

Meeting Minutes – Webinar 30/03/2021

CCCEV 2.0.0 Webinar 1

Project	Action 2016-07 Promoting semantic interoperability amongst the EU Member States	Meeting Date/Time	30/03/2021 10:00-12:00 (GMT+1)
Meeting Type	Webinar	Meeting Location	Cisco Webex Meetings
Meeting Coordinator	Makx Dekkers	Issue Date	12/04/2021

Meeting Agenda
<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Welcome and objectives2. CCCEV and its general context3. Comparative and explanatory example4. CCCEV 2.0.05. Open discussion6. Wrap-up
Presentation and meeting details: https://joinup.ec.europa.eu/collection/semantic-interoperability-community-semic/event/public-review-cccev-version-200-upcoming-webinar

Attendee Name		Organisation/Country
Agota Nemeth	AN	Hungary
Alessandro Jelmini	AJ	Sweden
Alexandros Gerontas	AG	Greece
Andre Lapa	AL	Portugal
Antonella Lunelli	AL'	Italy
Assen Antov	AA	Bulgaria

Bart Hanssens	BH	Belgium
Ben De Meester	BD	Belgium
Bert Van Nuffelen	BVN	Tenforce
Cécile Guasch	CG	European Commission
Christos Yiakoumettis	CY	Greece
Denis Dechandon	DD	European Commission
Didier Willame	DW	
Dimitri Schepers	DS	PwC
Dimitri Zeginis	DZ	
Dietmar Gattwinkel	DG	European Commission
Eveline Vlassenroot	EV	Belgium
Francesca Gleria	FG	Italy
Florian Barthélemy	FB	PwC
Giampaolo Sellitto	GS	Bulgaria
Giorgia Lodi	GL	Italy
Giovanni Scaglione	GS	Italy
Hide Yasui	HY	Japan
Igor Bercu	IB	Moldova
Igor Trickovic-Rifelj	ITR	Slovenia
Iraklis Varlamis	IV	Greece
Jorge Sousa	JS	Portugal

Joseph Azzopardi	JA	Malta
Kitano Naho	KN	Japan
Konstantinos Raptis	KR	
Lefteris Leontaridis	LL	Greece
Liliane Onofre	LO	Portugal
Luc Gathy	LG	Belgium
Makx Dekkers	MD	Independent / Spain
Marco Aarts	MA	The Netherlands
Marco Pedro	MP	Portugal
Margariti Vikcy	MV	
Maria Siapera	MS	
Marc-Christopher Schmidt	MCS	European Commission
Miguel Alvarez-Rodriguez	MAR	European Commission
Miha Jesenko	MJ	
Natalie Muric	NM	European Commission
Nele Harder	NH	Germany
Nikos Vasilakis	NV	Greece
Norman Calleja	NC	Malta
Ondrej Kerka	OK	Czechia
Pavlina Fragkou	PF	European Commission
Petra Penzes	PP	

Sander Van Dooren	SVD	Belgium
Sebastian Sklarss	SE	Germany
Seth van Hooland	SVH	European Commission
Sven Lieber	SL	Belgium
Simon Trusina	ST	Czechia

