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Executive Summary

This deliverable evaluates the first series of evaluation campaigns (i.e. challenges) organized by HOBBIT, both quantitatively and qualitatively. HOBBIT has organized five benchmarking challenges, in order to measure the fitness of implemented systems for processing Big Linked Data, in conjunction with established conferences in the Semantic Web domain, where the results of the challenges were presented to the public in dedicated workshop sessions:

- the Mighty Storage Challenge (MOCHA) at the European Semantic Web Conference (ESWC) 2017
- the Open Knowledge Extraction (OKE) challenge at the European Semantic Web Conference (ESWC) 2017
- the Question Answering over Linked Data (QALD) challenge at the European Semantic Web Conference (ESWC) 2017
- the DEBS Grand Challenge at the International Conference on Distributed and Event-Based Systems (DEBS) 2017
- the HOBBIT Link Discovery Task, as part of the OAEI campaign, at the Ontology Matching (OM) workshop at the International Semantic Web Conference (ISWC) 2017

The evaluation is conducted by measuring the number of benchmark datasets, of challenge participants, of workshop attendees and of visitors to the challenges’ websites. Also, questionnaires were distributed to the participants of the challenges and the attendees of the corresponding workshop sessions. The analysis shows that we managed to successfully organize the first series of HOBBIT challenges, giving a positive impression to the participants of the challenges and the attendees of the workshops.
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1 Introduction

The main objectives of WP7 – Evaluation Campaigns are (i) to organize benchmarking campaigns in order to measure the fitness of implemented systems for processing Big Linked Data and (ii) to organize workshops in order to present and promote these systems and the results of the evaluation campaigns.

This deliverable reports on the evaluation of the first series of evaluation campaigns (i.e. challenges) organized by HOBBIT. Five challenges were arranged at renowned conferences, where participants were invited to submit systems that tackle the HOBBIT benchmarks and the results of the challenges were presented to the public in dedicated workshop sessions. In particular, HOBBIT organized:

- the MOCHA challenge at ESWC 2017
- the OKE challenge at ESWC 2017
- the QALD challenge at ESWC 2017
- the DEBS Grand Challenge at DEBS 2017
- the HOBBIT Link Discovery Task at OAEI OM 2017 Workshop at ISWC 2017

The evaluation is performed both quantitatively, by reporting participation and website visitors numbers, and qualitatively, via questionnaires that were handed out to the challenge participants and the workshop attendees. Section 2 provides a brief overview of each of the five challenges, followed by the assessment results in Sections 3 and 4. Appendices A-H contain the questionnaires used for the qualitative evaluation of the five challenges.

Additional information on the HOBBIT challenges can be found on the project’s website, as well as related deliverables D7.1.1 – First Workshop Proceedings, D7.2.1 – First Workshop Organization Report and D7.3.1 – First Challenge Results Overview. D7.1.1 reports on the proceedings of the challenges, D7.2.1 reports on the organizational aspects of the challenges and D7.3.1 reports on the benchmarks, the challenges’ tasks, and the participating systems and their results.

2 Overview of the Challenges Organized by HOBBIT

The HOBBIT project has successfully organized its first series of challenges, consisting of five challenges, in conjunction with renowned conferences where the results of the challenges were presented to the public in workshop sessions. In particular, three challenges were organized at the ESWC 2017 conference\(^1\), one at the ISWC 2017 conference\(^2\) and one in collaboration with ACM DEBS Grand Challenge\(^3\). Detailed descriptions of the challenges and participating systems can be found on the project’s website\(^4\) and D7.3.1 – First Challenge Results Overview.

\(^1\)https://2017.eswc-conferences.org/call-challenges
\(^2\)http://iswc2017.semanticweb.org/
\(^3\)http://lsv1.ls.fi.upm.es/debs2017/call-for-grand-challenge-solutions/
\(^4\)https://project-hobbit.eu/
2.1 MOCHA Challenge at ESWC 2017

The Mighty Storage Challenge (MOCHA) consisted of four tasks and was part of the ESWC 2017 conference. Specifically, the challenge ran with the following tasks:

- Task 1: RDF data ingestion – This task measures how well systems can ingest streams of RDF data
- Task 2: Data storage – This task measures how data stores perform with different types of queries
- Task 3: Versioning – This task measures how well versioning and archiving systems for Linked Data perform when they store multiple versions of large datasets
- Task 4: Faceted Browsing – This task checks existing solutions for how well they support applications that need browsing through large datasets

Systems participating in the challenge and their results were presented in a dedicated workshop session at ESWC 2017 (this session also included the OKE and QALD challenges of HOBBIT) and were summarized in papers. In total, two teams/systems were accepted to the challenge, on top of the baseline systems provided by the challenge organizers. The papers describing those systems can be found in D7.1.1 – First Workshop Proceedings.

2.2 OKE Challenge at ESWC 2017

The Open Knowledge Extraction (OKE) challenge consisted of four tasks and was part of the ESWC 2017 conference. Specifically, the challenge ran with the following tasks:

- Task 1: Focused Named Entity Identification and Linking
- Task 2: Broader Named Entity Identification and Linking
- Task 3: Focused Musical Named Entity Recognition and Linking
- Task 4: Knowledge Extraction

Systems participating in the challenge and their results were presented in a dedicated workshop session at ESWC 2017 (this session also included the MOCHA and QALD challenges of HOBBIT) and were summarized in papers. In total, two teams/systems were accepted to the challenge (out of the three which submitted papers), on top of the baseline systems provided by the challenge organizers. One of the two accepted teams withdrew from the challenge a few days before the ESWC 2017 conference. The papers describing the systems can be found in D7.1.1 – First Workshop Proceedings.

2.3 QALD Challenge at ESWC 2017

The Question Answering over Linked Data (QALD) challenge consisted of four tasks and was part of the ESWC 2017 conference. Specifically, the challenge ran with the following tasks:

---

5 https://project-hobbit.eu/challenges/mighty-storage-challenge/
7 https://project-hobbit.eu/challenges/qald2017/
• Task 1: Multilingual question answering over DBpedia
• Task 2: Hybrid question answering
• Task 3: Large-scale question answering over RDF
• Task 4: English question answering over Wikidata

Systems participating in the challenge and their results were presented in a dedicated workshop session at ESWC 2017 (this session also included the MOCHA and OKE challenges of HOBBIT) and were summarized in papers. In total, three teams/systems were accepted to the challenge, on top of the baseline systems provided by the challenge organizers. The papers describing the systems can be found in D7.1.1 – First Workshop Proceedings.

2.4 DEBS Grand Challenge at DEBS 2017

The ACM DEBS Grand Challenge (DEBS GC) is a popular challenge series organized by the DEBS conference. The 2017 edition of the DEBS Grand Challenge was organized in collaboration with the HOBBIT project\(^8\), where HOBBIT provided the benchmarking dataset and the platform for the challenge. The challenge focused on the task of the analysis of RDF streaming data generated by digital and analogue sensors embedded within manufacturing equipment. Specifically, the scenario focused on the detection of anomalies in the behavior of the manufacturing equipment.

