



**Integrating Multimedia Metadata Standards  
and Metadata Formats with the Multimedia  
Metadata Ontology:  
Method and Examples**

Ansgar Scherp  
Daniel Eißing  
Carsten Saathoff

**Nr. 4/2012**

**Arbeitsberichte aus dem  
Fachbereich Informatik**

Die Arbeitsberichte aus dem Fachbereich Informatik dienen der Darstellung vorläufiger Ergebnisse, die in der Regel noch für spätere Veröffentlichungen überarbeitet werden. Die Autoren sind deshalb für kritische Hinweise dankbar. Alle Rechte vorbehalten, insbesondere die der Übersetzung, des Nachdruckes, des Vortrags, der Entnahme von Abbildungen und Tabellen – auch bei nur auszugsweiser Verwertung.

The “Arbeitsberichte aus dem Fachbereich Informatik“ comprise preliminary results which will usually be revised for subsequent publication. Critical comments are appreciated by the authors. All rights reserved. No part of this report may be reproduced by any means or translated.

### **Arbeitsberichte des Fachbereichs Informatik**

**ISSN (Print):** 1864-0346

**ISSN (Online):** 1864-0850

### **Herausgeber / Edited by:**

Der Dekan:

Prof. Dr. Grimm

Die Professoren des Fachbereichs:

Prof. Dr. Bátori, Prof. Dr. Burkhardt, Prof. Dr. Diller, Prof. Dr. Ebert, Prof. Dr. Furbach, Prof. Dr. Grimm, Prof. Dr. Hampe, Prof. Dr. Harbusch, jProf. Dr. Kilian, Prof. Dr. von Korflesch, Prof. Dr. Lämmel, Prof. Dr. Lautenbach, Prof. Dr. Müller, Prof. Dr. Oppermann, Prof. Dr. Paulus, Prof. Dr. Priese, Prof. Dr. Rosendahl, jProf. Dr. Scherp, Prof. Dr. Schubert, Prof. Dr. Sofronie-Stokkermans, Prof. Dr. Staab, Prof. Dr. Steigner, Prof. Dr. Sure, Prof. Dr. Troitzsch, Prof. Dr. Wimmer, Prof. Dr. Zöbel

### **Kontakt Daten der Verfasser**

Ansgar Scherp, Daniel Eißing, Carsten Saathoff  
Institut WeST

Fachbereich Informatik

Universität Koblenz-Landau

Universitätsstraße 1

D-56070 Koblenz

E-Mail: [scherp@uni-koblenz.de](mailto:scherp@uni-koblenz.de), [eissing@uni-koblenz.de](mailto:eissing@uni-koblenz.de), [saathoff@uni-koblenz.de](mailto:saathoff@uni-koblenz.de)

# Integrating Multimedia Metadata Standards and Metadata Formats with the Multimedia Metadata Ontology: Method and Examples

**Extended Technical Report**

Ansgar Scherp, Daniel Eißing, and Carsten Saathoff

University of Koblenz-Landau, Koblenz, Germany

{scherp,eissing,saathoffuni-koblenz.de}

<http://www.uni-koblenz-landau.de/koblenz>

June 20, 2012



**Summary:** The Multimedia Metadata Ontology (M3O) provides a generic modeling framework for representing multimedia metadata. It has been designed based on an analysis of existing metadata standards and metadata formats. The M3O abstracts from the existing metadata standards and formats and provides generic modeling solutions for annotations, decompositions, and provenance of metadata. Being a generic modeling framework, the M3O aims at integrating the existing metadata standards and metadata formats rather than replacing them. This is in particular useful as today's multimedia applications often need to combine and use more than one existing metadata standard or metadata format at the same time. However, applying and specializing the abstract and powerful M3O modeling framework in concrete application domains and integrating it with existing metadata formats and metadata standards is not always straightforward. Thus, we have developed a step-by-step alignment method that describes how to integrate existing multimedia metadata standards and metadata formats with the M3O in order to use them in a concrete application. We demonstrate our alignment method by integrating seven different existing metadata standards and metadata formats with the M3O and describe the experiences made during the integration process.

**Keywords:** Ontology alignment; multimedia metadata; metadata standards; metadata formats; Core Ontology on Multimedia (COMM); EXIF; ID3; Dublin Core; XMP; Search Monkey; Ontology for Media Resource; W3C

## 1 Introduction

A densely populated jungle with a myriad of partially competing species of different colors and size—this might be a good characterization of today’s world of multimedia metadata formats and metadata standards. Looking at the existing metadata models like [1–5] and metadata standards such as [6–11], we find it hard to decide which of them to use in a complex multimedia application. They focus on different media types, are very generic or designed for a specific application domain, overlap in the functionality provided, are semantically ambiguous, or provide only limited features for modeling the multimedia metadata. In addition, the existing standards and formats typically cannot be combined with each other as they are not designed for such a combined use. However, building a complex multimedia application often requires using several of these standards and formats *together*, e.g., when different tools have to be integrated along the media production process [12]. For example, it might be required to use and combine EXIF [6] metadata for images with ID3 [13] for audio metadata together with Dublin Core metadata [10, 11] and semantic annotations from DBpedia [14].

With XMP [7], there exists an initiative to enable interoperability along the production process of images. Nevertheless, this work is limited with respect to the functionality provided and focuses on the media type image only [15]. Overall, the XMP initiative is an important step but more is required to facilitate multimedia metadata interoperability along the media production process. Other efforts like the industry-driven Metadata Working Group [16] and the W3C Media Annotations Working Group [17] try to tackle these issues by developing a common vocabulary. However, they do not extend their effort beyond single media assets, i.e., they do not consider structured multimedia content as it can be created with formats like Flash [18], SMIL [19], and SVG [20]. In addition, the existing approaches do not provide a generic framework suitable for integrating arbitrary metadata formats and arbitrary metadata standards.

To solve this problem, we have developed the pattern-based Multimedia Metadata Ontology (M3O) [15]. The M3O is a sophisticated modeling framework for representing among others the annotation, decomposition, and provenance of multimedia content and multimedia metadata. The goal of the M3O is to provide a framework for the integration of existing metadata formats and metadata standards rather than replacing them. The M3O bases on a foundational ontology [21, 22] and by this inherits a rich axiomatization. A foundational ontology models the very basic and general concepts and properties and spans across many fields [21, 22]. These concepts and properties are specialized by the M3O to the field of multimedia metadata. The rich axiomatization provided by the foundational ontology is extended by the M3O in order to precisely describe the semantics

of the multimedia content with metadata. As such, the M3O is well-suited to serve as basis for integrating and aligning existing metadata standards and metadata formats. In addition, the M3O follows a pattern-based ontology design approach. Similar to design patterns in software engineering [23], ontology design patterns provide generic modeling solutions for recurring modeling problems [24]. It allows the M3O to arrange the different functionalities for representing multimedia metadata into smaller, modular, and reusable units (cf. [24]). Being an abstract and powerful representation model for multimedia metadata, it is not straightforward how to use the M3O in concrete multimedia applications and integrating and aligning it with existing metadata standards and metadata formats. In this paper, we fill this gap and present a step-by-step alignment method describing how to integrate existing formats and standards for multimedia metadata and the M3O.

As an example for applying the M3O, let us consider an audio object `money-abba-1` and annotate it with the date when it has been recorded and the band that actually has produced the recording. For conducting such annotations, we are using the Annotation Pattern provided by the M3O. For representing the recording date and the band, we use a M3O-aligned ontology of the widely adopted ID3 [13] metadata specification for describing audio files.

The audio object we want to annotate with its information when it has been originally recorded and by whom is represented by the individual `money-abba-1` as depicted in Figure 1. The individual is an instance of the `AudioConcept` and is defined in the ID3 ontology. In the context of the M3O Annotation Pattern, the audio object `money-abba-1` is classified by the individual `ac-1` using the `classifies` relation as the individual that is being annotated (`AnnotatedConcept`). The AnnotationPattern `id3ap-1` uses the `defines` relation to determine the ID3 compliant annotations to be used, namely the `OriginalRecordingConcept` with its two `hasPart` relations, the `ArtistConcept` and `ReleaseYearConcept`. These concepts defined by the AnnotationPattern provide the structure of the annotation. A `Quality` represents an attribute of an entity and connects the entity with a concrete `Region`. The `Regions` are the value spaces of the `Quality`. In the example, the object `money-abba-1` has two qualities that connect the object with the two region concepts `ArtistRegion ar-1` and `ReleaseYearRegion ryr-1`. To associate the regions with the annotation structure defined by the AnnotationPattern, they are parameterized by the corresponding `ArtistConcept` and `ReleaseYearConcept`. The actual annotations of our audio object `money-abba-1` are attached to the region concepts `ArtistRegion` and `ReleaseYearRegion` using the `hasRegionDataValue` relation. In our example, the audio object `money-abba-1` has been originally recorded by the pop group "ABBA" in "1976". The actual annotations of the audio object `money-abba-1` by the `Regions ar-1` and `ryr-1` are embedded by using the `hasSetting` relation into what

is called the concrete situation or application context of the Annotation Pattern, represented by the `AnnotationSituation` `id3as-1`. As the `AnnotationSituation` `id3as-1` is a valid annotation with respect to the annotation structure defined by the `AnnotationPattern` `id3ap-1`, we say the `AnnotationSituation` satisfies the `AnnotationPattern`.




Figure 1: Application of the ID3 metadata format using M3O.

A systematic introduction to the concepts and patterns of the M3O is provided in the subsequent Section 2. In Section 3, we describe the step-by-step alignment method along the tasks that have to be performed for integrating existing metadata standards and metadata formats with the M3O. Subsequently, we demonstrate the application of the alignment method in Sections 4 to 10 at the examples of seven metadata standards and metadata formats. These are the Core Ontology on Multimedia (COMM) [2], which is a formalization of the multimedia metadata standard MPEG-7 [9], the widely known and adopted industry standards EXIF [6] and XMP [7] for image metadata, the de-facto standard ID3 [13] for audio metadata, the Dublin Core [10,11] vocabulary for annotating documents, Yahoo!’s SearchMonkey Media [25] vocabulary, and the recently released Ontology for Media Resource [26] of the W3C. Section 11 presents two larger examples of the combined use of several metadata standards and metadata formats aligned with the M3O. We discuss in Section 12 some of the experiences made while applying our step-by-step alignment method. We present related work in Section 13, before we conclude the paper.

## 2 Introduction to the Multimedia Metadata Ontology

The Multimedia Metadata Ontology (M3O) [15] provides a generic modeling framework for representing multimedia metadata. It has been designed by abstracting from existing multimedia metadata standards and metadata formats (see related work in Section 13).



