



**Webinar DCAT-AP Major Release – 25 July 2019 – Meeting
Minutes**

DI/07624 - ABC IV Lot 3 SC141



Basic Document Metadata

Property	Value
Name	Webinar DCAT-AP Major Release – 25 July 2019 – Meeting Minutes
Release date	31/07/2019
Status	Completed
Version	0.10
Author	Natasa Sofou
Reviewed by	Fidel Santiago
Approved by	Click or tap here to enter text.
Abstract	This document presents the minutes of the DCAT-AP major release 2nd webinar held on 25 July 2019.

Document History

Version	Date	Description	Action
0.10	31/07/2019		Accepted
0.01	30/07/2019	First draft	Sent for Review

Disclaimer:

The views expressed in this report are purely those of the Author(s) and may not, in any circumstances, be interpreted as stating an official position of the European Commission.

The European Commission does not guarantee the accuracy of the information included in this study, nor does it accept any responsibility for any use thereof.

Reference herein to any specific products, specifications, process, or service by trade name, trademark, manufacturer, or otherwise, does not necessarily constitute or imply its endorsement, recommendation, or favouring by the European Commission.

All care has been taken by the author to ensure that s/he has obtained, where necessary, permission to use any parts of manuscripts including illustrations, maps, and graphs, on which intellectual property rights already exist from the titular holder(s) of such rights or from her/his or their legal representative.

Table of Contents

1. AGENDA	5
2. MINUTES.....	5
2.1. OPENING.....	5
2.2. REVIEW OF MAJOR CHANGE REQUEST	5
2.2.1. <i>Change Requests 1/5: related to mandatoryness of properties</i>	<i>5</i>
2.2.2. <i>Change Requests 2/5: related to RDF distribution.....</i>	<i>5</i>
2.2.3. <i>Change Requests 3/5: align with DCAT 2019 changes</i>	<i>6</i>
2.2.4. <i>Change Requests 4/5: related to SHACL distribution</i>	<i>8</i>
2.2.5. <i>Change Requests 5/5: issues to be closed marked as "won't-fix"</i>	<i>9</i>
2.3. NEXT STEPS	10
2.4. CLOSING REMARKS AND DISCUSSION.....	10
ANNEX I. DOCUMENT METADATA	11

1. AGENDA

1. Opening
2. Review of major change requests
3. Next steps

2. MINUTES

2.1. Opening

The meeting was opened by SEMIC team, the participants were welcomed and the agenda was presented. Emphasis was put on the purpose of this webinar that is to present major change requests posted on GitHub DCAT-AP repository and engage participants to elaborate on the proposed resolutions and propose alternative resolutions if needed.

2.2. Review of major change request

SEMIC technical team introduced the first set of major release requests.

2.2.1. Change Requests 1/5: related to mandatoryness of properties

Issues # 3, #9 - making `dct:spatial` recommended for `dcat:Catalog` and `dcat:Dataset` as in ADMS.

A participant mentioned that the spatial coverage is always useful for the reuse of the metadata.

Resolution: Make `dct:spatial` recommended for `dcat:Catalog` and `dcat:Dataset`.

Issue #10 - delete `adms:sample` from `dcat:Dataset`.

In ADMS the property (`adms:sample`) was deleted from the `dcat:Dataset`. Based on one comment received in GitHub, it was proposed by SEMIC technical team that maybe a different property could be designed that would allow an empty table to serve a template for the data. A participant mentioned that in Italy DCAT-AP_IT `adms:sample` is not used.

Resolution: delete `adms:sample` from `dcat:Dataset`

Issue #44 - Add `dcat:Distribution`

SPDX vocabulary had only one algorithm which did not cover the algorithms used by CKAN. In the meantime, there are now 3 algorithms covered by SPDX and the change is not deemed necessary anymore.

Resolution: no change will take place for this issue.

2.2.2. Change Requests 2/5: related to RDF distribution

Issue #45: DCAT: Distribution - Correction of `adms:changetype`

`adms:changeType` does not exist in ADMS vocabulary and therefore it cannot create a verifiable controlled vocabulary constraint. The current proposal is to either remove it from DCAT-AP and create a different vocabulary for it or add the vocabulary to ADMS. There was a third option proposed by a participant, to create a (W3C) DCAT

vocabulary for this. The option will be posted as a comment on the relevant issue. The participants and WG members are requested to express their preferred option. **Resolution:** The issue will remain open, and WG members are encouraged to express for the preferred option.

Issues #52, #57, #58, related to RDF clean-up.

- Create an RDF representation where we define owl classes and properties, so it is compatible with Protégé.
- Clean-up unused prefixes
- Perform a persistence quality to clean up the existence of URIs used as predicates.

No comments were made regarding these issues.

Resolution: proceed as planned with clean-up.

2.2.3. Change Requests 3/5: align with DCAT 2019 changes

Issue #35: Support data integration in the case of a combination of data from various sources.

Resolution to be proposed in line with DCAT review that is currently under development (`#qualified-relationship`, `#qualified-attribution`). A participant indicated the importance of provenance when dealing with multi-provider datasets. Indeed, in W3C they plan to add provenance for a dataset in the new version of DCAT.

