

The 2nd U.S. Semantic Technologies Symposium (US2TS 2019)

Editorial

Anna Lisa Gentile^a, Tania Tudorache^b

^a *IBM Research, CA, USA*

E-mail: annalisa.gentile@ibm.com

^b *Stanford University, CA, USA*

E-mail: tudorache@stanford.edu

Abstract. This report provides an overview of the 2nd edition of the U.S. Semantic Technologies Symposium (US2TS) series that took place between March 11-13, 2019 at Duke University, Durham, North Carolina. The main goal of the US2TS symposium series is to facilitate the formation of a coherent national agenda for exploring emerging trends in Semantic Technologies, and to help consolidate and build a U.S.-based community research network. This report describes the structure, program and the outcomes of the second edition of US2TS (<http://us2ts.org/2019/>).

1. The US2TS Series

The Semantic Web is an inherently multi-disciplinary field. The Artificial Intelligence community has contributed much in the way of formal logic and knowledge representation. Similarly, the applied computer science community, along with industry and government agencies, have contributed with application development and testing. With an ever-growing dependence on the web, and the continuously increasing importance of large-scale data sharing, integration, and reuse, natural science researchers, geoscience, biology, library science, health care, the humanities, just to name a few, have also taken an increasing interest in the Semantic Web. Large-scale industrial applications are under way or already deployed.

Yet, the division between computer science, natural science, and academia/government/industry, has a downside. It limits the formation of a coherent national agenda for exploring emerging trends in Semantic Technologies. What are needed are community consolidation and the building of a U.S.-based community research network.

The goal of the U.S. Semantic Technologies Symposium series is to bring together the U.S. Semantic

Web community and begin forming such a research network. We achieve this by supporting communication across disciplinary, organizational, and geographical boundaries. The symposium events provide a forum by which participants can share information and ideas, coordinate ongoing or planned research activities, foster synthesis and new collaborations, develop community standards, and advance their science and education through communication and the sharing of ideas.

The first edition of US2TS¹ took place at Wright State University, Dayton, Ohio between March 1-2, 2018, and it served as the bootstrapping of the series. The first edition lined up a series of well known researchers and leaders in the Semantic Web field. Besides the invited talks, the symposium also offered open-discussion space through break-out sessions.

The second edition of US2TS² took place between March 11-13, 2019 at Duke University, Durham, North Carolina. The symposium attracted 120 participants from academia, industry and government. Following the feedback from the first edition, the 2019 sympo-

¹<http://us2ts.org/2018/>

²<http://us2ts.org/2019/>

1 sium allowed the participants to co-create the program
 2 to include topics that were of interest to the commu-
 3 nity, and at the same time, it created a common discus-
 4 sion space through several plenary session.

7 2. The Symposium Program

9 The symposium ran over three days between March
 10 11-13, 2019. The goal when creating the symposium
 11 program was to support the community in coming to-
 12 gether not only around specific topics, but also around
 13 overarching themes that span different disciplines, or-
 14 ganizations and geographical locations, and that affect
 15 the Semantic Technologies community as a whole.

16 The US2TS 2019 symposium program³ was com-
 17 posed of two keynotes, 11 parallel sessions spanning
 18 the three days—each followed by a plenary report from
 19 the session, a poster session, two lightning talks ses-
 20 sions, and three additional plenary sessions: a panel on
 21 the “Semantic Web Technologies in the U.S. – five and
 22 ten years from now”, a panel on “Common Challenges
 23 and Solutions in Using Semantic Technologies”, and a
 24 town hall session.

25 The slides for several of the sessions are available
 26 online, and are linked from the US2TS 2019 web page.

28 2.1. The Keynotes

30 The symposium featured two inspiring keynotes
 31 given by Deborah McGuinness from the Rensselaer
 32 Polytechnic Institute, and by Helena Deus from Else-
 33 vier.

