CV WG VIRTUAL MEETING 2012.03.26 / 2012.03.27

Meeting minutes

CV WG VIRTUAL MEETING 2012.03.26 / 2012.03.27 – Meeting minutes		
Venue	Virtual Meeting on Arkadin	**Meeting date**	26/03/2012 (Core Business and Core Location) 27/03/2012 (Core Person)
Author	NVH	**Meeting time**	26/03: 16:00 – 18:00 27/03: 13:00 – 14:00
Reviewed by	SG	**Issue date**	28/03/2012
Status		**Version**	0.03

Attendees	ID	Organisation	Task Force
Vasilios Peristeras	VP	EU – DG DIGIT	Person, Business, Location
Erik Tilburgh	ET	EU – DG DIGIT	Person, Business, Location
Andras Micsik	AM	HU – MTA SZTAKI	Person
Philippe Vlérick	PV	EU – DG Justice	Person
Piotr Madziar	PM	EU – DG Markt	Business
Ignacio Boixo	IB	ES – External Expert	Business
Chris Taggart	CT	UK – Open Corporates	Business
Neven Vrček	NV	HR – University of Zagreb	Business
Michael Lutz	ML	EU – INSPIRE	Location
Paul Smits	PS	EU – INSPIRE	Location
Andrea Perego	AP	EU – INSPIRE	Location
Muriel Foulonneau	MF	LU – Tudor Public Research Centre	Person, Business, Location
Christope Guéret	CG	NL – Vrije Universiteit	Person, Business, Location
Anja Hopfstock	AH	DE – BKG	Location

Attendees	ID	Organisation	Task Force
Raj Singh	RS	USA – Open Geospatial Consortium	Location
Maris Tudre	MT	MT – Expert Business Registers	Business
Serena Coetzee	SC	ZA – University of Pretoria / External Export	Location
Giorgio Cangioli	GC	IT – Dedalus / eHealth and Standards Expert	Person
Clemens Portele	CP	DE – Interactive Instruments	Location
Stijn Goedertier	SG	PwC Belgium	Person, Business, Location
Niels Van Hee	MDK	PwC Belgium	Person, Business, Location
Phil Archer	PA	SEMIC team	Person, Business, Location

AGENDA:

26/03/2012 – Core Business

Agenda Item	Owner	Subject
0	All	Conference open for participants to connect and get Web and audio connections set up
1	PM	Welcome, introductions for any new members
2	PA	Overview of current status, comments received and plans for near future.
3	PA	Issue PEPPOL Legal Entity Types
4	PA	Issue Classes for status, type and activity
5	PA	Issue Registration type
6	PM	Any further comments from the WG? If not, propose to move to final publication.
7	CT	G20/FSB initiative on legal identifiers (meeting in Basel tomorrow)

8	PM/PA/SG	Wrap up

26/03/2012 – Core Location

Agenda Item	Owner	Subject
1	AP/ML/PS	Welcome, introductions for any new members
2	PA	Overview of current status, comments received and plans for near future.
13	PA	Issue Why single out XML Geometry?
8	PA	Issue Interoperability between Location CV and INSPIRE
3	PA	Issue Access Control, data ownership
4	PA	Issue Can anything have an address?
5	PA	Issue Inclusion of virtual locations
6	PA	Issue European use of UK and EL cf. ISO 3166 codes of GB and GR
7	PA	Issue Land parcels
9	PA	Issue Geometry sub types
10	PA	Issue Address Identifiers
11	PA	Issue Geographic Name as a class
12	PA	Issue Overall complexity
14	AP/ML/PS	Any further comments from the WG? If not, propose to move to final publication.
15	PM/PA/SG	Wrap up

27/03/2012 – Core Person

Agenda Item	Owner	Subject
0	All	Conference open for participants to connect and get Web and audio connections set up
1	GP	Welcome, introductions for any new members
2	PA	Overview of current status, comments received and plans for near future.
3	PA	Issue Stickiness of names

