



Small Steps Please! **(or maybe none at all!)**

June 26, 2010
Jeremy J. Carroll



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 ? ...

- 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

RDF 2004 Second Edition

- 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.



the challenge to this group

- 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

- [rd fms-contexts](#): Suggestion that the concept of context is missing from RDF.
 - Named graphs
- [rd f-embedded](#): How to indicate whether RDF embedded in another document is asserted
 - Named graphs
- [rd fms-assertion](#): RDF is not just a data model; an RDF statement is an assertion.
 - Rat hole – won't fix
- [rd fxml-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

- [rdms-syntax-incomplete](#): The RDF/XML syntax can't represent an 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