



HAL
open science

The Modular SSN Ontology: A Joint W3C and OGC Standard Specifying the Semantics of Sensors, Observations, Sampling, and Actuation

Armin Haller, Krzysztof Janowicz, Simon J.D. Cox, Maxime Lefrançois, Kerry Taylor, Danh Le Phuoc, Joshua Lieberman, Raúl García-Castro, Rob Atkinson, Claus Stadler

► To cite this version:

Armin Haller, Krzysztof Janowicz, Simon J.D. Cox, Maxime Lefrançois, Kerry Taylor, et al.. The Modular SSN Ontology: A Joint W3C and OGC Standard Specifying the Semantics of Sensors, Observations, Sampling, and Actuation. *Semantic Web – Interoperability, Usability, Applicability*, 2018, 10 (1), pp.9-32. 10.3233/SW-180320 . hal-01885335

HAL Id: hal-01885335

<https://hal.science/hal-01885335v1>

Submitted on 1 Oct 2018

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

The Modular SSN Ontology: A Joint W3C and OGC Standard Specifying the Semantics of Sensors, Observations, Sampling, and Actuation

Armin Haller^{a,*}, Krzysztof Janowicz^b, Simon J D Cox^c, Maxime Lefrançois^d, Kerry Taylor^a,
Danh Le Phuoc^e, Joshua Lieberman^f, Raúl García-Castro^g, Rob Atkinson^h, and Claus Stadlerⁱ

^a *Research School of Computer Science, Australian National University, Canberra, Australia*

E-mails: armin.haller@anu.edu.au, kerry.taylor@anu.edu.au

^b *Geography Department, University of California, Santa Barbara, CA, USA*

E-mail: jano@geog.ucsb.edu

^c *Land and Water, CSIRO, Melbourne, Australia*

E-mail: simon.cox@csiro.au

^d *Univ Lyon, MINES Saint-Étienne, CNRS, Laboratoire Hubert Curien UMR 5516, Saint-Étienne, France*

E-mail: maxime.lefrancois@emse.fr

^e *Open Distributed Systems, Technische Universität Berlin, Germany*

E-mail: danh.lephuoc@tu-berlin.de

^f *Center for Geographic Analysis, Harvard University, Boston, MA, USA*

E-mail: jlieberman@fas.harvard.edu

^g *Ontology Engineering Group, Universidad Politécnica de Madrid, Madrid, Spain*

E-mail: rgarcia@fi.upm.es

^h *Metalinkage, Wollongong, Australia*

E-mail: rob@metalinkage.com.au

ⁱ *Institut für Informatik, Universität Leipzig, Leipzig, Germany*

E-mail: cstadler@informatik.uni-leipzig.de

Editor: Pascal Hitzler, Wright State University, USA

Solicited reviews: Eva Blomqvist, Linköping University, Sweden; Alessandro Oltramari, Bosch Research and Technology Center, USA; Freddy Lecue, Accenture Tech Labs Ireland, and INRIA, France

Abstract. The joint W3C (World Wide Web Consortium) and OGC (Open Geospatial Consortium) *Spatial Data on the Web* (SDW) Working Group developed a set of ontologies to describe sensors, actuators, samplers as well as their observations, actuation, and sampling activities. The ontologies have been published both as a W3C recommendation and as an OGC implementation standard. The set includes a lightweight core module called SOSA (Sensor, Observation, Sampler, and Actuator) available at: <http://www.w3.org/ns/sosa/>, and a more expressive extension module called SSN (Semantic Sensor Network) available at: <http://www.w3.org/ns/ssn/>. Together they describe systems of sensors and actuators, observations, the used procedures, the subjects and their properties being observed or acted upon, samples and the process of sampling, and so forth. The set of ontologies adopts a modular architecture with SOSA as a self-contained core that is extended by SSN and other modules to add expressivity and breadth. The SOSA/SSN ontologies are able to support a wide range of applications and use cases, including satellite imagery, large-scale scientific monitoring, industrial and household infrastructures, social sensing, citizen science, observation-driven ontology engineering, and the Internet of Things. In this paper we give an overview of the ontologies and discuss the rationale behind key design decisions, reporting on the differences between the new SSN ontology presented here and its predecessor [9] developed by the W3C Semantic Sensor Network Incubator group (the SSN-XG). We present usage examples and describe alignment modules that foster interoperability with other ontologies.

1570-0844/18/\$35.00 © 2018 – IOS Press and the authors. All rights reserved

Keywords: Ontology, Sensor, Actuator, Observation, Actuation, Sampling, Linked Data, Web of Things, Internet of Things

1. Introduction

Sensors are a major source of data available on the Web today. The trend towards making cities, offices, and homes ‘smarter’ by turning them into sensor-rich environments [31] drives the demand for specifications that describe how to model and publish sensor and actuator data as well as how to foster interoperability across platforms on the Web or other data infrastructures.

Sensor readings are often provided only as raw numeric values, but any searching, reusing, integrating, or interpreting of these data requires more than just the observation results. Of equal importance for the proper interpretation of these values is contextual information about the studied feature of interest, such as a river, the observed property, such as flow velocity, the utilized sampling strategy, such as the specific locations or sampling stations and times at which the velocity was measured, the procedures followed to produce a result, and a variety of other information.

The Open Geospatial Consortium’s (OGC) Sensor Web Enablement (SWE) standards [6, 26, 49] provide a framework for describing sensors and observations, as well as encodings for their data and service interfaces for interacting with them. SWE implementations followed the style of other OGC standards, relying on web-hosted service calls and XML payloads, which have limited compatibility with the more recent and widely used web platforms.

A W3C Incubator Group was created in 2009 with the goal, among others, of defining an OWL ontology that would, to some degree, reflect the SWE standards. That group produced the original Semantic Sensor Network ontology (SSNX¹) [9, 36]. SSNX was designed to be consistent with W3C endorsed best practices on publishing data on the Web, which recommend a Linked Data approach, allowing sensor data, for example, to be published as part of a global and densely interconnected graph of data [42]. The SSNX ontology has been the basis for many subsequent research initiatives and some operational deployments. However, users of the original ontology have identified a number of potential points of improvement, inconsistencies with related vocabularies such as the Ontology of units of Measure (O&M) [12, 49], as well as extensions to

cover new aspects of sensing that have become more relevant, such as actuation, a key element of the Internet of Things (IoT).

Four years after the publication of the first version, work started on an update and formal standardization of the SSNX ontology, this time jointly led by the W3C and the OGC, to address the feedback gathered on the usage of the ontology and lessons learned. This activity resulted in the publication of the *new* Semantic Sensor Network (SSN) modular ontology, designed to provide a flexible but coherent perspective for representing the entities, relations, and activities involved in sensing, sampling, and actuation [22]. The main innovation of this formal standard version of SSN is the separation of SSN into ontology modules, the central of which is the Sensor, Observation, Sample, and Actuator (SOSA) ontology, providing a lightweight core for SSN. SOSA aims to broaden the target audience and application areas that can make use of Semantic Web ontologies. Other SSN modules add additional terms, introduce additional ontological commitments, and/or clarify and support the alignment of SSN with other ontologies.

This paper does not aim at providing an exhaustive description of the SSN ontology, since that can be found in the specification [22], but to motivate the development decisions and the design patterns followed while indicating the most substantial changes made since the initial release of the ontology. Throughout this paper we will introduce concepts from SSN (and SOSA) in detail, supported by examples of its use in a smart home case study. As will be detailed below, SOSA [30] is a self-contained pattern designed for reuse and to meet the demands of a larger, schema.org-style target audience. Hence, SOSA is only introduced here to a degree necessary to understand its relation to SSN and because SSN imports and extends SOSA classes and relations.

The remainder of the paper is structured as follows. Sec. 2 briefly reviews the origins of the SSN ontology. Sec. 3 explains the rationale behind the main changes to the core of SSN, with observations modeled as events alongside the related sampling and actuation activities which are introduced as well. The overall modular structure of the SSN ontology is described in Sec. 4. A general description of the *new*, simplified SSN ontology is provided in Sec. 5, along with examples and explanations for the changes from SSNX. Sec. 6 and 7 describe the horizontal and vertical ontology modules that SSN imports or that are imported by SSN, respectively. We provide an overview of what

* Corresponding author. E-mail: armin.haller@anu.edu.au.

¹In this paper SSNX will denote the 2011 version of the ontology produced by the W3C Incubator, with SSN used for the new version standardized through W3C/OGC and described here.

1 SSN is *not* intended to model in Sec. 8, and report
 2 in Sec. 9 on implementation evidence for SSN, which
 3 was crucial for it to become an OGC/W3C standard.

4 2. Original SSN and Antecedents

5
 6
 7
 8 The development of SSN and SOSA has been
 9 strongly influenced by the SSNX ontology [36] and
 10 models from the OGC's Sensor Web Enablement ini-
 11 tiative (SWE) [5].

12 Starting in 2002 SWE developed a generic frame-
 13 work for delivering sensor data. The Sensor Observa-
 14 tion Service defines a HTTP query interface for sen-
 15 sor and observation data [8], following the pattern suc-
 16 cessfully established by OGC starting with the Web
 17 Map Service [16]. Returned data conforms with the
 18 Sensor Model Language (SensorML) [6] and with the
 19 XML implementation of O&M [12, 49]. SensorML
 20 and O&M provide complementary viewpoints. Sen-
 21 sorML is 'provider-centric' and encodes details of the
 22 sensor along with a stream of (typically) raw observa-
 23 tion data. In contrast, O&M was designed to be more
 24 'user-centric', with the target of the observation and
 25 the observed property as first-class objects.

26 A key aspect of the O&M model is that it separately
 27 defined classes for the description of the observation
 28 event, the real world feature of interest being observed,
 29 and the platform, procedure and/or system responsi-
 30 ble for the observation. Geometries or other spatial
 31 location properties can be attached separately to fea-
 32 tures of interest, observations, platforms, and sensors,
 33 so the model can accommodate remote sensing and *ex-*
 34 *situ* observation scenarios alongside *in-situ* monitoring
 35 [32, §5.16][13, 26]. O&M also includes a model for
 36 sampling, since most practical observations are made
 37 on a subset of, or proxy for, the ultimate feature of in-
 38 terest.

39 O&M is only one of several similar conceptual
 40 models for observations and their results. A selection
 41 of these, also including OBOE [43], Sensei [2] and
 42 Seronto [55], were reviewed by the W3C Semantic
 43 Sensor Network Incubator Group, and guided the de-
 44 velopment of the SSNX ontology [36].

45 The SSNX ontology was ultimately built around a
 46 fundamental conceptual model implemented as an on-
 47 tology design pattern called the Stimulus Sensor Ob-
 48 servation (SSO) pattern [29] that was aligned to the
 49 Dolce-Ultralite upper ontology (DUL) [45]. SSO was
 50 intended to provide a minimal common ground for on-
 51 tologies for the use on the Semantic Sensor Web.

1 Drawing on considerable implementation and appli-
 2 cation experience with SSNX, as well as with sensor
 3 and observation models and ontologies more broadly,
 4 the *new* SSN ontology presented here is set out to ad-
 5 dress changes in scope and audience, new technical de-
 6 velopments and shortcomings of the initial work.

7 One such significant change in the extent of the au-
 8 dience of SSN has been the emergence of lightweight
 9 vocabularies such as schema.org and their increasing
 10 use on the Web [20] since SSNX had been published. It
 11 led to a requirement to provide a lightweight ontology
 12 with minimal ontological commitment [32, §5.22], the
 13 SOSA core, that can be used by Web developers to an-
 14 notate their IoT APIs using simple serialization for-
 15 mats such as JSON-LD, Microdata or RDFa 1.1 with-
 16 out the need to import any other ontology, including
 17 upper level ontologies (as required by SSNX).

18 New technical developments included particularly
 19 the emergence of complex actuation devices on the
 20 Web of Things, such as home automation devices like
 21 Google Nest, personal assistants like Amazon Echo,
 22 Apple Siri or Microsoft Cortana and personal camera
 23 drones. To be able to model the smart instrumentation
 24 of these devices and the environments they operate in
 25 more generally, the actuator and actuation perspective
 26 has been added to SSN.

27 The sections below highlights these significant
 28 changes and some of the other changes in the new
 29 SOSA/SSN ontology.