Such a generic model is not limited to a single media type such as images, video, text, and audio. It also provides support for structured multimedia content, i.e., a combination of several media assets of different media types like video and text coherently arranged in time and space. Such structured multimedia content can be created with today's multimedia presentation formats like SMIL, SVG, and Flash. The M3O is modeled as a highly axiomatized core ontology that is based on the foundational ontology DOLCE+DnS Ultralight (DUL) [27]. Foundational ontologies span across many fields and model the very basic and general concepts and relations [21,22]. They are rich in axiomatization and thus precisely describe the concepts and relations they define. For example, DUL provides a philosophically grounded formal conceptualization of objects, events, and information. Core ontologies provide a detailed abstract definition of structured knowledge in one particular field [21,22] such as multimedia metadata in the case of the M3O. They inherit the rich axiomatization provided by foundational ontologies and refine them by adding detailed concepts and relations (cf. [21]). In the case of DUL and the M3O, the axiomatization is conducted in Description Logics [28]. The M3O follows a pattern-based approach to ontology design. Ontology design patterns provide generic modeling solutions for recurring modeling problems [24] and thus are similar to design patterns in software engineering [23]. Each ontology design pattern is focused on modeling a specific and clearly identified aspect of the domain such as annotation and decomposition in the M3O (cf. competency question for ontology design patterns in [29]). From an analysis of existing multimedia metadata formats and metadata standards [15], we have identified six patterns required to express the metadata for multimedia content. These patterns model the basic structural elements of existing metadata models and are the Decomposition Pattern, Annotation Pattern, Information Realization Pattern, Data Value Pattern for representing complex values, Collection Pattern, and Provenance Pattern. We make use of the ontology design patterns provided by DUL such as the Descriptions and Situations (DnS) Pattern. The DnS Pattern provides an ontological formalization of context through the introduction of roles [21,30]. By this, it allows to formally represent different views onto entities. Basing a model like the M3O on ontology design patterns ensures a high degree of modularity and extensibility, while at the same time a high degree of axiomatization and thus semantic precision is retained. In order to realize a specific multimedia metadata standard or metadata format in the M3O, these patterns need to be specialized. In the following sections, we briefly introduce the *Information Realization Pattern*, *Annotation Pattern*, *Decomposition Pattern*, *Collection Pattern*, and *Data Value Pattern* of the M3O, which we will refer to in the upcoming sections.

## 2.1 Information Realization

The Information Realization Pattern in Figure 2 models the distinction between information objects and information realizations [27]. Consider a digital image that is stored on the hard disk in several formats and resolutions. An information object represents the image as an abstract *concept* or *idea*, namely the information that an image has been taken. This information object might be realized by different information realizations, i.e., different files may exist that *realize* the same information object. As shown in Figure 2, the pattern consists of the `InformationRealization` that is connected to the `InformationObject` by the `realizes` relation. Both are subconcepts of `InformationEntity`, which allows treating information in a general sense as we will see in the Annotation Pattern.




Figure 2: Information Realization Pattern

## 2.2 Annotation Pattern

Annotations are understood in the M3O as the attachment of metadata to an information entity. Metadata comes in various forms such as low-level descriptors obtained by automatic methods, non-visual information covering authorship or technical details, or semantic annotation aiming at a formal and machine-understandable representation of the contents. The Annotation Pattern models the basic structure that underlies all types of annotation. This allows for assigning arbitrary annotations to information entities while providing the means for modeling provenance and context. In Figure 3, we see that an annotation is not modeled as a direct relationship between some media item and an annotation. It is defined by a more complex structure, which is inherited by the Descriptions and Situations Pattern of DUL. Basically, a Descriptions and Situations Pattern is two-layered. The *Description* defines the structure, in this case the structure of an annotation, which contains some entity that is annotated and some entity that represents the metadata. The *Situation* contains the concrete entities for which we want to express the annotation. The pattern allows us to add further concepts and entities into the *context* of an annotation, e.g., expressing provenance or confidence information. At the top half of Figure 3, we see that the AnnotationPattern defines an `AnnotatedConcept` and an `AnnotationConcept`. The `AnnotatedConcept` classifies an `InformationEntity` and thus expresses that the information entity is the subject of the annotation. The Annotation-

Concept classifies some Entity, which identifies this entity as the annotation or metadata. The entity can be some complex data value, e.g., representing some low-level features represented using the Data Value Pattern, but also some concept located in a domain ontology such as DBpedia [14]. All the entities have as setting the AnnotationSituation, which satisfies the AnnotationPattern.




Figure 3: Annotation Pattern

### 2.3 Decomposition Pattern

The Decomposition Pattern shown in Figure 4 is like the Annotation Pattern a specialization of DUL's Descriptions and Situations Pattern. It allows to decompose (multi-)media assets into parts in order to annotate them further using the Annotation Pattern. In the context of the Decomposition Pattern, the (multi-)media asset that is decomposed is called the composite and the parts are the components. The Decomposition Pattern introduces a DecompositionPattern as specialization of DUL's Description concept and a DecompositionSituation as specialization of the Situation concept. It defines exactly one CompositeConcept and at least one ComponentConcept. The CompositeConcept and ComponentConcept classify InformationEntity that have the DecompositionSituation as setting.




Figure 4: Decomposition Pattern

## 2.4 Collection Pattern

A set of information entities that have one or more common properties can be represented as a collection of information entities using the Collection Pattern of the M3O. As depicted in Figure 5, the Collection Pattern is also based on the Descriptions and Situations Pattern of DUL. By using the Descriptions and Situations Pattern, the Collection Pattern supports the collaborative creation of collections. In addition, it is aware of the source of the information entities that are added. An example of a collection is the set of images collected by different people under a common topic like *antique cars* or *cute dogs* as it is possible by, e.g., the use of groups on the photo sharing platform Flickr<sup>1</sup>. The design of the Collection Pattern as shown in Figure 5 introduces a `CollectionPattern` as specialization of the `Description` concept and provides a `CollectionSituation` as specialization of the `Situation` concept of DUL's Descriptions and Situations pattern. As axiomatization, the concept of the `CollectionPattern` defines that there has to be exactly one `CollectionConcept` that classifies an `InformationEntityCollection`. The `InformationEntityCollection` is the actual collection of information entities. Thus, it is specialized from DUL's `InformationEntity` and `Collection` concepts. As first-order entity, the `InformationEntityCollection` can be annotated using the Annotation Pattern described above. In addition, the `CollectionPattern` contains an axiom that defines that there are some `ElementConcepts` that classify `InformationEntity`, i.e., the elements of the collection.




Figure 5: Collection Pattern

## 2.5 Data Value Pattern

To represent concrete data values such as strings and numerical values in DUL, there exists the concept `Quality`. A `Quality` represents an attribute of an `Entity`, i.e., that only exist together with the `Entity`. `Regions` are used to represent the values of an `Quality` and the data space they come from. The Data Value Pattern depicted in Figure 6 assigns a

<sup>1</sup><http://www.flickr.com/>

concrete data value to an attribute of that entity. The attribute is represented by the concept **Quality** and is connected to the **Entity** by the **hasQuality** property. The **Quality** is connected to a **Region** by the **hasRegion** relation. The **Region** models the data space the value comes from. We attach the concrete value to the **Region** using the relation **hasRegionDataValue**. The data value is encoded using typed literals, i.e., the datatype can be specified using XML Schema Datatypes [31].




Figure 6: Data Value Pattern

### 3 Alignment Method

This section introduces our method for aligning existing multimedia metadata standards and multimedia metadata formats with the M3O. The method has been derived from our experiences applying and specializing the M3O for seven existing multimedia formats and standards, namely COMM [2], EXIF [6], XMP [7], ID3 [13], Dublin Core [10,11], Yahoo!'s SearchMonkey Media [25], and the Ontology for Media Resource [26]. In contrast to automatic, adaptive, or machine learning approaches for ontology alignment [32–34], we conduct a pure manual alignment, as only a manual alignment ensures the high quality of the integration and minimizes ambiguities and imprecise matching. We consider the time and effort for manual alignment manageable, as we assume that each metadata format or standard has to be aligned only once and that updates to the integrated formats or standards will be infrequent and mostly incremental. Our experiences with integrating and aligning the above mentioned standards and formats for multimedia metadata shows that the effort is actually manageable. Aligning these metadata standards and metadata formats with the M3O took between 4 to 24 hours for a Master of Science student, depending on the size and complexity of the integrated metadata model.

We propose an iterative alignment method that helps ontology engineers to integrate existing metadata standards and metadata formats. In each iteration, we consecutively evolve the alignment of the standard or format with the M3O. Following an iterative approach, we are able to identify, analyze, and flexibly react to problems and challenges encountered during previous iterations of the alignment. Each iteration consists of four steps: The first step targets at the understanding of the format or standard to be integrated. The second step reorders concepts and properties into coherent groups. The

third step maps the concepts and properties and their arrangement in groups with the M3O. The fourth step proves and documents the validity of the alignment. It finalizes the iteration.

To introduce our alignment method, we proceed as follows: For each step, we first outline the goals and provide a brief summarization. Subsequently, we describe the core tasks to be performed within the step and provide concrete examples that show its relevance and application for concrete ontologies.

### 3.1 Step 1: Understanding

**Summary** A precise understanding of the metadata standard or metadata format to be integrated is an important prerequisite for aligning it with the M3O. Consequently, the first step of alignment is an in-depth analysis of the structure and core concepts and properties of the model at hand. While this advice may seem obvious, this is a task easily underestimated and problems neglected at an early stage can cause time-consuming problems along the integration process. Additional documentation, if available, will help to (re-)produce the overall structure not explicitly expressed in the formal specification.

**Detailed Description and Examples** In general, we have found three distinct modeling approaches to be very common for multimedia metadata standards and metadata formats.

**Predicate-centric** In a predicate-centric approach as followed, e.g., by the Ontology for Media Resource, the ontology is predominantly specified through a set of properties. Such a model offers very little structure in a machine readable format, e.g., in terms of conceptual relations between properties. However, by analyzing the documentation, we infer additional information about intended groupings of properties and the structural composition of the format or standard to be integrated.

**Pattern-based** Pattern-based ontologies, e.g., COMM, provide a high degree of axiomatization and structure in a formal and precise way. Through our analysis, we understand the patterns used and the functionality they provide. This allows us to compare the patterns of the ontology to be integrated with those provided by the M3O.

**Legacy Models** Other standards and formats have not yet been semantified. By analyzing the concepts and relations expressed in the specification of the format, we decide how the core concepts can be expressed in a formal and precise way using the M3O.

Ambiguities that are found during the initial analysis are discussed at this point. It is not our intention to revise all modeling decisions made for the ontology to be integrated. However, we consider the alignment a good opportunity to correct some of the *bad smells* [35] discovered. Once we have reached a sufficient understanding of the format or standard to be integrated, we proceed with the grouping step.

## 3.2 Step 2: Grouping

**Summary** Ontologies should provide structural information on the relations and groupings of concepts it defines. However, although many standards and formats provide this information in their documentation, the information is sometimes lost when the models are transformed to an ontology. By using the original specifications and documentations, we are able to preserve and recreate this information grouping, and provide them through formal specification in the aligned ontology.

**Detailed Description and Examples** In principle, we distinguish three forms of available grouping information:

**Explicit Grouping** With pattern-based models, we find an explicit grouping of concepts into coherent patterns. The patterns are often accompanied by a rich axiomatization on how the concepts in these patterns relate. As an example, the definition of a color histogram annotation in COMM specifies a `ColorQuantizationComponentDescriptorParameter` that groups the concepts `ColorComponent` and `NumberOfBinsPerComponent`.

**Implicit Grouping** For other metadata models grouping information may not be explicitly represented. This is often the case with predicate-centric approaches, e.g., the Ontology for Media Resource. In these cases, we refer to the textual documentation in order to (re-)construct the implicit groupings of the properties or concepts. As an example, the documentation of the Ontology for Media Resource offers a textual description on the grouping of its properties, e.g., in terms of identification or creation. However, this information is not accessible in the Resource Description Framework (RDF) representation [26] as proposed by the W3C. By defining the appropriate axioms, we have appended the implicit grouping information in a formal and explicit way, e.g., by stating that an `IdentificationAnnotation` `hasPart` some `TitleAnnotation`, `LanguageAnnotation`, and `LocatorAnnotation`.

