**D04.01 - Meeting Minutes – CPSV-AP revision webinar 4**

**Action 1.3 Catalogue of Services Specific Contract under Framework Contract DI/07171 – Lot 2**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Project:** | Action 1.3 Catalogue of Services | **Meeting Date/Time:** | 08/07/2016 10:00-12:00 |
| **Meeting Type:** | Webinar | **Meeting Location:** | Online |
| **Meeting Coordinator:** | Michiel de Keyzer | **Issue Date:** | 15/07/2016 |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Attendee Name**  | **Initials** | **Organisation/Country** |
| Bart Hanssens | BH | Fedict, Belgium |
| Thimo Thoeye | TT | Stad Gent, Belgium |
| Airi Reidi | AR | Ministry of Economic Affairs and Communications, Estonia |
| Marco Latvanen | ML | Suomi.fi, Finland |
| Giorgia Lodi | GL | AgID, Italy |
| Giovanni Paolo Sellitto | GPS | ANAC Autorità Nazionale Anticorruzione, Italy |
| Marco Combetto | MC | Trento PaT, Italy |
| Joseph Azzopardi | JA | Information Technology Agency, Malta |
| Patrocinio Nieto | PN | Ministry of Finance and Public Administrations, Spain |
| Miguel Álvarez Rodríguez | MA | ISA, European Commission |
| Peter Burian | PB |
| Phil Archer | PA | W3C |
| Nikolaos Loutas | NL | PwC EU Services |
| Michiel De Keyzer | MDK |
| Christophe Parrein | CP |
| Ana Fernández de Soria | AF |

|  |
| --- |
| **Meeting Agenda**  |
| 1. Welcome and overview
2. Context and objectives
3. First level of life events
4. Second level of business events
5. Output types
6. Next steps
7. Questions & closure

**Presentation and meeting details:** <https://joinup.ec.europa.eu/asset/cpsv-ap/event/cpsv-ap-revision-wg-virtual-meeting-controlled-vocabularies> |

