ADMS VIRTUAL MEETING 2012.03.14

Meeting minutes

-MEETING TITLE- Date – Meeting minutes			
Venue	Virtual Meeting on Arkadin	**Meeting date**	2013.03.14
Author	MDK	**Meeting time**	15:00 – 17:00
Reviewed by	SG, JRF	**Issue date**	
Status	For Review	**Version**	0.03

Attendees	Abbreviation	Organisation
Andreo Perego	AP	JRC
John Borras	JB	UK – OASIS
Robin Cover	RC	UK – OASIS
Paul Polydoras	PP	GR - UBITECH
Gofran Shukair	GS	IE – DERI
Fadi Maali	FM	IE – DERI
Baden Hughes	BH	AU – Australian Federal Government
Willem Van Gemert	WvG	EU – Publications Office
Max Craglia	MC	EC – Joint Research Centre
Marcia Lei Zeng	MLZ	US – Kent State University
Pavel Benda	PB	CZ – ISDP Consultant
Pavlos Polydoras	PP	GR - UBITECH
Vassilios Peristeras	VP	EC – DIGIT B2
Makx Dekkers	MD	SEMIC team
Phil Archer	PA	W3C
João Rodrigue Frade	JRF	BE – PwC Belgium
Stijn Goedertier	SG	BE – PwC Belgium
Michiel De Keyzer	MDK	BE – PwC Belgium

AGENDA:

Agenda Item	Owner	Subject
1	JRF	Welcome, roll call of participants, agreement on agenda
2	MD	Introduction to ADMS version 0.9 and changes since version 0.8
3	MD	***Open issues and discussion (numbers relate to JIRA issues)*** *Conceptual model* 278: Proposal: Introduce RADion as set of top concepts etc. 276: Metadata on metadata *Properties and Relationships* 203: Provide attribute to indicate that one file format is normative 214: Add reverse property of RepositoryOrigin 219: Do Releases point to assets also? 221: Distinguish between human and machine-generated translations of text 274: The cardinality of licence should be 1..* to cater for dual licensing *Vocabularies* 210: Geographic coverage - NUTS codes are not URI-based 213: Enable repository owners to express "Domain" and "Asset Type" as they have it in their repositories 226: Selected comments on Asset Type 239: IANA MIME types not suitable 240: NTU (list of statistical units aligned with political entities) as an alternative to NUTS *Other issues* Further open issues related to schema definition will be taken care of in the finalisation of the schemas; issues related to implementation and deployment and will be taken up in the CESAR community.
4	JRF	XML schema, approach and status
5	PA	RDF schema, approach and status
6	SG	News from the CESAR Community, report from 7 March CESAR workshop meeting
7	VP	Next steps toward endorsement and implementation
8	VP	Final comments from Project Officer

9	JRF	Wrap up

Meeting minutes

1. Welcome, roll call of participants, agreement on agenda

Discussion

- JRF explains the intention of this ADMS Virtual Meeting:
    - The intention is that this is the last virtual meeting of this Working Group
    - ADMS version 0.9 was released last week after the public review period. The purpose of this meeting is to get agreement about all the outstanding issues and put these in the ADMS Specification so ADMS Version 1.0 can be released.
    - This summer the federation of semantic asset repositories goes live on the Joinup platform using ADMS as a metadata exchange format.
- JRF and PA explain that after the release of Version 1.0, there will be a sequence on the work done on the ADMS Specification. PA explains that it is the plan ADMS is getting wider review so ADMS will be input of the W3C GLD (Government Linked Data) Working Group. ADMS is thus on track to become an official W3C Recommendation or Note.

