



GeoDCAT Application Profile for Data Portals in Europe

WORKING GROUP

VIRTUAL MEETING 2

2015-04-15

Meeting Minutes



GeoDCAT Application Profile – Working Group Virtual Meeting 2

Venue	Virtual Meeting	Meeting date	2015-04-15
Author	JVDL	Meeting time	14:00 – 16:00
Reviewed by	SG, AP	Issue date	2015-04-20
Status	for review	Version	0.04

DOCUMENTATION

https://joinup.ec.europa.eu/site/dcat_application_profile/GeoDCAT-AP/GeoDCAT-AP_2015-04-15_2nd_WG_Virtual_Meeting/

Meeting page: <https://joinup.ec.europa.eu/node/140206>

ATTENDEES

Name	Abbreviation	Country	Organisation
Anders Friis-Christensen	AF	EU	EC DG Joint Research Centre
Angelos Tzotsos	AT	GR	IMIS Athena Research Centre
Andrea Perego	AP	EU	EC DG Joint Research Centre
Georges Charlot	GC	BE	GIS team of BRIC
Hannes Reuter	HR	EU	GISCO Team at Eurostat
Hans Overbeek	HO	NL	KOOP
Jorgen Van den Langenbergh	JVDL	BE	PwC EU Services
Kostas Patroumpas	KP	GR	IMIS Athena Research Centre
Deirdre Lee	DL	IE	Digital Enterprise Research Institute
Lorena Hernandez Quiroz	LHQ	EU	EC DG Joint Research Centre
Martin Seiler	MS	DE	National Spatial Data Infrastructure
Stijn Goedertier	SG	BE	PwC EU Services
Susanne Wigard	SW	EU	European Commission
Udo Einspanier	UE	DE	Conterra

AGENDA

Item	Subject
1.	Welcome and practical matters approval of the minutes of the previous meeting
2.	Short presentation on the XSLT script converting ISO19139 into GeoDCAT-AP
3.	Agree on the bindings of the GeoDCAT-AP Core. The following issues have been opened on this topic so far: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 141755 - How to encode or represent a geographic bounding box or geometry• 138937 - IM4 - Recommend best practice for spatial coverage• 141756 - How to express the different conformity degrees supported in ISO19115 / INSPIRE• 141757 - How to express the different responsible party roles supported in ISO 19115 / INSPIRE• 138935 - IM2 - How to describe datasets available via services with specific access methods
4.	Discuss the bindings for GeoDCAT-AP Extended <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 138909 - PR14 - Add new property to express lineage
5.	AOB <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 140223 - GeoDCAT-AP - Decide when testing of the proposed specification should take place
6.	Wrap-up, actions, planning the next working group meetings

DISCUSSION AND DECISIONS

1. Welcome and practical matters approval of the minutes of the previous meeting

The participants were welcomed and a round table of introductions followed.

No comments were made by the WG Members on the [minutes of the previous meeting](#). The minutes are considered to be approved.

AP explained that the main objective of the meeting was to discuss and agree on the proposed bindings for the **GeoDCAT-AP Core** and the current issues on them. The GeoDCAT-AP Core includes bindings for metadata elements of the INSPIRE Metadata Regulation and metadata elements in the ISO 19115:2003 core for which DCAT-AP provides an RDF syntax binding – those for which DCAT-AP does not provide an RDF syntax binding are in *GeoDCAT-AP Extended*.

2. Short presentation on the XSLT script converting ISO19139 into GeoDCAT-AP

AP explained that in the context of Action 1.17 (the ARE3NA Reference Platform) an XSLT script was created, that can be used to transform ISO 19139 metadata into DCAT-AP. This XSLT can be found on the following link:

<https://webgate.ec.europa.eu/CITnet/stash/projects/ODCKAN/repos/iso-19139-to-dcat-ap/>

This XSLT is a proof of concept for the implementation of the suite of specifications concerning the initial work on the INSPIRE profile of DCAT-AP (INSPIRE+DCAT-AP), available in the collaboration space of the INSPIRE Maintenance and Implementation (MIG), and used as a basis for the draft GeoDCAT-AP specification: [alignment of INSPIRE metadata with DCAT-AP](#).

