

W3C RIF WG

... end of discussion on use cases

Mala: Higher knowledge representation, another use case?

Sandro: Has to be proposed as a new use case, can't be done by Monday

Christian: Do it for 2nd draft

Next face-to-face meetings

Axel: Proposal by REVERSE & DERI

- Next face-to-face immediately before ESWC, Montenegro, 11-14 June
- 8 - 9 June reserved for RIF
- 10 -11, 15-16 June not possible

Chris: No clash with KR meeting, 2-5 June

Markus: Would prefer not 8 - 9, prefer meeting closer to EWSC dates

Jeremy and Christian: Strong preference not to have Saturday meetings

Agreed:

- Montenegro, close to EWSC dates
- No telecon on June 6
- Email vote on 8 - 9 or 9 -10 June, by next telecon

Action on Sandro: organize email vote

Action on Axel: create Wiki page for travel directions to Montenegro.

Peter P-S: Chairs should not impose changes on face-to-face proposals.

Chris: Chairs have the right to veto dates when they cannot attend

Peter P-S: If this is the reason for refusing dates, it needs to be made clear. Dates were requested for late June - these dates are not.

Christian: The following face-to-face should be mid September - mid November:

- Submit proposals asap
- Decision at next face-to-face (Montenegro)

Peter P-S: Pre ISWC, Athens (Georgia, not Greece), November. Peter is holding space

Action on Peter P-S: make proposal on Wiki for ISWC, Athens, Nov 2006

Presentation: RIF Design Roadmap

Harold:

- Draft from evening 27 Feb 2006
- Distributed via email 28 Feb

Frank: Production Rules semantics are not monotonic. PR is not true subset in phase 1 - cannot characterize PR with assert and ignore retract. If PR is split from phase II, will have to undo assert - have to retract part of phase 1.

Action on Frank: write concerns and discuss by email

Francois: General point: we need complex events, complex conditions, complex actions.

Christian: These are requirements & design goals

Harold: can do syntactic extensions in Phase 1 to make clear what might be done semantically in Phase 2. See item 2 on slides (slide 5) "Syntactic and semantic extensions of Horn Logic".

Hassan: [*sorry, missed question*]

Action on Harold: explain technically what pure production rules are - item 2 on slides (slide 5) "Syntactic and semantic extensions of Horn Logic", points 2.1.1 - 2.1.3.

Uli: What are the proposals?

Harold: Show the basis for interoperation between PR and Horn rules item 2 (slide 5) "Syntactic and semantic extensions of Horn Logic", and item 9.2 (slide 13) "To enable tagging rulesets with intended semantics"

Uli: 2 or 3 formalisms for phase 2?

Christian: Maybe 9 can then be moved to Phase 2

Uli: What are Phase 1 semantics?

Michael: Phase 1 is FOL compatible,

Michael: In the roadmap Phase 1 and Phase 2 are unreasonable for 1 year. They need to be divided into packages.

Christian: Phase 1 is time limited. What does not fit in is by definition not in Phase 1.

Francois: The semantics discussed are about representation, not process. Declarative constraints can be transformed into reactive rule. It is important to separate representation from process.

Christian: Discuss this during afternoon.

Christian: collect & discuss requirements:

- New Wiki pages for requirements & design goals
- Name and short description, annotate existing requirements where possible
- Refer to existing
- Cut off in 3 weeks

Jos de Roo: Distinguish requirements and objectives

Action on Christian: create new Wiki page for requirements