Regarding alignment with DCAT, a participant raised the question about the *DataService* new class, and how it will be included. The SEMIC team answered that indeed additions have not yet been discussed, but the addition of data services is assumed.

Another participant requested to elaborate on the importance of *DataService* and the position of DCAT-AP on this. For example, Norway provides APIs, and adding *DataService* is an important change that may be difficult to be supported in platforms like CKAN. The SEMIC team responded that another webinar is considered to take place, dedicated to DCAT, so then more solid proposals will be made.

On ABR, access to Base Registers also considers *DataService* (Register of Registers) and are waiting for the final resolution from W3C and the next version of DCAT-AP.

It was also mentioned that since aspects from GeoDCAT are now in DCAT proper, would it make sense to keep the distinction between GeoDCAT and DCAT-AP? The SEMIC team replied that regarding GeoDCAT, we are not sure that DCAT will cover the whole GeoDCAT, but we will also do a major release of GeoDCAT after the new DCAT-AP release and also on StatDCAT.

Resolution: Align with DCAT (`#qualified-relationship`, `#qualified-attribution`), Check well about provenance, how to deal with compound data sets

Issue #38: Add dcat: Distribution dcat: granularity.

Resolution: Align DCAT-AP with DCAT that is also currently developing this area, see discussion #temporal-properties.

No further discussion were made rearding this change request.

Issue #40: Add dcat: Distribution, dcat: plannedAvailability

It was proposed to align DCAT-AP with DCAT on this issue that is also currently developing this area, see discussion #Class:Period_of_Time. A participant clarified that *plannedAvailability* is not the same property as *PeriodOfTime*. They use *planned availability* with the following list of predefined values:

<http://dcat-ap.de/def/plannedAvailability/temporal>
<http://dcat-ap.de/def/plannedAvailability/experimental>
<http://dcat-ap.de/def/plannedAvailability/available>
<http://dcat-ap.de/def/plannedAvailability/stable>

Another participant asked how does this relate to the *status* flag? Could additional values be added there? The *withdrawn* value is used to indicate that dataset will be offline eventually.

It was suggested to use a different name for this property, because the term *plannedAvailablity* sounds misleading and decide whether it will be optional or recommended. So, it was decided that the issue will remain open on GitHub, in order to propose another name and decide if it will be optional or recommended.

It was also mentioned that EU OPD is also tracking persistence of datasets, this is an additional argument why this property would be useful.

Resolution: add to dcat:Distribution plannedAvailability, propose a different name and decide whether it will be optional or recommended.

Issue #42: Add dcat: Dataset, dct:contributor

Align DCAT-AP with DCAT that is also currently developing this area, see discussion #qualified-forms.

A participant from Italy, pointed out that revision of roles is needed, since in Italy, regions publish on behalf of municipalities dct:contributor is important, but contributor, creator, publisher will be also needed.

GeoDCAT has many different roles suggested to align with INSPIRE, and DCAT seems now to take these on board, so DCAT-AP should align with that. (Role vocabulary of Inspire: <http://inspire.ec.europa.eu/metadata-codelist/ResponsiblePartyRole>)

In dcat-ap.de, they have already added the roles dcatde:originator and dcatde:maintainer – just the *publisher* is not sufficient. The same need is apparent in Italy, where apart from *originator* more roles are needed, so there should be alignment with W3C.

The proposal from SEMIC team was to align with W3C, keep the 3 “hardcoded” rules. Qualified attribution can deal with other relationships.

Participants from OP, indicated 2 use cases: (1) distribute datasets outside and (2) manage them internally. The detailed information about roles is more relevant to internal data management, to the outside we might want to distribute more generic information.

Participants from Italy mentioned that rightsHolder role is also important. They already publish who holds the rights to information, not just for internal data management but also important for reuse.

The issue of contact points was raised. A participant indicated that generally the roles properties just have names, there is a lack of contact point information for agents and roles. The SEMIC team responded that the class Agent is already there, we can add properties to the Agent class to allow the person to be contacted, and probably a web page information. However, there seems to be a problem of data quality, so we should think of the mandatoryness. The participant who raised the issue insisted on contact information. This is an old discussion, see <https://joinup.ec.europa.eu/release/how-are-publisher-and-contact-point-modelled>.

In CPSV-AP they have *hasContactPoint* for *PublicService* although in DCAT-AP it should be attached to the *Actor*, not to the dataset or distribution.

In conclusion, there is a general recognition of the fact that there are more people than publishers, and there should be a balance between having properties and the capacity to deal with more general situations. This can be dealt with by solution recommended by W3C. We may restrict by adding a codelist of roles. It is also important to be able to contact the different actors, we should improve on the capacity to support that.

Resolution: Align with DCAT, keep the 3 “hardcoded” roles, and qualified attribution can deal with other relationships. Contact point can be added to the Actor class.

2.2.4. Change Requests 4/5: related to SHACL distribution

Issue#SHACL29: Enhance SHACL distribution by implementing constraints for both Recommended and Optional properties (with :warnings and: info)

Resolution: Apply the requested change.