As such, this XSLT must be considered as unstable, and can be updated any time based on the revisions to the INSPIRE+DCAT-AP specifications and related work in the framework of INSPIRE and the EU ISA Programme, in particular with respect to the work concerning the definition of a geospatial extension to DCAT-AP (GeoDCAT-AP).

AP explained that one of the global parameters in the XSLT script (the profile parameter), can be set to indicate whether only the syntax bindings for the “Core” or also those for the “Extended” profile should be used for the conversion.

MS asked if the XSLT provided mappings for both the RS_Identifier (resource) as the MD_identifier (metadata).

- AP replied that the XSLT currently only encodes RS_Identifier (as dct:identifier), as the focus is on the identifiers of the resources (datasets and data series) rather than on the metadata.
- AP added that currently the XSLT does not include a default rule to assign URIs to the resource and the corresponding metadata record, since no consistent approach is used in ISO 19115 metadata to address this issue. GeoDCAT-AP might include recommendations on how to do that.

3. Agree on the bindings of the GeoDCAT-AP Core

During the call, all proposed syntax bindings for GeoDCAT-AP Core, as included in the [2nd WG draft specification](#) were discussed.

AP stated however that, as there is a limited timeframe to constitute the GeoDCAT-AP, it may not be possible to disentangle all issues on the tracker. In order to make sure that the most important issues will be solved first, the Working Group members were asked to **send their list of prioritised syntax bindings and issues to** discuss.

According to HO a lot of organisations have defined their own set of roles, as sometimes they do not only publish the data, but they also create and support it.

Next, the Core GeoDCAT-AP syntax bindings were discussed in order to get a formal approval of the Working Group.

1,2) Resource title and resource abstract

Decision: The following was decided by vote:

The proposed syntax bindings for resource title and resource abstract are approved by the Working Group without comments.

3) Resource type

In GeoDCAT-AP Core, it is proposed to transform the information on 'resource type' for dataset and dataset series into a `dcat:Dataset`, services are to be mapped to `dcat:Catalog`.

MS commented that it is not yet clear on how a connection between dataset series – relationship between datasets, like subsets - can be made.

- AP explained that in GeoDCAT-AP Extended, a proposed solution for this issue can be that the properties `dct:related` and `dct:partOf` can be used to represent data series.

Decision: For GeoDCAT-AP Core, the proposed syntax binding for resource types 'dataset' and 'data series' was approved. It was decided that the proposed syntax binding for resource type 'service' to `dcat:Catalog` needs to be further investigated.

During this discussion, HO explained that in the Netherlands there is still some uncertainty on how to use services so in order to get maximum functionality, they decided to postpone the use of services and focus on collecting as many data sets as possible.

According to MS, this issue on data coupling is definitely one of the most important issues at hand.

Decision: The following was decided by vote:

The issue on how to represent a service is definitely an issue that must be addressed with priority. A separate issue has been opened for this: [142437 - GeoDCAT-AP - how to encode services in GeoDCAT-AP Core](#).

4) Resource locator

A discussion on this syntax binding was held, with the following as the main issue: should dcat:landingPage or dcat:distribution be treated as the resource locator?

HO mentioned that it is important to take into account the target audience, as the way you model it and take decisions on important issues, strongly depends on who or what you are modelling it for. When developing it for a **human user**, the model can be more generic, less standardized and contain more information or links to extra documentation. This is not the case when developing models for **machines**.

- AP replied by stating that we need to create something that can be useful for as much people as possible, whilst working towards best practices. The ultimate goal will be to make it readable for both machines and humans, but relying on what metadata is currently available, will be key for the success of the GeoDCAT-AP.

HO commented that the resource locator is currently used in The Netherlands as metadata for services and datasets (ISO 19115) only. His opinion is that there should be three different options:

1. **Download URL:** for direct downloadable data files (both for humans and machines)
2. **Access URL:** for pages with more than one download URL (could still be readably by machines, but will mostly be used by humans)
3. **Landing page** containing more documentation, only readable by humans

MS informed the Working Group that there is no info about this in the INSPIRE MD, but that discussions are ongoing in the NSDI, where the landing page is often used. In the NSDI, the landing page is mostly used as a whistle (WSDL?) document, containing information and providing additional details. He confirms that it would be good to preserve it in the RDF, as it has a very general approach, but that it depends on what type of resource will be landed on.

