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Abstract: In this paper, we describe our ongoing effort in describing and formalizing semantic relations that link ontologies with each others on the Semantic Web in order to create an ontology, DOOR, to represent, manipulate and reason upon these relations. DOOR is a Descriptive Ontology of Ontology Relations which intends to define relations such as inclusion, versioning, similarity and agreement using ontological primitives as well as rules. Here, we provide a detailed description of the methodology used to design the DOOR ontology, as well as an overview of its content. We also describe how DOOR is used in a complete framework (called KANNEL) for detecting and managing semantic relations between ontologies in large ontology repositories. Applied in the context of a large collection of automatically crawled ontologies, DOOR and KANNEL provide a starting point for analyzing the underlying structure of the network of ontologies that is the Semantic Web.

1 INTRODUCTION

Ontologies are the pillars of the Semantic Web (SW) and, as more and more ontologies are made available online, the SW is quickly taking shape. As a result, the research community is becoming more and more aware that ontologies are not isolated artifacts: they are, explicitly or implicitly, related with each other (Kleshchev and Artemjeva, 2005). Indeed, a number of studies have intended to tackle some of the challenges raised by these ontology relationships, from both theoretical and practical points of view.

At a theoretical level, studies have targeted ontology comparison in order to identify overlaps between ontologies (Maedche and Staab, 2002). Approaches have been proposed to find differences between versions of an ontologies (Noy and Musen, 2002; Konev et al., 2008). According to (Klein and Fensel, 2001), the ontology versioning problem has been defined as the ability to handle changes in ontologies by creating and managing different variants of it. In other words, ontology versioning means that there are multiple variants of an ontology around. The authors of (Klein and Fensel, 2001) suggested that, ideally, developers should maintain not only the different versions of an ontology, but also some information about the way versions differ and whether or not they are compatible with each other. In (Gangemi et al., 1999) ontology integration is defined as the construction of an ontology C that formally specifies the union of the vocabularies of two other ontologies A and B. The most interesting case is when A and B are supposed to commit to the conceptualization of the same domain of interest or of two overlapping domains. In particular, A and B may be related by being alternative ontologies, truly overlapping ontologies, equivalent ontologies with vocabulary mismatches, overlapping ontologies with disjoint domain, homonymically overlapping ontologies. Finally, in ontology matching, an alignment is set of correspondences between the entities of two ontologies, therefore relating these two ontologies by mapping there models with each other.

At a practical level, Semantic Web Applications use the SW as a large-scale knowledge source (d’Aquin et al., 2008): they achieve their tasks by automatically retrieving and exploiting knowledge from the SW as a whole, using advanced Semantic Web Search Engines (SWSEs) such as WATSON (d’Aquin et al., 2007). These SWSEs provide keyword based
search mechanisms to locate relevant ontologies for particular applications. As an example, the query "student" currently gives 1079 ontologies as a result in WATSON\(^1\) (valid on the 22/04/2009). However, these results are provided as a simple list without making explicit the underlying relations that link ontologies with each other. Indeed, on the first page, at least 2 of the ontologies (http://www.vistology.com/ont/tests/student1.owl and http://www.vistology.com/ont/tests/student2.owl) represent, apart from their URIs and the base namespaces, exactly the same logical model, expressed in the same ontology language. Another common situation is when an ontology has been translated in different ontology languages. This is the case in the first and second results of the query "student, university, researcher" (http://reliant.teknowledge.com/DAML/Mid-level-ontology.owl and http://reliant.teknowledge.com/DAML/Mid-level-ontology.daml). These two ontologies are obviously two different encodings of the same model. Inspecting the results of WATSON in the same way, it is not hard to find ontologies connected with other, more sophisticated semantic relations: versioning, inclusion, similarity, etc. Leaving implicit these relations in SWSE’s ontology repositories generates additional difficulties in exploiting their results, expecting the users and the applications to find the “right” or “best” ontology to achieve their goal.