30 3. Observation, Sampling and Actuation events

31
 32
 33 Following the working group's Use Cases and Re-
 34 quirements analysis [32], the scope of the revised on-
 35 tology has first been reduced by removing the con-
 36 cepts for stimulus, systems, measurement and system
 37 capabilities from the core (either for reasons of lack of
 38 implementation evidence or in response to a require-
 39 ment [32, §5.47]), then expanded beyond sensors and
 40 their observations by including classes and properties
 41 for the closely linked concepts of actuation [32, §5.16]
 42 and sampling [32, §5.16].

43 Figure 1 provides an overview of the classes and
 44 properties in the core of the SSN ontology, showing
 45 how the three applications use the same pattern.

46 3.1. Sensors and Observations

47
 48
 49 The core of the SSNX ontology placed the sensor
 50 stimulus as the critical 'event' in the observation pro-
 51




Fig. 1. Overview of the core structure of the SSN ontology, emphasizing the common patterns used by the three activities with classes stacked where they play a similar role. The elements shown are from both SOSA and SSN modules, with classes and types from external vocabularies indicated with a namespace prefix and uncolored. Classes and properties in blue relate to observations, red to sampling, and green to actuation, and classes in yellow are used across all three applications. A full set of inverse properties are defined in the ontology, but only a subset are shown in this figure.

cess. Observations have therefore been modelled as a social construct (`oldssn:Observation` \sqsubseteq `dul:Situation`), i.e. observations were contexts for interpreting incoming stimuli and fixing parameters such as time and location. While this is sound conceptual modeling, in practice the stimulus class was rarely instantiated. This is because a stimulus triggers the sensor to perform an observation, and, thus, resides outside the scope of typical sensor and observation applications and use cases. In subsequent work focusing on the alignment of SSNX with the W3C Provenance ontology [34] the absence of a class representing an observation as an ‘act of sensing’ was noted [10, 14]. The revised model focuses on the complete observation as an event (`sosa:Observation` \sqsubseteq `dul:Event`), completed when the result is available, i.e. acts of carrying out an (observation) procedure in order to estimate or calculate a value of a `sosa:ObservableProperty` of a `sosa:FeatureOfInterest` or a `sosa:Sample` thereof. This modelling is aligned with other standard ontologies such as the OGC Observations and Measurements [13, 26] (i.e. `sosa:Observation` \equiv `sol9156-om:OM_Observation`) and the PROV Ontology (i.e. `sosa:Observation` \sqsubseteq `prov:Activity`) where entities (i.e. `sosa:Sensors` in SSN) perform activities (i.e. `sosa:Observations` in SSN). The new model is also in line with the view of most practitioners, e.g.,

the event-oriented O&M pattern used in INSPIRE implementations². Furthermore, it provides a pattern and terminology that can be used analogically for sampling and actuation activities.

In the process of separating SSN from DUL, also the semantics of the `sosa:Sensor` class has been reconsidered. SSNX has been criticized for its partially inconsistent handling of virtual sensors (including software and simulations) and related classes and properties. In particular, the comment in the `oldssn:Sensor` class suggested that a sensor can also be “computational methods, a laboratory setup with a person following a method, or any other thing that can follow a Sensing Method to observe a Property”. However, the `oldssn:Sensor` class was defined as a subclass of `dul:PhysicalObject`, making the comment inconsistent with the class definition. SOSA/SSN addresses this issue (and requirement §5.19 [32]) by allowing all major classes to be virtual, allowing humans and other animals as agents that perform observations, actuation, or sampling activities. In the optional alignment to DUL, `sosa:Sensors`, but also `sosa:Platforms`, and `ssn:Systems` are now defined as a subclass of the higher-level `dul:Object` class rather than the more specific `dul:PhysicalObject` class.

²<https://inspire.ec.europa.eu/id/document/tg/d2.9-o%26m-swe>

The SOSA pattern models `sosa:Sensors` as entities that make `sosa:Observations` about some `sosa:ObservableProperty` of a `sosa:FeatureOfInterest`. From the viewpoint of foundational ontologies such as DOLCE [18], endurants participate in perdurants. Consequently, the sensors, features of interest, samples, and so forth participate in the observation event in different roles. For instance, a sensor (typically) transforms a stimulus into a result thereby also setting the temporal bounds (start and end) of an observation. The feature of interest is the bearer of the property under consideration, and so on. To improve readability and to stay in line with the literature about sensors and observations we will say that a sensor triggered, initiated, performed, or took, an observation about a property of some feature instead of speaking about endurants and their participation in perdurants. Finally, it is also important to differentiate between the conceptual model of an observation as an event and the data models and data structures used to represent such an observation as a record in a database, e.g., as served by a semantically-enabled Sensor Observation Service (SOS) [24, 28].

Throughout the paper we will use an exemplary smart house that has been modelled using the SSN ontology. Fig. 2 gives an overview of the SOSA/SSN instances³ that we will refer to in the listings throughout the paper.

Listing 3.1 uses SOSA/SSN to describe an observation of the electric consumption in the kitchen of our exemplary smart house #134 made by sensor #927.

Listing 3.1: Observation Modelling

```
@prefix cdt:
  <http://w3id.org/lindt/custom_datatypes#> .
BASE <http://example.org/>
<observation/235727> a sosa:Observation ;
  sosa:hasFeatureOfInterest <house/134/kitchen> ;
  sosa:observedProperty <electricConsumption> ;
  sosa:madeBySensor <sensor/927> ;
  sosa:hasSimpleResult "22.4 kWh"^^cdt:ucum .
```

As a result of replacing the SSO pattern from SSNX by SOSA in SSN, the `oldssn:Sensing`⁴ class has been replaced by the `sosa:Procedure` class, which has a

³The complete ontology file for the example is available at: <https://github.com/w3c/sdw/blob/gh-pages/ssn/integrated/examples/house134.ttl>

⁴The following prefixes are used in the text - `sosa:` for SOSA; `ssn:` for SSN; and `oldssn:` for the old SSNX ontology which defined resources in the namespace <http://purl.oclc.org/NET/ssnx/ssn#>

more generic definition that allows it to be used for acts of observation, sampling or actuation (see Sec. 5.3).

3.2. Samplers and Sampling

Almost all observations make use of sampling strategies to connect an observation event with its ultimate feature of interest, even if the sample and sampling event are not explicitly described. Nevertheless, support for explicit modelling of samples and sampling is sometimes a design requirement, particularly in scientific applications. The SOSA ontology includes `sosa:Sampler` that makes a `sosa:Sampling` of some `sosa:FeatureOfInterest` to produce a `sosa:Sample`. A `sosa:Sample` is both a `sosa:FeatureOfInterest` and a `sosa:Result` of `sosa:Sampling`.

For example, Listing 3.2 describes an act of sampling using a spade to obtain a soil sample from the garden of our example house #134.

Listing 3.2: Sampling Modelling

```
@prefix geow3c:
  <http://www.w3.org/2003/01/geo/wgs84_pos#> .

<sampling/4578> a sosa:Sampling ;
  geow3c:lat "-37.9076" ;
  geow3c:long "145.0294" ;
  sosa:madeBySampler <trowel> ;
  sosa:hasFeatureOfInterest <house/134/garden> ;
  sosa:resultTime
    "2017-12-04T08:14:00:00+10:00"^^xsd:dateTime ;
  sosa:hasResult <sample/134g1> .
```

The result of this act of sampling is a `sosa:Sample` as exemplified in Listing 3.3.

Listing 3.3: Result Sample Modelling

```
<sample/134g1> a sosa:Sample ;
  sosa:isSampleOf <house/134/garden> ;
  sosa:isResultOf <sampling/4578> .
```

The relationship `sosa:isSampleOf` (inverse: `sosa:hasSample`) defines the link between a sample and the feature of interest that it represents, and is the essential property of a sample that allows observation of a sample to lead in turn to an observed property of the feature of interest.

For example, Listing 3.4 asserts that the kitchen and the bedroom, which are both features of interest in their own right, serve also as samples of our home. They might be used in observations to approximate some global property of the house, such as its temperature.

Location and other spatial properties of these entities may also be defined according to application- or community-specific models, which in turn make use of appropriate geospatial ontologies such as GeoSPARQL [47].

4. Modularization

Practitioners using the SSNX ontology have identified the complexity of both the ontology and its documentation as a significant usability issue. For example, SSNX imported the Dolce-Ultralite upper ontology (DUL) [45] and many SSNX terms inherited semantics from their parent DUL terms. The DUL alignment contributed a level of complexity and abstraction which affected adoption in some communities. More generally, the monolithic ontology design of SSNX that introduces all terms within one ontology while also relying on the import of the Dolce-UltraLite ontology, makes it difficult for users to focus on just those entities needed for a particular implementation. In response to this, the *new* SSN ontology is factored into several ontology subsets or modules that are similar in their domain of discourse and directly import one another as needed but differ in their ontological commitments and/or scope of coverage in order to suit different use cases and target audiences. The core module in particular, SOSA, is intended for data repositories and websites managed by web or data managers who need neither extensive axiomatization nor more specialized entities.

Modularization has been accomplished by way of two types or directions of ontology segmentation as shown in Fig. 3.

4.1. Vertical Segmentation

Vertically segmented SSN modules add higher levels of ontological commitment by directly importing lower modules and defining new axioms. The lower level modules are independent of the higher level modules, and logically consistent by themselves. The core SOSA module defines the key classes and properties but axiomatization is deliberately limited. In particular, SOSA uses no object property `rdfs:domain` or `rdfs:range` axioms. In place of these, schema.org `schema:domainIncludes` and `schema:rangeIncludes` annotations provide infor-




Fig. 3. SOSA/SSN ontologies "vertical" and "horizontal" modularization. Horizontal breadth of coverage is shown by arcuate modules at the same radius. Vertical height of expressivity is shown by modules at a larger radius

mal semantics to SOSA properties.⁵ SOSA also avoids any subclass and subproperty axioms. The motivation for these choices is to make SOSA simple enough to be incorporated *as is* in the schema.org extension for IoT.⁶ SOSA as the core, does not import any other ontologies, so is truly independent of vertical modules that add more terms, expressivity, and further ontological commitments to the lightweight semantics of SOSA.

The SSN module imports SOSA, and adds full axiomatization to the SOSA classes and properties, including `rdfs:subClassOf`, `rdfs:subPropertyOf`, `owl:disjointWith` and OWL cardinality and guarded existential restrictions on a class-level, along with some further classes and properties to complete the basic conceptual model corresponding approximately to the scope offered by SSNX.

In line with the changes implemented for the *new* SSN, alignment between SSN terms and DUL terms was reconsidered and externalized to an optional vertical module called the Dolce-Ultralite Alignment module (SSN-DUL) that is available at <http://www.w3.org/ns/ssn/dul>. Those axioms in SSN that include DUL terms have been separated into the SSN-DUL mod-

⁵See https://www.w3.org/2015/spatial/wiki/Domain,_Range,_InverseOf for pointers to the group discussions on this topic.

⁶The Spatial Data on the Web group endorses SOSA being taken up by schema.org, see thread <https://lists.w3.org/Archives/Public/public-sdw-wg/2017Jun/0067.html>

ule. The Dolce-UltraLite Alignment Module imports the Dolce-UltraLite Ontology and the Sample relations module, which in turn imports the SSN Ontology, and thereby transitively the SOSA Ontology. However, neither SOSA nor SSN import the Dolce-UltraLite Alignment Module in reverse. The SSN-DUL alignment module has been defined for backwards-compatibility reasons only and SSN (and SOSA) can now be used entirely independently of DUL. In fact, we are not anticipating the use of this alignment in applications other than the one's that are migrated from the old ontology.

Additional vertical modules (see Sec. 7 axiomatize alignments with other related ontologies, including O&M [13, 26], OBOE [43] and PROV-O [34].

4.2. Horizontal Segmentation

Modules that are horizontally layered may depend on each other, i.e., they may rely on the import of another horizontal module, but only extend scope by adding classes and properties, and do not otherwise enrich the semantics of existing terms. Two horizontal modules are defined in SSN (see Sec. 6.1): the Sample Relations Module and the System Capabilities Module.

5. The New SSN Ontology and its Core

SSNX was developed with ontology engineers as the primary audience in mind. Due to the widespread adoption of SSNX, the increasing role of citizen science, the strong focus on lightweight vocabularies by the Linked Data community, and the rising importance of simple vocabularies such as Schema.org, the SSNX ontology needed streamlining. The *new* SSN has been modularized so that the core ontology module, SOSA, can be used as a standalone ontology or even a simple vocabulary targeting web developers, citizen science, lightweight Linked Data publishing, resource-constrained IoT devices, and data intensive applications.

