Section 4 of final report “SSN Ontology” -- -careful edit by Kerry January 2011

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

- Introduction: various things that say it is what we \*will\* do. Also needs check that is correct at this time.

Structure overall: I think the ontology review, which is solid work and stands alone, should be lifted out of this section and put as a section on its own. Probably immediately before “SSN Ontology” , or perhaps right before “Intent and Process” section. It loads up the SSN ontology presentation too much by being at the front of it – and therefore detracts from it.

“Review” The "review" is very confusing structure -- seems to be looking like another container for the whole report....? I assume this is being worked on by Laurent?

“Review” – suggest delete because unnecessary and needs fixing anyway: ”This is because the goal of this review phase was to better understand the similarities and differences between all the existing ontologies to refine the scope of the SSN XG ontology. And also, at such an early stage of the XG work, there was more reasons to allocate the review of an ontology to someone involved in its development rather than to ask someone else from the group to do it. The reader of this report is advised that some of the reviews have been made by someone “

“Review” Disclaimer is repeated in 2 places. Once is enough. Suggest retain the abstract version in the abstract alone. NB that I’ve edited the abstract one, but not the second copy.

“Reviewed sensor ontologies table” and elsewhere includes informal 1st names – I’m happy with that – but other people may not be?

“review” – Sensei: **TO DO (PAYAM) RE-FORMAT AND COMPLETE THE INFORMATION AVAILABLE BELOW USING THE COMMON TEMPLATE**

“Review” many minor edits done.

- Scope: Introduction to this section is missing, and I can’t understand the diagrams “modules and mapping to use cases” They are very pretty – but convey no meaning to me. Suggest removing unless other people find them helpful? “provenance and diagnostic” should be “provenance and diagnosis”.

- spelling in a heading in table and wiki headings "Alignement to DUL Upper Ontology"

- In Module summary table: link " Communication#Communication" in final doc column points nowhere.

- in a few places "module per module" should be "module by module". is confusing as is.

-Section on ontology development notes should be removed. It is almost empty as is and the "foundational layer" /dolce alignment material is covered in the "skeleton" section elsewhere. The text about the process/collaborative tool is unimporatnt or wrong anyway. Also: this is variously called 'foundational layer", "core" and "skeleton" --it needs exactly one name!

- "the observation was made" (should be "is") arising from the comment for observatironResult

- "manufacturers specifications verses observed capabilites" in Measuring module

- "An observed value for which the probability of falsely claiming the

absence of a component in a material is ÃŽÂ², given a probability ÃŽÂ± of

falsely claiming its presence." is in comment for detectionLimit

-" manufacturers specifications verses " in sensor data sheet comment

- in ontology itself "Process" : we have 2 of these. One is from DUL (superclass of sensing) and the other is from SSN -- (parent of deploymentrelated process). not such a good idea?

-in ontology itself : several properties of observations are "min 0 thing" why? Is it just some kind of placeholder or documentation hint?

- in comment for observationResult: "observatioin"

- in ontology itself: ssn:hasValue is a poor choice of name because there is an owl:hasValue keyword. A bit late to change???

Ontology " Structure" section -tiny edits done

"SSN Foundational Layer": minor grammar/typo edits done

"SSN Foundational Layer": mentions the "SSO Result class" . This class is also called "Result" in "a Core patten for Ontologies" . There is no such thing in ssn-- probably "ObservationValue" is intended rahter thna "Result"? Or am I confused here? More generally , this is confused with 'foundational layer" "core" and 'skeleton", and "SSO design pattern" vs "core".

"SSN Foundational Layer": mentions "procedure" but there is no such thing. In think "process" is intended -- but note other problem with dual use of that term.

in University deployment example : various bits of grammar which I've edited

In smart product knife example: figure of observation has "hasQuantityValue" with a value of "????". Is this meant to mean unkown? probably should be explained? Is it an artifact of the drawing package (because the instance value is attached further down the class hierarchy?) ? I can't see it specifically in the OWL fragments.

In WM30 example: minor grammar/tyops corrected. Also -- there is something funny with 2 very similar-named instanc/class wm30+characteristicTransferfunction and the associated n1:thingswhich? . Should this be explained? Ok-- I can see from the owl that it is the representation of a one-of structure -- perhaps cannot be avoided?

In Agriculture Meterorology Network example : Minor edits done.

In Agriculture Meterorology Network example: "The following picture illustrates how the SSN ontology can be used to find the right sensor in function of the type of feature and the type of property of interest for a particular data collection campaign." needs rewiting but I can't understnd it. Also the the following list of dot points: what happened to the third dot point content? needs completion?

In Agriculture Meterorology Network example : "sensor View" section -- "The automatic Weather Station ontology ( aws.xml)" is named but not explained what it is nor where to get it. Maybe this scection is trying to explain that the example is split into two files and why?-needs to be clearer. e.g "is preferred" over what?

Sensor Discovery on Linked Data example: minor edits done.

Back to the report: "ontology development notes" is missing. Should be removed (and also from section introduction). The "methods and tools used" is not even correct in retrospect. Just drop it all, I suggest.