

ICAN Workshop, Copenhagen, 07-08 July 2008

Semantic Interoperability and SeaDataNet

Roy Lowry British Oceanographic Data Centre



- Plaintext used extensively to populate metadata
 - Works for humans but not intended software agents
- Some fields were populated from controlled vocabularies
- > However, the vocabularies were:
 - Poorly managed
 - Lacking in definitions
 - Abused to facilitate shoe-horning



SeaDataNet Semantic Markup

- SeaDataNet now has governed vocabularies in a managed semantic technical infrastructure (NDG Vocabulary Server)
- SeaDataNet semantics in data and metadata are represented by permanent machinereadable labels (URNs)
- SeaDataNet metadata schemas incorporate Schematron facilitating CONTENT validation against master vocabularies.



SDN Semantic Markup

An example URN is SDN:P021:21:TEMP

• Where:

- SDN = namespace identifier
- P021 = resource identifier
- 21 = resource version number
- TEMP = resource component identifier



From URN to URL

- Some simple string substitution converts this URN into something that may be found on the internet (URL)
 - http://vocab.ndg.nerc.ac.uk/ = namespace
 - term/P021 = resource
 - /21 = version
 - /TEMP = resource component identifier
- > This gives
 - <u>http://vocab.ndg.nerc.ac.uk/term/P021/21/TEMP</u>
- Which is an NDG Vocabulary Server term identifier that returns a SKOS document describing the concept and its mappings
- A SeaDataNet URN to URL translation service is planned



- This is a Semantic Web resource for the technical governance of controlled vocabularies
- Built by BODC as part of the NERC DataGrid project
- Adopted by, and being further developed for, SeaDataNet
- Fundamental entity is a concept that is represented by an identifier, a term, an abbreviation and a definition
- Concepts are organised into lists, designed to populate particular metadata elements



- Each concept has a web presence (i.e. a URL) corresponding to a dynamically generated SKOS (RDF-based) XML document
- This document delivers the concept identifiers and labels plus its mappings to other concepts
- For example, the SeaDataNet platform class category concept 'amphibious vehicle' is represented by the URL:
 - <u>http://vocab.ndg.nerc.ac.uk/term/L062/current/95</u>
- > This delivers an XML document thus....



<?xml version="1.0" ?>

<rdf:RDF xmlns:rdf="http://www.w3.org/1999/02/22-rdf-syntax-ns#" xmlns:skos="http://www.w3.org/2004/02/skos/core#" xmlns:dc="http://purl.org/dc/elements/1.1/">

<skos:Concept rdf:about="http://vocab.ndg.nerc.ac.uk/term/L062/2/95">

<skos:externalID>SDN:L062:2:95</skos:externalID>

<skos:prefLabel>amphibious vehicle</skos:prefLabel>

<skos:altLabel />

<skos:definition>A self-propelled platform capable of operating on land and within or on the surface of a water body.</skos:definition>

<dc:date>2008-02-26T14:25:51.822+0000</dc:date>

<skos:narrowMatch rdf:resource="http://vocab.ndg.nerc.ac.uk/term/L061/6/9A" /> !DUKW <skos:narrowMatch rdf:resource="http://vocab.ndg.nerc.ac.uk/term/L061/6/9B" /> !Hovercraft </skos:Concept>

</rdf:RDF>



The server has other more sophisticated access mechanisms designed to facilitate bulk access

URL access to SKOS lists (no mappings)

• HTTP-POX API (see

http://www.bodc.ac.uk/products/web_services/vocab/methods.html

SOAP API and method interface clients (see http://vocab.ndg.nerc.ac.uk/)



The server currently (2008-06-25) holds

- 112 public lists
- 122166 concepts
- 77347 mappings (RDF triples)

New content added daily

- Semantic content heavily (>200,000 hits per month) mined by robots
- Typical 'human' activity currently running at approximately 400 catalogue and 3000 list accesses per month



Limitations

- Planned to be addressed by V1.2 (funded: scheduled end 2007)
 - * RDF predicates restricted to SKOS
 - Lift restriction
 - Serve OWL for list and term URLs
 - Implement versioned list serving (V1.1 always serves current list)
 - * Label lists with governance

• Planned to be addressed by V2 (currently unfunded)

- * Upgrade to 'ontology server'
 - V1.2 OWL functionality
 - Allow mappings to concepts from other servers (currently must hold a list to map to it)



Relevance to ICAN

> Vocabulary Server

- Operational server (Alternative to MMI)
 - * My view (not necessarily shared by John Graybeal)
 - MMI strengths
 - » Metadata reference library
 - » Guides to best practice
 - » Solution developers
 - » Harnessing 'bleeding edge' technology
 - MMI weaknesses
 - » Operational aspects (e.g. synchronisation breakdowns)
 - » URLs to concepts deliver whole ontology
 - » Dependence on soft money

Rich semantic vein to be mined by ICAN

- * Developing an established list is much easier than starting from scratch!
- * SeaDataNet content governance infrastructure



Relevance to ICAN

Metadata validation technology

- Ensures only terms from master vocabulary/ontology are used in metadata documents
- Picks up typos and 'quick fix' local extensions (the bain of SeaSearch)
- Already arisen as an issue in ICAN (I recall an e-mail requesting only ontology terms be used in metadata documents)

SeaDataNet Experience

- We're bound to make mistakes in SeaDatanet
- Watch and learn from our experience!