SOSA consists of 13 classes, 21 object properties and 2 datatype properties, and includes very little axiomatization. The SSN ontology is available at <http://www.w3.org/ns/ssn/>. It imports the SOSA ontology, adds additional axioms and 6 classes and 15 object properties. The DL expressivity of the new lightweight SOSA core module is $\mathcal{AL}(\mathcal{D})$ which is efficiently supported by modern DL or RDFS+ rea-

soners [33, 46, 51], while that of the *new* SSN is $\mathcal{AL}(\mathcal{RIN}(\mathcal{D}))$. In contrast, the expressivity of SSNX is \mathcal{SRIQ} . Table 1 provides some key facts to compare SOSA and SSN to SSNX.

Ontology	SOSA	SSN	SSNX
Classes	13	6	41
Object properties	21	15	39
Datatype properties	2	0	0
Tot. logical axioms	13	127	1011 ⁷
DL expressivity	$\mathcal{AL}(\mathcal{D})$	$\mathcal{AL}(\mathcal{RIN}(\mathcal{D}))$	\mathcal{SRIQ}

Table 1

Number of classes, object properties, and datatype properties, defined in SOSA, SSN, and SSNX (for comparison); DL expressivity of these ontologies.

Terms defined by the core SOSA ontology are identified by URIs under the namespace <http://www.w3.org/ns/sosa/>, while those defined by the SSN ontology are identified by URIs under the namespace <http://www.w3.org/ns/ssn/>. In the rest of this article, we shorten these namespaces with the following prefixes (that are registered at <http://prefix.cc>).

```
@prefix sosa: <http://www.w3.org/ns/sosa/> .
@prefix ssn: <http://www.w3.org/ns/ssn/> .
```

SSN (with its imported SOSA core) is organized, conceptually, but not physically, into eight perspectives. The core component with its three conceptual perspectives (Observations, Sampling, Actuation) has already been described in Sec. 3. In the rest of this section we describe the other conceptual components, how they evolved from SSNX and the main rationale for this evolution. Table 2 in Appendix A lists all of the terms defined in SOSA and SSN, and the terms in the old SSN that they supersede, if they exist.

5.1. Feature of Interest and Sample

In an ontology that aims to describe interactions between the physical and digital world, the target object in the physical world is of primary concern. Even though it is quite common in practice to report measurements of, and actions on, the physical world without *explicit* reference to a specific target object, the object is still necessarily there, cognitively completing the act of observation. In SSN the target object is called

a `sosa:FeatureOfInterest`, which reflects a terminology heritage from OGC⁸.

The property `sosa:hasFeatureOfInterest` is used to link between a `sosa:Observation` and its associated `sosa:FeatureOfInterest`. This replaces `oldssn:featureOfInterest`, since the concept `oldssn:FeatureOfInterest` and the property `oldssn:featureOfInterest` were distinguished only by case. The new SSN avoids this to make it easier to be used in languages without case distinction.

In the broader context of Spatial Data on the Web, any *Spatial Thing* could also be a `sosa:FeatureOfInterest` [52] of an observation, sampling or actuation, as Listing 5.1 exemplifies.

Listing 5.1: Spatial Features of Interest Modelling

```
<house/134> a sosa:FeatureOfInterest ;
  rdfs:comment "House #134."@en .

<floralCouch> a sosa:FeatureOfInterest ;
  rdfs:comment "The lumpy 2-seater couch with the
  floral pattern."@en .

<roofInsulation> a sosa:FeatureOfInterest ;
  rdfs:comment "The insulation material in the roof
  of house #134."@en .
```

SSN defines `sosa:Sample` as a subclass of `sosa:FeatureOfInterest`, because, when used for an observation, the sample is the (proximate) feature of interest, as Listing 5.2 shows.

Listing 5.2: Proximate Feature of Interest Modelling

```
<observation/s1/5> a sosa:Observation ;
  sosa:hasFeatureOfInterest <sample/134g1> ;
  sosa:observedProperty <soil-pH> ;
  sosa:phenomenonTime [
    a time:Instant ;
    time:inXSDDateTimeStamp
    "2017-12-04T08:14:00+10:00"^^xsd:dateTimeStamp ;
  ] ;
  sosa:resultTime
  "2017-12-12T10:24:00+10:00"^^xsd:dateTime ;
  sosa:hasSimpleResult "6.1"^^cdt:pH .
```

In most circumstances the sample is only of interest in the context of observations, because it *represents* the (ultimate) feature of interest that is the object of real world or scientific interest within the investigation. In any observation we can query the property path⁹ `sosa:hasFeatureOfInterest/sosa:isSampleOf*`

⁸The geospatial community uses the term ‘feature’ primarily to refer to discernable, identifiable objects in the landscape and their digital representations.

⁹See <https://www.w3.org/TR/sparql11-query/#propertypaths> for the definition of SPARQL property paths

to find the ultimate feature of interest for the observation. In Listing 5.2, which continues the example introduced in Sec. 3, we can infer that the ultimate feature of interest is in fact the garden denoted `<house/134/garden>`.

A `sosa:FeatureOfInterest` and `sosa:Sample` will often have a specified location or other spatial properties, but this is not required. Observations can be made and samples taken from features for which the location is of no direct interest. For example, a material sample may represent a substance; an individual organism may be representative of a taxon; a statistical sample may represent a particular community that is not characterized by location, etc.

5.2. Properties

An observation targets a feature of interest but interacts with it only through estimating the value of a characteristic or property of that feature. The general class of feature properties, `ssn:Property`, is defined in the SSN module, complementing its subclasses in SOSA, `sosa:ObservableProperty` and `sosa:ActuableProperty`. The `ssn:hasProperty`, and its inverse `ssn:isPropertyOf`, relate a feature of interest to `ssn:Property`. We can state, as shown in Listing 5.3, that air temperature is a property of each room in the house.

Listing 5.3: Property Modelling

```
<airTemperature> a ssn:Property ;
  sosa:isPropertyOf <house/134/bedroom>,
  <house/134/kitchen> .
```

Some properties of a feature may not be observable or actuable characteristics, such as ‘name’. SOSA/SSN focus on those feature properties that have a triple connection to observation or actuation events: as an `ssn:Property` of the `sosa:FeatureOfInterest` of a `sosa:Observation` or `sosa:Actuation`, as the property being observed or actuated, and as the property usually observed or actuated by the sensor or actuator used in the observation or actuation. Any of these property paths should be able to be inferred from the others, whether or not all are explicitly stated.

5.2.1. Observable Properties

The multiplicity of property paths in which `sosa:observedProperty` is involved can lead to significant modeling and representation choices. On the one hand, as an inherent characteristic, a `sosa:observedProperty` is *specific* to a feature. On the

other hand, we consider that multiple observations across different features of interest or by different sensors or both can measure the same *generic* property, e.g., air temperature. Thus, the air temperature in different rooms of a smart home might be observed as shown in Listing 5.4.

Listing 5.4: Generic Observable Property Modelling

```
<observation/235714> a sofa:ObservableProperty ;
  sofa:hasFeatureOfInterest <house/134/bedroom> ;
  sofa:observedProperty <airTemperature> ;
  sofa:madeBySensor <sensor/926> .

<observation/235728> a sofa:ObservableProperty ;
  sofa:hasFeatureOfInterest <house/134/kitchen> ;
  sofa:observedProperty <airTemperature> ;
  sofa:madeBySensor <DHT22/2> .
```

It might even be that the same digital portable thermometer is being used to measure both air and water temperature (considered as an even more generic AmbientTemperature) alternately in both rooms.

The link from a sensor to the property that it observes, is made using the `sofa:observes` property, implying that every observation involving this sensor is about the same property. In Listing 5.5, sensor #926 is deployed only to observe the air temperature in the bedroom of our home, and we know that it made some observations.

Listing 5.5: Observable Property Modelling

```
<sensor/926> a sofa:Sensor ;
  sofa:observes <airTemperature> ;
  sofa:madeObservation <observation/235714>,
    <observation/235715>, <observation/235716> .
```

Since `<airTemperature>` is a generic Property and not specific to the bedroom, we cannot just follow the sensor property path and infer *which room's* air temperature was being observed: we need to know the `sofa:hasFeatureOfInterest` as well. A specific Property could instead be used, such as `<airTemperature#house134bedroom>`, but it would then be more difficult either to express the capabilities of a portable sensor or to represent the generalization `<airTemperature>`.

One approach to modeling generalization relationships between individual properties might be to use the `qudt:specialization` and `qudt:generalization` properties from the Quantities, Units, Dimensions and Data Types vocabulary [25]. For example, various temperatures around the home may be modeled as in Listing 5.6.

Listing 5.6: Generalised Property Modelling

```
@prefix qudt: <http://qudt.org/schema/qudt#> .

<temperature> a sofa:ObservableProperty,
  qudt:QuantityKind ;
  rdfs:label "Thermodynamic Temperature"@en .

<airTemperature> a sofa:ObservableProperty,
  qudt:QuantityKind ;
  qudt:generalization <temperature> .

<soilTemperature> a sofa:ObservableProperty,
  qudt:QuantityKind ;
  qudt:generalization <temperature> .

<waterTemperature> a sofa:ObservableProperty,
  qudt:QuantityKind ;
  qudt:generalization <temperature> .

<tapWaterTemperature> a sofa:ObservableProperty,
  qudt:QuantityKind ;
  qudt:generalization <waterTemperature> .

<poolWaterTemperature> a sofa:ObservableProperty,
  qudt:QuantityKind ;
  qudt:generalization <waterTemperature> .
```

Some ontology engineers (and some controlled vocabularies for quantity kinds) prefer to model such generalization-specialization relations using sub-class relations between observable property classes. In SSNX, for example, the class of observable properties was a subclass of `dul:Quality` and types of properties were usually modeled as subclasses of `oldssn:ObservedProperty` rather than as individuals.¹⁰ Using either approach in SSN, it is still necessary to create an individual of whatever observed property class(es) is appropriate, whether that individual is still a generic property or is specific to an individual feature of interest as shown in Listing 5.7 or Listing 5.8.

Listing 5.7: Specific Property Modelling

```
<AmbientTemperature> rdfs:subClassOf
  sofa:ObservableProperty .

<AtmosphericTemperature> rdfs:subClassOf
  <AmbientTemperature> .
```

¹⁰In SSNX, the class of observable properties was defined as a subclass of `dul:Quality` and as the class of “*observable Quality of an Event or Object. That is, not a quality of an abstract entity as is also allowed by DUL's Quality, but rather an aspect of an entity that is intrinsic to and cannot exist without the entity and is observable by a sensor.*” Section 5.3.1.3.4 in [36] further adds that types of properties, such as temperature or pressure should be added as subclasses of `oldssn:ObservedProperty` instead of individuals. Yet, usage reports [19] of SSNX revealed that most datasets were using observable properties as applicable to many features of interest. See https://www.w3.org/2015/spatial/wiki/What_is_an_instance_of_ssn:Property for more details on this point.

```
1 <airTemperature> a <AtmosphericTemperature> .
```

Listing 5.8: Specific Property Modelling using subclassing

```
6 <AmbientTemperature> rdfs:subClassOf
7   sosa:ObservableProperty .
8
9 <AtmosphericTemperature> rdfs:subClassOf
10  <AmbientTemperature> .
11
12 <AirTemperature> rdfs:subClassOf
13  <AtmosphericTemperature> .
14
15 <airTemperature32409845> a <AirTemperature> .
```

The subclass approach shown in Listing 5.8 avoids introducing an additional vocabulary to support the specialization/generalization relationships, but potentially at the cost of decreased flexibility in describing relations between defined properties.

We expect different communities and applications to develop their own approaches to building catalogues of observable properties and choosing appropriate levels of specificity and selecting one of the modeling approaches shown above.

5.2.2. Stimulus as Proxies for Observing Properties

Sensors respond to stimuli, e.g., changes in the environment, or input data composed from the results of prior observations, to generate the result. The class `ssn:Stimulus` is unchanged from SSNX and is a proxy (i.e. `ssn:isProxyfor`) for an observable property, or a number of observable properties. For example, the amount of dynamic acceleration in an accelerometer as a proxy for the tilt angle of a smart phone. Properties themselves are observable characteristics of (i.e. `ssn:isPropertyOf`) real-world entities (i.e. `ssn:FeatureOfInterests`).

