

# D05.01 20221107 Meeting Minutes: Webinar on the review of CPSV-AP

<b>Project:</b>	SEMIC: CPSV-AP	<b>Meeting Date/Time:</b>	07/11/2022 13:00 - 15:00
<b>Meeting Coordinator:</b>	Emidio Stani, Makx Dekkers	<b>Issue Date:</b>	07/11/2022

## Meeting Agenda

1. Welcome
2. Context of the Core Vocabularies
3. Issues on CPSV-AP - Part 1
4. Short break
5. Issues on CPSV-AP - Part 2 and Controlled Vocabularies
6. Wrap up and next steps

## Participants

<b>Name</b>	<b>Initials</b>	<b>Organisation</b>
Agata Majchrowska	AM	Poland
Alexandros Gerontas	AG	University of Macedonia, Greece
Bart Hanssens	BH	Fedict, Belgium
Sebastian Sklarß	SS	Init, Germany
Dimitris Zeginis	DZ	Centre for Research and Technology Hellas, Greece
Adam Arndt	AA	Digitaliseringsstyrelsen, Agency for Digitalisation, Ministry of Finance, Denmark
Pavlina Fragkou	PF	EC-DIGIT, EU
Eero Vegmann	EV	Riigi Infosüsteemi Amet, Estonia

Fabian Santi	FS	Federal Statistical Office, Switzerland
Gevog Bakhshyan	GB	Armenia
Giampaolo Sellitto	GS	TOOP, Italy
Giorgia Lodi	GL	Agenzia per l'Italia digitale, Italy
Hayk Moralyan	HM	EKENG CJSC, Armenia
Tamás Demeter	TD	NISZ, Hungary
Silvia Tursi	ST	Intellera consulting, Italy
Jim Yang	JY	Digdir, Norway
Kees Trautwein	KT	Logius, Netherlands
Kurt Stian	KS	Norway
Liivi Karpištšenko	LK	Estonia
Lyubo Blagoev	LB	USW, Bulgaria
Matthias Palmér	MP	MetaSolutions, Sweden
Miha Jesenko	MJ	Ministry of Public Administration, Slovenia
Norman Calleja	NC	MITA, Malta
Natasa Sofou	NS	Trasys International, Greece
Nils Janßen	NJ	Germany
Peter Bruhn Andersen	PBA	Digitaliseringsstyrelsen, Agency for Digitalisation, Ministry of Finance, Denmark
Jorge Sousa	JS	AMA, Portugal
Nuno Martins	NM	AMA, Portugal
Mafalda Gonçalves	MG	Portugal
Riitta Alkula	RA	DVV, Finland
Julia Rolfs	JR	Germany
Sebastiaan Taes	ST	BOSA, Service Manager, DG Transformation Digitale, Belgium
Ulrika Domerllöf Mattsson	UDM	DIGG, Sweden

Niki Chatzilvasili	NC	Deloitte, Greece
Bert Van Nuffelen	BVN	SEMIC team, Belgium
Makx Dekkers	MD	SEMIC team, Belgium
Nathan Ghesquière	NG	PwC Belgium
Emiel Dhondt	ED	PwC Belgium
Jitse De Cock	JDC	PwC Belgium
Emidio Stani	ES	PwC Belgium

## Points discussed and decisions taken

Topic discussed	Outcome
<b>CPSV-AP</b>	
<b>Issue 107</b> locn:address in the class foaf:Agent: the cardinality should be 0..*	<b>Approved</b> Apply proposition.
<b>Issue 99</b> Public Organization - preferred label: should be 1..*	<b>Approved</b> Apply proposition. Provide a clarification in usage note that the skos:prefLabel restriction applies here as well.
<b>Issue 103</b> Definition of the class Dataset is unclear	<b>Not approved</b> Investigate if the explicit inclusion of dcat:Dataset in the model is necessary and whether it is used or not.
<b>Issue 84</b> Why 0..n for dct:identifier in Dataset (while it is 1 for all other dct:identifier)?	<b>Not approved</b> Dependant on the outcome of issue 103
<b>Issue 91</b> cv:Output as a subclass of dcat:Dataset?	<b>Not approved</b> Review how the subclassing of Evidence is used. If not used, phase out. Review more general linking options. Review definitions in SDGR.

