

**9/2/24**

**Zoom link:**

<https://upm.zoom.us/j/82022252193?pwd=Z3lCRGI0SDBwSGF0NEhCUXlZWDI2QT09>

**Wiki link:**

[https://www.w3.org/community/ontolex/wiki/Terminology#Open\\_Issues](https://www.w3.org/community/ontolex/wiki/Terminology#Open_Issues)

**Participants**

**Patricia Martín Chozas**

**Rute Costa**

Ana Salgado

Federica Vezzani

Sigita Rackevičienė

Ana Ostroški Anić

Dagmar Gromann

Andon Tchechmedjiev

Christian Chiarcos

Paula Diez Ibarbia

Jorge Gracia

Yuliia Shpak

Sara Carvalho

John McCrae

Fahad Khan

Max Ionov

**Agenda**

1. Review action points from the previous meeting
2. Review already identified representation needs
3. Identify new use cases/representation needs
  - a. Sigita/Max
  - b. Multimodal Terminology (Andon)
4. Discuss (potential) solutions
5. TermTrends on Terminology Representation

**ToDoS from previous meeting:**

- Sara and Federica to add the use cases
- Sara, Federica and Sigita to add representation needs (as issues in the list of Open Issues: [https://www.w3.org/community/ontolex/wiki/Terminology#Open\\_Issues](https://www.w3.org/community/ontolex/wiki/Terminology#Open_Issues))
- New contributors to document issues.
- Terminology experts to document their reflections: provide some examples of the mismatches. Mismatches from the discussion:
  - Ontolex: semasiological or onomasiological
  - Differences between terminological concepts and ontological concepts
  - Ontolex model for terminology or brand new model for terminology

- Lexical Sense != Terminological Concept

## Minutes

### ToDo's New Use Cases

- Sara+Federica to work on the ToDo's during next week
- Max+Sigita to work on the ToDo's during next week (?)
  - The need of using a class for usage info about terminology
- Andon to work on Multimodal Terminology Use case (-> talk to Dagmar?)

## Discussion

*Ontolex: semasiological or onomasiological*

Jorge: Ontolex supports both. Refer to [https://oa.upm.es/72449/1/REV\\_INT\\_ELEC\\_03.pdf](https://oa.upm.es/72449/1/REV_INT_ELEC_03.pdf)

Dagmar: Not a lot of onomasiological resources in Ontolex.

Jorge: It is a matter of how the user applies the model, not that the model does not support it.

John: Wordnet is onomasiological. Btw do we need a terminological concept?

*Differences between terminological concepts and ontological concepts*

Dagmar: The problem: how to fit terminological theories into SKOS and Ontolex.

John: do not see any difference between lexical concept and a possible terminological concept

Sara: matter of perspective. One can model in ontolex, but

Rute: different notions of concepts, from a theoretical perspective

Terminological Concept/Lexical Concept does not correspond to any terminology standard

Rute: The definition of LexicalConcept is difficult to understand.

Jorge: Does ontolex fit into the needs of term resources?

Jorge+John: we should document use cases in which a terminological concept is really needed (and in which LC does not suffice)

Fahad: the problem maybe is the relation btw LC and SC?

Sara:

Elena: why associating LC to a SC and not to any other concept in owl?

Ana Salgado: maybe the main problem is the decision of using LC from the beginning

John: there is a LC cause it is a lexical model.

Dagmar+John: Ontolex is not agnostic (as Jorge says) but focused on lexical resources. The issue is to accommodate terminological needs into a lexical model.

Dagmar: Ontolex has an issue with the language level (which is associated to the form).

John: LC are to be lang independent.

Dagmar: Language not to be associated to LC, but also not to form: somewhere in between.

Levels: 1. Concept, 2. Language, 3. Term elements. Eg: IATE is modeled that way.

TBX is three layers: terminological entry, language entry. term entry (?)

John: Term entries equivalent to LCs. TBX model seems weak (?).

Dagmar: in terminology a concept cannot have different senses.

-> 1 reason not to use LC for terminology?

John: is not about onomasiological or semasiological is a graph.

Dagmar: although in a graph you can also have directions.

Langset = concept (?)

Dagmar: then we should turn terminologies into lexicon, in order to use Ontolex for terminologies?

Ana Otroski: what would be the benefit of transferring by data in tbx to Ontolex? Could we use SC and lose LC? Is there a significant need of developing another module?

John: if we go in this direction, it means that we want to merge terminologies and lexicons?

Fahad: there is interest to convert tbx into rdf but there are many doubts as well.