5.2.3. Actuatable Properties

The class of properties that can be acted on by actuators is `sosa:ActuatableProperty`. Instances of `sosa:ActuatableProperty` are usually generic to many features of interest (e.g., `<openCloseStatus>`), but they may be defined as specific to a single feature of interest (e.g., `<window/104#state>`).

For example, using a feature of interest -generic modeling choice for the previous example introduced in Listing 3.5, one may model the open or close status of the window as a first-class citizen as described in Listing 5.9.

Listing 5.9: Generic Feature of Interest Modelling

```
1 <actuation/188> a sosa:Actuation ;
2   sosa:hasFeatureOfInterest <window/104> ;
3   sosa:actsOnProperty <window/104#state> ;
4   sosa:hasSimpleResult true ;
5   sosa:resultTime
6     "2017-04-18T17:24:00+02:00"^^xsd:dateTimeStamp .
```

SOSA does not define a specific property to link an actuator to the property it acts on, but the SSN property `ssn:forProperty` can be used for this purpose.

5.3. Procedures and their Specification

Conceptually, an observation, sampling, or actuation, can be thought of acts that use(d) (parts) of a procedure. A `sosa:Procedure` is a reusable workflow, protocol, plan, algorithm, or computational method that can be used to specify how to make an observation, create a sample, or make a change to the state of the world (i.e. perform an actuation). This represents a significant departure from the semantics of the `oldssn:Process` class, defined as a subclass of `dul:Process`, and which described the real-world process, rather than a description of it. In the optional DUL alignment, a `sosa:Procedure` is now defined as subclass of `dul:Method` to describe a workflow that specifies how to make an observation, create a sample, or make a change to the state of the world via an actuator (see Sec. 5.3). The `oldssn:Sensing` class, which was defined as a sub-class of a `oldssn:Process` has seen very little implementation evidence and has been deprecated in SSN.

This change addressed several requirements (e.g. [32, §5.25] and [32, §5.40]) and is the result of extensive discussions within the group¹¹. The `sosa:Procedure` class now allows users to describe the protocol of Web services which themselves may represent ways on how to interact with, for example, `sosa:Actuators`. In particular, a `sosa:Procedure` can be linked to some description of the `ssn:Input` and `ssn:Output` of these procedures. For example, Listing 5.10 states that the output of the `<summingHourlyConsumptionProcedure>` procedure is the electricity consumption.

Listing 5.10: Output Modelling

```
1 <summingHourlyConsumptionProcedure> a
2   sosa:Procedure ;
3   ssn:hasOutput <electricityConsumption> .
```

¹¹See <https://www.w3.org/2015/spatial/track/issues/89> and https://www.w3.org/2015/spatial/wiki/Procedure_Process for a summary of the discussion and decision made on this topic.

If the result of an observation is a web document having some representation (e.g., in JSON or XML) other ontologies such as the RDF Presentation ontology¹² [37] or RaUL [23] can be used to model the result using the `ssn:hasOutput` relation of SSN. It links the output of an observation to a description of how a result document can be validated (e.g., using some JSON Schema), or how an RDF description can be obtained from it (using some RDF lifting rule such as [39, 48] as shown in Listing 5.11).

Listing 5.11: Validation Rule Modelling

```
@prefix rdfp: <https://w3id.org/rdfp/> .

<summingHourlyConsumptionProcedure> a
  sosa:Procedure ;
  ssn:hasOutput [
    rdfp:presentedBy [
      rdfp:validationRule <consumption.schema.json> ;
      rdfp:liftingRule <lifting-rule.rqg> ] ] .

<observation/235727> a sosa:Observation ;
  sosa:hasResult <observation/235727/result> .
```

Procedures linked to observation and sampling activities, beyond the description of the presentation of the output, are typically a record of how these activities are performed (a log), and are linked to a `sosa:Sensor` or `sosa:Sampler` with the `ssn:implements` relation as described in Listing 5.12.

Listing 5.12: Procedure Modelling

```
<sensor/927> a sosa:Sensor ;
  ssn:implements
    <summingHourlyConsumptionProcedure> .
```

Procedures linked to actuation activities, however, can be either a record of how the actuation has been performed or a description of how to interact with an actuator (i.e., the recipe for performing actuations). The `ssn:System` concept and its relations to activities through `ssn:implementedBy/implements` in combination with the inputs and outputs of a procedure can define the interface of how to interact with a `sosa:Actuator`. How much detail is provided to model inputs and outputs of the actuation procedure as well as the orchestration of multiple actuators is beyond the scope of SSN. Existing ontologies such as OWL-S [44] and execution protocols such as WSMX [21] can be used together with lower-level specifications such as the W3C Thing Description¹³ to model these details.

¹²<https://w3id.org/rdfp/>¹³<https://w3c.github.io/wot-thing-description/>

5.4. Results

SSN offers two ways of attaching properties to activities that observe, actuate or sample them. For simple (though frequent) cases that merely require a literal typed with an appropriate datatype, one may use the `sosa:hasSimpleResult` datatype property. Alternatively, observation results can be modeled as individuals and linked to the observation using the object property `sosa:hasResult`. In cases where the observed property is a physical quantity, one may then use one of the several existing ontologies to model the result.

5.4.1. `hasSimpleResult` and `hasResult`

Listing 5.13 shows how to attach a literal value to our previous `<observation/235715>`. It also uses a custom datatype (i.e. `cdt:temperature`) whose value space is some set of quantity values. However, such custom datatypes are not compatible with the OWL specifications, which restricts the set of datatypes that can be used and may consequently lead to an error in the OWL reasoner.

Listing 5.13: Simple Result Modelling

```
<observation/235715> a sosa:Observation ;
  sosa:resultTime
    "2017-11-15T14:35:13Z"^^xsd:dateTime ;
  sosa:hasSimpleResult "23.9 DEG"^^cdt:temperature .
```

The `ssn:hasResult` object property allows us to make statements about the `ssn:Result` object (as shown in Listing 5.14) by explicitly stating the unit of measurement for the value of the observation. Although it was not in the scope of the SSN specification to recommend any particular way of modeling results as quantity values, there exist several external vocabularies that are specifically designed for modeling quantity values as OWL individuals. Examples include the QUDT ontology ([25]) used in this listing, or the Ontology of Units of Measure (OM [49]). With QUDT, a `sosa:Result` would be a `qudt:QuantityValue`. With OM, a `sosa:Result` would be an `om:Measure`.

Listing 5.14: Qualified Result Modelling

```
<observation/235716> a sosa:Observation ;
  sosa:hasResult [
    a qudt-1-1:QuantityValue ;
    qudt-1-1:unit qudt-unit-1-1:DegreeCelsius ;
    qudt-1-1:numericValue "22.9"^^xsd:double ] .
```

The two alternative patterns reduce the complexity of the path to link an observation to the actual literal that encodes some value for the

1 result of this observation that was required in
 2 SSNX¹⁴. Compatibility with SSNX (see Sec. 7.4)
 3 is obtained through both `oldssn:SensorOutput` and
 4 `oldssn:ObservationValue` being subclasses of the new
 5 `sosa:Result`, and `oldssn:observationResult` being a
 6 subproperty of `ssn:hasResult`.

7 There have been discussions in the working group
 8 on potential actuation commands¹⁵, but their inclusion
 9 has been deemed out of scope for the current version
 10 of SSN.

11 5.4.2. Result of a Sampling activity

12 `sosa:Sample` is a subclass of `sosa:Result` be-
 13 cause a sample is the result of a `sosa:Sampling` ac-
 14 tivity. This is in addition to being a subclass of
 15 `sosa:FeatureOfInterest` so that it can serve as the target
 16 of a `sosa:Observation`.
 17

18 5.4.3. Result Time and Phenomenon Time

19 SOSA distinguishes between the
 20 `sosa:phenomenonTime` and `sosa:resultTime`, the
 21 former being the time that the result of an observa-
 22 tion, actuation, or sampling applies to the feature of
 23 interest, while the latter specifies the *instant* of time
 24 when an act, such as an observation, was completed.
 25 The `sosa:resultTime` is a datatype property with
 26 `rdfs:range xsd:dateTime` to capture the time instant
 27 that the activity completed and the result obtained.
 28 The `sosa:phenomenonTime` is an object property with
 29 range `time:TemporalEntity` [15], since it may be either
 30 an instant or interval, or even a temporal complex.
 31

32 For example, Listing 5.15 describes that the temper-
 33 ature was observed through April 15th 2017, and that
 34 the result was available 12 seconds after the end of this
 35 period.
 36

37 Listing 5.15: Phenomenon Time Modelling

```
38 @prefix time: <http://www.w3.org/2006/time#> .
39 @prefix xsd: <http://www.w3.org/2001/XMLSchema#> .
40
41 <observation/235714>
42   sosa:resultTime
43     "2017-04-16T00:00:12+00:00"^^xsd:dateTimeStamp ;
44   sosa:phenomenonTime [
45     a time:Interval ;
46     time:hasBeginning [
47       a time:Instant ;
48       time:inXSDDateTimeStamp
49         "2017-04-15T00:00:00+00:00"^^xsd:dateTimeStamp
50     ]
51   ] .
```

52 ¹⁴Wiki page https://www.w3.org/2015/spatial/wiki/Storing_Observation_Value lists pros and cons on the options that were considered, and excerpts of the discussion within the group.

53 ¹⁵See https://www.w3.org/2015/spatial/wiki/Result_and_Command for a summary of the discussion on this topic.
 54
 55

```
1 ] ;
2 time:hasEnd [
3   a time:Instant ;
4   time:inXSDDateTimeStamp
5     "2017-04-16T00:00:00+00:00"^^xsd:dateTimeStamp
6 ] .
```

7 The distinction between `sosa:resultTime` and
 8 `sosa:phenomenonTime` is important where the end
 9 of the observation, actuation, or sampling, activity is
 10 significantly different from that of the phenomenon
 11 that is observed or acted on. The separation covers
 12 cases involving observations over a long period of
 13 time, late results due to long-lasting procedures,
 14 delays due to lengthy information travel (e.g., in-
 15 formation traveling long distances), cases where the
 16 result describes the state in the distant past (e.g.
 17 observations that described the pressure and tem-
 18 perature of a mineral at its time of formation), and
 19 predictions and forecasts - which may be defined
 20 as observations with a `sosa:resultTime` before the
 21 `sosa:phenomenonTime` [13, 22, 26, §7.2]. In both
 22 of the last two cases, it is common to have multiple
 23 observations relating to the same feature of interest,
 24 observed property and phenomenon time, but with
 25 different result times. For example, different proce-
 26 dures might be used in different geology labs. And
 27 the results of forecasts obtained using computational
 28 procedures might later be subject to validation by
 29 instrumental observations. The outcome of the latter
 30 would be encoded as `sosa:Observations` with the same
 31 `sosa:hasFeatureOfInterest`, `sosa:observedProperty`,
 32 and `sosa:phenomenonTime`, as the forecast, but with
 33 a different `sosa:usedProcedure`, `sosa:madeBySensor`
 34 and `sosa:resultTime`.
 35

36 5.5. Systems and their deployments

37 The modelling of a sensor as a physical piece
 38 of technology and the way multiple sensors are at-
 39 tached to other such entities has been greatly simpli-
 40 fied in SSN. Whereas SSNX distinguished between
 41 an `oldssn:Sensor` that could be any entity that per-
 42 formed `oldssn:Sensing` and an `oldssn:SensingDevice`
 43 that was a subclass of an `oldssn:Device`, i.e. a phys-
 44 ical piece of technology, the *new* SSN drops the no-
 45 tion of an `oldssn:Device` as well as the notion of an
 46 `oldssn:SensingDevice`. The `ssn:System` class that al-
 47 ready existed in SSNX takes the place of those two
 48 classes, i.e. it can be used if someone wants to ex-
 49 plicitly model that a `sosa:Sensor`, `sosa:Actuator` or
 50 `sosa:Sampler` is a physical piece of technology. For
 51

similar reasons, the notion of a *sampling device* has been dropped¹⁶.

5.5.1. Platforms and hosts

One or more sensors (as well as actuators and samplers) can be hosted or mounted on a `sosa:Platform`. Such platforms can also define the geometric properties, i.e., placement, of sensors in relation to one another. `sosa:Platforms` can also host other `sosa:Platforms`.

