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Discussion and wrap-up

• OM-2008 workshop dinner
  – Multi Kulti restaurant at 20:00, Schlosplatz 19, D-76131 (15-20 mins walk from here)

• OM-2009 & OAEI-2009

• Challenges for ontology matching

• OAEI future actions

• Role of final users in ontology matching
Challenges for ontology matching

- Large-scale evaluation
- Performance of ontology matching techniques
- Discovering missing background knowledge
- Uncertainty in ontology matching
- Matcher selection and self-configuration
- User involvement
- Explanation of matching results
- Social and collaborative ontology matching
- Alignment management: infrastructure and support
- Reasoning with alignments
OAEI future actions

- Test cases with diversified relations
- Instance matching
- Other missing test cases (expressive)
- How to sustain OAEI?
- EU funding: FP7, CIP
  - ICT event in Lyon: November 25-27, 2008
  - InfoDays in Budapest: January 22, 2009
- What can we learn from the CADE, SAT and TREC campaigns to maximize impact?
Role of final users

• It is rarely the case that final users are directly involved in the definition of use cases in ontology matching research projects (some exceptional examples include OpenKnowledge, STITCH, …)

• Involving final users into R&D cycles requires addressing a social challenge of integrating relevant actors: research centers, technology providers and user institutions …

• In order to foster an early practical exploitation of the matching prototypes, it is necessary to directly involve final users in R&D cycles
Evaluating non equivalence mappings in OAEI [by Marta Sabou]

- Increasingly, systems are able to derive more than just non-equivalence mappings (e.g., Asmov, TaxoMap, Spider)
  - The OM field is clearly advancing in this direction
- No explicit support exists for their evaluation in (most of the) OAEI tracks
  - Spider obtained a precision value of 15% by comparison to the ref alignment, yet expert evaluation indicates 60%+ values.
- We propose a new track which focuses on evaluating non-equivalence mappings thus:
  - responding to the current advances in the field
  - encouraging the development of more matchers with advanced functionalities
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