

Multi-agent and Semantic Web Systems: Revision

Fiona McNeill

School of Informatics

25th March 2013

Fiona McNeill

Multi-agent Semantic Web Systems: Revision

25th March 2013 0/12

Potentially:

- Anything in the slides, including guest lectures
- Discussions we have had in class and the additional reading will not be necessary for adequate answers to exam questions. But answers to discursive questions which show a good awareness will score more highly so do this if you can!



WNIVERSTAND

Potentially:

- Anything in the slides, including guest lectures
- Discussions we have had in class and the additional reading will not be necessary for adequate answers to exam questions. But answers to discursive questions which show a good awareness will score more highly so do this if you can!

The exam will be a mixture between:

- Bookwork: essay*-type questions in which you discuss your understanding of a particular aspect of the course; this is where additional reading comes in especially useful.
- Worked: where you have to find solutions.

This does not imply the answers should be long: one paragraph, or a few, may be sufficient.

WNIVERSTAND

Potentially:

- Anything in the slides, including guest lectures
- Discussions we have had in class and the additional reading will not be necessary for adequate answers to exam questions. But answers to discursive questions which show a good awareness will score more highly so do this if you can!

The exam will be a mixture between:

- Bookwork: essay*-type questions in which you discuss your understanding of a particular aspect of the course; this is where additional reading comes in especially useful.
- Worked: where you have to find solutions.

The emphasis is on practical methods, ability to explain and critically evaluate.

This does not imply the answers should be long: one paragraph, or a few, may be sufficient.



• Formalise domains in RDF(S), formulate and perform SPARQL queries.



- Formalise domains in RDF(S), formulate and perform SPARQL queries.
- Be able to read, explain, and write content in all the formats discussed in the course.



- Formalise domains in RDF(S), formulate and perform SPARQL queries.
- Be able to read, explain, and write content in all the formats discussed in the course.
- Compare different technologies, sketch potential system and algorithm designs at a high level.



- Formalise domains in RDF(S), formulate and perform SPARQL queries.
- Be able to read, explain, and write content in all the formats discussed in the course.
- Compare different technologies, sketch potential system and algorithm designs at a high level.
- Discuss the ideas and philosophies covered in this course.



- You will have to answer two questions:
 - Question I is compulsory
 - Then answer Question 2 or Question 3.
 - Spend some time deciding which of these to answer (but not too much!) and make sure you look through the whole question.



- You will have to answer two questions:
 - Question I is compulsory
 - Then answer Question 2 or Question 3.
 - Spend some time deciding which of these to answer (but not too much!) and make sure you look through the whole question.
- The marks awarded for each section give you a clue as to how much time you should devote to each: a 10-mark question should generally take around twice as much time as a 5-mark question.



- You will have to answer two questions:
 - Question I is compulsory
 - Then answer Question 2 or Question 3.
 - Spend some time deciding which of these to answer (but not too much!) and make sure you look through the whole question.
- The marks awarded for each section give you a clue as to how much time you should devote to each: a 10-mark question should generally take around twice as much time as a 5-mark question.
- As a rule of thumb, every mark allocated to a question is looking for something specific. So a good answer to a question: *Discuss some of the issues* ... should contain (at least) three issues.



• You are marked for what you know, not marked down for what you don't know. If in doubt, put it in.



- You are marked for what you know, not marked down for what you don't know. If in doubt, put it in.
- In solution-based questions, include your workings, especially if you are not sure of your answer. You may get some credit even for a wrong answer if you can demonstrate you had the right idea.



- You are marked for what you know, not marked down for what you don't know. If in doubt, put it in.
- In solution-based questions, include your workings, especially if you are not sure of your answer. You may get some credit even for a wrong answer if you can demonstrate you had the right idea.
- Time yourself carefully. Do not allow Question I to take up more than half the exam (you can always return to it if you answer the next question quickly).





