

Meeting Minutes: Fourth Working Group webinar on the revision on GeoDCAT-AP (SEMIC - A04.02)

Project:	SEMIC	Date and Time:	14/05/2024 10:00 - 12:00
Meeting Type:	Webinar	Location:	Virtual
Coordinators:	Bert Van Nuffelen Jakub Klímek	Issue Date:	05/06/2024

Agenda of the webinar		
10:00 - 10:10	Introduction	Slides 1 - 3
10:10 - 10:15	DCAT-AP ecosystem	Slides 4 - 8
10:15 - 10:55	GeoDCAT-AP Issues	Slides 9 - 20
10:55 - 11:35	Codelists	Slides 21 - 39
11:35 - 11:50	XSLT & High-Value Datasets	Slides 40 - 49
11:50 - 11:55	GeoDCAT-AP 3.0.0: Overview of changes	Slides 50 - 51
11:55 - 12:00	Next steps & closing	Slides 52 - 56

Meeting Slides
LINK

Participants		
Name	Initials	Organisation
Age Sild	AS	Estonian Land Board
Anastasia Sofou	AS	SEMIC Team
Antoine Jacques	AJ	GIM, Belgium

Participants		
Name	Initials	Organisation
Arthur Schiltz	AS	SEMIC Team
Aurelija Sturaite	AS	Construction Sector Development Agency, Lithuania
Bert Van Nuffelen	BVN	SEMIC Team
Daniel Gomez	DG	Cartographic and Geological Institute of Catalonia, Spain
Pavlina Fragkou	PF	DIGIT
Emiel Dhondt	ED	SEMIC Team
Erik Obersteiner	EB	Environment Agency Austria
Fabio Vinci	FV	Epsilon Italia
Florian Barthelemy	FB	SEMIC Team
Francois Prunayre	FP	Cerfrance Haute-Loire, France
Gery Nicolay	GN	Spacebel, Belgium
Hanna Horppila	HH	National Land Survey of Finland
Ine de Visser	IdV	Geonovum, Netherlands
Inga Andriuskeviciute	IA	The National Center for Remote Sensing and Geoinformatics, Lithuania
Jakub Klímek	JK	SEMIC Team
Jitka Faugnerová	JF	Czech Environmental Information Agency
Joachim Nielandt	JN	Digital Flanders, Belgium
Joeri Robbrecht	JR	DG ENV
Jordi Escriu	JE	JRC
Josema Alonso	JA	SEMIC Team
Juliana Karciauskiene	JK	The National Center for Remote Sensing and Geoinformatics, Lithuania
Lena Hallin-Pihlatie	LHP	Finnish Land Survey
Lenka Rejentova	LR	Czech Environmental Information Agency

Participants		
Name	Initials	Organisation
Mayte Toscano	MT	OGC
Paloma Abad	PA	National Geographic Information Center, Spain
Pascal Derycke	PD	Sciensano, Belgium
Vendula Dastychová	VD	Czech Environmental Information Agency
Veronika Kusova	VK	State Administration of Land Surveying and Cadastre, Czech Republic
Pawel Soczewski	PS	GISPartner, Poland
Štěpán Kafka	SK	Charles University, Czechia

Points discussed and decisions taken

Topic discussed	Outcome
GeoDCAT-AP	
Issue #81 Distributor agent role	Approved: keep the property distributor on Dataset and clarify its meaning.
Issue #113 Revise usage of licences and AccessRights	Approved.
Issue #82 Relax rights max cardinality	Approved: lift cardinality both in GeoDCAT-AP and DCAT-AP.
Issue #100 Relation of spatial resolution on Dataset, Distribution and Data Service	Approved: cardinality of spatial resolution on Dataset to be kept unbounded, wording of 'data is managed' adapted to 'original spatial resolution' or similar.
Codelists	Approved: feedback is requested over the public review.