Both the theoretical and practical challenges concerning relations between ontologies indicate a need for a general study of these relations, providing a formal base for defining, manipulating and reasoning upon the links that relate ontologies online, explicitly or implicitly. Here, we chose to take an ontological approach to this problem. We design DOOR, a Descriptive Ontology of Ontology Relations that defines ontology relations using ontological primitives and rules. Apart from the ontology itself, the main contributions of this work concern the realization of a methodology to identify and define relations between ontologies, as well as the development of a complete system based on DOOR (KANNEL), providing services for detecting relations, populating DOOR, and formally querying detected and inferred relations in a large ontology repository.

This paper is structured as follows: in Section 2 we continue discussing significant work concerning ontology relations; Section 3 presents the adopted methodology for designing DOOR; Section 4 describes the DOOR ontology; In Section 5 we briefly describe KANNEL and the main role of DOOR in this framework. Finally, Section 6 concludes the paper and sheds the light on interesting future research on ontology relations.

2 RELATED WORK

J. Heflin (Heflin and Pan., 2004) was the first to studied formally some of the different types of links between ontologies, focusing on the crucial problems of versioning and evolution. However, currently, there is no Ontology Management Systems that implements his framework. The authors of (Kleshchev and Artemjeva, 2005) characterized, at a very abstract level, a number of relations between ontologies such as sameConceptualization, Resemblance, Simplification and Composition, without providing formal definitions for them, and without considering the links between these relationships. Several approaches have been focusing on how to compare two different versions of ontologies in order to find the differences. In particular, PROMTDIF (Noy and Musen, 2002) compares the structure of ontologies and OWLDiff (http://semanticweb.org/wiki/OWLDiff) computes the differences by entailment, checking the two set of axioms. SemVersion (Volkel, 2006) compares two ontologies and computes the differences at both the structural and the semantic levels. In addition, many measures exist to compute particular forms of similarity between ontologies (David and Euzenat, 2008).

All these studies discuss particular relations separately and are generally based on an abstract, informal definition of the relations they consider. A complete model is necessary to provide a wide overview of existing ontology relations, to clearly establish what are their definitions, formal properties, and how they are connected with each other.

3 METHODOLOGY FOR THE DOOR ONTOLOGY

Building an ontology of relationships between ontologies is a very ambitious task. It requires a deep analysis of the ontologies available online and of the literature, at different levels. Therefore, a reasonably rigorous but nonetheless flexible methodology is needed to identify, describe and formalize ontology relations and their connections, in order to build the DOOR ontology. Here, after defining some important elements that will be used in the rest of the paper, we present the steps involved in the methodology we adopted and briefly detail each of them.

\(^1\)http://watson.kmi.open.ac.uk
3.1 Definitions and Requirements

We consider the following definitions:

**Definition 1 (Ontology)** An ontology is a set of axioms (in the sense of the description logic) over a Vocabulary VOC, where VOC is the set of the primitive terms (named entities) employed in the axioms of the ontology;

**Definition 2 (Ontology Space)** An ontology space OS, is a collection of ontologies.

**Definition 3 (Ontology Relation)** Given an ontology space OS, an Ontology Relation is any binary relation defined over OS.

At the most general level, the design of the DOOR ontology was based on three main sources to identify relevant ontology relations:

1. We analyzed the results of SWSEs (e.g., WATSON) to manually identify existing, implicit relations between ontologies in these results.
2. We considered relations described in the literature, such as the ones already mentioned in the previous sections.
3. We also included existing, explicit relations that are primitives of the OWL ontology language.

Also, ontology relations in the DOOR ontology should reflect the following important features:
- they are general enough to be applied to multiple domains;
- they are sufficiently intuitive to reflect general meaning;
- they are formally defined to be processed automatically by inference engines;

3.2 Main steps of the Methodology

To design DOOR, we considered the methodology described in (Gangemi et al., 2001) for selecting general ontological categories and adapted it to the problem of ontology relations. As a result, we divided our approach into a number of steps, as follows:

1. Identifying the top level relations between ontologies, considering our three sources (SWSEs, literature and existing OWL primitives). At this stage, the task only consists in coming up with a list of relations that should be relevant, giving us a general overview of the different sections of the ontology. Relations such as inclusion, similarity, incompatibility and previous version are identified here.