4	PA	Issue [Residency](#)
5	PA	Issue [Citizenship](#)
6	PA	Issue [Handling gender](#)
7	PA	Issue [Name granularity](#)
8	PA	Issue [Cardinality Restrictions](#)
9	PA	Issue [Juridical Capability](#)
10	PA	Issue [Fiscal Residence](#)
11	PA	Issue [Person.identifier and Formal Identifier: how does this work in a multi-identification domain environment](#)
12	PA	Issue [Distinguish different levels of conformity for this specification](#)
13	GP	Any further comments from the WG? If not, propose to move to final publication.
14	GP/PA/SG	Wrap up

26/03/2012 – Core Business

1. Welcoming, overview and future plans

Discussion

- PA and PM welcome everyone to the call and explain the meeting's purpose.

- The review period of the Core Vocabulary has resulted in quite some comments. PA has drafted replies to all comments, but some still require some discussion and input from the Task Force. The meeting should be used to close all remaining issues.

- PA also explains that the Core Vocabularies, and the ADMS specification, will be published by W3C as "Draft Recommendations" after the Working Groups finalise their work. Having the specifications published by W3C will give them more visibility and reviews by a broader audience. This also means that any references to "example.org" will be replaced by references to "w3c.org".

Related documentation:

http://www.w3.org/QA/2012/03/interoperable_governments.html

http://www.w3.org/2011/gld/wiki/Main_Page

http://joinup.ec.europa.eu/news/key-specifications-interoperability-developed-eu%E2%80%99s-interoperability-solutions-european-public-a

2. Issue **PEPPOL Legal Entity Types**

Discussion

- This issue concerns a list of Legal Entity Types that was developed by the PEPPOL initiative (EC).

- PA believes that this is a good suggestion if the project receives proper funding and is sustainable. VP explains that PEPPOL is a large-scale project that has done a lot of work in the area of e-procurement. VP believes the TF should indeed consult what elements can be reused by contacting the author of the comment.

Related documentation:

http://www.peppol.eu/

Decisions

- The PEPPOL Legal Entity types should be analysed to see if they can be reused as a vocabulary.

Action Items	Responsible	Deadline
Contact the author of the comment and inquire about the PEPPOL Legal Entity Types.	PA	

3. Issue **Classes for status, type and activity**

Discussion

- PA proposes a solution for this issue. Instead of having a simple value (a string) for these properties, they would be replaced by another class and a relationship with that class.

- CT agrees with this simple solution but would like to keep the string as a fallback scenario. It is not straight-forward to implement this fallback mechanism however; it is more a policy or an approach to modelling.

- PA proposes to add a statement to the specification: use a controlled vocabulary and identify the one you use if possible. If not, use a string but do so consistently.

- CT mentions the use of "deprecation" as a possible approach: the vocabulary can use strings, but this use would be marked as "deprecated" in a future version of the specification, meaning that it is more than likely to be changed in a future version. For "activity", there will most likely be a leading vocabulary to use (such as NACE).

- G mentions that the UN/CEFACT Core Data Type Library can be a source of inspiration here. It has a data type Code, which has a string attribute, but also additional optional attributes to denote the code list to which the value pertains.

- PA believes this would be a good starting point. He also mentions that he has received information how NACE and ISIC relate and will mention both in the specification explicitly.

Decisions

- The string-attributes will be replaced with classes.

- The specification will describe a fallback mechanism (use a string consistently if needed)

Action Items	Responsible	Deadline
Include the information into the specification how NACE and ISIC relate.	PA	
Update the specification and the conceptual model to take this issue into account.	PA	

4. Issue **Registration type**

Discussion

- This issue stems from the fact that some issuing organisations can issue multiple identifiers. This mandates the use of an additional identifier to indicate what identifier from a given organisation is being used ("identifier type").

- PA clarifies the issue with the example of the British Tax Office. They could issue both a VAT number and a tax code. These two identifiers need to be

distinguishable by using another identifier for their type.

- CT summarises that identifier would then be a triple, consisting of issuing body / class of identifier / identifier.
- PA suggests naming this "identifier type". The TF agrees with this proposal.
- SG proposes to look at UN/CEFACT Identifier Core Data Type. A similar approach was taken for the Asset Description Metadata Schema.

