Word count: 1589

Case Study Review.

Part 1. Discuss the ontology development approaches described in the paper.

During this review, two ontology development approaches were identified: consulting domain experts and referencing knowledge bases (Malik et al., 2015).
A comprehensive analysis was conducted, revealing their respective strengths and weaknesses.

Consulting Domain Experts:

This approach encompasses soliciting insights from subject matter experts known for their profound expertise of knowledge, and it presents multiple advantages. It ensures a well-informed and highly accurate ontology, thanks to the expertise of these experts who provide precise definitions, establish relationships, and offer valuable context. This results in the creation of a semantically accurate ontology. Expert involvement tailors the ontology to domain requirements, making it more relevant and useful, while ongoing validation and refinement ensure alignment with real-world knowledge (Norris et al., 2021).

However, drawbacks exist. The availability of domain experts can pose challenges, causing delays in the ontology development process. Solely relying on experts may introduce bias, limiting applicability. Expert consultation can be costly, especially with multiple experts. They may lack information or have differing opinions, causing potential gaps or conflicts in the ontology (Norris et al., 2021; Vigo et al., 2014).

Referring to Relevant Knowledge Bases:

The second approach involves utilising existing knowledge bases as sources of information for ontology development. This offers distinct advantages. Knowledge bases contain extensive data, expediting ontology creation and reducing the risk of errors or inconsistencies. This approach is often cost-efficient compared to consulting experts (Solanki, 2019).

Nonetheless, this approach has limitations. Not all information in knowledge bases may be directly applicable, potentially introducing irrelevant elements. Relying on existing data may limit customization and adaptability to specific domain requirements. The quality and accuracy of information can vary, potentially leading to errors. Knowledge bases may not cover all aspects of a domain, requiring manual gap-filling efforts (Solanki, 2019).

In practice, a hybrid approach combines consulting domain experts and referencing knowledge bases, leveraging strengths for expert validation and customization while expediting ontology development (Malik et al., 2015). The choice between these two approaches, or their combination, depends on factors like project objectives, resources, and domain complexity.

It is essential to note that the methodology adopted for this research involves combining knowledge and expert advice from these two approaches. This combination serves as the basis for extracting and implementing data using a structured seven-step process, which will be explored in greater depth in Part 4. These steps collectively form the framework through which the insights and knowledge derived from the two aforementioned approaches are operationalized to construct a robust and comprehensive ontology.

Part 2. Identify two application areas where these approaches can be applied.

As the paper's (Malik et al., 2015) domain is agriculture, the first application area is Livestock Farming (Hashem et al., 2020), directly related to agriculture. The second area, called Professions (ilo.org, 2020), is more versatile and can be adapted for agriculture or other domains.

Part 3. Discuss the business context and need for ontology of the application areas.

A. Livestock Farming.

The significance of ontologies in the Livestock Farming application area within agriculture is evident due to its complex challenges, including diverse animal species, extensive data integration, and supply chain management (Hashem et al., 2020; lpelc.org, 2023). Ontologies offer structured knowledge representation to address these challenges effectively.

Business Context:

- **Complexity:** Livestock farming involves diverse animals with specific nutrition, health, and breeding requirements (lpelc.org, 2023), necessitating structured knowledge representation.
- **Data Integration:** Efficiently managing data like animal health records and feeding schedules is crucial for informed decision-making.
- **Supply Chain:** Tracking and ensuring quality in the extensive livestock supply chain is vital, complying with regulatory standards.
- **Health Management:** Disease tracking and vaccination management are top priorities, requiring ontological support.
- **Breed Management:** Managing and documenting distinct livestock breeds demands detailed classification.

Need for Ontologies:

- **Knowledge Representation:** Ontologies structure knowledge about livestock, defining classes, characteristics, and relationships.
- **Data Integration:** They integrate data from various sources, enabling analytics and decision support.

- **Semantic Interoperability:** Ontologies ensure consistent data interpretation among stakeholders like farmers, veterinarians, and regulators.

- **Disease Surveillance:** Disease ontologies aid in tracking outbreaks, identifying symptoms, and recommending control measures.

