

Meeting Minutes: Webinar - Introduction to the Interoperability Assessment Vocabulary (09/04)

Project:	SEMIC	Date and Time:	09/04/2025 10:00 - 11:00
Meeting Type:	Webinar	Location:	Virtual
Coordinators:	Sander Van Dooren Emiel Dhondt	Issue Date:	18/04/2025

Agenda of the webinar	
Introduction to the webinar	Slides 2-4
Context of the interoperability Assessment data model	Slides 5 - 9
Introduction to the IOPA data model	Slides 10 - 13
Interoperability Assessment form	Slides 14 - 21
Recap data model	Slide 22
Next steps	Slide 23 - 28

Meeting Slides
LINK

Full Meeting Minutes

Introduction Slides 2 - 4	Sander briefly introduced the webinar with: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Purpose of the session: To present the draft of the data model for interoperability (IOP) assessments.
---	--

<p>Speakers: Emiel Dhondt, Sander Van Dooren</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Emphasis on collaboration: Participants are encouraged to provide input and share use cases to validate and improve the model. <p>Emiel introduced the webinar by sharing the practical instructions followed by the main objectives of this webinar:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Explore the draft data model for IOP Assessments • Gauge the participants' interest to contribute • Share the timeline and the planning
<p>Context of the interoperability Assessment data model</p> <p>Slides 5 - 9</p> <p>Speakers: Emiel Dhondt, Sander Van Dooren</p>	<p>Sander and Emiel explained the regulatory foundation for the project. The Interoperable Europe Act mandates that both the Commission and Member States carry out and publish interoperability assessments. The model will support this by enabling machine-readable, API-compatible, and cross-border compliant reporting. SEMIC's role is to ensure that such work is not top-down but community-driven.</p> <p><u>Key points:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The model is based on the Interoperable Europe Act (Articles 3, 8 & annex) • The model supports the publication of assessments • The model enables machine machine-readable and accessible publication • SEMIC promotes bottom-up model development through community consensus

<p>Introduction to the IOPA data model</p> <p>Slides 10 - 13</p> <p>Speaker: Emiel Dhondt</p>	<p><u>Draft Model Overview</u></p> <p>Emiel presented a high-level overview of the draft model. At its core is a binding requirement, which triggers the assessment. The model captures details like public organizations involved, affected services and stakeholders, interoperability impacts, and related solutions. It aims to make interoperability impacts explicit and analysable, fostering better policy decisions that avoid reinventing the wheel.</p> <p>Key points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Core entity: binding requirement (e.g., law, policy) • Assessments connect to services, stakeholders, effects • The Assessments tracks if requirement aids or hinders interoperability • The Assessment should link to existing solutions (standards, tools) • The Assessment data aims to support smarter policy making through reuse and impact tracking <p><u>Feedback Michał Bukowski (PL)</u></p> <p>The discussion opened to participants. Michał Bukowski suggested adding unique identifiers for not just legal references, but also for organizations and other model elements, improving traceability. Emiel agreed that identifiers are vital for accurate referencing and future data analytics.</p>
<p>Interoperability Assessment form</p> <p>Slides 14 - 21</p> <p>Speakers: Emiel Dhondt, Sander Van Dooren</p>	<p><u>Form Design & Semantic Alignment</u></p> <p>Emiel walked through the form currently used on the portal. He explained the desire to transition from free text fields to structured code lists for country names, organization types, etc. He emphasized SEMIC's use of core vocabularies and invited attendees to suggest missing types or values.</p> <p>Key points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The current form uses free text for key data fields • The plan is to move toward code lists and standard vocabularies • Example: public sector types, countries, initiatives • The model already uses core vocabularies like CPSV-AP for consistency <p><u>Stakeholders, Services, & Interoperability Effects</u></p> <p>Emiel covered how the model identifies stakeholders (e.g., citizens, businesses, agencies) and affected public services. Emiel advocated for grouping services rather than identifying each one individually per country. The model lets users label the impact as positive, negative, or</p>

	<p>unclear and explain the effect.</p> <p>Key points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The stakeholders can include public and private actors• The public services may be grouped rather than listed each individually• The impacts are labelled and explained in the form (positive/negative)• Effects can help identify or overcome interoperability barriers <p>During the discussion on identifying affected public services, Hendrik Schmidt (DE) raised an important conceptual question: if a regulation (such as one about issuing ID cards to EU citizens) applies across all EU countries, should the model record one affected public service, or 27 separate instances, one for each country? This sparked a discussion on the granularity of how services are represented in the model. The underlying issue is how to balance clarity, accuracy, and practicality — too much granularity may overwhelm the system or users, while too little may obscure critical differences. Hendrik's input emphasized the need to define guidelines or flexible options for grouping services versus breaking them down per country.</p>
--	--

