

A Structural Ontology Model for Change Modelling

Perrine Pittet, Christophe Cruz, Christophe Nicolle

LE2I, UMR CNRS 630, University of Burgundy - Dijon, France
{perrine.pittet@u-bourgogne.fr, christophe.cruz@u-bourgogne.fr, cnicolle@u-bourgogne.fr}

Abstract. This paper presents a complete structural ontology model suited for change modelling on $\mathcal{SHOIN}(\mathcal{D})$ ontologies. The application of this model is illustrated along the paper through the description of an ontology example inspired by the UOBM ontology benchmark and its evolution.

Keywords. $\mathcal{SHOIN}(\mathcal{D})$ Description Logic; Change Modelling, OWL DL.

1 Introduction

Ontologies make possible to application, enterprise, and community boundaries of any domain to bridge the gap of semantic heterogeneity. Ontologies development, to be correctly achieved, requires a dynamic and incremental process (Djedidi & Afaure, 2008.). It starts with a rigorous ontological analysis (Guarino, 1995) that provides a conceptualization of the domain to model agreed by the community. The ontology, specified in a formal language, approximates the intended models of the conceptualization (Gruber, 1993): the closer it is the better it is. The ontology needs to be revised and refined until an ontological commitment is found. Ulterior updates of the ontology, addressed by ontology evolution, aim at responding to changes in the domain and/or the conceptualization (Flouris, 2008). Changes are consequently inherent in the ontology life cycle. Modelling changes then implies having an exhaustive and non-ambiguous definition of the ontology model according to its language, so that each element of the ontology impacted by changes can be formally described.

This paper focuses on the $\mathcal{SHOIN}(\mathcal{D})$ level of expressivity, on which the ontological language OWL DL is based (Horrocks I. , 2005). After presenting the structural constraints of a $\mathcal{SHOIN}(\mathcal{D})$ ontology, it describes a list of basic changes, constrained by this structural model to avoid performing structural inconsistent updates on the ontology. The application of this model is illustrated along the paper through the description of an ontology example, inspired by the UOBM Ontology Benchmark for OWL DL ontologies (Li, 2006), and its evolution.

2 $\mathcal{SHOIN}(\mathcal{D})$ Ontology Model

To formalize our framework the Karlsruhe Ontology Model (Ehrig, 2004) is used and extended to cover the whole $\mathcal{SHOIN}(\mathcal{D})$ constructors. From a mathematical point of view, an ontology can be defined as a structure. Formally, a structure is a triple $A=(S,$

σ, F) consisting of an underlying set S , a signature σ , and an interpretation function F that indicates how the signature is to be interpreted on S .

Definition 1: $\mathcal{SHOIN}(\mathcal{D})$ Ontology Model.

A $\mathcal{SHOIN}(\mathcal{D})$ ontology is a structure $O=(SO, \sigma O, FO)$ consisting of:

- The underlying set SO containing:
 - Six disjoint sets $sC, sT, sR, sA, sI, sV, sK_R$ and sK_A called concepts, datatypes, relations, attributes, instances, data values, relation characteristics (among Symmetric, Functional, Inverse Functional, Transitive) and attribute characteristics (Functional),
 - Four partial orders \leq_C, \leq_T, \leq_R and \leq_A , respectively on sC called concept hierarchy or taxonomy, on sT called type hierarchy, on sR called relation hierarchy and on sA called attribute hierarchy,
 such that $SO := \{(sC, \leq_C), (sT, \leq_T), (sR, \leq_R), (sA, \leq_A), sI, sV, sK_R, sK_A\}$,
- The signature σO containing two functions $\sigma_R: sR \rightarrow sC^2$ called relation signature and $\sigma_A: sA \rightarrow sC \times sT$ called attribute signature, such that $\sigma O := \{\sigma_R, \sigma_A\}$,
- The interpretation function FO containing:
 - A function $\iota_C: sC \rightarrow 2^{sI}$ called concept instantiation,
 - A function $\iota_T: sA \rightarrow 2^{sV}$ called data type instantiation,
 - A function $\iota_R: sC \rightarrow 2^{sI \times sI}$ called relation instantiation,
 - A function $\iota_A: sC \rightarrow 2^{sI \times sV}$ called attribute instantiation,
 - A function $\kappa_R: sR \rightarrow 2^{sKR}$ called relation characterization,
 - A function $\kappa_A: sA \rightarrow 2^{sKA}$ called attribute characterization,
 - A function $\varepsilon_C: sC \rightarrow 2^{sC}$ called concept equivalence,
 - A function $\varepsilon_R: sR \rightarrow 2^{sR}$ called relation equivalence,
 - A function $\varepsilon_A: sA \rightarrow 2^{sA}$ called attribute equivalence,
 - A function $\varepsilon_I: sI \rightarrow 2^{sI}$ called instance equivalence,
 - A function $\delta_C: sC \rightarrow 2^{sC}$ called concept disjunction,
 - A function $\delta_I: sI \rightarrow 2^{sI}$ called instance differentiation,
 - A function $-_C: sC \rightarrow 2^{sC}$ called concept complement specification,
 - A function $-_R: sR \rightarrow 2^{sR}$ called relation inverse specification,
 - A function $maxCardR: sR \rightarrow N$ called relation maximal cardinality restriction,
 - A function $minCardR: sR \rightarrow N$ called relation minimal cardinality restriction,
 - A function $\sqcap_C: sC \rightarrow 2^{sC}$ called concept intersection,
 - A function $\sqcup_C: sC \rightarrow 2^{sC}$ called concept union,
 - A function $\sqcup_{iC}: sI \rightarrow 2^{sC}$ called concept union enumeration,
 - A function $\sqcup_V: sV \rightarrow 2^{sC}$ called data value union,
 - A function $\sqcap_{iC}: sC \rightarrow 2^{sI}$ called concept enumeration,
 - A function $\rho_{\exists R}: sR \rightarrow 2^{sC}$ called relation existential restriction,
 - A function $\rho_{\forall R}: sR \rightarrow 2^{sC}$ called relation universal restriction,
 - A function $\rho_R: sR \rightarrow 2^{sI}$ called relation value restriction,
 - A function $\rho_{\exists A}: sA \rightarrow 2^{sT}$ called attribute existential restriction,
 - A function $\rho_{\forall A}: sA \rightarrow 2^{sT}$ called attribute universal restriction,
 - A function $\rho_A: sA \rightarrow 2^{sV}$ called attribute value restriction,