AP suggested that in GeoDCAT-AP, the resource locator will depend on the function code, which will distinguish download- and information pages. When the function code in ISO is download, the following property will be used:

"dcat:Dataset + dcat:distribution + dcat:Distribution + dcat:accessURL+URL"

When the function code is information, another property will be used.

Decision: The following was decided by vote:

When the CI_OnlineFunctionCode of the resource locator is 'download' the URL of the resource is encoded as a dcat:Distribution with dcat:downloadURL. For documentation dcat:landingPage will be used. Other codes like 'search' and 'view' need to be further investigated, also whether dcat:downloadURL could be used. A separate issue has been opened for this: [142437 - GeoDCAT-AP - how to encode services in GeoDCAT-AP Core](#).

5) Unique resource identifier

MS stated that the unique resource identifier is not a mandatory field in INSPIRE, as we do not need to identify the metadata record, but the actual resource itself. He agrees that the dcat:identifier is correct, but that the mapping source should be investigated.

Decision: The following was decided by vote:
The proposed syntax binding for uniform resource locator in the GeoDCAT-AP Core profile is accepted.

Decision: The following was decided by vote:
Further guidance on URIs does not have to be included in the GeoDCAT-AP specification.

6) Coupled resource

The proposed syntax binding for coupled resource is currently still under construction, as it is dependent on the proposed syntax binding for services (see above). A separate issue has been opened for this: [142437 - GeoDCAT-AP - how to encode services in GeoDCAT-AP Core](#).

7) Resource language

Decision: The following was decided by vote:
The proposed syntax binding for resource language is approved by the Working Group without comments.

8) Keyword Value

Decision: The following was decided by vote:
The proposed syntax binding for keyword value is approved by the Working Group without comments.

9) Geographic bounding box

AP explained that like DCAT-AP, GeoDCAT-AP proposes to encode the geographic bounding box using dct:spatial coverage and the encoding proposed by the Core Location Vocabulary. The following example illustrates this for a geometry:

```
dct:spatial [ a dct:Location ;          locn:geometry "<gml:Envelope
srsName=\"http://www.opengis.net/def/EPSG/0/4326\">
<gml:lowerCorner>-10.58 34.56</gml:lowerCorner>
<gml:upperCorner>34.59 70.09</gml:upperCorner>
</gml:Envelope>"^^ogc:GMLLiteral ] .
```

As the Core Location Vocabulary does not impose any specific encoding for geometry, the Working Group was asked whether GeoDCAT-AP should include any guidelines on a preferred encoding for the geographic bounding box.

- HO: I would like to discuss this with people from Geonovum.
- AT: GML would be more CSW friendly than other encodings.
- AP: CKAN is keen on GeoJSON. GeoSPARQL supports GML and WKT.
- AT: It may be awkward to include GeoJSON inside RDF. Having GML in RDF XML may be more appropriate.
 - AP: in all cases in RDF, the encoded geometries would be literals, CDATA.
- MS: Actually the WKT seems to 'look cleaner' in the turtle serialization.

This issue will be revisited during the next meeting.

Meanwhile, the working group members are invited to comment on the issue "[141755 – How to encode or represent a geographic bounding box or geometry](#)".

Decision: The following was decided by vote:

The proposed syntax binding for geographic bounding box is using dct:spatial and the Core Vocabularies is agreed. Which encoding to use (or recommend) for geometry will be discussed further.

10) Temporal extent

In the current version of the Core GeoDCAT-AP, the temporal extent specifies the temporal coverage of the dataset, in which a period of time can be used to model the start and end date.

HO suggested that another possibility is to model the start and end date as simple properties of the data set.

- AP countered this argument by stating that there are use cases with examples of multiple (interrupted) temporal coverages. This would also necessitate the current encoding, which has been proposed by DCAT and is most relevant for dataset series.

Decision: The following was decided by vote:

The proposed syntax binding for temporal extent has been approved by the Working Group.

11,12,13) Date of publication, date of last revision and date of creation

Decision: The following was decided by vote:

The proposed syntax bindings for date of publication, last revision and creation are approved by the Working Group without comments.

14,15) Conformity and conformity specification

MS agrees with the syntax bindings on conformity, on the sole condition that other cases will be covered by extension. He proposes to have a URI to identify the specification.

Decision: The following was decided by vote:

The proposed (partial) syntax binding for conformity in GeoDCAT-AP Core is accepted. The GeoDCAT-AP Extended profile should propose syntax bindings to encode the 'not evaluated' or 'not conform' case.

