Attendees

- Pieter Pauwels [Ghent University]
- Ana Roxin [Univ. Burgundy]
- Gonçal Costa [LaSalle University]
- Georg Ferdinand Schneider [Fraunhofer IBP]
- Walter Terkaj [ITIA-CNR]
- Mads Holten Rasmussen [DTU / Niras]
- Emilio Sanfilippo (LS2N, ECN Nantes-CNRS)
- Georgios Lilis [TUC]
- Kyriakos Katsigarakis [TUC]
- Richard Pinka [CTU-Prague]
- Maxime Lefrancois [MINES Saint-Étienne]
- Michel Bohms [TNO]
- Seppo Törmä [Aalto]
- Claudio Benghi [Northumbria University]
- Anna Wagner [TU Darmstadt]
- Mathias Bonduel [KU Leuven]

Excused

- First Last [Affiliation]

Date and time

- 12/03/2018
- 16:00 CET

Agenda

Properties Ontology Subgroup [MBonduel]

Minutes

[Link to the presentation](#)

Georg: Three Levels presented give a possibility to structure the varying complexity

- Ana: I agree - if you can do the most, you can do the minimum. If we implement the most complex approach, we should be able to design mechanisms to "shrink" it down or adapt it into lower complexities ?
- Anna: I also agree, but think we should also focus on developing such mechanisms to "shrink" the data (Could also solve the problem mentioned by Claudio)

Claudio B.: Simple technical solutions might be adopted much faster and prevent the rise of competitive methods (e.g. IFC/Cobie), If designing a roadmap to set Level 3 as a goal but not push on it from the

beginning on; the industry seems not be be working somewhere near the presented level 2, this would seem like a readily implementable conversion.

Walter: Levels of complexity depend on which ontologies should be integrated.

Matthias: To align with schema.org at least level two is needed.

Maxime: Might be possible to use CDT UCUM http://w3id.org/lindt/custom_datatypes#ucum also on Level 1

Georg: As far as I see it is possible to combine schema.org and QUDT (see SOSA example: schema:unitCode qudt-unit-1-1:Percent LINK

Ana: General remark: Blank nodes are not recommend to be used in Linked Data - not necessary to expose URIs for each blank node, just keep in mind it is against the LD best practices. Using blank nodes has to be justified.

Pieter: bnodes help to avoid unnecessary data/ URIs

Pieter:
We should implement starting from Level 3, make sure we can provide "adaptations" for Level 2 and Level 1.
In relation to this, we should continue to gather use cases:
https://w3c-lbd-cg.github.io/lbd/UseCasesAndRequirements/#UseCases

Maxime: Everyone should continue to contribute to this document. Use cases should be described for each considered level of complexity (e.g. Level 1: this property belongs to this instance and has values in this range, Level 3: add some time annotation ?)

A reference to multiple annotation strategies was made (https://www.w3.org/TR/prov-o/) this is a published w3.org standard.

Any future implementation has to be supported by use cases. A use case description should be the simplest possible. Each use case has its own requirements (e.g. property versioning is not necessary for each property).

The levels discussed today should be formally described and published on the website:
https://w3c-lbd-cg.github.io/lbd/

In parallel, we could consider having a webpage such as http://www.automotive-ontology.org/ describing our different ontologies e.g. PROPS, BOT.

Regarding the classification systems and properties to be included, we suggest the following:
   -   First, the "easiest" e.g. IFC PSets as "adapted/integrated" by Maxime
   -   Second, think of international classification standards e.g. omniClass, UniClass.
   -   Third, we have to document how one can integrate/link his/her own property sets into the PROPS ontology

New "official" sub-group for the PROPS ontology:

Ana Roxin and Claudio Benghi ok to join, but not really available before the end of April.

Previous minutes

https://docs.google.com/document/d/1KGl28NvLG0w5Q7xKBnR2HiWqB1qMx_cVt_tv4mq-F9M/edit#

Reminder

All, gentle reminder for you to add use cases and requirements in this document:

https://w3c-lbd-cg.github.io/lbd/UseCasesAndRequirements/#UseCases

Next Calls

26 March 2018 (16:00 CET)