

Using these slides

These slides were developed by Owen Stephens (owen@ostephens.com).

Unless otherwise stated, all images, audio or video content are separate works with their own licence, and should not be assumed to be CC-BY in their own right

This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/.

It is suggested when crediting this work, you include the phrase "Developed by Owen Stephens"

<u> </u>



URIs fundamental to Linked Data - can do RDF without creating/coining your own URIs but not really linked data "Use URIs as names for things", "Use HTTP URIs so people can look up those names" (<u>http://www.w3.org/DesignIssues/LinkedData</u>)

http:// www.amazon.co.uk/ Pride-Prejudice-Penguin-Classics-Austen/dp/ 0141439513

What does this identify?

Doesn't identify (as you might expect) Pride and Prejudice, but rather identifies the Amazon web page that describes the Penguin Classics edition of Pride and Prejudice. This may seem like splitting hairs, but if you want to start to make statements about things using their identifiers it is very important. I might want to state that the author of Pride and Prejudice is Jane Austen. If I say:

http://www.amazon.co.uk/Pride-Prejudice-Penguin-Classics-Austen/dp/0141439513 is authored by Jane Austen, then strictly I'm saying Jane Austen wrote the web page, rather than the book described by the web page.

http://data.open.ac.uk/page/person/ 0e5d4257051894026ea74b7ed55557e7

http://data.open.ac.uk/person/ 0e5d4257051894026ea74b7ed55557e7

Note the difference between these URIs – the first is about the page (click to show), the second is the ID for the person One of the most hotly debated topics around Linked Data – three schools of thought:

* Use redirects

* Use URI fragments

* Accept and deal with the ambiguity



TBL - "Cool URIs don't change"

Avoid including specific technology and variables in your URIs

Some debate as to whether opaque or readable URIs are better - I suspect no right answer

To some extent we must also embrace (as on the web) "broken links aren't the end of the world" - but they are a PITA

http://kmi.open.ac.uk/people.php? surname=daquin&forename=mathieu

http://data.open.ac.uk/person/daquin/ mathieu

http://data.open.ac.uk/person/ 0e5d4257051894026ea74b7ed55557e7

First would be seen less 'cool' than second

Includes a department name (Knowledge Media Institute) – what if this changes it's name or is disbanded?

Includes 'php' - what if the technology changes?

Includes field names - what if 'surname' changed to 'family name'?

2nd better and is logically equivalent - webserver can manage translating one into the other

3rd is opaque - clear advantages (doesn't matter if person changes their name) but disadvantages (unguessable/unreadable)



Terms used somewhat interchangeably, although 'ontology' probably slightly more formal. Problem from library perspective is that 'vocabulary' in this context doesn't mean a list of terms (like LCSH for example) but a schema for describing types of things

Shared ontologies are a way of agreeing we are describing the same type of thing.

To give a concrete example – Dublin Core is a widely used vocabulary. It contains a property of 'creator' (with a URI of <u>http://purl.org/dc/terms/creator</u>) – all users of this property in their data are working from a common definition (although this clearly doesn't stop misuse!)



Basic RDF syntax Note especially rdf:type which is used to say what type of thing you are dealing with



RDF Schema – generally used for describing other vocabularies!

Note especially that rdfs:label turns up a lot in data and is often the place the actual literal string you are interested in is recorded



The confusingly named 'Web Ontology Language' (working group quotes AA Milne in justification) – also underlying ontology that allows you to put constraints on other ontologies

But also the home of the infamous 'sameAs' statement which allows you to say one thing is the same as another thing in linked data



The increasingly inaccurately named 'Friend of a Friend' vocabulary - has become the defacto standard for describing people - names etc.



Important to note this is not just the 15 elements that might spring to mind when you think of DC, although some of those are the most widely used -Title and Creator especially



Simple Knowledge Organization System

For any structured 'vocabulary' (not in RDF sense)

For example an entry in NAF would be a SKOS Concept. As would be any Authorized Library of Congress Subject Heading SKOS has a 'prefLabel' property which is sometimes used as the 'display' label (as opposed to rdfs:label)

Other Vocabularies

- Bibliographic Ontology a.k.a BIBO (http:// purl.org/ontology/bibo)
- Bio (http://vocab.org/bio/0.1/.html)
- FRBR (http://vocab.org/frbr/core.html)
- ISBD (http://iflastandards.info/ns/isbd)
- CRM (http://erlangen-crm.org/current)

All of these seeing some use in the 'lodlam' (linked open data in libraries, archives and museums) space. CRM being used extensively by the British Museum http://collection.britishmuseum.org)

... and more ... e.g. SPAR ontologies (http://sempublishing.sourceforge.net)



Sample data (truncated) from Cambridge University Library You can see that it uses DC, RDA and ISBD vocabularies/ontologies in single record description

Publishing Linked Data



Once you have data represented in RDF you can 'publish' this by simply putting the RDF file(s) in an accessible place on a web server.

This is like authoring 'static' html pages and uploading them - e.g. via ftp

Publishing Linked Data in this way is simple, but lacks sophistication and probably works better for small data sets – not for millions of triples that we might typically expect in library data – although there are probably arguments that much could be achieved by one RDF file per 'record'

Large RDF files are sometimes published this way in conjunction with more sophisticated access to allow for easy download of large amount of data etc.

