

# D05.01 20221027 Meeting Minutes: Webinar on the review of Core Vocabularies

<b>Project:</b>	SEMIC: Core Vocabularies	<b>Meeting Date/Time:</b>	27/10/2022 10:30 - 12:30
<b>Meeting Coordinator:</b>	Emidio Stani	<b>Issue Date:</b>	27/10/2022

<b>Meeting Agenda</b>
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Welcome</li> <li>2. Context of the Core Vocabularies</li> <li>3. Updates on Core Location and Core Public Organisation</li> <li>4. Short break</li> <li>5. Presenting Core Public Event</li> <li>6. Wrap up and next steps</li> </ol>

## Points discussed and decisions taken

<b>Topic discussed</b>	<b>Outcome</b>
<b>Core Location</b>	
<b>Issue 22</b> Attribute for street name and number	Approved eProcurement will look to correct and comply.
<b>Issue 24</b> Expected Range "String" in the class Address should be replaced by "Literal"	Approved Make changes. Add designer note. Investigate Identifier class.
<b>Issue 25</b> AdminUnit	Not approved Investigate INSPIRE RDF guidelines.
<b>Issue 23</b> Support use of JSON-LD Playground	Approved Remove round brackets.

	Investigate dots (to be replaced by underscores).
<b>Core Public Organisation</b>	
<b>Issue 22</b> CPSV-AP / CPOV consistency: AdministrativeTerritorialUnit class	Not approved Organise separate discussion.
<b>Issue 24</b> CPSV-AP / CPOV consistency: Contact page to be added in ContactPoint	Approved Perform the changes.
<b>Issue 23</b> CPSV-AP / CPOV consistency: specialOpeningHoursSpecification	Approved Apply the proposition.
<b>Core Public Event CPEV</b>	
<b>Issues 4 and 6</b> PublicEvent definition	Approved Collect further comments and suggestions on the definition. The definition requires further work based on comments and suggestions. Look at the definition by CIDOC CRM.
<b>Issue 17</b> Unplanned Events	Approved Remove cardinalities in relations between DateTime and PubliEvent.
<b>Issue 19</b> Tickets	Approved Remove Ticket and Offer classes.
<b>Issue 22</b> Identification of events	Approved Apply changes. Consider initial keywords for the topic property. Consider the properties: language and meetingType.
<b>Issue 1, 10 and 15</b> Place	Approved Apply proposition.
<b>Issue 16</b> Hierarchy in events	Approved Add parentEvent.
<b>Issue 12, 18 and 20</b> Time dimension of Event	Approved Apply proposition
<b>Issue 21</b>	Approved

Contact Point	Apply proposition.
<b>Issue 9</b> Distinguishing active and passive participants	Approved Apply proposition. Review the direction of the relation between Agent and Participation.
<b>Issue 14</b> Public Event Type classification	Approved Apply proposition.
<b>Issue 5 and 8</b> Description, access, registration	Approved Apply proposition.
<b>Other issues will be treated on Github.</b>	

Full meeting minutes

Topic	Discussion
<b>Introduction</b>	<p>Pavlina welcomed the participants of the webinar.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This webinar: issues on Core location, Core Public Organisation and Core Public Event</li> <li>• The next webinar will be on Core Public Service Vocabulary Application Profile (CPSV-AP).</li> <li>• A webinar on Data Catalog Application Profile (DCAT-AP) will be held on November 25 2022.</li> <li>• 26 January 2023 there will be a webinar on Core Person Vocabulary (CPV) and Core Business Vocabulary (CBV).</li> </ul>
<b>Overview diagram with interdependencies</b>	Giorgia Lodi noticed CBV and CPEV could be connected.
<b>Core Public Location</b>	