<p><b>Issue 66</b> How to specify the "address" of a channel?</p>	<p><b>Approved</b> Leave the model as is. Extend/revise usage notes. Investigate vCard usage and add it to the usage note.</p>
<p><b>Issue 86</b> Alignment with CPOV: Specifying normal opening hours as structured data in Channel and Contact point.</p>	<p><b>Approved</b> Apply proposition</p>
<p><b>Issue 95</b> Use of cccev:EvidenceType instead of cv:Evidence</p>	<p><b>Approved</b> However, use "hasInputType" instead of "hasEvidenceType"</p>
<p><b>Issue 110</b> Inverse relation between Participation and Agent</p>	<p><b>Approved</b> Restrict participates 1.. * and hasParticipant 1..1 Use "participates" instead of "playsRole"</p>
<p><b>Issue 96</b> Add explicitly the Public Service Consumer</p>	<p><b>Not approved</b> See resolution of issue 79 below.</p>
<p><b>Issue 79</b> Addressee and SDG Annexes</p>	<p><b>Option 1 approved</b> Review using Dublin Core Audience as a recommendation. Overall working point for Core Vocabularies: Explain how to expand on a code list.</p>
<p><b>Issue 100</b> Concession Contract: eProcurement ontology</p>	<p><b>Not approved</b> The eProcurement ontology contains a URI for the same concept but with a different definition, to review differences in definitions with eProcurement.</p>
<p><b>Issues 101, 104 &amp; 105</b> Communication: Updates on the model</p>	<p><b>Approved</b> Apply propositions.</p>
<b>Controlled Vocabularies</b>	
<b>Controlled Vocabularies</b>	Collect suggestions and comment on the <a href="#">GitHub</a> page.

# Full meeting minutes

Topic	Discussion
<b>Introduction</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The next webinar is on DCAT-AP on 25/11/2022.</li> <li>• On 26/01/2022 there is a webinar on CPV, CBV and CCCEV.</li> <li>• The CPSV-AP and BregDCAT-AP specifications are now on the SEMIC GitHub.</li> </ul>
<b>CPSV-AP</b>	
<b>locn:address in the class foaf:Agent: the cardinality should be 0..* (issue #107, slide 13 )</b>	<p><b>Issue</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The cardinality for the property address (locn:Address) in the class Agent (foaf:Agent) currently is 0..1.</li> <li>• It should be 0..*, because an Agent may have several different addresses.</li> </ul> <p><b>Proposition</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Relax the cardinality of relation Agent - Address (0..*).</li> </ul> <p><b>Outcome: approved</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Apply proposition.</li> </ul> <p><b>Discussion</b></p> <p>No comments</p>
<b>Public Organisation - preferred label: should be 1..* (issue #99, slide 14)</b>	<p><b>Issue</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The property preferred label in the class Public Organisation currently is 1..1. It should be 1..*.</li> </ul> <p><b>Proposition</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Relax cardinality like other classes with name/title and description.</li> </ul> <p><b>Outcome: approved</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Apply proposition</li> <li>• Provide a clarification in usage note that the skos:prefLabel restriction applies here as well.</li> </ul>

