

Meeting Minutes: Webinar on the Core Vocabularies (SEMIC - 04.01)

Project:	SEMIC	Date and Time:	25/02/2025 10:00 - 12:00
Meeting Type:	Webinar	Location:	Virtual
Coordinators:	Anastasia Sofou Emiel Dhondt	Issue Date:	17/03/2025

Agenda of the webinar		
	Context of the Core Vocabularies	Slides 4 - 6
	Issues on CBV	Slides 7 - 11
	Issues on CPSV-AP	Slides 12 - 15
	Issues on CCCEV	Slides 16 - 20
	Core Vocabulary related assets	Slides 21-23
	Wrap-up	Slides 24-26

Meeting Slides
LINK

Participants		
Name	Initials	Organisation
Ahmed Abid	AA	NTT Data
Anastasia Sofou	AS	SEMIC Team
Andreea Pasare	AP	Not Shared

Participants		
Name	Initials	Organisation
Andreea Pasare	AP	Not Shared
Arnar Vilhjálmsson	AV	Iceland
B Lund	BL	Not Shared
Not shared	B	Babelfed
Barry Nauta	BN	Not Shared
Bert Van Nuffelen	BVN	SEMIC Team
Cristian Vasquez	CV	OP
Dominique Roelants	DR	Not Shared
Dörthe Koerner	DK	BRC NO
Emidio Stani	ES	SEMIC Team
Emiel Dhondt	ED	SEMIC Team
Emmanuel Mondon	EM	Not Shared
Erik Mossing	EM	Not Shared
Faruk Karabulut	FK	SEMIC Team
Flojera Thaqi	FT	Not Shared
Frans van der Zande	FVDZ	Not Shared
Geertrui Timmers	GT	Agentschap Binnenlands Bestuur
George Mourkousis	GM	HSE

Participants		
Name	Initials	Organisation
Georges Lobo	GL	EC
Héctor Rico	HR	Not Shared
Ine Weyts	IW	SEMIC Team
Inês Santos	IS	Not Shared
Jasna Sajko	JS	HR
Jim Yang	JY	NO
Johannes Theissen	JT	Lipp
Jorge Sousa	JS	PT – AMA
Jose Pedro	JP	Not Shared
Josema Alonso	JA	ERA
Juan Carlos Segura	JCS	NTT DATA
Maarten Duhoux	MD	ERA
Marco	M	NL
Marina Aguado	MA	ERA
Michał Bukowski	MK	PL
Micke af Hällström	MAH	Finnish Tax Admin
Mihai Paunescu	MP	OP
Mike Montasell	MM	Not Shared
Not Shared	MDA	Ministry of Digital Affairs Poland

Participants		
Name	Initials	Organisation
Nicos	N	Not Shared
Per Nordanlind	PN	Swedish Companies Registration Office
Priyanka	P	Not Shared
Riitta Alkula	RA	Not Shared
Sebastian Sklarß	SS	Not Shared
Stamatia Dasiopoulou	SD	Not Shared
Thomas Bendig	TB	BMI
Torbjörn Ull	TU	Not Shared
Tore Helland	TH	Not Shared

Points discussed and decisions taken

Topics discussed	Outcome
Issues on Core Business Vocabulary	
Issue #48	SEMIC proposal of the webinar approved
Issue #45	SEMIC proposal #2 of the webinar approved
Issues on CPSV-AP	
Issue #129	SEMIC proposal of the webinar approved
Issue #136	Issue raised to GitHub

Issues on CCCEV	
Issue #66	Issue raised to GitHub
Issue #56	SEMIC proposal of the webinar approved
Issue #57	SEMIC proposal of the webinar approved

Full Meeting Minutes

Introduction Slides 2 - 6 Speaker: Anastasia Sofou, Emiel Dhondt	<p>AS introduced the webinar by sharing the practical instructions followed by the main objectives of this webinar:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discuss open issues related to the Core Vocabularies and CPSV-AP • Gather input for issues that could not be resolved in the latest release for public review • Participants are invited to provide feedback on the XML Blog post and the XSDs of Core Vocabularies that will be shared in the upcoming weeks
Issues on Core Business Vocabulary Slides 7 - 11 Speaker: Emiel Dhondt	<p>ED highlighted the status of the CBV 2.2.0, hereby mentioning that accounting documents included to comply with the BRIS regulation.</p> <p>Issue #48: The BRIS directive and other EU initiatives require documenting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Signatory rights of a business • Beneficial ownership of a business <p>The Nordics have a proposed model covering these aspects</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Nordic Core Business Vocabulary expands on CBV • It introduces: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ BeneficialOwner class ○ SignatoryRights class ○ SignatoryRule class ○ Post class <p>SEMIC proposition Question to the community:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Should CBV cover this use case? • Should CBV adopt the same or similar approach to NCBV? <p>Resolution Based on the remarks received, it is evident that there is a clear need for it. This need falls within the scope of the core vocabularies, and by the next webinar, a concrete semantic proposition will be presented. Additionally, based on the request, the necessary properties and</p>