Issue #SHACL18: Replace the use of sh:hasValue with a node

Resolution: Apply the requested change.

Issue #SHACL9: Enhance to code with the following recommendations

- Add commentary to indicate the various sections
- Organise lists alphabetically, e.g. the list of namespaces at the start, order of the properties
- The class shape of Distribution to be aligned on the same hierarchical level as the shapes for Dataset, Catalog and CatalogRecord

- The property shapes under the classes to be ordered from mandatory to recommended and lastly optional ones.

Resolution: Apply the recommendations to enhance code

Issue #46 : Use `sh:targetClass` in the mandatory SHACL shapes

Resolution: use `sh:targetClass` in the SHACL shapes

Issue #48: Replace properties restriction written as blank nodes with IRI

Resolution: Rewrite properties restrictions as IRI instead of blank nodes

Issue #55: Incoherence between the class diagram and the SHACL shape.

Resolution: Fix inconsistency, Update SHACL by aligning `dct:language` to `dct:LinguisticSystem` as in class diagram of DCAT-AP.pdf

Issue #61: Redefinition of the `dcat` ontology in the `shacl` file.

Resolution: Take out the ontology description from the SHACL representation.

No comments were made regarding these set of change requests. The SEMIC technical team will proceed with the proposed resolutions.

2.2.5. Change Requests 5/5: issues to be closed marked as "won't-fix"

There are 22 open issues on GitHub that were marked as "Won't fix" and proposed to be closed with no changes in the specification. All participants and WG members are kindly requested to review issues by 1st of August and comment on the issues they think that should not be closed.

DCAT-AP Issues: #5, #6, #11, #15, #16, #17, #18, #21, #22, #23, #24, #28, #29

DCAT-AP Validator Issues: #8, #10, #20

At this point, a participant raised an issue (<https://github.com/SEMICeu/DCAT-AP/issues/63>) about the ISA metadata license.

The SEMIC team said that since the Commission recommends now to use Creative Commons, we might move there as well for ISA specifications. In Italy they use CCY 4.0 for all our published datasets. The OP mentioned that they should review the controlled vocabulary for license. Participants from `dcat-ap.de` mentioned that they had to create their own list of licenses, and they would like to use the OP list, if available. At this point a clarification was required by a participant whether we refer to licenses for metadata, for specifications or for the dataset? The SEMIC team was talking about the license for DCAT-AP itself. Participant from `dcat-ap.de` was talking about licenses for datasets. Participants from Italy refer to data licences and use also the Italian open data licence that it is still used in practice but no longer adopted.

The SEMIC team explained that since #63 suggests that licenses are linkable, this will be fixed if we migrate to CC. There was a general discussion about licenses, since Italy and OP have lists, these could be useful for others too. Another participant suggested that specifications' licences should be open for everyone. For the Swedish

adaptation they don't use the ISA license but CCY. Licences from SPDX are available at: <https://spdx.org/licenses/>.

2.3. Next steps

As next steps:

- A webinar on DCAT analysis will take place next (probably end of August).
- Contribute on open issues on GitHub or submit minor semantic changes until 1st of September 2019 and bug fixes until 1st of October 2019.
- Public review period for DCAT-AP v2.0 starts on 4 October 2019.
- Major Release to be published in November.

Regarding next steps, it was requested in the next meeting to talk about the general roadmap, the uptake of DCAT-AP (vs CKAN). This could be a separate webinar, as the SEMIC team indicated. Also licenses from SPDX: <https://spdx.org/licenses/> would be an interesting issue for discussion at following webinars. Other proposed topics for upcoming discussions include: What other MS use DCAT-AP? experiences for using dcat-ap? Germany for instance published on youtube a video explaining dcat-ap.de, https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=DGCay_bbvDc

2.4. Closing remarks and discussion

The SEMIC team thanked everyone who participated in this Webinar and expressed their satisfaction regarding engagement of participants in the process.

Annex I. DOCUMENT METADATA

Property	Value
Basic document metadata	
Name*	Webinar DCAT-AP Major Release – 25 July 2019 – Meeting Minutes
Release date*	31/07/2019
Status*	Completed
Version*	0.10
Author	Natasa Sofou
Reviewed by	Fidel Santiago
Approved by	Click or tap here to enter text.
Abstract	This document presents the minutes of the DCAT-AP major release 2nd webinar held on 25 July 2019.
Extended document metadata	
Benefits or value	Click or tap here to enter text.
CI type*	Study or methodology
Confluence page	
Description*	Click or tap here to enter text.
Download page	Click or tap here to enter text.
ID (contractual identifier)*	DI/07624 SC141 D02.02 (Note: structure as follows - [Framework contract] SC[Specific contract] D[Task.ID])
Language*	English
Previous version*	0.01 (Note: This is the version of the document preceding the current version. e.g. 0.10 or 1.20).
Producer	Click or tap here to enter text.
Purpose	Click or tap here to enter text.
Target audience	Click or tap here to enter text.
License*	Click or tap here to enter text.

*: to be completed if possible