Documentation

- W3C GLD Working Group

2. Introduction to ADMS version 0.9 and changes since version 0.8

Discussion

- MD gives a short introduction about the work that has been done since the last call:
    - There were a lot of comments that were discussed during last call and v0.9 was created from these topics there was agreement on.
    - In the release on Joinup, which can be downloaded (zip-file), there are also versions of the Specification included where you can see what changes have been made (track changes).
    - In the specification, also a change log has been added (page 3). This shows all the JIRA issues that have been closed now.
    - The issues that are not yet resolved are on the 2012.03.14 ADMS Virtual Meeting agenda.
- MD remarks that a lot of issues that were raised are related to implementation and deployment of the federation. These issues are not on this meeting's agenda because this is out of scope for this working group. These particular issues will be tackled by the federation implementation team.

- Some other issues were related to the implementation of ADMS. These are also not in scope of this Working Group and are therefore not on this meeting's agenda but they will be tackled by the CESAR Community.
  - o JRF explains that the idea of the CESAR Community is that it is the user community of ADMS, (the owners of the national and regional semantic asset repositories).
  - o JRF invites everyone to have a look at the CESAR Community space on Joinup and the information about the CESAR Workshop that was held on 7 March.
- MD repeats that the ADMS Specification work will be continued by the W3C GLD Working Group.

Documentation

- ADMS version 0.8
- ADMS version 0.9

3. Open issues and discussion (numbers relate to JIRA issues)

Discussion

Conceptual model

- Issue 278: This issue concerns a change request to separate the classes that are common to ADMS, ADMS.F/OSS and DCAT out into a top level model (RADion) and to define the specific properties only for the individual vocabularies.
  - o PA explains this issue in more detail:
    - ▪ ADMS and DCAT have similar purposes and have a lot in common. Then we also have ADMS.F/OSS to describe software. This reuses a lot from ADMS, so there are three vocabularies that have a lot in common.
    - ▪ In the RADion model, the common elements of the three vocabularies are separated in a single top level model. The specific properties are then individually defined for each vocabulary.
  - o PA says that there is almost no effect on ADMS by doing that (only a small change to domain).
  - o JB asks VP how important this is for this project.
    - ▪ VP says this is not a top priority but it is very useful to keep conformance with existing vocabularies.
  - o FM says that currently data catalogues look into using DCAT for publishing the asset description metadata of their assets. The RADion model would allow tools to make abstraction of assets, so that tools could have a common interface to access both data and metadata. This is a powerful use case.
  - o The RADion proposal is approved.
  - o MD will replace the diagram and do the appropriate changes to the

specification.

- Issue 276: This issue was raised by AP and is about adding some properties to ADMS that gives information (language, date ...) on the metadata of an asset (metadata of metadata).
  - AP has already proposed a solution in the issue (INSPIRE). He explains that adding metadata about the metadata can be very useful, for instance when you want to query on the language in which the metadata of an asset is described.
  - MD asks AP to send a proposal of which attributes that should be added. MD will then add them to Version 1.0 of ADMS.

Properties and Relationships

- Issue 203: This issue raised by RC suggests to provide an attribute to indicate that a file format is normative.
  - This proposal will be moved to a next version of ADMS because this needs some more investigation.
- Issue 214 and 219: these issues concern respectively adding a reverse property of RepositoryOrigin between repository and asset, and the unidirectional relationship between Asset and Release.
  - PA says he has included bidirectional links in the RADion proposal.
- Issue 221: This issue concerns adding information to be able to distinguish the difference between a human-translated and a machine-translated asset.
  - MD says that he is not sure this is a realistic requirement.
  - SG explains that on Joinup it would be nice if we could see which assets which texts have been machine-translated and which have been further improved by humans. This can stay out of the ADMS specification since there is probably no way of elegantly representing this in RDF or XML.
- Issue 274: this issue was raised in the ADMS.F/OSS Working Group. It concerns the fact that some software distributions have dual licensing, meaning that a software asset distribution is released under a paying and non-paying licence. Therefore the cardinality of "Licence" should be 1..*.
  - MD says there is no problem on changing this cardinality and we will see then in practice how this works for ADMS.
  - AP remarks that a licence is always applicable to a part of the distribution and this part can't have multiple licences. Different parts can have different licences but always only one licence for a certain part. It should be clear that this is the meaning of this cardinality.
    - MD agrees and will make a note in the specification to make this clear.