<p><b>Attribute for street name and number (Issue 22)</b></p>	<p><b>Issue</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>locn:thoroughfare does not include a number and is only the street name.</li> </ul> <p><b>Proposition</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>If full address is needed use locn:fullAddress otherwise if a subset is needed concatenate thoroughfare with locatorDesignator.</li> </ul> <p><b>Discussion</b></p> <p>Giorgia Lodi asked why fullAddress is not being used. Emidio Stani and Andreea Pasare clarified that it is used for a subset namely street and number since that is not yet a complete address.</p> <p>eProcurement has put the entire string in the locator designator. Geert Thijs stated that locator designators should only contain: house number, flat number, floor number, box number and not a street name.</p> <p>eProcurement will have to look into this and adjust in order to match the proposed resolution.</p> <p>In the definition of locatorDesignator 'relevant scope' = 'thoroughfare'.</p> <p><b>Outcome: approved</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>eProcurement will look to correct and comply.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Expected Range "String" in the class Address should be replaced by "Literal" (Issue 24)</b></p>	<p><b>Request</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Change expected range 'xsd:String' to 'rdfs:Literal' in Address:addressID, LocatorDesignator, poBox, postCode.</li> <li>Makes it backwards compatible W3C Core Location Vocabulary.</li> <li>xsd:String is compatible with rdfs:Literal.</li> <li>This will simplify the use of datatypes.</li> </ul> <p><b>Discussion on the issue, request and proposition</b></p> <p>Geert Thijs mentioned Literals are very flexible and can be used to describe uri, string, number...</p> <p>Emidio Stani explained that this would give MSs more freedom to use it the way they want.</p> <p>Giorgia Lodi proposed a possible expansion to a class identifier which could contain: identifier string/literal, identifier type and issuer of identifier. As a shared class over different vocabularies.</p> <p>Geert Thijs agreed and this would match INSPIRE.</p>

	<p>Matthias Palmér commented that this gives a lot of additional freedom and would advise to add clarifying designer note. Emidio agreed to add designer note to these properties.</p> <p><b>Outcome: approved</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Make changes</li> <li>• Add designer note</li> <li>• Investigate identifier class</li> </ul>
<p><b>AdminUnit (Issue 25)</b></p>	<p><b>Request</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Be more in line with INSPIRE specification.</li> <li>• There is no place in the Address class for the admin unit of the municipality in text format.</li> <li>• There is only the reference to the AdminUnit class.</li> </ul> <p><b>Proposition</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Add name property in AdminUnit.</li> </ul> <p><b>Discussion on the issue, request and proposition</b></p> <p>Geert Thijs noticed the Address class seems to mix the Address class from INSPIRE with the AddressRepresentation class from INSPIRE. He counter proposed to remove the link to AdminUnit and add adminUnit5 as a property.</p> <p>Emidio Stani clarified the class is used because the levels are dependent on countries.</p> <p>Giorgia Loni clarified that this originated from the INSPIRE RDF guidelines and should be checked against the guidelines before changing it.</p> <p>Bert Van Nuffelen very important that the class is still compatible with addresses for countries outside the EU.</p> <p><b>Outcome: not approved</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Investigate INSPIRE RDF guidelines</li> </ul>
<p><b>Support use of JSON-LD Playground (Issue 23)</b></p>	<p><b>Issue</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Labels in round brackets aren't compatible with JSON-LD playground.</li> </ul> <p><b>Proposition</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Remove round brackets.</li> </ul>

