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ABSTRACT
With the objective of extending an existing ontology-based search with a formalism for spatial reasoning two approaches to a representation of the Region Connection Calculus (RCC) in OWL DL are explored. The exploration results in a representation which is minimal yet still allows inferring the relations between all connecting regions in any of the different RCC species using a sound and complete calculus. The theoretical results are demonstrated in a sample application. The scale of the representation in the sample application is discussed. While the successful approach can be applied to small applications, we conclude that further research is required before applying it to large applications.

Categories and Subject Descriptors
I.1.3 [Symbolic and Algebraic Manipulation]: Languages and Systems – Constraint and logic languages

General Terms
Algorithms, Experimentation, Languages, Theory, Verification.
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1. INTRODUCTION
In recent years many countries have built National Spatial Data Infrastructures (NSDI). A NSDI is defined as the technologies, policies, and people necessary to promote sharing of geospatial data throughout all levels of government, the private and non-profit sectors, and the academic community [5]. The goals of such infrastructures are to reduce duplication of effort among agencies, to make geographic data more accessible to the public, and to increase the benefits of using available data. In Switzerland the NSDI is currently under construction. An expert application within this NSDI is the Virtual Data Center (VDC) which offers Web-based access to distributed geo-ecological resources [6].
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The term “minimal” refers to the smallest possible representation supporting a full-fledged combination of spatial and terminological reasoning services.
Using the primitive relation $C(x, y)$ a number of intuitively significant relations can be defined. The most common of these are illustrated in Figure 1 and their definitions as well as those of additional relations are given in Table 1. The asymmetrical relations $P$, $PP$, $TPP$ and $NTPP$ have inverses which we write, as $R_i$, where $R \in \{P, PP, TPP, NTPP\}$. These relations are defined by definitions of the form $R_i(x, y) \equiv_{df} R(y, x)$.

Of the defined relations, DC, EC, PO, EQ, TPP, NTPP, $PP_1$, $PP_2$ and $NTPP_1$ have been proven to form a jointly exhaustive and pairwise disjoint set, which is known as RCC-8. Similar sets of one, two, three and five relations are known as RCC-1, RCC-2, RCC-3 and RCC-5, respectively: RCC-1 = \{ SR \}, RCC-2 = \{ O, DR \}, RCC-3 = \{ ONE, EQ, DR \}, RCC-5 = \{ PP, PPI, PO, EQ, DR \}.

According to [15], regions support either spatial or temporal interpretation. In case of spatial interpretation, there is a variety of models to choose from. The authors provide some examples such as interpreting the relation $C$ ("connects with") in terms of two regions whose closures share a common point or stating that two regions connect when the distance between them is zero.

In order to check consistency of a knowledge base holding spatial relations, so-called composition tables are used (cf. the composition table for RCC-5 in Table 2). The entries in these tables share a uniform inference pattern which can be formalized as composition axioms of the general form $\forall x, y, z. S(x, y) \land T(y, z) \rightarrow R_i(x, z)$, where $S$, $T$, and $R_i$ are variables for relation symbols.

A similar approach which is based on the description of topological relations between two spatial regions was introduced as the 9-intersection model in [4]. In this model, eight out of nine relations can be interpreted in the same way as we interpret the RCC-8 relations, namely as spatial relations between polygons in the integral plane [9]. However, since it is based on a topological framework – and not on a logical one – the 9-intersection model is harder to combine with OWL DL than RCC.

3. REVIEW OF EXISTING APPROACHES

In [13] the authors aim at representing qualitative spatial information in OWL DL. On the basis of the (assumed) close relationship between the RCC-8 calculus and OWL DL they extend the latter with the ability to define reflexive roles. The extension of OWL DL with a reflexive property is motivated by the requirement that such a property, in addition to the transitive one, is needed in order to describe the accessibility relation. In order to represent RCC-8 knowledge bases the authors use a translation in which regions are expressed as non-empty regular closed sets. The RCC-8 relations are then translated into (sets of) concept axioms in OWL DL. The classes denoted by the introduced concepts are instantiated by asserting for each concept an individual in the ABox in order to ensure that the classes cannot be empty. This approach requires only a minimal extension to OWL DL which has been considered in the draft OWL 1.1 [7]. However, the notion of regions as sets in the abstract object domain prevents RCC from effectively combining with domain ontologies. The reason for this is that OWL DL requires type separation: a class cannot also be an individual (or a property) [14]. Yet, in order to classify regions in a domain ontology they must be represented as individuals, and not as concepts.

