

Toward a Method to Generate Capability Ontologies from Natural Language Descriptions

Luis Miguel Vieira da Silva*, Aljosha Köcher*, Felix Gehlhoff*, Alexander Fay†

*Institute of Automation

Helmut Schmidt University, Hamburg, Germany

Email: {miguel.vieira, aljosha.koecher, felix.gehlhoff}@hsu-hh.de

† Chair of Automation

Ruhr University, Bochum, Germany

Email: alexander.fay@rub.de

Abstract—To achieve a flexible and adaptable system, capability ontologies are increasingly leveraged to describe functions in a machine-interpretable way. However, modeling such complex ontological descriptions is still a manual and error-prone task that requires a significant amount of effort and ontology expertise. This contribution presents an innovative method to automate capability ontology modeling using Large Language Models (LLMs), which have proven to be well suited for such tasks. Our approach requires only a natural language description of a capability, which is then automatically inserted into a predefined prompt using a few-shot prompting technique. After prompting an LLM, the resulting capability ontology is automatically verified through various steps in a loop with the LLM to check the overall correctness of the capability ontology. First, a syntax check is performed, then a check for contradictions, and finally a check for hallucinations and missing ontology elements. Our method greatly reduces manual effort, as only the initial natural language description and a final human review and possible correction are necessary, thereby streamlining the capability ontology generation process.

Index Terms—Large Language Models, LLMs, Capabilities, Skills, Ontologies, Semantic Web, Model-Generation

I. INTRODUCTION

In today’s rapidly evolving manufacturing landscape, companies must adapt quickly to shifting demands, necessitating highly flexible systems. Consequently, it is imperative to select and modify systems and functions as needed. To facilitate such adaptability it is crucial to provide machine-interpretable descriptions of these functions. In this regard, the concepts of *capabilities* and *skills* have emerged as important concepts in recent years, due to the standardization efforts by working groups *Plattform Industrie 4.0*¹ and *IDTA*². Capabilities are defined as an implementation-independent specification of a function, while skills are executable implementations of a function specified by a capability [1]. However, the manual specification of capabilities and skills is a tedious effort. Therefore, the automated generation of such specifications is a topic of current research.

To generate machine-interpretable models of capabilities and skills, ontologies are predominantly used due to their benefits in knowledge representation (e.g., querying, reasoning, constraint-checking). As formal information models, ontologies define a set of concepts, delineate their meanings, and specify the relations between them [2]. However, the generation of model instances for existing capability ontologies demands considerable ontology expertise and significant effort. Although there are approaches that automatically generate parts of these ontologies from existing information (e.g., [3]), the modeling of capabilities remains a manual, labor-intensive, and error-prone task.

Large Language Models (LLMs) are promising for the automated generation of capability ontologies, as they show great potential for natural language processing tasks such as translation and code generation [4]. In our previous study [5] we compared different LLMs and prompting techniques for generating a capability ontology and confirmed their suitability for this task. Prompting techniques stem from the field of prompt engineering, which involves crafting prompts to interact with LLMs in a way that maximizes the accuracy and relevance of their responses. One notable prompting technique is *few-shot prompting*, which leverages *in-context learning* by providing context in the form of a number of examples within a prompt [6].

This article proposes a method utilizing LLMs to automate the generation of capability ontologies, thereby minimizing the manual effort. However, LLMs may cause *hallucinations* by generating information that is factually incorrect, invented, or irrelevant to the given natural language input [4]. Therefore, our method incorporates an automated, systematic verification and refinement of the resulting capability ontology in order to enable its integration into applications such as manufacturing execution systems.

The remainder of this paper is structured as follows: Section II reviews existing contributions to capability engineering methods and studies covering the use of LLMs to generate machine-interpretable models. Section III details our proposed method and Section IV gives an overview of the implementation. The paper concludes with a discussion of our findings and future research directions in Section V.

¹<https://www.plattform-i40.de/IP/Redaktion/EN/Downloads/Publikation/CapabilitiesSkillsServices.html>

²<https://github.com/admin-shell-io/submodel-templates/tree/main/development/Capability/1/0>

II. RELATED WORK

In [3], we present a method to create the various aspects of a capability and skill ontology from existing engineering artifacts in order to reduce the high effort required for manual ontology creation. Using a provided framework, the skill aspect is created automatically using source code of the skill behavior. For the capability aspect, a semi-automated approach using graphical modeling is used as there are no engineering artifacts describing functions in a structured manner. But even though that approach creates guidance in creating a capability model, it still requires some manual efforts for creating a graphical model. Furthermore, some parts of the capability aspect are not covered (e.g., constraints).