2. Specifying the identified relations, identifying relevant variants and sub-relations. Here, our three sources of relations are also employed to derive relations at a lower level than the top ones. We also use a more systematic approach, which consists in looking at ontologies (and so ontology relations) from 5 different dimensions that can characterize them:
   - **The Lexicographic level**, which concerns the comparison of the vocabularies of the ontologies.
   - **Syntactic level**, which concerns the comparison of the sets of axioms that form the ontologies.
   - **Structural level**, which concerns the comparison of the graph structure formed by the axioms of the ontologies.
   - **Semantic level**, which concerns the comparison of the formal models of the ontologies, looking in particular at their logical consequences.
   - **Temporal level**, which concerns the analysis of the evolution of ontologies in time.

For example, considering the relation of inclusion identified in the first step and that led to a property includedIn in the ontology, we can specify this relation according to three different dimensions (syntactic, structural and semantic), leading to three variants of inclusion between ontologies (syntacticallyIncludedIn, isHomomorphicTo and semanticallyIncludedIn) that consider the set of axioms, the graph and the formal models of the ontologies respectively.

In addition, besides the systematic analysis of this relation according to the dimensions, we include in DOOR particular forms of inclusions derived from existing OWL primitives (e.g., OWL imports) and from the literature (e.g., isAConservativeExtensionOf (Ghilardi et al., 2006)). More details about these relations are given in the next section.

3. Characterizing each relation by its algebraic properties. For example, the algebraic properties for similarity are that it is reflexive and symmetric. For inclusion, we can define that it is reflexive and transitive. Including such information in the ontology corresponds to what (Gangemi et al., 2001) calls defining the ground axioms.

4. Establishing connections between relations. The results obtained from the previous steps are mainly top-level relations with a list of variants, each of them being given algebraic properties.
Here, we want to structure these lists, in particular by giving them taxonomic relations. As an example, it can be easily established that syntacticallySimilarTo is a sub property of semanticallySimilarTo. In the same way, we can indicate that a previous version of an ontology ought to be similar to it. This corresponds to defining non-ground axioms in (Gangemi et al., 2001).

5. Introducing rules to define complex relations from atomic ones. For example, the equivalentTo property can be defined as:

\[ \text{equivalentTo}(X_1, X_2) :\text{-includedIn}(X_1, X_2), \text{includedIn}(X_2, X_1). \]

Like in any methodology, the application of these steps should be flexible and continuous. Getting back to a previous step is sometimes necessary and, as the building of an ontology such as DOOR is a constantly ongoing effort, it should be possible to re-apply the methodology entirely to make the ontology evolve.

The intended result is an ontology made, on the one hand, of an ontologically defined and taxonomically structured set of relations, and on the other hand, of a set of rules to define complex relations. In the following we give a detailed overview of the first version of the DOOR ontology, considering only the first (ontological) part of it, as, due to its complexity, the definition of rules governing complex relations is still a work in progress and would not fit in this paper.

4 FORMAL DESCRIPTION OF DOOR

The OWL version of the DOOR ontology can be downloaded at: http://kannel.open.ac.uk/ontology. We start with describing the first level of DOOR, in Figure 2. The main relevant abstract relations are simply represented as sub-properties of ontologyRelatedTo. An ontology X is ontologyRelatedTo another one Y if one of the top level relations is satisfied between X and Y. The top level relations include includedIn, similarTo, isAlignedTo, disagreesWith, agreesWith and isTheSchemaFor. We clustered them in four groups and each group will be explained in more details in the next sub-sections.