The properties `oldssn:attachedSystem` and `oldssn:onPlatform` have been renamed to `sosa:hosts` and `sosa:isHostedBy`, respectively, and they can now be used on both, the `sosa:Platform` and the `sosa:System` class to define that they host sensors, actuators or samplers.¹⁷

Temperature observations can be defined to be made, for example, by a temperature sensor that is built-in/hosted by a Nest thermostat. Listing 5.16 shows how to model this relation in our smart home use case. In this example, `<sensor/D1AA22A82>` is inferred to be an `ssn:System`, as only `ssn:Systems` can be hosted by `sosa:Platforms`.

Listing 5.16: Platform Modelling

```
<nest/D1AA22A8211> a sosa:Platform ;
  rdfs:label "3rd gen Nest Learning Thermostat
  D1AA22A8211"@en ;
  rdfs:comment "Nest Thermostat in bedroom of house
  #134"@en ;
  sosa:hosts <sensor/926> .

<sensor/926> a sosa:Sensor ;
  rdfs:label "Nest temperature sensor #1"@en ;
  sosa:observes <airTemperature> .
```

5.5.2. Systems and Sub-systems

The system class has remained unchanged from SSNX apart from its relation to DUL (see Sec. 3.1) as a unit of abstraction for pieces of infrastructure that implement procedures and that are hosted by platforms. A system can have components (`ssn:hasSubSystem`) which are also systems. Classes and relationships related to system capabilities, operating ranges, and survival ranges, under given conditions have been relegated to a separate horizontal module (see Sec. 6.1).

¹⁶See https://www.w3.org/2015/spatial/wiki/Link_between_platform_and_device for a summary of the discussion and decision made on this topic.

¹⁷Wiki page <https://www.w3.org/2015/spatial/wiki/Terms> provides an overview of how each term in SSNX has been dealt with, potentially renamed or simply deprecated in the *new* SSN.

5.5.3. Deployment

An `ssn:Deployment` is an activity or a set of activities that encompass all phases in the lifecycle of a deployed system, such as, the installation, maintenance and decommissioning of the platform, sensors, actuators or samplers attached to that system. The class of `ssn:Deployment` describes the deployment of one or more systems (`ssn:deployedSystem`) or platforms (`ssn:deployedOnPlatform`) for a particular purpose. For example, a temperature sensor deployed on a wall, or a whole network of sensors deployed for an observation campaign.

Listing 5.17 shows an example of how to model a deployment (i.e. `<house/134/deployment>`) of two systems `<PCBBoard1>`, `<PCBBoard2>` that are deployed in the kitchen of our example house #134.

Listing 5.17: Deployment Modelling

```
<house/134/kitchen> a sosa:Platform ;
  rdfs:label "House #134 Kitchen."@en ;
  rdfs:comment "House #134 Kitchen that hosts
  PCBBoard1 and PCBBoard2."@en ;
  sosa:hosts <PCBBoard1>, <PCBBoard2> .

<PCBBoard1> a ssn:System ;
  rdfs:label "PCB Board 1"@en ;
  rdfs:comment "PCB Board 1 hosts DHT22 temperature
  sensor #1."@en ;
  sosa:hosts <DHT22/1> .

<PCBBoard2> a ssn:System ;
  rdfs:label "PCB Board 2"@en ;
  rdfs:comment "PCB Board 2 hosts DHT22 temperature
  sensor #2."@en ;
  sosa:hosts <DHT22/2> .

<house/134/deployment> a ssn:Deployment ;
  rdfs:comment "Deployment of PCB Board 1 and 2 in
  the kitchen for the purpose of observing the
  temperature."@en ;
  ssn:deployedOnPlatform <house/134/kitchen> ;
  ssn:deployedSystem <PCBBoard1>, <PCBBoard2> ;
  ssn:forProperty <airTemperature> .
```

The `oldssn:DeploymentRelatedProcess` and `oldssn:deploymentProcessPart` have been deprecated as no usage of these terms has been reported.

6. Horizontal Extension Modules

Horizontal extension modules are ontologies that introduce new classes and relations on top of SSN.

6.1. The System Capabilities Module

The System Capabilities module, a.k.a. SSN-System, gathers classes and properties used to model

system capabilities, operating range, and survival range. This part of SSNX was rarely used in implementations, hence specific effort has been made to clarify and simplify its documentation, along with providing illustrative examples. Terms defined by the SSN-System ontology are identified by URIs under the namespace <http://www.w3.org/ns/ssn/systems/>. We shorten this namespace with prefix `ssn-system:.`

```
@prefix ssn-system:
  <http://www.w3.org/ns/ssn/systems/> .
```

Table 3 in Appendix B lists all of the terms defined in SSN-System, and the terms in the old SSN that they supersede, if they exist.

6.1.1. System Capabilities

An `ssn:System` may be linked to some `ssn-system:SystemCapability`, which in turn is linked to some `ssn-system:SystemProperty`: measurement, actuation, or sampling properties that describe the capabilities of the `ssn:System` such as its accuracy, latency, precision, etc. An `ssn-system:SystemCapability` can furthermore be linked to some `ssn-system:Condition` that define its validity context such as a temperature range. For example, Listing 6.1 specifies that the DHT22 temperature sensor sensitivity is 0.1°C in normal temperature conditions.

Listing 6.1: System Capability Modelling

```
@prefix schema: <http://schema.org/> .
@prefix qudt-unit-1-1:
  <http://qudt.org/1.1/vocab/unit#> .

<DHT22/2> a sosa:Sensor ;
  rdfs:comment "The DHT22 #4578 embedded
    temperature sensor."@en ;
  ssn-system:hasSystemCapability
    <DHT22TempCapability> .

<DHT22TempCapability> a ssn:Property ,
  ssn-system:SystemCapability ;
  rdfs:comment "The capabilities of the temperature
    sensor in normal temperature conditions."@en;
  ssn-system:inCondition <normalTemp> ;
  ssn-system:hasSystemProperty
    <DHT22TempSensitivity> .

<normalTemp> a ssn-system:Condition ,
  schema:PropertyValue ;
  rdfs:comment "A temperature range of -40 to 80
    Celsius."@en ;
  schema:minValue -40.0 ;
  schema:maxValue 80.0 ;
  schema:unitCode qudt-unit-1-1:DegreeCelsius .

<DHT22TempSensitivity> a ssn:Property ,
  ssn-system:Sensitivity ,
  ssn-system:Resolution , schema:PropertyValue ;
  rdfs:comment "The sensitivity and resolution of
    the temperature sensor is 0.1 $^{\circ}$C in
```

```
normal temperature and humidity
  conditions."@en ;
  schema:value 0.1 ;
  schema:unitCode qudt-unit-1-1:DegreeCelsius .
```

The Terms `ssn-system:SystemCapability` and `ssn-system:SystemProperty` are named after the SSNX `oldssn:SensorCapability` and `oldssn:SensorProperty` terms, that were generalized so that the new ones apply to the more general concept of `ssn:System` instead of just `sosa:Sensor`.¹⁸ Several sub-classes of `ssn-system:SystemProperty` are pre-defined as listed in Table 3. Most of these were already defined in SSNX but their definition was harmonized, simplified, and sometimes generalized when the term can be applied equally to a `sosa:Sensor`, `sosa:Actuator` or `sosa:Sampler`. A system property `ssn-system:ActuationRange` has been introduced as it was considered of high interest for actuators.

6.1.2. Operating Range and Survival Range

The pattern used to describe a system capability in terms of some of its property values under certain conditions is replicated to describe its operating range and survival range. An `ssn-system:OperatingRange` (resp. `ssn-system:SurvivalRange`) describes some normal `ssn-system:OperatingProperty` (resp. `ssn-system:SurvivalProperty`) of an `ssn:System` under some specified `ssn-system:Conditions`. For example, the power requirement or maintenance schedule of an `ssn:System` (resp. the system or its battery lifetime) under a specified temperature range. In the absence of an `ssn-system:OperatingProperty` (an `ssn-system:SurvivalProperty`), it simply describes the `ssn-system:Conditions` in which a System is expected to operate (under which the `ssn:System` can be exposed to without damage). The `ssn:System` continues to operate as defined by its `ssn-system:SystemCapability`. If, however, the `ssn-system:OperatingProperty` (resp. `ssn-system:SurvivalProperty`) is violated, the `ssn:System` is operating 'out of operating range' (resp. is 'damaged') and its `ssn-system:SystemCapability` specification may no longer hold. Some sub-classes of `ssn-system:OperatingProperty` and `ssn-system:SurvivalProperty` are also pre-defined, and listed in Table 3.

¹⁸See https://www.w3.org/2015/spatial/wiki/Measurement_and_Operating_properties_for_actuators and <https://lists.w3.org/Archives/Public/public-sdw-wg/2017Mar/0233.html> for more details on the discussions.

6.1.3. Extensibility of the System Capabilities Module

As a matter of fact, the SSN System Capabilities module contains a predefined list of capabilities, operating ranges, and survival ranges, that were considered of high relevance for SOSA/SSN users. External ontologies may propose new such terms in their own namespace, or even reuse the design pattern to describe other characteristics of other kinds of systems (for example, the maximal bandwidth or payload of a communicating device in some conditions).

6.2. The Sample Relations Module

Support for samples and sampling is one of the major enhancements in SOSA/SSN. The defining property of a `sosa:Sample` is the `sosa:isSampleOf` relationship with the thing that it is intended to represent.

However, in many cases a sample also has a relationship with another sample or samples as part of a study or deployment [26, 49][32, §5.38]. The nature of the relationship is typically quite specific, for example:

- spatial, such as pixels within a remote-sensed scene, stations along a traverse, or specimens collected along a borehole
- specific fractions of a mixture, such as platelets from a blood sample
- specific ("biased") fractions of an assay sample, such as the fraction of a powder that passes a specific sieve grating, the fraction that is magnetically susceptible, or the fraction whose density is higher than a specified value
- non-specific ("un-biased") fractions of a sample ("splits")
- parts of a specimen, such as the leg of an insect, which in turn represents a taxon

The design of sub-sampling strategies is a key element of scientific investigations, and is a critical source of innovation. Therefore, generic relationships such as ‘parent-child’, or ‘subset’ are insufficient.

The Sample Relations module provides a scalable pattern for linking samples which also allows relationship details to be captured. This is accomplished by introducing an intermediate class in the relationship between samples, so that the nature of the relationship can be recorded as an annotation on the association.

In Listing 6.2, the nature of the relationship between a sub-sample of our soil and the sample within which it is found is described in an `rdfs:comment` within a blank-node.

Listing 6.2: Sub-Sample Modelling

```
<sample/134g1/organics> a sosa:Sample ;
  rdfs:label "Soil sample 134g1 organic fraction" ;
  sampling:hasSampleRelationship [
    a sampling:SampleRelationship ;
    sampling:natureOfRelationship [
      a sampling:RelationshipNature ;
      rdfs:comment "organic fraction of material" ;
    ] ;
    sampling:relatedSample <sample/134g1> ;
  ] ;
  sosa:isResultOf <sampling/4650> .

<sampling/4650> a sosa:Sampling ;
  sosa:featureOfInterest <sample/134g1> ;
  sosa:usedProcedure
    <procedure/soil-organic-fraction/78> .

<procedure/soil-organic-fraction/78> a
  sosa:Procedure ;
  rdfs:comment "... details of procedure to
  separate the organic fraction of a soil
  sample ..." .
```

If there is a set of ‘standard’ relationships used within a particular discipline or community, these could be registered and assigned URIs. A reference to the standard relationship can then be used instead of the blank-node, as described in a modified version of the example above in Listing 6.3.

Listing 6.3: Sample Blank Node Modelling

```
<sample/134g1/organics> a sosa:Sample ;
  rdfs:label "Soil sample 134g1 organic fraction" ;
  sampling:hasSampleRelationship [
    a sampling:SampleRelationship ;
    sampling:natureOfRelationship
      <http://soil.example.org/rel/organic-fraction>
    ;
    sampling:relatedSample <sample/134g1> ;
  ] ;
  sosa:isResultOf <sampling/4650> .
```

The Sample Relations module is included in SSN/SOSA as a non-normative horizontal extension.

7. Vertical Extension Modules

Vertical extension modules are ontologies that introduce additional expressivity or axiomatic constraints on top of SSN.