- Semantic Web foundations
- RDF and RDFS



- Semantic Web foundations
- RDF and RDFS
- DL and OWL



- Semantic Web foundations
- RDF and RDFS
- DL and OWL
- Matching and Meaning



- Semantic Web foundations
- RDF and RDFS
- DL and OWL
- Matching and Meaning
- Agents and Services



- Semantic Web foundations
- RDF and RDFS
- DL and OWL
- Matching and Meaning
- Agents and Services
- Small ideas vs big ideas



• Ontologies: concepts, relations, hierarchies

- Ontologies: concepts, relations, hierarchies
- Representation: expressivity vs efficiency of reasoning

- Ontologies: concepts, relations, hierarchies
- Representation: expressivity vs efficiency of reasoning
- RDF vs. RFDS vs. OWL

- Ontologies: concepts, relations, hierarchies
- Representation: expressivity vs efficiency of reasoning
- RDF vs. RFDS vs. OWL
- Data, resources, meta-data and inference

- Ontologies: concepts, relations, hierarchies
- Representation: expressivity vs efficiency of reasoning
- RDF vs. RFDS vs. OWL
- Data, resources, meta-data and inference
- Semantic web vs. databases

- Ontologies: concepts, relations, hierarchies
- Representation: expressivity vs efficiency of reasoning
- RDF vs. RFDS vs. OWL
- Data, resources, meta-data and inference
- Semantic web vs. databases
- Communication: human, service, agent

- Ontologies: concepts, relations, hierarchies
- Representation: expressivity vs efficiency of reasoning
- RDF vs. RFDS vs. OWL
- Data, resources, meta-data and inference
- Semantic web vs. databases
- Communication: human, service, agent
- Anyone can say anything about anything

- Ontologies: concepts, relations, hierarchies
- Representation: expressivity vs efficiency of reasoning
- RDF vs. RFDS vs. OWL
- Data, resources, meta-data and inference
- Semantic web vs. databases
- Communication: human, service, agent
- Anyone can say anything about anything
- How to obtain semantic metadata





• Fundamental languages for capturing meaning



- Fundamental languages for capturing meaning
- The Semantic Web layer cake, URIs, namespace



- Fundamental languages for capturing meaning
- The Semantic Web layer cake, URIs, namespace
- Different notations: XML, N3, Turtle, Qnames, datatypes



- Fundamental languages for capturing meaning
- The Semantic Web layer cake, URIs, namespace
- Different notations: XML, N3, Turtle, Qnames, datatypes
- RDF and RDBS



- Fundamental languages for capturing meaning
- The Semantic Web layer cake, URIs, namespace
- Different notations: XML, N3, Turtle, Qnames, datatypes
- RDF and RDBS
- Classes, properties, instances domains, ranges



- Fundamental languages for capturing meaning
- The Semantic Web layer cake, URIs, namespace
- Different notations: XML, N3, Turtle, Qnames, datatypes
- RDF and RDBS
- Classes, properties, instances domains, ranges
- Inference in RDF and RDFS



- Fundamental languages for capturing meaning
- The Semantic Web layer cake, URIs, namespace
- Different notations: XML, N3, Turtle, Qnames, datatypes
- RDF and RDBS
- Classes, properties, instances domains, ranges
- Inference in RDF and RDFS
- XML query vs. SPARQL inference



- Fundamental languages for capturing meaning
- The Semantic Web layer cake, URIs, namespace
- Different notations: XML, N3, Turtle, Qnames, datatypes
- RDF and RDBS
- Classes, properties, instances domains, ranges
- Inference in RDF and RDFS
- XML query vs. SPARQL inference



• Description Logics are a family of logics; the letters in the name of a DL describes its functionality.



- Description Logics are a family of logics; the letters in the name of a DL describes its functionality.
- DLs are primarily concerned with complex concept definitions.



- Description Logics are a family of logics; the letters in the name of a DL describes its functionality.
- DLs are primarily concerned with complex concept definitions.
- DL ontologies are divided into A-boxes and T-boxes.



- Description Logics are a family of logics; the letters in the name of a DL describes its functionality.
- DLs are primarily concerned with complex concept definitions.
- DL ontologies are divided into A-boxes and T-boxes.
- Some DLs allow existential and universal restriction.



- Description Logics are a family of logics; the letters in the name of a DL describes its functionality.
- DLs are primarily concerned with complex concept definitions.
- DL ontologies are divided into A-boxes and T-boxes.
- Some DLs allow existential and universal restriction.
- Operate under the *closed world assumption* (assume something is true unless you can prove it isn't).



- Description Logics are a family of logics; the letters in the name of a DL describes its functionality.
- DLs are primarily concerned with complex concept definitions.
- DL ontologies are divided into A-boxes and T-boxes.
- Some DLs allow existential and universal restriction.
- Operate under the *closed world assumption* (assume something is true unless you can prove it isn't.
- OWL comes in three varieties: OWL-lite, OWL-DL and OWL-full (not covered).