Vocabularies

- Issue 226: This issue concerns the different options for asset type. Comments from ML and AP suggest that asset types are overlapping and that it is not always clear which asset type needs to be used.
  - SG explained that the mapping exercise conducted by WG Members to ADMS v0.8 has brought to light various observations, listed in Issue 226.

ADMS v0.9 contains a proposal for Asset Type that takes into account these observations. For each proposed Asset Type a definition and example is given. Definitions have been taken from ISO 25964, the NIEM Glossary, UN/CEFACT CCTS, the DCMI Glossary, etc.

- o AP remarks that having definitions is not enough to have a clear understanding on when to use which asset type. There should be added examples.
- o SG says that some examples are already included, but he will add some more so it becomes self-describing.
  - ▪ AP suggests that the ADMS specification is probably a good candidate example to illustrate the asset types.
- o AP remarks that for them an asset can have different asset types (with the current list of asset types) and it is not clear in that case, which asset type should be assigned.
  - ▪ JRF says in that case you should assign both the asset types and this is possible.
  - ▪ AP confirms that this is a solution to his problem.

- Issues 210, 213 and 240: These issues concern the examples and proposals used in the controlled vocabularies.
  - o MD proposes to keep all the examples in. This proposal is adopted.

- Issue 239: this issue concerns the fact that the MIME types of IANA are not exhaustive and not exploitable.
  - o MD says that this is the best we have. We can either use this one or build our own file type vocabulary. The latter is not the purpose of this Working Group.
  - o MD suggests to keep it as it is and this proposal is adopted by the working group.
  - o SG says that representation technique might be helpful to cover the gap on IANA MIME types.

Decisions

- The proposal for issue 278 (RADion) is adopted by the working group. The issue is resolved.
- Issue 276: the proposed attributes will be added to ADMS v1.0
- Issue 203 will be moved to a next version of ADMS.
- Issues 214 and 219 are resolved: bidirectional links are provided.
- Issue 221 is closed: an indication if an asset is machine-translated will not be added to the ADMS specification.
- Issue 274 is resolved: the cardinality will be changed and a note in the specification to indicate the purpose of the cardinality will be added.
- Issue 226 is resolved: more examples to the asset types will be added.
- Issues 210, 213 and 240 are resolved: no changes will be made to the examples
- Issue 239 is resolved: no changes will be made.

Documentation

- [RADion](#)
- [ADMS v0.9](#)

Action Items	Responsible	Deadline
Replace the diagram and do the appropriate changes to the specification, relating to the adoption of RADion (issue 278).	MD	21/03
Send a proposal of the attributes that have to be added to describe metadata on the metadata.	PA	21/03
Add the attributes to describe metadata on the metadata to ADMS v1.0.	MD	21/03
Change the cardinality of "License" to 0..*.	MD	21/03
Add a note to "Licence" in the specification so it is clear what the meaning and purpose of the cardinality is.	MD	21/03
Add more examples to the definitions of the asset types.	SG	21/03
Make clear that the cardinality of "adms:assetType" is 1..*	SG	21/03

4. XML schema, approach and status

Discussion

- JRF gives a brief status about the XML schema:
  - In [version 0.9](#) there is not a new version of the RDF and XML schema because it was not the purpose that this transitory version would be implemented.
  - The XML schema will be described in version 1.0 and will enrich the specification. The XML schema will be delivered to the Working Group by the beginning of April.
  - There needs to be alignment with the domain model.
- JRF will restructure the XML schema for v1.0 to avoid nesting of Repository, Asset, and Distribution, ...

Decisions

- The XML schema will be delivered to the Working Group by the beginning of April.

Action Items	Responsible	Deadline
Restructure the XML schema for v1.0 to avoid nesting	JRF	21/03

of Repository, Asset, and Distribution, ...