16) Conditions for access and use

MS asked AP to clarify if there was a segregation of the syntax bindings between the usage and access rights.

- AP elucidated the syntax bindings by stating that INSPIRE goes further than the ISO19115 and also includes access rights, in addition to usage rights. However, for GeoDCAT-AP Core, the DCAT-AP does not foresee any property for access rights. In the GeoDCAT-AP Extended profile, there is a proposed syntax binding for access rights. Therefore, it is necessary that in the GeoDCAT-AP, it is made clear that only the use limitation and use constraints could be covered, excluding the access restrictions.

Decision: The following was decided by vote:

The proposed syntax binding for the conditions for access and use is accepted, with the necessary clarification that it excludes access rights.

17) Responsible party

Currently the Working Group agrees that the proposed syntax bindings are the most effective, but as the issue is still open, comments can be made on the issue tracker: [141757 – How to express the different responsible party roles supported in ISO 19115](#).

The syntax binding proposed for the GeoDCAT-AP Extended is rather generic and based on the PROV ontology. This could be a relevant solution in other domains as well.

Decision: The following was decided by vote:

The proposed partial syntax bindings for 'responsible party' and the INSPIRE roles for GeoDCAT-AP Core are accepted.

4. Discuss the bindings for GeoDCAT-AP Extended

This item on the agenda was not discussed due to lack of time.

5. AOB

This item on the agenda was not discussed due to lack of time.

6. Wrap-up, actions, planning the next working group meetings

Discussion

- Next meeting:

The next virtual WG meeting will be held on **Wednesday 29th of April**. More information can be found here: <https://joinup.ec.europa.eu/node/140207>.

ACTIONS

Action	Owner	Date
WG members to comment the second draft of the DCAT Application Profile specification .	WG members	2015-04-30
WG member to sign the Contributor Licence Agreement .	WG members	2015-04-30
WG members to contribute new issues on the current WG draft via the mailing list	WG members	2015-04-30
WG members to comment on the issues are already raised in the issue tracker : <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 142437 - How to encode services in GeoDCAT-AP Core.	WG members	2015-04-30

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 141755 - How to encode or represent a geographic bounding box or geometry • 141756 - How to express the different conformity degrees supported in ISO19115 / INSPIRE • 141757 - How to express the different responsible party roles supported in ISO 19115 / INSPIRE • 139986 - GeoDCAT-AP: Clarify why the scope is set to ISO19115:2003 and not to ISO19115:2014 • 138935 - IM2 - How to describe datasets available via services with specific access methods • 138907 - PR12 - Replace dct:spatial by property in line with INSPIRE approach • 138937 - IM4 - Recommend best practice for spatial coverage • 138909 - PR14 - Add new property to express lineage • 140223- GeoDCAT-AP - Decide when testing of the proposed specification should take place 		
Editors to product third draft	Editors	2015-04-25
WG members to send their priority list of syntax bindings to be discussed	WG members	2015-04-27
Editors to consolidate list of prioritised issues and syntax bindings.	Editors	2015-04-28

SUMMARY OF DECISIONS TAKEN

Decision	Owner	Date
The proposed syntax bindings for resource title and resource abstract are approved by the Working Group without comments.	WG members	2015-04-15
For GeoDCAT-AP Core, the proposed syntax binding for resource types 'dataset' and 'data series' was approved. It was decided that the proposed syntax binding for resource type 'service' to dcat:Catalog needs to be further investigated.	WG members	2015-04-15
The issue on how to represent a service is definitely an issue that must be addressed with priority . A separate issue has been opened for this: 142437 - GeoDCAT-AP - how to encode services in GeoDCAT-AP Core .	WG members	2015-04-15
When the CI_OnlineFunctionCode of the resource locator is 'download' the URL of the resource is encoded as a dcat:Distribution with	WG members	2015-04-15