34 Deborah McGuinness gave a talk on “Knowledge
 35 Graphs Come of Age”⁴ that revealed the diversity of
 36 use cases in which knowledge graphs are currently
 37 used, with a special focus on deployed applications in
 38 complex health care systems. She also discussed the
 39 current trends in knowledge graphs, and how they are
 40 gaining in popularity in artificial intelligence and data
 41 science applications.

42 Helena Deus gave a talk on “Building the Health
 43 Knowledge Graph: From Linked Data to Knowledge
 44 Graphs to Machine Learning and back again”.⁵ The talk
 45 described the challenges and solutions that Elsevier

46 ³<http://us2ts.org/2019/posts/program.html>

47 ⁴<http://us2ts.org/2019/posts/program-session-keynote-deborah.html>

48 ⁵<http://us2ts.org/2019/posts/program-session-keynote-helena.html>

1 encountered when using an expert-curated knowledge
 2 graph as the source of training data to do extraction
 3 of triples from medical literature. The talk ended with
 4 very practical suggestions on projects that the semantic
 5 technologies could help solve.

6 Both keynotes were well-received by the partici-
 7 pants, and were often referenced throughout the sym-
 8 posium.

9 2.2. The Parallel Sessions

10 The 11 parallel sessions filled the main part of
 11 the symposium. We “crowd-sourced” from the partic-
 12 ipants these sessions ahead of the symposium. The
 13 structure of the symposium was intentionally designed
 14 bottom-up to enable the community to create a pro-
 15 gram that was highly relevant to the participants.

16 We gathered the request for discussion sessions
 17 from the community with an open call,⁶ where anyone
 18 with an interest in Semantic Web technologies could
 19 propose a session. We defined session as any relevant
 20 activity that could fit into a 90-minutes slot, e.g. a
 21 panel discussion, a series of presentations on a topic,
 22 a breakout-style discussion on a proposed topic, a tu-
 23 torial etc. The two main recommendations we gave to
 24 organize a session where to have at least 2-3 people as
 25 organizers, preferably from different institutions, and
 26 to cover cross-discipline topics as much as possible.

27 The response from the community was quite posi-
 28 tive, with a total of 11 accepted sessions. The proposed
 29 sessions were of three main types:

- 30 1. *Foundational Sessions*: Addressing core
 31 topics of the field;
- 32 2. *Applied Session*: Addressing the applica-
 33 tion of semantic technologies to specific
 34 verticals;
- 35 3. *Practical Sessions*: Addressing the usage
 36 of semantic technologies in real business
 37 applications, and solutions to overcome the
 38 existing barriers.

39 2.2.1. Foundational Sessions: Definitions, 40 Methodologies, and Algorithms

41 We classified under *foundational* those sessions that
 42 encouraged discussion and reflection on formal defini-
 43 tions and methodological problems related to semantic
 44 technologies.

45 The *Knowledge Graphs* (KG) session gathered dif-
 46 ferent interpretations of what constitutes a Knowledge

47 ⁶<http://us2ts.org/2019/posts/cfp.html>

1 Graph, with the aim of coming to an agreed defini-
 2 tion and sharing experiences on constructing large and
 3 small KGs in a variety of domains. A panel of experts
 4 from academia and industry shared their rationaliza-
 5 tion of the concept of KG. While coming up with a
 6 unique definition is a challenging task [1], the main
 7 message that surfaced is that one of the successes of
 8 KGs is data integration. It also became clear that KGs
 9 are the only viable way of dealing with large scale ap-
 10 plications that require organizing and accessing data.

