

A context information manager for dynamic environments

Jérôme Euzenat¹, Jérôme Pierson², Fano Ramparany²

¹INRIA Rhône-Alpes, Montbonnot St Martin, France

Jerome.Euzenat@inrialpes.fr

²France Telecom R&D, Meylan, France

{Jerome.Pierson, Fano.Ramparany}@francetelecom.com

Abstract. In a pervasive environment, heterogeneous devices need to communicate in order to provide services adapted to users. We have developed an extensible context model using semantic web technologies and a context information management component that enable the interaction between context information producer devices and context information consumer devices and as well as their insertion in an open environment.

1. Introduction

In a pervasive computing environment, various basic services can be provided by smart devices (sensors, actuators, human-computer interface, etc.). To provide more elaborate services, they have to act together and cooperate. Then they can offer a large number of services. It would be better if the devices could adapt their behaviour to the user, his/her preference and his/her task, than if users have to find the specific service they want among all the smart devices.

This idea requires the perception of the environment in which devices and users interact. There are pieces of information that can be considered common to all services. In particular, spatial and temporal location as well as information related to the physical environment in which services are made available [1, 2]. These elements are part of the context in which applications operate. We are here concerned with context-aware applications, i.e., application whose behavior is determined to some extent by the context.

Our goal is to design a context management system general enough for being used by different pervasive computing applications, specific enough for encompassing already existing services and application, and flexible enough for supporting the dynamic addition of new devices.

First we introduce our proposition for a distributed architecture to manage context information (Section 2), then we define a context representation (Section 3) which is independent of applications and an architecture enabling their evolution. The openness of the system will lead to deal with heterogeneous representations that will have to be reconciled before being used (section 4). For that purpose, we will take advantage of solutions developed for the “semantic web”.

2. A context information management component

Context is the set of information (partly) characterizing the situation of some entity [3]. The notion of context is not universal but relative to some situation, task or application [4, 5]. Pervasive Computing applications retrieve context data directly or indirectly from sensors, which are grounded in the physical environment. We propose an architecture in which applications won't need to directly connect to each sensor available and where adding a new sensor won't require all applications to be recompiled and redeployed.

Designing architecture for hosting context-aware services, suggests the development of a context management service for providing other services or devices context information [6, 7, 11]. In our approach, each device (or his proxy if it cannot embed enough computing resource) or service embeds a context management component (CMC) for maintaining context information for its own use or for the benefit of others (Fig. 1).

This component provides mechanisms for helping context-aware devices to request context information from context sensitive devices. For this purpose we design a protocol enabling devices to identify a service, know what kind of context information it could provide and interact with it in order to access this information. Thus the context management component provides few methods. A first method allows identifying devices that are available in the environment. The identifier can then be used to contact the device. Alternatively, it could be used to get a more detailed description of the device (e.g. in case the identifier is a URI pointing to a network location where a description of the identified object is stored). A second method identifies the class (in OWL terminology) of the device. In theory, this class should be accessible from the network and once its definition is found, it provides a detailed description of the device. A third method provides the device description (or rather that of context information they provide) in a OWL formalism (OWL-S). A fourth method is used to post queries to the devices and to get the context information returned.

Thus any device is able to: find out, in its environment, services that are able to provide information relevant to its own context, get features of services that have been found (for example, measurement precision), connect to the selected service to get the information sought.

We need a language to describe the context model of heterogeneous devices so that these devices can interact in a dynamic environment.




Fig. 1: Each device embeds a context management component (CMC) and a semantic description of his context.

3. Context model and language

In this dynamic pervasive environment, each CMC manages context information of its device. To express its context model, its needs or its capabilities, we use semantic web languages described below. They ensure interoperability between these heterogeneous devices.

The ground language for the semantic web is RDF (Resource Description Framework [8]). It enables expressing assertions of the form subject-predicate-object. The strength of RDF is that the names of entities (subjects, predicates or objects) are URIs (the identifiers of the web that can be seen as a generalization of URLs: <http://www.w3c.org/sw>). This opens the possibility for different RDF documents to refer precisely to an entity (it is reasonable to think that a URI denotes the same thing for all of its users).

The OWL language [9], has been designed for expressing « ontologies » or conceptual models of a domain of knowledge. It constrains the interpretation of RDF graphs concerning this domain. OWL defines classes of objects and predicates and makes it possible to declare constraints applying to them (i.e., that the « output » of a « thermometer » is a « temperature »).

The context model that we will use at that stage is very simple: a context is a set of RDF assertions. Interoperability is guaranteed through considering that context-aware devices are consumer and producer of RDF. However, this is not precise enough and devices might want to extract only the relevant information from context sources. For that purpose, a language like RDQL [10] is useful for querying or subscribing to context sources. In order to post the relevant queries to the adequate components, it is necessary that components publish the OWL classes of objects and properties on which they can answer.

