



Inria

MLW-LT and Representation Formats: Suggestions.

Maxime Lefrançois
Maxime.Lefrancois@inria.fr

Inria – wimmics
inria.fr – wimmics.inria.fr



Ph.D. student Explanatory Combinatorial Lexicology¹ and the Semantic Web

Maxime Lefrançois
Maxime.Lefrancois@inria.fr

Inria – wimmics
inria.fr – wimmics.inria.fr

¹: <http://olst.ling.umontreal.ca/pdf/ECD.pdf>



Outline

1. “Dropping RDFa as a requirement”
2. CURIEs
3. Provenance – XG
4. HTML: local vs. global ITS annotations ?
5. Publication of schemas and vocabularies for ITS 2.0

”Dropping RDFa as a requirement ?”

1. RELATED ISSUE-18

answer: NO, it's in the charter

<https://www.w3.org/International/multilingualweb/lt/track/issues/18>

ITS and RDF - RDFa

Core issues:

ITS and RDF seem conceptually incompatible,

ITS 1.0: one annotates *à-priori* fragments of text

in RDF literals can't be subject of a triple

Different conceptualizations !

Suggestion for ITS 2.0

by Sebastian Hellmann:

use the NIF String ontology¹ elements for mapping ITS 2.0 Data Models to RDF

¹: <http://nlp2rdf.lod2.eu>

ITS and RDF - RDFa

The `str:String` Class - NIF recipes

For any text file (HTML -> source code)

Offset-based URIs

`doc.html#offset_14406_14418_Semantic%20Web`

Context-Hash-based URIs

`doc.html#hash_4_12_79edde636fac847c006605f82d4c5c4d_Semantic%20Web`

For XML documents

XPointer based URIs

In the future NIF 2.0 ?

example: `Dublin is a great city`:

`doc.html#xpointer(string-range(id("myId"), "", 1, 7)[1])` -> this « Dublin » string in doc.html

`doc.html#xpointer(string-range(//, "Dublin", 1, 7))` -> every « Dublin » string in doc.html

ITS and RDF - RDFa

	NIF Recipe: offset http://ex.org#offset ...	NIF Recipe: hash http://ex.org#hash ...	http://ex.org r http://ex.org#hash ...	CSS selector myId	XPath 1.0 1/2/3	XPath 2.0	XPointer 1.0 ex.org#xpointer(...)
Ranges in HTML source	one ~	?					
Elements	/	/	one ~	list of ~	list of ~	list of ~	list of ~
Attributes	/	/			list of ~	list of ~	list of ~
Ranges in DOM	/	/				?	list of ~
Valid URI							2

ITS and RDF - RDFa

	NIF Recipe: offset http://ex.org#offset ...	NIF Recipe: hash http://ex.org#hash ...	http://ex.org r http://ex.org#myId	CSS selector 1/2/3	XPath 1.0	XPath 2.0	XPointer 1.0 ex.org#xpointer(...)
Ranges in HTML source	one ~	?					
Elements	/	/	one ~	list of ~	list of ~	list of ~	list of ~
Attributes	/	/			list of ~	list of ~	list of ~
Ranges in DOM	/	/				?	list of ~
Valid URI							2



reduces verbosity (get rid of lots of spans)
but ITS annotations for range can't be added inline

ITS and RDF - RDFa

	NIF Recipe: offset http://ex.org#offset ...	NIF Recipe: hash http://ex.org#hash ...	http://ex.org r http://ex.org#myId	CSS selector 1/2/3	XPath 1.0	XPath 2.0	XPointer 1.0 ex.org#xpointer(...)
Ranges in HTML source	one ~	?					
Elements	/	/	one ~	list of ~	list of ~	list of ~	list of ~
Attributes	/	/			list of ~	list of ~	list of ~
Ranges in DOM	/	/				?	list of ~
Valid URI							2

XPointer 1.0:

small extension to XPath but hard to implement ?