Decisions

- There will be an additional attribute, "identifier type", to classify the identifier that is issued by an organisation.

Action Items	Responsible	Deadline
Update the specification and the conceptual model by adding an "identifier type".	PA	

5. Any further comments from the WG? If not, propose to move to final publication.

Discussion

- PA raises one final comment. He suggests removing all cardinalities from the specification, although this might be a problem for the legal identifier. This issue is caused by the fact that it is possible to have multiple valid formats for a single value. It is possible to write an address in multiple formats for instance, each valid.
- CT does not object but would definitely keep the cardinality constraints for the legal identifier.
- PM believes cardinalities have been an important part of the work the TF has been doing, implying that these cardinalities are important and have a lot of value in them. Keeping them would also be a sign of respect for the work done.
- PA will also raise this issue with the other Task Forces.

Action Items	Responsible	Deadline
Propose a specification with removed cardinalities	PA	

6. G20/FSB initiative on legal identifiers (meeting in Basel tomorrow)
7. Wrap-up

Discussion

- CT has been asked by the Financial Stability Board to attend a conference on Global Business Identifiers (by the G20). He believes there is momentum and drive for the G20 to help raise awareness for the need for such global identifiers.
- IB also mentions an upcoming conference (end of May) related to European banking supervision. He proposes to present the Core Business Vocabulary on

that conference.

- PM asks CT if there is a "single European voice" to back up the work of the G20/FSB. CT states this is not the case – it is very much limited to G20. VP does say there is some involvement from DG Markt.

- To conclude the meeting, VP thanks everyone for their contributions. He is hopeful that this work will become a W3C recommendation in 2012.

26/03/2012 – Core Location

8. **Welcoming, overview and future plans**
Discussion

- Please refer to section 1. The future plans for all Core Vocabularies are similar.

9. Issue **Why single out XML Geometry?**
Discussion

- A comment was raised by the INSPIRE team to ask why a special case is made for XML Geometry. The same exception could be made for RDF (e.g. with GEO-SPARQL) and potentially others.

- VP states that the word "XML" does not belong in a conceptual model.

- PA proposes to use "XML Geometry" as a property instead of as its own class.

- RS has invited Clemens Portele (CP), a GML expert, to the meeting. He points to the work on GML: GML 3.3 compact encodings (GML_CE_Geometry) can be found in this document: https://portal.opengeospatial.org/files/?artifact_id=46568. GML specifications are conformant to ISO 19100 series of specifications. The expert says that including the GML conceptual model would be another solution. However, this would make the Core Location conceptual model quite comprehensive.

- ML suggests an alternative approach: remove all properties from Geometry and specify its usage in the text of the specification.

- PA thinks this makes the specification more flexible but argues that it might also make it less clear.

- ML states that XML Geometry really is different; it models a (slightly) different concept than the other attributes (which are more "real-life" items).

- The INSPIRE team points out that the basics are the same: it allows anyone to represent geometry in fairly simple terms.

-

Action Items	Responsible	Deadline

Propose an adequate solution to represent Geometry in the conceptual model.	PA

10. Issue Interoperability between Location CV and INSPIRE

Discussion

- PA thinks this is an extremely important comment, raised by SC (as ISO representative). The fundamental issue is that the Core Location vocabulary is not interoperable with a number of address specifications. PA hopes this is a mere matter of cardinalities.

- SC states however, based on comments from RW (Rob Walker) and ML (Morten Lind), that there is also an issue with identifiers. The issue is more fundamental than the cardinalities alone. Relaxing the cardinality restrictions, implies that one can create incorrect addresses (e.g. with only locatorDesignator populated and nothing else).

- PA asks if removing the cardinalities could help in any way. SC does not believe this is a good approach as this leads to other problems (e.g. an empty address).

- The Task Force needs to analyse this issue further. Some of the persons with valuable input were excused for this meeting (INSPIRE members, Rob Walker), to the Task Force agrees to postpone this issue and to set up a call with the relevant TF members included.