	<p><b>Discussion on the issue, request and proposition</b>  Matthias proposes that for better JSON compatibility dots should also be replaced by underscores.</p> <p><b>Outcome: approved</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Remove round brackets.</li> <li>• Investigate dots (to be replaced by underscores).</li> </ul>
<p><b>Core Public Organisation</b></p>	
<p><b>CPSV-AP / CPOV consistency: AdministrativeTerritorialUnit class (Issue 22)</b></p>	<p><b>Issue</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• AdministrativeTerritorialUnit refers to a URI outside of any Semic models.</li> </ul> <p><b>Proposition</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Re-use AdminUnit from Core Location</li> </ul> <p><b>Discussion on the issue, request and proposition</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• AdminUnits is too strict for unique jurisdictions.</li> <li>• Just using the geospatial location is too generic.</li> <li>• A hierarchy is needed for UX design. (Users must be able to perform a hierarchical search.)</li> <li>• GeoNames can serve as an example which is partially the idea behind AdminUnit.</li> <li>• MS can use their own system via AdminUnit or try to match with GeoNames.</li> <li>• AdminUnit is a controlled vocabulary.</li> </ul> <p>Makx Dekkers: There is no agreement on this yet. A separate discussion needs to take place to take these different comments into consideration so that we can come to a solution where we can find an agreement.</p> <p><b>Outcome: not approved</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Organise separate discussion</li> </ul>
<p><b>CPSV-AP / CPOV consistency: Contact page to be added in ContactPoint (Issue 24)</b></p>	<p><b>Request</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Add contactPage property to the Core Voc::ContactPoint class to align with CPSV-AP.</li> </ul>

	<p><b>Discussion on the issue, request and proposition</b>  There were no comments and therefore the request was approved.</p> <p><b>Outcome: approved</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Perform the changes</li> </ul>
<p><b>CPSV-AP / CPOV consistency: specialOpeningHoursSpecification (Issue 23)</b></p>	<p><b>Request</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Change the URI of availabilityRestriction.</li> </ul> <p><b>Proposition</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Fix the URI as requested, in compliance with CPSV-AP to cv:specialOpeningHoursSpecification;</li> <li>• Make openingHours a relation instead of a property, to give more freedom in describing the opening hours;</li> <li>• Replace the Class OpeningHoursSpecification with time:TemporalEntity, this will be in alignment with Core Public Event</li> </ul> <p><b>Discussion on the issue, request and proposition</b>  There were no comments and therefore the request was approved.</p> <p><b>Outcome: approved</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Apply the proposition.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Core Public Event</b></p>	
<p><b>PublicEvent definition (Issues 4 and 6)</b></p>	<p><b>Issue</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A definition for PublicEvent is needed</li> </ul> <p><b>Proposition</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• “Something that happens at a particular place and time, organised by one or more agents for a particular purpose, and is of interest to the general public.”</li> <li>• This definition excludes natural events such as earthquakes and hurricanes.</li> </ul> <p><b>Discussion on the issue, request and proposition</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Public event will have attributes on which it can be filtered such as type</li> <li>• It is not for commercial events</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• These are events open to the public. (Not only those organised by public entities.)</li> <li>• Look at the definition by CIDOC CRM.</li> </ul> <p><b>Outcome: approved</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Collect further comments and suggestions on the definition.</li> <li>• The definition requires further work based on comments and suggestions.</li> <li>• Look at the definition by CIDOC CRM.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Unplanned Events (Issue 17)</b></p>	<p><b>Issue</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Events are not always scheduled or planned in advance.</li> <li>• An event can happen and only later be qualified as an event</li> </ul> <p><b>Proposition</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cardinalities for the relation startDate and endDate between PublicEvent and DateTime will be removed.</li> </ul> <p><b>Discussion on the issue, request and proposition</b> There were no comments and therefore the request was approved.</p> <p><b>Outcome: approved</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Remove cardinalities in relations between DateTime and PubliEvent.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Tickets (Issue 19)</b></p>	<p><b>Issue</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ticket price might be considered too granular for the core model.</li> </ul> <p><b>Proposition</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Remove Offer and Ticket classes, as requirements are not defined.</li> </ul> <p><b>Discussion on the issue, request and proposition</b> There were no comments and therefore the request was approved.</p> <p><b>Outcome: approved</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Remove Ticket and Offer classes.</li> </ul>



