Combining Process and Sensor Ontologies to Support Geo-Sensor Data Retrieval

A. Devaraju[1], H. Neuhaus[2], K. Janowicz[3], M. Compton[4]

[1]Institute for Geoinformatics, University of Muenster, Germany
Email: anusuriya.devaraju@uni-muenster.de

[2]Tasmanian ICT Centre, CSIRO, Australia
Email: holger.neuhaus@csiro.au

[3]Department of Geography, Pennsylvania State University, USA
Email: jano@psu.edu

[4]CSIRO ICT Centre, Canberra, Australia
Email: michael.compton@csiro.au

1. Introduction

The Sensor Web Enablement (SWE) framework specifies how to access web-enabled sensors and sensor data on a syntactical level. Nevertheless, it is difficult to retrieve, interpret, and combine sensor data based on heterogeneous schemas. Semantics-based approaches promise to overcome these challenges (Bermudez and Piasecki 2004, Babitski et al. 2009, Kuhn 2009, Janowicz et al. 2010), but so far most work has focused on ontologies for sensors and their observations. We propose a combined approach which relates a sensor ontology to a process-centric domain ontology and hence takes into account how observation data was created and what types of features it relates refers to.

In accordance with the OGC specifications and related work (Compton et al. 2009, Kuhn 2009, Stasch et al. 2009), our sensor network ontology is not limited to physical devices but is constructed such that any entity (e.g., physical sensors, computational process) observing a phenomenon can be represented as a sensor. In contrast to existing hydrology ontologies (Bermudez and Piasecki 2004, Beran 2007, OrdnanceSurvey 2007, Vilches-Blázquez et al. 2009), we focus on a process-centric ontological approach. Process-centric means that the domain ontology is developed by first identifying geo-processes, entities (i.e., objects and matters), and their properties, followed by the relations between them. These relations are used as basis to handle naming heterogeneities and hence support data retrieval.

The following sections of the paper describe our ontologies. We will use the concept of evapotranspiration as running example as it is a key component is in the Hydrological Sensor Web research by the CSIRO Water for a Healthy Country Flagship initiative. For details, see (Guru et al. 2008).

2. Ontology Development

In this section, we introduce our sensor and hydrology ontologies. Note that we use *italics* to denote ontological categories.

2.1 Design and Development of the Sensor Network Ontology

Figure 1 depicts the core components of the Sensor Network Ontology (Neuhaus and Compton 2009). *System* abstracts computational processes as well as physical entities such as devices. *Procedures* are abstract descriptions of a sequence of operations, which may have *Input* and *Output*. Such a sequence of operations might be realized by a particular physical arrangement of a device, a computer program, or a lab procedure. For example, a *Device* can play the thematic role of being a *Sensor* using the *playRole* relation. This means that the *Device* implements the algorithm described by the *Procedure*. To sense some property is to follow a process that results in an observation, hence, *Sensor* is *subClassOf* of *Procedure*. Not only technological devices can sense – rather, a sensor is an entity that estimates or calculates a value for a physical quality, either through physical stimulus or as a calculation on previous observations.



Figure 1. The partial view of the sensor network ontology.

The sensor network ontology, which is implemented in the Web Ontology Language (OWL) draws from the SensorML and Observation and Measurements (O&M) specifications. The ontology leaves the observed domain unspecified (to be supplied in an application) and instead, in accordance with top-level ontologies, allows abstract representations of real world entities, which are not observed directly but through their observable qualities. Domain concepts, units of measurement, time and time series, as well as location, can be imported from other ontologies.

2.2 Design and Development of the Hydrology Ontology

The interpretation of observed properties requires understanding the geo-processes which influence them (Devaraju and Kuhn 2010). Our domain ontology represents concepts that relate geo-processes to the properties measured by sensors . We align the domain vocabularies to the DOLCE foundational ontology (Masolo et al. 2003). DOLCE distinguishes different types of occurents and specifies relations between occurent types and properties at a fundamental level. *Endurant*, *Perdurant*, *Quality* and *Abstract* are the four top categories of DOLCE. *Endurants* (e.g., *Physical Object*, *Amount Of Matter* and *Feature*) exist in full at an instant of time. *Perdurants* (e.g., *Process* and *Event*) are only partially present at any time, at which they exist. *Qualities* are the entities we perceive or measure. In Table 1, we summarize some of the ontological relations that hold between the domain categories.