Decisions

- A separate call will be organised to discuss this issue.

Action Items	Responsible	Deadline
Set up a follow-up call with members from INSPIRE and the Core Location TF to discuss the interoperability between both specifications.	PA	

11. Issue Land parcels

Discussion

- PA asks if the current specification could handle representing land parcels. The Task Force believes it is possible.

- SC says that a land parcel has a unique identifier which is not an address. One could add a link from the address to a land parcel in the UML model.

- RS points to the classic geographical relationships: http://www.w3.org/2010/POI/documents/Core/core-20111216.html#relationship

- PA will write a use case for these. Several classes have all attributes optional. This appears to imply that they might be empty.

Action Items	Responsible	Deadline

Write a use case for the classic geographical relationships.	PA

12. Issue **Geometry sub types**

13. Issue **Address Identifiers**

Discussion

- PA comments that there must be at least a rule that says that at least one (Geometry or Address) must be populated. The attributes of Geometry are all complementary, i.e. only one should be populated in each instance. This means that they are subtypes. PA asks how such a rule can be enforced in the model.

- ML explains that INSPIRE uses a particular constraint.

- SC explains that the issue on address identifiers is related to interoperability with INSPIRE. Core Location uses a single string representation for an address, which makes it difficult to split and identify the different components.

- PA explains this approach was chosen because some administrations only have an address in this format. SC questions however if there should only be a single approach (which maximises interoperability). PA argues that flexibility will make it easier to adopt the specification.

- SC does not think a single class with multiple properties is a good solution either. It would not be clear to users which property to use. PA however does not see how this behaviour could be enforced with subclasses.

- ML explains the concept of a UML union, which basically represents a "choice". ML believes this issue is more general than just the Geometry. On the one hand, the specification tries to provide data providers with a specification that suits them best, but this complicates things for the data consumers because they have to support multiple representations as well.

- PA believes flexibility is important – forcing people to use one approach will most likely lead to a greater resistance to this specification. Indicating a "trend" for a particular approach might be helpful. SC says that the use of a "type" property can also be considered. This type would indicate what format the data provider is using.

- PA will update the specification with "preferred approaches" for these situations (which could be use case dependent).

Action Items	Responsible	Deadline
Add "preferred approaches" to the specifications to handle ambiguous or unclear situations.	PA	

14. Issue **European use of UK and EL cf. ISO 3166 codes of GB and GR**

Discussion

- One solution to this issue is asking DBpedia to add redirects for some country codes. The alternative would be an update to an ISO-controlled list.

- The INSPIRE specification had to handle this issue as well. They updated their specification from the ISO list to the EU Publications Office list. They received strong arguments from the UK to do this.
- The TF believes this issue should be handled with care however, as this is a politically sensitive issue.

Decisions

- Use the EU Publications Office list and ask DBPedia to add redirects.

Action Items	Responsible	Deadline
Change the country list to be based on the EU Publications Office list.	PA	
Contact DBPedia to add the required redirects.	PA	

15. Issue Access Control, data ownership

16. Issue Inclusion of virtual locations

17. Issue Overall complexity

18. Wrap-up

Discussion

- PA states that the issue on access control and data ownership was already discussed. The Task Force agrees that this is out of scope.
- PA says that virtual locations have also been discussed, but that the general sentiment was that these should not be included in the Core Location vocabulary. The Task Force agrees that virtual locations are too different from what this vocabulary aims to represent.
- A general issue was on the overall complexity of the vocabulary. The feeling in the Task Force is that the specification might indeed be perceived as complex when only looking at the conceptual model (diagram). The accompanying text is however rather simple and easy to understand.
- AH has a final comment on interoperability with INSPIRE and asks if the Task Force wishes to have interoperability on all levels. ML believes this would lead the specification too far. INSPIRE takes different scripts, languages, etc into account and this would make the Core Location vocabulary too complex.
- PA thanks everyone for joining the meeting. He will organise a follow up call on the remaining issues to close this Task Force's work.

Decisions

- The issue on access control will not be implemented.
- Virtual locations will not be considered.
- No specific actions will be taken to reduce complexity.