Summary of the meeting	
Topic	Summary
Welcome and objectives	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Seth van Hooland (SVH) opened the meeting and welcomed everyone. • Pavlina Fragkou (PF) explained that this is the first of a series of three webinars. Feedback on the proposed vocabularies is much appreciated, either via these webinars or via Github. • Makx Dekkers (MD) introduced himself as the moderator of this webinar.
CCCEV and its general context	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dimitri Schepers (DS) situated the Core Criterion and Core Evidence Vocabulary (CCCEV) within the other SEMIC solutions and gave an overview of the objectives, benefits and scope of CCCEV. • Next, he explained the rationale of creating a new version of CCCEV, by indicating the areas of improvement that could be found within the previous version. • Alexandros Gerontas (AG) asked if implementation examples existed that could be used as practical guidance. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ Currently, these do not exist, but MD noted down this need from the community.
Comparative and explanatory example	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Using an example storyline of someone who wishes to get married, DS explained how this would be expressed using CCCEV version 1.0.0. Next, he indicated the areas of improvement and showed how the same example expressed using CCCEV version 2.0.0, resolved the indicated issues.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dietmar Gattwinkel (DG) asked how CCCEV relates to recent endeavours to standardize similar concepts such as Verifiable Credentials (W3C). <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ SVH elaborated by saying that the Verifiable Credentials work mainly stems from the ID and payment communities, which partially overlaps with our stakeholders but not entirely. ◦ Bert Van Nuffelen (BVN) stated that Verifiable Claims were looked into: some of the concepts are similar, but not all, e.g., an Evidence in CCCEV is a central and broader notion, whereas in Verifiable Credentials, it is only a supportive document. A Verifiable Credentials statement comes close to the notion of <code>cccev:supportedValue</code>. It is a good suggestion to make the relationship between both more visible. But as SVH mentioned, the models have their differences. • Sander Van Dooren (SVD) asked if the model could also be applied to Evidence that isn't disclosed, e.g., to simply ascertain that you are of legal age without showing your entire birth certificate. One can for example imagine a third party validating this claim for the requester, on behalf of the provider. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ MD explained that the model is flexible enough to allow for Evidence that is not a document but just a statement, e.g. yes or no. ◦ BVN confirmed this. In that case, the Evidence is rather empty and only contains the trusted source. Nevertheless, this requires a particular way of handling the response side, that will have to be agreed during implementation. • Giorgia Lodi (GL) asked what the difference is between Criterion and the Rule class of CPSV-AP. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ DS explained that the integration of CCCEV and CPSV-AP is being looked into. ◦ GL further elaborated on the need for clarifying the relationships between Formal/Reference Framework, Rule and Criterion. ◦ BVN confirmed there is quite a gap between the Reference Framework and the machine-readable Requirement. The Rule class could play a role in bridging this gap.
<p>CCCEV 2.0.0</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • BVN gave an overview of the classes and relationships within CCCEV version 2.0.0. • AG asked if CCCEV could be used in both the informational phase (e.g. to build an online public service catalogue) as well

	<p>as in the transactional phase of a public service. He also asked if there is a reuse of classes between CPSV-AP and CCCEV.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Cécile Guasch (CG) confirmed that the Requirement class can also be used to provide information ex ante, and not only at the instance creation phase. ○ DS also stated that work is ongoing to further align CPSV-AP and CCCEV. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Sebastian Sklarss (SE) asked how Criteria and Requirements could be validated in a concrete manner at runtime? Is SHACL or ISO Schematron foreseen? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ PF responded that we intend to provide all types of serializations and validations. ○ MD clarified that this is a Core Vocabulary, however, which has no restrictions such as cardinalities.
<p>Open discussion</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● [On the open question whether all the steps in the flow of Requirements (Criterion --> Information Requirement --> Constraint) are always required.] <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ GL raised the point whether this decision should be left to the application/implementation, and thus to keep it flexible in the Core Vocabulary. ○ GL asked whether the subclasses of Requirement are disjoint. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ BVN stated that the disjointness is not explicitly stated now. ● SE asked what the mandatory properties are for Evidence, the latter being a subclass of dcat:Dataset. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ MD clarified that only DCAT-AP has mandatory properties, but that CCCEV is reusing dcat:Dataset, i.e. the class from the Vocabulary. ● [On the open question of which specific Agent roles should be included within CCCEV.] <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Eveline Vlassenroot (EV) stated that the current two relationships (issuedBy and isAbout) are the general ones as also used in Flanders; others will probably be more domain-specific. GL agreed. ○ Marc-Christopher Schmidt (MCS) raised the point that the relationship {Evidence isProvidedBy Agent} could also be useful. In the domain of procurement, for example, you have intermediaries who provide the evidence, which can be different from the ones who have issued it. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ MD and BVN agreed that this might be a good general relationship to add. BVN noted the

importance of looking into the reuse of roles from DCAT.