Systems participating in the challenge and their results were presented in a dedicated workshop session at DEBS 2017 and were summarized in papers. In total, seven teams/systems were accepted to the challenge, on top of the baseline systems provided by the challenge organizers. The papers describing the systems can be found in D7.1.1 – First Workshop Proceedings.

2.5 HOBBIT Link Discovery Task at OAEI OM 2017 Workshop at ISWC 2017

As part of the OAEI (Ontology Alignment Evaluation Initiative) campaign at the 2017 Ontology Matching (OM) workshop which was held in conjunction with ISWC 2017, HOBBIT organized the Link Discover Task\(^9\). The Link Discovery Task consisted of two sub-tasks:

• Task 1: Linking – This task measures how well systems can match traces (GPS fixes) that have been altered using string-based approaches along with addition and deletion of intermediate points
• Task 2: Spatial – This task measures how well systems can identify DE-9IM (Dimensionally Extended nine-Intersection Model) topological relations on GPS fixes

The results of the systems participating in the Link Discovery Task were presented in the OM workshop at ISWC 2017 and were summarized in papers. In total, four teams/systems participated in the task. The papers describing the systems can be found in D7.1.1 – First Workshop Proceedings.

\(^8\)https://project-hobbit.eu/challenges/debs-grand-challenge/
\(^9\)https://project-hobbit.eu/challenges/om2017/
Table 1: Overview of the HOBBIT benchmarks and their use in the challenges.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benchmark</th>
<th>Short Description</th>
<th>Challenge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Data Acquisition(^{12})</td>
<td>Evaluate storage solutions that deal with the ingestion of streams of RDF data</td>
<td>MOCHA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge Extraction(^{13})</td>
<td>Test the performance (runtime and accuracy) of entity recognition and linking frameworks over streams of unstructured data (text)</td>
<td>OKE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Link Discovery(^{14})</td>
<td>Go beyond mere instance matching and check how well tools performs on other types of links (e.g., geospatial links) when faced with large amounts of data</td>
<td>Link Discovery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structured Learning(^{15}) Machine Learning</td>
<td>Study the performance of machine Learning techniques (i.e., performance and runtime) on streams of structured data (e.g., RDF)</td>
<td>DEBS GC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Storage(^{16})</td>
<td>Stress test storage solutions for RDF when faces with realistic scenarios such as being the backend of a social network</td>
<td>MOCHA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Versioning(^{17})</td>
<td>Check how well storage solutions deal with storing evolving data available in several versions and performing queries on and across these different versions</td>
<td>MOCHA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question Answering(^{18})</td>
<td>Evaluate the performance of data access solutions that can answer questions in natural language as well as keyword queries on large amounts of data</td>
<td>QALD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faceted Browsing(^{19})</td>
<td>Test storage solutions w.r.t. their performance as backends of data browsers</td>
<td>MOCHA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3 Evaluation based on Participation, Benchmarks and Web Statistics

To support the tasks of the five challenges outlined in Section 2, HOBBIT has created several diverse benchmarks which are summarized in Table 1. In total, eight benchmarks have been developed and all have been exploited in the challenges organized by HOBBIT.

For each challenge, participating teams were asked to submit their systems for evaluation on the HOBBIT platform\(^ {10}\) and a corresponding workshop session took place where the systems and their results were presented to the public. Table 2 provides an overview of the main statistics concerning the evaluation of the challenges\(^ {11}\). In particular, two teams participated in MOCHA, one in OKE (actually two teams were accepted in OKE, but one of them withdrew), three in QALD, seven in DEBS.

---

\(^{10}\) [http://master.project-hobbit.eu/](http://master.project-hobbit.eu/)

\(^{11}\) Baseline systems provided by the challenge organizers are not considered in Table 2.


\(^{13}\) [https://ckan.project-hobbit.eu/dataset/data-extraction-benchmark-for-unstructured-data](https://ckan.project-hobbit.eu/dataset/data-extraction-benchmark-for-unstructured-data)

\(^{14}\) [https://ckan.project-hobbit.eu/dataset/linkingbenchmark](https://ckan.project-hobbit.eu/dataset/linkingbenchmark)

\(^{15}\) [https://ckan.project-hobbit.eu/dataset/sml](https://ckan.project-hobbit.eu/dataset/sml)

\(^{16}\) [https://ckan.project-hobbit.eu/dataset/data-storage-benchmark](https://ckan.project-hobbit.eu/dataset/data-storage-benchmark)

\(^{17}\) [https://ckan.project-hobbit.eu/dataset/versioning-benchmark](https://ckan.project-hobbit.eu/dataset/versioning-benchmark)

\(^{18}\) [https://ckan.project-hobbit.eu/dataset/question-answering-benchmark](https://ckan.project-hobbit.eu/dataset/question-answering-benchmark)

\(^{19}\) [https://ckan.project-hobbit.eu/dataset/faceted-browsing-benchmark](https://ckan.project-hobbit.eu/dataset/faceted-browsing-benchmark)
Table 2: Statistics of the first series of HOBBIT challenges. N/A means that no corresponding task was part of the challenge.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Challenge</th>
<th>Participating Teams/Systems</th>
<th>Workshop Attendees</th>
<th>Workshop Venue &amp; Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Task 1</td>
<td>Task 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOCHA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OKE</td>
<td>1 (2)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QALD</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEBS GC</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Link Discovery</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

GC and four in the HOBBIT Link Discovery Task. The distribution of the participating systems to the tasks of each challenge can be found in Table 2. For the MOCHA, OKE and QALD challenges a common workshop session was organized at ESWC 2017 that was attended by 25 people. For DEBS GC a workshop session was organized at DEBS 2017, attracting around 90 participants, while the HOBBIT Link Discovery Task was part of the OM workshop at ISWC 2017 that attracted around 25 participants. For MOCHA, OKE and QALD the number of participants was less than the number of offered tasks and, naturally, some tasks had no participants. This is something that has been noted by the consortium and efforts will be made in attracting more participants in the future editions of the challenges (see Section 4.1 for some of our ideas on how to increase participation).

Figure 1: Unique visitors of MOCHA challenge website from December 2016 to December 2017.

Two teams/systems were accepted to the OKE challenge, but one withdrew a few days before the ESWC 2017 conference.
To further evaluate the challenges, in Figures 1-5 we report the number of visitors to the challenges’ websites. A look at the statistics indicates a high interest to the challenges that picked the first months after the challenges were announced. Even after the end of each challenge\(^{21}\) there was significant traffic on the corresponding websites indicating the community’s interest in the HOBBIT challenges.

Figure 2: Unique visitors of OKE challenge website from December 2016 to December 2017.