5. RDF schema, approach and status

Discussion

- PA gives a brief status about the RDF schema:
    - The RDF Schema is almost ready. It still needs to be checked (with the help of AP).
    - The RDF schema is human-readable and includes all the classes and properties of ADMS.
    - JRF asks if the ADMSv1.0 namespace will already have the w3.org/ns namespace because of the move of the specification to the W3C GLD Working Group.
        - PA confirms that this is the intention.
        - VP says this is no problem from his side.
    - PA remarks that W3C won't provide namespaces for controlled vocabularies as values for ADMS because this is application specific and out of scope for them.

Action Items	Responsible	Deadline
Check the RDF schema	PA & AP	21/03

6. News from the CESAR Community, report from 7 March CESAR workshop meeting

Discussion

- SG gives a short overview of last week's CESAR (Community of European Semantic Asset Repositories) Workshop that was held in Brussels.
    - With approximately 50 people attending to the workshop, it can certainly be called a success.
    - Four organisations with a semantic asset repository have already decided to join the first wave of the federation: GS1, ICCS-CIEC, Listpoint and Xrepository. A number of repositories still have to be contacted and for some repositories we are waiting for confirmation.
    - A spreadsheet to generate ADMS RDF for assets with will also be provided.
    - For the federation we are asking the repositories to take a snapshot of their assets and make this visible in the federation (Joinup). Therefore there are pull and push scenarios.

Documentation

- [CESAR Community](#)
- [Workshop Highlights](#)
- [Workshop Brochure](#)
- [Workshop Agenda](#)
- [ADMS Brochure](#)

7. Next steps toward endorsement and implementation.

8. Final comments from Project Officer.

Discussion

- VP explains the next steps:
  - The [ADMS](#) specification will be submitted to the [ISA](#) Coordination Group for endorsement. The endorsement by the [ISA](#) Coordination does not imply any legal consequence, but it is very important to the adoption of [ADMS](#) by the Member States. The endorsement is expected at latest in May.
  - After the endorsement from the member states, [ADMS](#) will be actively promoted so it will be used by the Member States (implementation in interoperability frameworks, metadata standards ...).
  - The first wave of the ADMS-enabled federation is expected to go live by the end of June.
  - An [ADMS](#) editor will also be made available. This will make it possible to easily upload [ADMS](#)-compliant metadata to Joinup.
- JRF adds that the implementation of the [ADMS](#) Specification will be implemented in the context of the [CESAR Community](#). Everyone is invited to participate and have a look at the [CESAR Community](#) page on Joinup.
- VP thanks everyone for participating and the good work that has been done. He confirms that he is happy with the result.

Documentation

- [CESAR Community](#)

9. Wrap up

Discussion

- MD confirms that there is a solution for all the issues.
- SG explains that all the meeting minutes and the working group document are migrated to [Joinup](#). We can also put a pdf-copy of all the wiki pages on Joinup.
- SG has a question on [issue 280](#) (documentation type):
  - MD says that the documentation types were originally proposed by FM.

- o MD says that many of the documentation types can be represented as a link between an asset and a document. We can have a list of types or we can have a subproperty of the documentation link.
  - o AP asks if we can transform this documentation types into a relation.
  - o AP suggests to finalise this discussion by the end of the week.
  - o AP will put this in a proposal to the Working Group.
  - o MD will create an issue in JIRA for this.
- JRF wraps up with thanking everyone for their contribution and making ADMS reality. Now there will be continued with the implementation work.

Decisions

- The content from the ADMS wiki will be migrated to Joinup.

Documentation

- ADMS documents on Joinup

Action Items	Responsible	Deadline
Put a pdf-copy of the wiki pages on Joinup.	MDK	21/03
Create a proposal to the Working Group concerning documentation type.	AP	21/03
Create an issue in JIRA concerning documentation type.	MD	21/03