- **Genomic Information:** Ontologies manage genomic data for breeding and genetic improvement.

- **Supply Chain Traceability:** Tracking livestock products from farm to fork ensures food safety and rapid response to incidents.

- **Decision Support:** Ontologies enable data-driven recommendations for breeding, feeding, and disease management.

- **Regulatory Compliance:** They help farms and regulators ensure compliance with industry standards.

In summary, ontologies are invaluable tools in Livestock Farming (lpelc.org, 2023). They offer a unified framework for knowledge representation, data integration, and informed decision-making across the livestock supply chain. This enhances the efficiency, productivity, and sustainability of livestock farming businesses (Hashem et al., 2020).

B. Professions (in Agriculture).

Applying ontology in Professions within Agriculture (prospects.ac.uk, 2022; ilo.org, 2020) is profoundly significant for addressing workforce dynamics. It serves as a powerful tool to bridge the gap between non-agricultural professionals and the intricacies of the agriculture sector.

Business Context:

- **Changing Workforce Dynamics:** Agriculture is evolving, requiring a skilled workforce adept in modern farming techniques, technology, and sustainability practices.

- **Cross-Sector Skill Transfer:** Individuals from non-agricultural backgrounds may seek roles in agriculture due to job availability, economic shifts, or personal interests.

- **Skill Gap Identification:** Businesses and educational institutions must identify the skills needed for individuals from other professions to excel in agricultural roles.

- **Resource Optimization:** Efficiently retraining individuals from diverse backgrounds can bridge labour gaps, optimising resource usage and enhancing food production.

Need for Ontology:

- **Skills Standardisation:** An ontology for "Professions" can standardise required skills, benefiting job seekers and employers.

- **Curriculum Development:** Educational institutions can use the ontology to design targeted training programs aligned with agricultural profession requirements.

- **Skill Assessment and Certification:** The ontology can support skill assessment, identify knowledge gaps, and validate acquired skills through certifications.

- **Job Matching:** Job seekers transitioning to agriculture can use the ontology to match their skills with available positions, facilitating smoother career transitions.

- **Policy Development:** Governments and industry bodies can leverage the ontology to inform workforce development and skill enhancement policies in agriculture.

Essentially, ontology bridges diverse professionals with agriculture's dynamic landscape, providing a structured pathway for contributions. It fosters a diverse, adaptable workforce, addressing labour shortages, optimizing resource use, and promoting agriculture industry sustainability and growth.

Part 4. Discuss how you will adapt the approaches described to ensure it works in your application area.

Adapting the ontology (Noy & Mcguinness, 2001) development approaches described in the paper (Malik et al., 2015) for the specific application areas of Livestock Farming (Hashem et al., 2020) and Professions (prospects.ac.uk, 2022) (in Agriculture) (ilo.org, 2020) requires customization to suit the unique requirements and challenges of each domain. The following section outlines how these approaches can be tailored for each respective area.

For Livestock Farming:

1. **Determine the domain and scope of the ontology:** Clearly define the scope of the ontology (Noy & Mcguinness, 2001) within Livestock Farming, encompassing aspects like animal species, breeds, health, nutrition, and supply chains.

2. **Consider reusing existing ontologies:** Explore and make use of relevant ontologies to streamline development efforts (e.g., OLS Ontology (Joret et al., 2013)).

3. **Enumerate important terms in the ontology:** Identify and compile essential terms, such as "breed", "nutrition", and "health record".

4. **Define the classes and the class hierarchy:** Create classes for different animal species, breeds, and categories (e.g., dairy cattle, broilers, piglets). Establish a hierarchy that reflects relationships between these classes, such as "is a" relationships between breeds and species.

5. **Define the properties of classes (slots):** Provide detailed descriptions of class properties (Noy & Mcguinness, 2001), specifying attributes like "weight" and "vaccination schedule."

6. **Define the facets of the slots:** Define facets for class properties, including units of measurement for attributes like "weight."

7. **Create Instances:** Instantiate the ontology (Noy & Mcguinness, 2001) with specific data about livestock instances, including individual animals, their health records, and supply chain events.