It seems to be more intuitive to define the RCC relations in terms of role descriptions than to translate them into concept axioms. Since current OWL does not provide constructors for role descriptions (apart from inverse), the underlying description logics have to be extended with these constructors. In [12] it is shown that the extension of SHIQ with complex role inclusion axioms of the form $S \circ T \subseteq R$ is undecidable, even when these axioms are restricted to the forms $S \circ T \subseteq S$ or $T \subseteq S \subseteq S$, but that decidability can be regained by further restricting them to be acyclic. Complex role inclusion axioms of the unrestricted form are supported by the description logic SHIQ which serves as a logical basis for OWL 1.1 [10]. However, in order to axiomatize the composition of RCC relations, a language must support an extension of the unrestricted form of role inclusion axioms, namely $S \circ T \subseteq R_1 \cup \ldots \cup R_n$, as can be seen in Table 2 for RCC-5. If decidability should be preserved, complex role inclusion axioms are, therefore, not a solution to the translation problem of RCC. Axioms defining the basic RCC relations require additional role constructors such as intersection and complement. Extensions of SHIQ with these kinds of role constructors have, to our knowledge, not been investigated so far. SHIQ supports negation of roles (i.e. complement) but not intersection.

In [3] it is proposed to encode spatial inferences in the Semantic Web Rule Language (SWRL) [11]. Even though not explicitly

Table 1. Definitions of the basic RCC relations

| $SR(x, y)$ | $\equiv_{df} \top(x, y)$ | Spatially Related |
| $C(x, y)$ | (primitive relation) | Connects with |
| $DC(x, y)$ | $\equiv_{df} \neg C(x, y)$ | DisConnected from |
| $P(x, y)$ | $\equiv_{df} \forall z. [C(z, x) \rightarrow C(z, y)]$ | Part of |
| $O(x, y)$ | $\equiv_{df} \exists z. [P(x, z) \land P(z, y)]$ | Overlaps |
| $DR(x, y)$ | $\equiv_{df} \neg O(x, y)$ | DisRete from |
| $EC(x, y)$ | $\equiv_{df} \forall x. [C(y, x) \leftrightarrow \neg C(x, y)]$ | Externally Connected to |
| $EQ(x, y)$ | $\equiv_{df} \exists z. [P(x, y) \land P(y, x)]$ | Equipol |
| $ONE(x, y)$ | $\equiv_{df} \forall z. [O(x, y) \land \neg EQ(z, y)]$ | Overlaps Not Equal |
| $PP(x, y)$ | $\equiv_{df} \exists z. [P(x, y) \land \neg P(y, x)]$ | Proper Part of |
| $PO(x, y)$ | $\equiv_{df} \exists z. [P(x, y) \land \neg P(y, x) \land \neg P(x, z)]$ | Partially Overlaps |
| $TPP(x, y)$ | $\equiv_{df} \exists z. [P(x, y) \land \neg P(y, z) \land P(z, x)]$ | Tangent Proper Part of |
| $NTPP(x, y)$ | $\equiv_{df} \exists z. [P(x, y) \land \neg P(y, z) \land \neg P(z, x)]$ | Non-Tangential Proper Part of |

Table 2. RCC-5 composition table

| $\circ$ | $DR(x, y)$ | $PO(x, y)$ | $EQ(x, y)$ | $PP(x, y)$ | $PP(x, y)$ |
| $\neg$ | $\neg T(x, y)$ | $\neg T(x, y)$ | $\neg T(x, y)$ | $\neg T(x, y)$ | $\neg T(x, y)$ |

Figure 1. RCC-8 relations (cf. the long names in table 1)
mentioned, the examples are provided in a RCC-like style. SWRL uses Horn-like rules which are combined with OWL DL (and OWL Lite). Horn rules do not allow complex heads (which refer to the expressions on the right hand side of the implication connective). However, complex heads in terms of disjunctions are required in order to formalize the RCC composition axioms (cf. section 2).

4. COMBINING RCC WITH OWL DL

Considering the result of the review of existing approaches we are combining RCC and OWL at the level of the knowledge representation system and not at the level of the formalisms. This implies that the architecture of a knowledge representation system based on DL is extended with a RCCBox. A detailed account of the resulting hybrid knowledge representation system is provided in [9].

The RCCBox contains the definitions of the RCC relations as introduced in section 2 and the composition tables for RCC-1, RCC-2, RCC-3, RCC-5 and RCC-8. The reasoner uses these definitions together with selected role assertions in the ABox in order to calculate the spatial relations holding between individual regions, and it uses the composition tables in order to check spatial consistency of the ABox. This implies that the names of the relations have previously been introduced as role names in the TBox of the knowledge base. Table 3 shows the terminology introduced in the TBox of the knowledge base with our sample ontology. The DL expressivity of the ontology is that of $\text{ACHI}$.

The numbered axioms in table 3 introduce the relations of the various RCC species as a hierarchy of roles (cf. section 2): RCC-1 $=$ \{1\}, RCC-2 $=$ \{2, 3\}, RCC-3 $=$ \{3, 4, 5\}, RCC-5 $=$ \{3, 5, 6, 7, 8\}, RCC-8 $=$ \{5, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14\}. The unnumbered axioms introduce the concept Region as subsumed by the universal concept; they state that regions are spatially related to each other, define the symmetric property of the role connectsWith and the inverse roles.