Figure 3: Unique visitors of QALD challenge website from December 2016 to December 2017.

\(^{21}\)The end date of each challenge corresponds to the workshop session date reported in Table 2.
4 Evaluation based on Questionnaires

To perform a deeper assessment of the challenges, we created and distributed questionnaires to the challenge participants (i.e. the teams that submitted systems to each challenge) and the workshop attendees (i.e. the people that attended the workshop session organized at the respective conference
venue). The questionnaires aim, among others, to assess the challenges’ tasks, the system and paper submission process, the quality of the support to the participants, the HOBBIT platform and the workshop sessions content. The questionnaires can be found in appendices A-H.

4.1 Challenge Participants Evaluation

The questionnaires distributed to the teams participating in the first series of the HOBBIT challenges included questions targeting several aspects of the challenges organization, such as the individual tasks (e.g. data quality, guidelines, evaluation), the paper and system submission process (e.g. submission instructions, realistic deadlines, support and Q&A), the challenge website and the HOBBIT platform. Additionally, more general questions were included to capture the overall impression of the participants (e.g. choice of venue, interest in participating in future editions of the challenge). A single questionnaire was filled by each team participating in a particular challenge.

Figures 6-20 present the evaluation results for the MOCHA challenge, Figures 21-35 for OKE, Figures 36-49 for QALD, Figures 50-61 for DEBS Grand Challenge and Figures 62-74 for HOBBIT Link Discovery Task. Note that in all bar charts the y axis corresponds to number of participants. For those bar charts where the x axis is labeled in the range 1 to 5, 1 corresponds to the most negative and 5 to the most positive level.

Figures 6, 7, 21, 22, 36, 37, 50, 62, 63 illustrate how the challenge participants were made aware of the challenges and the tasks they decided to tackle. Based on the answers to our questionnaires, in general, the participants are satisfied with the challenges. For most questions we received positive feedback, with the average rating falling in the range Fair-Good, or 3-4 out of 5, depending on the chart. Specifically, participants found it relatively easy to understand the challenges’ tasks (Figures 8, 23, 38, 51, 64), found the websites’ content useful (Figures 13, 28, 43, 56, 69), were happy with the paper submission process (Figures 16, 31, 46, 59), approved of our conference choices to host the challenges (Figures 9, 24, 39, 52, 65) and had a positive overall impression about the challenges (Figures 12, 27, 42, 55, 68). A strong indication of their satisfaction is the fact that they are willing to contest future editions of the challenges (Figures 10, 25, 40, 53, 66), as well as to recommend the challenges to their colleagues (Figures 11, 26, 41, 54, 67).

However, there were some difficulties with the system submission process that mainly concerned the use of the HOBBIT platform and its documentation, which was not deemed adequate (Figures 14, 15, 17, 29, 30, 32, 44, 45, 47, 57, 58, 60, 70, 71, 72). To alleviate these problems we will improve the platform documentation and simplify the procedures and technologies needed to integrate and execute a system on the platform. Moreover, the instructions provided on the challenges’ websites on how to submit and test the systems will be improved and leaderboards will be implemented allowing participants to preview their systems’ performance. Finally, to increase the number of participants (which currently averages to 3.5 teams per challenge), we plan to invite more people through personal contact to participate in the challenges and also start the dissemination of the CFPs earlier - something which has already been addressed as we have already announced the launch of four open challenges which function as the prodromal phase of the main challenges which will be hosted in prestigious events for 2018. Furthermore, we plan to incorporate in the challenges’ websites a simple subscription mechanism, where anyone who is interested in the challenge can provide his/her email address and receive material related to the challenge.

https://project-hobbit.eu/open-challenges/
4.2 Workshop Attendees Evaluation

The questionnaires distributed to the attendees of the workshop sessions of the challenges focused on various aspects such as the evaluation of the content and structure of the workshop, the choice of venue and the intention to participate in a future edition of the challenge.

Figures 75-82 illustrate the evaluation results for the workshop session that was organized at ESWC 2017 where the results of MOCHA, OKE and QALD were presented. Figures 83-89 refer to the workshop session of the DEBS Grand Challenge and Figures 90-95 to the OM workshop session at ISWC 2017 which included the HOBBIT Link Discovery Task. Note that in all bar charts the y axis corresponds to number of participants. For those bar charts where the x axis is labeled in the range 1 to 5, 1 corresponds to the most negative and 5 to the most positive level.

Overall, the attendees were satisfied with the workshop sessions and the majority were positively disposed towards participating in one of the next incarnations of the challenge (Figures 81, 88, 92). In particular, the structure and the content of the workshop sessions was considered to be satisfactory (Figures 76, 78, 82, 84, 86, 89, 95) and attendees found the sessions to be interesting and relevant for them (Figures 77, 85, 91, 93, 94) and approved of our conference choices to host the challenges (Figures 80, 87). Finally, Figures 75, 83, 90 illustrate how the attendees learned about the challenges.

Figure 6: MOCHA participants answers to question 1 of the evaluation survey.

Figure 7: MOCHA participants answers to question 2 of the evaluation survey.
Figure 8: MOCHA participants answers to question 3 of the evaluation survey.

Figure 9: MOCHA participants answers to question 4 of the evaluation survey.

Figure 10: MOCHA participants answers to question 5 of the evaluation survey.
Would you recommend the MOCHA challenge to your colleagues?

Figure 11: MOCHA participants answers to question 6 of the evaluation survey.

What is your overall impression of the MOCHA challenge?

Figure 12: MOCHA participants answers to question 7 of the evaluation survey.

Was the material provided on the MOCHA challenge website helpful?

Figure 13: MOCHA participants answers to question 8 of the evaluation survey.
Figure 14: MOCHA participants answers to question 9 of the evaluation survey.

Figure 15: MOCHA participants answers to question 10 of the evaluation survey.
Figure 16: MOCHA participants answers to question 11 of the evaluation survey.
Figure 17: MOCHA participants answers to question 12 of the evaluation survey.
Figure 18: MOCHA participants answers to question 13 of the evaluation survey.
Figure 19: MOCHA participants answers to question 14 of the evaluation survey.
Figure 20: MOCHA participants answers to question 16 of the evaluation survey.
Figure 21: OKE participants answers to question 1 of the evaluation survey.

Figure 22: OKE participants answers to question 2 of the evaluation survey.

Figure 23: OKE participants answers to question 3 of the evaluation survey.
Figure 24: OKE participants answers to question 4 of the evaluation survey.

Figure 25: OKE participants answers to question 5 of the evaluation survey.

Figure 26: OKE participants answers to question 6 of the evaluation survey.
Figure 27: OKE participants answers to question 7 of the evaluation survey.

Figure 28: OKE participants answers to question 8 of the evaluation survey.

