

## Chapter 6.21

# Corporate Semantic Webs

**Rose Dieng-Kuntz**  
*INRIA, ACACIA Project, France*

### INTRODUCTION

An organization is made up of people interacting for common objectives, in a given structure (may be rather formal in the case of a company, an administration, or an institution, or rather informal in the case of an interest community or a practice community), in an internal environment, and with an external environment.

Based on definitions of Grundstein (2004) and O’Leary (1998), we define knowledge management (KM) as the “management of knowledge resources of an organization in order to ease:

- access, sharing, reuse of this knowledge (that can be explicit or tacit, individual or collective), with an objective of capitalization;
- creation of new knowledge, with an objective of innovation.”

Among the various approaches for KM, this article focuses on those aimed at knowledge capitalization and sharing. They can rely on the notion

of corporate memory (or organizational memory (OM)) that, extending van Heijst’s definition (1996), we define as the “explicit and persistent materialization of crucial knowledge and information of an organization in order to ease their access, sharing out and reuse by the members of the organization in their individual and collective tasks” (Dieng-Kuntz et al., 2001).

As such an OM relies on individuals interacting in an organization, with support of software tools, construction and management of a corporate memory require a multidisciplinary approach, taking into account at least three dimensions: (1) individual (memory must be compatible with users’ cognitive models and their work environment), (2) organization (memory must be compatible with culture and strategy of the organization), and (3) technology (the chosen software tools must be adapted to the memory objectives and to the environment of future users).

This article will detail a particular approach of OM called the “corporate semantic Webs” approach, proposed by the Acacia team which the author deeply thanks.

## **BACKGROUND**

### **From Knowledge-Based Systems to Knowledge Management**

If the need of KM in enterprises has long been emphasized in management sciences (Grundstein, 2004), this notion started to be studied thoroughly at the beginning of the '90s by artificial intelligence researchers who had previously worked on expert systems and knowledge-based systems (KBSs), and had evolved towards knowledge engineering (KE): Steels (1993) was one of the first researchers in this community to stress the notion of corporate memory in order to promote knowledge growth, knowledge communication, and knowledge preservation in an organization; since 1993, the ISMICK conferences have been dedicated to these topics (Barthès, 1996). In 1996, the KE community emphasized the interest of OM and its differences with regards to KBS: definitions were proposed (van Heijst, Van der Spek, & Kruizinga, 1996), as well as concrete examples (Dieng et al., 1996). Then several workshops at KAW, ECAI, IJCAI, and AAAI thoroughly studied methods and tools for building and using OM (Dieng & Matta, 2002).

### **Ontologies and Knowledge Management**

Meanwhile, the KE community was working on ontologies (Gruber, 1993). The Banff Knowledge Acquisition workshops (KAW)<sup>1</sup> enabled a better comprehension of foundations of ontologies (Guarino & Giaretta, 1995; Guarino, 1996). Researchers proposed tools for collaborative building of ontologies (Farquhar, Fikes, & Rice, 1996; Domingue, 1998; Tennison & Shadbolt, 1996), as well as concrete, huge ontologies in KM large applications (Swartout et al., 1996; Golebiowska, Dieng, Corby, & Mousseau, 2001). Moreover, some researchers on ontologies emphasized the

interest of ontologies for KM (Benjamins, Fensel, & Gómez-Pérez, 1998a; Dieng et al., 2001).

The (KA)<sup>2</sup> initiative (Benjamins et al., 1998b) was a significant example of collaborative building of an ontology and of semantic annotations by the knowledge acquisition community.

### **Knowledge Management Based on Ontologies and Documents**

The evolution from KBS to KM was based on the idea that a corporate memory could be naturally materialized in a knowledge repository without any reasoning aims; therefore ontologies seemed to be a quite natural way to make the conceptual vocabulary shared by an organization explicit. But this evolution led to recognition that the most frequent knowledge sources that could be integrated in an OM were documents. The need for a link between documents (considered as informal knowledge sources) and knowledge bases/ontologies (expressing formal knowledge) was emphasized by research that associated to a document a knowledge base aimed at making the underlying semantics of the document explicit and at improving information retrieval by reasoning on this knowledge base (Martin, 1997; Euzenat, 1996). The advent of XML led several KM researchers to rely on XML-based formalisms and on the future semantic Web (Rabarijaona, Dieng, Corby, & Ouaddari, 2000; Martin & Eklund, 2000). Shoe (Luke, Spector, Rager, & Hendler, 1997) and Ontobroker (Fensel, Decker, Erdmann, & Studer, 1998) offered an ontology-guided information retrieval approach; community semantic portals were developed using such tools (Staab et al., 2000).

### **Knowledge Management and the Semantic Web**

The interest of the Web for KM and knowledge distribution over the Internet, either through an

16 more pages are available in the full version of this document, which may be purchased using the "Add to Cart" button on the publisher's webpage: [www.igi-global.com/chapter/corporate-semantic-webs/25296](http://www.igi-global.com/chapter/corporate-semantic-webs/25296)

## Related Content

---

### Measuring the Influence of Expertise and Epistemic Engagement to the Practice of Knowledge Management

Kwang Seok Yoon (2012). *International Journal of Knowledge Management* (pp. 40-70).  
[www.irma-international.org/article/measuring-influence-expertise-epistemic-engagement/62590](http://www.irma-international.org/article/measuring-influence-expertise-epistemic-engagement/62590)

### Interesting Knowledge Patterns in Databases

Rajesh Natarajanand B. Shekar (2006). *Encyclopedia of Knowledge Management* (pp. 297-304).  
[www.irma-international.org/chapter/interesting-knowledge-patterns-databases/16964](http://www.irma-international.org/chapter/interesting-knowledge-patterns-databases/16964)

### Rule-Based Transformation of Graphs and the Product Type

Renate Klempien-Hinrichs, Hans-Jörg Kreowskiand Sabine Kuske (2005). *Transformation of Knowledge, Information and Data: Theory and Applications* (pp. 29-51).  
[www.irma-international.org/chapter/rule-based-transformation-graphs-product/30439](http://www.irma-international.org/chapter/rule-based-transformation-graphs-product/30439)

### Knowledge Retention Challenges in Information Systems Development Teams: A Revelatory Story From Developers in New Zealand

Yi-Te Chiu, Kristijan Mirkovski, Jocelyn Cranefieldand Shruthi Shankar (2022). *International Journal of Knowledge Management* (pp. 1-25).  
[www.irma-international.org/article/knowledge-retention-challenges-in-information-systems-development-teams/291096](http://www.irma-international.org/article/knowledge-retention-challenges-in-information-systems-development-teams/291096)

### Analysis of Knowledge Sharing Barriers in Sri Lankan Software Companies

Jayani Probodhaand Shanmuganathan Vasanthapriyan (2019). *International Journal of Knowledge Management* (pp. 78-93).  
[www.irma-international.org/article/analysis-of-knowledge-sharing-barriers-in-sri-lankan-software-companies/234742](http://www.irma-international.org/article/analysis-of-knowledge-sharing-barriers-in-sri-lankan-software-companies/234742)