The European Media Wrapper Round Table-V (Amsterdam, 2010 Friday September 10th)

From Semantic to Ontology Towards the management of the KNOWLEDGE

Presented by:

Guy Maréchal on behalf of TITAN

guy.noel.marechal@gmail.com

www.titan.be



Plan of the presentation

- 1. INFORMATION versus DATA
- 2. WHY ONTOLOGY modeling?
- 3. The concepts of Upper & Dedicated ONTOLOGIES
- 4. The concept of PROFILE
- 5. AXIS-CRM: a Configuration Management ONTOLOGY



Plan of the presentation

- 1. INFORMATION versus DATA
- 2. WHY ONTOLOGY modeling?
- 3. The concepts of Upper & Dedicated ONTOLOGIES
- 4. The concept of PROFILE
- 5. AXIS-CRM: a Configuration Management ONTOLOGY



SEMANTIC versus ONTOLOGY



Information





Definitions (ISO)

INFORMATION :

The **meaning** that human assigns to **data** by means of **conventions** applied to the data

DATA

A representation of facts, concepts or instructions, in a **formalized** manner, suitable for communication, interpretation, or processing by **human** or by **automatic means**

INTEROPERABILITY in space



INTEROPERABILITY in time



"DATA" modelling



The **IT does not access** to the "formalized" manner of representing the "conventions"!

"SEMANTIC" modelling



The **IT accesses** to the "**formalized**" manner of representing the "**conventions**"!

The W3C standards for the modelling of ONTOLOGIES



Plan of the presentation

- 1. INFORMATION versus DATA
- 2. WHY ONTOLOGY modeling?
- 3. The concepts of Upper & Dedicated ONTOLOGIES
- 4. The concept of PROFILE
- 5. AXIS-CRM: a Configuration Management ONTOLOGY



Why ONTOLOGY modelling?

- 1. Linking Persons / Resources / Documents (Web-2)
- 2. Linking DATA (Web-3)
- 3. Structural navigations
- 4. Inference
- 5. Enhancements (Negentropy)
- 6. 'Unstructured' to 'Structured'
- 7. 'Active' to 'Passive' / 'Passive' to 'Active'
- 8. Structural queries
- Interoperability in 'time', 'space' and 'formats'
 ...

LINKED DATA



Plan of the presentation

- 1. INFORMATION versus DATA
- 2. WHY ONTOLOGY modeling?
- 3. The concepts of Upper & Dedicated ONTOLOGIES
- 4. The concept of **PROFILE**
- 5. AXIS-CRM: a Configuration Management ONTOLOGY



The controversial approach of the UPPER ontologies

See WIKIPEDIA: http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Upper_ontology_(computer_science)

Information science

In <u>information science</u>, an upper ontology (top-level ontology, or foundation ontology) is an <u>ontology</u> which describes very general concepts that are the same across all <u>knowledge domains</u>. The most important function of an upper ontology is to support very broad <u>semantic interoperability</u> between a large number of ontologies accessible "under" this upper ontology. As the metaphor suggests, it is usually a <u>hierarchy</u> of entities and associated rules (both <u>theorems</u> and <u>regulations</u>) that attempts to describe those general entities that do not belong to a specific problem domain.

The seemingly conflicting use of metaphors implying a solid rigorous bottom-up "foundation" or a top-down imposition of somewhat arbitrary and possibly political decisions is no accident - the field is characterized by controversy, politics, competing approaches and academic rivalry.

Philosophy

In <u>philosophy</u>, an upper ontology implies debates! It can be said that a very important part of each upper ontology can be considered as the computational implementation of <u>natural philosophy</u>, which itself is a more empirical method for investigating the topics within the philosophical discipline of <u>physical ontology</u>.

Library classification

<u>Library classification</u> systems predate these upper ontology systems. Though library classifications organize and categorize knowledge using general concepts that are the same across all knowledge domains, neither system is a replacement for the other.

The IEEE initiative

Standard Upper Ontology (SUO) is a term for a near-universal <u>upper ontology</u>. The <u>Upper Ontology Summit</u> organised in 2006 by <u>IEEE 1600.1</u> has identified the issue without clear action plan.