Besides ontologies, the Asset Administration Shell (AAS) is also used to create capability models using an existing submodel template. In the context of the AAS, there are also initial approaches to support modeling processes: One such approach is shown in [7], which presents a modeling process based on a graphical modeling framework. Similar to [3], this approach also eases the creation of a capability model by giving users an easy-to-use modeling environment. Models created in this environment are automatically translated to the actual AAS model. Another work aiming to automate the creation of AAS models is presented in [8]. In [8], LLMs are used to generate instances of AAS from textual technical data. For this purpose, a so-called *semantic node* is introduced to capture the semantic essence of textual data. Multiple LLMs and system designs were evaluated and the results are promising, showing an effective generation rate of 62–79%. Manual effort is only required to verify the results, for which no method is provided.

The authors of [9] present an approach to automatically create a concept hierarchy using GPT-3.5 Turbo. Starting from a given concept, e.g., *animal*, ChatGPT is repeatedly asked for subconcepts until a complete taxonomy is created. The results are considered promising, despite some cases of hallucination and incompleteness. However, as the created ontology is only a taxonomy, complex relations like dependencies or constraints found in our capability ontology are not generated. Furthermore, verification is achieved through manual prompts. With our method, we aim to automate back-prompting.

In [10] the *LLM4OL* approach, which uses LLMs for ontology learning, is presented. Three types of tasks are examined: type discovery, recognizing taxonomies and discovery of non-taxonomic relations. A zero-shot prompting technique and 11 different LLMs are used to study these tasks for different knowledge domains. The authors of [10] conclude that LLMs are suitable assistants in ontology learning, but that task-specific finetuning is required to achieve practically viable solutions. However, only zero-shot prompts are used, so it is not clear to what extent prompt engineering alone would have led to better results.

LLMs are not only used to create ontologies, but also in other areas where manually creating models is known to be time-consuming and complicated. Ref. [11] is an approach

to generate AI planning problems in the language *Planning Domain Definition Language (PDDL)* from natural language using LLMs. Both the description of the domain and the problem to solve are generated. The contribution describes that LLMs cannot perform planning or reasoning themselves, but can support planning by generating the planning problem in existing languages. Conventional planners are then used to solve the planning problem. In the case of an incorrect planning problem, PDDL validators are used to check the syntax and human experts are used to check for factual errors and incompleteness. The findings are input as an additional prompt to the LLM, which then makes corrections. Both GPT-4 and GPT-3.5 Turbo are used and few-shot is used as a prompting technique. Even though the approach in [11] is built for PDDL, a different modeling language from a different domain, our idea is close to [11] because it describes a method that uses the formalism of the generated model to perform verification and correction.

A similar method is presented in [12] for the domain of systems engineering. In this paper, Apvrille and Sultan show how GPT can be used to automatically generate valid SysML diagrams from natural-language specifications. After inputting knowledge on systems engineering and diagram types, the specification is separated into multiple prompts and a JSON-formatted answer is requested. Answers are automatically parsed into SysML diagrams and analyzed for correctness. On errors, additional prompts are issued automatically or based on user interaction. In an evaluation against a conventional, manual modeling workflow, the developed framework is shown to achieve better results in a significantly shorter time. However, the authors of [12] argue that their framework is not a direct replacement for systems engineers, but instead needs to be combined with human expertise, especially for complex real-world systems. Just like [11], the approach of [12] has some commonalities with our approach, but deals with a different modeling domain and language.

III. LLM4CAP METHOD

The creation of model instances for specific capabilities based on an existing capability ontology has been a time-consuming manual process that requires a great amount of expertise. To address this, we propose the *LLM4Cap* method (see Figure 1), which on the one hand automatically generates these model instances with the help of LLMs and on the other hand automatically checks the generated results. A detailed step-by-step explanation of the method presented in Figure 1 follows in the next subsection.

A. Capability Ontology Generation with an LLM

First, a description of the capability to be generated must be provided in natural language by a human (see **NL Description** in Figure 1). This description is the only manual step required during the generation process. The natural language description should clarify the effect of the capability within the physical or virtual world, detailing the inputs and outputs of a capability, such as products or information, as well as




Fig. 1. Overview of the proposed approach LLM4Cap: A natural language description of a capability is transformed into a capability ontology through an LLM and then verified in four steps.

their properties (e.g., position). Each property must be clearly categorized based on its purpose — whether it represents a current value, a requirement for applying the capability, an assured property after applying the capability, or a variable parameter. Furthermore, existing dependencies or constraints among these properties should be thoroughly outlined. It is important to comprehensively describe all necessary elements or details of the capability to ensure its accurate modeling. Otherwise, missing elements cannot be modeled.