Full Meeting Minutes

Welcome & Introduction Slides 1 - 3	PF welcomes the participants and introduces the topics of the webinar: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Introduction • GeoDCAT-AP Issues • Codelists
---	---

<p>Speaker: Pavlina Fragkou</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● HVD, GeoDCAT-AP XSLT ● Next steps <p>The purpose of this webinar is to close the series on the revision of GeoDCAT-AP.</p>
<p>The GeoDCAT-AP ecosystem</p> <p>Slides 4 - 10</p> <p>Speaker: Jakub Klímek, Bert Van Nuffelen</p>	<p>GeoDCAT-AP ecosystem GeoDCAT-AP is primarily a DCAT-AP profile for geospatial datasets. However, the major other inputs are the ISO and INSPIRE standards. Recently, the OGC Standards Working Group (SWG) started working on the GeoDCAT standard.</p> <p>GeoDCAT-AP timeline The revision started with an introductory webinar in February, followed by three working group webinars including this one. In June the editor’s draft of GeoDCAT-AP will be released and a public review will ensue. The public review will end in September followed by the official release of GeoDCAT-AP 3.0.0.</p> <p>Issue overview A total of 59 issues are open in the GeoDCAT-AP GitHub repository. The first draft of GeoDCAT-AP, which will be published soon, already contains the resolution to 34 of those issues.</p> <p>The remaining issues are classified as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● 4 issues have a resolution provided, but are not yet implemented; ● 4x to be discussed today; ● 2x closed, because no feedback was received; ● 9x implementation evidence; ● 3x postponed beyond version 3.0.0; ● 3x editorial.
<p>GeoDCAT-AP issues</p> <p>Slides 9 - 20</p> <p>Speaker: Jakub Klímek</p>	<p>Issue #81 Some of the GeoDCAT-AP agent roles, such as distributor, may not make sense for all DCAT entities, that is Dataset, Dataset Series, Data Service, Distribution.</p> <p>In Flanders, distributor on ISO “dataset” scope code is mapped to geodcatap:distributor of dcat:Distribution instead of dcat:Dataset.</p> <p>SEMIC Proposition The SEMIC proposition is to either:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Clarify meaning of the distributor role on dcat:Dataset, or 2. Move the distributor from dcat:Dataset to dcat:Distribution, i.e. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Remove distributor from dcat:Dataset, and b. Map distributor on Datasets always to corresponding dcat:Distribution.

Resolution

The majority of the votes are in favour of keeping the property *distributor* on the class Dataset.

Discussion

JN wonders whether it ever makes sense to have a Dataset without a distribution, but with a distributor role. JK raises this question to the community, but a lack of responses indicates that no one has faced this issue yet. JN cannot say for sure that they have not faced this situation.

IdV asks whether there can be more distributors of one dataset. BVN replies that currently there are no limitations on this, however on a Distribution one distribution seems more intuitive.

BVN mentions that the semantics of the property distributor refer to the distributor of a resource, which is very close to the notion of the Distribution class in DCAT-AP.

JN argues that having both options available is confusing. A case can be made for having the distributor role on a Dataset if there are no Distributions, but once there is a Distribution present the meaning of the role needs to be clear. Moving it removes ambiguity according to him.

JR comments that it is not just about having distributions. A dataset is originally created by a data owner, who acquires the data and the metadata. By definition there is this dataset which is the original source or any distribution which could be connected to a distributor which is the data owner. On the Dataset level this would be the case if a public administration acquiring the data is not responsible for distributing the data, in this case the public administration could be the distributor of the dataset itself.

Issue #113

Currently in GeODCAT-AP 2 a licence can be expressed as free text. This is not allowed according to the High-Value Dataset Implementing Regulation where the licence has to be machine-readable and dereferenceable. Ideally, this licence is from NAL.

The content of *accessrights* that are found in practice look more akin to *rights* instead of a licence.

SEMIC Proposition

The SEMIC proposition is to remove licence as text and allow licence usage only with licence IRIs, and change mappings of non-IRI accessRights statements to dct:RightsStatements using dct:rights.

Resolution

The majority of the votes are in favour of accepting the proposition.

Discussion

JF is interested in the practical side of publishing a licence. She wonders what would happen to licences that are in national languages that are not English.

BVN replies that the Publications Office has a centralised list which contains the most prominent open licences that are available. Some Member States have reached out to include their national licences. The Publication Office can accommodate national licences in this codelist. However, as this content is of a legal nature it is likely that this text is published on a national portal and ideally the published licence by the Publications Office can point to that licence. The licence does not have to be translated in all official EU languages. Additionally, when published by OP translation services may be offered, but this has to be discussed in accordance with OP.

JF requests clarification on the use of a URL pointing to a published licence in a national data portal. BVN mentions that the register is important in the context of the HVDs because it has to be an open licence, which becomes hard to compare in the case of national licences. However, mapping it to a licence from the EU NAL is allowed.

Issue #82

In INSPIRE metadata, rights are expressed as multiple textual statements. However, in DCAT-AP & GeoDCAT-AP, rights (on Catalogue and Distribution) currently have cardinality 0..1.