**Recovery of Groupings** In other cases grouping information is lost when transferring metadata formats or standards to RDF. For example the EXIF metadata standard

provides textual descriptions about groupings, e.g., in terms of pixel composition and geo location. However, this distinction got lost in the adaptation of EXIF to an RDF vocabulary [36]. The same happened for the de-facto metadata standard ID3 for audio. The documentation of ID3 provides textual descriptions about groupings like the original recording, volume adjustment, and equalization. An RDF vocabulary for ID3 has been developed in the context of the NEPOMUK project<sup>2</sup>, called the NEPOMUK ID3 Ontology [37]. However, the grouping information provided in the original ID3 documentation cannot be found in the NEPOMUK ID3 Ontology and got lost. In addition, some of the key-value pairs defined in the ID3 format are not mapped to the ontology at all. For example, the volume adjustment and equalization is missing in the NEPOMUK ID3 Ontology. For the alignment with the M3O, we have reconstructed the grouping information and appended it to the model in a formal and explicit way. In addition, we have added the key-value pairs that were not mapped to the NEPOMUK ID3 Ontology at all.

Once we have provided all relevant grouping relations through a formal specification, we continue with the mapping step.

### 3.3 Step 3: Mapping

**Summary** This step achieves the mapping of the ontology's concepts and structure to the modeling framework of the M3O. The goal of this step is to create a working ontology, which, after validation, can be published on the Internet or used as basis for further iterations.

**Detailed Description and Examples** For the alignment, we follow a sequence of the following three steps:

- 1. Mapping of Concepts** If some superclass of the concept to be aligned is present in both ontologies, direct mapping of concepts is feasible. This is mainly the case for ontologies that share the same foundation, e.g., COMM and the M3O, which both base on the DUL foundational ontology. All axioms of the aligned concepts are preserved as long as they are applicable through the M3O. If a concept is not applicable in the M3O, we align all dependent subclasses and references to the nearest matching M3O concept. As an example, the COMM `DigitalData` concept, which is a subclass of the DUL `InformationObject`, has been removed during the

---

<sup>2</sup><http://nepomuk.semanticdesktop.org/>



alignment. The dangling dependencies and references have been resolved by subclassing or referencing the `InformationObject` instead. In other cases, an alignment could be directly conducted by introducing new subclasses based on the description of the metadata format. For example, the Yahoo!'s SearchMonkey Media vocabulary provides media types like article, audio, image, photo, text, and video. They have been aligned with DUL by introducing subclasses of `InformationRealization` for each media type, namely `ArticleRealization`, `AudioRealization`, `ImageRealization`, `PhotoRealization`, `TextRealization`, and `VideoRealization`.

**2. Structural Mapping** For structural mapping, we consider the functionality of the concept and property groupings as obtained from the second alignment step. The concept and property groupings can be provided, e.g., in form of ontology design patterns like in the case of COMM, as set of re-organized concepts and properties as in the example of the Ontology for Media Resource, or as set of newly created concepts and properties like for EXIF and ID3. If a grouping of concepts and properties, e.g., an ontology design pattern, offers the same or an equal functionality than a pattern of the M3O, we replace it with the M3O pattern. By adapting the M3O pattern, we are often able to express the same functionality using a more generic approach. As an example, COMM proposes the Digital Data Pattern to express data values in a digital domain. A similar functionality is provided by the M3O Data Value Pattern, which expresses data values through the generic concepts of `Quality` and `Region`. The COMM Digital Data Pattern can be considered as special case of expressing data values and therefore has been replaced by using the M3O Data Value Pattern instead.

In the same way, we simplify the structural composition of the existing model by merging multiple concepts and patterns that offer the same or an equal functionality. As an example, COMM defines three annotation patterns. Each deals with a different aspect of multimedia annotation, although they vary only slightly in their structural composition. We have aligned those patterns by adapting the M3O Annotation Pattern. The domain specific concepts that result from the separation into three distinct patterns have been preserved by subclassing the corresponding concepts of the M3O Annotation Pattern. This simplifies the structure of the model, while also preserving the original functionality.

**3. Removing Unnecessary Concepts** We finalize the mapping step by cleaning up unused dependencies from the ontology. Concepts that either have no further relevance for the target context or are sufficiently covered by the M3O are removed at this point. An example, the COMM `AnnotatedMediaRole` offers an equal func-

tionality as the M3O AnnotatedInformationRealizationConcept. We therefore have removed COMM's AnnotatedMediaRole and replaced any formal relation that involves the concept.

### 3.4 Step 4: Validation and Documentation

In each iteration of the alignment process, we need to check the consistency of the resulting ontology. This can be done by using a reasoner like Fact++<sup>3</sup> or Pellet<sup>4</sup>. Any problem encountered during the alignment can be resolved by reiterating the four steps of the alignment method. After proving the consistency of the resulting ontology, we finalize the process by documenting all major decisions and adjustments made during the alignment.

### 3.5 Summary

In this section, we have presented a four-step alignment method for integrating existing multimedia metadata standards and multimedia metadata formats with the M3O. In the following Sections 4 to 10, we demonstrate the application of our alignment method at the examples of seven existing standards and formats for multimedia metadata. They are the Core Ontology on Multimedia, EXIF, ID3, Dublin Core, XMP, Yahoo!'s Search-Monkey Media vocabulary, and the Ontology for Media Resource. We present the result of applying the alignment method and summarize some of the experiences made during the alignment in Section 12.

## 4 Example 1: Core Ontology on Multimedia (COMM)

The Core Ontology on Multimedia (COMM) [2] is a formal specification of the MPEG-7 metadata standard [9]. In contrast to other approaches to modeling MPEG-7 as an ontology [1, 38], COMM is not designed as a one-to-one mapping, but provides a set of patterns that cover the core and repetitive building blocks of MPEG-7. The central challenge of the alignment of COMM and M3O is understanding the patterns of COMM and mapping them to the modeling framework provided by the M3O. This section describes the experiences and challenges of aligning COMM and the M3O, using the four-step alignment method proposed above.

---

<sup>3</sup><http://owl.man.ac.uk/factplusplus/>

<sup>4</sup><http://clarkparsia.com/pellet/>

## 4.1 Application of the Alignment Method

**Understanding** COMM follows a pattern-based approach to ontology design and builds on the DUL foundational ontology. Some of the core patterns, i.e., the Descriptions and Situations Pattern, are shared between COMM and the M3O. Others, e.g., the Digital Data Pattern, form major structural differences.

COMM defines five structural patterns, namely the Content Annotation Pattern, Media Annotation Pattern, and Semantic Annotation Pattern for media annotation, the Decomposition Pattern for media (de-)composition, and the Digital Data Pattern, which expresses annotations in a digital domain. Domain specific knowledge is separated from the core concepts and defined in separate ontologies, e.g., concepts concerning annotation of visual entities are defined in the *visual ontology*.

Some ambiguities that were found in the initial analysis have been resolved at this point. As an example, COMM specifies concepts such as `NumberOfBinsPerComponent` that are specialization of both `Parameter` and `Region`. While this may not be syntactically incorrect, it violates the DnS pattern of DUL. In the DnS pattern, a `Parameter` parametrizes a `Region`. Thus, these two concepts should not have common sub-concepts. To solve this problem, we have removed the superclass relations to the `Parameter` concept and introduced a `parametrizes` relation. For example, COMM specified a `ColorComponent` and `NumberOfBinsPerComponent`, which are subclasses of both the `ColorQuantizationComponentDescriptorParameter` and the `Region` concept. We have removed the superclass relation from the `ColorComponent` and `NumberOfBinsPerComponent` to the `ColorQuantizationComponentDescriptorParameter`, which instead now `parametrizes` these concepts.

**Grouping** Following a pattern-based design, COMM already provides a rich degree of conceptual groupings and their axiomatization in a machine readable format. However, reusability can be improved by redistributing concepts among the six ontologies of COMM, *core*, *datatype*, *localization*, *media*, *visual*, and *textual*, respectively. As an example, the concept `RootSegmentRole`, located in the COMM *core ontology*, is not used in any pattern definition and has therefore been relocated to the *localization ontology*.

**Mapping** The main challenge of aligning COMM and the M3O concern the differences of the patterns used and how to relate them. Although some principles are shared between the ontologies, there are also major differences, e.g., the Digital Data Pattern of COMM and the Information Realization Pattern of the M3O.

Often COMM patterns have been replaced using a more generic pattern of the M3O. As an example, Figure 7 displays the adaption of the COMM Digital Data Pattern through

the M3O. For the alignment, we have decided that the functionality of the Digital Data Pattern, i.e., expressing data values, can be maintained by adopting the M3O Data Value Pattern instead. All related concepts have either been removed or mapped to the next matching M3O concept. As an example, the `StructuredDataDescription` concept has been removed as it held no further relevance in the context of the Data Value Pattern. The `StructuredDataParameter` concept on the other hand has been preserved as specialization of the M3O Annotation Pattern. To accommodate `StructuredDataParameters` with the M3O, we consider `StructuredDataParameters` as subclass of the `AnnotationConcept`. Through parameterizing the appropriate `Region`, we can constrain the range applicable for a specific `StructuredDataParameter`. The value itself is expressed using the `hasRegionDataValue` relation. In a similar manner, the three annotation patterns of COMM have been replaced through the M3O Annotation Pattern and all dependent concepts have been mapped to the M3O Annotation Pattern instead.




Figure 7: Excerpt of COMM subsequently to the integration with the M3O. White boxes show the concepts of the M3O or DUL, whereas grey boxes represent concepts of COMM aligned to the M3O.

**Validation and Documentation** The alignment of COMM and the M3O has been validated using Fact++ and Pellet reasoner.

## 4.2 Application of the Aligned Ontology

Figure 8 demonstrates the application of `StructuredDataParameters` using COMM aligned with the M3O. We specify a `ColorQuantizationComponentDescriptorParameter` (`CQCDParameter`) as part of the `RGBHistogramAnnotationConcept`. The `CQCDParameter` parametrizes the `ColorComponents` and `NumberOfBinsPerComponent`, which are considered part of the `RGBHistogramRegion`. The `hasRegionDataValue` relation expresses the primitive value for this annotation, e.g., an unsigned integer for the `NumberOfBinsPerComponent` concept. Staying in line with the specification of the M3O Data Value Pattern, we




Figure 8: Application of COMM after its integration with the M3O

consider the use of `StructuredDataParameters` optional. Thus, we do not specify that an `AnnotationConcept` must specify any `StructuredDataParameters` in a `hasPart` relation but recommend using them as they add an additional layer of formal expressiveness.

## 5 Example 2: EXIF

EXIF is a common metadata standard for images and supports mainly technical metadata [6]. It is embedded directly into media assets such as JPEG files. The following section presents the alignment of EXIF and the M3O.

### 5.1 Application of the Alignment Method

**Understanding** The key-value based metadata specified in EXIF is binary encoded into the header of, e.g., JPEG files. Consequently the mapping of the non-semantified concepts onto the modeling framework of the M3O posed the major challenge for this particular alignment. Thus, for aligning EXIF and the M3O, we first needed to semantify the key-value pairs of EXIF.

**Grouping** The EXIF metadata standard has been translated to a RDF vocabulary [36] by the W3C through an one-to-one mapping. Here, each key of the EXIF specification has been directly mapped to a corresponding property. This approach ignores the groupings of metadata keys that is provided in the original EXIF specification such as pixel composition and geo location. For the alignment, we have reconstructed this grouping information from the EXIF specification.

**Mapping** When mapping EXIF to the M3O, special consideration has been provided on how to map EXIF properties to information objects and information realizations. For example, locations have been constrained to information objects, as they convey information on where the original picture has been taken. Image resolutions describe a quality of a concrete realization, e.g., a JPEG file, and are therefore associated with the information realization instead. Specific properties can be referred to by using preexisting vocabularies, e.g., the WGS84 vocabulary [39] for GPS information. As EXIF restrains itself to describing qualities of images, all keys have been mapped as specialization of the M3O Annotation Pattern.