11 The *Identifying Cross-Domain Ontology Design*
 12 *Patterns* session focused on trying to define common
 13 modeling patterns that span different domains. The
 14 state of the art differs widely among different appli-
 15 cation domains. While some domains, such as the life
 16 sciences and some fields in industry, apply modeling
 17 patterns more commonly, patterns are rarely used in
 18 other domains. This session spanned two 90-minute
 19 slots and was organized as two break-out sessions,
 20 in which participants self-selected into two groups of
 21 common interests. The first group worked on several
 22 design patterns, such as the “agent-role” pattern and
 23 qualified relationships. The second group discussed
 24 patterns for modeling processes. The participants of
 25 the session agreed to continue the work through a
 26 mailing list. Another outcome is the report⁷ by Chris
 27 Mungall who documented how Knowledge Graph
 28 modeling patterns may differ from the RDF/OWL pat-
 29 terns.

30 The breakout session *Towards Fusion of Seman-
 31 tic Knowledge into Deep Learning Models*⁸ discussed
 32 how semantic technologies can help deep learning
 33 models to incorporate common sense about the real
 34 world and achieve sense making on a multi-model
 35 level, via injecting knowledge, i.e. ontologies, into the
 36 deep models.

37 The *Pushing the boundaries on reasoning applica-
 38 tions to promote discovery* session addressed some of
 39 the big opportunities of different types of reasoning,
 40 but at the same time recognizing that the applications
 41 of formal reasoning are hampered by hard challenges
 42 and trade-offs, such as between logical expressivity
 43 and scaling reasoner performance, and a tool ecosys-
 44 tem with many gaps. This session brought awareness
 45 of both opportunities and challenges, and tried to co-
 46 alesce the otherwise disparate community around tack-
 47 ling common gaps. Several well-received talks de-

1 scribed real-world use cases of using reasoning, such
 2 as the development, maintenance and use of the Gene
 3 Ontology [2]; the challenges of reasoning over the se-
 4 mantics of shared descent with phylogenetic trees; the
 5 indispensability of reasoning in the development and
 6 maintenance of OBO Foundry ontologies [3]; or the
 7 state of OWL reasoning systems.

8 The tutorial on *the Role of Data Semantics for Ex-
 9 plainable AI*⁹ explored the current state of the art
 10 on explaining AI and how semantic technologies can
 11 help, proposing methods to shift the classification
 12 models towards hierarchical models that incorporate
 13 ontological models from the beginning.

14 2.2.2. Applied Sessions: Semantic Technologies for 15 Specific Verticals

16 The session on *Rich Spatial Semantics* explored
 17 the topics of Locations, Places, and Spatial Relations
 18 and advocated for the need of richer and more nu-
 19 anced geospatial concepts and vocabularies. The var-
 20 ious talks examined strategies for improving and ver-
 21 sioning available ontologies, as well as connecting for-
 22 mal and natural language representations of spatial
 23 knowledge.

24 The session on *Agriculture and Food* explored the
 25 application of semantic technology to the logistical, se-
 26 curity and assurance problems of food and agricultural
 27 supply chains. One of the takeaway messages from the
 28 session was to focus on controlled vocabularies and
 29 on making them easy to use and adopt, then annotate
 30 them, i.e. match them to ontologies.

31 The *Traits, Phenotypes, Diseases, and Qualities* ses-
 32 sion addressed the need to come to an agreement on
 33 the representation of characteristics of entities and
 34 processes. These characteristics have been referred to
 35 as traits, phenotypes, diseases, and qualities, some-
 36 times interchangeably or inconsistently. Each commu-
 37 nity has developed its own design patterns, classes,
 38 and properties for representing characteristics, some-
 39 times in isolation. This session tried to bring clarity on
 40 why and how communities of practice are representing
 41 characteristics to avoid and remove unnecessary silos.