	<p>classes will be examined to ensure alignment with eIDAS.</p> <p>Discussion</p> <p>PN mentioned that from the Nordic countries, it was observed that this was a missing element. The aim was to demonstrate how a legal entity operates, including signatory rules or representation rights. This aspect is partly utilised by BRIS solutions recognising this need, efforts were directed towards addressing it. TU added that the work is still based on the Core Vocabularies but identified some gaps.</p> <p>Comments raised in the chat regarding Core Business Vocabulary not being sufficient when it comes to role. Question raised regarding in which extent Nordic Core Vocabulary is aligned with eIDAS2.0 legal person.</p> <p>MAH raised the concern about the low awareness of the Core Vocabularies, which has made it difficult to convince people who are not familiar with them to align the eIDAS2.0 legal person attribute according to the core business structure and format.</p> <p>MAH added that the adms identifier class is mentioned as a tricky aspect because people unfamiliar with it tend to become almost hostile when it's proposed to use a generic identifier class for all legal person identifiers. Highlighting that the Nordic countries are trying to align as much as possible with the EU core vocabularies and avoid inventing anything new unless there are gaps identified. MAH expressed the need for active assistance from the SEMIC team or the community in the Nordic context. After creating the first version of the signatory rights model, it became apparent that there was uncertainty about the terminology to represent different concepts. EM emphasised that developing it collaboratively would be fantastic and noted down the suggestion</p> <p>GL confirmed that this will be conveyed to colleagues responsible for eIDAS and encouraged participants to push the request through channels within their countries. GL emphasised that support from MS helps enforcing such initiatives and recommended the participants to use their own channels within administrations and governments to relay this message.</p> <p>Issue #45:</p> <p>The HVD regulations requires reporting on Company Status:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• "Company status (such as when it is closed, struck off the register, wound up, dissolved (as well as the date of these events), economically active or inactive as defined in national law);"• Currently the CBV does not allow the date to be associated with the status of the company.• Timing aspects have not been allowed in the Core Vocs as otherwise all entities will require a temporal component
--	--

	<p>SEMIC proposition</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Add a legalStatusDate property to the legal entity 2. Introduce a new class, LegalStatus, containing the legalEntityStatus and legalStatusDate 3. No changes <p>Resolution Consensus reached via the chat on option 2.</p> <p>Discussion SS expressed that option 2 initially seems more reasonable from a modelling perspective but raised concerns about the naming and design rules applied. SS mentioned that the name of the class should not be used directly with its attributes, such as "legal entity status state" or "legal entity status code" and the same applies to "legal entity activity", highlighting that this approach leads to losing advantage of having a unified concept within Core Vocs. Instead, SS suggested taking the name of the class and adding the attributes to provide context. Regarding the registration date, SS questioned whether it should be considered part of the legal entity status, including the status being registered and the date of registration.</p> <p>EM mentioned that changes cannot be made to the existing attributes because they have already been agreed upon and accepted. However, they suggested being consistent with the future approach, expressing willingness to avoid repeating class names before property names in the future.</p> <p>MAH mentioned that it is informative to hear that there is still a debate about the same issue that has been discussed in the Nordics for many years. The debate revolves around how much additional prefix information is needed in the attribute.</p> <p>AS suggested addressing the naming issue in the style guide during its revision. AS proposed dedicating more space to this topic and reconsidering the approach based on the recent discussion. Updating the style guide would ensure clarity and consistency moving forward.</p>
<p>Issues on CPSV-AP</p> <p>Slides 12 - 15</p> <p>Speaker: Emiel Dhondt, Emidio Stani</p>	<p>Issue #129:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is no relation between PublicService and ServiceConcessionContract • There is no relation between Channel and ServiceConcessionContract <p>SEMIC proposition Introduce a direct relation to cv:ServiceConcessionContract from</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • cpsv:PublicService • Cv:Channel <p>Resolution There were no objections, introduction of direct relations has been accepted.</p> <p>Discussion</p>

