

Meeting Minutes – Webinar on the Catalogue of Services: Review of the CPSV-AP specification 06/04/2022

Catalogue of Services Action

Project	Catalogue of services action - Review of the CPSV-AP specification	Meeting Date/Time	06/04/2022 10:00-12:00 (GMT+1)
Meeting Type	Webinar	Meeting Location	Cisco Webex Meetings
Meeting Coordinator	Miguel Alvarez Rodriguez Florian Barthélemy Emidio Stani Nathan Ghesquière	Issue Date	06/04/2022

Meeting Agenda
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Introduction 2. Action roadmap and governance 3. Part 1: Overview of issues and changes to CPSV-AP 4. Part 2: Open issues from webinar 1 5. Part 3: Alignment with other core vocabularies

6. Next steps and wrap-up

Webinar's participants

Attendee Name	Abbreviation	Organisation/Country
Alexandros Gerontas	AG	Greece
Antonella Lunelli	AL	Italy
Ana Rosa Guzman	ARG	Spain
Bart	B	ABB (Belgium)
Bart Hanssens	BH	Belgium BOSA
Costas Simatos	CS	TestBed Action
Giampaolo Sellitto	GS	ANAC Italy
Emidio Stani	ES	PwC EU Services

Florian Barthélemy	FB	PwC EU Services
Iraklis Varlamis	IV	GRNET
Jim Yang	JY	Norway
Jorge Sousa	JS	Portugal
Lisdalia Sanches	LS	Portugal
Lorenzo Iannone	LI	Italy
Lyubomir Blagoev	LB	
Marco Aarts	MA	The Netherlands
Marco Combetto	MC	Italy
Marco Pedro	MP	Portugal
Max De Wilde	MDW	European Commission
Miguel Alvarez Rodriguez	MAR	European Commission
Nathan Ghesquière	NG	PwC EU Services

Norman Calleja	NC	Malta
Niki C	NC	
Panagiotis Sakkis	PS	
Pavlina Fragkou	PF	DIGIT
Pieter Van Maldegem	PVM	ABB
Rui Coimbra	RC	Portugal
Sander Van Dooren	SVD	Joinup
Tamas Demeter	TD	Hungary
Xenophon Tsilibaris	XT	GRNET

Summary of the meeting	
Introduction	<p>Miguel Alvarez Rodriguez (MAR) welcomed the audience and presented the agenda for the webinar. The purpose of the webinar is to discuss pending issues and prepare for a major release of CPSV-AP (v3.00).</p> <p>MAR pointed out new initiatives in the CoS Action:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Training course on EU Academy

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Study and webinar on Natural Language Processing in the public sector <p>Next, an introduction was given on the Catalogue of Services Action.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CPSV-AP and semantic interoperability • Activities and future webinars • Available tools within Catalogue of Services
<p>Action roadmap and governance</p>	<p>MAR presented the CPSV-AP Roadmap.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The current version is CPSV-AP 2.2.1 • The objective of this webinar is to move towards a new major release in May (CPSV-AP 3.0). <p>Next, the governance was presented:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The same methodology is used as for SEMIC Process and methodology for developing semantic agreements • Controlled vocabularies created by the CPSV-AP working group are maintained and hosted as part of the CPSV-AP specification • Controlled vocabularies created by other entities are maintained and hosted by those entities
<p>Part 1: Overview of issues and changes to CPSV-AP</p>	<p>#77 Add optional dct:language to the Output class</p> <p>Nathan Ghesquière (NG) presented the issue and asked if there are any objections to adding dct:language to the Output class. The example was given of the Public Documents regulation, where documents are exchanged between Member States, indicating the need for multilingual support in output.</p> <p>Participants agreed in the chat on the solution proposed</p> <p>#75 Add cv:processingTime to the Channel class</p> <p>NG presented the issue and asked if there are any objections to adding cv:processingTime to the Channel class. This property is currently in the Public Service class, but processing time might vary depending on the channel chosen.</p> <p>Participants agreed in the chat on the solution proposed</p> <p>#44 and #32: Link to the policy objectives of a service and the UN 2030 Sustainable Development Goals</p> <p>NG presented the issue and asked the working group if there is a need for adding an extension that allows a Public Service to be linked with the policy objectives it is designed to meet. It could be implemented by adding a 'Goal' class.</p> <p>Several participants did not see the need for this extension (add Goal class and</p>

