container (e.g. XML complexTypes);• messaging (e.g. Aeronautical Fixed Telecommunication Network address);• network (e.g. datalink protocol version, IP address);• system (e.g. technical identifiers, availability flags);• non-atm (e.g. human resource related information);• local (e.g. data only making sense for on specific service instance); and• other (not covered by the other categories). <p><i>Note:</i> The declaration that no semantic correspondence has been established allows the authors of an information definition to perform the mapping exercise in an iterative manner. However, it is important that a rationale is made available to make clear why no semantic correspondence has been established.</p>
Level of Implementation	<i>Mandatory</i>

Guidance

A rationale has to be given in order to justify the use of the out-of-scope declaration and the declaration that no semantic correspondence has been established. This requirement ensures that the use of these options is verifiable.

Out-of-scope declaration

The specification contains examples of rationales for an out-of-scope declaration. Although these were developed in SESAR they are still widely applicable.



Best Practice

The list of rationales to use for an out-of-scope declaration is:

- **container**. This can be used for concepts that are merely structural elements and have no semantic value of their own
- **messaging**. This can be used when the concept contains information related to the message itself rather than the ATM information content of the message.
- **network**. This can be used when the concept contains information related to the network itself rather than the ATM information content of the message.
- **system**. This can be used when the concept contains information related to the system itself rather than the ATM information content of the message.
- **non-atm**. This can be used when the concept is not an ATM concept. For example, this could be human resource content or content concerning pricing at an airport. (This content may, of course, be covered by a separate ontology!)
- **local**. This can be used when the concept is for internal use on a specific service.
- **other**. Any other text can be added when the rationale is not covered by the other categories.



Best Practice

The option to use out-of-scope or change request may not be obvious. In this case, the best practice is to use the change request option. This will allow the AIRM change control board to consider the input and whether the AIRM's scope needs to be changed.

No semantic correspondence declaration

The use of the declaration that no semantic correspondence has been established must also be justified. The specification gives the example that it allows the mapping exercise to be done in an iterative way. Other obvious examples are when a problem in the information definition means that no mapping is obvious. It is, of course, hoped that the problem can be fixed but in many cases this is not always an easy process.



Best Practice

The list of rationales to use for a no semantic correspondence established declaration is:

- **information definition issue.** This can be used when a problem has been identified in the information definition. An example of this is when there is a missing definition and it is therefore impossible to establish a correspondence. The problem cannot be resolved during the mapping exercise and it is not clear what the outcome of the resolution will be.
- **incomplete mapping.** This can be used when the mapping exercise has not been completed. In effect, it highlights areas where the mapping exercise is still to be performed.
- **other.** Any other text can be added when the rationale is not covered by the other categories.



Best Practice

Once the issue that has prevented the establishment of the semantic correspondence has been resolved, the statement should be updated to one of the other three forms of semantic correspondence.

Verification Support

Completeness

Check that:

- Each semantic correspondence declaring that a concept in an information definition is out-of-scope of the AIRM has a rationale.
- Each semantic correspondence declaring that no semantic correspondence has been established has a rationale.

Examples

See [SWIM-INFO-014 Forms of semantic correspondence](#) for examples.