<p>Recap data model</p> <p>Slide 22</p> <p>Speaker: Emiel Dhondt, Sander Van Dooren</p>	<p><u>Referencing Solutions & Identifying Gaps</u></p> <p>Emiel explained how the model allows linking existing interoperability solutions, hosted on the EU portal or externally. This encourages policy authors to discover tools during the design stage. A free-text field lets users flag additional cross-border barriers, even if not directly related to the requirement.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Solutions can be referenced in the model from the portal or external sources • This option aims to promotes reuse and awareness of existing tools • The inclusion of solutions helps guide policy toward technical compatibility • This section includes an open text field for identifying new or adjacent barriers <p><u>Flexibility & Community Decision-Making</u></p> <p>Emiel reiterated that key aspects of the model, like cardinality rules (e.g., how many services per requirement), are still open for discussion. Sander clarified that decisions should focus on the model itself (not just the form) and be shaped by participant needs.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Model structure is still flexible • Community input will determine field constraints • Goal: consensus-based decisions through dialogue
<p>Next steps</p> <p>Slide 23 - 28</p> <p>Speaker: Emiel Dhondt, Sander Van Dooren</p>	<p><u>Development Roadmap & Community Role</u></p> <p>Emiel detailed SEMIC's development cycle, which includes use case collection, dialogue, draft updates, and public review. The current phase is gathering use cases, due by 24 April, to feed into the first working session on 7 May. He urged everyone to contribute early.</p> <p>Key points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Collaborative 5-step model development cycle • Current focus: collecting use cases • First working session: 7 May • Final model aimed for release in June <p><u>Contributing via GitHub</u></p> <p>Sander and Emiel encouraged everyone to raise issues on GitHub, upvote ideas, and engage in peer discussion. They stressed that only ideas with sufficient community interest would be included in the final model to avoid bloat.</p>

	<p>Key points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use GitHub to share and refine use cases • Vote and comment to shape priorities • Only widely supported ideas will be integrated <p><u>Timeline Recap</u></p> <p>The team informed participants that development ends by June for API work to begin and that review periods are critical for feedback and corrections. Also, participation is required to ensure everyone's needs are included.</p> <p>The team laid out the development timeline:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 24 April – Deadline for use cases • 7 May – First working session • 7–22 May – Public review • 5 June – Optional second session • 30 June – Final approval of model <p><u>Synergies with Other Initiatives</u></p> <p>In closing, Emiel linked the model to other EU initiatives, including CAMSS, Catalogue of Services, Legal Financial and Digital Statement and the Reporting Requirements Metadata Vocabulary. These overlaps are intentional and support greater interoperability across EU tools.</p> <p>Key points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Model aligns with other EU vocabularies and projects • Designed for reuse and semantic consistency • Aims to reduce duplication and promote integration
<p>Use cases mentioned in the webinar (either in chat or verbally)</p>	<p><u>Use Case: Poland - Michał Bukowski (PL)</u></p> <p>Michał shared Poland's national plan to build a public interoperability repository that connects with the EU portal via API. They aim to finalise regulations this year and build the portal next year. The plan includes semantic alignment with the EU model for data reuse and compatibility.</p> <p>Key points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Poland is building a national interoperability portal • They plan an API-based data exchange with EU • They will reuse or align with the structure and semantics of the EU model

	<p><u>Use Cases - Cécile Guasch (EC)</u></p> <p>Cécile proposed several use cases. She talked about leveraging existing binding requirements to enhance legislative searches, cascading from higher-level to more specific legislation. She also emphasized the importance of checking user-centricity and delving deeper into stakeholder impacts.</p> <p>Key points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cascading interoperability requirements from legislation to procurement. • Searching for solutions by identifier. Enable solution discovery using semantic references • Emphasizing user-centricity by better modelling affected stakeholder groups like citizens. <p><u>Uses Cases Germany - Hendrik Schmidt (DE)</u></p> <p>Hendrik Schmidt mentioned two use cases in Germany:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Merging the federal Digital check process with the IEA-assessment to automatically produce IEA-reports • Creating a repository for showcasing best practices in assessments and digital-ready regulations.
--	---