**Consistency Checking and Documentation** We have tested the validity of the resulting ontology using Fact++ and Pellet.

## 5.2 Application of the Aligned Ontology

The example shown in Figure 9 defines an `EXIFAnnotationPattern` concept that allows us to represent EXIF compliant annotations. In this case, the `EXIFAnnotationPattern` defines an `EXIFGeoParameter` that parametrizes a `GeoPoint`. Within this construct, we accumulate all parameters that can be specified with regards to *GPS Attribute Information* as specified in EXIF. Going conform with the Data Value Pattern, we express the `GeoPoint` through `geo:lat` and `geo:long`, which specify primitive values of type `xsd:decimal`. In this case, we want to represent the location at which the image was created and thus attach the information to the information object.

The M3O-aligned version of EXIF has been integrated in the K-Space Annotation Tool (KAT) [40]. KAT is a flexible framework and provides different plug-ins for semantic annotation of media assets, retrieval of media assets, and visualization, e.g., on a map. A screenshot of KAT is depicted in Figure 10. It shows the annotation of an image in Paris using the M3O-aligned EXIF ontology and the visualization of the image on a map view.




Figure 9: Application of the EXIF metadata standard using M3O.




Figure 10: Semantic Annotation of an Image in the K-Space Annotation Tool.

## 6 Example 3: ID3

ID3 is the de-facto metadata standard for describing audio assets [13]. It allows sophisticated descriptions of various features of the audio assets like composer, album, lyrics, copyright, beat-per-minute, volume adjustment, and equalization.

### 6.1 Application of the Alignment Method

**Understanding** Like the EXIF standard, metadata in ID3 format is binary encoded and embedded with the audio file it describes. ID3 has a tag header and tag body with one or more frames. Each frame contains one or more groups which actually represent the audio metadata in form of typed key-value pairs. Although ID3 has never been officially specified as metadata standard for audio data, it has become a de-facto standard by its widespread use and support by today's software and hardware systems. In this paper, we have analyzed and aligned ID3 in version 2.3. The upcoming version 2.4 has not gained popularity yet due to some disagreements on some of the revisions and the high effort in introducing it into the existing software and hardware systems [13].

**Grouping** The ID3 metadata format has been translated into a RDF vocabulary, called the NEPOMUK ID3 Ontology [37], within the context of the the NEPOMUK project. Like the translation of EXIF to a RDF vocabulary (see above), the NEPOMUK ID3 Ontology has been created by a one-to-one mapping of the metadata keys specified in the ID3 format to corresponding ontology properties. This mapping ignores the grouping information provided in the original ID3 documentation like the category concept in ID3 that consists of a *content group description* (e.g., classical music is often sorted in different musical sections [13]), a *title* or *songname*, and *subtitle* or *description refinement*. Other groups of key-value pairs defined in the ID3 format are not mapped to the NEPOMUK ID3 Ontology at all such as the volume adjustment and equalization. For aligning the ID3 metadata format to the M3O, we have reconstructed the grouping information in the resulting ontology and have added the groups of key-value pairs that were not mapped at all.

**Mapping** Specifically the grouping information that is provided in the ID3 documentation has been considered and appended to the resulting ontology. Apart from that, the mapping of ID3 properties to information objects and information realizations has been considered as with EXIF (see Section 5.1) and all metadata keys have been mapped as specializations of the M3O Annotation Pattern.



**Consistency Checking and Documentation** The M3O-aligned version of the ID3 ontology has been tested for validity using Fact++ and Pellet.

## 6.2 Application of the Aligned Ontology

An example of applying the M3O-aligned ID3 ontology is already provided in the introduction Section 1. If there is a picture attached to the audio asset, it is modeled using the `AttachedPictureConcept`. To model the relationship between the audio asset and the attached picture, the decomposition pattern of the M3O is applied as the example of combining different metadata standards and metadata formats in Section 11.2 shows.

## 7 Example 4: Dublin Core

The Dublin Core Metadata Initiative [10] aims at developing interoperable metadata standards which are applicable in various domains. In this work, we consider the Dublin Core Metadata Element Set [11], which is a set of 15 metadata elements defined in the “classical” Dublin Core. This core metadata element set is widely adopted and has been standardized by the International Organization for Standardization.

### 7.1 Application of the Alignment Method

**Understanding** The Dublin Core Metadata Initiative provides a RDF version of the simple Dublin Core metadata set [41]. We took the textual description of the Dublin Core Metadata Element Set and the RDF version as input to map the 15 properties such as *creator*, *date*, or *format* defined in the simple element set to the M3O. As the simple Dublin Core is quite small, the step was quite quick.

**Grouping** The textual description of the metadata elements defined in the Dublin Core Metadata Element Set does not contain any grouping information. Given the small number of metadata elements defined in the Dublin Core Metadata Element Set and the heterogeneity of the metadata elements, no additional grouping has been introduced.

**Mapping** Like with EXIF and ID3, we have considered for each metadata element defined in the Dublin Core Metadata Element Set whether it is applicable to information objects or information realizations. For example, the metadata element *format* is applicable to information realizations only whereas creation *date* and *creator* is in principle applicable to both information objects and information realizations.

**Consistency Checking and Documentation** The resulting Dublin Core Metadata Element Set aligned to the M3O has been tested for validity using Fact++ and Pellet.

## 7.2 Application of the Aligned Ontology

An example of using the Dublin Core properties `subject` and `language` is given in the example in Section 8.2. It shows the combination of Dublin Core with properties of XMP. The example in Section 11.2 shows the use of the very common `creator` property of Dublin Core together with properties of ID3 to annotate an audio file.

## 8 Example 5: XMP

XMP is a property-centric metadata format defined by Adobe to describe image assets [7]. Like EXIF and ID3 metadata, XMP metadata is also embedded within the binary media data. XMP aims integrating different standards for image metadata and thus enabling interoperability along the media production process [12]. Compared to the M3O, the industry-driven XMP metadata format is limited with respect to the functionality provided. In addition, XMP focuses on a single media type only, namely images.

### 8.1 Application of the Alignment Method

**Understanding** The XMP metadata format is well described in several documents. Regarding this work, we are referring to Part 1 of the XMP metadata format specification. The additional properties of the XMP Specification Part 2 remain as future work. Part 1 of the XML metadata format specification defines several groups of metadata properties, called *namespaces*. These namespaces of XMP are *basic*, *rights management*, *media management*, and *dublin core*.

The *basic* namespace defines properties that provide basic descriptive information like creation date, label, and rating. In the *rights management* namespace, properties are defined for the legal access of a resource like owner, certificate, and terms of usage. In the *media management* namespace, one finds properties such as for the identification and history of a resource. For example, the XMP *media management* property *derivedFrom* can be used to model for a media asset from which other media asset it is derived from (during the media production process). Finally, the *dublin core* namespace of XMP contains the 15 elements specified in the Dublin Core Metadata Element Set. As the Dublin Core Metadata Element Set has already been aligned with the M3O in Section 7, we are able to reuse the previously aligned ontology for Dublin Core.

**Grouping** Due to the good documentation of XMP, grouping of the concepts and properties for the M3O-aligned ontology of XMP was straightforward. A group has been created for each of the namespaces as introduced above, except for the *dublin core* namespace that did already exist.

**Mapping** As the three XMP groupings *basic*, *rights management*, and *media management* contain descriptive information about image assets, they have been mapped as specializations of the Annotation Pattern to the M3O. When mapping the individual metadata elements to the M3O, the usual considerations whether to map to information realizations or information objects have been applied. This was of particular importance for the *media management* namespace. Most XMP metadata elements defined in the *media management* namespace are identifiers that could be replaced by using the concepts `InformationRealization` and `InformationObject` from DUL instead. For example, the XMP *media management* property *InstanceID* represents a specific incarnation of a resource and is modeled as `InformationRealization`.

**Consistency Checking and Documentation** The resulting ontology is verified for validity using `Fact++` and `Pellet`.

## 8.2 Application of the Aligned Ontology

The example depicted in Figure 11 shows the combined application of the XMP metadata standard and Dublin Core standard to annotate an `InformationObject` of a technical specification represented by the individual `doc-1`. Regarding XMP, the `RightsManagementConcept` with its parts `OwnerConcept` and `WebStatementConcept` is defined in the annotation. These parts classify the two regions `OwnerRegion` and `WebStatementRegion` to specify that the technical document `doc-1` is owned by the "Example, Inc." company and that the statement of the ownership and usage rights is available from some web resource. From Dublin Core, the properties *subject* and *language* are used to annotate the individual `doc-1`, represented by the two concepts `SubjectConcept` and `LanguageConcept`. The `SubjectConcept` classifies the `SubjectRegion` which has `RegionDataValue` "Technical Specification"^^`xsd:string`, i.e., annotating the `doc-1` as a technical specification. The language is modeled as recommended in the Dublin Core specification using the controlled vocabulary defined in RFC 4646<sup>5</sup>. In our example, the string "en-US" states that the technical specification is written American English. The qualities that connect the `InformationObject` (and information entities in general) with the regions, i.e.,

<sup>5</sup><http://www.ietf.org/rfc/rfc4646.txt>

the concrete value spaces of the annotations, are not shown in Figure 11 for reasons of brevity. An additional example of applying the M3O-aligned XMP ontology is shown in Section 11.1.




Figure 11: Application of the XMP metadata standard and Dublin Core using M3O.

## 9 Example 6: SearchMonkey Media

The SearchMonkey Media vocabulary [25] is part of the SearchMonkey vocabulary collection developed by Yahoo! to annotate pages with semantic metadata. Each vocabulary defines terms and classes relevant in the considered domain. In addition, existing vocabularies are reused such as Dublin Core and domain specific knowledge sources like DBpedia [14].

### 9.1 Application of the Alignment Method

**Understanding** The Media vocabulary of SearchMonkey defines ten classes and 15 properties. It is focused on single media assets only and introduces media types such as article, audio, image, photo, text, and video. In addition it defines sets of media assets such as a set of photos and a set of videos. The properties cover technical details of the media as-

sets like *bitrate* and *channels* and also the number of times a media asset has been viewed (*views*). The vocabulary uses the domain and range restrictions of RDF Schema [42].

**Grouping** The SearchMonkey Media vocabulary does not provide any grouping information on the classes and properties it defines. However, some informal subsumptions are documented in the textual description such as the introduction of a superconcept media for the media types. As the SearchMonkey Media vocabulary contains only a few concepts and properties and as they all are serving the same purpose of annotating media assets, we have decided to form only one group for this vocabulary.

**Mapping** The concepts defining the media types in the SearchMonkey Media vocabulary have been mapped to the M3O as subconcepts of `InformationRealization`, i.e., `ArticleRealization`, `AudioRealization`, `ImageRealization`, `TextRealization`, and `VideoRealization`. The concept `ImageRealization` has two further subconcepts for `PhotoRealization` and `ThumbnailRealization`. The concept `InformationRealization` has been chosen as superconcept for defining the media types instead of `InformationEntity`, as the properties describing the media assets and associated with SearchMonkey’s media concept are of mere technical nature such as *bitrate*, *channels*, *duration*, *fileSize*, *framerate*, and *samplingrate*. For the concepts representing sets of photos and sets of videos, two specializations of M3O’s `CollectionPattern` have been introduced. These are called `PhotoRealizationCollection` and `VideoRealizationCollection`.