<p><b>Definition of the class Dataset is unclear (issue #103, slide 15)</b></p>	<p><b>Issue</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Change current definition of Dataset:</li> <li>• “This class represents a collection of metadata and where they can be found, for instance on a regional public service portal and/or a national eGovernment portal.”</li> </ul> <p><b>Proposition</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reuse definition from DCAT: "A collection of data, published or curated by a single agent, and available for access or download in one or more representations."</li> <li>• Add the current definition as a usage note.</li> </ul> <p><b>Outcome: not approved</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Investigate if the explicit inclusion of dcat:Dataset in the model is necessary and whether it is used or not.</li> </ul> <p><b>Discussion</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Why is dcat::Dataset used here? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ The original work came from Dutch pilot a long time ago to express datasets for public services.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• GL: understands the use case but it applies to the type of data. The usage of DCAT(-AP) is always done within the EU and shouldn't be part of the model.</li> <li>• Either reuse dcat::Dataset everywhere or nowhere. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ Look at whether it would be interesting to make it consistent across vocabularies.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• MP: The bi-directional relation between Dataset and PublicService makes no sense and would blow up the triple store based on the amount of usage. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ Propose to phase out these relations.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• MD: We will look at dcat::Dataset and if possible propose to phase it out. It has to be checked whether it would break current implementations.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Why 0..n for dct:identifier in Dataset (while it is 1 for all other dct:identifier)? (issue #84, slide 16)</b></p>	<p><b>Issue</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The identifier in Dataset has cardinality 0..* while in other classes the identifier has cardinality 1..1.</li> </ul> <p><b>Proposition</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Keep the cardinality open (0..*)</li> <li>• Add the guideline on identifiers in the usage note for further information on how to use identifiers in the context of Datasets.</li> </ul>

	<p><b>Outcome: not approved</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Dependant on the outcome of issue 103</li> </ul> <p><b>Discussion</b></p> <p>This is a non-issue, dcat:Dataset is not defined in this vocabulary and a special version, a new "profile" in this setting is not necessary.</p>
<p><b>cv:Output as a subclass of dcat:Dataset? (issue #91, slide 17)</b></p>	<p><b>Issue</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Like the Evidence class, make Output class a subclass of Dataset.</li> </ul> <p><b>Proposition</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Like the Evidence class, make Output class a subclass of Dataset.</li> </ul> <p><b>Outcome: not approved</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Review how the subclassing of Evidence is used.</li> <li>• If not used, phase it out.</li> <li>• Review more general linking options.</li> <li>• Review definitions in SDGR.</li> </ul> <p><b>Discussion</b></p> <p>Question: What are the needs ? Reusing Dataset properties?  JY: Reusing is a major reason for discussing this issue.  MD: Are all Outputs dcat::Datasets or not?  JY: Evidence class and Output class are similar and should be the same  MP:This will affect all Outputs. All Outputs would have to be a Dataset, while a document isn't always a Dataset.  GL: Agreed  MD clarified we weren't going to discuss what Dataset is or isn't.  GL: Agreed Evidence and Output should be treated the same. Preferably by not being a subclass of Dataset.  JY: The main point is that Output and Evidence are treated equally.  How JY's team currently sees it: Output refers to a Dataset about the actual Document and not the Document produced by the PublicService.  MD: Subclassing of Evidence and Output is not useful/necessary. Can we remove the subclassing?  MP: Yes.</p>

	<p>MD: What effect would this have?</p> <p>ES: Will have an effect on CCCEV we can discuss it in the associated webinar.</p> <p>Usage is not completely visible and thus it needs investigation into the usage.</p> <p>JY: Maybe we could refer to DataSet instead of inheriting from it.</p> <p>MD: Identified the current misalignment within the working group is due to the fact some think about Dataset as a personal dataset and others think about Dataset as a collection of information on multiple people.</p> <p>MP: The loose definition is giving us a lot of headaches.</p> <p>MD: Proposed to phase out the usage of the Subclassing and replace it with a more general way of linking since some cases still need to make the connection.</p> <p>GS: Evidence and output are something specific clearly defined for example in SDGR. Do the terms have the same meaning here? Are we sure that we don't need to be able to know if something is an evidence or an output, for example in the sense of SDGR?</p> <p>ES: This class predates the regulation and definitely should be reviewed.</p>
<p><b>How to specify the "address" of a channel? (issue #66, slide 18 )</b></p>	<p><b>Issue</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How to specify the email address when the channel type is email, the homepage/URL when the channel type is homepage, etc.?</li> </ul> <p><b>Proposition</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• MS can extend the Channel class to add properties/subclass.</li> </ul> <p><b>Outcome: approved</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Leave the model as is.</li> <li>• Extend/revise usage notes.</li> <li>• Investigate vCard usage and add it to the usage note.</li> </ul> <p><b>Discussion</b></p> <p>ES: Which channels are often used by MS?</p> <p>GL: Leave the class and allow MS to extend in their own way, either with subclasses or using the type property.</p> <p>MD: Maybe we could add the most common ones to prevent interoperability loss due to everyone implementing the same in a</p>

