

D05.01 20230221 Meeting Minutes: Webinar on Core Vocabularies

Project:	SEMIC	Meeting Date/Time:	21/02/2023 10:00 - 12:00
Meeting Coordinator:	Bert Van Nuffelen, Emidio Stani	Issue Date:	28/02/2023

Meeting Agenda

1. Welcome
2. Context of the Core Vocabularies
3. Issues on Core Business Vocabulary
4. Short break
5. Issues on Core Person Vocabulary
6. Issues on Core Criterion and Core Evidence Vocabulary
7. Wrap-up & next steps

Meeting Slides

[LINK](#)

Participants

Name	Initials	Organisation
William Verbeeck	WV	SEMIC team
Bert Van Nuffelen	BVN	SEMIC team
Jitse De Cock	JDC	SEMIC team
Anastasia Sofou	AS	SEMIC team
Pavlina Fragkou	PF	SEMIC team
Emidio Stani	ES	SEMIC team

Emiel Dhondt	ED	SEMIC team
Claudio Baldassarre	CB	SEMIC team
Anastasia Sofou	AS	SEMIC team
Makx Dekkers	MD	SEMIC team
Ana Rosa	AR	The Italian Ministry of Territorial Policy and Civil Service
Anabel Fraga	AF	UC3M
Andreea Pasare	AP	QIAGEN
Antonella Lunelli	AL	Region of Trento Italy
Benny Lund	BL	Swedish Companies Registration Office
Denis Van Nuffelen	DVN	SPW transversal data centre Wallonia
Dimitris Zeginis	DZ	Centre for Research and Technology Hellas
Erik Mossing	EM	Swedish Companies Registration Office
Gaurav Jaglan	GJ	S&P Global
Geert Thijs	GT	Digitaal Vlaanderen
Giampaolo Sellitto	GS	ANAC / TOOP semantics WG
Giorgia Lodi	GL	Agency for Digital Italy
Hans de Raad	HDR	OpenNovations
Iraklis Varlamis	IV	GRNET
Jana Ahmad	JA	Czech Technical University Prague
Julien Dupont	JD	Fedasil
John Cunningham	JC	Swedish Companies Registration Office
Jakub Klimek	JK	Ministry of the Interior of the Czech Republic
Konstantinos Raptis	KR	UPRC Greece
Linus Törngren	LT	Swedish Public Employment Service
Lyubo Blagoev	LB	United Software Writers
Marius Hartmann	MH	Danish Business Authority

Maya Borges	MB	Danish Agency for Digital Government
Miha Jesenko	MJ	Ministry of Public Administration
Mihai Paunescu	MP	Publications Office of the European Union
Natalie Muric	NM	Publications Office of the European Union
Norman Calleja	NC	Malta Information Technology Agency
Nick Berkvens	NB	Atos
Nicolas Bodart	NBO	SPW transversal data centre Wallonia
Olli Hurskainen	OH	Finnish Centre for Economic Development, Transport and the Environment
Jim Yang	JY	Norwegian Digitalisation Agency
Paloma Arillo	PA	Publications Office of the European Union
Peter Bruhn Andersen	PBA	Danish Agency for Digital Government
Peter Winstanley	PW	W3C
Ricardo Sanchez Curiel	RSC	Digitization Västra Götalandsregionen
Rob Walker	RW	Compulink Information eXchange
Sirkku Kokkola	SK	Gofore
Tarja Myllymäki	TM	OICRF
Tore Helland	TH	Norwegian Defence Research Establishment

Summary		
10:00—10:15	Intro	Slides 1-11
10:15—11:00	Core Business slides	Slides 12-23
11:00—11:05	Break	
11:05—11:25	Core Person	Slides 25-29
11:25—11:50	CCCEV	Slides 30-34
11:50—12:00	Wrap-up	Slides 36-40