SEMIC Proposition

The SEMIC proposition is to either relax rights max cardinality in both GeoDCAT-AP and DCAT-AP, or merge multiple rights statements into one in the mapping from INSPIRE to GeoDCAT-AP.

Resolution

The majority of the votes are in favour of lifting the cardinality of dct:rights in both GeoDCAT-AP and DCAT-AP.

Discussion

No discussion on this issue was held.

Issue #100

This issue is regarding specifying the definition of spatial resolution on the different levels of Dataset, Distribution, Data Service and Dataset Series, and their relationship.

SEMIC Proposition

The SEMIC proposition to this issue is fourfold:

1. for Distribution, spatial resolution represents the spatial resolution of the described file with a cardinality of 0 to 1;
2. for Data Service, spatial resolution describes the capabilities of the data service with an unbounded cardinality [0..n], i.e. in

- which spatial resolutions it can serve data;
3. for Dataset, spatial resolution describes the spatial resolution the data is managed in in the dataset with cardinality 0 to1, i.e. regardless of how it is distributed using distributions;
 4. for Dataset Series, it is unclear what spatial resolution of a dataset series means.

Resolution

The majority of the votes are in favour of the proposition, however the cardinality of spatial resolution on the class Dataset must remain unbounded (0..*). Additionally, the wording 'data is managed in' will be changed to 'source spatial resolution', 'original spatial resolution' or similar.

Discussion

JN asks what it means to manage data in a dataset in a certain spatial resolution?

JK replies that a dataset is managed by a publisher and this dataset is kept in a certain spatial resolution. However, in a distribution it can be distributed in different spatial resolutions that could be converted computationally. The spatial resolution of a dataset should be as intended by the data manager or data owner.

JN mentions that the wording of 'manage the data' was unclear to him. He argues that perhaps it could be clearer to specify 'source resolution' or 'original resolution'. JK responds that this suggestion will be included.

AA mentions they have datasets that have different spatial resolutions, for example rural areas have lower resolutions, while cities and towns are more detailed. Therefore, having a maximum cardinality on spatial resolution on Dataset is not ideal and an unbounded cardinality would make more sense. PA, LHP, and JE and DG agree with this.

Resolved issues

The following issues were resolved as no negative feedback was received on the proposed resolution:

1. CRS support in GeoJSON ([#6](#))
2. Required / Recommended properties of supporting classes ([#109](#))

Closed issues

The following issues were closed as no feedback was received:

1. Support 1-to-many mappings for responsible party roles ([#39](#))
2. Relationships between GeoDCAT-AP and DCTERMS agent roles ([#57](#))

Codelists

[Slides 21 - 39](#)

Speaker: Bert Van Nuffelen

In this section a common interpretation for the sentence below will be attempted to be established.

“The property **MUST** use as range values codes from {codelist} which are transferred from one specification to another.”

An example of the codelist is the following:

```
ns:codelist1 a skos:ConceptScheme.  
ns:codelist1 skos:prefLabel "Example Codelist1"@en.
```

```
codelist1:x2 a skos:Concept.  
codelist1:x2 skos:prefLabel "Code x2"@en.  
codelist1:x2 skos:inScheme ns:codelist1.  
codelist1:x2 skos:topConceptOf ns:codelist1.
```

Most of the code lists are based on a well structured SKOS controlled vocabulary that includes URIs and metadata about such codes or values.

Below three examples are given of the use of codelists. Depending on how the reader interprets MUST, they may see different examples as valid, or not.

Codelist Qualifier

Example

The property **MUST** use as range values codes from EU vocabularies Data theme.

Example 1

```
_:d dcat:theme nal:AGRI.
```



Example 2

```
_:d dcat:theme inspire:au.
```



Example 3

```
_:d dcat:theme nal:AGRI.  
_:d dcat:theme inspire:au.
```



In example one the value is from the Data theme codelist, in example 2 the value is from another, INSPIRE codelist, and in the last example, both values are used.

The same thought exercise is done but with “the property **MAY** use as range values codes from EU vocabularies Data theme” instead of **MUST** as was the case in the previous example.

Codelist Qualifier

Example

The property **MAY** use as range values codes from EU vocabularies Data theme.

Example 1

```
_:d dcat:theme nal:AGRI.
```



Example 2

```
_:d dcat:theme inspire:au.
```



Example 3

```
_:d dcat:theme nal:AGRI.  
_:d dcat:theme inspire:au.
```



BVN presents his own interpretation. For the **MUST** example he only regards the first option as true. In the **MAY** case he regards the first as true and the second as 'unclear', that is neither true or false.