4. Openness, dynamics and heterogeneity

The languages developed for the semantic web, and particularly RDF and OWL, are adapted to context representation in pervasive computing and particularly to the representation of dynamically evolving contexts for two reasons: these languages are open: they implement the open world assumption under which it is always possible to add more information to a context characterization; and they have been designed to work in a networked way.

If we can add components at any time, they are not easily usable. Indeed, there is no a priori reason that components available, new applications and new sensors are really compatible. Fortunately, using the knowledge representation techniques that are integrated in OWL language it is possible to introduce new devices in the environment by extending the ontology, through specifying a new concept or a property. The applications must be as general as possible to describe the information they need whereas the context management system must be as precise as possible on the information it makes available. This approach enables the most specialized applications to take advantage of CMCs. The essential point is to have sufficiently generic ontologies to cover the various concepts implied in pervasive computing applications [12].

Unfortunately this is not always the case and agreeing on standard, universal and self contained context ontology is not a reasonable assumption. This raises the issue of matching context information produced to applications context information requirements. There are three alternative approaches addressing interoperability in pervasive computing environments: (i) A priori standardisation of ontologies, (ii) setting up mediators among ontologies and (iii) a dynamical ontology alignment service. These three approaches are not incompatible and might even be jointly used. We propose to set up one (or more) ontologies alignment service(s) (Fig. 2). The goal of such service is to help agents (context managers in our case) to find a matching between different ontologies. These services provide mechanisms for finding out ontologies close to a given ontology, archiving (and retrieving) past alignments, dynamically computing matching between two ontologies and translating queries and responses to queries between context managers that use different ontologies [13].




Fig. 2: For finding correspondence between his model and the model of the context information provider, the window service asks to an alignment service to translate his model to another device model.

5. Conclusion and perspectives

We specifically addressed the problem of adaptability of context management to an ever-evolving world. This is achieved by providing distributed component based architecture and by using semantic web technologies. Components enable the addition, at any moment, of new devices that can provide information about the context of applications. The use of RDF and OWL ensures interoperability between components developed independently by taking advantage of the open character of these technologies. Moreover, using ontology alignment modules allows dealing with the necessary heterogeneity between components. The proposed approach relies on a minimal commitment on basic technologies: RDF, OWL, and some identification protocol.

We are currently developing a demonstrator of this technology. We will develop a toolkit for developers of pervasive applications which help them deploy a distributed context management system. This toolkit will provide a component to manage (search, diffuse and update) context information.

Acknowledgement

This work is being partly supported by the European Union IST project 004182: "Amigo – Ambient Intelligence for the networked home environment". More information on <http://www.amigo-project.org>.

References

1. R. Guha, Contexts: a formalization and some applications, PhD thesis, Stanford university (CA US), 1991 (Technical Report STAN-CS-91-1399-Thesis et MCC ACT-CYC-423-91).
2. O. Khriyenko, V. Terziyan, Context description framework for the semantic web, Proceedings Context 2005 Context representation and reasoning workshop, Paris (FR), 2005
3. A. Dey, D. Salber, G. Abowd, A conceptual framework and a toolkit for supporting the rapid prototyping of context-aware applications, *Human-Computer Interaction* 16:97-166., 2001
4. P. Dourish, Seeking a foundation for context-aware computing, *Human-Computer Interaction*, 16(2-3), 2001.
5. M. Chalmers, A Historical View of Context, *Computer supported cooperative work* 13(3), 223-247, 2004.
6. A. Dey, Understanding and using context, *Personal and ubiquitous computing* 5(1):4-7, 2001.
7. J. Coutaz, J. Crowley, S. Dobson, D. Garlan, Context is key, *Communications of the ACM* 48(3):49-53, 2005.
8. G. Klyne, J. Carroll, Eds., Resource Description Framework (RDF): Concepts and Abstract Syntax, W3C Recommendation, 2004 <http://www.w3.org/TR/rdf-concepts/>
9. M. Dean, G. Schreiber Eds, OWL Web Ontology Language: Reference, W3C Recommendation, 2004. <http://www.w3.org/TR/owl-ref/>
10. A. Seaborne, RDQL — A Query Language for RDF, W3C Member submission, 2004. <http://www.w3.org/Submission/2004/SUBM-RDOL-20040109/>
11. J. Crowley, J. Coutaz, G. Rey, P. Reignier, Perceptual components for context aware computing, Proceedings International Conference on Ubiquitous Computing, Göteborg (SW), pp. 117-134, 2002.
12. X. H. Wang, D. Q. Zhang, T. Gu, H. Keng Pung, Ontology based context modeling and reasoning in OWL, Proceedings 2nd International conference on pervasive computing and communication Workshop on Context Modeling and Reasoning (CoMoRea), Orlando (FL US), 2000.
13. J. Euzenat, Alignment infrastructure for ontology mediation and other applications, Proceedings ICSOC 1st international workshop on Mediation in semantic web services, pp.81-95, Amsterdam (NL), 2005.