dcat:downloadURL. For documentation dcat:landingPage will be used. Other codes like 'search' and 'view' need to be further investigated, also whether dcat:downloadURL could be used.		
The proposed syntax binding for uniform resource locator in the GeoDCAT-AP Core profile is accepted.	WG members	2015-04-15
Further guidance on URIs does not have to be included in the GeoDCAT-AP specification.	WG members	2015-04-15
The proposed syntax binding for resource language is approved by the Working Group without comments.	WG members	2015-04-15
The proposed syntax binding for keyword value is approved by the Working Group without comments.	WG members	2015-04-15
The proposed syntax binding for geographic bounding box is using dct:spatial and the Core Vocabularies is agreed. Which encoding to use (or recommend) for geometry will be discussed further.	WG members	2015-04-15
The proposed syntax binding for temporal extent has been approved by the Working Group.	WG members	2015-04-15
The proposed syntax bindings for date of publication, last revision and creation are approved by the Working Group without comments.	WG members	2015-04-15
The proposed (partial) syntax binding for conformity in GeoDCAT-AP Core is accepted. The GeoDCAT-AP Extended profile should propose syntax bindings to encode the 'not evaluated' or 'not conform' case.	WG members	2015-04-15
The proposed syntax binding for the conditions for access and use is accepted, with the necessary clarification that it excludes access rights.	WG members	2015-04-15
The proposed partial syntax bindings for responsible party and the INSPIRE roles for GeoDCAT-AP Core are accepted.	WG members	2015-04-15

CHAT TRANSCRIPT FROM GEODCAT-AP

Stijn Goedertier - PwC: Welcome everyone.

Stijn Goedertier - PwC: The meeting page contains all relevant information and links for today's call:
<https://joinup.ec.europa.eu/node/140206>

Angelos Tzotsos: hello everyone

Stijn Goedertier - PwC: http://joinup.ec.europa.eu/site/dcat_application_profile/GeoDCAT-AP/GeoDCAT-AP_2015-03-31_1st_WG_Virtual_Meeting/GeoDCAT-AP_2015-03-31_1st_WG_Virtual_Meeting-minutes_v0.02.pdf

Hans Overbeek (NL): +1 on XSLT!

Martin Seiler, DE: Armin Retterath is from DE, not IT

Martin Seiler, DE: could you scroll down?

Andrea Perego (JRC): <https://webgate.ec.europa.eu/CITnet/stash/projects/ODCKAN/repos/iso-19139-to-dcat-ap/browse>

Angelos Tzotsos: Angelos Tzotsos GR: data.gov and geodata.gov.gr

Hans Overbeek (NL): Is there documentation about the paramter and so?

Stijn Goedertier - PwC: Comments included in <https://webgate.ec.europa.eu/CITnet/stash/projects/ODCKAN/repos/iso-19139-to-dcat-ap/browse/iso-19139-to-dcat-ap.xsl>

Stijn Goedertier - PwC: An example with data from the Flemish Geo Portal (CSW): http://joinup.ec.europa.eu/site/dcat_application_profile/GeoDCAT-AP/GeoDCAT-AP_2015-04-15_2nd_WG_Virtual_Meeting/XSLT-iso-19139-to-dcat-ap/

Stijn Goedertier - PwC: (for the minutes) Martin Seiler: does the XSLT provide mappings for both the RS_Identifier (resource) and MD_Identifier (metadata)?

Martin Seiler, DE: +1, good idea

Stijn Goedertier - PwC: (for the minutes) Martin Seiler: how to you represent a spatial data service? (catalog/discovery service, download service, transofrmation service, etc). Does the mapping to dcat:Catalog work in all cases?

Stijn Goedertier - PwC: (for the minutes) Martin Seiler: we only incluce services as resource links... we don't include them in the catalog.

Martin Seiler, DE:@Andrea: thx for elaborating on this!

Stijn Goedertier - PwC: (for the minutes) Hans Overbeek: our first take on this would be to treat a service just as a dataset (dcat:Dataset), this of course is not always so useful, because you cannot "download" a service.

Martin Seiler, DE: yes, View Services are interesting as well, though most ppl would want to download the data in the end.

Martin Seiler, DE: +1

Angelos Tzotsos: +1

Udo Einspanier: +1

Stijn Goedertier - PwC:(for the minutes) Andrea Perego: for the DCAT-AP revision there was a discussion on this too. Services can also be seen as dcat:Distributions... one way to access datasets.

Stijn Goedertier - PwC:(for the minutes) Andrea Perego: let's discuss this via the issue tracker

hannes reuter:from the statistical side the SDMX should be looked at..

