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if it ain’t broke, don’t fix it

- RDF 2004 is giving genuine interop.
- Higher level Recs (SPARQL, OWL, RIF, POWDER) addressing higher level goals
- *No* showstopping lower level bugs with RDF 2004 (contrast with HTML or SQL)
- Some minor annoyances (but depends who you talk to)
- Opening the can of worms … datatyping, semantics, RDF/XML … (we probably did make a pig’s ear, but it is made now)
Recs are expensive

- HP spent approx. $0.8M on RDF Rec. alone (WG chairing and participation)
- Working group is maybe 15 people for 2 or 3 years at 1 or 2 days a week: between $1M and $2M.
- This excludes cost to implementers:
  - Changing implementations
  - Rework marketing material
  - Work out how to take advantage of new stuff
  - …

- Costs to users
  - Training …
New Recs create FUD

- Customers get confused
- Situation is genuinely confusing (e.g. is LET in SPARQL 1.1 ?)
- Possible Semantic Web users try something different instead
- …

- So why are we here ? …
Standards Community needs new Standards

- Or else why would we get together?
- What would our PhD students do?
- How would we justify our research grants?
- What would Ivan do?
- What would Tim do?
  - (I expect they are quite capable of being useful without RDF 2!)
What should we be doing?

- Linking data
- Solving problems
- Making the world a better place

- Applications of Semantic Web
Could roll in a few errata

Could close as invalid a few of the postponed issues.

http://www.w3.org/2000/03/rdf-tracking/#futures

Perhaps discourage use of a few not so well thought out vocab items.

I have my own pet hate list (rdf:_1, rdf:subject, …)

Even small groups cannot reach consensus on the weakly deprecate list.
Lower Level Next Steps Rec’s

- Additional to RDF 2004 – not rework
- Named Graphs (already de facto – so costs should be reasonable small – GRDDL scale – not RIF scale: benefit lots of people use it, consistency improves interop and makes customers feel good, rightly so)
- Turtle – again already de facto.
- Perhaps something about follow your nose: HTTP get being recommended to find information about predicates and classes.
Some people here want change
Please show that the benefits outweigh the costs.

E.g. rescinding RDF Semantics Rec would meet Peter’s points. I think he makes good points. However, I see lots of cost – with what is conceptually easy – so I would like to be convinced that there are balancing benefits.
End of Main Talk

- I have 5 slides on the 21 postponed issues …
  
  http://www.w3.org/2000/03/rdf-tracking/#futures

- Do we want to glance at these:
  - Now?
  - Later?
  - Never?
Postponed issue list

- `rdfms-abouteachprefix`: Something should be done about aboutEachPrefix construct
  - POWDER - fixed

- `rdfms-qnames-as-attrib-values`: Suggestion that Qnames should be allowed as values for attributes such as rdf:about.
  - RDFa/CURIE - fixed

- `rdfms-qnames-can't represent-all-uris`: The RDF XML syntax cannot represent all possible Property URI's.
  - Bug –non-critical – won’t fix (or turtle)

- `rdfms-quoting`: The syntax needs a more convenient way to express the reification of a statement.
  - Named Graphs

- `rdf-equivalent-uri's`: Should RDF have a mechanism for declaring two uri's to be equivalent?
  - OWL sameAs - fixed
Postponed issue list

- **rdfms-validating-embedded-rdf**: RDF embedded in XHTML and other XML documents is hard to validate.
  - GRDDL - fixed

- **rdf-containers-otherapproaches**: The design of the RDF Model collection classes exhibit various awkward features. Might these be augmented with a 'better' design?
  - Bug non-critical – won’t fix

- **rdfms-literalsubjects**: Should the subjects of RDF statements be allowed to be literals
  - Bug non-critical – won’t fix

- **rdf-bnode-predicates**: Request to allow b-nodes as property labels
  - Bug non-critical – won’t fix
Postponed issue list

- **rdfms-contexts**: Suggestion that the concept of context is missing from RDF.
  - Named graphs

- **rdf-embedded**: How to indicate whether RDF embedded in another document is asserted
  - Named graphs

- **rdfms-assertion**: RDF is not just a data model; an RDF statement is an assertion.
  - Rat hole – won’t fix

- **rdfxml-literals-in-collections**: RDF collection syntax should allow literals.
  - Turtle?
Postponed issue list

- **rdfs-lang-vocab**: request for a richer vocabulary for languages
  - Postpone further

- **rdfs-fyi**: A request for a semantics free predicate for comments.
  - Maybe, easy enough to DIY, minor

- **rdfs-layered-subset**: A request to define subset of RDFS with a more conventional layered architecture
  - Intersect OWL DL with RDFS – won’t fix

- **rdf-mapping-lists-and-containers**: A request to define a formal semantic relationship between lists and containers.
  - Duplicate. Hard work, little value – won’t fix
Postponed issue list

- **rdfms-syntax-incomplete**: The RDF/XML syntax can't represent an arbitrary graph structure.
  - Duplicate - Bug – won’t fix (or turtle)

- **rdf-fragids-in-embedded-rdf**: Defining the interpretation of fragment identifiers in RDF embedded in other document formats.
  - TAG issue ???

- **rdf-plain-and-xml-literals**: An XML literal without markup, e.g. "foo" should denote the same thing as the plain literal "foo".
  - Hopeless bug – can’t fix won’t fix

- **test-manifest-semantics**: The test cases manifest format has a semantic error.
  - Who cares? – won’t fix