	<p>SDG classification) and mentioned that this felt out of scope of CPSV-AP.</p> <p>Ana Rosa Guzman (ARG) commented that currently, there is a way of classifying Public Services using skos:concept. This can be used to model links to policy objectives.</p> <p>Florian Barthelemy (FB) and Emidio Stani (ES) confirmed that the relation between the Public Service and skos:concept can be used, and that this can be indicated under the Github issue or/and in the usage note of the relevant classes.</p> <p>The Editorial team will take two actions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Indicate on GitHub that the participants to the Webinar around CPSV-AP of 06 April 2022 perceived these needs as out-of-scope regarding CPSV-AP and therefore will not be added to the model. Anyone objecting to this resolution will be invited to reply to the GitHub issue. • Nonetheless, regarding the UN SDG classification, any user of CPSV-AP can make use of the relation isClassifiedBy between the Public Service class and the Concept class to model such classification. The UN SDG classification can be added to the usage note of the property in the specification as an example of classification mentioned by the WG members. <p>#61 Legal Resource: Alignment with CCCEV and CPOV</p> <p>NG referred back to the discussions on this issue during webinar 1 release, and proposed to establish the relation ‘hasRequirement’ from Rule to Requirement as a final solution.</p> <p>The editors will create a relation between the Legal Resource class and the Requirement class in CPSV-AP 3.0</p>
<p>Part 2: Open Issues from webinar 1</p>	<p>#71 channels owned by non public organizations and costs defined by non public organizations</p> <p>ES presented the open issue which had been already discussed during webinar 1. ES then summarised the main points brought forward during that previous webinar:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The borders between public and private services are not always clear and change over time - Commercial activity should be out of the scope - Delegation of a Service can happen at different levels (partly delegation, delegation of the channel etc.) - The meaning of delegation needs to be defined - In Spain, private organisations are under a different regulatory framework and there is a catalogue of services that are provided by private organisations (e.g. hospitals and schools) - In Norway, funeral services are not delegated by any public organisation

- A public service can have sub services (ref. [issue 76](#))

ES then reminded the audience of the definition of the public service class.

Next, ES explained the first part of the proposed solution by the editorial team:

- 1) Change the range of the relations 'isDefinedby' and 'ownedBy' from cv:PublicOrganization to org:organisation

Discussion on changing the range of the relations to org:organisation

ES first asked the working group if there are any objections to the first proposition: change the range of the relations to org:organisation.

Jim Yang (JY) agreed with the proposition.

Alexandros Gerantos (AG) commented that there is a risk in a private organisation acting as a service provider defining the Cost of a Service.

FB referred back to the definition of Public Service. FB stressed that the relation 'hasCompetentAuthority' remains, so it is still a public organisation that is the competent authority for a Public Service. The simplest solution for the issue is to extend the range for the relations from Cost and Channel.

FB asked the working group if the current definition of Public Service is compatible with this change.

AG asked whether the services for which the cost is defined by private organisations are public ones.

ES replied that the service is always public.

Pavlina Fragkou (PF) asked whether the costs are defined by law.

FB commented that both cases are possible: costs defined by law and costs defined directly by organisations whether public, semi-public or private

There were no further objections to point 1 of the proposed solutions.

ES presented the second part of the proposed solution:

- 2) The creation of a class 'Concession Contract' in Core Vocs
 - a) It is a subclass of ePO:contract
 - b) Relation towards LegalResource (e.g. 'established in') or relation from LegalResource to concession
 - c) Relation towards Public Organisation (defined by: hasContractingAuthority, [Art.11.](#))
 - d) Relation towards an Agent (defined by: [hasEconomicOperator](#))

Discussions on the creation of the class 'Concession Contract' in Core Voccs

MAR and ES invited participants to elaborate on their practical examples of delegation of a Public Service.