For Professions (in Agriculture):

1. **Determine the domain and scope of the ontology:** Articulate the domain and scope (Noy & Mcguinness, 2001), encompassing agricultural roles, required skills, educational pathways, job responsibilities.
2. **Consider reusing existing ontologies:** Investigate and adapt concepts from education and job matching ontologies to inform ontology development (e.g., The ESCO ontology (De Smedt, 2023)).

3. **Enumerate important terms in the ontology:** Compile a list of crucial terms related to agricultural professions, such as "agricultural engineer", "horticulturist", and "sustainable farming practices".

4. **Define the classes and the class hierarchy:** Create a structured hierarchy of classes (Noy & Mcguinness, 2001) for various agricultural professions (e.g., agronomist, farm manager, precision agriculture specialist) and subfields, reflecting specialisation within each field.

5. **Define the properties of classes (slots):** Define specific properties for classes (Noy & Mcguinness, 2001), outlining attributes like "required certifications", "educational background", and "years of experience".

6. **Define the facets of the slots:** Specify additional details for class properties, such as types of certifications and certifying authorities.

7. **Create Instances:** Populate the ontology with real-world data representing professionals, their qualifications, and relevant job profiles within the agricultural sector.

In both application areas, collaboration with domain experts, industry stakeholders, and educational institutions is essential to ensure the ontology aligns with current Livestock Farming and Agriculture Professions' needs and practices. Utilizing relevant knowledge bases complements expert input, integrating comprehensive information. Ongoing updates are crucial to adapt to evolving fields, resulting in a robust, adaptable ontology.

Conclusion.

In conclusion, these ontology development approaches offer valuable frameworks for enhancing knowledge representation and addressing specific challenges in agriculture-related and not related domains. By customising these approaches and methods to suit the unique requirements of each application area, successful implementation and long-term efficiency can be achieved.

References.

De Smedt, J. (2023) *The ESCO ontology.* Available from: https://ec.europa.eu/esco/lod/static/model.html [Accessed 22 September 2023].

Hashem, N. M., González-Bulnes, A., & Rodriguez-Morales, A. J. (2020) Animal Welfare and Livestock Supply Chain Sustainability Under the COVID-19 Outbreak: An Overview. *Frontiers in veterinary science,* 7, 582528.

ilo.org (2020) *Sector Skills Strategy. Agricultural Sector.* International Labour Organization. Available from: https://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/---ed_emp/---ifp_skills/documents/publication/wcms_754214.pdf [Accessed 22 September 2023].

Joret, L., Hurtaud, C., Dameron, O., Le Bail, P-Y., Vernet, J., Fatet, A., Meunier-Salaün, M-C., Reichstadt, M., Nédellec, C., Bugeon, J., and Hue, I. (2013) *Animal Trait Ontology for Livestock*. Available from: https://www.ebi.ac.uk/ols/ontologies/atol [Accessed 22 September 2023].

lpelc.org (2023) Beginning Farmer and Rancher Stewardship Resources. Available from: https://lpelc.org/beginning-farmer-and-rancher-stewardship-resources/ [Accessed 21 September 2023].

Malik, N., Sharan, A. & Hijam, D. (2015) Ontology development for agriculture domain. *In 2015 2nd International Conference on Computing for Sustainable Global Development (INDIACom)* (pp. 738-742).

Norris, E., Hastings, J., Marques, M. M., Mutlu, A. N. F., Zink, S., & Michie, S. (2021) Why and how to engage expert stakeholders in ontology development: insights from social and behavioural sciences. *Journal of biomedical semantics*, *12*(1), 4.

Noy, N. & Mcguinness, D. (2001) Ontology Development 101: A Guide to Creating Your First Ontology. Knowledge Systems Laboratory. 32.

Prospects.ac.uk (2022) Agriculture. Available from: https://www.prospects.ac.uk/careers-advice/what-can-i-do-with-my-degree/agriculture [Accessed 23 September 2023].

Solanki, A. (2019) *An Introduction to Knowledge Engineering*.

Vigo, M., Bail, S., Jay, C., & Stevens, R. (2014) Overcoming the pitfalls of ontology authoring: Strategies and implications for tool design. *International Journal of Human-Computer Studies*, *12*, 72.