Discussion

JF argues that **MUST** and **MAY** are very similar in meaning. In the past she had experience with EU documents where **SHOULD** is used with the meaning of **MUST**.

PS has the same interpretation as BVN in the case of **MUST**.

JR mentions that 'shall' indicates a requirement, 'should' indicates a recommendation, and 'may' is used to indicate that something is permitted. Lastly, 'can' is used to indicate that something is possible.

JE agrees with JR as this is the approach used in the INSPIRE framework.

JK points the participants to [RFC2119](#) which contains information on the meaning for **MAY/MUST** and others.

SHACL shapes: as-is

The shapes are used for validation services and conformance testing.

The following pattern is used:

```

:Codelist1Restriction
a sh:NodeShape ;
rdfs:comment "Codelist1 restriction" ;
sh:property [
  sh:hasValue ns:codelist1;
  sh:minCount 1 ;
  sh:nodeKind sh:IRI ;
  sh:path skos:inScheme
] .

:PropertyShape
a sh:NodeShape ;
sh:property [
  sh:node :CodelistRestriction ;
  sh:nodeKind sh:IRI ;
  sh:path dct:subject ;
  sh:severity sh:Violation
] ;
sh:targetClass dcat:Dataset.

```

In case of MANDATORY the severity is a 'Violation',
in all other cases the severity is a 'Warning'.

A value has to be within the codelist restriction to be considered part of that codelist. This is how the pattern works. In case of a mandatory value the error is a violation, in all other cases the violation is a warning.

Multiple systems

The question is what happens when multiple systems harvest the dataset that contains the value from the EU NAL codelist. Each system harvesting the dataset might have a slightly different specification.

Imagine that Portal A harvests according to the EU NAL values in the codelist. However, Portal B might require a value from the INSPIRE codelist. In Portal A the validation will be successful, however, in Portal B it will not be validated correctly, and therefore won't be harvested correctly.

In case that the INSPIRE value is used in the dataset, then the opposite is true.

In the case that both values are used, then it is invalid on both portals in the case of MUST.

The interpretations of mandatory codelists can be as follows:

Interpretation 1: The value space is closed under the codelist.

- Cardinality and value space constraints are independent.
- Restricts the freedom of compatible (sub)profiles in terms of reinforcing the cardinalities or further restricting the possible codelist values (e.g. to a single value).

Interpretation 2: At least 1 value from the codelist is included.

- Cardinality and value space constraint are made dependent.
- Compatible (sub)profiles may freely add other codelist constraints.

- Cannot be used in case the property is optional (cardinality 0 means optional).

Interpretation 1 is conformant to the way literal value spaces are expressed and is most natural for programming languages and software systems. Interpretation 2 on the other hand is of interest in cases where there is a need for aggregation at the level of properties in the specification.

The validation for each interpretation is also different.

In Interpretation 1 the existing SHACL shapes can be used as-is and the validation results are simple and direct. An error is received when the value is outside of the value space, in that sense violations drive the feedback

In Interpretation 2 the existing SHACL shapes cannot be used as-is. It would require a filtering process as an inherent part of the processing and conformance building. Such a filtering process is non-trivial to standardise and would be imposed on all implementations. Additionally, as the value space is not closed, poor usages are harder to detect. It is, however, possible to create matching SHACL shapes for Interpretation 2.


The last point is that of multiple systems. Both interpretations will have an impact on other related specifications. If Interpretation 1 is used in one of the specifications it will overwrite Interpretation 2 as it is more restrictive. For example, if GeoDCAT-AP used Interpretation 1 and DCAT-AP uses Interpretation 2, then Interpretation 1 will be enforced on DCAT-AP as some datasets will be expressed, and harvested, in both GeoDCAT-AP and DCAT-AP.

The conclusion here is that coordination is required.

SEMIC Proposition

The SEMIC proposition is fourfold to accommodate the different types of interpretations:

- A. The property **MUST** use as range values codes from {codelist}
 - Interpretation 1: The value space is closed under the codelist and validation results in violations.
 - All (sub)profiles must avoid conflicts by creating subproperties.
- B. The property **MUST** have at least one value from {codelist}
 - Interpretation 2: The value space is minimally constrained and validation results in warnings.
 - All (sub)profiles must adopt this interpretation in case they want to restrict the value space.

