

## Assumptions:

A1: Mapping rules and metadata descriptions are declarative and follow W3C standards A2: The ontology for integrating the source data

is available and is implemented in OWL. A3: Mapping rules and metadata are available A4: Data are represented in formats that are not

RDF A5: Datasets are static, not streams.

## Restrictions:

**R**3

R1: Input data sources must be located in the same physical place as the KGC process is run.

R1. R2

R2: Not have to consider data protection nor access restrictions.

R3: The size of datasets is defined in terms of Gigabytes

R4: Our proposal does not make use of the capabilities of SPARQL-to-SQL engines R5: Our proposal does not make use of the features of the transformation functions

performed over the input data sources.

Hypotheses:

H1: It is possible to translate declarative mapping rules among different specifications.

H2: The exploitation of declarative annotations can enhance current virtual KGC systems H3: A benchmark on transport data is able to

stress and provide a full overview of the current state of different KGC engines H4: Physical data structures and operators can be defined for scaling up KGC engines

H5: Optimizations for functional mapping rules can be applied to scale up the construction of KGC