42 The *Using MediaWiki and WikiBase as a Platform
 43 for Library Linked Data* session described a recently
 44 completed pilot driven by the Online Computer Li-
 45 brary Center (OCLC) using MediaWiki and WikiBase
 46 as a platform for creating and editing Linked Data.
 47 Their local installation was populated with linked-data
 48 entities mined from the OCLC WorldCat database,

49 ⁷[https://douroucouli.wordpress.com/2019/03/14/
 50 biological-knowledge-graph-modeling-design-patterns/](https://douroucouli.wordpress.com/2019/03/14/biological-knowledge-graph-modeling-design-patterns/)

51 ⁸<https://deepsemantic2019.github.io/>

⁹<https://semanticsforai.github.io/>

1 which were synchronized with descriptions from cor-
 2 responding Wikidata pages. The speakers of the ses-
 3 sion described the technical aspects of deploying the
 4 wiki for Link Data authoring, and also discussed
 5 lessons learned from their project.

6 2.2.3. Practical Sessions: Fostering Adoption of 7 Semantic Technologies in Industry

8 The session on *Bringing Semantics to Enterprise*
 9 *Data* addressed the technical and social challenges to
 10 bring KG to the enterprise. The take-away message
 11 was about focusing on the end goal, i.e. what is the
 12 value that a KG adds? And how to communicate and
 13 expose the value to people in the organization who are
 14 not semantic technologies experts but rather UX de-
 15 signers, data scientists, etc.

16 One other aspect of making semantic technologies
 17 more appealing for industry was addressed in the ses-
 18 sion *Toward Easier RDF*, as the RDF ecosystem is per-
 19 ceived as too hard for developers. The session explored
 20 a few potential solutions, like focusing on property
 21 graphs as well as putting the focus on the “marriage”
 22 of RDF and JSON, and the success of GraphQL.¹⁰ An-
 23 other issue that was discussed was how to create a cen-
 24 tral webpage that could serve as a starting point for
 25 people wanting to build an application using semantic
 26 technologies.

27 2.3. Challenges in Using Semantic Technologies

28 One of the highlights of the symposium was the ple-
 29 nary session that took place on the third day on the
 30 topic of “Common Challenges and Solutions in Using
 31 Semantic Technologies”. We asked the participants to
 32 submit the challenges they faced with semantic tech-
 33 nologies through a Google form¹¹ during the sym-
 34 posium. We also asked six participants from diverse
 35 backgrounds to give a 5-minute position talk at the be-
 36 ginning of the session. Then, we opened the floor for
 37 discussions, and also invited all participants to edit a
 38 shared Google document¹² during the session. The dis-
 39 cussions were very productive, identifying challenges
 40 that span across fields and use cases, and also gener-
 41 ating ideas about ways to move forward. Below are
 42 some of the main ideas. The interested reader can find
 43 a complete reference in the shared Google document
 44 referenced above.

45 ¹⁰<https://graphql.org/>

46 ¹¹<https://goo.gl/forms/pREFgjT25jbOcqXH3>

47 ¹²<http://tinyurl.com/US2TS2019>

- 1 – *Modeling is hard*: Participants from different do-
 2 mains and with different expertise levels, ranging
 3 from novices to experts, raised several issues re-
 4 lated to the difficulty of modeling of ontologies
 5 and KGs: There is a lack of good methodologies
 6 and modeling patterns for different use cases; it is
 7 very difficult to change a modeling pattern once
 8 you made a commitment; we need simpler model-
 9 ing languages and better schema languages; there
 10 should be simpler ways to deal with constraint
 11 checking and reification. These issues are aggra-
 12 vated by a lack of tool support.
- 13 – *Need for education and professionalisation*: This
 14 issue found a lot of support from most partici-
 15 pants. There is a substantial need for better educa-
 16 tion in using semantic technologies, and it should
 17 start in academic environments. Is it possible to
 18 develop a common curriculum? We need to de-
 19 velop a training programs that creates the Knowl-
 20 edge Engineer profession.
- 21 – *Lowering the barriers for entry*: This is definitely
 22 an old challenge, but obviously still unresolved,
 23 as many of the participants agreed. It is still very
 24 difficult for newcomers in the field to find the
 25 right resources to start developing with semantic
 26 technologies; there isn’t a central webpage or hub
 27 with the most important resources. We also need
 28 better tools that are built with the user in mind.
 29 There is also a need for better ways of document-
 30 ing ontologies to make them appropriate also for
 31 “human consumption”.
- 32 – *Trust and maintainability*: Even though there are
 33 many ontologies and Linked datasets published
 34 on the Web, it is not clear which ones can be
 35 trusted. We need some kind of “stamp of ap-
 36 proval” by accredited entities. Also licensing of
 37 ontologies and linked data is very important, es-
 38 pecially for companies who would like to make
 39 use of them.