**Consistency Checking and Documentation** As the other ontologies, the SearchMonkey Media ontology aligned with the M3O is verified for validity using `Fact++` and `Pellet`.

## 9.2 Application of the Aligned Ontology

The application of the M3O-aligned SearchMonkey Media vocabulary is shown in Figure 12 at the example of a `PhotoRealizationCollection` `prc-1`, i.e., a collection of `PhotoRealizations`. It is defined in the context of a `PhotoRealizationCollectionPattern` that defines a `PhotoRealizationCollection` classifying the `prc-1`. The `PhotoRealizationCollectionPattern` further defines `n` `PhotoRealizationElementConcepts` `prec-1` to `prec-n`, which classify the actual elements of the `PhotoRealizationCollection`. The elements of the `PhotoRealizationCollection` are the `PhotoRealizations` `pr-1` to `pr-n`.




Figure 12: Application of the SearchMonkey Media vocabulary using M3O.

## 10 Example 7: Ontology for Media Resource

The Ontology for Media Resource [26] developed by the W3C defines a core vocabulary for multimedia annotation. The ontology targets at an unifying mapping of common media formats like EXIF [6] or Dublin Core [10,11]. The core challenge for this alignment is the mapping of properties to either information object or information realization as provided by M3O's Information Realization Pattern.

### 10.1 Application of the Alignment Method

**Understanding** The Ontology for Media Resource follows a property-centric approach to ontology modeling and consists of 28 predicates including properties like *title* and *language*. Some properties are specified in further detail, e.g., through *role* or *type* properties. Only entities such as media assets and persons are represented as concepts. Any other information such as roles or types are represented using primitive values, e.g., strings. The Ontology for Media Resource defines no structural patterns and uses the domain and range restrictions of RDF Schema to specify the properties. Unlike the M3O, there is no distinction between information object and information realization.

**Grouping** The Ontology for Media Resource's documentation on the web provides a number of conceptual groupings for certain aspects of multimedia description, e.g., identification or fragmentation. However, this information is not manifested in the RDF vocabulary. With the alignment of the Ontology for Media Resource and the M3O, we provide grouping information by defining the appropriate axioms. For example an `IdentificationAnnotation` concept `hasPart` some `TitleAnnotationConcept`, `LanguageAnnotationConcept`, and `LocatorAnnotationConcept`.

**Mapping** For mapping the Ontology for Media Resource to the M3O, we define a sub-concept of the `AnnotationConcept` for each property of the ontology. For example, we define a `LocatorAnnotationConcept` to match the *locator* property. Concrete values are expressed using the Data Value Pattern of the M3O. To this end, we define appropriate `Region` concepts. In the case of the `LocatorAnnotationConcept`, we define a `LocatorRegion` with the property `hasRegionDataValue` and an URI specifying a concrete location on the web.

By taking into account the difference between information objects and information realizations, we can improve semantic precision of the aligned ontology. To this end, we have examined each attribute of the Ontology for Media Resource for its inherent meaning and constrain it to the appropriate concept of the Information Realization Pattern of the M3O. As an example, the *locator* property of the Ontology for Media Resource annotates media files that are locatable on the web. This is a quality only applicable for information realizations and is expressed in the definition of the `LocatorAnnotationConcept`.

We express the *type* property of the Ontology for Media Resource through specialization, e.g., by specifying an `ImageRealization` as subclass of the `InformationRealization`. Finally the *fragments* facet of the Ontology for Media Resource has been modeled using the Decomposition Pattern of the M3O. The functionality indicated by the *namedFragments* property can be obtained by decomposing multimedia assets using the Decomposition Pattern and by using the Annotation Pattern to annotate the resulting fragment with a `FragmentLabelAnnotationConcept`.

**Consistency Checking and Documentation** The resulting ontology has been validated using Fact++ and Pellet.

## 10.2 Application of the Aligned Ontology

Figure 13 demonstrates the application of the aligned ontology. We explicitly distinguish between an `ImageObject` and an `ImageRealization` that realizes the `ImageObject`. The specific type for each media is expressed through specialization of the corresponding `InformationObject` and `InformationRealization` concepts. As the figure shows, an `ImageObject` is annotated with some `TitleAnnotationConcept`, where the title "Mona Lisa" is expressed using the Data Value Pattern. The `ImageRealization` is annotated with some `LocatorAnnotationConcept` that parametrizes a `Region` for an URI locatable on the web, in this case an image resources from Wikipedia.




Figure 13: Application of the Ontology for Media Resource after the Alignment

## 11 Combined Use of Integrated Metadata Models

We have presented the alignment of seven selected metadata standards and metadata formats with the M3O using our four-step alignment method introduced in Section 3. In this section, we present two extensive examples showing how different M3O-aligned metadata standards and metadata formats can be used in combination. In Section 11.1, we show the combined application of XMP, COMM, and Linked Data [43]. Linked Data is a community effort to publish and link semantic data on the web. In Section 11.2, we present the combination of ID3 with Dublin Core and XMPm. In both examples, the qualities connecting the information entities with the regions are not shown for reasons of brevity.

### 11.1 Example: Combining Dublin Core, COMM, and DBpedia

We consider the scenario of the Austrian photographer Ferdinand Schmutzer who took a picture of Albert Einstein depicted in Figure 14 during a lecture in Vienna in 1921.<sup>6</sup> The example demonstrates the combined use of the metadata standard Dublin Core, the Core Ontology on Multimedia (COMM), and annotations using Linked Data resources from DBpedia to describe the picture.

The fact that such a picture has been taken during the lecture is represented by the InformationObject aeio-1 as shown in Figure 15. The ImageObject is a specialization of DUL's

<sup>6</sup>[http://de.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Datei:Einstein1921\\_by\\_F\\_Schmutzer\\_2.jpg](http://de.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Datei:Einstein1921_by_F_Schmutzer_2.jpg)






Figure 14: Picture of Albert Einstein taken by Ferdinand Schmutzer in 1921.

InformationObject and specified in COMM. The AnnotationPattern exp-1 specifies the annotation of the ImageObject. It defines a CreatorConcept and DateConcept from Dublin Core to represent the creator "F. Schmutzer" and date of capturing the picture, namely 1921. The capturing date of the picture is modeled using xsd:string as it cannot be ensured that a concrete date proper to the xsd:date type can be provided, like in our example. The AnnotationPattern further defines an annotation concept DepictedPersonConcept that is specifically introduced for the example and classifies the individual dbpedia-einstein-1. It is a resource from DBpedia representing the person Albert Einstein, namely the URI [http://dbpedia.org/resource/Albert\\_Einstein](http://dbpedia.org/resource/Albert_Einstein). The individual dbpedia-einstein-1 is of rdf:type NaturalPerson from DUL. The metadata is attached to the ImageObject aeio-1 and not to a concrete realization of this object, as the information about the creator, date, and the person (from DBpedia) is independent of a concrete realization of that object.

A second AnnotationPattern exp-2 is used to describe a concrete realization einstein-jpg-1 of the ImageObject aeio-1. This AnnotationPattern defines a RGBHistogramAnnotationConcept using COMM in order to annotate the ImageRealization einstein-jpg-1 with a histogram. The different parts of the histogram as shown in the COMM example in Section 4.1 are not shown for reasons on brevity. To connect the InformationRealization einstein-jpg-1 with the InformationObject, the Information Realization pattern of DUL is used as shown in Figure 15. Thus, the ImageRealization einstein-jpg-1 has a property realizes to aeio-1.




Figure 15: Combination of COMM color histogram with technical details from XMP *basic* namespace and background knowledge in form of Linked Data from DBpedia

## 11.2 Example: Combining ID3, Dublin Core, and XMP

The example shown in Figure 16 demonstrates the combined use of the ID3 metadata format and the Dublin Core and XMP metadata standards. Using the Annotation Pattern and the Decomposition Pattern of the M3O, the song *Mamma Mia* of the pop group ABBA is annotated with information about its musical category, title, and how the media asset has been created. ID3 can embed a picture with the audio asset. This picture is annotated in the example with its mime type, a description, and where it has been derived from.

The DecompositionPattern *abba-single-dp-1* defines a CompositeConcept *composite-1*, which classifies the AudioObject of the ABBA song *Mamma Mia*, represented by the individual *mammamia-1*. As parts of the AudioObject, the DecompositionPattern defines the two composites *composite-1* and *composite-2*, which classify the AudioRealization *track-1* of the ABBA song and the embedded PictureRealization *pic-1*. This corresponds to a MP3-file of the ABBA song *Mamma Mia* with a picture embedded.

Having introduced the components defined by the Decomposition Pattern, we can start annotating the AudioRealization *track-1* and PictureRealization *pic-1*. The AudioRealization *track-1* plays the role of an AnnotatedConcept in the context of the AudioAnnotationPattern




Figure 16: Combination of ID3, DublinCore, and Linked Data from DBpedia

aap-1. The annotations of the audio track-1 are defined by the AudioAnnotationPattern, namely the LargerCategoryConcept originating from ID3 and the CreatorConcept from Dublin Core. The LargerCategoryConcept describes by its ContentGroupDescriptionConcept the broader category "Pop" of the ABBA song and its title "Mamma Mia" using the TitleConcept. The CreatorConcept classifies the concrete Agent itunes-1 that has created track-1, namely Apple's iTunes<sup>7</sup> application.

The PictureAnnotationPattern pap-1 is used to describe the PictureRealization pic-1. It is annotated using the AttachedPictureConcept from ID3 with its mime type "image/png" and a description. Finally, the origin of the attached picture is modeled using XMP's

<sup>7</sup><http://www.apple.com/itunes/>

DerivedFromConcept. The `DerivedFromConcept` classifies the `abba-logo-1`, which is a resource from Wikipedia, namely <http://upload.wikimedia.org/wikipedia/de/thumb/f/f4/ABBA-Logo.svg/690px-ABBA-Logo.svg.png>.

## 12 Summary of Experiences Made During the Alignment

In this section, we briefly describe some of the experiences made during the alignment of the existing metadata standards and metadata formats with the M3O. In the first step of the alignment process, we had to gain a comprehensive understanding of the intent of the existing metadata standards and metadata formats. The different standards and formats have been developed within a specific context and for different purposes. Thus, it is important to understand the “mindset” in which the existing models have been created and developing strategies how to integrate them. This understanding of the existing metadata models was significantly supported by proper documentation like in the cases of the de-facto standard ID3 or the industry standard XMP.

When aligning the concepts of the existing standards and formats with the M3O, we can state that we encountered only little problems. Our experience is that this is mainly due to the strong formal foundation the M3O builds on, i.e., the use of a foundational ontology as basis and inheriting and refining its rich axiomatization. In addition, the use of ontology design patterns like the Information Realization Pattern and the metadata-specific patterns such as the Annotation Pattern and Collection Pattern allowed us for an efficient mapping between the metadata model under consideration and the M3O.

When ontologies that are to be aligned share a common basis, i.e., have a common ontology they import, integration of them is potentially easier. However, an obstacle with such an alignment can be the possibly different versions of the common basis. This was the case for COMM and M3O, which both base on the foundational ontology DOLCE. However, COMM used the more heavy-weight DOLCE ontology whereas M3O is build on the newer and lightweight DOLCE+DnS Ultralight ontology (see also Section 2).

If no common foundation is shared between the M3O and the metadata model to be integrated such as in the case of the Ontology for Media Resource or EXIF, the mapping can still be done very conveniently. The modeling framework provided by the M3O offers dedicated connection points, where the existing ontologies can be aligned. The connection points are typically the entities classified and the roles defined in the patterns based on the Descriptions and Situations Pattern of DUL and the concepts defined in the Information Realization Pattern and Data Value Pattern. For example, the connection point for media types is typically a specialization of the `InformationEntity` concept and

InformationRealization concept, respectively. The qualities of media assets, however, are typically expressed using the Data Value Pattern.