Table 3. Terminology of our knowledge base in $\text{ACHI}$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region $\subseteq \top$</th>
<th>Region $\subseteq \Delta^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>spatiallyRelated $\subseteq$ spatiallyRelated$^2$ $\subseteq$ $\Delta^2 \times \Delta^2$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>$\exists$ spatiallyRelated.$\top \cap$ Region</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>connectsWith $\cap$ spatiallyRelated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>$(a, b) \in$ connectsWith $\cap$ connectsWith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>$(a, b) \in$ connectsWith $\cap$ connectsWith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>properPartOf $\cap$ overlapsNotEqual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>inverseProperPartOf $\cap$ overlapsNotEqual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>partiallyOverlaps $\cap$ partiallyOverlaps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>tangentialProperPartOf $\cap$ properPartOf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>nonTangentialProperPartOf $\cap$ properPartOf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>inverseTangentialProperPartOf $\cap$ properPartOf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>inverseNonTangentialProperPartOf $\cap$ properPartOf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>externallyConnectedTo $\cap$ externallyConnectedTo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>disconnectedFrom $\cap$ disconnectedFrom</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The relations of the different RCC species, when requested, run by time using their definitions in the RCCBox.

2. Asserting the RCC-8 relations for all pairs of connecting regions and, when requested, inferring from them the more general relations of the other RCC species at runtime by using the respective OWL DL axioms in the TBox. Note that this approach does not fulfill the desideratum of generating a knowledge base which can be checked also for spatial consistency by an OWL reasoner.

5. REPRESENTING RCC IN OWL DL

5.1 Asserting the Primitive RCC Relation

The relation $P(x, y)$ ("$x$ is a part of $y$") plays a key role in the definitions of the RCC relations (cf. table 1). Therefore, the first part of our exploration is limited to this relation: only if $P(x, y)$ can be reliably calculated, that is by a sound and complete formalism, the calculation of the remaining relations is expected.
to be sound and complete. The theory defines the relation $P(x, y)$ as follows:

$$P(x, y) \equiv_{df} \forall z[C(z, x) \rightarrow C(z, y)].$$

Note that from an epistemic viewpoint this definition has the form of a universal proposition. It can, therefore, not be empirically verified but only falsified. It is not possible to test for the infinite number of all imaginable regions $z$ connecting with $x$ if they also connect with $y$. Conversely, a single observation of a region $z$ connecting with $x$ but not with $y$ is sufficient to falsify the hypothesis that $x$ is a part of $y$. Following this line of argumentation a calculus for $P(x, y)$ reasoning about a finite data structure is not expected to be sound in a formal sense. Instead the question is whether it is complete or not and how good it approximates the spatial setting (the latter will be explored in section 5.3). The following formula adapts the original definition to a finite data structure:

$$P(x, y) = \bigwedge_{1 \leq i \leq n} (C(z_i, x) \rightarrow C(z_i, y)) \quad (1)$$

with $1 \leq i \leq n$, $n$ the number of regions represented.

In the minimum case the region $x$ connects only with itself (remember that the relation $C$ is by definition reflexive) and it holds that $x = y = z$. In the maximum case all regions, including $x$ (y, respectively) connect with $x$ (y, respectively). Intuitively, the calculation of $P(x, y)$ is expected to be more precise with a high number of regions $z_i$ represented.

The question whether a calculus using formula (1) is complete or not can be answered by referring to the reflexive and symmetric properties of the primitive relation $C(x, y)$. If $z = y$ and $x$ connects with $y$ the formula $C(y, x) \rightarrow C(y, y) \equiv C(x, y) \rightarrow C(y, y)$ evaluates to true for $P(x, y)$. Thus, the condition that $x$ connects with $y$ is sufficient for hypothesizing that $x$ is a part of $y$. This means that a calculus using formula (1) is expected to be complete in a practical application.

5.2 Asserting the RCC-8 Relations

The inferences from the RCC-8 relations asserted between the connecting regions in the ABox of the knowledge base to relations of any of the four other RCC species share the uniform pattern of the logical modus ponens:

$$[(R_{\text{RCC-i+}} \sqsubseteq R_{\text{RCC-i}}) \land R_{\text{RCC-i+}}(x, y)] \rightarrow R_{\text{RCC-i}}(x, y) \quad (2)$$

where RCC-i+ denotes the RCC species from which is inferred and RCC-i the species to which is inferred with $i^+$, $i \in \{1, 2, 3, 5, 8\}$ and $i^+ > i$. Note that because of the transitive property of the inclusion operator in OWL DL the following holds:

$$((R_{\text{RCC-i+}} \sqsubseteq R_{\text{RCC-i}}) \land (R_{\text{RCC-i+}} \sqsubseteq R_{\text{RCC-i}})) \rightarrow R_{\text{RCC-i+}} \sqsubseteq R_{\text{RCC-i}}.$$

Different from (1) formula (2) refers to an inference pattern which is quite common in description logics (including OWL DL). Unlike (1) it can, therefore, be processed by any OWL reasoner. Since the soundness and completeness of reasoning services for a great variety of description logics – including OWL DL – have been proven [1], we expect inferences with formula (2) to be sound and complete in a practical application.

