**D04.01 - Meeting Minutes – CPSV-AP revision webinar 3**

**Action 1.3 Catalogue of Services Specific Contract under Framework Contract DI/07171 – Lot 2**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Project:** | Action 1.3 Catalogue of Services | **Meeting Date/Time:** | 24/05/2016 10:00-12:00 |
| **Meeting Type:** | Webinar | **Meeting Location:** | Online |
| **Meeting Coordinator:** | Michiel de Keyzer/Phil Archer/Thomas D’Haenens/Thimo Thoeye | **Issue Date:** | 25/05/2016 |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Attendee Name**  | **Initials** | **Organisation/Country** |
| Bart Hanssens | BH | Fedict, Belgium |
| Thomas D'haenens | TDH | Flemish Agency for Information, Belgium |
| Thimo Thoeye | ThTh | Stad Gent, Belgium |
| Risto Hinno | RH | Ministry of Economic Affairs and Communications, Estonia |
| Marco Latvanen | ML | Suomi.fi, Finland |
| Yannis Charalabidis | YC | University of Macedonia, Greece |
| Loukia Demiri | LD | Ministry of Interior, Greece |
| Antonio Rotundo | AR | AgID, Italy |
| Giorgia Lodi | GL |
| Marco Combetto | MC | Trento PaT, Italy |
| Nicola Guarino | NG | CNR, Italy |
| Eduards Cauna | EC | Ministry of Environmental Protection and Regional Development, Latvia |
| Vytautas Juršėnas | VJ | Ministry of the Interior (national public service catalogue), Lithuania |
| Julien Silverio | JS | Centre of Information Technologies of the State (CTIE), Luxembourg |
| Marco Aarts | MA | ICTU, The Netherlands |
| Patrocinio Nieto | PN | Ministry of Finance and Public Administrations, Spain |
| Mikael Österlund | MO | Bolagsverket - Swedish Companies Registration Office, Sweden |
| Miguel Álvarez Rodríguez | MAR | ISA, European Commission |
| Peter Burian | PB |
| Sol Mateu | SM |
| Phil Archer | PA | W3C |
| Nikolaos Loutas | NL | PwC EU Services |
| Michiel De Keyzer | MDK |
| Christophe Parrein | CP |
| Ana Fernández de Soria | AF |

|  |
| --- |
| **Meeting Agenda**  |
| 1. Welcome and overview
2. Applied changes to the CPSV-AP
3. [Current issues](https://joinup.ec.europa.eu/asset/cpsv-ap/issue/all) in the CPSV-AP

[Definition of Public Service](https://joinup.ec.europa.eu/asset/cpsv-ap/issue/changing-definition-public-service)[Event - association with Agent](https://joinup.ec.europa.eu/asset/cpsv-ap/issue/event-assotiation-agent)[Addition of more detail on the Role of an Agent](https://joinup.ec.europa.eu/asset/cpsv-ap/issue/addition-more-detail-role-agent)[Updating the relation between the (Business) Event and Public Service class](https://joinup.ec.europa.eu/asset/cpsv-ap/issue/updating-relation-between-business-event-and-public-service-class)[Information about authentication for a Public Service](https://joinup.ec.europa.eu/asset/cpsv-ap/issue/information-about-authentication-public-service)[Additional channels](https://joinup.ec.europa.eu/asset/cpsv-ap/issue/additional-channels)[More detail for Period of Time](https://joinup.ec.europa.eu/asset/cpsv-ap/issue/more-detail-period-time)[Extending the Processing Time property of a Public Service](https://joinup.ec.europa.eu/asset/cpsv-ap/issue/extending-processing-time-property-public-service)[Remove has creator from Formal Framework -> PO](https://joinup.ec.europa.eu/asset/cpsv-ap/issue/remove-has-creator-formal-framework-po)[Addition of properties related to the measuring the delivery of Public Services through their Channels](https://joinup.ec.europa.eu/asset/cpsv-ap/issue/addition-properties-related-measuring-delivery-public-services-through-their-cha)[Additional properties related to Public Service Portfolio Management](https://joinup.ec.europa.eu/asset/cpsv-ap/issue/additional-properties-related-public-service-portfolio-management)[Need to cite Person Class?](https://joinup.ec.europa.eu/asset/cpsv-ap/issue/need-cite-person-class)[Contact Information / Contact Point](https://joinup.ec.europa.eu/asset/cpsv-ap/issue/contact-information/contact-point)[Indication of the language in which an Input needs to be provided](https://joinup.ec.europa.eu/asset/cpsv-ap/issue/indication-language-which-input-needs-be-provided)[Indication whether an Input is mandatory/optional to be provided](https://joinup.ec.europa.eu/asset/cpsv-ap/issue/indication-whether-input-mandatory/optional-be-provided)1. Next steps and [next webinar](https://joinup.ec.europa.eu/asset/cpsv-ap/event/cpsv-ap-revision-wg-virtual-meeting-0)