The description of the capability to be generated is used as input in the next step of **Prompt Generation** as shown in Figure 1. The prompt is predefined and consists of the following aspects:

- Short and concise *instruction* to translate the following task description describing a capability into an Web Ontology Language (OWL) ontology in Turtle syntax based on the capability ontology from the context description.
- *Context* is established by the capability ontology *CaSk*³, which is based on industry standards and can be used to describe systems, their capabilities, and executable skills. The CaSk ontology is detailed in [13]. This context furnishes the LLM with possible classes and relations for the purpose of capability modeling.
- *Examples* according to the few-shot prompting technique. In our previous study in [5], we examined the suitability of LLMs for generating capabilities and compared different prompting techniques — zero-shot, one-shot and few-shot prompting technique — with few-shot providing the best results. Each example consists of the capability description in natural language as input and the resulting capability ontology as an expected output. The three examples used are a coffee-making capability, a simple mathematical operation with multiplication and a more complex capability of distillation.
- *Task* description serves as a placeholder for a specific capability to create and is automatically replaced by the natural language text input from the previous step.

In the next step **Prompting LLM** the generated prompt is sent to the LLM. The LLM is then tasked with generating the capability ontology in the last step (**Generate Ontology**). To ensure deterministic and reliable solutions, the parameter *temperature* is set to zero. Although our study [5] shows that LLMs deliver good results, it also shows that LLMs hallucinate and may not always provide completely correct results. Therefore, a verification of the generated ontology is imperative for its subsequent integration into applications.

B. Verification of LLM-Generated Ontology

The verification process comprises three automated steps. Should an error be detected in any of these steps, the error is automatically backprompted to LLM for correction, as LLMs show good results in correcting errors with the inclusion of feedback. If an error recurs in the same step, the result is passed directly to the human for manual verification, thus preventing a potentially infinite cycle of error generation within the capability ontology generation process.

The initial step of the verification process is the **Syntax Check** to ensure the structural and syntactical correctness of the ontology. The syntax check identifies any character errors, missing prefixes, or violations of formal syntax rules defined by the OWL standard.

Following the provision of a syntactically valid ontology, the logical consistency of the ontology is evaluated in the next step **Reasoning** by employing a standard, off-the-shelf reasoner. Reasoning is used to infer new knowledge from the modeled instances, thereby identifying contradictions. These contradictions indicate that the LLM does not adhere to the predefined rules governing classes and relations within the capability ontology, resulting in an inconsistent ontology. For example, instances that belong to two disjoint classes are identified as contradictory. This step is critical for verifying the accurate modeling of instances within the defined capability ontology.

For a more specific check of the ontology with regard to capabilities, further and more specific rules are used in the last step **Shapes Constraint Language (SHACL) Validation** (see

³<https://github.com/caskade-automation/cask>

Figure 1). SHACL is used to describe constraints that ensure the presence or absence of certain information within an ontology. With a so-called *closed shape* only relations explicitly defined within the SHACL constraint are permitted to exist. Otherwise, invalid relations are identified and the ontology violates the constraints — indicating hallucination of an LLM. Moreover, SHACL constraints provide a preliminary check for incompleteness by signaling the absence of mandatory relations for a comprehensive modeled capability.

After a successful automated verification, the final necessary step is **Manual Verification**, conducted by a domain expert. This is necessary to ensure that the generated ontology aligns with the required capability elements. It is not possible to verify the full extent of a specific capability automatically, and thus this manual step remains indispensable.

IV. IMPLEMENTATION

LLM4Cap is implemented as a Java framework. The decision in favor of Java was made in particular due to the availability of reasoners and SHACL validators. Especially in the area of reasoners, there is only a very limited selection for Python — which is typically used in the context of LLMs.

LLM4Cap supports capability ontology generation using either *GPT-4o*⁴ or *Claude 3*⁵, depending on user selection. Claude is selected by default as it performed best in our previous study [5]. For prompting both LLMs their available RESTful Application Programming Interfaces (APIs) are used. The generated ontology is verified using the *Apache Jena* framework⁶, which is selected for its great possibilities in handling ontologies. Apache Jena supports various reasoners, including *Pellet*⁷, and enables the integration of SHACL constraints.

LLM4Cap is provided as a library to be integrated into other Java projects, as a standalone Command Line Interface (CLI) to be used directly by users as well as a RESTful API. This RESTful API can be used to integrate LLM4Cap into other, web-based systems, where interactions via REST APIs is common. Users can input the natural language description of the desired capability either through a text file or directly as text input.

The components of our framework are accessible online at <https://github.com/CaSkade-Automation/LLM4Cap>.

