**D02.03 - Meeting Minutes – CPSV-AP v2.0 revision final webinar**

**Action 2016.29 Catalogue of Services Specific Contract 414 under Framework Contract DI/07171 – Lot 2**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Project:** | Action 2016-29 Catalogue of Services | **Meeting Date/Time:** | 27/09/2017  10:00-12:00 |
| **Meeting Type:** | Webinar | **Meeting Location:** | Online |
| **Meeting Coordinator:** | Michiel de Keyzer | **Issue Date:** | 17/10/2016 |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Attendee Name** | **Initials** | **Organisation/Country** |
| Alexandros Gerontas | AG | University of Macedonia, Greece |
| Bart Hanssens | BH | Fedict, Belgium |
| Cristina Ramos | CR | Ministry of Finance, Spain |
| Deirdre Lee | DL | Derilinx, Ireland |
| Giorgia Lodi | GL | AgID, Italy |
| Helena Lepp | HL | Ministry of Economic Affairs and Communications, Estonia |
| Marco Aarts | MA | ICTU, The Netherlands |
| Nicola Guarino | NG | CNR, Italy |
| Miguel Álvarez Rodríguez | MAR | ISA, European Commission |
| Peter Burian | PB |
| Michiel De Keyzer | MDK | PwC EU Services |
| Carmen Vandeloo | CV |
| Ana Fernández de Soria | AF |

|  |
| --- |
| **Meeting Agenda** |
| 1. Welcome and overview 2. Applied changes to the [CPSV-AP final draft](https://joinup.ec.europa.eu/release/core-public-service-vocabulary-application-profile-v21-final-draft). Closed issues:    1. [ExecutionStatus label and range](https://joinup.ec.europa.eu/asset/cpsv-ap/issue/document-possible-public-service-statuses)    2. [Cardinality of isDescribedAt property](https://joinup.ec.europa.eu/asset/cpsv-ap/issue/add-new-class-cover-description-catalogue)    3. [Public Organisation class - Cardinality of the Spatial property](https://joinup.ec.europa.eu/asset/cpsv-ap/issue/public-organisation-class-cardinality-spatial-property)    4. [Comments on the example included on CPSV-AP v2.0](https://joinup.ec.europa.eu/asset/cpsv-ap/issue/comments-example-included-cpsv-ap-v20)    5. [Criterion Requirement class - Cardinality of Type property](https://joinup.ec.europa.eu/asset/cpsv-ap/issue/criterion-requirement-class-cardinality-type-property)    6. [Type of Formal Framework](https://joinup.ec.europa.eu/asset/cpsv-ap/issue/type-formal-framework)    7. [Errors on the second draft of the CPSV-AP](https://joinup.ec.europa.eu/node/165147/)    8. [Cardinality of the Has Contact Point property](https://joinup.ec.europa.eu/node/165148/) 3. Open issues:    1. [Relate the Criterion Requirement and Evidence](https://joinup.ec.europa.eu/node/165143/)    2. [Specialise the Related Service and Spatial properties](https://joinup.ec.europa.eu/node/165145/)    3. [Addition of properties to the Contact Point class](https://joinup.ec.europa.eu/node/165149/) 4. Demo on the [Public Service Description Creator](http://52.50.205.146:8890/rdforms/PSDescriptionCreator.html) 5. [CPSV-AP tools](https://joinup.ec.europa.eu/asset/cpsvap_test_implementations/description) project on Joinup 6. CoS Promotional video 7. Next steps 8. Q & A   **Presentation and meeting details:** <https://joinup.ec.europa.eu/asset/cpsv-ap/event/cpsv-ap-v20-revision-wg-virtual-meeting-webinar-3> |

|  |
| --- |
| **Summary of Meeting** |
| |  |  | | --- | --- | | **Topic** | **Summary** | | Welcome and overview | * MDK introduced the webinar and thanked the WG members for their participation. * The goal of the webinar is to review the [final draft](https://joinup.ec.europa.eu/release/core-public-service-vocabulary-application-profile-v21-final-draft) of the CPSV-AP v2.1 (published with the changes highlighted in yellow), share other solutions developed by CoS during the summer period and agree on future work. | | | Applied changes to the [CPSV-AP final draft](https://joinup.ec.europa.eu/release/core-public-service-vocabulary-application-profile-v21-final-draft) | The following change requests were agreed upon during the previous webinar and applied to the CPSV-AP v2.1 final draft:   1. **ExecutionStatus label and range** (<https://joinup.ec.europa.eu/node/159501/>)  * NG proposed to remove this property. He explained that, in order to capture the concept of execution statuses, CPSV-AP needs to have a class that accounts for the process that follows a service request. Execution statuses are statuses of such particular process. Therefore, since this process is not introduced as a separated class, the only solution is to delete the execution statuses attribute. * GL agreed that this property can create confusion and is changing the scope of the model, i.e. from having a model oriented to citizens and businesses, to including in the model properties to help public administrations monitor the status of a public service during its execution. * MDK explained that it was included after some MSs implemented the CPSV-AP in their own context. They realised that they needed to define the different statuses that a public service can go through when a public service is being executed thus they raised the