<http://www.w3.org/XML/2002/10/LinkingImplementations.html>

²: For a XPointer to be a valid URI, characters [] / ? # @ need to be escaped

<http://www.w3.org/TR/xptr-framework/#escapingModel>

ITS and RDF - RDFa

Suggestion for ITS 2.0

1. use **XPointer 1.0** in selector attribute, and in new attributes
2. "the resulting locations **MUST** be either element node or attribute node or range nodes." (c.f. ITS 1.0 REC.)
3. "ITS 2.0 implementations **MUST** implement **XPointer**" (may use NIF's ?)
4. use `str:StringSet` and `str:String` in the mappings to RDFa

Suggestion of requirement for NIF 2.0

introduce **str:StringSet** for the class of a XPointer URI evaluation
+ other requirements to be discussed

Still one big issue with RDF / RDFa

How to deal with attribute inheritance / overriding ?

2. CURIES: USE URIS WITH LESS VERBOSITY

CURIEs: use URIs with less verbosity

CURIE¹ = 'compact URI' expressions (e.g., rdfs:label)

Suggestion for ITS 2.0

reuse these interesting features of RDFa : **@vocab** , **@prefix**, **CURIE Datatype**



limit the verbosity of a (X)HTML + ITS 2.0 document
ease the transformation to RDFa.

Example:

less verbose, e.g.:

- one/multiple XPointers in a single `@its-selector` for a global rule
- no need for `@its-terminology`, just use CURIE(s) in `@its-conceptReference`
- ... e.g., `its-conceptReference="ex:SemanticWeb"`

¹: http://www.w3.org/TR/rdfa-core/#s_curies

DRAW OUR INSPIRATION FROM THE PROVENANCE – XG

Draw our inspiration from the Provenance – XG

PROV Data Model¹:

PROV-XML, an XML schema for the PROV data model

PROV-O, the PROV ontology, an OWL-RL ontology allowing the mapping of PROV to RDF

+ other...

Suggestion for ITS 2.0 : multiple facets

1. **ITS Data Model**: "Conceptual, prose definitions of data categories"

2. **ITS-XML**, an XML schema for the PROV data model

Global rule = `its:Rule` element with `@selector="<a XPointer>"`

3. **ITS-O**, the ITS ontology allowing the mapping of ITS to RDF

Global rules = simple `its:*` properties on `<a XPointer>` `rdf:type its:Rule`

4. **ITS-HTML**,

`@its-*` attributes on elements

5. **ITS-HTML-RDFa**, `its:*` properties that can be used in a HTML document.

6. **ITS-HTML-Microdata**, nested groups of name-value pairs that can be added to a HTML doc.

for 4., 5., 6., XML or RDF companion document to store :

global rules, annotations, older versions, annotations that don't fit in the HTML...

¹: <http://www.w3.org/TR/prov-dm>

Draw our inspiration from the Provenance – XG

PROV Data Model¹:

Agents lead Activities on Entities

in MLW-LT:

Translators lead LT-activities on fragments of text

Suggestion for ITS 2.0

Extend the Provenance Data Model

⇒ 7th facet:

7. ITS-PROV-Mapping, a mapping from ITS Data Model to PROV Data Model

¹: <http://www.w3.org/TR/prov-dm>

Draw our inspiration from the Provenance – XG

PROV Data Model¹:

Agents lead Activities on Entities

in MLW-LT:

Translators lead LT-activities on fragments of text

Suggestion for ITS 2.0

Re-read users, activities, ... in terms of Provenance Entities, Activities, Agents

Agents	Activities	Entities
prov:Organization <i>ex:myLSP, ...</i>	its:HumanTranslation ?	its:QAResult <i>informations on a QA</i>
prov:Person <i>ex:John, ...</i>	its:MachineTranslation ?	str:String* ? <i>a document, a span ...</i>
prov:SoftwareAgent <i>ex:BingTranslator102</i>	its:QualityAssessment	

subClasses
instances

¹: <http://www.w3.org/TR/prov-dm>

Draw our inspiration from the Provenance – XG

PROV Data Model¹:

Agents lead Activities on Entities

in MLW-LT:

Translators lead LT-activities on fragments of text

Table 3: PROV-DM Relations At a Glance¹

	Entity	Activity	Agent	Note
Entity	<u>wasDerivedFrom</u> <u>wasRevisionOf</u> [redacted] <u>hadOriginalSource</u> [redacted]	<u>wasGeneratedBy</u> [redacted]	<u>wasAttributedTo</u>	<u>hasAnnotation</u>
Activity	[redacted]	<u>wasStartedByActivity</u> <u>wasInformedBy</u>	<u>wasAssociatedWith</u>	<u>hasAnnotation</u>
Agent			[redacted]	<u>hasAnnotation</u>
Note				<u>hasAnnotation</u>

Suggestion for ITS 2.0

Introduce our relations and annotations

¹: <http://www.w3.org/TR/prov-dm/#data-model-components>

RESTRICT LOCAL ITS ANNOTATIONS FOR HTML

Restrict local ITS annotations for HTML

3 combined Issues for local HTML annotations

1. Can't express complex set of ITS attributes: (can't introduce `its-*` element, attributes)
2. Can't annotate inline `str:String` that are not DOM elements (NIF Recepte: XPointer)
3. DOM elements are `str:String`, not Activities (QAResults, ...), Agents (SoftwareAgent, ...), ...

Suggestion for ITS 2.0

in HTML, restrict local ITS annotations to only a subset of ITS data categories: those that apply directly on DOM elements `str:String` entities.

Other annotations must be made global.

Restrict local ITS annotations for HTML

Suggestion for ITS 2.0

Possible solutions to make annotations global: as simple as for javascript

1. write directly ITS-XML or ITS-RDF in a `script` element under the `head` element
2. link to a ITS-XML or ITS-RDF companion ITS file through a `link` element under the `head` element



=> Keep the HTML facet of the recommendation very light

<http://www.w3.org/TR/html-markup/script.html>

<http://www.w3.org/TR/html-markup/link.html>

<http://lists.w3.org/Archives/Public/public-rdf-comments/2012Jun/0007.html>

PUBLICATION OF SCHEMAS AND VOCABULARIES

Publication of schemas and vocabularies: Content negotiation



recommendation: <http://www.w3.org/TR/skos-reference/>
namespace : <http://www.w3.org/2004/02/skos/core>

Look at HTTP requests/responses for SKOS namespace

<http://www.w3.org/2004/02/skos/core>

"HTTP 303 See other" to <http://www.w3.org/2009/08/skos-reference/skos>

+ content negotiation:

<http://www.w3.org/2004/02/skos/core.html>

- human readable description of vocab

<http://www.w3.org/2004/02/skos/core.rdf>

- application/rdf+xml description of vocab

Publication of schemas and vocabularies: Content negotiation

Suggestion for ITS 2.0

use the same ITS 1.0 namespace + redirection + content negotiation

ITS 2.0 recommendation: <http://www.w3.org/TR/skos-reference/>

ITS 2.0 namespace : <http://www.w3.org/2005/11/its>

1. "HTTP 303 See other" to <http://www.w3.org/TR/its-2.0/its>
2. "HTTP 301 Moved Permanently" to:

human readable description of the data model

<http://www.w3.org/TR/its-2.0/its.html> (when HTTP accept:text/html)

application/rdf+xml description of the schema

<http://www.w3.org/TR/its-2.0/its.rdf> (default otherwise)

<http://www.w3.org/TR/its-2.0/its.n3> text/n3

<http://www.w3.org/TR/its-2.0/its.ttl> text/turtle

non-normative description of XML based ITS 2.0

<http://www.w3.org/TR/its-2.0/its.dtd> DTD

<http://www.w3.org/TR/its-2.0/its.xsd> XSD

Recap of suggestions for ITS 2.0

Make extensive use of **XPointer**, **NIF** String ontology, **CURIEs**

Re-read users, activities, data categories
in terms of **Provenance** Entities, Activities, Agents, relations.

For HTML

Define what data-categories can be kept local on the HTML elements,
Define what data-categories must be defined globally, in `script` or `link`

Clearly separate facets of the recommendation (stubs in the wiki)

Publication of schemas and vocabularies: redirection + content negotiation



Inria

MLW-LT and Representation Formats: Suggestions.

Maxime Lefrançois
maxime.lefrancois@inria.fr

INRIA – WIMMICS
inria.fr – wimmics.inria.fr