	<p>slightly different way?</p> <p>GL: Original is sufficient and additional guidelines can be included.</p> <p>MD: A vCard could be referenced to have the URL or Email.</p> <p>MP: Is there a list of types of channels?</p> <p>ES: The current usage note advises to look at the Europass standard list of communication channel types. The usage note can be extended.</p> <p>JY: Where then should the actual address of the specific service go ?</p> <p>MD: If we suggest in the usage notes that vCards can be used then the actual address can be stored in such a vCard.</p>
<p><b>Alignment with CPOV: Specifying normal opening hours as structured data in Channel and Contact point (issue #86, slide 19)</b></p>	<p><b>Issue</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Like for Contact Point, make Channel have a relationship towards Temporal Entity for normal opening hours.</li> </ul> <p><b>Proposition</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Add same relations (openingHours and availabilityRestriction) to Channel like for ContactPoint towards TemporalEntity.</li> </ul> <p><b>Outcome: Approved</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Apply proposition.</li> </ul> <p><b>Discussion</b></p> <p>No comments</p>
<p><b>Use of cccev:EvidenceType instead of cv:Evidence (issue #95, slide 22)</b></p>	<p><b>Issue</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Add direct relation between Public Service and EvidenceType in case of public service description.</li> </ul> <p><b>Proposition</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Add relation “hasEvidenceType” between PublicService and EvidenceType to support public service descriptions case.</li> </ul> <p><b>Outcome: Approved</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• But use “hasInputType” instead of “hasEvidenceType”</li> </ul> <p><b>Discussion</b></p> <p>GL: In the Evidence class is there a type property? Isn't it already connected in this way to EvidenceType?</p> <p>ES: The property is generic and this is specific.</p> <p>MP: Does EvidenceType only contain evidenceTypeClassification: Code if so isn't modelling in through a relation to complex.</p>

	<p>BVN: The usage of EvidenceType should be mainly seen as a code list. It is a class because in CCCEV there was a need to describe more conditions.</p> <p>MP: Questioned the naming of the relation.</p> <p>DZ: Proposed hasInputType since relation with Evidence is called hasInput.</p>
<p><b>Inverse relation between Participation and Agent (issue #110, slide 23)</b></p>	<p><b>Issue</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Add inverse relation between Participation and Agent.</li> </ul> <p><b>Proposition</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In alignment with the request during the Core Public Event webinar, add the inverse relation "hasParticipant".</li> </ul> <p><b>Outcome: Approved</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Restrict participates 1.. * and hasParticipant 1..1</li> <li>• Use "participates" instead of "playsRole"</li> </ul> <p><b>Discussion</b></p> <p>GL: Review cardinalities</p> <p>ES: Restrict to 0..1?</p> <p>GL and MP: No 1..1. Cardinalities have been the source of issues in the eProcurement ontology. People didn't use some classes because of cardinalities.</p> <p>MP: Turn playsRole into participates.</p>
<p><b>Add explicitly the Public Service Consumer (issue #96, slide 24)</b></p>	<p><b>Issue</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Make an explicit relation between Public Service and Agent.</li> </ul> <p><b>Proposition</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Add relation "isProvidedTo" since it could be helpful for public service execution to analyse usage of Public Service.</li> </ul> <p><b>Outcome: not approved</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• See outcome of issue 79</li> </ul> <p><b>Discussion</b></p> <p>MP and MD question why an individual is targeted. isProvidedTo is for PS provision and therefore targets an Agent which is an individual and not a group.</p> <p>MP thought the Issuer meant category of consumers not an individual.</p>