The Ontology for Media Resource, the EXIF RDF vocabulary, and the NEPOMUK ID3 Ontology do not provide information on how the properties they define are logically grouped. This was surprising to us as the documentation of the Ontology for Media Resource and the metadata standards EXIF and ID3 provide some detailed information about groupings of the properties. We experienced the alignment with the M3O as good opportunity to re-introduce these grouping information.

## 13 Related Work

Numerous metadata standards and metadata formats with different goals and backgrounds have been proposed in research and industry. Most focus on a single media type such as image, text, or video. They differ in the complexity of the data structures they provide and have partly overlapping and partly complementary functionality. With standards like EXIF [6], XMP [7], and IPTC [8], we find metadata models that provide (typed) key-value pairs to represent metadata of the media type image. ID3 provides typed key-value pairs for audio assets [13]. The SearchMonkey Media [25] is a vocabulary developed by Yahoo! to annotate media types such as article, audio, image, photo, text, and video. Like the previous standards and formats, it focuses on single media assets only. However, it introduces sets of media assets such as a set of photos and a set of videos. The Dublin Core Metadata Element Set [11] is a set of 15 metadata elements aimed to describe arbitrary documents. It has been widely adopted and standardized by the International Organization for Standardization. Although the Dublin Core Metadata Element Set is applicable to any kind of documents and thus to different media types, it does not consider the structure of multimedia content like the M3O.

A more complex metadata standard is MPEG-7 [9]. It provides a rich set of complex descriptors that mainly focus on expressing low-level features of images, audio, and video. Several approaches have been published providing a formalization of MPEG-7 as an ontology [38], e.g., by Hunter [1] or the Core Ontology on Multimedia [2]. Although these ontologies provide clear semantics for the multimedia annotations, they still focus on MPEG-7 as the underlying metadata standard. More importantly, these ontologies basically provide a formalization of MPEG-7, but do not provide for the integration of different standards. For further discussions of existing metadata formats and metadata standards, we refer to the analyses conducted in [15,44], the report of the W3C Multimedia Semantics Incubator Group [45], and the overview of the W3C Media Annotations Working Group [17].

The drawbacks of these standards are the lacking interoperability and the missing alignment between them. Each standard and format is designed for a specific purpose and application context. A combined use of the different metadata standards and metadata formats, however, is not foreseen. Harmonization efforts like the Metadata Working Group [16] or the Media Annotations Working Group [17] try to tackle these issues and develop a common vocabulary. However, they remain on the same technological level and do not extend their effort beyond single media types, i.e., image, audio, text, and video. In addition, they do not provide a generic framework suitable for integrating arbitrary metadata standards and metadata formats. XMP aims at an integrated standard for image metadata. However, it tackles the problem from a different point of view. While XMP also aims at providing a framework for multimedia metadata, it focuses on images only and does not consider other media types or structured multimedia content. Another major difference is that XMP stays on the level of standards such as EXIF or IPTC and does not take into account requirements such as provenance of metadata, decomposition, or information realization. The Ontology for Media Resource [26] of the W3C aims at providing a common mapping for media formats like EXIF [6] or Dublin Core [10, 11]. To this end, it defines a set of 28 properties and specifies them using domain and range restrictions of RDF Schema. However, the RDF Schema of the Ontology for Media Resource defines no structural patterns, i.e., groupings of concepts and properties, and also considers single media types only.

The alignment method presented in this paper is fully manual. There are several publications about (semi-)automatic alignment and matching methods like [32–34]. However, these methods typically do not provide the high accuracy we require for aligning the different metadata standards and metadata formats and are usually applied to problems such as ontology learning or the alignment of domain models.

## 14 Conclusions

In this paper, we have shown how the generic modeling framework provided by the Multimedia Metadata Ontology (M3O) can be specialized to integrate existing multimedia metadata standards and metadata formats. To this end, we have developed a four-step alignment method that describes the tasks to be performed. We have demonstrated the applicability of our approach at the example of seven existing metadata models. These are the Core Ontology on Multimedia, EXIF, ID3, Dublin Core, XMP, Yahoo!'s SearchMonkey Media vocabulary, and the Ontology for Media Resource. The experiences made in conducting the alignment of these metadata standards and metadata formats with the M3O have been described. The M3O and the alignments of the seven metadata

standards and metadata formats are available from the following website: <http://west.uni-koblenz.de/m3o>.

*Acknowledgment.* This research has been co-funded by the EU in FP7 in the We-KnowIt project (215453). We thank our student Frederik Jochum for implementing the integration of the M3O-aligned EXIF ontology with the K-Space Annotation tool.

## References

- [1] Hunter, J.: Enhancing the semantic interoperability of multimedia through a core ontology. *mTrans. on Circuits and Systems for Video Technology* **13**(1) (2003)
- [2] Arndt, R., Troncy, R., Staab, S., Hardman, L., Vacura, M.: COMM: designing a well-founded multimedia ontology for the web. In: *ISWC+ASWC*. (2007) 30–43
- [3] Markkula, M., Sormunen, E.: End-user searching challenges indexing practices in the digital newspaper photo archive. *Information Retrieval* **1**(4) (January 2000) 259–285
- [4] Hollink, L., Schreiber, A.T., Wielinga, B.J., Worring, M.: Classification of user image descriptions. *Int. J. of Human-Computer Studies* **61**(5) (Nov. 2004) 601–626
- [5] Hollink, L., Schreiber, G., Wielinga, B.: Patterns of semantic relations to improve image content search. *Web Semantics: Science, Services and Agents on the World Wide Web* **5**(3) (2007) 195–203
- [6] JEITA: Exchangeable image file format for digital still cameras: EXIF version 2.2 (April 2002) <http://www.exif.org/Exif2-2.PDF>.
- [7] Adobe Systems, Inc.: XMP (2008) <http://www.adobe.com/devnet/xmp/>.
- [8] International Press Telecommunications Council: “IPTC Core” Schema for XMP Version 1.0 Specification document (2005) <http://www.iptc.org/>.
- [9] MPEG-7: Multimedia content description interface. Technical report, Standard No. ISO/IEC n15938 (2001)
- [10] Dublin Core Metadata Initiative: DCMI Metadata Terms (2008) <http://dublincore.org/documents/dcmi-terms/>.
- [11] Dublin Core Metadata Initiative: Dublin Core Metadata Element Set, Version 1.1 (2010) <http://dublincore.org/documents/dces/>.

- [12] Hardman, L., Obrenovic, Z., Nack, F., Kerhervé, B., Piersol, K.W.: Canonical processes of semantically annotated media production. *Multimedia Syst.* **14**(6) (2008) 327–340
- [13] Nilsson, M., Mutschler, M.: ID3 (2009) <http://www.id3.org/>.
- [14] Bizer, C., Lehmann, J., Kobilarov, G., Auer, S., Becker, C., Cyganiak, R., Hellmann, S.: DBpedia - a crystallization point for the web of data. *J. Web Sem.* **7**(3) (2009) 154–165
- [15] Saathoff, C., Scherp, A.: Unlocking the semantics of multimedia presentations in the web with the multimedia metadata ontology. In: *WWW*, ACM (2010) 831–840
- [16] MWG: Metadata working group (2010) <http://www.metadataworkinggroup.org/>.
- [17] W3C: Media annotations working group: Video, audio, images (2011) <http://www.w3.org/2008/WebVideo/Annotations/>.
- [18] Adobe Systems, Inc.: Flash file format (2008) <http://www.adobe.com/licensing/developer/>.
- [19] W3C: SMIL 3.0 (2008) <http://www.w3.org/TR/SMIL/>.
- [20] W3C: SVG (2009) <http://www.w3.org/TR/SVG/>.
- [21] Oberle, D.: *Semantic Management of Middleware*. Springer (2006)
- [22] Borgo, S., Masolo, C.: Foundational choices in DOLCE. In: *Handbook on Ontologies*. 2nd edn. Springer (2009)
- [23] Gamma, E., Helm, R., Johnson, R., Vlissides, J.: *Design patterns: elements of reusable object-oriented software*. Programmer's Choice. Addison-Wesley (2004)
- [24] Gangemi, A., Presutti, V.: *Ontology Design Patterns*. In: *Handbook on Ontologies*. 2nd edn. Springer (2009)
- [25] Yahoo!: SearchMonkey Media (2009) <http://developer.yahoo.com/searchmonkey/smguide/searchmonkey-media.html>.
- [26] W3C: Ontology for media resource 1.0 (2010) <http://www.w3.org/TR/mediaont-10/>.
- [27] Borgo, S., Masolo, C.: Foundational choices in DOLCE. In: *Handbook on Ontologies*. 2nd edn. Springer (2009)



- [28] Baader, F., Calvanese, D., McGuinness, D.L., Nardi, D., Patel-Schneider, P.F., eds.: The Description Logic Handbook. Cambridge University Press (2003)
- [29] Presutti, V., Gangemi, A.: Content ontology design patterns as practical building blocks for web ontologies. In: Conceptual Modeling, Springer (2008) 128–141
- [30] Gangemi, A., Mika, P.: Understanding the semantic web through descriptions and situations. In: CoopIS/DOA/ODBASE, Springer (2003) 689–706
- [31] Biron, P.V., Malhotra, A.: XML Schema Part 2: Datatypes Second Edition, W3C Recommendation. (2004) <http://www.w3.org/TR/xmlschema-2/>.
- [32] Euzenat, J., Shvaiko, P.: Ontology matching. Springer (2007)
- [33] Ehrig, M.: Ontology Alignment: Bridging the Semantic Gap. Volume 4 of Semantic Web and Beyond. Springer (2007)
- [34] Blomqvist, E.: OntoCase-automatic ontology enrichment based on ontology design patterns. In: International Semantic Web Conference, Springer (2009) 65–80
- [35] Fowler, M., Beck, K., Brant, J., Opdyke, W., Roberts, D.: Refactoring: Improving the Design of Existing Code. Addison Wesley (1999)
- [36] Kanzaki, M.: EXIF vocabulary workspace - RDF schema (2003) <http://www.w3.org/2003/12/exif/>, last update in 2007.
- [37] Mylka, A., Sauermann, L., Sintek, M., van Elst, L.: NEPOMUK ID3 ontology: Task-force ontologies (2007) <http://www.semanticdesktop.org/ontologies/nid3/>.
- [38] Dasiopoulou, S., Tzouvaras, V., Kompatsiaris, I., Strintzis, M.G.: Enquiring MPEG-7 based multimedia ontologies. MTAP (October 2009) 331–370
- [39] Brickley, D.: Basic Geo (WGS84 lat/long) Vocabulary (2006) <http://www.w3.org/2003/01/geo/>.
- [40] Saathoff, C., Schenk, S., Scherp, A.: KAT: The K-Space annotation tool. In: K-Space plenary meeting co-located at Int. Conf. on Semantic and Digital Media Technologies; Koblenz, Germany, Springer (December 2008)
- [41] Dublin Core Metadata Initiative: Expressing Dublin Core metadata using the resource description framework (2008) <http://dublincore.org/documents/dc-rdf/>.