PF commented that in Greece, the costs of controlling car emissions is defined by law, by the Public Organisation. This is a common case in Greece.

FB commented that this is also the case in Belgium. There, the VAT registration process (public service) has two different processes: https://business.belgium.be/en/setting_up_your_business/registration_with_the_vat_authorities. One for free delivered by a public organisation and one with a fee delivered by different private organisations.

ARG elaborated on the hospital example in Spain. There are regulations on how they should work, but they are still private businesses. They can set their own prices, functioning roles.. There is a legal framework, but there is no direct relationship between the public regulation and the school. But, there are other cases where the relationship between the public and private organisation is a concession. For example, private highways are running under a concession contract. There are also cases where only a small part of the service is subcontracted.

ARG recommended sticking with what is useful for the end-user of the Public Service. This is also why they don't include private services in their catalogue, despite their important role in providing a Public Service.

AG commented that we have to delimit the scope of a public service catalogue to public services in order to keep the model more focused. AG continued that we have to distinguish between public services and services of the private sector that are regulated by law or are supervised by the public.

FB commented that there seems to be an overall need for including organisations delivering a service (the service provider).

FB invited the members to give feedback in the chat on the need for including the service provider in the model (yes or no).

The working group agreed that there is a need to include the service provider in the model.

ARG commented that there are two different situations:

- 1) The responsibility of a Public Service is held by something else than a Public Organisation
- 2) Only part of the Public Service (like the Cost) is defined by a non-public organisation

ARG commented that the question here is asked for the whole public service, so there is not one answer.

ES replied that it depends on the content of the contract. This is why the proposition is to introduce Concession (contract), to put the scope of what should be provided by the private organisation. It serves as a means to add the private aspect and define the scope.

ARG replied that in this case, the example of the private schools and hospitals is out of scope, because there is no contract in place there. So ARG prefers to consider this as out of scope of CPSV-AP.

MAR commented that this is out of scope. It is about delegation, which is the case in several of the Nordic countries. In Spain, there is a contract when the management of a hospital is procured by a private organisation, even though the hospital is a public hospital.

ARG replied that in that case, the user does not need to know what organisation it is. This is why we should not model it perse.

MAR agreed with that comment.

FB commented that this may differ from one service to another. Sometimes, the interface will be delegated to an external provider (Channel). In the end, this concession can also be between two Public Organisations, or between a Public and a semi-public organisation. At this stage, we are not trying to capture the different ways in which the concession can take place. The objective here is to make sure that a user looking in the catalogue of services can see which are responsible organisations that they need to be aware of.

JY commented that In Norway they have “free choice of hospital” for the patients, which incl. private hospitals on contract with the public. Norway has to list up private contractors in their catalogue because it affects the choice of the end-users.

ES commented that these two propositions should cover the main use cases. FB added that in summary, there where 2 key questions:

- Should we include information about the organisation delivering the public service?
 - The answer here was positive
- How do we capture this concession? Does the proposed concession capture the different kinds of information through the countries?
 - ARG agrees to include concessions as delegation of public organisations' responsibility but not licences to develop an activity that can be considered a public service, such as telecom services, health services or educational services. The CPSV-AP could be extended by any Member State that wants to include the latter case.

The scope and what falls under the concession (contract) needs to be determined.

ES commented that the definition on the slides from DBpedia should be generic enough. The participants can then reflect on whether this satisfies the needs.
Further discussion will be held on GitHub.

[#78 Need of 1-to-many relationship between Public Service and Public Organization](#)

ES presented the issue and asked the working group if participants were in favour of extending the cardinality, or if there are any objections to including the 1..n relationship in CPSV-AP 3.0.