such that $FO := \{I_C, I_T, I_R, I_A, K_R, K_A, E_C, E_R, E_A, E_I, \delta_C, \delta_b, -_C, -_R, \maxCard_R, \minCard_R, \sqcap_C, \sqcup, \sqcup_{iC}, \sqcup_V, \sqcap_{iC}, \rho_{\exists R}, \rho_{\forall R}, \rho_R, \rho_{\exists A}, \rho_{\forall A}, \rho_A\}$.

2.1 $\mathcal{SHOIN}(\mathcal{D})$ Change Modelling

To model changes, we give the five definitions below.

- **Definition 2: Change.** A change ω is the application of a modification on an ontology O , that potentially affects one or more elements of its structure as defined by the $\mathcal{SHOIN}(\mathcal{D})$ Ontology Model.
- **Definition 3: Log of Changes.** Given an ontology O a log of changes, noted log_i , is defined by an ordered set of changes (simple and complex) $\langle \omega_1, \dots, \omega_n \rangle$ that applied to O results in O .

Like in (Klein, 2004), 2 change types are distinguished: basic and complex.

- **Definition 4: Basic Change.** A basic change on an ontology O is a function $\omega_B: sK \rightarrow 2^O$ with $sK := \{sC \cup sI \cup sR \cup sA\}$ that corresponds to an addition, a removal of a modification of one element $\in O$.
- **Definition 5: Complex Change.** A complex change on an ontology O is a disjoint union of basic changes. It is a function $\omega_C: nsK \rightarrow 2^O$ such that $\omega_C := \omega_{B1} + \dots + \omega_{Bn}$.

The application of a change on an ontology, basic or complex, can be an addition or a deletion. It is traced as such in the log of changes.

- **Definition 6: Addition of a Change.** The addition of a change ω_i traced in the log of changes log_i , noted $log_i + \{\omega_i\}$, is defined by the disjoint union between the two disjoint sets log_i and $\{\omega_i\}$.
- **Definition 7: Deletion of a Change.** The deletion of a change ω_i traced in the log of changes log_i , noted $log_i - \{\omega_i\}$, is defined by the set-theoretic complement such that $log_i - \{\omega_i\} = \{x \in log_i \mid x \notin \{\omega_i\}\}$.

2.2 Basic Changes Modelling.

To produce the list of basic change operations on $\mathcal{SHOIN}(\mathcal{D})$ ontologies, the $\mathcal{SHOIN}(\mathcal{D})$ Ontology Model is exploited as described in Table 1. The third column lists the 47 operators representing basic changes, which, if applied on the ontology, affect the corresponding $\mathcal{SHOIN}(\mathcal{D})$ model element. According to our model, every basic change can be declined as an addition or a deletion of an element of the underlying set, the signature or the interpretation function.

Example: Addition of the basic change InstancesOfObjectProperty.

