In which role are you here today?

- Ontologist: 10
- Database expert: 1
- Application developer: 4
- End user: 2
- Business developer: 1
- Other: 11
Where does your institute/company sit on this map?
What are the main application domains of your company/insitution?
In your institute/company, semantic technologies ...

- 14 are heavily used
- 12 start to be used
- 3 are not used at all yet
Materials research data: how relevant will these dimensions be for data exchange in 2030?

Not at all relevant

- Proprietary data (IPR driven, data monetization) 5.4
- Open data (permissive licensing) 5.2
- FAIR data 5.7
- Ontology-based data exchange 5.4
- One-to-one exchange (e.g., P2P, B2C, B2B) 5.1

Extremely relevant
Materials research data: how will it be governed in 2030?

- Centrally at a national level: Very probable (2.7)
- Centrally at the European level: Not probable (3)
- Federated governance (clusters of institutions, some autonomy retained): Not probable (3.7)
- Via Public Private Partnerships: Not probable (3.6)
- Via multiple sub-domain-specific associations: Not probable (3.5)
As a user/provider of data/software, what features of a common data space are necessary to trust it?

1st: Platform security
2nd: Data quality
3rd: Users identity & access rights management
4th: Asset usage traceability
5th: Data provenance
6th: Transparent licensing
As a user/provider of data/software, what OTHER features of a common data space are necessary to trust it?

- Usability
- Structured data
- A human-centric and a beyond human, ecosystemic approach
- data sovereignty
- Ease of use
- Code of Conduct
- ooh a snail __@__y
- Added Value on both ends, user and provider
- Traceability of usage vs. traceability of data
As a user/provider of data/software, what **OTHER** features of a common data space are necessary to trust it?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Moral values, aims behind providers</th>
<th>Peer acceptance</th>
<th>Certification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ensure right Understanding of assets</td>
<td>A (large) number of successful and transparent transactions recorded.</td>
<td>The supplier of the data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It needs to give the provider freedom to undo anything.</td>
<td>Usability and simplicity</td>
<td>Effective withdraw. Decentral ownership.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As a user/provider of data/software, what OTHER features of a common data space are necessary to trust it?

- Transparent Open governance
- Security
As a user/provider of data/software, which factors prevent you from using a common data space?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Too much effort</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Necessary training and learning curve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of data skills/knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High complexity of usage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust to the source</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Having a good idea of the business model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We have very disjoint groups and people, it is not even clear what their data are</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of standard(s) which are widely adopted</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As a user/provider of data/software, what OTHER factors prevent you from using a common data space?

- There is none I want ....
- Complexity in/of federation
- Availability of suitable data spaces
- Complexity
What outcomes of the OntoCommons project are you most likely to use in the next 5 years?

1st: Industrial ontology portal
2nd: Landscape reviews of tools & ontologies
3rd: Recommendations & Roadmap
4th: LOT methodology for ontology development
5th: Bridge concept template
6th: Top reference ontology (joining EMMO, DOLCE, BFO)