

Multilingual Thesaurus of Geosciences

Interim Report

Joachim Gersemann, August 2006

Working group members

Marco Amanti (APAT, Italy), Claude Beaupère (BRGM, France), Joachim Gersemann (BGR, Germany) [spokesman], Rachel Heaven (BGS, United Kingdom), Jan Jellema (TNO-NITG, Netherlands), Tomasz Mardal (PGI, Poland), Luca Olivetta (Ministry of the Environment, Italy), Maija Pennanen (GTK, Finland), Sharon Tahirkheli (AGI, USA)

In advisory capacity: Marielle Arregros-Rouvreau (BRGM, France); Caj Kortman: (formerly GTK, Finland)

Upcoming Meeting in 2006

6th MTG meeting in Espoo, Finland (21st September – 22nd September 2006)

Activities

Funding

Participation in the working group is funded by the participating individual agencies. It was realised that lack of funds affects essentially the progress of the project. The working group decided to apply for EU funds within the scope of the eContentplus programme. A proposal was drafted during the Warsaw meeting in September 2005 and worked out by interested institutions. As the Polish Geological Institute agreed to act as applicant T. Mardal submitted it to the EU (Proposal No. ECP 38136-MultTG).

The answer was negative. It said that the proposal “would be acceptable if it did not only concern the development of the thesaurus, but if it was combined with a project making existent digital content accessible in the area of geo-science.”

During the first three meetings it was agreed by the participants and CGI not to develop an IT project with a focal point on linking existing geo-data. In fact the Multilingual Thesaurus should become a tool for projects with the need of such an universal multilingual instrument. Apparently the EU eContent Plus Programme doesn't support such a specific attempt.

MTG terms

Based on the new category scheme worked out during the meetings in Utrecht, Rome and Keyworth the ca 5800 existing terms were assigned to the new categories. This was done by four working teams discussing sets of ca 1500 terms in each case. Now, this categorization will be the basis for the elaboration of a hierarchy. The lack of such a hierarchy was the most prominent disadvantage of the former Multhes published in 1995 although there was a draft hierarchic scheme kept by the Finnish Survey.

A review of this first draft showed that only one half of the terms were integrated in this scheme. Obviously they belong to an earlier collection of relevant terms which were arranged up-and-down while subsequent added terms were not.

Fortunately it is possible to merge the old hierarchy scheme and the newly categorized terms. So the MTG working group will be able to complete the lacking hierarchic relations. Guidelines for this completion have to be agreed during the next meeting in Espoo (Finland). Afterwards the merged file can be split according to the new categories. This will allow us to create manageable amounts of associated terms which can be assigned to working teams in charge of completing hierarchies and improving it where necessary. We will begin during the Espoo meeting and continue locally.