The controversial approach of the UPPER ontologies

A few attempts of "Upper ontologies":

- Cyc
- Basic Formal Ontology (BFO)
- DOLCE & WonderWeb
- COSMO

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Cyc

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Basic_Formal_Ontology

http://www.loa-cnr.it/Papers/D18.pdf

http://micra.com/COSMO/





The limits of the approach of the dedicated ontologies

Typical detailed DOMAIN Ontologies:

- FOAF
- EVENT
- MUSIC
- UNITS of MEASURE
- •

The controversial approach of the UPPER ontologies

CONCLUSIONS

- No single approach will fit
- The use of "Upper ontologies" means easy interoperability even if distinct
- Mapping of good ontologies on the same topics is easy
- Mapping of distinct philosophical approaches require 'Interoperability wickets'
- Management of the evolution of the ontologies is required for persistence
- Make the trade-of between "COPY" / "DERIVE" / "ABSORB / ... of existing ontologies or 'parts' of ontologies
- The W3C intends of organising a workshop in Brussels on the subject in spring 2011
- The approach by the "PROFILES" seems to offer a powerful solution.

Plan of the presentation

- 1. INFORMATION versus DATA
- 2. WHY ONTOLOGY modeling?
- 3. The concepts of Upper & Dedicated ONTOLOGIES
- 4. The concept of PROFILE
- 5. AXIS-CRM: a Configuration Management ONTOLOGY



The KEY contents of a PROFILE

- 1. An IDENTIFICATION system
- 2. A CONFIGURATION MANAGEMENT system
- 3. The ONTOLOGY expressed in a specific IT technology (for example: .owl)
- 4. The AUTHORITY LISTS
- 5. The ALIAS LISTS
- 6. The **REFERENCES** pertaining to dedicated applications
- 7. The REFERENCES to the STANDARDS not represented in the definition of the ontology

Plan of the presentation

- 1. INFORMATION versus DATA
- 2. WHY ONTOLOGY modeling?
- 3. The concepts of Upper & Dedicated ONTOLOGIES
- 4. The concept of PROFILE
- 5. AXIS-CRM: a Configuration Management ONTOLOGY



REQUIREMENTS for the Management of the Semantic models: *Representing "Knowledge" through the IT*'s

- EVERYTHING should be possible to be covered
- HUMAN can express their visions of the MEANING of things (SEMANTICS)
- ITC MACHINES can 'understand', 'process', 'retrieve', ... the semantic items (Through Intelligent Active Agents)
- Any new semantic item can be added
- The representation can go at any level of detail and accuracy
- Several representations of the same semantic item can coexist (*multiple point of views and multiple representation formats*)
- The representations can be distributed
- The representations are enabled native persistent

The key constructs of the "AXIS-CRM"



Attaching an "UPPER ONTOLOGY" to the AXIS-CRM



Accessing, Creating, Enriching, Sharing ASO's



Accessing, Creating, Enriching, Sharing ASO's



The ESE's construct



Elementary Semantic Entities

A composite concrete example:





Example of a Configuration Management View at the

Norwegian Institute of Recorded Sound (FULL view)



Definitions

SUBSTANCE :

Abstract concept designating the specific thing intended to be represented through data.

Example: The 'substance' is the information induced from several represented of the song "Yesterday" by the Beatles, coded in .wav or .mp3 or .ogg

ORTHOGONALITY :

Representations of items, however closely related, are called orthogonal, when they can be **modified independently from each other** to achieve a particular **intention**

Example: Some of the data carriers (such as USB stick; CD-R; HDD) are orthogonal with the files and folders they carry.

INTEROPERABILITY LAYERS



IT WORLD

The compatibility with the OAIS model (ISO 14 721)



EMWRT-V PROGRAMME "Let's manage the KNOWLEDGE"

09H45 - 10H00 : Welcome of the participants

10H00 – 10H20 : Opening of the EMWRT IV

Adding semantics to the AV contents: from words to interactions?

(Bruno BACHIMONT – UTC Compiègne)

10H20 – 11H10 : The dynamic relations between the logical and knowledge layers

- The semantic breakthrough in Standards ... a work in progress
 (Jean-Pierre EVAIN EBU)
- Implementation and Practical cases of DMS-1, the link with semantic technology (Maarten Verwaest MediaMap)
- A rich View in audiovisual distributed architectures

11H10 – 12H15 : The knowledge base

From semantic to ontology: towards the management of the knowledge
 The "GAMELAN" Project: Tracking the provenance to ensure interoperability

(Guy MARECHAL – TITAN) (Jerome BARTHELEMY – IRCAM)

> (Franck Casado – MEMNON) (Julien LAW-TO – Exalead)

> > (Roger ROBERTS – TITAN)

(Steny Solitude – Perfect memory)

Demonstrations of the MediaMap project

- Semantic data base & Finite State Machines & Computation farm
- The serendipity search

12H15 – 12H30 : Q & A & Conclusions

12H30 – 14H00 : Lunch

... You just need to cross the road to attend IBC-2009 when opening !