REPORT – MEETING 24 NOV

The focus of our meeting was the query taxonomy. We discussed the slides, which include examples of queries. Following there is a list of points highlighted by Chirine and Nadia:

a. To build an example that includes all possible requirements;
b. To differentiate requirements associated to the service provided and requirements associated to the data provided by the service;
c. To define the requirements, for example "is provenance related only to the data provider or to the data provider and the data itself?"
d. To propose a priority classification of requirements in order to be able to compare different sets of requirements and identify which sets are more restrict or less restricts;
e. According to this classification, I must define the final list of types of query;
f. Be able to compare queries in our knowledge base and identify which query is more close to the one in a new request. It is also possible to make the system more fuzzy and identify queries which guarantee for example 80% of the requirements;
g. In the cases in which there are requirements more restrict and less restrict, based on the priority classification, identify if the query is finally more or less restrict and in which percentage.
h. It is possible to profit from cases in which queries as different. For example, queries could share a higher number of services. Thus, instead of rewriting the entire query part of it could be reused and only the absent part should be rewritten from zero;
i. There are diagram that are still incorrect according to the query result set.

The task for this week is to work on the requirements and how to compare them to propose a complete list of queries.