7.1. Alignment to OGC O&M

The observation and sample aspects of SSN are closely aligned to the OGC O&M model precedent [13, 26]. However, (a) OGC O&M is defined using UML and (b) some of the class and property names have been adjusted. Therefore, a formal (axiomatized)

alignment to OGC O&M is provided as a vertical module which `owl:imports` SOSA, and uses the URI scheme defined by ISO 19150-2 to denote the O&M classes and properties [27].

The main conceptual difference between SSN and O&M is that the latter conflates both Procedures and Systems into a pair of classes: `OM_Process` and `SF_Process`. Alignment is achieved by way of the following axiom: `iso19156-om:OM_Process` \equiv `sosa:Sensor` \sqcup `sosa-om:ObservationProcedure` where `sosa-om:ObservationProcedure` \sqsubseteq `sosa:Procedure`. Some other entities and properties of O&M, such as `validTime`, are not presently mapped to any terms of SOSA/SSN.

7.2. Alignment to PROV-O

The re-orientation of SSN so that observations (as well as samplings and actuations) are activities or “acts of sensing | sampling | actuation” means that SSN now clearly matches a process-flow model. This makes an alignment with PROV-O [34] quite natural, as foreseen in [10, 14]. A formal (axiomatized) alignment to PROV-O is provided as a vertical module which `owl:imports` SOSA and PROV-O. The key alignments are:

1. `sosa:Observation` \sqsubseteq `prov:Activity`
`sosa:Sampling` \sqsubseteq `prov:Activity`
`sosa:Actuation` \sqsubseteq `prov:Activity`;
2. `ssn:System` \sqsubseteq `prov:Agent` \sqcap `prov:Entity`
`sosa:Sensor` \sqsubseteq `prov:Agent` \sqcap `prov:Entity`
`sosa:Sampler` \sqsubseteq `prov:Agent` \sqcap `prov:Entity`
`sosa:Actuator` \sqsubseteq `prov:Agent` \sqcap `prov:Entity`.

The latter merits a little more explanation. When participating in an act of observation, sampling or actuation the sensors, samplers or actuators are responsible for the activity, so are thus agents. When not involved in the activity, they are merely entities which have to be maintained or stored.

7.3. Alignment to OBOE

The OBOE ontology [43] is used by parts of the biodiversity community in particular to represent observations of traits or characteristics of organisms. A formal (axiomatized) alignment to OBOE is provided as a vertical module which `owl:imports` SOSA and OBOE.

In OBOE a set of `oboe:Measurements` of different characteristics relating to the same entity (usually an organism) are grouped into a single `oboe:Observation`.

Thus, the alignment expresses this as a property-chain axiom: `oboe:measurementFor` \circ `oboe:ofEntity` \sqsubseteq `sosa:hasFeatureOfInterest`.

7.4. Alignment to the Old SSN Ontology

It is strongly recommended that applications that use the SSN ontology are migrated to the *new* SSN ontology published at: <http://www.w3.org/ns/ssn/>. However, for legacy applications that continue to use SSNX, a new version of that ontology has been published at the old namespace: <http://purl.oclc.org/NET/ssnx/ssn>. This new version has been updated as follows:

- some errors with the previous version, such as the outdated import location for the DUL ontology, have been fixed;
- all axioms that pertain to the alignment of the SSNX to the Dolce-UltraLite ontology have been removed and an import of the DUL alignment module <http://www.w3.org/ns/ssn/dul> has been added instead;
- and mapping relations to the *new* SSN through `owl:equivalentClass`, `owl:equivalentProperty` and `owl:subClassOf` axioms have been added, while `owl:deprecated` annotation properties have been added to terms that were removed in the *new* SSN.

The June 2011 version of SSNX remains available at <https://www.w3.org/2005/Incubator/ssn/ssnx/ssn/>, where either an HTML (`ssn.html`) or an RDF/XML (`ssn.owl`) representation will be served by the W3C server depending on the client preferences.

8. Topics out of Scope for SSN

While the reworked SSN has achieved most of the goals set by the Charter and the Working Group chairs [54], and more, there are some concepts that are relevant to the intended scope of SSN but are not included in any of the present SOSA/SSN modules.

Since the publication of SSNX [36], the authors have been collecting feature requests from the user community. Early in the standardization process the Working Group members were asked to solicit and document use cases from which requirements were derived and published by the W3C and OGC [41]. Of the 28 requirements for SSN noted there, 10 relate to the representation of temporal and spatial aspects of sensors and their observations. Like SSNX before it, a

1 decision was made to defer to external ontologies for
2 such modelling, and this is consistent with the advice
3 of the Working Group in its Best Practice publication
4 [52], which identifies some suitable ontologies rang-
5 ing from W3C-BASIC-GEO [7] to GeoSPARQL [47].
6 Although this omission from SSN will have the effect
7 of making SSN harder to use, and perhaps too lightly
8 passes off demanding requirements for streaming mea-
9 surements, mobile sensors and compact time series,
10 there is no ideal single answer to this need. These re-
11 quirements may be well served by followup primer
12 publications currently planned, in preference to ontol-
13 ogy extension.

14 Two requirements are met simply by virtue of the
15 choice of a Web Ontology Model for SSN, and three
16 others have been met by preserving SSNX capabilities.
17 Nine have been met by the new work reported here.
18 Arguably, a requirement for verifiable profiles has been
19 partly met by the modularization presented here, and
20 a requirement for examples in concert with external
21 vocabularies has been met via the ontology mappings
22 and examples presented in the specification and here.
23 Multilingual annotation is being developed at present.
24 The requirement for aggregated observations has not
25 been specifically addressed.

26 Other informally requested features that have not
27 been implemented include direct support for net-
28 works of sensors, such as device communications, net-
29 work structures, relations between sensors, or spe-
30 cific data discovery and exchange interfaces. Some
31 IoT-specific ontologies such as [3] and [4] (built on
32 SSNX) as well as [17], and APIs such as [40] do cover
33 some of these aspects. The recursive `ssn:System` class
34 might be a starting point for network nodes, but net-
35 work relations would still be required. Such relations
36 could perhaps be modelled by extending the concepts
37 `InteractionPattern` and `Link` of the “Thing
38 Description”¹⁹ standard being developed by the W3C
39 Web of Things Working Group.

40 The new terms for actuation do not include actua-
41 tion commands (analogous to sensor capabilities for
42 observations). Other ontologies could add these con-
43 cepts as a vertical module. For example, the Proce-
44 dure Execution ontology, one of the core modules of
45 the Smart Energy Aware Systems ontology [38] gen-
46 eralizes the core classes and properties of SSN to de-
47 scribe `pep:ProcedureExecutor` (sensor, actuator, web
48 service, etc.) that implement `pep:Procedure` methods

1 (sensing, actuating, forecasting, some algorithm) and
2 make `pep:ProcedureExecution` activities (observation,
3 actuation, web service execution, forecast), which may
4 then be linked to some description of the command
5 and/or the result.

9. Evaluation of Implementation Evidence

9
10 Since its publication in 2011 the SSNX ontology has
11 been used in many IoT applications, linked datasets
12 and ontologies. Examples of its use in linked datasets
13 include meteorological models from the Spanish Me-
14 teorological Office [1], a case study on environmen-
15 tal sensing and livestock monitoring published by
16 CSIRO [53], long-term climate observation data pub-
17 lished by the Australian Bureau of Meteorology [35],
18 real-time passenger data in the GetThere smartphone
19 app [11] and fault analysis and worker support for
20 cyber-physical production systems in a case study in
21 the German Industrie 4.0 initiative [56].

22 The decision to formally standardize the SSN was
23 a consequence of the interest expressed at a public
24 workshop held in London in March 2015 [https://www.
25 w3.org/2014/03/lgd/](https://www.w3.org/2014/03/lgd/) and was managed through a joint
26 W3C-OGC working group.

27 The use of SSN for data and applications pub-
28 lished openly on the Web has been documented
29 in detail by the Spatial Data on the Web working
30 group in a note published at: [https://w3c.github.io/
31 sdw/ssn-usage/](https://w3c.github.io/sdw/ssn-usage/). The list of usage of SSNX and SSN
32 was obtained by crawling the LOD Laundromat, the
33 LOD Cloud Cache, LODStats and the LOV Ontology
34 repository, as well as through requests for implemen-
35 tation evidence on the Spatial Data on the Web work-
36 ing group mailing list. During the development of the
37 *new* SSN between March 2016 and October 2017, the
38 working group collected implementation evidence of
39 all old (but equivalent) and new SOSA/SSN terms in
40 the same document [19]. Standardization of the SSN
41 through the W3C required evidence of use of each term
42 in at least two consumer and two provider applications,
43 i.e. applications or datasets that use SSN to describe
44 their data and ontologies that extend SSN, respectively.

45 At the time of its publication as a W3C candidate
46 recommendation in July 2017, SOSA/SSN terms had
47 been used in 23 open linked datasets, and 23 openly
48 published ontologies were known to use the SSN on-
49 tology to either describe their data or extend the SSN
50 ontology, respectively. All terms have been used at
51 least once in a dataset and an ontology, while 87% of

¹⁹<https://www.w3.org/TR/wot-thing-description/>

terms have been used in at least two datasets and 81% of all terms have been used in at least two ontologies.

Community expectations were an important motivation for reconsideration of the core model. In particular, with the term “observation” now used for “event of observation” this allows for closer alignment of SSN to the O&M model. As a consequence, the OGC community is now examining adoption of SSN/SOSA for internet of things and linked data applications, for example in the ELFIE²⁰ activity.

The newly introduced sampling terms in SOSA are implemented in a register of several million geological samples at Geoscience Australia that provides descriptions using several alternative schemas and ontologies, including SOSA/SSN²¹.

Some datasets and ontologies using SSNX have already been adapted to SOSA/SSN. For example, a dataset of measurements of a meteorological station, Irstea owns in one of its experimental farms, between 2010 and 2015 and that has previously been described using SSN [50] has since been updated to SOSA²².

10. Conclusion

The W3C/OGC Spatial Data on the Web Working Group has redesigned the SSNX ontology that was published through a W3C Incubator Group in 2011, incorporated feedback from users of the ontology and extended it with terms to model sampling and actuation activities that have been identified as missing from the original ontology in many use cases. A new version of the ontology has been published as an official W3C recommendation and an OGC implementation standard at: <http://www.w3.org/ns/ssn/>.

The initial SSNX was perceived as too heavyweight in its axiomatization, and too dependent on OWL reasoning by some users. To strike a balance, the complexity of the *new* SSN ontology has been reduced through a modularization that allows different user groups to pick and chose terms of the ontology appropriate for their domain of discourse and also chose between different levels of axiomatization of the ontology.

Another key novelty in the modularization of SSN has been the introduction of the lightweight and self-contained core pattern called SOSA (Sensor, Obser-

vation, Sampler, and Actuator) as a replacement of the initial Stimulus Sensor Observation (SSO) pattern which is available at: <http://www.w3.org/ns/sosa/>. SOSA and SSN together can now be used to describe sensors and their observations, the involved procedures, the studied features of interest, the samples used to do so, the feature’s properties being observed or sampled, as well as actuators and the activities they trigger.

SSNX has already been broadly accepted as a de-facto standard for representing sensor data on the Web and has been the inspiration for multiple ontologies layered on top of SSNX. With the standardization of the SSN and SOSA ontologies through the OGC and the W3C and the introduction of different modules for different audiences, we expect the new ontology to be used in even more varied use cases, especially in the Internet-of-Things domain.

Acknowledgements

The SSN ontology was developed through the OGC/W3C Spatial Data on the Web Working Group, see <https://www.w3.org/2000/09/dbwg/details?group=75471&public=1> for the list of members. The efforts of W3C staff Phil Archer and François Daoust were invaluable in enabling the successful completion of the work through to publication as a W3C Recommendation and OGC Standard. The authors acknowledge partial support from NSF (award number 1540849), CSIRO (Oznome project) and Marie Skłodowska-Curie Programme H2020-MSCA-IF-2014 (SMARTER project, under Grant No. 661180).