5.3 Applying the Two Approaches

In order to demonstrate the theoretical results obtained with the two approaches to a representation of RCC in OWL, we use a sample of 44 two-dimensional spatial regions (polygons) from different GIS layers in the canton of Zurich (cf. figure 2). The regions are asserted as individuals in the ABox of our OWL DL knowledge base. The connections between them – which were identified by cartographic analysis – are asserted as role assertions of type $C(x, y)$ for calculation with formula (1) or as role assertions in terms of the RCC-8 relations for inferences with formula (2). Overall, there are 262 relations asserted in our sample. The OWL reasoner Pellet (version 1.4) is used in order to access and manipulate the knowledge base. An additional reasoner used in order to compute formula (1) is programmed in Java. It accesses the knowledge base by means of standard OWL API.

Using formula (1) the RCC reasoner calculates 153 relations of type $P(x, y)$. The cartographic evaluation results in 27 relations being falsely calculated as $P(x, y)$ whereas they are relations of type $E(x, y)$. All relations of type $P(x, y)$ verified by cartography are identified as such. As expected, the calculation with formula (1) is complete but not sound in our sample.

To give an example, one of the relations of type $E(x, y)$ which is falsely calculated as $P(x, y)$ refers to the relation between Geroldswil and Oetwil (cf. figure 2). Since all regions connecting with Geroldswil also connect with Oetwil the relation between them is (falsely!) assumed to be of type $P(x, y)$. As explained above, this is neither a shortcoming of the calculus nor of the theory but a result of the finite number of regions represented. If, for instance, the region in the east of Geroldswil were split into two similar sub regions and the southerly sub region only connected with Geroldswil but not with Oetwil, formula (1) would evaluate to false in this modified sample. That is, the hypothesis that $P(\text{Geroldswil, Oetwil})$ holds would be falsified.

![Figure 2. Regions in the canton of Zurich](image)
that the district of Zurich and the commune of Zurich share the same geometry, in terms of RCC: $E_Q(\text{Bezirk Zürich, Zürich})$.

Using formula (2) the OWL reasoner properly infers the 126 relations of type $P(x, y)$ – calculated as $E_Q(x, y) \lor PP(x, y)$ (cf. Table 1) – from the RCC-8 relations asserted in our sample. It further properly infers the less specific RCC-5, RCC-3, RCC-2 and RCC-1 relations in a number of spot samples. As expected the reasoning service is sound and complete in these samples. Since reasoning services based on OWL DL are proven to be sound and complete, this part of our exploration confirms the OWL DL legality of our representation and the conformance of the OWL reasoner with the OWL DL specification.

To give an example, the RCC-3 relation $\text{overlapsNotEqual}(Zürich, Albiskette-Reppischtal)$, which is not asserted in the knowledge base, is inferred from the asserted RCC-8 relation $\text{partiallyOverlaps}(Zürich, Albiskette-Reppischtal)$ using the theorem $[(\text{partiallyOverlaps} \sqsubseteq \text{overlapsNotEqual}) \land \text{partiallyOverlaps}(Zürich, Albiskette-Reppischtal)] \rightarrow \text{overlapsNotEqual}(Zürich, Albiskette-Reppischtal)$.

6. DISCUSSION
Our exploration shows that the RCC-8 relations qualify for a minimal representation in order to effectively combine RCC with OWL DL in practical applications. Based on the 262 asserted relations, the OWL reasoner infers a total of 2228 relations. Thus the number of relations asserted as a minimal representation in our sample is roughly one tenth of the number of a full representation without counting the relations between regions which are not connected. The high number of inferred relations can be explained by the fact that for each connecting pair of regions the valid relations in all five RCC species plus the symmetric relations being inferred from both ends.

7. CONCLUSION
The results obtained in section 5 suggest that the second approach can be applied to small applications in general. It requires that the relations between connecting regions are asserted in terms of RCC-8 in the ABox at the outset of the knowledge base. This implies that these relations can be easily determined in practical applications. However, this is not the case in large applications such as those underlying the bilingual ontology introduced in section 1. In these applications the identification of spatial relations involves a series of geometrical computations and relational operations. With the objective of streamlining this process, future work will explore methods for the calculation or approximation of spatial settings based on information which can be easily accessed from geographic information systems.
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