2. Q & A

**Presentation and meeting details:** <https://joinup.ec.europa.eu/asset/cpsv-ap/event/cpsv-ap-revision-wg-virtual-meeting-0> |

|  |
| --- |
| **Summary of Meeting**  |
|

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Topic** | **Summary** |
| Welcome and overview | * MDK introduced the webinar and thanked the WG members for their participation.
* People from the WG are kindly requested to sign the [ISA contributor license agreement](https://joinup.ec.europa.eu/node/104627) (CLA) by posting "I agree" as a comment.
 |
| [Applied changes](https://joinup.ec.europa.eu/asset/cpsv-ap/asset_release/all) to the CPSV-AP | * PA explained the main updates done on the [second interim version](https://joinup.ec.europa.eu/node/151628) of CPSV-AP v1.1. The main changes result from discussions during previous webinars and through the issues on Joinup.
* A copy of the diagram can be found on the [webinar page](https://joinup.ec.europa.eu/asset/cpsv-ap/event/cpsv-ap-revision-wg-virtual-meeting-0).
* It is intended to have a stable version of the interim version after the webinar.
 |
| [Current issues](https://joinup.ec.europa.eu/asset/cpsv-ap/issue/all) in the CPSV-AP | The following issues were discussed during the webinar:1. **Definition of Public Service** (<https://joinup.ec.europa.eu/node/150402/>)
* *PROPOSED*: Define a public service as “a mandatory or discretional set of acts performed, or able to be performed, by or on behalf of a public authority. Services may be for the benefit of an individual, a business, or other public authority, or groups of any of these. The capacity to act exists whether it is used or not, and the term 'benefit' may apply in the sense of enabling the fulfilment of an obligation.”
* NG raised the concern that the description mixes microscopic with macroscopic levels. He asked whether we look for the parties (citizens, governments) or only for individuals, as it is a set of acts. PA explained that we model for the user itself, not for the government thus it is for an individual use of the service.
* TDH explained that specific services performed for different departments can be seen as intergovernmental services to each other with their own cost. The composite cost can be obtained by aggregating all the costs. ML agreed with him.
* *PROPOSED*: Include the term specific in the definition. The WG agreed on this.
* *RESOLVED*: A public service is defined as “a mandatory or discretional set of acts performed, or able to be performed, by or on behalf of a public authority. Services may be for the benefit of a specific individual, a business, or other public authority, or groups of any of these. The capacity to act exists whether it is used or not, and the term 'benefit' may apply in the sense of enabling the fulfilment of an obligation.”
1. **Event - association with Agent** (<https://joinup.ec.europa.eu/node/150873/>)
* *PROPOSED*: Add a new class of Criterion (from Core Evidence and Core Criterion Vocabulary, i.e. CCCEV) to indicate the criteria that a user needs to satisfy to be able to use the service. The issue was raised by YC.
* NL explained that, in that case, we need to align the CPSV-AP with the [CCCEV](https://joinup.ec.europa.eu/asset/criterion_evidence_cv/description), which is currently under development in collaboration with DG GROW.
* YC mentioned that we miss an important fact, i.e. life events happen to people and business events to enterprises thus we need a link between an Event, and Agent, i.e. to who the Event happened.