References

- [1] G. A. Atemezing, Óscar Corcho, D. Garijo, J. Mora, M. Poveda-Villalón, P. Rozas, D. Vila-Suero, and B. Villazón-Terrazas. Transforming meteorological data into Linked Data. *Semantic Web*, 4(3):285–290, 2013. <https://doi.org/10.3233/SW-120089>.
- [2] P. Barnaghi, S. Meissner, M. Presser, and K. Moessner. Sense and sensibility: Semantic data modelling for sensor networks. In *Proceedings of the ICT Mobile Summit*, pages 1–9, Santander, Spain, 2009. IIMC.
- [3] M. Bermudez-Edo, T. Elsaleh, P. Barnaghi, and K. Taylor. IoT-Lite Ontology. W3C Member Submission, World Wide Web Consortium, nov 2015. <http://www.w3.org/Submission/iot-lite/>.
- [4] M. Bermudez-Edo, T. Elsaleh, P. Barnaghi, and K. Taylor. IoT-Lite: A Lightweight Semantic Model for the Internet of Things. In *Proceedings of the International IEEE Conferences on Ubiquitous Intelligence Computing, Advanced and Trusted Computing, Scalable Computing and*

²⁰<http://www.opengeospatial.org/projects/initiatives/elfie>

²¹<http://pid.geoscience.gov.au/sample/>

²²<http://ontology.irstea.fr/pmwiki.php/Site/Weather2017>

- 1 *Communications, Cloud and Big Data Computing, Inter-*
2 *net of People, and Smart World Congress (UIC/ATC/Scal-*
3 *Com/CBDCom/IoP/SmartWorld)*, pages 90–97, Toulouse,
4 France, July 2016. IEEE. [https://doi.org/10.1109/](https://doi.org/10.1109/UIC-ATC-ScalCom-CBDCom-IoP-SmartWorld.2016.0035)
5 [UIC-ATC-ScalCom-CBDCom-IoP-SmartWorld.2016.0035](https://doi.org/10.1109/UIC-ATC-ScalCom-CBDCom-IoP-SmartWorld.2016.0035).
- [5] M. Botts, G. Percivall, C. Reed, and J. Davidson. OGC sensor web enablement: Overview and high level architecture. Technical Report OGC 07-165, Open Geospatial Consortium, 2007. <http://www.opengeospatial.org/ogc/markets-technologies/swe>.
- [6] M. Botts and A. Robin. OGC SensorML: Model and XML Encoding Standard. OGC Encoding Standard, version 2.0, Open Geospatial Consortium, Feb. 04 2014. <http://www.opengeospatial.org/standards/sensorml>.
- [7] D. Brickley. Basic Geo (WGS84 lat/long) Vocabulary. Technical report, W3C Semantic Web Interest Group, 2006. <https://www.w3.org/2003/01/geo/>.
- [8] A. Bröring, C. Stasch, and J. Echterhoff. OGC Sensor Observation Service Interface Standard. OpenGIS Implementation Standard, version 2.0, Open Geospatial Consortium, Apr. 16 2012. <http://www.opengeospatial.org/standards/sos>.
- [9] M. Compton, P. Barnaghi, L. Bermudez, R. García-Castro, Óscar Corcho, S. J. D. Cox, J. Graybeal, M. Hauswirth, C. Henson, A. Herzog, V. Huang, K. Janowicz, W. D. Kelsey, D. L. Phuoc, L. Lefort, M. Leggieri, H. Neuhaus, A. Nikolov, K. Page, A. Passant, A. Sheth, and K. Taylor. The SSN ontology of the W3C semantic sensor network incubator group. *Web Semantics: Science, Services and Agents on the World Wide Web*, 17(0):25–32, 2012. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.websem.2012.05.003>.
- [10] M. Compton, D. Corsar, and K. Taylor. Sensor data provenance: SSNO and PROV-O together at last. In *Joint Proceedings of the 6th International Workshop on the Foundations, Technologies and Applications of the Geospatial Web and 7th International Workshop on Semantic Sensor Networks*, volume 1401, pages 1–16, Riva del Garda, Italy, 2014. CEUR.
- [11] D. Corsar, P. Edwards, J. Nelson, C. Baillie, K. Papangelis, and N. Velaga. Linking open data and the crowd for real-time passenger information. *Web Semantics: Science, Services and Agents on the World Wide Web*, 43(Supplement C):18–24, 2017. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.websem.2017.02.002>.
- [12] S. J. D. Cox. Observations and Measurements - XML Implementation. OGC Encoding Standard, Version 2.0, Open Geospatial Consortium, Mar. 22 2011. http://portal.opengeospatial.org/files/?artifact_id=41510.
- [13] S. J. D. Cox. Geographic information - Observations and measurements. OGC Abstract Specification, Version 2.0, Open Geospatial Consortium, Sept. 17 2013. http://portal.opengeospatial.org/files/?artifact_id=41579.
- [14] S. J. D. Cox. Ontology for observations and sampling features, with alignments to existing models. *Semantic Web*, 8(3):453–470, 2017. <https://doi.org/10.3233/SW-160214>.
- [15] S. J. D. Cox and C. Little. Time ontology in OWL. W3C Recommendation, World Wide Web Consortium, Oct. 2017. <https://www.w3.org/TR/owl-time/>.
- [16] J. de la Beaujardiere. OpenGIS Web Map Server Implementation Specification. OpenGIS Implementation Specification, Open Geospatial Consortium, Mar. 15 2006. version 1.3.0.
- [17] D. P. et al. Spitfire: Toward a semantic web of things. *IEEE Communications Magazine*, 49(11):40–48, 2011.
- [18] A. Gangemi, N. Guarino, C. Masolo, A. Oltramari, and L. Schneider. Sweetening ontologies with dolce. In *Proceedings of the International Conference on Knowledge Engineering and Knowledge Management*, pages 166–181, Sigüenza, Spain, 2002. Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/3-540-45810-7_18.
- [19] R. García-Castro, A. Haller, and N. Mihindukulasooriya. On the usage of the SSN ontology. W3C Note, World Wide Web Consortium, November 2017. <https://w3c.github.io/sdw/ssn-usage/>.
- [20] R. Guha, D. Brickley, and S. Macbeth. Schema.org: Evolution of structured data on the web. *ACM Queue*, 13(9), 2015. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2857274.2857276>.
- [21] A. Haller, E. Cimpian, A. Mocan, E. Oren, and C. Bussler. WSMX - a semantic service-oriented architecture. In *Proceedings of the International Conference on Web Services (ICWS)*, pages 321–328, Orlando, FL, USA, 2005. IEEE. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ICWS.2005.139>.
- [22] A. Haller, K. Janowicz, S. J. D. Cox, D. Le Phuoc, K. Taylor, and M. Lefrançois. Semantic Sensor Network Ontology. W3C Recommendation, World Wide Web Consortium, Oct. 19 2017. <https://www.w3.org/TR/vocab-ssn/>.
- [23] A. Haller, J. Umbrich, and M. Hausenblas. RaUL: RDFa User Interface Language – A Data Processing Model for Web Applications. In *Proceedings of the 11th International Conference of Web Information Systems Engineering (WISE)*, pages 400–410, Hong Kong, China, 2010. LNCS. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-17616-6_36.
- [24] C. A. Henson, J. K. Pschorr, A. P. Sheth, and K. Thirunarayan. SemSOS: semantic sensor observation service. In *Proceedings of International Symposium on Collaborative Technologies and Systems (CTS'09)*, pages 44–53, Baltimore, MD, USA, 2009. IEEE. <https://doi.org/10.1109/CTS.2009.5067461>.
- [25] R. Hodgson, D. Mekonnen, D. Price, J. Hodges, J. E. Masters, S. J. D. Cox, and S. Ray. Quantities, Units, Dimensions and Types (QUDT) Schema - Version 2.0. Technical report, qudt.org, Jan. 2017.
- [26] ISO. ISO 19156:2011 Geographic information - Observations and measurements. International Standard, ISO, Dec. 2011.
- [27] ISO. ISO 19150-2:2015 Geographic information - Ontology – Part 2: Rules for developing ontologies in the Web Ontology Language (OWL). International Standard, ISO, July 2015.
- [28] K. Janowicz, A. Bröring, C. Stasch, S. Schade, T. Everding, and A. Llaves. A RESTful proxy and data model for linked sensor data. *International Journal of Digital Earth*, 6(3):233–254, 2013. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17538947.2011.614698>.
- [29] K. Janowicz and M. Compton. The stimulus-sensor-observation ontology design pattern and its integration into the semantic sensor network ontology. In *Proceedings of the 3rd International Workshop on Semantic Sensor Networks*, volume 668, pages 64–78, Shanghai, China, 2010. CEUR.
- [30] K. Janowicz, A. Haller, S. Cox, D. Le Phuoc, and M. Lefrançois. SOSA: A lightweight ontology for sensors, observations, samples, and actuators. *Journal of Web Semantics*, In Press. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.websem.2018.06.003>.
- [31] R. Kitchin. The real-time city? Big data and smart urbanism. *GeoJournal*, 79(1):1–14, 2014. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10708-013-9516-8>.
- [32] F. Knibbe and A. Llaves. Spatial Data on the Web Use Cases & Requirements. W3C Note, World Wide Web

- Consortium, Oct. 25 2016. <https://www.w3.org/TR/2016/NOTE-sdw-ucr-20161025/>.
- [33] M. Krötzsch. *OWL 2 Profiles: An Introduction to Lightweight Ontology Languages*, pages 112–183. LNCS, Vienna, Austria, 2012. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-33158-9_4.
- [34] T. Lebo, S. Sahoo, and D. McGuinness. PROV-O: The PROV Ontology. W3C Recommendation, World Wide Web Consortium, Apr. 30 2013. <https://www.w3.org/TR/prov-o/>.
- [35] L. Lefort, A. Haller, K. Taylor, G. Squire, P. Taylor, D. Percival, and A. Woolf. The ACORN-SAT linked climate dataset. *Semantic Web*, 8(6):959–967, 2017. <https://doi.org/10.3233/SW-160241>.
- [36] L. Lefort, C. Henson, and K. Taylor. Semantic Sensor Network XG Final Report. W3C Incubator Group Report, World Wide Web Consortium, June 28 2011. <http://www.w3.org/2005/Incubator/ssn/XGR-ssn-20110628/>.
- [37] M. Lefrançois. Interopérabilité sémantique libérale pour les services et les objets. In *Actes de la 17ème conférence Extraction et Gestion des Connaissances (EGC'17)*, Grenoble, France, Jan. 2017.
- [38] M. Lefrançois. Planned ETSI SAREF Extensions based on the W3C&OGC SOSA/SSN-compatible SEAS Ontology Patterns. In *Proceedings of Workshop on Semantic Interoperability and Standardization in the IoT, SIS-IoT*, Amsterdam, The Netherlands, July 2017.
- [39] M. Lefrançois, A. Zimmermann, and N. Bakerally. A SPARQL extension for generating RDF from heterogeneous formats. In *Proceedings of the Extended Semantic Web Conference (ESWC'17)*, Portoroz, Slovenia, May 2017. LNCS. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-58068-5_3.
- [40] S. Liang, C.-Y. Huang, and T. Khalafbeigi. OGC SensorThings API Part 1: Sensing. Technical Report 15-078r6, OGC, July 2016. <http://docs.opengeospatial.org/15-078r6/15-078r6.html>.
- [41] A. Llaves and F. Knibbe. Spatial data on the web use cases & requirements. W3C note, W3C, Oct. 2016. <https://www.w3.org/TR/2016/NOTE-sdw-ucr-20161025/>.
- [42] B. F. Lóscio, C. Burle, and N. C. (editors). Data on the Web Best Practices. W3C recommendation, W3C, January 2017. <https://www.w3.org/TR/dwbp/>.
- [43] J. Madina, S. Bowers, M. Schildhauer, S. Krivovc, D. Pennington, and F. Villa. An ontology for describing and synthesizing ecological observation data. *Ecological Informatics*, 2(3):279–296, 2007. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecoinf.2007.05.004>.
- [44] D. Martin, M. Burstein, J. Hobbs, O. Lassila, D. McDermott, S. McIlraith, S. Narayanan, M. Paolucci, B. Parsia, T. Payne, et al. OWL-S: Semantic markup for web services. W3c member submission, W3C, Nov. 2004. <https://www.w3.org/Submission/OWL-S/>.
- [45] C. Masolo, S. Borgo, A. Gangemini, N. Guarino, A. Oltramari, and L. Schneider. The WonderWeb Library of Foundational Ontologies and the DOLCE ontology. Technical report, LOA-ISTC, 2003.
- [46] Y. Nenov, R. Piro, B. Motik, I. Horrocks, Z. Wu, and J. Banerjee. RDFox: A Highly-Scalable RDF Store. In *Proceedings of the 14th International Semantic Web Conference (ISWC)*, volume 9367 of LNCS, pages 3–20, Bethlehem, PA, USA, October 11–15 2015. Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-25010-6_1.
- [47] M. Perry and J. Herring. OGC GeoSPARQL - A Geographic Query Language for RDF Data. OGC Implementation Standard 11-052r4, OGC, Sept. 2012.
- [48] A. Polleres, T. Krennwallner, N. Lopes, J. Kopecký, and S. Decker. XSPARQL Language Specification. W3C Member Submission, World Wide Web Consortium, Jan. 2009. <http://www.w3.org/Submission/2009/SUBM-xsparql-language-specification-20090120/>.
- [49] H. Rijgersberg, M. van Assem, and J. Top. Ontology of units of measure and related concepts. *Semantic Web*, 4(1):3–13, 2013. <https://doi.org/10.3233/SW-2012-0069>.
- [50] C. Roussey, S. Bernard, G. André, O. Corcho, G. De Sousa, D. Boffety, and J.-P. Chanet. Weather Station Data Publication at Irstea: an Implementation Report. In *Joint Proceedings of the 6th International Workshop on the Foundations, Technologies and Applications of the Geospatial Web and 7th International Workshop on Semantic Sensor Networks*, volume 1401, Riva del Garda, Italy, Oct. 2014. CEUR.
- [51] J. Subercaze, C. Gravier, J. Chevalier, and F. Laforest. Inferray: fast in-memory RDF inference. *PVLDB*, 9(6):468–479, 2016. <https://doi.org/10.14778/2904121.2904123>.
- [52] J. Tandy, P. Barnaghi, and L. van den Brink (editors). Spatial Data on the Web Best Practices. W3C Note, W3C, September 2017. <https://www.w3.org/TR/sdw-bp/>.
- [53] K. Taylor, C. Griffith, L. Lefort, R. Gaire, M. Compton, T. Wark, D. Lamb, G. Falzon, and M. Trotter. Farming the Web of Things. *IEEE Intelligent Systems*, 28(6):12–19, 2013. <https://doi.org/10.1109/MIS.2013.102>.
- [54] K. Taylor and E. Parsons. Where is everywhere: Bringing location to the web. *IEEE Internet Computing*, 19(2):83–87, Mar 2015. <https://doi.org/10.1109/MIC.2015.50>.
- [55] D. van der Werf, M. Adamescu, M. Ayromlou, N. Bertrand, J. Borovec, H. Boussard, C. Cazacu, T. V. Daele, S. Datcu, M. Frenzel, V. Hammen, H. Karasti, M. Kertesz, P. Kuitunen, M. Lane, J. Lieskovsky, B. Magagna, J. Peterseil, S. Rennie, H. Schentz, K. Schleidt, and L. Tuominen. SERONTO A Socio-Ecological Research and Observation Ontology: the core ontology. Alter-Net Deliverable 4.I6.D2, Wageningen University, 2009.
- [56] I. Zinnikus, A. Antakli, P. Kapahnke, M. Klusch, C. Krauss, A. Nonnengart, and P. Slusallek. Integrated Semantic Fault Analysis and Worker Support for Cyber-Physical Production Systems. In *Proceedings of the IEEE 19th Conference on Business Informatics (CBI)*, Thessaloniki, Greece, 2017. IEEE. <https://doi.org/10.1109/CBI.2017.54>.