Figure 29: OKE participants answers to question 9 of the evaluation survey.
Figure 30: OKE participants answers to question 10 of the evaluation survey.
Figure 31: OKE participants answers to question 11 of the evaluation survey.
Figure 32: OKE participants answers to question 12 of the evaluation survey.
Figure 33: OKE participants answers to question 13 of the evaluation survey.
Figure 34: OKE participants answers to question 14 of the evaluation survey.
Figure 35: OKE participants answers to question 15 of the evaluation survey.
Figure 36: QALD participants answers to question 1 of the evaluation survey.

Figure 37: QALD participants answers to question 2 of the evaluation survey.

Figure 38: QALD participants answers to question 3 of the evaluation survey.
Figure 39: QALD participants answers to question 4 of the evaluation survey.

Figure 40: QALD participants answers to question 5 of the evaluation survey.

Figure 41: QALD participants answers to question 6 of the evaluation survey.
Figure 42: QALD participants answers to question 7 of the evaluation survey.

Figure 43: QALD participants answers to question 8 of the evaluation survey.

Figure 44: QALD participants answers to question 9 of the evaluation survey.
Figure 45: QALD participants answers to question 10 of the evaluation survey.

**Was the documentation for using the HOBBIT platform sufficient?**

![Bar chart showing responses](chart.png)
Figure 46: QALD participants answers to question 11 of the evaluation survey.
Figure 47: QALD participants answers to question 12 of the evaluation survey.
Figure 48: QALD participants answers to question 13 of the evaluation survey.
Figure 49: QALD participants answers to question 16 of the evaluation survey.
Figure 50: DEBS Grand Challenge participants answers to question 1 of the evaluation survey.

Figure 51: DEBS Grand Challenge participants answers to question 2 of the evaluation survey.

Figure 52: DEBS Grand Challenge participants answers to question 3 of the evaluation survey.
Figure 53: DEBS Grand Challenge participants answers to question 4 of the evaluation survey.

Would you participate in a future edition of the DEBS Grand Challenge co-organized by the HOBBIT project?

Figure 54: DEBS Grand Challenge participants answers to question 5 of the evaluation survey.

Would you recommend the DEBS Grand Challenge to your colleagues?

Figure 55: DEBS Grand Challenge participants answers to question 6 of the evaluation survey.

What is your overall impression of the DEBS Grand Challenge?
Figure 56: DEBS Grand Challenge participants answers to question 7 of the evaluation survey.

Figure 57: DEBS Grand Challenge participants answers to question 8 of the evaluation survey.

Figure 58: DEBS Grand Challenge participants answers to question 9 of the evaluation survey.
Figure 59: DEBS Grand Challenge participants answers to question 10 of the evaluation survey.
Figure 60: DEBS Grand Challenge participants answers to question 11 of the evaluation survey.
Figure 61: DEBS Grand Challenge participants answers to question 12 of the evaluation survey.
Figure 62: HOBBIT Link Discovery Task participants answers to question 1 of the evaluation survey.

Figure 63: HOBBIT Link Discovery Task participants answers to question 2 of the evaluation survey.

Figure 64: HOBBIT Link Discovery Task participants answers to question 3 of the evaluation survey.
Figure 65: HOBBIT Link Discovery Task participants answers to question 4 of the evaluation survey.

Figure 66: HOBBIT Link Discovery Task participants answers to question 5 of the evaluation survey.

Figure 67: HOBBIT Link Discovery Task participants answers to question 6 of the evaluation survey.
What is your overall impression of the "HOBBIT Link Discovery" task?

Figure 68: HOBBIT Link Discovery Task participants answers to question 7 of the evaluation survey.

Was the material provided on the "HOBBIT Link Discovery" task website helpful?

Figure 69: HOBBIT Link Discovery Task participants answers to question 8 of the evaluation survey.

How would you rate your experience with the HOBBIT platform?

Figure 70: HOBBIT Link Discovery Task participants answers to question 9 of the evaluation survey.
Figure 71: HOBBIT Link Discovery Task participants answers to question 10 of the evaluation survey.
Figure 72: HOBBIT Link Discovery Task participants answers to question 11 of the evaluation survey.
Figure 73: HOBBIT Link Discovery Task participants answers to question 12 of the evaluation survey.
Figure 74: HOBBIT Link Discovery Task participants answers to question 13 of the evaluation survey.
Figure 75: Answers of the ESWC 2017 challenges’ workshop attendees to questions 1, 2, and 3 of the evaluation survey.

Figure 76: Answers of the ESWC 2017 challenges’ workshop attendees to question 4 of the evaluation survey.
How relevant and helpful do you think the workshop was for you?

Figure 77: Answers of the ESWC 2017 challenges’ workshop attendees to question 5 of the evaluation survey.

How satisfied are you with the workshop content?

Figure 78: Answers of the ESWC 2017 challenges’ workshop attendees to question 6 of the evaluation survey.

Do you find it useful that the challenges' systems will also be presented as posters during the Posters and Demos session?

Figure 79: Answers of the ESWC 2017 challenges’ workshop attendees to question 7 of the evaluation survey.
Figure 80: Answers of the ESWC 2017 challenges’ workshop attendees to question 8 of the evaluation survey.

Figure 81: Answers of the ESWC 2017 challenges’ workshop attendees to question 9 of the evaluation survey.
Figure 82: Answers of the ESWC 2017 challenges’ workshop attendees to question 10 of the evaluation survey.
Figure 83: Answers of the DEBS Grand Challenge workshop attendees to question 1 of the evaluation survey.

Figure 84: Answers of the DEBS Grand Challenge workshop attendees to question 2 of the evaluation survey.

Figure 85: Answers of the DEBS Grand Challenge workshop attendees to question 3 of the evaluation survey.
Figure 86: Answers of the DEBS Grand Challenge workshop attendees to question 4 of the evaluation survey.

Figure 87: Answers of the DEBS Grand Challenge workshop attendees to question 5 of the evaluation survey.

Figure 88: Answers of the DEBS Grand Challenge workshop attendees to question 6 of the evaluation survey.
Figure 89: Answers of the DEBS Grand Challenge workshop attendees to question 7 of the evaluation survey.

Figure 90: Answers of the OAEI OM 2017 workshop attendees wrt HOBBIT Link Discovery Task. Answers to question 1 of the evaluation survey.

Figure 91: Answers of the OAEI OM 2017 workshop attendees wrt HOBBIT Link Discovery Task. Answers to question 2 of the evaluation survey.
Figure 92: Answers of the OAEI OM 2017 workshop attendees wrt HOBBIT Link Discovery Task. Answers to question 3 of the evaluation survey.

Figure 93: Answers of the OAEI OM 2017 workshop attendees wrt HOBBIT Link Discovery Task. Answers to question 4 of the evaluation survey.