issue. However, as the property creates confusion, it is better to remove it. * *PROPOSED*: Remove the property Execution Statuses from the specifications. * *AGREED*: The WG agreed on this.  1. **Cardinality of isDescribedAt property** (<https://joinup.ec.europa.eu/node/160936/>)  * *PROPOSED*: Keep the class Public Service Dataset as a subclass of dcat:Dataset and link it to the Public Service class through the isDescribedAt property, with cardinality 0..n. * *AGREED*: The WG agreed on this.  1. **Public Organisation class - Cardinality of the Spatial property** (<https://joinup.ec.europa.eu/node/163442/>)  * The NAL vocabulary proposed for the dct:spatial property of a Public Organisation does not cover the description of local administrations. Therefore, MDK proposed to either remove the suggestion of using a controlled vocabulary for this property, or use other controlled vocabularies, e.g. as NUTS. * GL proposed to use the controlled vocabulary that DCAT-AP suggests for this property, i.e. the use of MDR lists and [Geonames](http://sws.geonames.org/). * *PROPOSED*: Align the controlled vocabulary suggested for the property dct:spatial to the DCAT-AP suggestion, i.e. the use of MDR lists and Geonames. * *ACCEPTED*: The WG agreed on this  1. **Comments on the example included on CPSV-AP v2.0** (<https://joinup.ec.europa.eu/node/163443/>)  * Ignacio Serrano reported through the mailing list some errors on the RDF example included on the draft specifications. MDK informed that the example has been corrected.  1. **Criterion Requirement class - Cardinality of Type property** (<https://joinup.ec.europa.eu/node/163447/>)  * *PROPOSED*: Change the cardinality of a Criterion Requirement type to 0..n. * *AGREED*: The WG agreed on this.  1. **Type of Formal Framework** (<https://joinup.ec.europa.eu/node/163452/>)  * MDK explained that, by the time the CPSV-AP was created, ELI was not finalised. Therefore, we tried to align as much as possible with ELI’s definition of Formal Framework. Regarding the statement on controlled vocabularies, we clarified in the Conformance section of the specifications that their usage is not mandatory but recommenced. * *PROPOSAL*: Have a look at the way that ELI defines a Formal Framework and come back to the WG with a proposal via the mailing list. * *AGREED*: The WG agreed on this.  1. **Errors on the second draft of the CPSV-AP** (<https://joinup.ec.europa.eu/node/165147/>)  * MDK informed the WG that the errors reported on the RDF Schema of the CPSV-AP second draft are corrected.  1. **Cardinality of the Has Contact Point property** (<https://joinup.ec.europa.eu/node/165148/>)  * MDK proposed to change the cardinality of the Has Contact Point property to 0..n. * NG agreed on that. However, he pointed out that the reason to have more than one contact point is usually because there is a contact point for each specific activity within the service (e.g., processing requests vs. delivering the service), and this should be somehow expressed. * *PROPOSED*: Change the cardinality of the Has Contact Point property to 0..n. * *AGREED*: The WG agreed on this.   The following issues were still open:   1. **Relate the Criterion Requirement and Evidence** (<https://joinup.ec.europa.eu/node/165143/>)  * This issue was raised by Karolina Wolniewicz through the mailing list. Her proposal was to add a link between the classes Criterion Requirement and Evidence. * However, MDK asked whether adding this relation implies modelling the business and process logic in very much detail, making the model more complex. The WG agreed. * *PROPOSAL*: Not adding the relation between the classes Criterion Requirement and Evidence. * *AGREED*: The WG agreed on this.  1. **Specialise the Related Service and Spatial properties** (<https://joinup.ec.europa.eu/node/165145/>)  * This issue was raised by Dieter De Paepe via the mailing list. He proposed to create CPVS-AP specific definitions and URIs for the properties relation and spatial, subclassing them to the current used ones. * MDK explained that we would like to reuse existing specifications as much as possible. Therefore, we would propose to leave both properties as they are currently. * GL agreed with MDK, as any MS can extend the specialisation if needed. * *PROPOSED*: Not to specialise the properties related and spatial, but to include a usage note to clarify the usage of the properties. * *AGREED*: The WG agreed on this.  1. **Addition of properties to the Contact Point class** (<https://joinup.ec.europa.eu/node/165149/>)  * AG proposed to add properties like name, address, fax to the Contact Point class. * However, as MDK explained, the CPSV-AP reuses the class from schema.org. Therefore, it is not recommended to add new properties to this class. * *PROPOSED*: Not to change the definition of Contact Point class in the CPSV-AP and continue reusing all the properties from schema.org. * *AGREED*: The WG agreed on this. | | | Additional issues raised during the webinar | 