1	Appendix A. List of all SOSA/SSN Terms	1
2		2
3	Appendix B. SSN-System terms	3
4		4
5	Appendix C. Deprecated SSNX Terms	5
6		6
7		7
8		8
9		9
10		10
11		11
12		12
13		13
14		14
15		15
16		16
17		17
18		18
19		19
20		20
21		21
22		22
23		23
24		24
25		25
26		26
27		27
28		28
29		29
30		30
31		31
32		32
33		33
34		34
35		35
36		36
37		37
38		38
39		39
40		40
41		41
42		42
43		43
44		44
45		45
46		46
47		47
48		48
49		49
50		50
51		51

SOSA/SSN term	replaces	SOSA/SSN term	replaces
sosa:FeatureOfInterest	\sqsupseteq oldssn:FeatureOfInterest	ssn:hasProperty	\equiv oldssn:hasProperty
ssn:Property	\equiv oldssn:Property	ssn:isPropertyOf	\equiv oldssn:isPropertyOf
sosa:ObservableProperty	-		
sosa:ActuatableProperty	-		
sosa:Sample	-	sosa:hasSample	-
		sosa:isSampleOf	-
sosa:Platform	\equiv oldssn:Platform	sosa:hosts	\equiv oldssn:attachedSystem
		sosa:isHostedBy	\equiv oldssn:onPlatform
sosa:Procedure	\equiv oldssn:Process		
ssn:hasInput	\equiv oldssn:hasInput	ssn:hasOutput	\equiv oldssn:hasOutput
ssn:Input	\equiv oldssn:Input	ssn:Output	\equiv oldssn:Output
ssn:implementedBy	\equiv oldssn:implementedBy		
ssn:implements	\equiv oldssn:implements		
sosa:Sensor	\equiv oldssn:Sensor	sosa:Actuator	-
sosa:observes	\equiv oldssn:observes	ssn:forProperty	\equiv oldssn:forProperty
sosa:isObservedBy	-		
sosa:Sampler	-		
sosa:usedProcedure	\equiv oldssn:sensingMethodUsed	sosa:hasFeatureOfInterest	\equiv oldssn:featureOfInterest
		sosa:isFeatureOfInterestOf	-
sosa:Observation	oldssn:Observation	sosa:Actuation	-
sosa:madeObservation	\equiv oldssn:madeObservation	sosa:madeActuation	-
sosa:madeBySensor	\equiv oldssn:observedBy	sosa:actuationMadeBy	-
sosa:observedProperty	\equiv oldssn:observedProperty	sosa:actsOnProperty	-
		sosa:isActedOnBy	-
sosa:Sampling	-		
sosa:madeSampling	-		
sosa:madeBySampler	-		
ssn:Stimulus	\equiv oldssn:Stimulus , \equiv oldssn:SensorInput	ssn:wasOriginatedBy	-
		ssn:detects	\equiv oldssn:detects
		ssn:isProxyFor	\equiv oldssn:isProxyFor
sosa:Result	\sqsupseteq oldssn:ObservationValue, \sqsupseteq oldssn:SensorOutput	sosa:hasSimpleResult	-
sosa:hasResult	\sqsupseteq oldssn:hasValue, \sqsupseteq oldssn:observationResult	sosa:hasResultingSample	-
sosa:isResultOf	\equiv oldssn:isProducedBy	sosa:isSamplingResultOf	-
sosa:resultTime	oldssn:observationResultTime	sosa:phenomenonTime	\equiv oldssn:observationSamplingTime
ssn:System	\equiv oldssn:System	ssn:hasSubSystem	\equiv oldssn:hasSubSystem
ssn:Deployment	\equiv oldssn:Deployment		
ssn:deployedSystem	\equiv oldssn:deployedSystem	ssn:deployedOnPlatform	\equiv oldssn:deployedOnPlatform
ssn:hasDeployment	\equiv oldssn:hasDeployment	ssn:inDeployment	\equiv oldssn:inDeployment

TOTAL SOSA: 13 classes, 21 object properties, 2 datatype properties

TOTAL SSN: 6 classes, 15 object properties

Table 2

Complete list of SOSA and SSN terms, and the terms in the old SSN that they supersede, if they exist, along with the formal relation between the new term and the old term. No relation means [rdfs:seeAlso](#). The grouping of terms is only meant to ease readability.

SOSA/SSN term	replaces	SOSA/SSN term	replaces
<code>ssn-system:qualityOfObservation</code>	\equiv <code>oldssn:qualityOfObservation</code>		
<code>ssn-system:inCondition</code>	\equiv <code>oldssn:inCondition</code>	<code>ssn-system:Condition</code>	\equiv <code>oldssn:Condition</code>
<code>ssn-system:hasSystemCapability</code>	\sqsupseteq <code>oldssn:hasMeasurementCapability</code>		
<code>ssn-system:SystemCapability</code>	\sqsupseteq <code>oldssn:MeasurementCapability</code>		
<code>ssn-system:hasSystemProperty</code>	\sqsupseteq <code>oldssn:hasMeasurementProperty</code>		
<code>ssn-system:SystemProperty</code>	\sqsupseteq <code>oldssn:MeasurementProperty</code>		
System properties for sensors			
<code>ssn-system:MeasurementRange</code>	\equiv <code>oldssn:MeasurementRange</code>	<code>ssn-system:DetectionLimit</code>	\sqsupseteq <code>oldssn:DetectionLimit</code>
System property for actuators			
<code>ssn-system:ActuationRange</code>	-		
System properties for any system			
<code>ssn-system:Accuracy</code>	\sqsupseteq <code>oldssn:Accuracy</code>	<code>ssn-system:Drift</code>	\sqsupseteq <code>oldssn:Drift</code>
<code>ssn-system:Frequency</code>	\sqsupseteq <code>oldssn:Frequency</code>	<code>ssn-system:Latency</code>	\sqsupseteq <code>oldssn:Latency</code>
<code>ssn-system:Precision</code>	\equiv <code>oldssn:Precision</code>	<code>ssn-system:Resolution</code>	\sqsupseteq <code>oldssn:Resolution</code>
<code>ssn-system:Repeatability</code>	-	<code>ssn-system:ResponseTime</code>	\sqsupseteq <code>oldssn:ResponseTime</code>
<code>ssn-system>Selectivity</code>	\sqsupseteq <code>oldssn>Selectivity</code>	<code>ssn-system:Sensitivity</code>	\equiv <code>oldssn:Sensitivity</code>
<code>ssn-system:hasOperatingRange</code>	\equiv <code>oldssn:hasOperatingRange</code>		
<code>ssn-system:OperatingRange</code>	\equiv <code>oldssn:OperatingRange</code>		
<code>ssn-system:hasOperatingProperty</code>	\equiv <code>oldssn:hasOperatingProperty</code>		
<code>ssn-system:OperatingProperty</code>	\equiv <code>oldssn:OperatingProperty</code>		
Operating ranges for any system			
<code>ssn-system:MaintenanceSchedule</code>	\equiv <code>oldssn:MaintenanceSchedule</code>		
<code>ssn-system:OperatingPowerRange</code>	\equiv <code>oldssn:OperatingPowerRange</code>		
<code>ssn-system:hasSurvivalRange</code>	\equiv <code>oldssn:hasSurvivalRange</code>		
<code>ssn-system:SurvivalRange</code>	\equiv <code>oldssn:SurvivalRange</code>		
<code>ssn-system:hasSurvivalProperty</code>	\equiv <code>oldssn:hasSurvivalProperty</code>		
<code>ssn-system:SurvivalProperty</code>	\equiv <code>oldssn:SurvivalProperty</code>		
Survival ranges for any system			
<code>ssn-system:SystemLifetime</code>	\equiv <code>oldssn:SystemLifetime</code>		
<code>ssn-system:BatteryLifetime</code>	\equiv <code>oldssn:BatteryLifetime</code>		
TOTAL SSN-System: 23 classes, 8 object properties			

Table 3

Complete list of terms in SSN-System, and the terms in the old SSN that they supersede, if they exist, along with the formal relation between the new term and the old term. The grouping of terms is only meant to ease readability.

Term	Cause	Alignment to concepts in SOSA/SSN
oldssn:startTime	Unused	-
oldssn:endTime	Unused	-
oldssn:Device	Misused	\sqsubseteq sosa:Platform \sqcap ssn:System
oldssn:SensingDevice	Misused	\sqsubseteq sosa:Platform \sqcap sosa:Sensor
oldssn:Sensing	Unused	\sqsubseteq sosa:Procedure
oldssn:DeploymentRelatedProcess	Unused	-
oldssn:deploymentProcessPart	Unused	-
oldssn:ofFeature	Unused	
oldssn:SensorDataSheet	Unused	
TOTAL: 9 deprecated terms		

Table 4

Terms in the old SSN that have no equivalent in the SOSA or SSN, and are simply deprecated. *Unused* terms were deprecated because no implementation evidence was found, and no requirement justified their inclusion in SSN. *Misused* terms were proven to be prone to misinterpretation and were deprecated in SSN.