Points discussed and decisions taken

Topic discussed	Outcome
<p>The redirection of W3C ns/legal</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -SEMIC will take over responsibility for ns/legal domain. -The ns/legal entity will be deprecated. -The URIs will remain the same. -The Core Business vocabulary is aligned with ns/regorg. -The URIs of ns/regorg will not be changed.
<p>Issues on Core Business Vocabulary</p>	
<p>Issue 26 Definition of LegalEntity</p>	<p>Not approved</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To be refined and further discussed on GitHub. • The approach of issue 24 could also be applied here.
<p>Issue 24 [Use case]: Representation of people as legal entities</p>	<p>Not approved</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The usage of a property identifying the legalEntityType is to be considered. The intent would be to use a Controlled Vocabulary. • Some open questions would be: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ At what level should the property be included? ○ What code list could be used? ELF was mentioned. ○ Does sole trader have enough properties which differ from LegalEntity to justify a separate class? If it does not it can be included in the definition or usage note of Legal Entity. • Remove the explicit exclusion of Sole Trader.
<p>Issue 31,39 Requirements for businesses in context of</p>	<p>Approved</p>

HVD, <u>Registration date</u>	
Issue 31,39 Requirements for businesses in context of HVD, <u>Accounting document</u>	Approved <ul style="list-style-type: none"> An analysis should be conducted for other types of documents related to businesses.
Issue 40 Alignment with BRIS	Approved <ul style="list-style-type: none"> For memberOf Restrictions of their level of representation could be considered.
Issue 17 Multiple names and locations	Approved
Issues on Core Person Vocabulary	
Issue 23 Addition of a Name class	Not approved <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Move discussion to GitHub
Issue 38 CPV1.00gender is nomina periculosa	Approved
Issue 36 Proposal to create ContactInfo	Approved
Issues on Core Criterion and Core Evidence Vocabulary	
Issue 51 Combining Criteria	Not approved <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Move discussion to GitHub
Issue 46 Evidence is a subclass of dcat:Dataset	Approved
Issue 47 Usage Note is provided by	Approved
Issue 52 Wrong range properties in Period of Time	Approved
Other issues will be treated on GitHub.	

Full meeting minutes

<p>Welcome</p>	<p>PF welcomed the participants and presented the agenda. She gave an overview of the passed webinars and announced that SEMIC is preparing the releases of the Core Vocabularies.</p>
<p>Context of the Core Vocabularies</p>	<p>ES announced that the Vocabularies initially developed under the W3C space will be redirected to their SEMIC successor. The main goal is to have one community to work on the specification and not have the efforts scattered among different communities.</p> <p>BVN presented how this will specifically impact Core Business. Core Business 1.0 used the W3C ns/legal namespace. Development on the namespace resulted initially in ns/legal-entity and eventually ns/regorg. Within SEMIC Core Business 2.0 was developed still using the ns/legal namespace. SEMIC will keep using ns/legal and take up the responsibility to keep it up-to-date. The ns/legal entity itself will be more clearly deprecated. Finally ns/regorg will remain as an independent specification. ns/legal URIs will be considered as part of Core Business. Core Business is aligned with RegOrg and no URI will change.</p> <p>GT would like to have confirmation that no URIs from ns/regorg will change. BVN gave this confirmation and stressed that nothing will change in regard to ns/regorg.</p>
<p>Issues on Core Business Vocabulary</p>	
<p>Issue 26 Definition of LegalEntity</p>	<p>Issue</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The usageNote of LegalEntity gives the impression that every LegalEntity transacts business, which is not true. Most of them conduct business for profit but there are also non-profit Organisations. Maybe define what is understood with business or leave it out of the usageNote altogether. <p>Proposition</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Align with Financial Industry Business Ontology (FIBO): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Make Non-profit class a subclass of Formal Organization. ○ Change “transact business” into “capacity to negotiate contract” in the usage note

Discussion

GT explained that they did something similar but they made Non-profit a subclass of [org::Organization](#) instead of [org::FormalOrganization](#).