	<p>ES: In that case we can proceed to the next issue since it is related to that.</p>
<p><b>Addressee and SDG Annexes (issue #79, slide 25)</b></p>	<p><b>Issue</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Add a category of addressee to which a Public Service is addressed to, such as citizens, businesses, etc.</li> </ul> <p><b>Proposition</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Option 1: Add property "addressee" (code) to Public Service to indicate the addressee of a Public Service</li> <li>• Option 2: Add relation "addressee" to a foaf:Group to which an Agent might belong to.</li> </ul> <p><b>Outcome: option 1 approved</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Review using Dublin Core Audience as a recommendation.</li> <li>• Overall working point: Core Vocabularies: Explain how to expand on a code list.</li> </ul> <p><b>Discussion</b></p> <p>MP: if this actually works with foaf and it is a category instead of a specific group then option 1.</p> <p>MD: EU Vocabulary Target Audience is a code list that already exists and could be used. But businesses should still be added. GL also prefers option 1.</p> <p>MD : Could the extension of Target audience be discussed with the Publication Office?</p> <p>MD: Dublin Core Audience list is another possible list.</p> <p>SS: This could make it hard to distinguish business from Public service. Avoid separating public service and business</p> <p>MP: Restricted to code list or allow open list?</p> <p>MD: Recommend one but not restrict it.</p> <p>MP: In that case an example of how to extend a code list is useful.</p>
<p><b>Concession Contract: eProcurement ontology (issue #100, slide 26 &amp; 27)</b></p>	<p><b>Issue</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The 3.0.0 release of the Eprocurement Ontology has introduced the Concession Contract, which is already present in CPSV-AP.</li> <li>• Similar concepts with differing definitions.</li> </ul> <p><b>Proposition</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Keep URI as the definition comes from the Directive and mention services.</li> <li>• Optional: create a relation between the 2 URIs.</li> </ul> <p><b>Outcome: not approved</b></p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The eProcurement ontology contains a URI for the same concept but with a different definition, to review differences in definitions with eProcurement.</li> </ul> <p><b>Discussion</b></p> <p>GL: Why introduce a concessionContract here?</p> <p>ES: It existed here in case a contractor was used for the provision of PS and existed before the equivalent class in eProcurement.</p> <p>GL: Do we still need this since the info can be part of the Participation class.</p> <p>ES: This is the who, not the what.</p> <p>MD: Not looking at remodelling just review alignment with eProcurement.</p> <p>GL: Would propose to align with eProcurement and contact the ontology makers.</p>
<p><b>dct:relation has multiple ranges in the rdf schema (issue #63, slide 28)</b></p>	<p><b>Issue</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• dct:Relation is used 3 times: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ from event to public service (range: public service)</li> <li>○ from public service to itself (range: public service)</li> <li>○ from legal resource to itself (range: legal resource)</li> </ul> </li> <li>• As a consequence in the rdf schema, it appears that dct:relation has public service and legal resources as ranges.</li> </ul> <p><b>Proposition</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Make the relations as subproperties of dct:relation.</li> </ul> <p><b>Outcome: Not Approved</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Discussion moved to GitHub</li> </ul>
<p><b>Communication: Updates on the model (issues #101, #104 and #105, slide 29)</b></p>	<p><b>Issue</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cardinality of dcat::Dataset landingPage: Document</li> <li>• Cardinality of cv::Evidence relatedDocumentation: Document</li> <li>• cv in cv::Address</li> <li>• Typos related to cv::ContactPoint <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ hasEmail</li> <li>○ hasTelephone</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p><b>Proposition</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Change landingPage cardinality to 0..*.</li> <li>• Change relatedDocumentation cardinality to 0..*.</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Change cv::Address to locn::Address.</li> <li>• Change hasEmail to email.</li> <li>• Change hasTelephone to telephone.</li> </ul> <p><b>Outcome: Approved</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Apply propositions.</li> </ul> <p><b>Discussion</b></p> <p>There were no comments therefore the changes were approved.</p>
<p><b>Controlled Vocabularies</b></p>	
<p><b>Controlled Vocabularies overview (slide 31 and 32)</b></p>	<p>NG gave a short explanation of pending issues (issues 50, 74 and 76) and explained the table on proposed classification for Business and Life events.</p> <p>Followed by a general call to action asking the working group to contribute, add comments and give suggestions on the <a href="#">GitHub</a>.</p>
<p><b>Other issues will be treated on GitHub.</b></p>	