40 3. Feedback and Takeaway Messages

41 At the end of the symposium we run a town hall
 42 session to gather feedback from all participants on
 43 what worked well and what could be done better next
 44 year. The plenary and interactive sessions were well re-
 45 ceived, specifically the poster sessions and the discus-
 46 sion of the challenges. Also the opportunity of giving
 47 short lightening talks was well received. Sometimes
 48
 49
 50
 51

1 having three parallel sessions made it harder to partic-
2 ipate in some of the discussions.

3 During the town hall discussion, two major im-
4 provements for next editions have emerged. Firstly, it
5 was suggested to strongly clarify and share the goals
6 of the symposium. While the primary goal of this event
7 so far it has been to create awareness of each other
8 within the US semantic technologies community, the
9 goals going forward should become more concrete and
10 content-based. Secondly, in the spirit of the commu-
11 nity becoming more solid and established, more of the
12 activities of the symposium should be proposed by the
13 crowd during the event itself, rather than all the ses-
14 sions being defined before the event. Essentially, the
15 suggestion is to leave more space for interactive ses-
16 sions, where participants can gather together during
17 the event and decide what to discuss about.

18 The town hall session also revealed the overwhelm-
19 ing interests of the participants to have the third edition
20 of the US2TS series organized next year rather than in
21 two years. As of now, US2TS 2020 will be organized
22 in Spring 2020 at the Woods Hole Oceanographic In-
23 stitution, Massachusetts. Next year's edition will con-
24 tinue to promote the formation of a U.S.-based com-
25 munity research network around semantic technolo-
26 gies and it will be shaped by the feedback we received
27 from the participants in this and the previous edition of
28 the event.
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51

4. Acknowledgements

1 We would like to thank the entire organization com-
2 mittee for making this symposium possible: Pascal
3 Hitzler (General Chair), Hilmar Lapp (Local Chair),
4 Marshall X Ma (Sponsorships), Amit Joshi (Pub-
5 licity) and Krzysztof Janowicz (Outgoing Program
6 Chair). We would also like to warmly thank our spon-
7 sors, listed at <http://us2ts.org/2019/posts/sponsor.html>,
8 without which this event would not have been possible.
9
10
11
12
13
14
15

References

- 16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
- [1] P.A. Bonatti, S. Decker, A. Polleres and V. Presutti, Knowledge Graphs: New Directions for Knowledge Representation on the Semantic Web (Dagstuhl Seminar 18371), *Dagstuhl Reports* **8**(9) (2019), 29–111. doi:10.4230/DagRep.8.9.29. <http://drops.dagstuhl.de/opus/volltexte/2019/10328>.
 - [2] M. Ashburner, C.A. Ball, J.A. Blake, D. Botstein, H. Butler, J.M. Cherry, A.P. Davis, K. Dolinski, S.S. Dwight, J.T. Eppig et al., Gene ontology: tool for the unification of biology, *Nature genetics* **25**(1) (2000), 25.
 - [3] B. Smith, M. Ashburner, C. Rosse, J. Bard, W. Bug, W. Ceusters, L.J. Goldberg, K. Eilbeck, A. Ireland, C.J. Mungall et al., The OBO Foundry: coordinated evolution of ontologies to support biomedical data integration, *Nature biotechnology* **25**(11) (2007), 1251.