Figure 94: Answers of the OAEI OM 2017 workshop attendees wrt HOBBIT Link Discovery Task. Answers to question 5 of the evaluation survey.
5 Conclusions

The HOBBIT project successfully organized its first series of evaluation campaigns which consisted of five challenges. The MOCHA, OKE and QALD challenges were organized in conjunction with the ESWC 2017 conference. Also, HOBBIT was responsible for the 2017 DEBS Grand Challenge that annually runs as part of the DEBS conference, as well as the Link Discovery Task at the 2017 OAEI campaign which was held under the Ontology Matching workshop at the ISWC 2017 conference.

Participating systems were tested using the eight benchmarks developed by HOBBIT (Table 1) and their evaluation was conducted on top of the HOBBIT platform. The challenges’ results were presented to the public in dedicated workshop sessions that attracted several attendees (Table 2). The questionnaires handed to the participating teams and the workshop attendees (Section 4) demonstrated the success of our first series of challenges, as we received positive ratings for most of the questions, and provided useful feedback on shortcomings that should be improved for the next HOBBIT challenges.

In particular, we identified that challenge participants were facing difficulties in integrating their systems into the HOBBIT platform. In the second version of the HOBBIT platform (that is currently under development) we will simplify the procedures and technologies needed to integrate and execute a system on the platform. We will also improve the platform’s documentation and corresponding instructions provided on challenges’ websites on how to submit and test systems. The number of challenge participants averaged to 3.5 teams per challenge (Table 2), which is something we want to improve upon. Towards this, we planned to start the dissemination of the 2018 challenges’ CFPs earlier. Actually, this is something that has already begun, as we have announced the launch of four open challenges[23] – MOCHA, OKE, SQA (Scalable Question Answering), an offspring of QALD, and StreaML that is based on the 2017 DEBS Grand Challenge data – which function as the prodromal phase of the MOCHA, OKE and SQA challenges that will be part of ESWC 2018 and the 2018 DEBS Grand Challenge that will be organized by HOBBIT. Finally, we plan to incorporate in the challenges’ websites a simple subscription mechanism, where anyone who is interested in the challenge can provide his/her email address and receive material related to the challenge, and implement leaderboards allowing participants to preview their systems’ performance (these have already been done for the open

---

[23] https://project-hobbit.eu/open-challenges/
challenges.

Note that on top of the challenges mentioned above, HOBBIT will also contribute the Link Discovery task in OAEI 2017.5 challenge which will run at ESWC 2018 and plans to run the Link Discovery task as part of the 2018 OAEI campaign at ISWC 2018.
Appendix A  MOCHA Challenge Participants Questionnaire
MOCHA Challenge Participants Evaluation Form

Under the umbrella of the HOBBIT project, three benchmarking challenges are organized at ESWC 2017
- QALD-7 - Question Answering over Linked Data Challenge
- MOCHA - Mighty Storage Challenge
- OKE - Open Knowledge Extraction Challenge

This short survey aims at assessing the quality of the MOCHA challenge organization from the participants viewpoint. More information about HOBBIT can be found here: https://project-hobbit.eu/
The survey can also be completed online here: https://goo.gl/forms/L93qjpcxiMhfteXV2

*Required

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. How did you hear about MOCHA challenge? *</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mark only one oval.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Website</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Twitter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Mailing List</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Personal Contact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Other:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2. To which tasks of the MOCHA challenge have you participated in? *</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tick all that apply.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Task 1: RDF Data Ingestion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Task 2: Data Storage Benchmark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Task 3: Versioning RDF Data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Task 4: Faceted Browsing Benchmark</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall Impression

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3. How easy was it to understand the MOCHA challenge tasks overall? *</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mark only one oval.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1  2  3  4  5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very difficult</th>
<th>Very easy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4. Do you find it fitting that the MOCHA challenge was organized at ESWC 2017? *</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mark only one oval.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1  2  3  4  5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not very</th>
<th>Very much</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. Would you participate in a future edition of the MOCHA challenge? *
Mark only one oval.
☐ Yes
☐ Maybe
☐ No

6. Would you recommend the MOCHA challenge to your colleagues? *
Mark only one oval.
☐ Yes
☐ Maybe
☐ No

7. What is your overall impression of the MOCHA challenge? *
Mark only one oval.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very bad</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very good</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Challenge Organization**

8. Was the material provided on the MOCHA challenge website helpful? *
With regards to paper and system preparation-submission, tasks descriptions, etc.
Mark only one oval.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not helpful at all</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very helpful</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. How would you rate your experience with the HOBBIT platform? *
Was the platform easy to understand and use?
Mark only one oval.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very bad</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very good</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. Was the documentation for using the HOBBIT platform sufficient? *
Mark only one oval.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Completely insufficient</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very sufficient</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11. Evaluate the paper submission process according to the following: *
Mark only one oval per row.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quality of submission instructions</th>
<th>Very bad</th>
<th>Bad</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Very good</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Realistic schedule - deadlines</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of the EasyChair system</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of reviewers' comments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support - Q&amp;A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
12. Evaluate the system submission process according to the following:
Mark only one oval per row.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quality of submission instructions</th>
<th>Very bad</th>
<th>Bad</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Very good</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Realistic schedule - deadlines</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of the HOBBIT platform</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System preparation and uploading</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support - Q&amp;A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Task 1: RDF Data Ingestion

Please answer the following questions only if you participated in Task 1

13. Evaluate Task 1 according to the following:
Mark only one oval per row.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task description</th>
<th>Very bad</th>
<th>Bad</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Very good</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Guidelines</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data format</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data quality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheduling (e.g. release of training and test data, notifications, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation methods</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall impression</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Task 2: Data Storage Benchmark

Please answer the following questions only if you participated in Task 2

14. Evaluate Task 2 according to the following:
Mark only one oval per row.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task description</th>
<th>Very bad</th>
<th>Bad</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Very good</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Guidelines</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data format</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data quality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheduling (e.g. release of training and test data, notifications, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation methods</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall impression</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Task 3: Versioning RDF Data

Please answer the following questions only if you participated in Task 3
15. **Evaluate Task 3 according to the following:**

Mark only one oval per row.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very bad</th>
<th>Bad</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Very good</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Task description</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guidelines</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data format</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data quality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheduling (e.g. release of training and test data, notifications, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation methods</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall impression</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Task 4: Faceted Browsing Benchmark**

Please answer the following questions only if you participated in Task 4

16. **Evaluate Task 4 according to the following:**

Mark only one oval per row.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very bad</th>
<th>Bad</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Very good</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Task description</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guidelines</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data format</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data quality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheduling (e.g. release of training and test data, notifications, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation methods</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall impression</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

17. **Name (optional)**

__________________________

18. **Email (optional)**

__________________________
Appendix B  OKE Challenge Participants Questionnaire
OKE Challenge Participants Evaluation Form

Under the umbrella of the HOBBIT project, three benchmarking challenges are organized at ESWC 2017
- QALD-7 - Question Answering over Linked Data Challenge
- MOCHA - Mighty Storage Challenge
- OKE - Open Knowledge Extraction Challenge