Example of publishing RDF as a simple static file: <u>http://www.meanboyfriend.com/overdue_ideas/middlemash.rdf</u> (for background see <u>http://www.meanboyfriend.com/overdue_ideas/2009/10/middlemash-middlemarch-middlemap/</u>)

Example of publishing large RDF dump: http://www.bl.uk/bibliographic/download.html#basicbnb

See also http://linkeddatabook.com/editions/1.0/#htoc66



Typically based on data stored in a triple store (what's a triple store? basically a kind of database designed specifically to store RDF triples) or a more traditional database.

More like the way a blog like Wordpress works than a static html page

Software generates the 'views' (which can be HTML views of the data, or RDF in one or more serialisations, or other formats). The view you get is sometimes determined by the URL you use, or based on the type of request made to the web server which allows you to specify the format you want (this is called 'content negotiation' and is part of HTTP)

Lots of different ways of doing this - just as to publish HTML you can use Wordpress, Blogger, Drupal, other Content Mangement Systems etc. etc.

See:

http://linkeddatabook.com/editions/1.0/#htoc68 http://linkeddatabook.com/editions/1.0/#htoc69 http://linkeddatabook.com/editions/1.0/#htoc70 http://linkeddatabook.com/editions/1.0/#htoc71



Publishing structured data embedded in HTML is becoming more common – this can be done with or without it being 'linked data'. However there are ways of publishing 'linked data' in this way. The one that seems to have most momentum at the moment is 'schema.org' (<u>http://schema.org</u>) which is backed by Google/Yahoo/Yandex/Bing and others.

Whether 'schema.org' markup is linked data probably depends exactly how you use it. There is a mapping of schema.org to "RDFa Lite" which is an initiative from W3C (<u>http://www.w3.org/TR/rdfa-lite/</u>) to allow embedding of RDF in web pages

See http://linkeddatabook.com/editions/1.0/#htoc67



Key aspect of 'linked data' is ... the 'links'.

Back to Linked Data design issues statement by TBL "Include links to other URIs. so that they can discover more things." (<u>http://www.w3.org/DesignIssues/LinkedData</u>)

Typical to establish your own links first, then establish 'sameAs' statements to equivalent URIs elsewhere.

Not necessarily easy to establish equivalence between things (this is part of the point of moving to identifiers - to try to make this easier)

Sometimes can do this via existing identifiers

Sometimes need to do some lookup via text strings (e.g. with id.loc.gov this is an approach you can take)

Sometimes takes more work...

Tools that can help - OpenRefine (https://github.com/OpenRefine/OpenRefine/wiki) and SILK (http://wifo5-03.informatik.uni-mannheim.de/bizer/silk/)



Not going to say a lot about this but ... what licence is used in it's publication? BL published BNB under CCO declaration – puts it in the public domain Archives Hub did the same Cambridge ended up with a mixture of 'attribution' licence (ODC-BY) and public domain (ODC-PDDL) – depending on the rights they had over their metadata (see <u>http://data.lib.cam.ac.uk/datasets.php</u>) Europeana goes with CCO

DPLA says 'we don't believe copyright applies to metadata ... but if it does then we put it in the public domain' (<u>http://dp.la/info/wp-content/uploads/</u>2013/04/DPLAMetadataPolicy.pdf)

Consuming Linked Data

"due to the likelihood of scalability problems with on-the-fly link traversal and federated querying, it may transpire that widespread crawling and caching will become the norm in making data from a large number of data sources available"

If we envisage a distributed bibliographic data environment, it is this approach we'd need to take to build the equivalent of an OPAC.

http://linkeddatabook.com/editions/1.0/#htoc84

This type of approach is what Google does! See also the 'CommonCrawl' <u>http://commoncrawl.org</u> which is trying to make a public version of a web crawl available - the equivalent could be done for linked data (or they may turn out to be the same thing)

Definitely a challenging area - see my blog post <u>http://www.meanboyfriend.com/overdue_ideas/2012/08/what-to-do-with-linked-data/</u>

One of the key aspects of linked data is that the links enable to take a 'follow your nose' approach to the available links. For some applications this is all that is needed

For example I wrote a bookmarklet (a way of adding functionality/data to websites by clicking a browser bookmark) using this approach - see <u>http://www.meanboyfriend.com/overdue_ideas/2011/07/compose-yourself/</u>

It works as long as you can return enough information quickly enough. It wouldn't work for (e.g.) a search application where you can't really index all the relevant information 'just in time', but it could work where you wanted to enhance the display of a record in an OPAC (or equivalent) 'just in time' when a person views the record.

Idea being send out queries to distributed linked data sources using SPARQL (a query language for RDF Triple stores).... anyone who has dealt with federated search in libraries will know the challenges that this can bring! http://linkeddatabook.com/editions/1.0/#htoc84

Further Reading

Linked Data Design Issues: http://www.w3.org/DesignIssues/LinkedData

The Linked Data book http://linkeddatabook.com/editions/1.0/

Further thoughts on using linked data from me http://www.meanboyfriend.com/overdue_ideas/ 2012/08/what-to-do-with-linked-data/

Publishing and Using Linked Data

Owen Stephens, November 2014