The working group agreed that the 1..n relationship will be included.

Part 3: Alignment with other core vocabularies

[#5 Classification of a public service](#)

ES presented the issue and the three ways of describing public services (sector, thematic area and type).

Next, ES presented the different codelists that can be used, and some key characteristic about each vocabulary:

- Nace (too long and not maintained since 2010 and includes only economical activities)
- Data themes (generic and includes non-economical activities, maintained by the PO and used by <http://data.europa.eu>)
- SDG Annex I and Annex II (strict link to CPSV-AP but it is not described as a vocabulary)
- COFOG (top level is maintained by the PO)
- Output, Business and Life Events (Annex IV, V, VI)

ES then presented the proposed solution:

<u>Sector</u>	<u>Thematic area</u>	<u>Type</u>
Data themes	SDG Annexes	COFOG

ES pointed out that the use of certain controlled vocabularies here is not mandatory, it is simply a suggestion.

Discussion on the controlled vocabularies recommended for “Thematic area”

ARG did not agree with the SDG Annexes as the Thematic area. ARG would also rename “type” to “functions of government” because “type” is too ambiguous.

ES replied that for sector and type, we can agree on the proposed controlled vocabularies.

FB asked the working group if there are other lists that can be used for the Thematic Areas.

AG commented that the classification of a PS should be user centric. Thus, it should be to what citizens know. Also, multiple classifications could be used.

JY asked whether SDGR Annexes will be used for dct:type of Event too.

FB replied that there are different aspects in the [two annexes](#).

- Annex I has areas such as work and retirement
- Annex II has life events

Both annexes are limited in scope.

FB asked whether we should align CPSV-AP with the annexes of the SDGR.

The participants are in favour of alignment between CPSV-AP and the SDGR.

FB asked the group whether the label “type” should be changed to “functions of government”.

Few participants are in favour of this change but because of a limited number of participants in this webinar, this particular issue will be handled on Github.

Discussion on the controlled vocabulary recommended for “Sector”

ES asked the working group if there are objections to recommending the Data Themes vocabulary.

There were no objections.

Discussion on the controlled vocabularies included in annexes IV, V, VI of CPSV-AP 2.0.

ES presented the annexes of life and business events included in the [previous specification document \(PDF\)](#). ES asked the working group whether these classifications are currently used by the participants.

FB commented that for the life events, we need to align with the SDGR for the terms that are similar. We can then contact OP to establish this.

	<p>JY commented that they are using CPSV-AP v.2 but they support aligning to SDGR. This is currently only as a trial version of CSPV-AP-NO, so they are ready to change this.</p> <p>ES presented the codelist associated with Output and asked the working group whether they are currently used.</p> <p>JY commented that the same answer is true for Output, so we should move towards the SDGR.</p> <p>FB commented that indeed, there are outputs in Annex II of the SDGR. They are far more detailed, for example: the proof of registration of birth. This annex can be considered for examples that could be mapped to the classification proposed in CPSV-AP.</p> <p>ES commented that the relation between the event and the output is also included in Annexes I and II.</p> <p>For business/life events and the output (annexes IV, V, VI), the editors will look into the options of aligning with the SDGR and will make a proposition to the working group.</p> <p>FB came back on the issue of the addressee, brought up by ARG as an additional change request. FB asked if we could capture this under Agent.</p> <p>ARG replied that the SDG annexes include this consideration. Every area is linked to a business or life event. It could be solved by using the SDG classification. If you want to be more specific and include non-businesses, this is not included in the SDG annexes. We could also change the business and life naming to legal and natural entities.</p> <p>ARG added that we can indicate more properties as mandatory in the future. In that case, we need to make sure that the optional values are not too limited.</p> <p>FB invited ARG to post this as a change request on GitHub to ensure transparency.</p>
<p>Next steps and wrap-up</p>	<p>ES presented the next steps and roadmap for CPSV-AP. Version 3.0 will be published in the coming month.</p> <p>MAR wrapped up the webinar referring to the contact points with the Catalogue of Service Action, and the webinar on Natural Language Processing on 28/04/2022.</p> <p>MAR and FB thanked the participants for their attendance and involvement and wrapped-up the webinar.</p>