This short survey aims at assessing the quality of the OKE challenge organization from the participants viewpoint. More information about HOBBIT can be found here: https://project-hobbit.eu/
The survey can also be completed online here: https://forms.gle/b4jTSqNhSW6O923

*Required

1. How did you hear about OKE challenge? *
   Mark only one oval.
   - Website
   - Twitter
   - Mailing List
   - Personal Contact
   - Other:

2. To which tasks of the OKE challenge have you participated in? *
   Tick all that apply.
   - Task 1: Focused NE Identification and Linking
   - Task 2: Broader NE Identification and Linking
   - Task 3: Focused Musical NE Recognition and Linking
   - Task 4: Knowledge Extraction

Overall Impression

3. How easy was it to understand the OKE challenge tasks overall? *
   Mark only one oval.
   
   1 2 3 4 5
   Very difficult  Very easy

4. Do you find it fitting that the OKE challenge was organized at ESWC 2017? *
   Mark only one oval.
   
   1 2 3 4 5
   Not very  Very much
5. Would you participate in a future edition of the OKE challenge? *
Mark only one oval.
- Yes
- Maybe
- No

6. Would you recommend the OKE challenge to your colleagues? *
Mark only one oval.
- Yes
- Maybe
- No

7. What is your overall impression of the OKE challenge? *
Mark only one oval.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very bad</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Challenge Organization

8. Was the material provided on the OKE challenge website helpful? *
With regards to paper and system preparation-submission, tasks descriptions, etc.
Mark only one oval.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not helpful at all</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. How would you rate your experience with the HOBBIT platform? *
Was the platform easy to understand and use?
Mark only one oval.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very bad</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. Was the documentation for using the HOBBIT platform sufficient? *
Mark only one oval.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Completely insufficient</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11. Evaluate the paper submission process according to the following: *
Mark only one oval per row.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quality of submission instructions</th>
<th>Very bad</th>
<th>Bad</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Very good</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Realistic schedule - deadlines</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of the EasyChair system</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of reviewers’ comments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support - Q&amp;A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
12. Evaluate the system submission process according to the following:

Mark only one oval per row.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quality of submission instructions</th>
<th>Very bad</th>
<th>Bad</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Very good</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Realistic schedule - deadlines</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of the HOBBIT platform</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System preparation and uploading</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support - Q&amp;A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Task 1: Focused NE Identification and Linking

Please answer the following questions only if you participated in Task 1

13. Evaluate Task 1 according to the following:

Mark only one oval per row.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task description</th>
<th>Very bad</th>
<th>Bad</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Very good</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Guidelines</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data format</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data quality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheduling (e.g. release of training and test data, notifications, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation methods</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall impression</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Task 2: Broader NE Identification and Linking

Please answer the following questions only if you participated in Task 2

14. Evaluate Task 2 according to the following:

Mark only one oval per row.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task description</th>
<th>Very bad</th>
<th>Bad</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Very good</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Guidelines</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data format</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data quality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheduling (e.g. release of training and test data, notifications, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation methods</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall impression</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Task 3: Focused Musical NE Recognition and Linking

Please answer the following questions only if you participated in Task 3
15. Evaluate Task 3 according to the following:
Mark only one oval per row.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very bad</th>
<th>Bad</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Very good</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Task description</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guidelines</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data format</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data quality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheduling (e.g. release of training and test data, notifications, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation methods</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall impression</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Task 4: Knowledge Extraction**

Please answer the following questions only if you participated in Task 4

16. Evaluate Task 4 according to the following:
Mark only one oval per row.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very bad</th>
<th>Bad</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Very good</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Task description</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guidelines</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data format</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data quality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheduling (e.g. release of training and test data, notifications, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation methods</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall impression</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

17. Name (optional)

________________________

18. Email (optional)

________________________
Appendix C  QALD Challenge Participants Questionnaire
QALD-7 Challenge Participants Evaluation Form

Under the umbrella of the HOBBIT project, three benchmarking challenges are organized at ESWC 2017
- QALD-7 - Question Answering over Linked Data Challenge
- MOCHA - Mighty Storage Challenge
- OKE - Open Knowledge Extraction Challenge

This short survey aims at assessing the quality of the QALD-7 challenge organization from the participants viewpoint. More information about HOBBIT can be found here: https://project-hobbit.eu/
The survey can also be completed online here: https://igoo.nl/forms/qbchpDTRK17bCwNm2

*Required

1. How did you hear about QALD-7 challenge? *
   
   Mark only one oval.
   
   [ ] Website
   [ ] Twitter
   [ ] Mailing List
   [ ] Personal Contact
   [ ] Other:

2. To which tasks of the QALD-7 challenge have you participated in? *

   Tick all that apply:
   
   [ ] Task 1: Multilingual question answering over DBpedia
   [ ] Task 2: Hybrid question answering
   [ ] Task 3: Large-scale Question answering over RDF
   [ ] Task 4: English question answering over Wikidata

Overall Impression

3. How easy was it to understand the QALD-7 challenge tasks overall? *

   Mark only one oval.
   
   1 2 3 4 5

   Very difficult [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] Very easy

4. Do you find it fitting that the QALD-7 challenge was organized at ESWC 2017? *

   Mark only one oval.
   
   1 2 3 4 5

   Not very [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] Very much
5. Would you participate in a future edition of the QALD challenge? *
   Mark only one oval.
   - Yes
   - Maybe
   - No

6. Would you recommend the QALD challenge to your colleagues? *
   Mark only one oval.
   - Yes
   - Maybe
   - No

7. What is your overall impression of the QALD-7 challenge? *
   Mark only one oval.
   
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very bad</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Challenge Organization

8. Was the material provided on the QALD-7 challenge website helpful? *
   With regards to paper and system preparation-submission, tasks descriptions, etc.
   Mark only one oval.
   
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not helpful at all</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very helpful</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. How would you rate your experience with the HOBBIT platform? *
   Was the platform easy to understand and use?
   Mark only one oval.
   
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very bad</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very good</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. Was the documentation for using the HOBBIT platform sufficient? *
    Mark only one oval.
    
    | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
    |---|---|---|---|---|
    | Completely insufficient | | | | |
    | Very sufficient |

11. Evaluate the paper submission process according to the following: *
    Mark only one oval per row.
    
    | Quality of submission instructions | Very bad | Bad | Fair | Good | Very good |
    |-----------------------------------|----------|-----|------|------|-----------|
    | Realistic schedule - deadlines    |          |     |      |      |           |
    | Use of the EasyChair system       |          |     |      |      |           |
    | Quality of reviewers' comments    |          |     |      |      |           |
    | Support - Q&A                      |          |     |      |      |           |
12. Evaluate the system submission process according to the following:
Mark only one oval per row.