Table 1. Basic ontological relations (Masolo, Borgo et al. 2003).

Relation	Description	Example
proper-part-of (between individuals)	Mereological relation between two instances of a perdurant (time independent) or between two instances of an endurant (time dependent).	An instance of an *Evaporation* or a *Transpiration* process is *proper-part-of* some instances of an *Evapotranspiration* process.

participant-in	Relates *Endurants* to the *Perdurants* in which they participate.	An instance of *Vegetation* is *participant-in* an instance of a *Transpiration* process.
host-of	*Feature* is a 'parasitic entity' that cannot exist without its *Host*.	An instance of *Leaf* is *Host-Of* an instance of *Stomata*.
has-quality	A *PhysicalEndurant has-quality* a *PhysicalQuality*, whereas a *Perdurant has-quality TemporalQuality*.	An amount of *Air has-quality* like *AirTemperature*; A *Wind* process *has-quality* such as *WindDuration*.

In Figure 2, we present the physical endurants and physical properties related to evapotranspiration process. See (Devaraju and Kuhn 2010) for further details and design decisions. The properties are classified based on units relevant to hydrology in SI measurement.



Figure 2. The partial view of ET- related categories.

Table 2. Examples of physical endurants and their physical properties.

Category	PhysicalQuality
WaterSurface	WaterSurfaceTemperature, ActualEvaporation
Air	AirTemperature, RelativeAirHumidity
Vegetation	CropCoefficient, NetRadiation

3. Relating the Sensor and the Hydrology Domain Ontologies

In this section, we describe how our approach assists in resolving naming ambiguities and the description of derived properties - thus easing the retrieval of geo-sensor data.

3.1 Handling Naming Heterogeneity

One process can be distinguished from other processes by the participation relation. For instance, in contrast to *Evaporation*, the process of *Transpiration* has different participants, such as *Vegetation*. The *equivalentClass* relation is used in our framework to identify synonymous categories. For example, a user requesting evaporation data will be able to retrieve all the observations encoded as *EvaporationRate* as well as *ActualEvaporation* (Figure 2).

3.2 Supporting Sensor Data Discovery

In the following we assume an application ontology that imports our sensor and hydrology ontologies and relates them as presented in the two following steps. In the first step (Figure 3), the categories defined in the domain ontology are related to the categories in the sensor network ontology as sub-categories, thus, describing the features (e.g., *Lake*) as well as the properties (e.g., *EvaporationRate*) measured by sensors (a device like *FloatingEvaporationPan*).



Figure 3. Importing domain categories into the sensor network ontology.



Figure 4. Estimating ETo from weather parameters.

In the second step (Figure 4), the domain categories are used to specify the parameters of a derived observation procedure. For existing reservoirs, the reference evapotranspiration (ETo) can be measured using specific devices, or it can be calculated, for example with the Penman Monteith equation. In the absence of a measured ETo, observation service can be configured to return the related weather parameters because the calculation of evapotranspiration from meteorological data has been specified.

4 Conclusions

This study is motivated by the need for an ontology of observable property-types to improve the discovery and retrieval of sensor data sources (OGC 2007). In this context, our approach argues for an 'integrated view' of the Semantic Sensor Web, instead of purely sensor-centric approaches. We illustrate this by an example that relates sensor concepts (i.e., how observations are performed) with domain concepts (i.e., observed properties and their associated real world entities). Our work provides new insights into the current research in semantic-based sensor data retrieval with the following developments:

a. Combining sensor concepts with domain concepts helps evaluate the design of both ontologies. The relation between features and their properties in the sensor ontology is consistent with the relations between respective categories in the domain ontology.
b. The sensor ontology distinguishes between sensing procedure and sensing devices. This allows a representation of simple as well as multi-component sensors (e.g., weather station) in terms of their operations. The idea of 'roles' allows any observing entity to be represented as a sensor. For example, a meteorological observation which requires both human observer and reference instrument.
c. The process-centric domain ontology relates the geo-processes with the observed properties. These relations are used as a basis to handle the process and property naming heterogeneities, therefore improving the retrieval of sensor data. In addition, a complex observation request can be developed based on the relations between processes, their participants and their properties.