<p><b>Identification of events (Issue 22)</b></p>	<p><b>Issue</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• title may not be unique and could not serve as an identifier.</li> </ul> <p><b>Proposition</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• keep title, add identifier (Literal) and topic (code) properties.</li> </ul> <p><b>Discussion on the issue, request and proposition</b>  Topic will be left open and could be anything.  Matthias Palmér proposed to add initial keywords to help people find good topic words.  Sebastian proposed to add language and meeting type (physical, online or hybrid).</p> <p><b>Outcome: approved</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Apply changes.</li> <li>• Consider initial keywords for the topic property.</li> <li>• Consider the properties: language and meetingType.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Place (Issue 1, 10 and 15)</b></p>	<p><b>Request</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Easier discovery of events within and between countries;</li> <li>• Difference between physical and virtual location;</li> <li>• Accessibility of an event;</li> <li>• Multiple locations for a single event.</li> </ul> <p><b>Proposition</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Add the “address” relation to (Core Location) Address class for physical location;</li> <li>• Keep the "format" (Code) property to specify the format of the event;</li> <li>• Keep the "accessibility" (Text) property;</li> <li>• Cardinalities are not enforced, so there can be multiple locations for an event.</li> </ul> <p><b>Discussion on the issue, request and proposition</b>  There were no comments and therefore the request was approved.</p> <p><b>Outcome: approved</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Apply proposition</li> </ul>

<p><b>Hierarchy in events (Issue 16)</b></p>	<p><b>Request</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Events can sometimes have a parent and / or a child relationship.</li> </ul> <p><b>Proposition</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• keep subEvent relation and add parentEvent relation.</li> </ul> <p><b>Discussion on the issue, request and proposition</b>  There were no comments and therefore the request was approved.</p> <p><b>Outcome: approved</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Add parentEvent.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Time dimension of Event (Issue 12, 18 and 20)</b></p>	<p><b>Issues</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Date vs DateTime</li> <li>• Frequency in case of recurrence</li> <li>• Focus on timing</li> </ul> <p><b>Proposition</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Use TemporalEntity</li> <li>• Add description and a frequency property to TemporalEntity</li> <li>• Add hasNextEvent and hasPreviousEvent</li> </ul> <p><b>Discussion on the issue, request and proposition</b>  Matthias Palmér proposed to add EventSeries and not have too many repeated relations. (Store like an array instead of like a double linked list.)  Emido said the links should be limited and EventSeries could be an expansion.</p> <p><b>Outcome: approved</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Apply proposition</li> </ul>
<p><b>Contact Point (Issue 21)</b></p>	<p><b>Request</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ContactPoint is needed</li> </ul> <p><b>Proposition</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• reuse ContactPoint from CPOV and add relation with PublicEvent <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Option:use TemporalEntity to clarify contact times.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

	<p><b>Discussion on the issue, request and proposition</b>  There were no comments and therefore the request and its option were approved.</p> <p><b>Outcome: approved</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Apply proposition.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Distinguishing active and passive participants (Issue 9)</b></p>	<p><b>Request</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Add participant roles.</li> </ul> <p><b>Proposition</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• reuse Participation class from CPSV-AP including the concept role. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ Option add hasTime relation for the timing of the Participation.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p><b>Discussion on the issue, request and proposition</b>  Matthias Palmér proposed to change the direction of the relation from Agent to Participation to Participation to Agent.</p> <p><b>Outcome: approved</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Apply proposition.</li> <li>• Review the direction of the relation between Agent and Participation.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Public Event Type classification (Issue 14)</b></p>	<p><b>Request</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• classify public events and describe audience type.</li> </ul> <p><b>Proposition</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Keep eventType and add audience property (How to implement this is up to the MS)</li> </ul> <p><b>Discussion on the issue, request and proposition</b>  Sebastian noticed this vocabulary could also be interesting to universities communicating their classes although they are not public in the strict meaning of the word.</p> <p><b>Outcome: approved</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Apply proposition.</li> </ul>

**Description, access, registration (Issue 5 and 8)**

**Request**

- More info about the PublicEvent, about registration and about edition.

**Proposition**

- Keep description;
- Replace url (URI) with homepage (Document);
- keep registration (Document);
- Add eventNumber.

**Discussion on the issue, request and proposition**

There were no comments and therefore the request was approved.

**Outcome: approved**

- Apply proposition.

**Other issues will be treated on Github.**