	<p>C. The property IS RECOMMENDED to use as range values codes from {codelist}</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Interpretation 1: The value space is closed under the codelist, but other values are tolerated and validation results give warnings. <p>D. The property MAY use as range values codes from {codelist}</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Interpretation 1: The value space is closed under the codelist, but other values are accepted. In this case no validation is required. <p>Resolution The proposal will be implemented and can be further assessed by the community during the review.</p> <p>Discussion IdV thinks it is a difficult discussion and she argues it should be viewed from the level of the Application Profile. For example, a generic AP such as DCAT-AP may not use specific codelists compared to a specialised AP. Therefore, she believes that for example the national level should not be too restrictive, while the domain level should.</p>
<p>HVD, GeoDCAT-AP XSLT</p> <p>Slides 40 - 49</p> <p>Speaker: Jakub</p>	<p>XLST This part of the webinar focuses on the impact of the review of the XSLT.</p> <p>Before the update, in GeoDCAT-AP 2, the property dct:subject was used on which gmd:topicCategory was mapped as can be seen in the example below.</p> <p>After the update the same property of INSPIRE will be mapped to the new GeoDCAT-AP topicCategory property. The input remains the same, only the output is mapped on a different property. Therefore, the effects of the update remain minimal.</p> <pre> <!-- GeoDCAT-AP 2.0.0 output --> <rdf:Description> <dct:subject rdf:resource="http://inspire.ec.europa.eu/metadata-codelist/TopicCategory/Environment"/> </rdf:Description> </pre>  <pre> <!-- INSPIRE MD input from www.nationaalgeoregister.nl --> <gmd:topicCategory> <gmd:MD_TopicCategoryCode>Environment</gmd:MD_TopicCategoryCode> </gmd:topicCategory> </pre> <pre> <!-- GeoDCAT-AP 3.0.0 output --> <rdf:Description> <geodcatap:topicCategory rdf:resource="http://inspire.ec.europa.eu/metadata-codelist/TopicCategory/Environment"/> </rdf:Description> </pre> <p>The same is true for referenceSystem.</p>

HVD

On June 4th a webinar on HVD reporting will be organised by DG CNECT.

On April 25th a meeting was organised by the Action 2.5 subgroup. As a result two options were introduced to identify HVD in the INSPIRE metadata. Either INSPIRE metadata should be extended to indicate what is a HVD, or datasets should be automatically mapped from the INSPIRE themes to HVD Categories for those datasets that fall under the HVD IR.


The decision on which option to adopt will be held on Friday May 17th. Based on this information it will become clear what needs to happen with the XSLT from SEMIC's side.

Additionally, the HVD Categories NAL code list will be finer-grained and not be limited to the 6 top level categories, but also include second level categories. The release in June will include the IRIs and their English labels. However, in September the translations in the European languages will be added.

XSLT limitations for HVD

One of the limitations of the XSLT in terms of HVD is with regards to licensing information. DCAT-AP HVD assumes that the licensing information is given in the form of an IRI from the EU licence NAL or that there is at least a mapping towards those licence NAL.

The example below contains some indication towards a creative commons licence. After the transformation in the XSLT it is a Data Service with rights pointing to a rights statement with a description as the IRI as text.

<pre><gmd:resourceConstraints> <gmd:MD_LegalConstraints> <gmd:accessConstraints> <gmd:MD_RestrictionCode codeList="http://www.iso211.org/2005/resources/codelist.xml#MD_RestrictionCode" codeListValue="otherRestrictions"/> </gmd:accessConstraints> <gmd:otherConstraints> <gco:CharacterString>Geen beperkingen</gco:CharacterString> </gmd:otherConstraints> </gmd:otherConstraints> <gco:CharacterString>http://creativecommons s.org/publicdomain/mark/1.0/deed.nl</gco:CharacterStri ng> </gmd:otherConstraints> </gmd:MD_LegalConstraints> </gmd:resourceConstraints></pre>		<pre>@prefix rdf: <http://www.w3.org/1999/02/22-rdf-syntax-ns#> . @prefix dcat: <http://www.w3.org/ns/dcat#> . @prefix dcterm: <http://purl.org/dc/terms/> . @prefix geocatap: <http://data.europa.eu/938/> . [] a dcat:DataService ; geocatap:resourceType <http://inspire.ec.europa.eu/metadata-codelist/ResourceType/service> ; dcterm:accessRights [a dcterm:RightsStatement ; dcterm:description "http://creativecommons.org/publicdomain/mark/1.0/deed.nl"@nl ;] .</pre>
---	---	---

1. Not recognized as Licence IRI
2. Unknown relation to CC0 in the EU NAL

There are two problems with this. The first is that the licence is not recognised as an IRI and the relation to CC-BY-4.0 is unknown. The relation to CC-BY-4.0 is required by the HVD Implementing Regulation. The XSLT will not be able to produce a correct representation of each licence in every implementation. Therefore, publishers will have to correct this manually in a mapping or with a licence from the codelist.