4.1 includedIn and equivalentTo

includedIn and equivalentTo are two of the main ontology relations. The former represents the meaning of “an ontology contains an another one”. The latter intends to convey the meaning of “two ontologies express the same knowledge”. According to our methodology, these two relations have been analyzed at different levels, giving origin to different kinds of inclusion and equivalence relations. In Table 1, we summarize the result of these analyses:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>includedIn</th>
<th>equivalentTo</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Semantic</td>
<td>semanticallyIncludedIn</td>
<td>semanticallyEquivalentTo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structural</td>
<td>isHomomorphicTo</td>
<td>isIsomorphicTo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syntactic</td>
<td>syntacticallyIncludedIn</td>
<td>syntacticallyEquivalentTo</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In particular, the sub-relations of includedIn are defined as follows:

- **SyntacticallyIncludedIn(X₁, X₂)** if the set of axioms of X₁ is contained in the set of axioms of X₂, which means X₁ ⊆ X₂.
- **isHomomorphicTo(X₁, X₂)** if a homomorphism exists between the RDF-graph of X₁ and the RDF-graph of X₂.
- **SemanticallyIncludedIn(X₁, X₂)** if the set of models of X₁ is contained in the set of models of X₂. In other words, if X₁ |= X₂.
- **isAConservativeExtensionOf(X₁, X₂)**, informally, if syntacticallyIncludedIn(X₂, X₁) and all the axioms entailed by X₁ over the vocabulary of X₂ are also entailed by X₂. A more formal definition can be found in (Ghilardi et al., 2006). The notion of conservative extension has been used in particular for ontology modularization (Grau et al., 2007).

import(X₁, X₂) if there is an explicit statement in X₁ indicating that it imports X₂ using the owl:imports primitive. Formally, this means that all the axioms of X₂ should be considered as contained in X₁.

The sub-relations of equivalentTo are defined as follows:

- **syntacticallyEquivalentTo(X₁, X₂)** if and only if SyntacticallyIncludedIn(X₁, X₂) and SyntacticallyIncludedIn(X₂, X₁).
isIsomorphicTo\((X_1, X_2)\) if an isomorphism exists between the graph of \(X_1\) and the graph of \(X_2\).

SemanticallyEquivalentTo if and only if \(\text{SemanticallyIncludedIn}(X_1, X_2)\) and \(\text{SemanticallyIncludedIn}(X_2, X_1)\).

Finally, following our methodology, we defined the algebraic properties of each relation\(^2\) and classified them to create a taxonomic structure relating these relations. This structure is showed in Figure 2\(^3\).

### 4.2 similarTo

Ontology similarity has been described as a measure to assess how close two ontologies are (David and Euzenat, 2008). Various ways to compute the similarity between two ontologies have been described which are relevant in different application contexts. In our work, similarTo is used to represent the meaning of “how an ontology overlap/cover parts of the same area of interest of another ontology”. Following our methodology, similarTo has been analyzed and formalized at the lexicographic, structural and semantic level, giving origin to different kinds of similarity relations (see Table 2).

To define these relations, we need to introduce the following elements: given two ontologies \(X_1\) and \(X_2\), we denote by \(LC(X_1, X_2)\) the set of axioms of \(X_1\) that are logical consequences of \(X_2\) and by \(Voc(X_j)\) the vocabulary of \(X_1\). The following definitions depend on a threshold \(T > 0\).

\(^2\)Since these are fairly obvious, we do not detail then.

\(^3\)The arrows represent the subPropertyOf relation. For example, syntacticallyEquivalentTo is a sub property of semanticallyIncludedIn.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Similarity Type</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Semantic</td>
<td>(\text{SemanticallySimiliarTo}(X_1, X_2)), if (\frac{</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syntactic</td>
<td>(\text{SyntacticallySimiliarTo}(X_1, X_2)), if (\frac{</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lexicographic</td>
<td>(\text{LexicographicallySimiliarTo}(X_1, X_2)), if (\frac{</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Finally, in addition to the relations defined above, we also consider a similarity relation that relies on the existence of an alignment between the two ontologies. Indeed, mappingSimilarTo is a relation that links two ontologies \(X_1\) and \(X_2\) if there exists an alignment from \(X_1\) to \(X_2\) and this alignment covers a substantial part of the vocabulary of \(X_1\) (i.e., a proportion greater than a threshold \(T\)). Not that, since alignments can be unidirectional, mappingSimilarTo differs from the other similarity functions by not being symmetric.

Finally, we have classified the relations in Table 1 to create the taxonomic structure showed in Figure 3.