ES explained that subclassing from [org::FormalOrganization](#) was chosen to highlight “with associated rights and responsibilities” which is part of the definition of [org::FormalOrganization](#).

AR proposed to make Non-profit a subclass of LegalEntity and PBA agreed.

AF gave the definition of non-profit organisation (source: Cornell Law School) to support the sub-classing under Legal Entity: “A nonprofit organisation or non-profit organisation, also known as a non-business entity, or nonprofit institution, is a legal entity organised and operated for a collective, public or social benefit, in contrary with an entity that operates as a business aiming to generate a profit for its owners.”

RW doesn't like the change from “transact business” to “the capacity to negotiate contracts”.

ES explained that the term business is not defined in the CBV and carries some ambiguity.

PBA asked where a government organisation would fit under LegalEntity, Non-profit or both?

MP asked whether the usage noted needs to be as detailed as it currently is.

PW highlighted that FIBO is very complex. Using it could result in a lot of ontological commitment.

MD concluded that no consensus will be found and this issue will be further discussed on GitHub. Both aspects have open issues both the subclassing and the change in the usage note.

ES concluded that further inquiry and discussion is needed and that the only agreement today is that Non-profit is not just a property of LegalEntity.

If this is reviewed AR would also like that branches are to be considered since they can be their own registered entity.

GT replied that branches are available at [org::Organization](#) level

Outcome: not approved

- To be refined and further discussed on GitHub.
- The approach of issue 24 could also be applied here.

<p>Issue 24 [Use case]: Representation of people as legal entities</p>	<p>Issue</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Include Sole Traders within Core Business Vocabulary <p>Proposition</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Align with Financial Industry Business Ontology (FIBO): ● Make Sole Trader class a subclass of Formal Organization. <p>Discussion</p> <p>GT is of the opinion that SoleTrader is not compatible with org::Organization. In Belgium Sole Traders need to be registered as well. GT elaborated that to not have this problem Sole Traders are never explicitly mentioned in their models.</p> <p>While PW mentioned that in the UK single traders can transact business, but they are not registered organisations.</p> <p>GT proposed the adoption of the name LegalOrganisation instead of LegalEntity.</p> <p>GT sees an opportunity to use double typing and have one aspect that describes an organisation's legal setting (registered or not) and one which describes the capacity to perform business (normal company, Sole Trader, Non-profit).</p> <p>ES asked what JK thinks of the proposition since issue 24 was opened by him.</p> <p>JK liked the proposition since the classes are not disjoint.</p> <p>AR asked why some types of legal entities are classified in the model as a class.</p> <p>ES since they are not all registered and we want to be able to distinguish them in a way.</p> <p>AR would prefer to define legalEntityType as a property of LegalEntity using a controlled vocabulary.</p> <p>MD we could investigate the difference in properties between the types and if the differences are significant we could look to make a separate class. AR agreed with this approach.</p> <p>JK clarified that his original question was whether a single person who is registered as a business can be a LegalEntity instance. In the current proposition Sole Traders can be legal entities but they don't need to be.</p> <p>GL: in Italy they use such a controlled vocabulary. Only if a legal</p>

	<p>entity type has a significant amount of different properties should a subclass be introduced.</p> <p>BVN highlighted we should in that case consider adding the property on FormalOrganization level since not all Sole Traders are registered for example.</p> <p>GT highlighted that there is already a classification property at Organization level.</p> <p>JK identified ELF as a potential code list although it is not yet available in RDF.</p> <p>GT having it as a property would reduce the visibility. He highlighted that the need exists since Flanders and FIBO both have made separate classes for these.</p> <p>PW had a remark on the overall approach to align with FIBO for some issues. He said you can't pick and choose what to use from FIBO you can be inspired by it but if you want to align you will need to adopt a bigger set of classes and relations.</p> <p>AS replied that we could indeed remain at an "inspired by FIBO" level and in the future a mapping could be provided if needed.</p> <p>Outcome: not approved</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The usage of a property identifying the legalEntityType is to be considered. The intent would be to use a Controlled Vocabulary. ● Some open questions are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ At what level should the property be included? ○ What code list could be used? ELF was mentioned. ○ Does a sole trader have enough properties which differ from LegalEntity to justify a separate class? If it does not it can be included in the definition or usage note of Legal Entity. ● Remove the explicit exclusion of Sole Trader.
<p>Issue 31,39 Requirements for businesses in context of HVD, <u>Registration date</u></p>	<p>Issue</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Registration date is not a property of LegalEntity but is required by the HVD Commission implementing regulation (EU) 2023/138 Annex 5.1 <p>Proposition</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Include registrationDate as property of LegalEntity

