

**1. Do you have general comments regarding IQIS 2005 workshop (organization, papers, web site, talks, price, etc.) ?**

- 1- good organization and paper selection
- 2- excellent workshop
- 3- great ! thanks !
- 4- organizers did a nice job - well organized
- 5- 30% of time was spent restating the data cleaning problem - good keynotes ; more interactive discussions like 1st keynote ; papers were of lower quality than SIGMOD papers, so i would have gotten more out of brainstorming discussions or tutorials
- 6- sessions, 2 keynotes & breaks were well organized and the quality of the papers high ; the additional « session » for unpublished work at the workshop is a great idea but the format can be improved, e.g. by announcing it and organizing it as a « Gong show » ; short papers (except one) seemed like long papers that were shortened to be published. What is actually the purpose of short papers ? i would see it as an opportunity to present and discuss unfinished work.
- 7- 11 papers were a bit on the high side
- 8- all were great - many thanks
- 9- good workshop, i learned a lot
- 10-i suggest double blind review like in the main conf
- 11-nice overview over the field, helpful to gain an overview, website ok, helpful, talks/papers appropriate, price very reasonable compared to SIGMOD
- 12-ok
- 13-very good
- 14-no, everything was great, the papers were good
- 15-should be advertised for more. Get famous people involved (Hector + Winkler is a big step in the right direction). Famous presenters of papers is important
- 16-
- 17-speakers should be prepared to fit their talk within the given amount of time (some were rushing at the end and the audience missed valuable information)
- 18-would have liked to see final printed proceedings available to the rest of the SIGMOD group (i understand there were problems with ACM )

**2. Should we have a third edition of IQIS workshop in 2006 ?**

- 1- yes
- 2- yes
- 3- yes
- 4-
- 5-
- 6- yes
- 7- not sure
- 8- yes sure
- 9- probably, though i would like to see more technical papers
- 10- yes
- 11- definitely
- 12- yes
- 13- definitely
- 14- yes there are many issues in this area and possibilities for papers
- 15- yes
- 16- yes
- 17- sure
- 18- yes definitely

**3. If so in which form ? stand-alone workshop ? co-located with SIGMOD or another conference ?**

- 1- with SIGMOD/PODS
- 2- co-located
- 3- co-located with SIGMOD
- 4- co-located with SIGMOD
- 5- co-located with SIGMOD
- 6- definitely not a stand-alone workshop so that the attendance stays high & consists of both PhD students presenting work & renowned professors that give most valuable comments, co-located with SIGMOD
- 7- co-located
- 8- co-located with SIGMOD
- 9- does not matter it is mature enough to be stand alone
- 10- co-located with SIGMOD
- 11- definitely co-located with conference, for better attendance SIGMOD works well, although Beijing will be unreachable for me
- 12- co-located with SIGMOD or ICDE or VLDB
- 13- co-located with SIGMOD i believe it attracts more audience this way
- 14- co-located with SIGMOD
- 15- co-located with SIGMOD or ICDE
- 16- co-located with SIGMOD
- 17- co-located with SIGMOD
- 18- co-located : adds to the reputation and leverages the conference organization machine

**4. what should be the scope of the future workshop ? (Information System, Management, "Pure" database topics, others ?**

- 1-
- 2- web
- 3- information management, quality improvement & assessment
- 4-
- 5- probabilistic dbs/ fuzzy, deductive dbs
- 6-
- 7-
- 8- choice A : quite broad e.g. as it is now ; choice B : focused on few very specific topics e.g. record linkage
- 9- no !
- 10- keep the scope open
- 11- i think it had a good mix ; otherwise might get too heavy on data cleaning /record linkage
- 12- applications/case studies ?!
- 13- info system
- 14- all
- 15- should maintain its current focus for now
- 16- pure database topics
- 17- for pure database topics we have SIGMOD and many others so this should cover topics which are not « traditional » but « hot » topics
- 18- may be domain specific research ? i am interested in IQ in life sciences and find that there is room for focused research, i mean there is more to IQ than enterprise data management

**5. what are in your opinion the major challenges in information and data quality areas ?**

- 1- quality of data issues
- 2- availability of data
- 3- quality metrics, assessment, improvement
- 4- effect of quality on use/analyses
- 5- models that can leverage more metadata feature selection, generation
- 6-
- 7-
- 8- 1) info integration both at the design (e.g., schema matching, design for QoS, theory for data exchange problem with focus on data cleaning) and implementation phase (e.g., ETL) , 2) individual problems (e.g., record linkage estimation of missing values
- 9- there are a lot ;)
- 10- relate quality metrics with repair technics
- 11- relevance to user community, integrated (rather than point) solutions
- 12- entity resolution in adversial situations
- 13- benchmark, more application
- 14- fixing inconsistent data in db
- 15- creating solutions that serve real problems !
- 16- strict limitation of time
- 17- concrete/systematic ways of computing quality rather than « subjective » user perception
- 18- solving real problems in scientific domains - provide effective support to e-science

**6. was something important missing in IQIS 2005 workshop ?**

- 1-
- 2- no
- 3-
- 4- still need more quality metrics
- 5- would be nice to organize a repository of datasets for deduplication
- 6-
- 7-
- 8- not really ; still a panel or discussion on the major/important research topics could help
- 9- perhaps knowing ML people looking at this would be good
- 10- feedback comments from PC chair (to the authors) areas of reserach, stats, etc.
- 11- no may be distribute some programs/schedules at the main conference as well (as advertisement) ?
- 12- computer copy of presentation slides
- 13-
- 14- no
- 15- panel presentations
- 16-
- 17- i don't know
- 18- i think it was well-balanced and the keynotes were high-profile

**7. Were you at the IQIS 2004 workshop in Paris ? If so, could you give your comparative opinion ?**

- 1- no
- 2- no
- 3- no
- 4- no
- 5- no
- 6-

7- no

8-

9- no

10-

11- no

12- no

13-

14- no

15- no

16-

17- no

18- no : PS : note that IQIS was competing with a similar CAiSE  
workshop - maybe the two chairs could coordinate to avoid this in  
the future ?