# Urgent Matters w.r.t. MOLTO 2<sup>nd</sup> year review as of 26.03.2012

The matters in this document need to be resolved as soon as possible. A full report of the 2<sup>nd</sup> year review will be following shortly.

**Deliverable 4.2 and Deliverable 4.3 are considered insufficient and are not approved by the reviewers in their current status.**

The objectives of WP4 are, as stated in the DoW:

(i) research and development of two-way grammar-ontology interoperability bridging the gap between natural language and formal knowledge;

(ii) infrastructure for knowledge modeling, semantic indexing and retrieval;

(iii) modeling and alignment of structured data sources;

(iv) alignment of ontologies with the grammar derived models.

D4.2 should contain a report on the Data Models, Alignment Methodology, Tools and Documentation. More specifically, it should contain information about the aligned semantic models and instance bases. While D4.2. contains information about *Reason-able views* and the key principles constituting these views are stated in the document, it does not state how these key principles have been implemented in the MOLTO-project. D4.2 does not comply with the key principle stating "Clean up, post-process and enrich the datasets if necessary, and do this in a **clearly documented and automated manner.**" D4.2 should contain exactly all details about the automation process of multiple ontologies. so that this knowledge and technique can be re-used to integrate now ontologies with the existing ones.

D4.3. should clear out the issue of the two-way interoperability between ontologies and GF grammars. This is still unclear, although objective (i) of WP4 is clear that this is a research-intensive part of MOLTO. Based on the WP4 presentation given in the review, this process requires the manual writing of mapping rules (NL Query -> GF, GF-> SPARQL query), which means limited potential for further re-use. The partners must clear the degree of automation that can be performed. What is required for porting this to a new application? Concrete steps should be provided making clear what can be automated and what cannot with the provided infrastructure. Details about mapping rule induction etc. should be provided.

**Concerning D9.1**, last year's review recommendation 9 states "Taking into account the numerous endeavors undertaken in the translation domain, both research and commercial, the market segment addressed by MOLTO should be identified with maximum precision. The specific case studies should also be taken into account in this effort. It is suggested that careful planning is initiated as early as possible and not later than the next reporting period."

A concrete evaluation methodology is needed focusing on MOLTO major goals. How the consortium will prove that its objectives were fully/partially met (see the slide from the introductory presentation for the 2 years of MOLTO -> *target: producers, input: predictable, coverage: limited, quality: publishing*). We expect to see D9.1E "Addendum to the MOLTO test criteria, methods and schedule" requiring that the recommendations suggested above as well as in the 1<sup>st</sup> review, in relation to D9.1, will be included there. This should also include an updated description of the test criteria and used methods for each of the use cases as they are progressing, so each of the use cases can be properly evaluated at the end of the project. This also holds for the new use cases.

**Concerning WP1/WP10:** The web site is not well structured and, in some cases, it is difficult to find appropriate documents. There should be an organisation allowing to check what has been published per WP, chronologically. The DoW and extended DoW should also be made available. The document deliverables and documents concerning the reviews should be well separated from the public presentations and papers at various events.