### 4.3 Versioning

Versioning is a temporal relation that concerns the evolution of an ontology. In (Klein and Fensel, 2001),
the ontology versioning problem has been defined as

_The ability to handle changes in ontologies by creating and managing different variants of it._

An ontology can evolve over time in different directions, e.g., _lexicographic_, changing the names of some resources, _syntactic_, adding or removing axioms, _semantic_, changing the definition of some concepts or simply adding or removing axioms. Therefore, the new ontology could be equivalent or totally different from the previous one. When we analyze different ways of linking two ontologies by the versioning relation, the two following sentences are suggested immediately: “X₁ is the previous version of the X₂” or “X₂ is the latter version of the X₁”. These two typical pieces of knowledge are represented in the DOOR ontology by the relations _isPreviousVersionOf_ and its inverse _isLatterVersionOf_ respectively.

Conforming to our methodology, the _isPreviousVersionOf_ and _isLatterVersionOf_ relations have been analyzed and formalized, to identify sub-relations and variants. In Table 3 we summarize the result of this analysis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th><em>isLatterVersionOf</em></th>
<th><em>isPreviousVersionOf</em></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Temporal</td>
<td>conceptualEvolutionOf</td>
<td>priorVersion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>explanationEvolutionOf</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>backwardCompatibleWith</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>owl:IncompatibleWith</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semantic</td>
<td>conceptualEvolutionOf</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syntactic</td>
<td>explanationEvolutionOf</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to (Klein et al., 2002; Heflin and Pan., 2004; Heflin, 2001) the modification of an ontology can lead to two different types of evolutions: being a conceptual change, meaning that the model of the ontology changed, or being an explanation change, meaning that the modifications happened only at a syntactic level, without affecting the model of the meaning that the modifications happened only at a syntactic level, without affecting the model of the ontology. Therefore, we specialized the _isLatterVersionOf_ relation into

**conceptualEvolutionOf(X₁,X₂)** if X₁ is a latter version that is not semantically equivalent to X₂.

**explanationEvolutionOf(X₁,X₂)** if X₁ is a latter version that is semantically equivalent to X₂.

These two relations will lead to the definition of rules to infer them from equivalence and other versioning relations.

In addition, the OWL ontology properties _priorVersion_, _backwardCompatibleWith_ and _incompatibleWith_ represent explicit relations between versions of ontologies and are included in DOOR as sub-properties of _isLatterVersionOf_ and _isPreviousVersionOf_.

To complete this section of the DOOR ontology, we can classified the relations in Table 3 as showed in Figure 4.

![Figure 4: Taxonomy for versioning relations.](image)

Indeed, according to (Klein et al., 2002; Heflin and Pan., 2004; Heflin, 2001) the modification of an ontology can lead a new version which is completely different from the original one. But in practice, by analyzing Watson’s ontology repository, it is almost always possible establish a similarity between the two ontologies, at least at the lexicographic level. Due to this fact, we chose to consider the versioning relations to be sub-properties of _similarTo_, to indicate that two different versions of the same ontology should, to some extent, be similar. Moreover, in accordance with its definition, the _explanationEvolutionOf_ relation is a sub-property of _semanticallyEquivalentTo_.

### 4.4 Agree and Disagree

Based on the formal measure of the agreement and disagreement between two ontologies presented in (d’Aquin, 2009), we introduce the _agreesWith_ and _disagreesWith_ relations in DOOR. Informally, the former holds the general meaning of “to have the same opinion about something”. In other words, it connects two ontologies, sharing the same knowledge partially and is therefore very related to the _similarTo_ and the _equivalentTo_ relations. The later indicates that the ontologies “contradict each other” to a certain extent, these contradictions appearing at various levels. Envisaged sub-relations for these two relations are listed in Table 4.

In this Table, all the sub-relations of _agreesWith_ have already been defined before. We add a few relations to express specific ways for ontologies to disagree, all related to the semantic dimension of the on-
Table 4: Specialization of agreesWith and disagreesWith.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>agreesWith</th>
<th>disagreesWith</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Temporal</td>
<td>backwardCompatibleWith</td>
<td>owlIncompatibleWith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semantic</td>
<td>semanticallyEquivalentTo</td>
<td>hasDisparateModeling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>semanticallySimilarTo</td>
<td>incompatibleWith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>inconsistentWith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syntactic</td>
<td>syntacticallyEquivalentTo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>syntacticallySimilarTo</td>
<td>explanationEvolution</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 5: Taxonomy for the agreement relations.