Stijn Goedertier - PwC:In the scientific domain, the CERIF4Datasets metadata specifcation is relevant. Also in the metereological domain, specific medata standards exist.

Stijn Goedertier - PwC:On representing services in DCAT-AP, the following issue was raised: <https://joinup.ec.europa.eu/node/138935>

Stijn Goedertier - PwC:I propose to add your comments here.

Stijn Goedertier - PwC:Hans Overbeek started discussing the following issue on encoding responsible party <https://joinup.ec.europa.eu/node/141757>

Stijn Goedertier - PwC:(for the minutes): Hans Overbeek: ISO19115 has this very flexibly way of creating custom roles. The INSPIRE Metadata Regulation proposes quite some roles. This approach is sometimes too complicated.

Stijn Goedertier - PwC:(for the minutes) Hans overbeek: it may be better to be pragmatic and restrict the number of roles to a few frequently occurring ones.

Stijn Goedertier - PwC:(for the minutes) Marting Seiler: the metadata on datasets and services is really an important (yet more complex) issue. We should really try to solve this one.

Martin Seiler, DE: +1

Udo Einspanier: +1

Angelos Tzotsos: +1

hannes reuter: +1

Hans Overbeek (NL): +1

Georges CHARLOT: +1

Stijn Goedertier - PwC:VOTE: can we agree that "how to model a service is what me must address"?

Stijn Goedertier - PwC:DECISION: accepted.

Angelos Tzotsos: +1

Kostas Patroumpas (Athena RC): +1

Martin Seiler, DE: +1

Hans Overbeek (NL): +1

Stijn Goedertier - PwC:(Martin Seiler) do you agree that guidelines on how to encode URIs for resources and metadata should be included in the GeoDCAT-AP?

Martin Seiler, DE: @stijn: +1

Georges CHARLOT: +1

Udo Einspanier: +1

Stijn Goedertier - PwC:(for the minutes) Andrea Perego: this is more an implementation issue. Guidance on URIs would not be included in the GeoDCAT-AP sepcs.

Stijn Goedertier - PwC:(for the minutes): the WG agrees

hannes reuter: +1

Stijn Goedertier - PwC:The specifications shown can be downloaded via this link: http://joinup.ec.europa.eu/site/dcat_application_profile/GeoDCAT-AP/GeoDCAT-AP_2015-04-15_2nd_WG_Virtual_Meeting/

Angelos Tzotsos: +1 on resource title/abstract

Udo Einspanier: +1

Martin Seiler, DE: +1

Stijn Goedertier - PwC: +1 (but service needs further disucssion)

Hans Overbeek (NL): +!