Elena: I do not see how SC could be blocking.

Dagmar: for instance in thesauri you only have preferred terms, cause they are controlled vocabularies, in terminologies you have preferred, deprecate and so on.

Elena suggests avoiding skos concept and using an owl concept. Elena thinks that Ontolex is flexible enough.

Workshop within MDTT in Granada, to present use cases for terminology representation, so we could have discussions on more concrete levels:

[https://drive.google.com/file/d/1HHdIsyddVqZxzqvBzITBWqokFvHqymp0/view?usp=drive\\_link](https://drive.google.com/file/d/1HHdIsyddVqZxzqvBzITBWqokFvHqymp0/view?usp=drive_link)

—27/11/23

## Participants

Patricia Marín Chozas  
Rute Costa  
Ana Salgado  
Federica Vezzani  
Sigita Rackevičienė  
Ana Ostroški Anić  
Dagmar Gromann  
Andon Tchechmedjiev  
Christian Chiarcos  
Paula Diez Ibarbia  
Jorge Gracia  
Yuliia Shpak

## Agenda:

- Review action points from the previous meeting
- Review already identified representation needs
- Identify new use cases/representation needs
- Discuss (proposed) solution

## Meeting minutes:

1. Previous meeting notes:  
[https://docs.google.com/document/d/1-9PjS9rAJe\\_znfx8cgW0WzdMeAfaXuWvvdububjyljNQ/edit?usp=sharing](https://docs.google.com/document/d/1-9PjS9rAJe_znfx8cgW0WzdMeAfaXuWvvdububjyljNQ/edit?usp=sharing)
  - ToDo: Sara and Federica to add the use cases
2. Review already identify representation needs
  - ToDo: Sara, Federica and Sigita to add representation needs (as issues in the list of Open Issues:  
[https://www.w3.org/community/ontolex/wiki/Terminology#Open\\_Issues](https://www.w3.org/community/ontolex/wiki/Terminology#Open_Issues))
- Sigita working with Christian and Max
3. Identify new use cases/representation needs
  - Paula Diez: TERMCAT use case.
    - From XML terminologies to RDF terminologies
    - Issue with verb modelling (specifically catalan verbs): pronominal and prepositional verbs
    - Paula tried to used Olia that supports pronominal adverbs
    - Christian can support Paula offline about Olia
      - verbs+ -se could be (rdfs:subClassOf|rdf:type) olia:Verb and olia:ReflexivePronoun (as previously done for Multext-East reflexive verbs in Slavic etc.)

- Christian also suggests Synsem:  
[https://www.w3.org/community/ontolex/wiki/Syntax\\_and\\_Semantics\\_Module](https://www.w3.org/community/ontolex/wiki/Syntax_and_Semantics_Module)  
 (for prep verbs)
- 
- Andon's use case: Procedural knowledge. Terms not defined with text but with procedures or other technical elements, media, video...
- Dagmar: multimodal terminology has been considered before and would be a nice use case
- Rute, Ana, Dagmar: maybe this is not "terminology" but "lexicography"
  - move the discussion to lexicography

#### 4. Discussion:

- Rute: first: why do we need this terminology module?:
  - What is the approach? Concept-based approach.
- Dagmar: Ontolex is semasiological - lemma based
- Rute: Terminology should be onomasiological - concept based
- Jorge: ontolex supports different views: semasiological and onomasiological. It depends on the view of the user.
- Dagmar and Rute: Ontolex does not work for the concept-based needs of terminology. We need a brand new model (not sure if this is correct)
- Jorge: Maybe we should try to identify what lemon is not able to represent.
- Federica: Working on tbx to ontolex converter. They identified some issues that may help in the discussion. For them, the concept of a term is not the same as the sense of a term.
- Andon: how different are terminological concepts from the ontological concepts?
- Dagmar: terminological concept is fuzzy, that's why people proposed to use frames. Lexical sense is not the same as terminological concept
- Dagmar: skos for thesaurus, not terminology
- Patricia: Do we want an ontolex terminology module or a brand new terminology vocabulary?
- Andon: maybe
- Jorge: maybe terminology experts should present the issues that ontolex can not cover for terminological resources.
- Jorge: It seems that it's necessary to rethink theoretical implications. Ontolex does not stick with a particular theoretical view.
- Jorge: to try to accommodate the different theoretical views with a new entity/class

ToDo: Dagmar and Rute to identify Ontolex limitations

Next step:

- New contributors to document issues.
- Terminology experts to document their reflections: provide some examples of the mismatches.