from Jim Yang to everyone: 10:15 AM

+1

from ES - Ana Rosa to everyone: 10:15 AM

+1

from Alexandros Gerontas to everyone: 10:15 AM

+1

from Bart Hanssens BE to everyone: 10:16 AM

+1

from Iraklis Varlamis GRNET to everyone: 10:16 AM

+1

from Jim Yang to everyone: 10:17 AM

+1

from Alexandros Gerontas to everyone: 10:17 AM

+1

from Bart Hanssens BE to everyone: 10:17 AM

+1

from Iraklis Varlamis GRNET to everyone: 10:17 AM

yes

from ES - Ana Rosa to everyone: 10:17 AM

+1

from Sander Van Dooren to everyone: 10:19 AM

Is it in scope of the model?

from Bart Hanssens BE to everyone: 10:20 AM

don't see an immediate need for it ... perhaps a different ontology / set of properties not limited to/within scope of cpsv-ap ?

from ES - Ana Rosa to everyone: 10:21 AM

Although it is no harmful if optional, it seems out of the scope of this core vocabulary

from ES - Ana Rosa to everyone: 10:22 AM

A question

from Jim Yang to everyone: 10:32 AM

+1 to 1

from Miguel Alvarez DIGIT EC to everyone: 10:32 AM

Any objection?

from ES - Ana Rosa to everyone: 10:33 AM

1 seems more "core"

from Alexandros Gerontas to everyone: 10:33 AM

I am not sure . However, I think it is a little bit risky.

from Alexandros Gerontas to everyone: 10:39 AM

Are the services for which the cost is defined by private organisations public ones?

from EC DIGIT D2 Pavlina Fragkou to everyone: 10:40 AM

are the cost defined by law?

from Florian Barthelemy to everyone: 10:43 AM

@Pavlina: I think both cases can happen (costs defined by law and costs defined directly by organisations whether public, semi-public or private)

from EC DIGIT D2 Pavlina Fragkou to everyone: 10:44 AM

@Florian: true

from Florian Barthelemy to everyone: 10:45 AM

Same in Belgium, see for example the VAT registration process (public service) which has two different processes:

https://business.belgium.be/en/setting_up_your_business/registration_with_the_vat_authorities

from Florian Barthelemy to everyone: 10:46 AM

one for free delivered by a public organisation and one with a fee delivered by different private organisations

from Alexandros Gerontas to everyone: 10:51 AM

I think we have to delimit the scope of a public service catalogue to public services in order to keep the model more focused.. Also. I think we have to distinguish between public services and services of the private sector that are regulated by law or are supervised by a public organisation.

from Jim Yang to everyone: 10:53 AM

+1 to incl.

from ES - Ana Rosa to everyone: 10:53 AM

+1 Alexandros

from Alexandros Gerontas to everyone: 10:53 AM

Could you please repeat the question?

from Giampaolo Sellitto - ANAC IT to everyone: 10:53 AM

+1 to incl

from Iraklis Varlamis GRNET to everyone: 10:53 AM

+1 to include

from Alexandros Gerontas to everyone: 10:54 AM

+1

from Alexandros Gerontas to everyone: 10:58 AM

Is this class going to be a subclass of the Agent class?

from Jim Yang to everyone: 10:59 AM

In Norway we have "free choice of hospital" for the patients, which incl. private hospitals on contract with the public.

from Bart Hanssens BE to everyone: 11:00 AM

other meeting, thanks for the discussions and improvements

from Miguel Alvarez DIGIT EC to everyone: 11:03 AM

Thank you Jim for this valuable insight

from ES - Ana Rosa to everyone: 11:03 AM

I agree to include concessions as delegation of public organizations' responsibility but not licences to develop an activity that can be considered a public service, such as telecom services, health services or educational services. The CPSV-AP could be extended by any Member State that wants to include the latter case.

