INTRODUCTION

Mobile applications today face the challenges of increasing information, diversity of users and user contexts, and ever-increasing variations in mobile computing platforms. They need to continue being a successful business model for service providers and useful to their user community in the light of these challenges.

An appropriate representation of information is crucial for the agility, sustainability, and maintainability of the information architecture of mobile applications. This article discusses the potential of the Semantic Web (Hendler, Lassila, & Berners-Lee, 2001) framework to that regard.

The organization of the article is as follows. We first outline the background necessary for the discussion that follows and state our position. This is followed by the introduction of a knowledge representation framework for integrating Semantic Web and mobile applications, and we deal with both social prospects and technical concerns. Next, challenges and directions for future research are outlined. Finally, concluding remarks are given.

BACKGROUND

In recent years, there has been a proliferation of affordable information devices such as a cellular phone, a personal digital assistant (PDA), or a pager that provide access to mobile applications. In a similar timeframe, the Semantic Web has recently emerged as an extension of the current Web that adds technological infrastructure for better knowledge representation, interpretation, and reasoning.

The goal of the mobile Web is to be able to mimic the desktop Web as closely as possible, and an appropriate representation of information is central to its realization. This requires a transition from the traditional approach of merely presentation to representation of information. The Semantic Web provides one avenue towards that.

Indeed, the integration of Semantic Web technologies in mobile applications is suggested in Alesso and Smith (2002) and Lassila (2005). There are also proof-of-concept semantic mobile applications such as MyCampus (Gandon & Sadeh, 2004) and mSpace Mobile (Wilson, Russell, Smith, Owens, & Schraefel, 2005) serving a specific community. However, these initiatives are limited by one or more of the following factors: the discussion of knowledge representation is one-sided and focuses on specific technology(ies) or is not systematic, or the treatment is restricted to specific use cases. One of the purposes of this article is to address this gap.

UNDERSTANDING KNOWLEDGE REPRESENTATION IN SEMANTIC MOBILE APPLICATIONS

In this section, our discussion of semantic mobile applications is based on the knowledge representation framework given in Table 1.

The first column addresses semiotic levels. Semiotics (Stamper, 1992) is concerned with the use of symbols to convey knowledge. From a semiotics perspective, a representation can be viewed on six interrelated levels: physical, empirical, syntactic, semantic, pragmatic, and social, each depending on the previous one in that order. The physical level is concerned with the representation of signs in hardware and is not directly relevant here.

The second column corresponds to the Semantic Web “tower” that consists of a stack of technologies that vary across the technical to social spectrum as we move from bottom to top, respectively. The definition of each layer in this technology stack depends upon the layers beneath it.

Finally, in the third column, we acknowledge that there are time, effort, and budgetary constraints on producing a
representation and include feasibility as an all-encompassing factor on the layers to make the framework practical. For example, an organization may choose not to adopt a technically superior technology as it cannot afford training or processing tools available that meet the organization’s quality expectations. For that, analytical hierarchy process (AHP) and quality function deployment (QFD) are commonly used techniques. Further discussion of this aspect is beyond the scope of the article.

The architecture of a semantic mobile application extends that of a traditional mobile application on the server-side by: (a) expressing information in a manner that focuses on description rather than presentation or processing of information, and (b) associating with it a knowledge management system (KMS) consisting of one or more domain-specific ontologies and a reasoner.

We now turn our attention to each of the levels in our framework for knowledge representation in semantic mobile applications.

**Empirical Level of a Semantic Mobile Application**

This layer is responsible for the communication properties of signs. Among the given choices, the Unicode Standard provides a suitable basis for the signs themselves and is character-by-character equivalent to the ISO/IEC 10646 Standard Universal Character Set (UCS). Unicode is based on a large set of characters that are needed for supporting internationalization and special symbols. This is necessary for the aim of universality of mobile applications.

The characters must be uniquely identifiable and locatable, and thus addressable. The uniform resource identifier (URI), or its successor international resource identifier (IRI), serves that purpose.

Finally, we need a transport protocol such as the hypertext transfer protocol (HTTP) or the simple object access protocol (SOAP) to transmit data across networks. We note that these are limited to the transport between the mobile service provider that acts as the intermediary between the mobile client and the server. They are also layered on top of and/or used in conjunction with other protocols, such as those belonging to the Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers (IEEE) 802 hierarchy.

**Syntactic Level of a Semantic Mobile Application**

This layer is responsible for the formal or structural relations between signs. The eXtensible Markup Language (XML) lends a suitable syntactical basis for expressing information in a mobile application.

The XML is supported by a number of ancillary technologies that strengthen its capabilities. Among those, there are domain-specific XML-based markup languages that can be used for expressing information in a mobile application (Kamthan, 2001).

The eXtensible HyperText Markup Language (XHTML) is a recast of the HyperText Markup Language (HTML) in XML. XHTML Basic is the successor of compact HTML (cHTML) that is an initiative of the NTT DoCoMo, and of the Wireless Markup Language (WML) that is part of the wireless application protocol (WAP) architecture and an initiative of the Open Mobile Alliance (OMA). It uses XML for its syntax and HTML for its semantics. XHTML Basic has native support for elementary constructs for structuring information like paragraphs, lists, and so on. It could also be used as a placeholder for information fragments based on other languages, a role that makes it rather powerful in spite of being a small language.

The Scalable Vector Graphics (SVG) is a language for two-dimensional vector graphics that works across platforms, across output resolutions, across color spaces, and across a range of available bandwidths; SVG Tiny and SVG Basic are profiles of SVG targeted towards cellular phones and PDAs, respectively.

The Synchronized Multimedia Integration Language (SMIL) is a language that allows description of temporal behavior of a multimedia presentation, associates hyperlinks with media objects, and describes the layout of the presentation on a screen. It includes reusable components that can allow integration of timing and synchronization into XHTML and into SVG. SMIL Basic is a profile that meets the needs of resource-constrained devices such as mobile phones and portable disc players.

Namespaces in XML is a mechanism for uniquely identifying XML elements and attributes of a markup language, thus making it possible to create heterogeneous (compound) documents (Figure 1) that unambiguously mix

**Figure 1. The architecture of a heterogeneous XML document for a mobile device**