1. **Service user property** (<https://joinup.ec.europa.eu/discussion/service-user-and-provider-properties>)  * NG asked why there is no service user property as there was in a previous version of the CPSV-AP. In addition, he proposed to change to cardinality of service provider from 0..n to 1..n. * He added that there are constraints concerning roles that cannot be modelled using only the participation class. For instance, the delegation relationship between the competent authority and the provider. * However, during the webinar held on the 18/11/2016 ([see the issue number 13](https://joinup.ec.europa.eu/sites/default/files/event/attachment/d04.01-meeting_minutes_cpsv-ap_final_webinar_-_20161118_v0.01.docx)), the WG agreed to remove the service user, together with the service provider. Therefore, we would like to suggest the removal of both properties from the model in order to be consistent with this decision. Examples of roles will be described in the section defining the participation class and its relationships with Agent and Public Service.   *PROPOSED*: Keep consistent with the previous decision.   1. **Public service categories** (<https://joinup.ec.europa.eu/discussion/public-service-categories>)  * AG proposed to add to the specifications a classification to categorise public services. NG suggested to extend the model to include other types of classifications rather than by events. * *PROPOSED*: As it would be a bigger change to the model, document the issue on Joinup to continue the discussion, keeping the model stable for the moment. * *AGREED*: The WG agreed on this. | | | Demo on the [Public Service Description Creator](http://52.50.205.146:8890/rdforms/PSDescriptionCreator.html) | * CV gave a demo of the [Public Service Description Creator](http://52.50.205.146:8890/rdforms/PSDescriptionCreator.html). The main difference with the Public Service Description Editor is that the Creator does not store PS descriptions, only imports, creates and exports them. * Positive feedback was expressed from different members of the WG. MA suggested to be able to refer to existing resources (e.g. an already created life event) instead of typing them per each PS description. He also proposed to give the option to create and export more than one PS description. * In addition, CV explained the adaptability of the tool and the pilot with The Netherlands. MA pointed out that it could be useful to be able to export to their national data model (on the pilot) and not only to the CPSV-AP. CV explained that we are working on it. | | | [CPSV-AP tools](https://joinup.ec.europa.eu/asset/cpsvap_test_implementations/description) project on Joinup | * AF presented the new CoS project on Joinup, where the stakeholders can check any information about the tools, technical documentation, and pilots developed with the MSs. * AF invited the pilot owners to review their pilot description and share with us any possible comment. In addition, MAR requested any stakeholder to inform us or provide feedback on the usage of the tools, reusability or technical documentation. Finally, he reminded that CoS can provide support to anyone interested in reusing the tools or working on pilots. * NG asked whether there are examples on specific PS descriptions. In both, the [cross-border catalogue](http://cpsv-ap.semic.eu/cpsv-ap_harvester_xBorder_pilot/index.html) and [federal one](http://cpsv-ap.semic.eu/cpsv-ap_harvester_federal_pilot/index.html), there are PS description from the different sources that participated in the pilot. * GL pointed out that they are using the validator and they will have a look at the harvesting. | | | CoS Promotional video | * AF showed the promotional video created by CoS. Positive feedback was expressed from different members of the WG. * The video will be published in the near future. | | | Next steps | * MDK explained the next steps, i.e. they will update the version 2.1 of the specifications with the final issues agreed during the webinar. * The CPSV-AP 2.1 will be released before the end of October, together with the RDF and XML Schemas, diagram, and the template and RDF Skeleton for the transformation. * MDK informed that any suggestion of discussions with colleagues are welcome. We can organise a webinar oriented to share experiences. | | | Q & A | * MDK and MAR thanked everyone for the interesting discussion and feedback provided. WG members are welcome to provide further comments and/or questions using the available tools ([mailing list](mailto:cpsv-ap@joinup.ec.europe.eu) and [Joinup](https://joinup.ec.europa.eu/asset/cpsv-ap/issue/all)). | | |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Action Nr** | **Action description** | **Target Date** | **Action Owner** |
|  | Send meeting minutes to the WG. | 20/10/2017 | PwC |
|  | Publish the CPSV-AP v2.1 specifications, together with the rest of material. | 31/10/2017 | WG |
|  | Raise interest and propose topics for the webinar on sharing experiences. | 31/12/2017 | WG |