V. CONCLUSION

In this contribution, we presented a method to automatically generate capability ontologies from natural language descriptions with LLMs and to automatically verify and correct the results. The use of LLMs greatly reduces the effort and expertise needed to create such a capability ontology.

Future work should evaluate the prompt by testing more prompting-techniques, optimizing the natural language capability description and improving the CaSk ontology to make

it better understandable for the LLM. The natural language description could be improved by defining a more structured format instead of free text. And the ontology could be improved by adding labels, comments and similar annotation properties. These elements were originally intended to foster human understanding, but are now a way of providing LLMs with more context information.

As we have shown in more detail in [5], due to the size of the ontologies used, our prompts have a very high token count. This leads to comparatively high costs per prompt and also limits the selection of possible LLMs to the two with the biggest context window. More efficient ways to integrate context information by using embedding techniques like the one presented in [14] are thus worth investigating.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

This research in the RIVA project is funded by dtcc.bw – Digitalization and Technology Research Center of the Bundeswehr. dtcc.bw is funded by the European Union – NextGenerationEU

REFERENCES

- [1] A. Köcher, A. Belyaev *et al.*, “A Reference Model for Common Understanding of Capabilities and Skills in Manufacturing,” *at - Automatisierungstechnik*, no. 2, 2023.
- [2] M. Uschold, “Knowledge level modelling: concepts and terminology,” *The Knowledge Engineering Review*, vol. 13, no. 1, pp. 5–29, 1998.
- [3] A. Köcher, C. Hildebrandt *et al.*, “Automating the Development of Machine Skills and their Semantic Description,” in *2020 25th IEEE International Conference on Emerging Technologies and Factory Automation (ETFA)*. IEEE, 08.09.2020 - 11.09.2020, pp. 1013–1018.
- [4] Y. Chang, X. Wang *et al.*, “A Survey on Evaluation of Large Language Models,” *ACM Transactions on Intelligent Systems and Technology*, vol. 15, no. 3, pp. 1–45, 2024.
- [5] L. M. Vieira da Silva, A. Köcher *et al.*, “On the Use of Large Language Models to Generate Capability Ontologies,” in *submitted for publication at 2024 29th IEEE ETFA*, 2024.
- [6] T. B. Brown, B. Mann *et al.*, “Language Models are Few-Shot Learners,” 28.05.2020, 40+32 pages. [Online]. Available: <http://arxiv.org/pdf/2005.14165v4>
- [7] Y. Huang, S. Dhoub, and J. Malenfant, “An AAS Modeling Tool for Capability-Based Engineering of Flexible Production Lines,” in *IECON 2021 - 47th Annual Conference of the IEEE Industrial Electronics Society*. Piscataway, NJ: IEEE, 2021, pp. 1–6.
- [8] Y. Xia, Z. Xiao *et al.*, “Generation of Asset Administration Shell with Large Language Model Agents: Interoperability in Digital Twins with Semantic Node.” [Online]. Available: <http://arxiv.org/pdf/2403.17209>
- [9] M. Funk, S. Hosemann *et al.*, “Towards Ontology Construction with Language Models.” [Online]. Available: <http://arxiv.org/pdf/2309.09898>
- [10] H. Babaei Giglou, J. D’Souza, and S. Auer, “LLMs4OL: Large Language Models for Ontology Learning,” in *The semantic web - ISWC 2023*, ser. Lecture Notes in Computer Science, T. R. Payne, V. Presutti *et al.*, Eds. Cham: Springer, 2023, vol. 14265, pp. 408–427.
- [11] L. Guan, K. Valmeekam *et al.*, “Leveraging Pre-trained Large Language Models to Construct and Utilize World Models for Model-based Task Planning,” *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, vol. 36, pp. 79 081–79 094, 2023.
- [12] L. Apvrille and B. Sultan, “System Architects Are not Alone Anymore: Automatic System Modeling with AI,” in *Proceedings of the 12th International Conference on Model-Based Software and Systems Engineering*. SCITEPRESS - Science and Technology Publications, 2024, pp. 27–38.
- [13] A. Köcher, C. Hildebrandt *et al.*, “A Formal Capability and Skill Model for Use in Plug and Produce Scenarios,” in *2020 25th IEEE International Conference on Emerging Technologies and Factory Automation (ETFA)*. IEEE, 9/8/2020 - 9/11/2020, pp. 1663–1670.
- [14] J. Chen, P. Hu *et al.*, “OWL2Vec*: embedding of OWL ontologies,” *Machine Learning*, vol. 110, no. 7, pp. 1813–1845, 2021, pII: 5997.

⁴<https://openai.com/index/hello-gpt-4o/>

⁵<https://claude.ai>

⁶<https://jena.apache.org/>

⁷<https://github.com/stardog-union/pellet>