Figure 6: Taxonomy for the disagreement relations.

According to (Qi and Hunter, 2007) an ontology \(X_1\) is incoherent if and only if there is an unsatisfiable concept name in \(X_1\). Therefore, two ontologies are incoherent with each other if, when they are merged, they generate an incoherent result.

According to (Bell et al., 2007) an ontology \(X_1\) is inconsistent if it has no model. Therefore, two ontologies are inconsistent with each other if, when they are merged, they generate an inconsistent result.

Besides the logical notion of disagreement, we also consider disagreements related to the conceptualization of the ontologies. Two ontologies are considered to have disparate modeling if they represent corresponding entities in different ways, e.g. as an instance in one case and a class in the other.

It comes from OWL language (Patel-Schneider et al., 2004).

Finally, we have also classified the relations in Table 4 as showed in Figures 5 and 6.

4.5 isTheSchemaFor and isAlignedTo

Analyzing Watson’s ontology repository we found out that there are many documents which only represent the TBox of an ontology and others representing just the ABox. By the isTheSchemaFor relation we want to keep the link between the TBox and the corresponding ABox, which is very important when we want to retrieve information.isAlignedTo relation is not well defined yet.

5 KANNEL: AN APPLICATION FOR THE DOOR ONTOLOGY

In the previous section, we described the DOOR ontology in detail. Here we provide a brief overview of the way it is used in the KANNEL system. KANNEL (Allocca., 2009) is a framework for detecting and managing ontology relations for large ontology repositories, such as WATSON. It is an ontology-based system where the DOOR ontology plays an important role, providing an explicit representation of the implicit relations between ontologies. We have designed an architecture for this framework, as depicted in Figure 7. As showed in this figure, the DOOR Ontology separates the on-line part of the architecture—providing APIs and services that relies on a reasoner—from the off-line part—detecting relations in the repository and populating the ontology. The offline part is based on three components: the Control Component (CC), the Detecting Component (DC) and the Populating Component (PC). As a first step, the CC selects from the Ontology Repository ontologies that need to be evaluated to establish potential relations. Then, the selected sets of ontologies are processed by the DC, which contains the main mechanisms to discover the possible relations between ontologies, relying on the definitions provided in this paper. Finally, the PC populates the semantic structure with the detected relations. What is obtained is a set of automatically discovered relations, represented as part of the DOOR ontology so that the reasoner used in the system can infer new relations from the ontological and rule based knowledge included in the ontology. As such, DOOR provides meta-information on the ontology repository in KANNEL.
6 CONCLUSIONS

In this paper, general relationships between ontologies have been examined. In particular, we have chosen to consider well-known relations in the literature, as well as the ones needed to support the development of Semantic Web Applications. To achieve that, we adapted an ontology building methodology for the construction of DOOR, an ontology of relations between ontologies. This ontology describes relations both from the point of view of their taxonomic structure and from the point of view of their formal definitions, providing the formal properties to describe them as well as a set of rules to derive complex relations from other relations.

We also described KANNEL, a framework for detecting and managing ontology relationships for large ontology repositories. The DOOR ontology plays a fundamental role in KANNEL, not only to provide an explicit representation on ontology relations, but also to supply meta-information that offers several advantages, among which the possibility to reason upon ontologies and their relations. This possibility provides a relevant support for the development of Semantic Web Applications, which can use the semantic web as a large-scale knowledge source (d’Aquin et al., 2008).

The first version of the DOOR ontology is available in OWL at http://kannel.open.ac.uk/ontology. The KANNEL framework is currently under development. The development of DOOR is obviously a continuous task, which requires a proper assessment of each version. For this reason, we plan to test and validate the first version presented here, in particular by populating it with automatically detected relations between ontologies in WATSON.
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