from Alexandros Gerontas to everyone: 11:03 AM

I this case, the public service is the payment of a benefit or the health service provided by a hospital?

from Lorenzo Iannone to everyone: 11:08 AM

Option 3 would be the best option for us

from Jim Yang to everyone: 11:08 AM

+1 to opt 3

from ES - Ana Rosa to everyone: 11:08 AM

+1 opt3

from PT -Jorge SOUSA to everyone: 11:09 AM

+1 opt3

from Alexandros Gerontas to everyone: 11:09 AM

+1 opt 3

from Giampaolo Sellitto - ANAC IT to everyone: 11:09 AM

+1 3

from MT - Norman Calleja to everyone: 11:09 AM

+1 opt3

from ES - Ana Rosa to everyone: 11:15 AM

I don't agree with SDG Annexes as Thematic Area

from ES - Ana Rosa to everyone: 11:16 AM

I would rename "type" by "functions of government"

from ES - Ana Rosa to everyone: 11:16 AM

or "function"

from ES - Ana Rosa to everyone: 11:16 AM

"type" is too generic

from PT -Jorge SOUSA to everyone: 11:18 AM

+1 ES

from Florian Barthelemy to everyone: 11:19 AM

We can hear you

from ES - Ana Rosa to everyone: 11:20 AM

I'll try to reconnect

from Alexandros Gerontas to everyone: 11:20 AM

I think that the classification of a PS should be user centric. Thus, I think it should be to what citizens know. Also I think that multiple classifications could be used .

from Jim Yang to everyone: 11:20 AM

But, SDGR Annexes will be used for dct:type of Event too?

from ES - Ana Rosa to everyone: 11:23 AM

Sorry, I am here again

from Alexandros Gerontas to everyone: 11:23 AM

+1

from Jim Yang to everyone: 11:23 AM

+1 to aligning

from Iraklis Varlamis GRNET to everyone: 11:23 AM

+1

from Giampaolo Sellitto - ANAC IT to everyone: 11:23 AM

align

from ES - Ana Rosa to everyone: 11:23 AM

We definitely need the addressee of the service, either business, citizen or both

from Alexandros Gerontas to everyone: 11:24 AM

+1 Ana Rosa

from Jim Yang to everyone: 11:24 AM

+1 to function

from ES - Ana Rosa to everyone: 11:24 AM

SDG teams is now trying to reconcile the both annexes

from ES - Ana Rosa to everyone: 11:25 AM

Yes of course

from Florian Barthelemy to everyone: 11:29 AM

We can tackle the "addressee" request right after.

from Jim Yang to everyone: 11:30 AM

We are using CPSV-AP v.2 but we support aligning to SDGR

from Jim Yang to everyone: 11:30 AM

... currently only as a trial version of CSPV-AP-NO, so we are ready to change

from Jim Yang to everyone: 11:33 AM

same with this one, so go for SDGR

from Alexandros Gerontas to everyone: 11:37 AM

Also elements of the profile of a PS beneficiary could be considered.

from Jim Yang to everyone: 11:39 AM

Agree with Ana Rosa, that a PS could also benefit e.g. a Public Org (e.g. grants)

from ES - Ana Rosa to everyone: 11:41 AM

ok

from Florian Barthelemy to everyone: 11:44 AM

Thank you very much for the contributions! It was valuable! Enjoy the day!

from Jim Yang to everyone: 11:44 AM

Thanks and bye!

from Giampaolo Sellitto - ANAC IT to everyone: 11:44 AM

bye

from EC DIGIT D2 Pavlina Fragkou to everyone: 11:44 AM

thank you

from Miguel Alvarez DIGIT EC to everyone: 11:44 AM

thank you all

from PT -Jorge SOUSA to everyone: 11:44 AM

thank you! Bye±

from Giampaolo Sellitto - ANAC IT to everyone: 11:44 AM

thank you