

# Standards for Knowledge Graphs in the Financial Sector

Mike Bennett, Hypercube Ltd.

Ontology Summit 2020

13 May 2020



## Overview

- Finance Industry Motivations
- Industry Use Cases
- FIBO
- Styles of ontology
- ISO 20022
- Ontology Standards Usage
- Summary and Conclusions

#### Finance Industry Motivations







# Systemic Risk: What Happened?

- Firms took a long time to establish their exposures to endangered banks
- Data wasn't the problem
- Knowledge was

#### FIBO

#### **STANDARDS-BASED INFRASTRUCTURE**





#### FIBO Early Development







#### FIBO: Scope and Content

Upper Ontology			
FIBO Foundations: High level abstractions			
FIBO Financial Business and Commerce		FIBO Indices and Indicators	
FIBO Contract Ontologies			
, Equities)	Securities (Debt)		
Derivatives		Loans, Mortgage Loans	
Funds		Rights and Warrants	
	Upper C dations: H FIBO Fi Busine Comr BO Contra Equities)	Upper Ontology dations: High level al FIBO Financial Business and Commerce BO Contract Ontologi Equities) Sec Loans Righ	

FIBO Pricing and Analytics (time-sensitive concepts) Pricing, Yields, Analytics per instrument class

#### **FIBO Process**

Corporate Actions, Securities Issuance and Securitization

#### Future FIBO: Portfolios, Positions etc.

Concepts relating to individual institutions, reporting requirements

## **FIBO Ecosystem**

#### Industry Collaboration (Ecosystem)

- GitHub for collaborative coding
- JIRA for issue management
- Jenkins for automated testing
- Confluence (wiki) for audit trail

#### • BTDM Methodology (Tested)

- Built 🛛 Test 🗋 Deploy 🗋 Maintain methodology for governance
- Full end-to-end ontology (visible and navigable)
- Fully extendable for proprietary applications
- Expressed in both OWL and UML (auto-generated)
- Automated testing of machine executable FIBO







# Properties with No Domain or Range



#### Styles of ontology

## Concept Ontology







# **Application Ontology**



#### Foundational v Correspondence Ontologies

Deep classification hierarchy of types of thing in the world, with relationships and sufficient logic to disambiguate

> Self-contained classes, properties and logical statements corresponding to some set of things in the world



#### Conceptual and Operational Ontology



# Conceptual and Operational Ontology



- OWL is an application language!
- OWL plus data (Knowledge Graph) is a physical artifact
- There are real things, the definitions of which are not based on data
  - There are also (some) real things that *are* natively data (e.g. Identifiers)

#### Data Surrogates versus Real Things

- Look for signatures in data that imply the presence of real world, identifying matter
- Frame the necessary conditions for membership of a class (in a logical ontology) in terms of what would be found (true) in data when the class of thing is there
- Inference as distinct from meaning in the original sense
- From the data you can infer that a thing exists in reality
- Real meaning by definition mostly does not rely on data!

## Reference v Application Ontologies



# Reference v Application Ontologies



#### ISO 20022

#### ISO 20022 Standard Organs



#### ISO 20022 compliance at model level



#### ISO 20022 Semantics: Trade



- A trade normally leads to an obligation.
- Different types of trade create different types of obligations.



#### Details

- Map ISO 20022 metamodel to OWL/SKOS/RDF to be documented within a Technical Report
- Create an OWL/SKOS/RDF metamodel for code lists to be documented within a Technical Report
- SWIFT Standards should be able to create the transform from the ISO 20022 e-repository to the semantic version.
- The RA could then run the transform for each update to the e-repository.
- The working group and possibly a follow on study group or working group would be responsible for the evolution and functionality of the transform and the semantic version of the e-repository. The RA will not be responsible for maintenance of the transform or the artifacts generated.

# ISO 20022 Semantics

- Phase 1: OWL representation of ISO 20022 Metamodel
  - i.e. <<BusinessComponent>>, <<MessageComponent>> etc. stereotypes
- OWL Usage
  - Single format (OWL) for all meta-levels (M2 and M1)
  - Single namespace?
- Enables querying etc. across the whole space
  - Ontology of metamodel elements for ISO 20022, FIX etc. to map native message content
  - Representation of business concepts (securities, transactions etc.) for concept mapping
  - Potentially, representation of mapping relations as OWL properties
- The conceptual ontology will be a later phase of work
- Some mapping proofs of concept...

#### Ontology to Data Model

#### Mapping Considerations (1)



#### Data Model to Ontology

#### Mapping Considerations (2)



# Mapping Ontology



# Mapping Ontology

- Consider a data model with multiple prope
  - These are usually optional
  - There are a lot of them
- Ontology (of any sort) should get rid of optionality
  - Sub-classes, each with properties or restrictions saying what makes that class (of thing) what it is
- Ontology treats properties as first class citizen (they are not attached to a class)
- These properties all have narrow meanings, specific to the presence of that property on that class

Loan Borrower Loan Borrower Name Loan Borrower SSID Loan Borrower Address Line 1 ... Loan Borrower ZIP Code

#### Reasoning / Inference Processing Ontology



#### Semantic Web Applications

• Semantic Operational Processing *Reasons* over Data to Infer Classifications and Relationships



#### **Ontology Standards Usage**



#### Conclusions

- There is no 'one size fits all' style of ontology
- Different usages indicate different ontology styles
  - Data or Things
  - Deep foundational hierarchies or correspondence graphs
  - Deep property hierarchy for mapping, restrictions for reasoning
- Novel applications like AI and NLP may require further distinctions



#### **Thank You!**

Mike Bennett Hypercube Ltd – a member of the Semantic Shed www.hypercube.co.uk



**Takeaways: Financial Ontology Standards Applications** 

#### Integration



# Regulatory Reporting with Semantics

Common

ontology

#### **REPORTING ENTITY**

Common

ontology

Data is mapped from each system of record into a common ontology Reported as standardized, granular data Agnostic to changes in forms

#### **REGULATORY AUTHORITY**

Receives standardized, granular data aligned with standard ontology (FIBO)

Uses semantic queries (SPARQL) to assemble information

Changes to forms need not require reengineering by reporting entities

# Applications

#### Data-focused Ontology



and identification

David Newman, Wells Fargo



#### Virtual Data Lakes: ET and NoETL