- Quality of submission instructions
- Realistic schedule - deadlines
- Use of the HOBBIT platform
- System preparation and uploading
- Support - Q&A

Task 1: Multilingual question answering over DBpedia

Please answer the following questions only if you participated in Task 1

13. Evaluate Task 1 according to the following:
Mark only one oval per row.

- Task description
- Guidelines
- Data format
- Data quality
- Scheduling (e.g. release of training and test data, notifications, etc.)
- Evaluation methods
- Technical support
- Overall impression

Task 2: Hybrid question answering

Please answer the following questions only if you participated in Task 2

14. Evaluate Task 2 according to the following:
Mark only one oval per row.

- Task description
- Guidelines
- Data format
- Data quality
- Scheduling (e.g. release of training and test data, notifications, etc.)
- Evaluation methods
- Technical support
- Overall impression

Task 3: Large-Scale Question answering over RDF

Please answer the following questions only if you participated in Task 3
15. Evaluate Task 3 according to the following:
Mark only one oval per row.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task description</th>
<th>Very bad</th>
<th>Bad</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Very good</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Guidelines</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data format</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data quality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheduling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation methods</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall impression</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Task 4: English question answering over Wikidata

Please answer the following questions only if you participated in Task 4

16. Evaluate Task 4 according to the following:
Mark only one oval per row.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task description</th>
<th>Very bad</th>
<th>Bad</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Very good</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Guidelines</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data format</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data quality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheduling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation methods</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall impression</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

17. Name (optional)


18. Email (optional)


Powered by Google Forms
Appendix D  DEBS Grand Challenge Participants Questionnaire
DEBS Grand Challenge Participants Evaluation Form

2017 DEBS Grand Challenge is co-organized by the HOBBIT (https://project-hobbit.eu/) project represented by AGT International (http://www.agtinternational.com/). This short survey aims at assessing the quality of the DEBS Grand Challenge organization from the participants viewpoint. More information about HOBBIT can be found here: https://project-hobbit.eu/
The survey can also be completed online here: https://docs.google.com/forms/d/e/1FAIpQLSc40cNhRRh5cD6UHA3aQz5nS9JFTAA73mXWCQESyoUnMw/viewform?usp=sf_link

*Required

1. How did you hear about DEBS Grand Challenge? *
   Mark only one oval.
   - Website
   - Twitter
   - Mailing List
   - Personal Contact
   - Other: ____________________________

Overall Impression

2. How easy was it to understand the DEBS Grand Challenge scenarios overall? *
   Mark only one oval.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very difficult</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very easy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Do you find it fitting that the DEBS Grand Challenge 2017 was co-organized by the HOBBIT project? *
   Mark only one oval.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not very</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very much</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. Would you participate in a future edition of the DEBS Grand Challenge co-organized by the HOBBIT project? *

Mark only one oval.

☐ Yes
☐ Maybe
☐ No

5. Would you recommend the DEBS Grand Challenge to your colleagues? *

Mark only one oval.

☐ Yes
☐ Maybe
☐ No

6. What is your overall impression of the DEBS Grand Challenge? *

Mark only one oval.

1 2 3 4 5

Very bad ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ Very good

Challenge Organization

7. Was the material provided on the DEBS Grand Challenge website helpful? *

With regards to paper and system preparation-submission, scenarios descriptions, etc.

Mark only one oval.

1 2 3 4 5

Not helpful at all ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ Very helpful

8. How would you rate your experience with the HOBBIT platform? *

Was the platform easy to understand and use?

Mark only one oval.

1 2 3 4 5

Very bad ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ Very good

9. Was the documentation for using the HOBBIT platform sufficient? *

Mark only one oval.

1 2 3 4 5

Completely insufficient ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ Very sufficient
10. Evaluate the paper submission process according to the following: *
Mark only one oval per row.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very bad</th>
<th>Bad</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Very good</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quality of submission instructions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Realistic schedule - deadlines</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of the EasyChair system</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of reviewers' comments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support - Q&amp;A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11. Evaluate the system submission process according to the following: *
Mark only one oval per row.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very bad</th>
<th>Bad</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Very good</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quality of submission instructions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Realistic schedule - deadlines</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of the HOBBIT platform</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System preparation and uploading</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support - Q&amp;A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12. Evaluate DEBS Grand Challenge task according to the following:
Mark only one oval per row.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very bad</th>
<th>Bad</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Very good</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Task description</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guidelines</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data format</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data quality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheduling (e.g. release of training and test data, notifications, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation methods</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall impression</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13. Name (optional)

14. Email (optional)
Appendix E  HOBBIT Link Discovery Task Participants Questionnaire
"Link Discovery Benchmark for Spatial Data" (HOBBIT) -Participants Evaluation Form

This short survey aims at assessing the quality of the "Link Discovery Benchmark for Spatial Data" from the participants viewpoint. More information about HOBBIT "Link Discovery Benchmark for Spatial Data" can be found here: https://project-hobbit.eu/challenges/om2017/
The survey can also be completed online here: https://goo.gl/forms/n3jmB1hqki1fpP3A2

*Required

1. How did you hear about the HOBBIT Link Discovery Task at OM 2017? *
   Mark only one oval.
   - Website
   - Twitter
   - Mailing List
   - Personal Contact
   - Other: ____________________________

2. Which benchmarks of the "HOBBIT Link Discovery" did you use? *
   Tick all that apply.
   - Task 1: Linking
   - Task 2: Spatial

Overall Impression

3. How easy was it to understand the "HOBBIT Link Discovery" tasks overall? *
   Mark only one oval.
   1 2 3 4 5
   Very difficult ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ Very easy

4. Do you find it fitting that the "HOBBIT Link Discovery" task was one of the tasks at OM 2017? *
   Mark only one oval.
   1 2 3 4 5
   Not very ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ Very much
5. Would you participate in a future edition of the "HOBBIT Link Discovery" task? *
Mark only one oval.

☐ Yes
☐ Maybe
☐ No

6. Would you recommend the "HOBBIT Link Discovery" task to your colleagues? *
Mark only one oval.

☐ Yes
☐ Maybe
☐ No

7. What is your overall impression of the "HOBBIT Link Discovery" task? *
Mark only one oval.

1 2 3 4 5

Very bad ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ Very good

Task organization

8. Was the material provided on the "HOBBIT Link Discovery" task website (https://project-hobbit.eu/challenges/om2017) helpful? *
With regards to paper and system preparation-submission, tasks descriptions, etc.
Mark only one oval.

1 2 3 4 5

Not helpful at all ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ Very helpful

9. How would you rate your experience with the HOBBIT platform? *
Was the platform easy to understand and use?
Mark only one oval.

