



**Working Group meeting on Core Criterion and Core
Evidence Vocabulary (CCCEV)**

Virtual Meeting 6

SEMIC Phase 7

Meeting Minutes



Meeting with .. on ..- minutes			
Venue	Adobe Connect	Meeting date	2016-28-11
Author	Dimitris Hytioglou	Meeting time	15:00-16:00 CET
Reviewed by	Oriol Bausa Peris	Issue date	2016-29-11
Status	For review	Version	0.02

ATTENDEES

Name	Abbreviation	Organisation
Ansgar Mondorf	AM	University Koblenz-Landau, Germany
Enric Staromiejski	ES	Everis
Giampaolo Sellitto	GS	Autorita Nazionale Anticorruzione (Italy)
Makx Dekkers	MD	AMI Consult SARL
Ole Madsen	OM	DIGST (Denmark)
Oriol Bausa Peris	OB	Invinet
Natalie Muric	NM	Publications Office
Dimitris Hytioglou	DH	PwC EU Services

AGENDA

ID	Description
1.	Opening, agenda, tour de table
2.	Minutes from the last WG meeting
3.	Public review issues
4.	Next steps

1. OPENING, AGENDA, TOUR DE TABLE

OB welcomed everyone and presented the agenda for the meeting. A summary of the participants of the previous working group meetings is available on [Joinup](#).

2. MINUTES FROM LAST MEETING

OB informed the participants that the minutes from the previous meeting are available on [Joinup](#), and inquired whether there are any comments.

3. DISCUSSION POINTS

During the call the following points were discussed:

1. AM expressed his concerns on adopting the CCCEV in eSENS until there is a stable version.
2. MD explained the process of versioning for all Core Vocabularies. He explained that there is a strict versioning process. A new major version of a specification is not published more often than once every 2 years. Minor changes and error corrections can be done more often with the release of minor versions.
3. ES explained that they are currently working with Members States and stakeholders on the public github of DG GROW on evolutions of the ESPD. ES explained that they are already implementing version 1.02 and they will start implementing version 1.10 within a month. Furthermore ES encourages the MSs to participate in their biweekly meetings organised by DG GROW.

4. PUBLIC REVIEW ISSUES

The public review issues discussed where the following three:

1. The standard could be improved by specifying the RDF elements in the vocabulary of the standard. It is not sufficient to reference the used RDF vocabulary as a whole. It is necessary to reference the specific RDF class and the specific RDF characteristics. We are going to provide an RDF version of the vocabulary.

Resolution: We will provide the RDF elements for the vocabulary

2. Improve the clarity of the descriptions of the different use cases in the document. The use cases have as a goal to give specific descriptions of the needs that the vocabulary will be providing solutions for. However, the use cases seem to be cases which are focused on describing how the needs are fulfilled using the vocabulary. The general use case descriptions for CCCEV should focus on stating the needs only. Describing the fulfilment of the needs should be separated from the description of the needs.

Resolution: The needs are summarised in section 4, so there is no need to change the specification.

3. Add into the Criterion class required elements to allow for automatic evaluation of criteria.
 - EvaluationTypeCode: a code specifying whether the criterion is of type fail/pass, weight in, or any other.
 - EvaluationWeightTypeCode: a code representing possibly a percentage, a formula returning a weight or whatever other solution specifying a relative weight the CA may come up with when evaluating this criterion.

- **EvaluationInformation:** a text field to describe any particular circumstance around the weighting of the criterion or a specific aspect of the application of the general weighting methodology to this particular criterion.

Resolution: The ESPD model is still not finalised so it is not yet stable. The changes in the model cater for a whole new functionality that has never been analysed within our group and it would require changes in many parts of the standard, from the requirements down to the examples. It is suggested to postpone the adoption of these new fields for a future release of the CCCEV.

Conclusion: All attending members from the working group agreed on all the above resolutions, therefore there are no outstanding issues and the specification can proceed to publication.

5. NEXT STEPS

ID	Description	Owner	Due date
1.	ISA and PwC to proceed to the official publication of the specification		

CHAT LOG

Giampaolo Sellitto: Hi all

Athanasios KARALOPOULOS: Hello

Ole Madsen: Hello

Athanasios KARALOPOULOS: This is Dimitris from PwC stepping in for Stefanos

Giampaolo Sellitto: yes we can see it now

Ole Madsen: I am on Listen Only. My Name is Ole Madsen, Ministry of Finance, Denmark. Just home from holiday.

Makx Dekkers: +1

Makx Dekkers: +1

Enric Staromiejski (GROW): trying to reconnect

Makx Dekkers: +1

Ansgar Mondorf: is there a defined process how to version the cccev?

Giampaolo Sellitto: +1... we can foresee an Application profil for this vocabulary , where the actual implementation is taken into account

Enric Staromiejski (GROW): MS are invited to join the discussion we hold biweekly organised by DG GROW

Enric Staromiejski (GROW): For instance, Italy, could you participate?

Giampaolo Sellitto: yes, I can

Giampaolo Sellitto: can you invite us? I need details about when and how to connect

Athanasios KARALOPOULOS: yes that would be good

Athanasios KARALOPOULOS: (dimitris)

Giampaolo Sellitto: ok, thanks

Makx Dekkers: +1

Enric Staromiejski (GROW): +1

Makx Dekkers: thanks oriol

Enric Staromiejski (GROW): My Congratulations

Makx Dekkers: congratulations to all

Giampaolo Sellitto: Thanks Oriol

Makx Dekkers: thanks gianpaolo!

Makx Dekkers: bye bye

Giampaolo Sellitto: Bye all