Further work will focus on extending the current ontological framework to describe time series observation and to restrict the possible interpretations of ‘feature types’ as defined in O&M.

Acknowledgements

This paper is a result of collaboration between Institute for Geoinformatics, University of Muenster and CSIRO Tasmanian ICT Centre.

References

Babitski G, Bergweiler S, Hoffmann J, Schön D, Stasch C and Walkowski A, 2009, Ontology-Based Integration of Sensor Web Services in Disaster Management, In: Janowicz K, Raubal M and Levashkin S (eds.), *Proceedings of the Third International Conference of GeoSpatial Semantics (GeoS 2009)*, Mexico City, Mexico, 103-121.

Beran B, 2007, *HYDROSEEK: An Ontology-Aided Data Discovery System for Hydrologic Sciences*, PhD Dissertation, Department of Civil, Architectural and Environmental Engineering, 156.

Bermudez L E and Piasecki M, 2004, Role of ontologies in creating hydrologic metadata, International Conference on HydroScience and Engineering, Brisbane, Australia.

Compton M, Henson C, Lefort L, Neuhaus H and Sheth A, 2009, A Survey of the Semantic Specication of Sensors, In: Taylor K, Ayyagari A and Roure D D (eds.), *Proceedings of the 2nd International Workshop on Semantic Sensor Networks, 8th International Semantic Web Conference (ISWC 2009)*, Washington DC, USA, 17-32.

Devaraju A and Kuhn W, 2010, A Process-Centric Ontological Approach for Integrating Geo-Sensor Data, 6th International Conference on Formal Ontology in Information Systems (FOIS 2010), Toronto, Canada.

Guru S M, Taylor P, Neuhaus H, Shu Y, Smith D and Terhorst A, 2008, Hydrological SensorWeb for the South Esk Catchment in the Tasmanian state of Australia, *Proceedings of the Fourth IEEE International Conference on eScience (ESCIENCE '08)*, Washington, DC, USA, 432-433

Janowicz K, Schade S, Broering A, Kessler C, Maue P and Stasch C, 2010, Semantic Enablement for Spatial Data Infrastructures, *Transactions in GIS*, 14(2): 111-129.

Kuhn W, 2009, A Functional Ontology of Observation and Measurement, In: Janowicz K, Raubal M and Levashkin S (eds.), *Proceedings of the Third International Conference on Geospatial Semantics (GeoS 2009)*, Mexico City, Mexico, 26-43.

Masolo C, Borgo S, Gangemi A, Guarino N, Oltramari A and Schneider L, 2003, WonderWeb EU Project Deliverable D18: The WonderWeb Library of Foundational Ontologies, 349.

Neuhaus H and Compton M, 2009, The Semantic Sensor Network Ontology: A Generic Language to Describe Sensor Assets, AGILE Workshop on Challenges in Geospatial Data Harmonisation, Hannover, Germany.

OGC, 2007, Observations and Measurements (Part 1 - Observation schema), *OpenGIS Implementation Standard*, OGC 07-022r1, 85.

OrdnanceSurvey, 2007, Hydrology Ontology v0.1, www.ordnancesurvey.co.uk/oswebsite/ontology/.

Stasch C, Janowicz K, Bröring A, Reis I and Kuhn W, 2009, A Stimulus-Centric Algebraic Approach to Sensors and Observations, In: Trigoni N, Markham A and Nawaz S (eds.), *Proceedings of the Third International Conference on GeoSensor Networks*, Oxford, UK, 169-179.

Vilches-Blázquez L M, Ramos J A, López-Pellicer F J, Corcho O and Nogueras-Iso J, 2009, An Approach to Comparing Different Ontologies in the Context of Hydrographical Information, In: Cartwright W, Gartner G, Liqiu Meng and Peterson M P (eds.), *Information Fusion and Geographic Information Systems*, Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 193-207.