1 2 3 4 5

Very bad ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ Very good

10. Was the documentation for using the HOBBIT platform sufficient? *
Mark only one oval.

1 2 3 4 5

Completely insufficient ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ Very sufficient
11. Evaluate the system submission process according to the following: *
Mark only one oval per row.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quality of submission instructions</th>
<th>Very bad</th>
<th>Bad</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Very good</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Realistic schedule - deadlines</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of the HOBBIT platform</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System preparation and uploading</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support - Q&amp;A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Task 1: Linking**

Please answer the following questions only if you participated in Task 1

12. Evaluate Task 1 according to the following:
Mark only one oval per row.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task description</th>
<th>Very bad</th>
<th>Bad</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Very good</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Guidelines</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data format</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data quality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheduling (e.g. release of training and test data, notifications, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation methods</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall impression</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Task 2: Spatial**

Please answer the following questions only if you participated in Task 2

13. Evaluate Task 2 according to the following:
Mark only one oval per row.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task description</th>
<th>Very bad</th>
<th>Bad</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Very good</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Guidelines</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data format</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data quality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheduling (e.g. release of training and test data, notifications, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation methods</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall impression</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

14. System Name (optional)

15. Name (optional)
16. Email (optional)
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Appendix F  ESWC 2017 Challenges’ Workshop Attendees Questionnaire
HOBBIT Challenges Workshop Assessment

Under the umbrella of the HOBBIT project, three benchmarking challenges are organized at ESWC 2017

QALD-7 - Question Answering over Linked Data Challenge
MOCHA - Mighty Storage Challenge
OKE - Open Knowledge Extraction Challenge

This short survey aims at assessing the HOBBIT workshop session at ESWC 2017, both as a whole and with regard to each of the three challenges. More information about HOBBIT can be found here: https://project-hobbit.eu/
The survey can also be completed online here: https://goo.gl/forms/HQW36obSEGRO49402

*Required

1. How did you hear about QALD-7 challenge? *
Mark only one oval.

- Website
- Twitter
- Mailing List
- Personal Contact
- Other:

2. How did you hear about MOCHA challenge? *
Mark only one oval.

- Website
- Twitter
- Mailing List
- Personal Contact
- Other:

3. How did you hear about OKE challenge? *
Mark only one oval.

- Website
- Twitter
- Mailing List
- Personal Contact
- Other:

4. How satisfied are you with the way the workshop session was structured? *
Mark only one oval.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not very</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very much</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. How relevant and helpful do you think the workshop was for you? *
Mark only one oval.

1 2 3 4 5

Not very Not very Not very Not very Very much

6. How satisfied are you with the workshop content? *
Both challenge overviews and system presentations
Mark only one oval.

1 2 3 4 5

Not very Not very Not very Not very Very much

7. Do you find it useful that the challenges’ systems will also be presented as posters during the Posters and Demos session? *
Mark only one oval.

1 2 3 4 5

Not very Not very Not very Not very Very much

8. Do you find it fitting that the workshop was co-organized with ESWC 2017? *
Mark only one oval.

1 2 3 4 5

Not very Not very Not very Not very Very much

9. Would you be interested in participating with your own system in a future edition of the challenges? *
Mark only one oval per row.

No Maybe Yes

QALD-7 Challenge   
MOCHA Challenge   
OKE Challenge   

10. Please evaluate the following parts of the workshop *
Mark only one oval per row.

Very Bad Bad OK Good Very Good

QALD-7 Challenge Overview
MOCHA Challenge Overview
QALD-7 System Presentations
MOCHA System Presentations
OKE Challenge Overview
OKE System Presentations

11. Name (optional)


12. Email (optional)


Appendix G  DEBS Grand Challenge Workshop Attendees Questionnaire
DEBS Grand Challenge Attendants Assessment Form

2017 DEBS Grand Challenge is co-organized by the HOBBIT (https://project-hobbit.eu/) project represented by AGT International (http://www.agtinternational.com/).

This short survey aims at assessing the DEBS Grand Challenge session at DEBS 2017 as a whole. More information about HOBBIT can be found here: https://project-hobbit.eu/
The survey can also be completed online here: https://goo.gl/forms/HQW36obSEGRO49402

*Required

1. How did you hear about DEBS Grand challenge? *
   Mark only one oval.
   - Website
   - Twitter
   - Mailing List
   - Personal Contact
   - Other:

2. How satisfied are you with the way the Grand Challenge session was structured? *
   Mark only one oval.
   1 2 3 4 5
   Not very 0 0 0 0 0 Very much

3. How relevant and helpful do you think the Grand Challenge session was for you? *
   Mark only one oval.
   1 2 3 4 5
   Not very 0 0 0 0 0 Very much

4. How satisfied are you with the Grand Challenge session content? *
   Both challenge session overview and system presentations
   Mark only one oval.
   1 2 3 4 5
   Not very 0 0 0 0 0 Very much
5. Do you find it fitting that the DEBS Grand Challenge 2017 is co-organized by the HOBBIT [https://project-hobbit.eu/] project?  
Mark only one oval.

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No
- [ ] Maybe

6. Would you be interested in participating with your own system in a future edition of the DEBS Grand Challenge co-organized with the HOBBIT project? *  
Mark only one oval per row.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Maybe</th>
<th>Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DEBS Grand Challenge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. Please evaluate the following parts of the workshop *  
Mark only one oval per row.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very Bad</th>
<th>Bad</th>
<th>OK</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Very Good</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DEBS Grand Challenge System/Papers Presentations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. Name (optional)  
__________________________

9. Email (optional)  
__________________________
Appendix H  OAEI OM 2017 Workshop Attendees Questionnaire regarding HOBBIT Link Discovery Task
"Link Discovery Benchmark for Spatial Data" (HOBBIT) - Attendees Evaluation Form

This short survey aims at assessing the part of the OM workshop hosting the results produced by the "Link Discovery Benchmark for Spatial Data" Task organized by the HOBBIT project. More information about HOBBIT "Link Discovery Benchmark for Spatial Data" Task can be found here: https://project-hobbit.eu/challenges/om2017/

The survey can also be completed online here: https://goo.gl/forms/WJtOihC1rSyXDEmQ2

*Required

1. How did you hear about the HOBBIT Link Discovery Task at OM 2017? *
Mark only one oval.

- Website
- Twitter
- Mailing List
- Personal Contact
- Other: __________________________

2. How interesting do you think the HOBBIT Link Discovery Task was for you? *
Mark only one oval.

1 2 3 4 5

- Not very
- Very much

3. Would you be interested in participating with your own system in a future edition of the HOBBIT Link Discovery Task? *
Mark only one oval.

- Yes
- No
- Maybe

4. Did you find the HOBBIT Linking Benchmark (Task 1) interesting?
Mark only one oval.

1 2 3 4 5

- Not very
- Very much
5. Did you find the HOBBIT Spatial benchmark (Task 2) interesting?
Mark only one oval.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not Very</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Very Much</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. Did you find the presentation of the participating systems in the HOBBIT Link Discovery Task interesting?
Mark only one oval.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not Very</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Very Much</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. Name (optional)


8. Email (optional)
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