- [42] W3C: RDF Vocabulary Description Language 1.0: RDF Schema (February 2004) <http://www.w3.org/TR/rdf-schema/>.
- [43] Bizer, C., Heath, T., Berners-Lee, T.: Linked data - the story so far. *Int. J. Semantic Web Inf. Syst.* **5**(3) (2009) 1–22
- [44] Haslhofer, B., Klas, W.: A survey of techniques for achieving metadata interoperability. *ACM Comput. Surv.* **42**(2) (2010)
- [45] Boll, S., Bürger, T., Celma, O., Halaschek-Wiener, C., Mannens, E., Troncy, R.: Multimedia Vocabularies on the Semantic Web (July 2007) <http://www.w3.org/2005/Incubator/mmsem/XGR-vocabularies/>.

## Bisher erschienen

### Arbeitsberichte aus dem Fachbereich Informatik

(<http://www.uni-koblenz-landau.de/koblenz/fb4/publications/Reports/arbeitsberichte>)

Ansgar Scherp, Daniel Eißing, Carsten Saathoff, Integrating Multimedia Metadata Standards and Metadata Formats with the Multimedia Metadata Ontology: Method and Examples, Arbeitsberichte aus dem Fachbereich Informatik 4/2012

Martin Surrey, Björn Lilge, Ludwig Paulsen, Marco Wolf, Markus Aldenhövel, Mike Reuthel, Roland Diehl, Integration von CRM-Systemen mit Kollaborations-Systemen am Beispiel von DocHouse und Lotus Quickr, Arbeitsberichte aus dem Fachbereich Informatik 3/2012

Martin Surrey, Roland Diehl, DOCHOUSE: Opportunity Management im Partnerkanal (IBM Lotus Quickr), Arbeitsberichte aus dem Fachbereich Informatik 2/2012

Mark Schneider, Ansgar Scherp, Comparing a Grid-based vs. List-based Approach for Faceted Search of Social Media Data on Mobile Devices, Arbeitsberichte aus dem Fachbereich Informatik 1/2012

Petra Schubert, Femi Adisa, Cloud Computing for Standard ERP Systems: Reference Framework and Research Agenda, Arbeitsberichte aus dem Fachbereich Informatik 16/2011

Oleg V. Kryuchin, Alexander A. Arzamastsev, Klaus G. Troitzsch, Natalia A. Zenkova, Simulating social objects with an artificial network using a computer cluster, Arbeitsberichte aus dem Fachbereich Informatik 15/2011

Oleg V. Kryuchin, Alexander A. Arzamastsev, Klaus G. Troitzsch, Simulating medical objects using an artificial network whose structure is based on adaptive resonance theory, Arbeitsberichte aus dem Fachbereich Informatik 14/2011

Oleg V. Kryuchin, Alexander A. Arzamastsev, Klaus G. Troitzsch, Comparing the efficiency of serial and parallel algorithms for training artificial neural networks using computer clusters, Arbeitsberichte aus dem Fachbereich Informatik, 13/2011

Oleg V. Kryuchin, Alexander A. Arzamastsev, Klaus G. Troitzsch, A parallel algorithm for selecting activation functions of an artificial network, Arbeitsberichte aus dem Fachbereich Informatik 12/2011

Katharina Bräunlich, Rüdiger Grimm, Andreas Kasten, Sven Vowé, Nico Jahn, Der neue Personalausweis zur Authentifizierung von Wählern bei Onlinewahlen, Arbeitsberichte aus dem Fachbereich Informatik 11/2011

Daniel Eißing, Ansgar Scherp, Steffen Staab, Formal Integration of Individual Knowledge Work and Organizational Knowledge Work with the Core Ontology *strukt*, Arbeitsberichte aus dem Fachbereich Informatik 10/2011

Bernhard Reinert, Martin Schumann, Stefan Müller, Combined Non-Linear Pose Estimation from Points and Lines, Arbeitsberichte aus dem Fachbereich Informatik 9/2011

Tina Walber, Ansgar Scherp, Steffen Staab, Towards the Understanding of Image Semantics by Gaze-based Tag-to-Region Assignments, Arbeitsberichte aus dem Fachbereich Informatik 8/2011

Alexander Kleinen, Ansgar Scherp, Steffen Staab, Mobile Facets – Faceted Search and Exploration of Open Social Media Data on a Touchscreen Mobile Phone, Arbeitsberichte aus dem Fachbereich Informatik 7/2011

Anna Lantsberg, Klaus G. Troitzsch, Towards A Methodology of Developing Models of E-Service Quality Assessment in Healthcare, Arbeitsberichte aus dem Fachbereich Informatik 6/2011

Ansgar Scherp, Carsten Saathoff, Thomas Franz, Steffen Staab, Designing Core Ontologies, Arbeitsberichte aus dem Fachbereich Informatik 5/2011

Oleg V. Kryuchin, Alexander A. Arzamastsev, Klaus G. Troitzsch, The prediction of currency exchange rates using artificial neural networks, Arbeitsberichte aus dem Fachbereich Informatik 4/2011

Klaus G. Troitzsch, Anna Lantsberg, Requirements for Health Care Related Websites in Russia: Results from an Analysis of American, British and German Examples, Arbeitsberichte aus dem Fachbereich Informatik 3/2011

Klaus G. Troitzsch, Oleg Kryuchin, Alexander Arzamastsev, A universal simulator based on artificial neural networks for computer clusters, Arbeitsberichte aus dem Fachbereich Informatik 2/2011

Klaus G. Troitzsch, Natalia Zenkova, Alexander Arzamastsev, Development of a technology of designing intelligent information systems for the estimation of social objects, Arbeitsberichte aus dem Fachbereich Informatik 1/2011

Kurt Lautenbach, A Petri Net Approach for Propagating Probabilities and Mass Functions, Arbeitsberichte aus dem Fachbereich Informatik 13/2010

Claudia Schon, Linkless Normal Form for ALC Concepts, Arbeitsberichte aus dem Fachbereich Informatik 12/2010

Alexander Hug, Informatik hautnah erleben, Arbeitsberichte aus dem Fachbereich Informatik 11/2010

Marc Santos, Harald F.O. von Kortzfleisch, Shared Annotation Model – Ein Datenmodell für kollaborative Annotationen, Arbeitsberichte aus dem Fachbereich Informatik 10/2010

Gerd Gröner, Steffen Staab, Categorization and Recognition of Ontology Refactoring Pattern, Arbeitsberichte aus dem Fachbereich Informatik 9/2010

Daniel Eißing, Ansgar Scherp, Carsten Saathoff, Integration of Existing Multimedia Metadata Formats and Metadata Standards in the M3O, Arbeitsberichte aus dem Fachbereich Informatik 8/2010

Stefan Scheglmann, Ansgar Scherp, Steffen Staab, Model-driven Generation of APIs for OWL-based Ontologies, Arbeitsberichte aus dem Fachbereich Informatik 7/2010

Daniel Schmeiß, Ansgar Scherp, Steffen Staab, Integrated Mobile Visualization and Interaction of Events and POIs, Arbeitsberichte aus dem Fachbereich Informatik 6/2010

Rüdiger Grimm, Daniel Pähler, E-Mail-Forensik – IP-Adressen und ihre Zuordnung zu Internet-Teilnehmern und ihren Standorten, Arbeitsberichte aus dem Fachbereich Informatik 5/2010

Christoph Ringelstein, Steffen Staab, PAPER: Syntax and Semantics for Provenance-Aware Policy Definition, Arbeitsberichte aus dem Fachbereich Informatik 4/2010

Nadine Lindermann, Sylvia Valcárcel, Harald F.O. von Kortzfleisch, Ein Stufenmodell für kollaborative offene Innovationsprozesse in Netzwerken kleiner und mittlerer Unternehmen mit Web 2.0, Arbeitsberichte aus dem Fachbereich Informatik 3/2010

Maria Wimmer, Dagmar Lück-Schneider, Uwe Brinkhoff, Erich Schweighofer, Siegfried Kaiser, Andreas Wieber, Fachtagung Verwaltungsinformatik FTVI Fachtagung Rechtsinformatik FTRI 2010, Arbeitsberichte aus dem Fachbereich Informatik 2/2010

Max Braun, Ansgar Scherp, Steffen Staab, Collaborative Creation of Semantic Points of Interest as Linked Data on the Mobile Phone, Arbeitsberichte aus dem Fachbereich Informatik 1/2010

Marc Santos, Einsatz von „Shared In-situ Problem Solving“ Annotationen in kollaborativen Lern- und Arbeitsszenarien, Arbeitsberichte aus dem Fachbereich Informatik 20/2009

Carsten Saathoff, Ansgar Scherp, Unlocking the Semantics of Multimedia Presentations in the Web with the Multimedia Metadata Ontology, Arbeitsberichte aus dem Fachbereich Informatik 19/2009

Christoph Kahle, Mario Schaarschmidt, Harald F.O. von Kortzfleisch, Open Innovation: Kundenintegration am Beispiel von IPTV, Arbeitsberichte aus dem Fachbereich Informatik 18/2009

Dietrich Paulus, Lutz Priese, Peter Decker, Frank Schmitt, Pose-Tracking Forschungsbericht, Arbeitsberichte aus dem Fachbereich Informatik 17/2009

Andreas Fuhr, Tassilo Horn, Andreas Winter, Model-Driven Software Migration Extending SOMA, Arbeitsberichte aus dem Fachbereich Informatik 16/2009

Eckhard Großmann, Sascha Strauß, Tassilo Horn, Volker Riediger, Abbildung von grUML nach XSD soamig, Arbeitsberichte aus dem Fachbereich Informatik 15/2009

Kerstin Falkowski, Jürgen Ebert, The STOR Component System Interim Report, Arbeitsberichte aus dem Fachbereich Informatik 14/2009

Sebastian Magnus, Markus Maron, An Empirical Study to Evaluate the Location of Advertisement Panels by Using a Mobile Marketing Tool, Arbeitsberichte aus dem Fachbereich Informatik 13/2009

Sebastian Magnus, Markus Maron, Konzept einer Public Key Infrastruktur in iCity, Arbeitsberichte aus dem Fachbereich Informatik 12/2009

Sebastian Magnus, Markus Maron, A Public Key Infrastructure in Ambient Information and Transaction Systems, Arbeitsberichte aus dem Fachbereich Informatik 11/2009

Ammar Mohammed, Ulrich Furbach, Multi-agent systems: Modeling and Virification using Hybrid Automata, Arbeitsberichte aus dem Fachbereich Informatik 10/2009

Andreas Sprotte, Performance Measurement auf der Basis von Kennzahlen aus betrieblichen Anwendungssystemen: Entwurf eines kennzahlengestützten Informationssystems für einen Logistikdienstleister, Arbeitsberichte aus dem Fachbereich Informatik 9/2009

Gwendolin Garbe, Tobias Hausen, Process Commodities: Entwicklung eines Reifegradmodells als Basis für Outsourcingentscheidungen, Arbeitsberichte aus dem Fachbereich Informatik 8/2009

Petra Schubert et. al., Open-Source-Software für das Enterprise Resource Planning, Arbeitsberichte aus dem Fachbereich Informatik 7/2009

Ammar Mohammed, Frieder Stolzenburg, Using Constraint Logic Programming for Modeling and Verifying Hierarchical Hybrid Automata, Arbeitsberichte aus dem Fachbereich Informatik 6/2009

Tobias Kippert, Anastasia Meletiadou, Rüdiger Grimm, Entwurf eines Common Criteria-Schutzprofils für Router zur Abwehr von Online-Überwachung, Arbeitsberichte aus dem Fachbereich Informatik 5/2009

Hannes Schwarz, Jürgen Ebert, Andreas Winter, Graph-based Traceability – A Comprehensive Approach. Arbeitsberichte aus dem Fachbereich Informatik 4/2009