A second point is concerning identifiers. In the HVD IR there is a requirement that the metadata and service identifiers are persistent and

dereferenceable. In the INSPIRE metadata there may be an identifier in the form of a UUID, however this is not dereferenceable, and there is no guarantee that this is a persistent identifier. The XSLT cannot make the IRI dereferenceable and persistent, as can be seen in the example below. Each publisher should make the identifier available as a URI and make them persistent.

```
<gmd:fileIdentifier>  
  <gco:CharacterString>229a081d-5c6b-4181-8410-6f07d9b55437</gco:CharacterString>  
</gmd:fileIdentifier>
```



```
@prefix dcat: <http://www.w3.org/ns/dcat#> .  
@prefix dcterms: <http://purl.org/dc/terms/> .  
@prefix geodcatap: <http://data.europa.eu/930/> .  
  
[] a dcat:DataService ;  
   geodcatap:resourceType <http://inspire.ec.europa.eu/metadata-codelist/ResourceType/service> ;  
   dcterms:identifier "229a081d-5c6b-4181-8410-6f07d9b55437" .
```

Lastly, in INSPIRE currently the simplified INSPIRE metadata exists. This no longer contains independent metadata records for Data Services. The metadata about the Data Service is available by dereferencing the endpoint URL, which the XSLT cannot do. Therefore, it might become difficult to distinguish bulk downloads from APIs which will need to be done manually for reporting purposes.

The XSLT can be found [here](#). The community is encouraged to provide feedback on the limitation under the issue section of this repository.

Discussion

JR mentions that the XSLT does not have enough logic to make the ISO or INSPIRE metadata completely compliant with the HVD requirements. The XSLT would need smarter logic to guarantee compliance. There are two options, map on a national level to DCAT-AP or use the XSLT and accept the fact that some errors may be included. Therefore, JR warns the audience to not be 100% reliant on the XSLT.

LHP mentions that they still have a lot of service metadata. From the presentation she understood that the metadata should also be tagged with "bulk-download" or "API" or distinguish them with another solution. LHP wonders whether data providers should rush to meet the deadline of June 9th or wait until clear guidelines are in place.

JR answers that by the 9th of June the implementation should be in place. However, reporting should be done by the 9th of February. Until then no actions on compliance will be taken. The meeting with DG CNECT on the 4th of June should also bring additional clarity. He expects DG CNECT to be lenient as fully functional implementations cannot be expected yet.

FP mentions that GeoNetwork also planned to embed the [conversion](#) which provides conversion to various DCAT profiles.

<p>GeoDCAT-P 3.0.0: Overview of changes</p> <p>Slides 50 - 51</p> <p>Speaker: Jakub Klímek</p>	<p>Over the course of the webinars the following main changes were identified and will be implemented in the new version. In total 6 new subproperties will be added.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● <code>dcterms:conformsTo</code> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ <code>geodcatap:serviceProtocol</code> ○ <code>geodcatap:referenceSystem</code> ● <code>dct:subject</code> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ <code>geodcatap:topicCategory</code> ● <code>dct:type</code> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ <code>geodcatap:serviceType</code> ○ <code>geodcatap:resourceType</code> ○ <code>geodcatap:serviceCategory</code> <p>The introduction of <code>DatasetSeries</code>, and the properties that are present on a <code>Dataset</code> are also included in this class.</p> <p>Additionally, clarification of usage notes and cardinalities will be provided. Licence and rights mappings and label mappings are also included in the revision.</p> <p>The changes are relatively small and the specification is still very similar to GeoDCAT-AP 2. The additional effort to comply with DCAT-AP 3.0.0 is therefore expected to be minimal.</p>
<p>Wrap-up & next steps</p> <p>Slides 52 - 56</p> <p>Speaker: Bert Van Nuffelen, Pavlina Fragkou</p>	<p>The intention is to start the public review by the end of June and release an official version of GeoDCAT-AP 3.0 in September.</p> <p>The community is encouraged to engage with GeoDCAT-AP and the XSLT on GitHub. Additionally, the first editor's draft will become available soon.</p> <p>The community, the members of DG ENV and the JRC are thanked for their participation in the process and over the course of the four webinars.</p>