27/03/2012 – Core Person

19. Welcoming, overview and future plans

Discussion

- PA opens the meeting and welcomes Giorgio Cangioli as a new member to the WG.

- GC is involved in the epSOS Large Scale Pilot project and worked on the epSOS Common Structure for Patient Data. He is particularly interested in the Core Person vocabulary from an end-user perspective and in interoperability with other vocabularies (http://www.epsos.eu/)

- Please refer to section 1. The future plans for all Core Vocabularies are similar.

20. Issue Stickiness of names

Discussion

- PA says that this issue was raised by someone with rather strong terms. The author does not believe the Task Force will produce a useful product. PA however believes the author was expecting a full blown identification system. This was never the intent of this vocabulary however.

- PA does suggest removing the "stickiness" from the specification if no one objects. CG is more in favour of keeping it.

Decisions

- "Stickiness" of names remains in the specification.

21. Issue Residency
22. Issue Citizenship

Discussion

- During the public review, it was pointed out that residency is different from citizenship.

- PA proposes to add a new class "Jurisdiction" and to create a new property to handle the citizenship. The Task Force agrees with this suggestion.

Decisions

- A new class "Jurisdiction" will be added a new property will be added to handle citizenship.

Action Items	Responsible	Deadline

Update the conceptual model and the specification with "Jurisdiction" and citizenship.	PA

23. Issue **Juridical Capability**

24. Issue **Fiscal Residence**

Discussion

- These two issues relate to "legal" perspectives on roles a person might have during his/her lifetime.
- CG believes this does not have a place in a Core Vocabulary. These are legal aspects and will bring a lot of complexity into the vocabulary. A "legal" extension of the Core Person vocabulary could be useful however.
- The Task Force agrees with this observation. These issues are not about real properties or attributes of a person.

Decisions

- No action will be taken on these issues.

25. Issue **Handling gender**

Discussion

- Several comments on gender were raised. PA analysed these and believes the discussion is about the subtle distinction between "sex" and "gender". Whereas "sex" refers to physical, genetic information, "gender" is more used for societal purposes (it is how a person perceives him- or herself).
- PA proposes to use the Eurostat vocabulary to handle this issue. This is a more complete list.
- CG agrees with this proposal and sees the textual information from the Eurostat list as an added benefit (e.g. for RDF).
- SG states it should be possible to support multiple code lists, for the sake of interoperability. The Code core data type of the UN/CEFACT can be of inspiration here. It has a mandatory attribute of type string to denote the code, but also a number of optional attributes to denote the code list. PA says this is in line with what is happening in the other vocabularies.
- The Task Force agrees with this approach.

Decisions

- Support multiple code lists for gender and use an identifier to specify which one is used in a particular situation.
- Eurostat will be included in the specification as a preferred code list.

Action Items	Responsible	Deadline

Update the specification and the conceptual model to take these decisions into account.	PA

26. Issue Name granularity

27. Issue Cardinality Restrictions

28. Issue Person.identifier and Formal Identifier: how does this work in a multi-identification domain environment

Discussion

- PA explains that several comments asked for name to be a single field and to no decompose a name into several attributes. CG and MF prefer keeping these fields however, as they were discussed at length in the WG. They are optional so they can be ignored or used if needed.

- PA mentions the comment on cardinality restrictions as it is related. It appears that it is possible to have multiple valid names, which means the 0..1 restriction cannot be maintained. PA proposes to remove all cardinality constraints from the diagram.

- The Task Force does not object but CG proposes to mention the preferred or intended cardinalities in the text.

- The issue on person identifier and formal identifier is handled by using an additional identifier to classify the type for an identifier. This had already been discussed. SG has made a proposal to address this issue inspired by the UN/CEFACT Identifier type.

Decisions

- Cardinalities can be removed from the diagram, yet they will be specified in the text.

29. Wrap-up

Discussion

- AM adds a final comment. He expresses the concern that the Core Vocabulary should be as simple as possible.

- PA thanks everyone for joining and closes the meeting.