* PA explained that we are working to provide a catalogue of services to people. If the event that happens is not related to a PS, it is irrelevant to the work done here. Therefore PA does not see the need to link an Event with an Agent, because it broads the scope. However, anyone is able to take the data model and adapt it to its own needs (by adding the link between the Agent and the Event, for instance). TDH and ML agreed with him.
* PA asked whether the people from the WG are aware of the [CCCEV](https://joinup.ec.europa.eu/asset/criterion_evidence_cv/description). They are not, but NL is part of the team working on it. He can provide any related information needed.
* *RESOLVED*: There will not be a relation between Event and Agent.
1. **Addition of more detail on the Role of an Agent**(<https://joinup.ec.europa.eu/node/150399/>)
* *PROPOSED*: Add a new class of Participation linked to a class of Role. This is in line with the Italian model and W3C ORG Ontology (which is the basis of CPOV).
* PA explained that it is difficult to put time constraints on the Agent role. There could be situations where the service provider is different depending on the region or time, i.e. there are moments when you need to say more about the other Participant. The Italian solution to this is to add the class “RoleinTime” as a way to provide this information.
* However, PA opined that the class RoleInTime is very linked to temporal aspects. He stressed the need of having something more generic. He proposed to use the term “Participation”.
* GL explained the reason of the inclusion of the class RoleInTime. They had a specific requirement, a public organisation is responsible for a specific service. But there could be a moment when another organisation has to replace the responsible one on providing the service during a specific time. The use of the “RoleInTime” class covers this case and replaces the need of having the class competent authority.
* NG opined that the Italian proposal addresses two important things, i.e. the temporal issue (not very important) and the different roles involved (very important as there are roles that cannot be represented as classes). He proposed to add roles for authority, provider and customer to the diagram.
* TDH said that the issue on competent authorities is different than the issue about roles. He opined that a competent authority is an attribute of a public service, something different than Participation or Agent.
* PA summarised that we are trying to model a catalogue of services, keeping in mind the importance of maintaining things as simple as possible.
* GL agreed with PA, i.e. the inclusion of the class depends on the existing requirements. If we want to add the temporal dimension, the RoleInTime class is needed. Otherwise, we can just include a property to specify the roles.
* TT explained that many of the time-related issues can be managed by keeping the databases up-to-date.
* PA asked whether it is better to have the participation class thus having a more completed model, or whether it is enough with roles such as service provider, user and competent authority.
* ML explained that RoleInTime goes very deep, considering the usual service descriptions produced by public organisations. The inclusion of these new classes would create an extra obstacle for the completion of public service descriptions. In addition, he said that he was not 100% convinced that the class RoleInTime provides relevant information to service end users, as they usually need basic and generic information about the public services. End users can find more detail information when they login to the public service, but this information does not need to be collected in the catalogue. From the Finish experience, users are more interested on specific requirements of the public service, contact information, etc.
* MA agreed with ML, i.e. adding time anywhere in the model brings another dimension which is not needed for the purpose of the model. He raised that if the temporal dimension is introduced in the model, then we should introduce it elsewhere as well. For instance, should the model support that the cost varies in time? He suggested to keep the model as simple as possible. PN and JS agreed on this.
* PA summarised: there are a couple of basic roles, i.e. competent authorities, service providers and user. The rest are not relevant. GL agreed with this, considering that local extensions of the CPSV-AP can be adapted to fulfil their needs.
* TDH agreed but warning that this decision could limit future exchangeability throughout Europe.
* JS added that having a very complete and complex data model will limit interoperability as well, as it could not be used.
* TT shared with the WG the work done in Flanders related to the participation role (which is in Dutch): <http://contactinformatie.v-ict-or.be/welke>
* *PROPOSED*: Have properties called competent authority, provider and user. The “Participation” class can be retained as optional. The time dimension will not be included. There will be a text in the specifications to promote a simpler view.
* AR proposed to keep the role properties recommended thus local extensions can include mandatory restrictions.
* *RESOLVED*: The WG agreed on this.