- Norman Calleja (NC) and CC agreed in the chat.
- SVD asked whether there really is a need for the symmetric (inverse) relationships.
 - BVN clarified that they are indeed not needed from a purely semantical perspective. There are however use cases where the queries might go in two directions and there is no generally preferred direction, e.g. start from atomic requirements and go up versus start from general requirements and drill down.
 - This is however an open discussion point and we invite the Working Group to challenge the need for bidirectional relationships.
- In light of the once-only-principle, Francesca Gleria (FG) asked how the model would work in case of a “machine-executed procedure” between two or more public administrations, i.e. without involvement of the Agent.
 - MD clarified that this mechanism is supposed to work in various environments. The model makes no assumptions on that part. It is for example not stated that the Evidence is to be provided by the Person; it only needs to support the Requirement.
 - BVN further explained that a lot of decisions have to be taken in order for the once-only-principle to work: What does “only asking once” mean in an actual data exchange?, What can you ask? What can you re-ask?, etc. That is not within the scope of this model. This model “only” connects the request with the response.
 - MD mentioned that this further supports the need for the isProvidedBy relationship (see supra).
- [On the open question of whether temporal information should be included within CCCEV.]
 - MCS stated that the validity period of an Evidence is included within eCertis, without thereby stating that this information should be part of CCCEV.
 - Jorge Sousa (JS), GL, CG, Miguel Alvarez-Rodriguez (MAR) and DG gave other examples of Evidences with validity periods: driving licences, ID cards, passports, mandatory insurances etc.
 - There is an agreement to add the expiration date on the Evidence.
 - BVN asked MCS whether, in eCertis, this relates to (1) the expected temporal validity that

should be supplied or (2) the validity period that is usually associated with that Evidence Type.

- MCS responded that having an expiration date on a specific Evidence makes a lot of sense. What exists in eCertis is "how long is an Evidence valid". So it's more general.
- MCS further elaborated that in the procurement domain, it is more complex. Depending on the Evidence Type, the procurement document, ... it varies greatly. For the once-only-principle, MCS would stick to the validity period / expiration date.
- CG raised the question whether the Requirement should also contain some temporal information, e.g. the Evidence may not be older than x months.
 - Agreement from the Working Group.
- MD summarized that there are thus two additions to the model: (1) the Requirement should be able to ask for validity period on the Evidence and (2) the Evidence should be able to contain an expiration date.
 - Agreement from the Working Group.
- AG proposed to associate the expiration of an Evidence with the relevant process for renewing said Evidence.
- SE spotted an inconsistency in the copyright attribution: European Union versus European Commission.
 - SVH clarified that, within the Unit, this is being looked into. It will be picked up again when there is more clarity on this.
 - PF further added that, considering that the ISA² Action is finishing, the Core Vocabularies are nevertheless still supported and maintained under the Digital Europe Programme.
- Ben De Meester (BDM) asked whether conditional requirements/workflows are in scope of CCCEV v2.0.0, e.g. if you have a handicap.
 - CG considered this to be in scope.
 - BVN clarified that no detailed analysis had been done on the best practices for this; nevertheless, a large amount of conditional settings is currently supported: via (1) the Evidence Type Lists and (2) (sub)Requirements, that can be chained and collected

	<p>together. It is still an open question though whether this is an easy and straightforward approach.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">○ MD also noted that this is definitely possible thanks to the flexibility of the Requirements and that you could see this as a Constraint; if you have a particular situation, a particular characteristic, you must meet some Requirements. And indeed, if these requirements are very specific and detailed, the Requirement chain might be long. In future work, we should provide guidelines and examples that will clarify the usage of CCCEV. But in general: the more complex your specific situation, the more complex the implementation will be as well.● EV commented that the enhanced machine-readability of the classes is a major improvement from the previous version.● MCS commented that the new version is helpful for ESPD and eCertis.
Wrap-up	<ul style="list-style-type: none">● MD gave a brief summary of the webinar, the major discussion points and conclusions, as well as of further work.● MD pointed to the specification of CCCEV 2.0.0 and noted that feedback and input could still be given via Github or mail.● MD invited the participants to the next webinar on the Core Vocabularies on the 23rd April and to the next webinar on CCCEV on the 27th April.● SVH and PF thanked the different stakeholders for joining and participating, for their input and for the level of discussion. They invited everyone to look into CCCEV with their own examples and use cases in mind.● PF also asked the current users of version 1.0.0, to inform the editors in case of certain shortcomings of version 2.0.0.