|  |
| --- |
| **Summary of Meeting**  |
|

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Topic** | **Summary** |
| Welcome and overview | * MDK introduced the webinar and thanked the WG members for their participation.
* The presentation used during the webinar can be found on [Joinup](https://joinup.ec.europa.eu/sites/default/files/isa_field_path/2016-07-08_-_presentation_for_webinar_4_v0.03.pptx).
 |
| Context and objectives | * The goal of the webinar was to present and discuss the initial proposals for the controlled vocabularies for:
* 1st level life events;
* 2nd level business events;
* Output type.
 |
| First level of life events | * MDK explained the approach followed for the creation of the 1st level of life events.
* MDK went through the [initial list](https://joinup.ec.europa.eu/sites/default/files/isa_field_path/first_level_life_events_v0.02.xlsx), composed by a total of 14 life events. To know more, please go to the webinar presentation shared on [Joinup](https://joinup.ec.europa.eu/sites/default/files/isa_field_path/2016-07-08_-_presentation_for_webinar_4_v0.03.pptx).
* AR said that the level of abstraction of the list is not always the same. She also said that a LE should not be a continuous activity, but a specific event in a specific moment.
* GL expressed the need to have more detailed description of the LEs. MDK proposed to add a description to each life event.
1. Obtaining identity/personal documents
* JA suggested to distinguish between the “Event” and the resulting “Status” or new role acquired on that basis. For example, “apply as student” is an event that has, as a result, “becoming a student” thus there is the need to add role/status. MDK explained that this proposal should be part of the modelling of the roles of an agent (related to a life event) better than the life events list.
* PROPOSED: Remove “Obtaining identity/personal documents” from the first level of life events.
* RESOLVED: The WG agreed on the proposal.
1. Military service
* PROPOSED: Add the “Military service” to the 1st list of life events.
* RESOLVED: The WG agreed on this.
1. Dealing with the law
* MDK explained that there are public services related to legal aspects. Should we add a life event to the list to refer to them?
* JA agreed with having something like “dealing with the law”, but raised the need of being clearer.
* ML raised the question whether they should be divided into criminal cases, e.g. "being a witness", "being a crime victim", etc. He explained that “Dealing with the law” is more for criminal cases as a criminal, but doesn’t really cover things such being a witness, for example.
* AR clarified that “arrest” is a consequence, the “court” is also a consequence, but there is a life event that happens before that. For example, “I witness a crime”.
* ML expressed that “dealing with the law” might be too wide, but it could be added on the first LEs level.
* PROPOSAL: Add the life event “Dealing with the law” on the first level of LEs. It will be divided into several life events in the future.
* RESOLVED: The WG agreed on this.
1. Settling taxes and financial issue
* PROPOSED: Keep “Settling taxes and financial issue” on the first level of LEs.
* RESOLVED: The WG agreed on it.
1. Environment, agriculture, religion…
* AR said that events relating to environment, agriculture, religion, etc. are not covered under the controlled vocabulary.
* MDK explained that those are considered as themes than LEs.
* AR agreed with him.
1. Acquiring citizenship and seeking asylum
* PROPOSED: Keep “acquiring citizenship” and “seeking asylum” under the “moving to a country” life event.
* RESOLVED: The WG agreed on this.
1. Take care of a family member
* ML suggested to add the life event “Caring for sick family member”*.*
* PROPOSED: Add “Take care of a family member” on the first level of LEs.
* RESOLVED: The WG agreed on this.
 |
| Second level of business events | * MDK gave an overview of the previous work done on BEs, i.e. the creation of the first level of business events. He went through the second level of BEs. To know more about the list, please go to the webinar presentation shared on [Joinup](https://joinup.ec.europa.eu/sites/default/files/isa_field_path/2016-07-08_-_presentation_for_webinar_4_v0.03.pptx).
* AR stressed that there is a mix of business events and public services on the second proposed level of BEs. She explained that we need to be more precise on the second level.
1. Point of view to classify BEs
* MDL explained that, during the identification of the second level of business events, they noticed that there are two ways of looking at BEs thus classifying them, i.e. from a business point of view or from an administration point of view.
* He pointed out that there is no big difference on the identification of BEs depending on the different points of view, but there is on the mapping to the first level of BEs.
* AR mentioned that point of view does not matter that much and it is rather about the individual business events.
* PROPOSED: Create the BEs list looking from a business point of view.
* RESOLVED: The WG agreed on this.
1. Applying for a license and Staffing
* MDK proposed to remove “Applying for a license” from the list and make it part of company registration.
* TT agreed with MDK. He also proposed to add “Hiring an employee” as an event. AR agreed with him.
* AR proposed to add “Register a branch” or “Register a new activity” as part of the second level of BEs.
* PROPOSED: Add “Register a branch” or “Register a new activity” on the second level of BEs,
* RESOLVED: The WG agreed on this.
1. Paying taxes
* AR raised that she did not see “Paying taxes” and “Asking for protection” as events on their own.
* MDK asked whether “Paying taxes” would be a consequence of “Declaring taxes”. NL expressed that “Declaring taxes” looks more like a public service.
* PN said that “Paying taxes” is a BE in the business environment.
* MDK asked whether to have “Paying taxes” as business event or if it should be included into “Reporting”, for example.
* JA stressed that “Paying takes” is not an event. ML proposed to add it under “Reporting”. PN did not agree with this.
* AR pointed out that “Becoming a taxpayer” looks more like a BE. The regular task of paying takes is a regular obligation.
* PROPOSED: Remove “Paying taxes” as event, as it could be considered as a periodic public service.
* RESOLVED: The WG agreed on this.
1. Asking for protection
* PROPOSED: Keep “Asking for protection from creditors” as second level of BE but reformulate it, for instance, “Coming into financial troubles”.
* RESOLVED: The WG agreed on this.
 |
| Output types | * MDK explained the methodology followed to identify the list of outputs. He asked the WG whether they have a list of outputs already defined on their side. In that case, they can send us their list as input for the identification of outputs.
* MDK went through the list of outputs. To know more about the list, please go to the webinar presentation shared on [Joinup](https://joinup.ec.europa.eu/sites/default/files/isa_field_path/2016-07-08_-_presentation_for_webinar_4_v0.03.pptx).
1. Declaration, recognition and permit
* PROPOSED: Keep the “Declaration”, “Recognition” and “Permit” types of output.
* RESOLVED: The WG agreed on this.
1. Physical objects
* NL asked whether the “Physical objects” output type is clear enough. It can overlap with other outputs in some cases. He asked how to define a non-overlapping “Physical object” output.
* MDK proposed to clarify the definition of the “Physical object” output type.
* TT proposed to add “intangible objects” to make them specifically disjoint with the other outputs, instead of reformulating the “physical objects”. For example, a paper does not give any valuable information, but it is the fact that a citizen can submit that paper what has meaning.
* AR hesitated about the need to describe intangible services. He explained that we were discussing about public services where there is a direct contact between a person and the state.
* MDK proposed to have two outputs, “Tangible output” and “Intangible output”.
* GL stressed out that there is no need to indicate the intangible outputs, as output is an optional class.
* PROPOSED: Rename and clarify the definition of “Physical objects” as “Tangible output”.
* RESOLVED: The WG agreed on this.
1. Financial obligations and financial benefits
* PROPOSED: Keep “Financial obligations” and “Financial benefit” on the list.
* RESOLVED: The WG agreed on this.
 |
| Next steps | * It is intended to have the closing webinar in September, after the public review.
* During the public review, the WG members are welcome to provide comments on the controlled vocabularies or any other element of the CPSV-AP specification.
* The WG is asked to perform the following tasks before the next webinar:
* Disseminate the CPSV-AP version for public review amongst their colleagues. They are invited to provide comments should they want to.
* MDK explained the next steps:
* Process the comments received for creating a new version of the controlled vocabularies. This version will be added to the CPSV-AP spec that will be sent out for public review;
* Publish the specifications for public review;
* Collect the comments received during that period;
* Discuss during the next webinar about any comment received during the public review;
* Finalise the specifications and publish version 2.0 of the CPSV-AP.
 |
| Questions & closure | * MA thanked everyone for the interesting discussion and feedback provided. WG members are welcome to provide further comments and/or questions using the available tools (mailing list and [Joinup](https://joinup.ec.europa.eu/asset/cpsv-ap/issue/all)).
 |

 |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Action Nr** | **Action description** | **Target Date** | **Action Owner** |
|  | Process the comments received during the webinar. | 2016-07-22 | PwC |
|  | Send meeting minutes to the WG. | 2016-07-22 | PwC |
|  | Give feedback on the controlled vocabularies using the mailing list (cpsv-ap@joinup.ec.europe.eu) or [Joinup](https://joinup.ec.europa.eu/asset/cpsv-ap/issue/all). | 2016-09-15 | WG |
|  | Disseminate the CPSV-AP specifications that will be sent out for public review amongst colleagues. | 2016-09-15 | WG |
|  | Set the date for the final CPSV-AP revision webinar. | 2016-09-15 | PwC and ISA |