- Description Logics are a family of logics; the letters in the name of a DL describes its functionality.
- DLs are primarily concerned with complex concept definitions.
- DL ontologies are divided into A-boxes and T-boxes.
- Some DLs allow existential and universal restriction.
- Operate under the closed world assumption (assume something is true unless you can prove it isn't.
- OWL comes in three varieties: OWL-lite, OWL-DL and OWL-full (not covered).
- OWL-lite and OWL-DL are based on DLs.



• Important to the Semantic Web because individuals develop their own data.



- Important to the Semantic Web because individuals develop their own data.
- Matching can be applied to ontologies or web service integration, etc.



- Important to the Semantic Web because individuals develop their own data.
- Matching can be applied to ontologies or web service integration, etc.
- Perfect matching requires full understanding of the semantics of the developer's mind \Rightarrow we aim for good enough matching.



- Important to the Semantic Web because individuals develop their own data.
- Matching can be applied to ontologies or web service integration, etc.
- Perfect matching requires full understanding of the semantics of the developer's mind \Rightarrow we aim for good enough matching.
- Matching can mean: *mapping*, *merging*, *alignment*, *translation*.



- Important to the Semantic Web because individuals develop their own data.
- Matching can be applied to ontologies or web service integration, etc.
- Perfect matching requires full understanding of the semantics of the developer's mind \Rightarrow we aim for good enough matching.
- Matching can mean: *mapping*, *merging*, *alignment*, *translation*.
- Off-line vs run-time; complete vs focussed; simple hierarchies vs complex ontologies.



• Service-oriented vs. agent-oriented view



- Service-oriented vs. agent-oriented view
- Agent reasoning, communication, and coordination

- Service-oriented vs. agent-oriented view
- Agent reasoning, communication, and coordination
- The Jason agent programming language



- Service-oriented vs. agent-oriented view
- Agent reasoning, communication, and coordination
- The Jason agent programming language
- Choreographing/orchestrating workflows



- Service-oriented vs. agent-oriented view
- Agent reasoning, communication, and coordination
- The Jason agent programming language
- Choreographing/orchestrating workflows
- Client-server interaction using HTTP and XML (JSON, MIME)



- Service-oriented vs. agent-oriented view
- Agent reasoning, communication, and coordination
- The Jason agent programming language
- Choreographing/orchestrating workflows
- Client-server interaction using HTTP and XML (JSON, MIME)
- Service-orientation and P2P networks of services



- Service-oriented vs. agent-oriented view
- Agent reasoning, communication, and coordination
- The Jason agent programming language
- Choreographing/orchestrating workflows
- Client-server interaction using HTTP and XML (JSON, MIME)
- Service-orientation and P2P networks of services
- Web services: interfaces, bindings, endpoints, types



- Service-oriented vs. agent-oriented view
- Agent reasoning, communication, and coordination
- The Jason agent programming language
- Choreographing/orchestrating workflows
- Client-server interaction using HTTP and XML (JSON, MIME)
- Service-orientation and P2P networks of services
- Web services: interfaces, bindings, endpoints, types
- WSDL, SOAP, RPC/XML, REST



- Service-oriented vs. agent-oriented view
- Agent reasoning, communication, and coordination
- The Jason agent programming language
- Choreographing/orchestrating workflows
- Client-server interaction using HTTP and XML (JSON, MIME)
- Service-orientation and P2P networks of services
- Web services: interfaces, bindings, endpoints, types
- WSDL, SOAP, RPC/XML, REST
- Semantic Web Services, Web Service Composition





• A recurring theme throughout the course



- A recurring theme throughout the course
- Folksonomies vs. ontologies



- A recurring theme throughout the course
- Folksonomies vs. ontologies
- Web APIs vs. "big" Web Services



- A recurring theme throughout the course
- Folksonomies vs. ontologies
- Web APIs vs. "big" Web Services
- LinkedData, OpenData, and Triple Stores



- A recurring theme throughout the course
- Folksonomies vs. ontologies
- Web APIs vs. "big" Web Services
- LinkedData, OpenData, and Triple Stores
- SPARQL inference vs. OWL



- Thursday, 25th April, 1200-1300
- Thursday, 18th May, 1200-1300