Anastasia Meletiadou, Simone Müller, Rüdiger Grimm, Anforderungsanalyse für Risk-Management-Informationssysteme (RMIS), Arbeitsberichte aus dem Fachbereich Informatik 3/2009

Ansgar Scherp, Thomas Franz, Carsten Saathoff, Steffen Staab, A Model of Events based on a Foundational Ontology, Arbeitsberichte aus dem Fachbereich Informatik 2/2009

Frank Bohdanovicz, Harald Dickel, Christoph Steigner, Avoidance of Routing Loops, Arbeitsberichte aus dem Fachbereich Informatik 1/2009

Stefan Ameling, Stephan Wirth, Dietrich Paulus, Methods for Polyp Detection in Colonoscopy Videos: A Review, Arbeitsberichte aus dem Fachbereich Informatik 14/2008

Tassilo Horn, Jürgen Ebert, Ein Referenzschema für die Sprachen der IEC 61131-3, Arbeitsberichte aus dem Fachbereich Informatik 13/2008

Thomas Franz, Ansgar Scherp, Steffen Staab, Does a Semantic Web Facilitate Your Daily Tasks?, Arbeitsberichte aus dem Fachbereich Informatik 12/2008

Norbert Frick, Künftige Anforderungen an ERP-Systeme: Deutsche Anbieter im Fokus, Arbeitsberichte aus dem Fachbereich Informatik 11/2008

Jürgen Ebert, Rüdiger Grimm, Alexander Hug, Lehramtsbezogene Bachelor- und Masterstudiengänge im Fach Informatik an der Universität Koblenz-Landau, Campus Koblenz, Arbeitsberichte aus dem Fachbereich Informatik 10/2008

Mario Schaarschmidt, Harald von Kortzfleisch, Social Networking Platforms as Creativity Fostering Systems: Research Model and Exploratory Study, Arbeitsberichte aus dem Fachbereich Informatik 9/2008

Bernhard Schueler, Sergej Sizov, Steffen Staab, Querying for Meta Knowledge, Arbeitsberichte aus dem Fachbereich Informatik 8/2008

Stefan Stein, Entwicklung einer Architektur für komplexe kontextbezogene Dienste im mobilen Umfeld, Arbeitsberichte aus dem Fachbereich Informatik 7/2008

Matthias Bohnen, Lina Brühl, Sebastian Bzdak, RoboCup 2008 Mixed Reality League Team Description, Arbeitsberichte aus dem Fachbereich Informatik 6/2008

Bernhard Beckert, Reiner Hähnle, Tests and Proofs: Papers Presented at the Second International Conference, TAP 2008, Prato, Italy, April 2008, Arbeitsberichte aus dem Fachbereich Informatik 5/2008

Klaas Dellschaft, Steffen Staab, Unterstützung und Dokumentation kollaborativer Entwurfs- und Entscheidungsprozesse, Arbeitsberichte aus dem Fachbereich Informatik 4/2008

Rüdiger Grimm: IT-Sicherheitsmodelle, Arbeitsberichte aus dem Fachbereich Informatik 3/2008

Rüdiger Grimm, Helge Hundacker, Anastasia Meletiadou: Anwendungsbeispiele für Kryptographie, Arbeitsberichte aus dem Fachbereich Informatik 2/2008

Markus Maron, Kevin Read, Michael Schulze: CAMPUS NEWS – Artificial Intelligence Methods Combined for an Intelligent Information Network, Arbeitsberichte aus dem Fachbereich Informatik 1/2008

Lutz Priese, Frank Schmitt, Patrick Sturm, Haojun Wang: BMBF-Verbundprojekt 3D-RETISEG Abschlussbericht des Labors Bilderkennen der Universität Koblenz-Landau, Arbeitsberichte aus dem Fachbereich Informatik 26/2007

Stephan Philippi, Alexander Pinl: Proceedings 14. Workshop 20.-21. September 2007 Algorithmen und Werkzeuge für Petrinetze, Arbeitsberichte aus dem Fachbereich Informatik 25/2007

Ulrich Furbach, Markus Maron, Kevin Read: CAMPUS NEWS – an Intelligent Bluetooth-based Mobile Information Network, Arbeitsberichte aus dem Fachbereich Informatik 24/2007

Ulrich Furbach, Markus Maron, Kevin Read: CAMPUS NEWS - an Information Network for Pervasive Universities, Arbeitsberichte aus dem Fachbereich Informatik 23/2007

Lutz Priese: Finite Automata on Unranked and Unordered DAGs Extended Version, Arbeitsberichte aus dem Fachbereich Informatik 22/2007

Mario Schaarschmidt, Harald F.O. von Kortzfleisch: Modularität als alternative Technologie- und Innovationsstrategie, Arbeitsberichte aus dem Fachbereich Informatik 21/2007

Kurt Lautenbach, Alexander Pinl: Probability Propagation Nets, Arbeitsberichte aus dem Fachbereich Informatik 20/2007

Rüdiger Grimm, Farid Mehr, Anastasia Meletiadou, Daniel Pähler, Ilka Uerz: SOA-Security, Arbeitsberichte aus dem Fachbereich Informatik 19/2007

Christoph Wernhard: Tableaux Between Proving, Projection and Compilation, Arbeitsberichte aus dem Fachbereich Informatik 18/2007

Ulrich Furbach, Claudia Obermaier: Knowledge Compilation for Description Logics, Arbeitsberichte aus dem Fachbereich Informatik 17/2007

Fernando Silva Parreiras, Steffen Staab, Andreas Winter: TwoUse: Integrating UML Models and OWL Ontologies, Arbeitsberichte aus dem Fachbereich Informatik 16/2007

Rüdiger Grimm, Anastasia Meletiadou: Rollenbasierte Zugriffskontrolle (RBAC) im Gesundheitswesen, Arbeitsberichte aus dem Fachbereich Informatik 15/2007

Ulrich Furbach, Jan Murray, Falk Schmidsberger, Frieder Stolzenburg: Hybrid Multiagent Systems with Timed Synchronization-Specification and Model Checking, Arbeitsberichte aus dem Fachbereich Informatik 14/2007

Björn Pelzer, Christoph Wernhard: System Description: "E-KRHyper", Arbeitsberichte aus dem Fachbereich Informatik, 13/2007

Ulrich Furbach, Peter Baumgartner, Björn Pelzer: Hyper Tableaux with Equality, Arbeitsberichte aus dem Fachbereich Informatik, 12/2007

Ulrich Furbach, Markus Maron, Kevin Read: Location based Information systems, Arbeitsberichte aus dem Fachbereich Informatik, 11/2007

Philipp Schaer, Marco Thum: State-of-the-Art: Interaktion in erweiterten Realitäten, Arbeitsberichte aus dem Fachbereich Informatik, 10/2007

Ulrich Furbach, Claudia Obermaier: Applications of Automated Reasoning, Arbeitsberichte aus dem Fachbereich Informatik, 9/2007

Jürgen Ebert, Kerstin Falkowski: A First Proposal for an Overall Structure of an Enhanced Reality Framework, Arbeitsberichte aus dem Fachbereich Informatik, 8/2007

Lutz Priese, Frank Schmitt, Paul Lemke: Automatische See-Through Kalibrierung, Arbeitsberichte aus dem Fachbereich Informatik, 7/2007

Rüdiger Grimm, Robert Krimmer, Nils Meißner, Kai Reinhard, Melanie Volkamer, Marcel Weinand, Jörg Helbach: Security Requirements for Non-political Internet Voting, Arbeitsberichte aus dem Fachbereich Informatik, 6/2007

Daniel Bildhauer, Volker Riediger, Hannes Schwarz, Sascha Strauß, „grUML – Eine UML-basierte Modellierungssprache für T-Graphen“, Arbeitsberichte aus dem Fachbereich Informatik, 5/2007

Richard Arndt, Steffen Staab, Raphaël Troncy, Lynda Hardman: Adding Formal Semantics to MPEG-7: Designing a Well Founded Multimedia Ontology for the Web, Arbeitsberichte aus dem Fachbereich Informatik, 4/2007

Simon Schenk, Steffen Staab: Networked RDF Graphs, Arbeitsberichte aus dem Fachbereich Informatik, 3/2007

Rüdiger Grimm, Helge Hundacker, Anastasia Meletiadiou: Anwendungsbeispiele für Kryptographie, Arbeitsberichte aus dem Fachbereich Informatik, 2/2007

Anastasia Meletiadiou, J. Felix Hampe: Begriffsbestimmung und erwartete Trends im IT-Risk-Management, Arbeitsberichte aus dem Fachbereich Informatik, 1/2007

#### **„Gelbe Reihe“**

(<http://www.uni-koblenz.de/fb4/publikationen/gelbereihe>)

Lutz Priese: Some Examples of Semi-rational and Non-semi-rational DAG Languages. Extended Version, Fachberichte Informatik 3-2006

Kurt Lautenbach, Stephan Philippi, and Alexander Pinl: Bayesian Networks and Petri Nets, Fachberichte Informatik 2-2006

Rainer Gimnich and Andreas Winter: Workshop Software-Reengineering und Services, Fachberichte Informatik 1-2006

Kurt Lautenbach and Alexander Pinl: Probability Propagation in Petri Nets, Fachberichte Informatik 16-2005

Rainer Gimnich, Uwe Kaiser, and Andreas Winter: 2. Workshop "Reengineering Prozesse" – Software Migration, Fachberichte Informatik 15-2005

Jan Murray, Frieder Stolzenburg, and Toshiaki Arai: Hybrid State Machines with Timed Synchronization for Multi-Robot System Specification, Fachberichte Informatik 14-2005

Reinhold Letz: FTP 2005 – Fifth International Workshop on First-Order Theorem Proving, Fachberichte Informatik 13-2005

Bernhard Beckert: TABLEAUX 2005 – Position Papers and Tutorial Descriptions, Fachberichte Informatik 12-2005

Dietrich Paulus and Detlev Droege: Mixed-reality as a challenge to image understanding and artificial intelligence, Fachberichte Informatik 11-2005

Jürgen Sauer: 19. Workshop Planen, Scheduling und Konfigurieren / Entwerfen, Fachberichte Informatik 10-2005

Pascal Hitzler, Carsten Lutz, and Gerd Stumme: Foundational Aspects of Ontologies, Fachberichte Informatik 9-2005

Joachim Baumeister and Dietmar Seipel: Knowledge Engineering and Software Engineering, Fachberichte Informatik 8-2005

Benno Stein and Sven Meier zu Eißén: Proceedings of the Second International Workshop on Text-Based Information Retrieval, Fachberichte Informatik 7-2005

Andreas Winter and Jürgen Ebert: Metamodel-driven Service Interoperability, Fachberichte Informatik 6-2005



Joschka Boedecker, Norbert Michael Mayer, Masaki Ogino, Rodrigo da Silva Guerra, Masaaki Kikuchi, and Minoru Asada: Getting closer: How Simulation and Humanoid League can benefit from each other, Fachberichte Informatik 5-2005

Torsten Gipp and Jürgen Ebert: Web Engineering does profit from a Functional Approach, Fachberichte Informatik 4-2005

Oliver Obst, Anita Maas, and Joschka Boedecker: HTN Planning for Flexible Coordination Of Multiagent Team Behavior, Fachberichte Informatik 3-2005

Andreas von Hessling, Thomas Kleemann, and Alex Sinner: Semantic User Profiles and their Applications in a Mobile Environment, Fachberichte Informatik 2-2005

Heni Ben Amor and Achim Rettinger: Intelligent Exploration for Genetic Algorithms – Using Self-Organizing Maps in Evolutionary Computation, Fachberichte Informatik 1-2005