1. **Updating the relation between the (Business) Event and Public Service class**(<https://joinup.ec.europa.eu/node/150385/>)
* *PROPOSED*: Make the property “isGroupedBy” optional.
* NG raised that there are consequences on changing the cardinality of this property in relation with the PS description agreed before.
* *RESOLVED*: The WG agreed on changing the property to optional.
1. **Information about authentication for a Public Service**(<https://joinup.ec.europa.eu/node/150398/>)
* *PROPOSED*: Not include the “Authentication” class and refer to the CCCEV work.
* *RESOLVED*: The WG agreed on this.
1. **Additional channels**(<https://joinup.ec.europa.eu/node/150388/>)
* PA explained that the relations for processing time, cost and input are now linked to public service and channel classes. The text suggests to use the processing time, cost and input at the public service level, unless it is needed to specify those values on the channel level, but you should not specify both.
* ML said that leaving the properties at the public service level is more conceptual. They tried to do so, but then they decided to link them to the channel, as public organisations seem to understand the link with the channel more easily and natural.
* NG asked how many channels a service has.
* PN identified three main channels: Physical, telephone and electronic. ML shared the six channels identified by the Finnish model: eService (transactions), webpage (information), digital, local, phone, printed form and mobile (such as a library bus in remote regions).
* NL stressed that we cannot model instances, we should focus on creating a data model for a catalogue of services. The webinar was not oriented to share the different types of channels, but to decide whether a public service is linked to a channel or not.
* TT said it is not a problem to include the type property in the channel since they have done it before.
* *PROPOSED*: Drop subclasses of the channel and just have a controlled vocabulary for the type.
* PA added that there will be a webinar specific on controlled vocabularies.
* *RESOLVED*: The WG agreed on this.
1. **More detail for Period of Time**(<https://joinup.ec.europa.eu/node/150397/>)
* The Period of Time is when the public service is available, not the time in which the public service needs to process the information. Schema.org defines days of the week in English.
* NG asked for the meaning of availability of a public service. We mentioned that we should specify somehow that availability is usually understood as concerning service requests.
* TT explained further detail about <http://openinghours.io/>. It makes an instantiation of different appointments in the calendar. PA asked whether the opening hours accept periods of time (such as days or months).
* *PROPOSED*: Use schema.org-like (opening hours.io) method to encode availability periods.
* *RESOLVED*: The WG agreed on this.
1. **Extending the Processing Time property of a Public Service**(<https://joinup.ec.europa.eu/node/150401/>)
* PA asked whether it is enough to offer an estimated time for processing. On the other hand, if it is necessary to model minimum/maximum process in time, schema.org cannot be used.
* TDH said it is not enough as there are cases where more detail is needed. However, they can extend it locally.
* NG expressed that we should distinguish between the processing time needed to accept a request, and the total processing time required for delivering a service. PA explained that the processing time is the time to get an answer back.
* GL shared the Italian experience. They do not have the estimated processing time of CPSV-AP. She proposed to make the estimated processing time optional.
* ML proposed to leave the addition of more specific processing times to local appliance of the CPSV-AP, avoiding its inclusion to the CPSV-AP specifications.
* TT and MA agreed with ML. MA opined that it is good to have more options, especially the maximum time which is usually legal information.
* *PROPOSED*: Use concept of an estimated processing time that takes an ISO8601 duration as value (like schema.org) but this can be extended locally, either with text or data.
* *RESOLVED*: The WG agreed on this.
1. **Remove has creator from Formal Framework -> PO**(<https://joinup.ec.europa.eu/node/151483/>)
* TDH opened this issue since the “creator” property in Formal Framework is out of the CPSV-AP scope.
* *PROPOSED*: Remove the link (creator property) from Formal Framework to Public Organisation, as this is out of scope.
* *RESOLVED*: The WG agreed on this.
1. **Addition of properties related to the measuring the delivery of Public Services through their Channels**(<https://joinup.ec.europa.eu/node/150386/>)
* The Estonian adaptation includes collection of information to measure the performance of public services.
* *PROPOSED*: Not add properties related to the measuring of public services, as it is out of scope.