	<p>JY, who created the issue, is expressing satisfaction with the presentation and confirming that no further information is needed</p> <p>Issue #136:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Output and Evidence are concrete instances • During design of a Public Service requirements can be put on the evidence • During design the type of an Output could be indicated <p>SEMIC proposition</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Introduce such requirements in "EvidenceType" <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ For example, add <code>dct:language</code> to specify the language an evidence has to be in • Introduce the class "OutputType" <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ This will act as EvidenceType does for Evidence <p>Resolution</p> <p>The voting was inconclusive and further discussions are required.</p> <p>Discussion</p> <p>JY noted that the type of data is difficult to connect by name, as a type is inherently distinct from a data set. To address this, the proposal in the national application profile is to name it "required evidence." This approach allows required evidence to be found in a data set, whereas "EvidenceType" may not be found in a data set. JY explains that when you have a service catalogue, you describe what is expected, not what is the real evidence or real output.</p> <p>Question raised in the chat asking about the end result when there is an overlay, mentioning that some outputs may be evidence. ES explains that it is possible to double type an instance of output as both output and evidence. This means that the same instance can be classified as both an output and an evidence simultaneously.</p> <p>SS suggests modelling requirements and evidence separately and argues against adding several properties to the evidence class to define requirements. Instead, he proposes having a separate class called requirements, which includes required language and other properties.</p>
<p>Issues on CCCEV</p> <p>Slides 16 - 20</p> <p>Speaker: Emiel Dhondt</p>	<p>Issue #66:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is a desire to reference examples of evidences • BregDCAT-AP used to use <code>adms:sample</code>: def: "Links to a sample of an Asset (which is itself an Asset)." • Adding such examples would support OOTS and national implementations <p>SEMIC proposition</p> <p>Add a property to evidenceType:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Introduce the property <code>cv:exampleURI</code> 2. Use the property <code>adms:sample</code>

Resolution

Insufficient votes, issue will be moved to GitHub. In case of no feedback provided on GitHub most voted option of #2 will be pursued.

Discussion

EM inquired if there is anybody who has seen this need to provide examples or be able to link examples from data. SD raised in the chat that if an example is provided, the format of the example should be considered relevant for description.

SS explains the need from OOTS, mentioning the evidence explorer and other tools based on the Exchange data model, which itself is based on CCCEV. SS opts for option #1 but mentions that option #2 might also be fine. SS emphasises the importance of not discarding information about example evidences, as they are needed for mapping exercises and discussing the content of information entities in the evidence.

Issue #56:

- There is a need to describe various class instances.
- dct:descriptions is present in
 - EvidenceTypeList
 - InformationConcept
 - Requirement
- The following have no description
 - InformationRequirement
 - ReferenceFramework
 - EvidenceType
 - Evidence

SEMIC proposition

Add a property [dct:description](#) to

- InformationRequirement
- ReferenceFramework
- EvidenceType
- Evidence

Resolution

There were no objections, addition of [dct:description](#) has been agreed.

Discussion

AP noted that “InformationRequirement” might already inherit [dct:description](#) highlighting it being a non-issue.

Issue #57:

From practice the need arose to assign a human readable label to class instances.

SEMIC proposition

1. Add [rdfs:label](#)
2. Recommend the usage of [dct:description](#) (add where missing)
3. Keep as is

Resolution

There were no objections, addition of [rdfs:label](#) has been agreed.

	<p>Discussion</p> <p>EM proposed to go forward with proposition #1, being the addition of <code>rdfs:label</code> to be added to the classes in question</p>
<p>Core Vocabulary related assets</p> <p>Slides 21-23</p> <p>Speaker: Emiel Dhondt</p>	<p>EM introduces additional Core Voc related assets that are been worked on, emphasising the importance of receiving feedback from the community to improve these assets. EM mentions the blog post that lays out the usage of XML schemas for RDF and invites the community to review it due to its relevancy, providing a link to GitHub where the community can post any concerns.</p> <p>EM proceeded to introduce the creation of XML schemas for all the core vocabularies, mentioning that in some projects, such as OOTS, there is a preference to still use XSDs. EM emphasised the importance of these XSDs to be aligned with SEMIC specifications.</p> <p>Currently the following XML drafts are available for review:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Core Business • Core Criterion and Core Evidence • Core Location • Core Person • Core Public Event • Core Public Organisation <p>These are published as draft XSDs so community input can be gathered before formalising, followed by providing XSDs for other SEMIC specifications.</p>
<p>Wrap-up</p> <p>Slides 24-26</p> <p>Speaker: Emiel Dhondt</p>	<p>EM concluded the webinar by inviting participants to provide feedback on the open issues and the draft XSDs. Mentioning that after the review period, another webinar could be held to discuss the issues identified during the review process.</p> <p>EM encouraged participants to complete the survey using the QR code, which assesses the utilisation of SEMIC assets. The survey allows SEMIC to understand your need in a more in-depth and thorough manner, allowing the identify focus areas.</p>