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • With the definition “The date on which the legal entity has registered in some jurisdiction for regulatory and / or for tax purposes” <p>Discussion Geert explained that in the Flemish model they use the date related to the ADMS Identifier for the same purpose. AR replied that a LegalEntity could have multiple identifiers with differing dates therefore relying on that property could be unclear. JK agreed with AR.</p> <p>Outcome: approved</p>
<p>Issue 31,39 Requirements for businesses in context of HVD, <u>Accounting document</u></p>	<p>Issue</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Accounting document is not present in the Core Vocabulary but is required by the HVD Commission implementing regulation (EU) 2023/138 Annex 5.1. <p>Proposition</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Add a new class AccountingDocument • As definition use “Financial and non-financial information as a result of an activity of an organisation.” • As usage note, use the legal text: “ Accounting documents, might include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Financial statements (incl. the list of participating interests, subsidiary undertakings and associated undertakings, their registered office address and proportion of capital held), audit reports. - Non-financial statements, management reports and other statements or reports. - Annual financial reports.” <p>Discussion AR agreed with the inclusion of accounting documents and asked to consider the addition of other types of documents. MD we will keep Accounting Document as is since it is a one-to-one match with the legal text. If we consider other documents we will add another class.</p> <p>Outcome: approved</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An analysis should be conducted for other types of documents related to businesses.
<p>Issue 40</p>	<p>Issue</p>

<p>Alignment with BRIS, <u>ContactPoint</u></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● BRIS article 19 requires “details of the company website, where such details are recorded in the national register;” <p>Proposition</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Reuse ContactPoint class from CPOV with contactPoint relation. <p>Discussion</p> <p>GL highlighted that in DCAT this is done differently by using Vcard. ES said that the first aim would be to align all the Core Vocabularies and afterwards we could investigate further alignment with DCAT.</p> <p>PW mentioned that reusing classes from other ontologies can have consequences. Is this adoption analysed properly?</p> <p>MD clarified that we are inspired by FIBO but we do include Core Vocabularies classes since they are to be aligned.</p> <p>GT proposed that contactPoint could be interesting for other classes as well and therefore could be considered at a higher level.</p> <p>Outcome: approved</p>
<p>Issue 40 Alignment with BRIS, <u>memberOf</u></p>	<p>Issue</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● BRIS article 19 requires “the particulars of any persons who either as a body or as members of any such body are currently authorised by the company to represent it in dealing with third parties and in legal proceedings and information as to whether the persons authorised to represent the company may do so alone or are required to act jointly;” <p>Proposition</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● It is implicit since LegalEntity inherits from org:Organization. Therefore it inherits hasMember and headOf relations. <p>Discussion</p> <p>AR highlighted that there can be restrictions to an individual's ability to represent an Organization.</p> <p>GT mentioned that post could be used at Organization level.</p> <p>Outcome: approved</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Restrictions of their level of representation could be considered.
<p>Issue 40 Alignment with BRIS,</p>	<p>Issue</p>

