

Taxonomy of KOS - NKOS Circa 2000

1. Term lists - flat lists
 - Authority files
 - Glossaries
 - Gazetteers
 - Dictionaries
 - controlled pick list
2. Classification and categorizations
3. relationship groups
 - Thesauri
 - Semantic
4. Ontologies
 - complex relationship models with rules and axioms

[Change to Doug's slide set]

the KOS spectra: a tentative typology of Knowledge Organization Systems.

D. Soergel 2001 Characteristics for describing and evaluating KOS

- purpose
- coverage
- terminology analysis
- index language
- access and display
- updating.

Sue Ellen Wright ISKO 2006 keynote

Knowledge representation resources with a wonderful map of the resources

Factors governing types of KOS

- Subject heading
- Concepts as terms
- high coordination
- relationships
- done by a domain of interest

KOS Map

to KOS dimensions map

- intrinsic
 - essential
 - structural
 - standardization
- accidental
- extrinsic

Structural is just one element of the type

There are hybrid KOS nowadays

- having a good set of metadata will help in describing these things

[Doug second slide set

terminology registries]

Task to describe metadata and the current efforts

choice to see what the different options are for using the registries

KOS resource as a whole? Pointing to the contents or holding the

creator of work for each edition
New expression
one work
all editions grouped
relationships between expressions
Many expressions: editions, translations, adaptations
Need to be distinguished or we have a pike - a mess

Option B

graphic of the options
ddc
ddc 21 original
DDC 22 Original
online edition
printed edition
DDC 22 - German
ddc\outline - German
Provide as three levels perhaps
Work
Expression
Manifestation

Maja leans to this model rather than option A

For translations

The same as any text resources
new expression linked to the source expressions
translator as creator of expression
one more...

Adaptations

is it necessary to identify the segment modified?
links to the originating expressions
Express as a partial relationship as needed.

Subsets

partial relationships
21st edition
22 editions
German translation of 22nd edition
.....

All of these thoughts should apply to all KOS

Reaction by Joan Mitchell. All of these are related to the original. All translations are inter-operable and localized only by examples. They are the same and Swiss used the DDC in five levels as the catalog for their National Library

A GENERAL DOMAIN MODEL

Connecting to agent
HasAffiliation / AffiliatedWith
IsSupportedBy / SupportsCreatedBy/creates

What is the problem which needs to be solved?

KOS could be reused and repurposed and shared if they could be discovered.

Discovery, reuse and repurpose the KOS that exist so that we can speed the process or discovery of the collections that are subject metatagged and not available. So to get at more information and cross walk collections.

classify data collection. have to be able to go out manipulate, find the formats, the data is in how big how deep

Bridge to the data registers versus KOS and terminology registries resource levels for KOS's

Want to be sure there is interoperability between the KOS

In naming triples for the Z39.19 there can be confidence that the same relationship is stated consistently across many KOS but using SKOS that is not the same. We can not be sure that the same is true in trying to map various SKOS KOS. An altLabel may not always be there same

Human evaluation component is also needed

Next Steps

Get additional use cases

Get samples of use cases as examples so that we can use that to write up our case

Write the functional requirements

- use Margie's models

- use Maja's models

Will continue or meeting after the standards committee meeting at the ASIST Meeting to decide on task assignments and time line.

Oct. 24, 2010. 6:00 pm to 6:45 pm. During ASIST Annual Meeting, after Standards Committee meeting

Task Group members: Marjie Hlava, Traugott Koch, Maja Zumer, Gail Hodge, Marcia Zeng

Other participants: Athena Salaba, Phillip Meyer, Joe Tennis, Mark Needleman, two others

Major problems to solve: how to find KOS - Discovery options.

A way to define or describe a KOS

A way to consistently describe a KOS

KOS taxonomy . How to handle it? Any more to add

Enhance the list from NKOS and NISO Z39.19 and add Concept Map

terminologies - for translation - or as used by ISO 37 or.....

1. Defining the functional requirements:

Use cases can be identified, (mostly related to directories and registries)

1. Registry like TRSS / JISC and TaxoBank

2. HTML Metatags

3. For ingesting systems for linked dictionaries registry of the KOS used in building the metadata registry. Way to refer from the one registry
4. Cross referencing registries or individual KOS.
5. Catalog of KOS resources
6. Directory of KOS like Taxonomy Warehouse tells about it
7. OCLC registry is a term registry and maintains the relationships

Needs to be broad enough that other people can broaden in the future. Be sure that it is broad enough but formal and clear.

We could put out a call to SLA Taxonomy Division, to the NKOS list. For use cases.

These would be biased to implementation cases. Not many implementations now so we need to discuss and make some user scenarios that people could add to and expand on.

Get member generated use cases and then get broader scenarios for the future.

The registries we have identified. Use those first
what was the use case for building each of them?

Might surface functional requirements for each. What was the purpose, formulation of the requirements, divide it up and suggest broader applications.

There might be documents and suggestions for each.

Doug Tudhope TRSS report - section 5 has some use cases.

Z39.19 survey.

SKOS use cases six of them

We could review them all and see what might be useful

Linked data use cases - ISO 3 is related to vocabularies, one to the registry

Start from these sources and see what there is.

Outline of what we need to do:

Find use cases

Define requirements.

Develop our own vocabulary

Joe Tennis - perhaps has a model of the work we need to do. Useful in the Metadata area for the registries. Taxonomies are frequently single dimensional but now we can look at it from many views. Scope it. Make it simple needs to be a hook or handle, what is in and what is out. Could just use a pick list for our work

Functional requirement Model

SWAP as an example - Scholarly Work Application Profile.

<http://dublincore.org/usage/reviews/2009/swap/>

Simple model

Image model excludes the manifestation

W3C requirements style

collection description application profile.

Joe T. has review criteria for the applications board

Library Application profile. - Marcia thinks we should not use this one. Our case is closer to describing Gov Doc or SWAP. Clear goals of description. This one is for the community using DC to catalog instead of MARC. Should we do something more like a resource type?

What level FRBR might be a good example for us.

http://nkos.slis.kent.edu/FRSAR/DC2010_FRBR4APDomainModel.pdf

The problem with KOS is that they are never finished - not a spot in time - continue to evolve.

Who are the use cases - who is going to use this?

Who is the consumer of the application profile?

Who are the users of the applications built following the application profile?

Build an application profile for describing KOS

Functional requirements for the application profile.

List of required metadata

minimal set of metadata

optional additional metadata

Describing collections and describing KOS are very similar.

Guide people on how to published the recommended data for each type of KOS

If Classification systems are xxx

then how are these maintained.

what are the elements for each?