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- A lot of this was covered in the proposal
- Basically talking here about highlights
Interview Targets

- Sponsors
  - Talked to Cisco, Accenture, and Sony reps
- Other newcomers to the lab
  - Interviewed some UROPs about lab
- Communication and Development Office
  - Finally managed to talk to them last week
  - Talked to web manager about integration and interests
Focus Groups

- Technical: Badge and deployment details
- Meta-level: keyword selection, user interaction issues, services
Agenda/Questions

- Visitors
  - Problems they face
  - What they want
  - What they need
  - What they expect

- Badge folks
  - What features are needed to support other research
  - What is technically feasible

- C*D office
  - Wants, needs, politics...
What We Have...

- List of keywords specified by advisors
  - Very low cross-subscription rates
  - Lack of context makes most keywords useless
  - Trails for very generic interests
- Interest expression
  - Research the PLDB, which contains no associative data
  - Ask C*D office to facilitate contact
  - “Poll” groups during a visit to find real interests
Sponsor Interview outcomes

- Fairly informal and opportunistic due to time constraints and availability
- Different sponsor “ages”, but outcomes uniform throughout
- Confusion about specific activities of groups
- Long term sponsors will likely have less knowledgeable representatives present during the event
- Cynicism about ability of system to direct successfully
- Multifaceted utility will help acceptance
Sponsors: Relational Aspects

- Envision system to be something like highly knowledgeable C*D personnel
- However, there was a lack of understanding about the proactive nature of the system compared to the normal actions of the C*D office
  - May need to see system in action
  - Issues of minimum introductory period
- Need to overcome cynicism born from decades of promises made by AI community (to which this project will be mentally compared)
Focus Group on Target Description

- Extensive analysis of PLDB entries at syntactic and semantic levels
- Indicates several issues
  - Entries focus of distinctiveness, while this requires a metric for similarity
  - Entries are descriptive, not declarative
  - Widespread repurposing of words
  - Highly context-dependent usage
  - PLDB parsing is basically out
  - Lack of semantic association data in PLDB → hard to use for humans
Other Approaches

- Use synonyms for association formation
  - Repurposing requires context metric
- Use common sense framework
  - Same issue + incorrect impressions from repurposing
- Use ACM keywords
  - Lack of granularity within ML domain of work
- Parse papers for keywords
  - We don’t write about all the things that are important
  - C*D office had tried this, to no avail
Chosen approach

- Less draconian than the rigid ACM framework
- Much more draconian than current free-for-all system
- Allow some limited number of new keywords for expressing distinctions per group and project
- ...
- But require a minimum number of selections from the preset general keywords
Focus Group on Badge Capabilities

- Badge is no longer a good display platform
- Move display and search functionality from badge to kiosk network
  - Addresses sponsor comment on added functions
  - “Find User” feature now works from kiosk
    - Upshot: location data makes it easy to track compliance regardless of vote
  - New system for ad-hoc grouping based on inter-person interaction (Jon Gips)
- But increases stress on the kiosk system
Relational Requirements

- Generally same as before
- Incorporate a natural language agent capable of explaining “thought process” at final point of contact (kiosks)
  - Trust maintenance is key
  - There is a feeling that this problem is unsolvable
- Incorporate location data for smarter suggestions that exclude visited groups, which shows a level of “personal attention”
  - Attempt to “hold” attention
- Address person by name: show awareness of individual