<p><u>subOrganizationOf</u></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • BRIS article 19 requires “information on any branches opened by the company in another Member State including the name, registration number, EUID and the Member State where the branch is registered.” <p>Proposition</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is partially implicit since LegalEntity inherits from org:Organization. Therefore it inherits hasSubOrganization relation. • EUID and registration number can both be provided through adms:Identifier <p>Discussion No significant discussion was held.</p> <p>Outcome: approved</p>
<p>Issue 17 Multiple names and locations</p>	<p>Issue</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Businesses may operate from different addresses with associated names which can differ from the name used to register the business <p>Proposition</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Through org:Organization there is the option to have subOrganizations with a different Name and Address <p>Discussion GT highlighted that Organization can also have Sites. MD indeed if the name is the same you could use Sites if a different name is used related to a different site hasSubOrganization can be used. GT and GL OrganizationalUnit could also be used.</p> <p>Outcome: approved</p>
<p>Issues on Core Person Vocabulary</p>	
<p>Issue 23 Addition of a Name class</p>	<p>Issue</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A person might have a middle name, no property in current model. <p>Proposition</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Add middle name property with definition: “The name written between the person's first given name and their family name.” <p>Discussion AR mentioned that there are different rules for the naming of person, none of the properties fit with the Spanish names. She suggested adding another name property in general, which complements the given and family name. ES replied that all these properties are optional. HDR agreed with the middle name but suggested also looking into additional properties.</p> <p>Outcome: not approved</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Move discussion to GitHub
<p>Issue 38 CPV1.00gender is nomina periculosa</p>	<p>Issue</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The gender of a person is not the same as the sex of a person. <p>Proposition To differentiate sex from gender properties in Person class:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For sex (definition: “The organism's biological sex.”) reuse the controlled vocabulary “Human sex” from the Publications Office. Sex is used in the multilingual forms of the Regulation on Public Documents. • For gender (definition: “The identities, expressions and societal roles of the Person.”) wait for the controlled vocabulary to be published by the Publications Office. <p>Discussion No discussion.</p> <p>Outcome: approved</p>
<p>Issue 36 Proposal to create ContactInfo</p>	<p>Issue</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To add contact information about a person. <p>Proposition</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reusing the ContactPoint class and the contactPoint relation with a Person class. <p>Discussion No discussion.</p>

	Outcome: approved
Issues on Core Criterion and Core Evidence Vocabulary	
<p>Issue 51 Combining Criteria</p>	<p>Issue</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide guidance on how to express Criteria should be combined. <p>Proposition</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Collect more feedback from the practice. <p>Discussion MD suggested that people contribute on GitHub to issue 51.</p> <p>Outcome: not approved Discussion moved to GitHub.</p>
<p>Issue 46 Evidence is a subclass of dcat:Dataset</p>	<p>Issue</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To remove the subclass relationship between Evidence and dcat:Dataset <p>Proposition</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maintain as-is but add additional information in the usage note. <p>Discussion GT mentioned that it is tricky because not all Evidence is a dataset. BVN replied that we see dataset in the broader definition of data. AR agrees with the proposal.</p> <p>Outcome: approved</p>
<p>Issue 47 Usage Note is provided by</p>	<p>Issue</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The usage note of property "is provided by" is unclear. <p>Proposition</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • "Agents transmitting the Evidence are usually the Agents that are issuing the Evidence or service providers acting on behalf of the Evidence issuing Agents such as software developer companies." <p>+</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • "The Evidence provisioning might pass through a chain of providers. Implementers have to define which providers are to be shared or not." <p>Discussion No discussion</p> <p>Outcome: approved</p>
<p>Issue 52 Wrong range properties in Period of Time</p>	<p>Issue</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The properties endtime and starttime in Period of Time are from Time Ontology. The range is time:Instant but in CCCEV a literal with xsd:dateTime. <p>Proposition</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Change the range to time:Instant. <p>Discussion No discussion.</p> <p>Outcome: approved</p>
<p>Wrap-up & next steps</p>	<p>The session was wrapped up and everyone was thanked for their participation. PF explained the survey on usage of SEMIC assets.</p>