* *RESOLVED*: The WG agreed on not adding them.
1. **Additional properties related to Public Service Portfolio Management**(<https://joinup.ec.europa.eu/node/150395/>)
* Estonia and Italy added a property to indicate the status of the public service. Italy added the property interactivityLevel as well.
* NG agreed on adding properties related to PSPM which concern the macroscopic view of the service.
* *PROPOSED*: Add the status property of the public service as optional.
* *RESOLVED*: The WG agreed to add the status property in the public service. However, the interactivityLevel property will not be included.
1. **Need to cite Person Class?**(<https://joinup.ec.europa.eu/node/151626/>)
* *PROPOSED*: Remove the Person Class from the diagram.
* *RESOLVED*: The WG agreed on this.
1. **Contact Information / Contact Point** (<https://joinup.ec.europa.eu/node/150400/>)
* *PROPOSED*: Include the contact point class.
* *RESOLVED*: The WG agreed on this.
1. **Indication of the language in which an Input needs to be provided**(<https://joinup.ec.europa.eu/node/150392/>)
* *PROPOSED*: Change the cardinality of the language code in the Input class to optional.
* *RESOLVED*: The WG agreed on this.
1. **Indication whether an Input is mandatory/optional to be provided**(<https://joinup.ec.europa.eu/node/150391/>)
* NL raised that the modelling of Input can be impacted by the CCCEV. The WG will receive more information about this within the coming days.
* MDK explained that the purpose of this issue is to indicate whether the input is mandatory or optional for the public service, i.e. if the user of the public service has to provide the input when making use of the public service. It is different than discussing if the provider of the public service description has to describe or not the inputs related to the public service.
* *PROPOSED*: Change the hasInput property from Public Service class to an optional.
* This issue will be further discussed offline.
 |
| Next steps and next webinar | * The next webinar on controlled vocabularies is not planned yet. The WG will be informed once the date is set. After that, the new interim version of the CPSV-AP will be published for review.
* It is intended to have the closing webinar in September, after the public review.
* MDK informed that PwC will look into the Core Criterion and Core Evidence Vocabulary, map it with the corresponding classes of CPSV-AP and see what the requirements are for aligning CPSV-AP with CCCEV. Information will be shared through the mailing list.
* The WG is asked to perform the following tasks before the next webinar:
* Sign the [ISA contributor license agreement](https://joinup.ec.europa.eu/node/104627);
* Give feedback on the opened issues using the mailing list (cpsv-ap@joinup.ec.europe.eu) or [Joinup](https://joinup.ec.europa.eu/asset/cpsv-ap/issue/all);
* Review the specification and submit new issues through the mailing list or directly on Joinup.
 |
| Q & A | * MDK 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 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. | 2016-05-27 | PwC |
|  | Sign the [ISA contributor license agreement](https://joinup.ec.europa.eu/node/104627). | 2016-05-31 | WG |
|  | Give feedback on the opened issues using the mailing list (cpsv-ap@joinup.ec.europe.eu) or [Joinup](https://joinup.ec.europa.eu/asset/cpsv-ap/issue/all). | 2016-06-15 | WG |
|  | Look into the Core Criterion and Core Evidence Vocabulary, map it with the corresponding classes of CPSV-AP and see what the requirements are for aligning CPSV-AP with CCCEV. | 2016-06-15 | PwC |
|  | Participate and send feedback for those issues that need to be discussed and agreed offline:* [Types of Input](https://joinup.ec.europa.eu/asset/cpsv-ap/issue/types-input);
* [Translation of the labels](https://joinup.ec.europa.eu/asset/cpsv-ap/issue/translation-labels);
* [Controlled Vocabularies for Life Events Type](https://joinup.ec.europa.eu/asset/cpsv-ap/issue/controlled-vocabularies-life-events-type).
 | 2016-06-15 | WG |
|  | Review the specification and submit new issues. | 2016-06-15 | WG |
|  | Set the date for the webinar on controlled vocabularies. | 2016-05-31 | PwC and ISA |
|  | Send further information about the controlled vocabularies webinar to the WG. | 2016-06-15 | PwC |