Event Tagging Similarities:

- Both methods handle mentions, core (above) from non-core (below).
- ERE and ACE have similar event classes (above) from non-core (below).
- ACE allows for unlinked events (events that may have occurred or happened some probability of occurring in the future). E.g., ARMS of arrests/captures/conviction.

Argument Tagging Differences:

- Event Type: ACE defines it as always being the entire sentence within which the Event is described. In ERE, the extent is the entire document unless an event is conferred.
- ERE does not tag negative, future, hypothetical, conditional, uncertain, or genetic events.

Social Relation Differences:

- ACE and ERE have three subtypes with similar goals: Business, Family, Unspecified/Lasting-Personal, but ERE has an additional Membership subcategory.
- ERE also includes the SocialRole Subtype in order to address the TITLE entity type, which only applies to ERE.

Conclusion

The ACE and ERE annotation schemes have closely related goals of identifying similar information across various possible types of documents. Though their approaches differ due to separate goals regarding scope and replicability, ERE differs in collapsing different type distinctions and in removing annotation features in order to eliminate annotator confusion and to improve consistency, efficiency, and higher-inter-annotator agreement. TAC-KBP and FrameNet share some goals with ACE/ERE, but in wholly focused on a set collection of slots (to slots be filled), concerning entities to the extent that there is no explicit modeling of events. At the other extreme, FrameNet seeks to capture the full range of linguistic and lexicographic variation in event representations in text. In general, all events, relations, and attributes that can be represented by ACE/ERE and TAC-KBP can be mapped to FrameNet representations, although adjustments need to be made for granularity of event/relation types and granularity of arguments.