Given the previous example ontology O , the evolution of O into O_{new} with the addition of the relation instantiation $t_{Ri} = hasSupervisor(perrine christophe1)$ w.r.t. our model, represented by the change $\omega_1^B = InstancesOfObjectProperty(perrine, christophe1, hasSupervisor)$ can be formalized:

2.3 Complex Changes Modelling

More generally, an infinite set of complex changes can be generated from the aggregation of basic changes (Plessers, 2005). Their pertinence depends on the need of particular changes implied by particular uses. For example, the renaming of a concept is often used in collaborative development of an ontology to reach a consensus but can be unused in other contexts. For this reason, our model natively provides the limited set of 47 basic changes but, depending on change modelling needs, gives the opportunity to build complex changes from these basic changes. Below is an example of the “renaming concept” complex change definition. In this example is considered the set-theory renaming not the lexical one.

Example: renameClass Complex Change definition.

Renaming a concept C in a concept C_{new} is a complex change called here *renameClass*, which implies the creation of a new concept C_{new} , the copy of the concept descriptions of C (from its related ontology sets, signatures and interpretations) to C_{new} , then the deletion these descriptions of C followed by the deletion of C itself.

3 Discussion and Conclusion

Our model aims at facilitating the modelling of basic and complex changes. It aims at contributing to the maintenance of the ontology structural consistency by clearly defining each change impact on the structure of the ontology. This model is the structural basis of a change management methodology called *OntoVersionGraph* (Pittet, 2012). To ensure a complete consistent evolution of the ontology, it is used in conjunction with a logical inconsistency identification methodology called *CLOCK* (Gueffaz, 2012), based on ontology design patterns and model-checking.

4 References

- Djedidi, R. (2009). *Approche d'évolution d'ontologie guidée par des patrons de gestion de changement*.
- Djedidi, R., & Aufaure, M. A. (2008.). - Change Management Patterns for Ontology Evolution Process –. *IWOD at ISWC 2008*. Karlsruhe.
- Ehrig, M. H. (2004). Similarity for ontologies-a comprehensive framework. *Workshop Enterprise Modelling and Ontology: Ingredients for Interoperability, at PAKM*.
- Flouris, G. M. (2008). Ontology Change: Classification & Survey. (C. U. Press, Ed.) *the Knowledge Engineering Review*, 23(2), pp. 117-152.
- Gruber, T. R. (1993). A translation approach to portable ontology specifications. *Knowledge acquisition*, 5(2), 199-220.
- Guarino, N. &. (1995). Formal ontology, conceptual analysis and knowledge representation. *International Journal of Human Computer Studies*, 43(5), 625-640.

- Gueffaz, M. P. (2012). Inconsistency Identification In Dynamic Ontologies Based On Model Checking. *INSTICC, ACM SIGMIS*, (pp. 418-421.).
- Haase, P. &. (2005). Consistent evolution of OWL ontologies. *The Semantic Web: Research and Applications* , 182-197.
- Horrocks, I. &-S. (2003). Reducing OWL entailment to description logic satisfiability. *The Semantic Web - ISWC 2003* (pp. 17-29). Springer Berlin Heidelberg.
- Horrocks, I. (2005). Owl: A description logic based ontology language. *Logic Programming.*, 1-4.
- Jaziri, W. (2009). A methodology for ontology evolution and versioning. In IEEE. (Ed.), *Advances in Semantic Processing, SEMAPRO'09*, (pp. 15-21).
- Klein, M. C. (2004). *Change management for distributed ontologies*.
- Li, M. Y. (2006). Towards a complete OWL ontology benchmark. (S. B. Heidelberg, Ed.) *In The Semantic Web: Research and Applications*, 125-139.
- Michael K. Smith, C. W. (n.d.). *OWL Web Ontology Language Guide*. Retrieved from w3.org: <http://www.w3.org/TR/owl-guide/>
- Noy, N. F. (2004). *Ontology Evolution: Not the Same as Schema Evolution* . Stanford Medical Informatics, Stanford University.
- Paquette, G. &. (2008). An executable model for virtual campus environments. (S. B. Heidelberg, Ed.) *Handbook on Information Technologies for Education and Training* , 363-403.
- Pinto, H. S. (2004). DILIGENT: Towards a fine-grained methodology for Distributed, Loosely-controlled and evolving Engineering of oNTologies. *ECAI, 16*, 393.
- Pittet, P. N. (2012). Guidelines for a Dynamic Ontology-Integrating Tools of Evolution and Versioning in Ontology. . arXiv.
- Plessers, P. D. (2005). Ontology Change Detection using a Version Log. In Springer-Verlag (Ed.), *4th International Semantic Web Conference* (pp. 578-592). Galway, Ireland: Yolanda Gil, Enrico Motta, V.Richard Benjamins, Mark A. Musen.
- Stojanovic, L. &. (2002). Ontology evolution within ontology editors. *OntoWeb-SIG3 Workshop at the 13th International Conference on Knowledge Engineering and Knowledge Management* (pp. 53-62). Siguenza: CEUR-WS.org.
- Stojanovic, L. (2004). *Methods and tools for ontology evolution*.