Georges CHARLOT:+1
Hans Overbeek (NL):+1
Udo Einspanier:+1
Stijn Goedertier - PwC:DECISION: proposed syntax bindings for resource abstract and resource title are approved.
Andrea Perego (JRC):Now we are discussing about resource types
Stijn Goedertier - PwC:DECISION: syntax binding for service needs to be further discussed.
Stijn Goedertier - PwC:(for the minutes) Andrea Perego: Discussion on dataset series. The properties: related and partOf can be used to represent dataset series.
Stijn Goedertier - PwC:(for the minutes) Andrea Perego: in GeoDCAT-AP Extended we propose to include dct:type to indicate whether a resource is a dataset, data series, or service.
Stijn Goedertier - PwC:Resource locator.
Stijn Goedertier - PwC:(for the minutes) Andrea Perego: should we use dcat:landingPage or treat resource locator as a dcat:Distribution?
Martin Seiler, DE: is what?
Stijn Goedertier - PwC:(for the minutes) Martin Seiler: I would recommend using dcat:landingPage, the resource locator could be pretty much anything in INSPIRE. So it would be better to use dcat:landingPage.
Stijn Goedertier - PwC:Example: `<CI_OnlineFunctionCode codeListValue="information" codeList="http://standards.iso.org/ittf/PubliclyAvailableStandards/ISO_19139_Schemas/resources/Codelist/ML_gmxCodetables.xml#CI_OnlineFunctionCode" xmlns="http://www.isotc211.org/2005/gmd"/>`
Stijn Goedertier - PwC:(for the minutes) Andrea Perego: depending on the function code, we could distinguish those that are for 'download' or just those that are for further 'information'
Hans Overbeek (NL):resource locator is MD of services, that's why we didn't use it up to now
Hans Overbeek (NL):We used MD for datasets (19115) only
Martin Seiler, DE: which DCAT property are you suggesting instead?
Andrea Perego (JRC):dcat:Dataset + dcat:distribution + dcat:Distribution + dcat:accessURL + URL
Andrea Perego (JRC):This when functionsCode in ISO is "download"
Hans Overbeek (NL):+1
Andrea Perego (JRC):When function code is "information", we use a different property.
Udo Einspanier:+1
Martin Seiler, DE: +1
Kostas Patrourmpas (Athena RC):+1
Angelos Tzotsos:+1
Hans Overbeek (NL): My suggestion:* Download-url for direct downloadable dataFILES* Access-url for page with more than one download-url of for services* Landing page for documentation
Martin Seiler, DE: +1 @ Andrea. No info for this in the INSPIRE MD...
Martin Seiler, DE: No, but discussions going on in the NSDI here.
Hans Overbeek (NL): Yep
Martin Seiler, DE: yep.
Udo Einspanier:ok
Georges CHARLOT:ok
Stijn Goedertier - PwC:DECISION: when the CI_OnlineFunctionCode of the resource locator is 'Download' the URL of the resource is encoded as a dcat:Distribution with dcat:downloadURL. For documentation dcat:landingPage will be used. (other codes like 'search' and 'view' need to be further investigated, also whether dcat:downloadURL could be used).
Hans Overbeek (NL):OK
Udo Einspanier:+1
Martin Seiler, DE: +1
Angelos Tzotsos:+1
Stijn Goedertier - PwC:Unique resource identifier.
Stijn Goedertier - PwC:(accepted)
Stijn Goedertier - PwC:Resource language
Stijn Goedertier - PwC:oh... sorry
Stijn Goedertier - PwC:Proposed binding for resource locator was accepted.
Stijn Goedertier - PwC:Unique resource identifier
Stijn Goedertier - PwC:(for minutes) Martin Seiler: unique resource identifier is not a mandatory field in INSPIRE. We don't need to identify the metadata record, but the actual resource.
Stijn Goedertier - PwC:(for the minutes) Andrea Perego: agrees.
Martin Seiler, DE: +1
Udo Einspanier:+1
Hans Overbeek (NL):+1
Angelos Tzotsos:+1
Georges CHARLOT:+1
Stijn Goedertier - PwC:DECISION: proposed syntax binding for resource identifier accepted.
Stijn Goedertier - PwC:discussion on keyword value.
Hans Overbeek (NL):+1
Udo Einspanier:+1
Angelos Tzotsos:+1
Martin Seiler, DE: +1
Stijn Goedertier - PwC:DECISION: proposed syntax bindings for keyword value accepted.
Stijn Goedertier - PwC:Discussion: temporal extent
Udo Einspanier:+1

Stijn Goedertier - PwC: (for the minutes) Hans Overbeek: period of time could be modelled just as a simple start date and end date.

Stijn Goedertier - PwC: (for the minutes) Andrea Perego: there are counter example of multiple (interrupted) temporal coverages.. This would necessitate the current encoding. Also proposed by DCAT. This is most relevant for dataset series.

Hans Overbeek (NL):+1

Angelos Tzotsos:yes, no issues for me

Stijn Goedertier - PwC: DECISION: proposed syntax bindings for temporal extent accepted.

Stijn Goedertier - PwC: discussion: geographic bounding box

Stijn Goedertier - PwC: please comment on the issue: 141755 - How to encode or represent a geographic bounding box or geometry

Stijn Goedertier - PwC: <https://joinup.ec.europa.eu/node/141755>

Stijn Goedertier - PwC: Example shared by Andrea Perego:

Stijn Goedertier - PwC: [] dct:spatial [a dct:Location ; locn:geometry "<gml:Envelope srsName=\"http://www.opengis.net/def/EPSSG/0/4326\"> <gml:lowerCorner>-10.58 34.56</gml:lowerCorner> <gml:upperCorner>34.59 70.09</gml:upperCorner></gml:Envelope>\"^ogc:GMLLiteral] .

Stijn Goedertier - PwC:(for the minutes) the Core Location Vocabulary does not impose any specific encoding for geometry. What would you prefer?

Stijn Goedertier - PwC:(for the minutes) Hans Overbeek: I would like to discuss htis with people from Geonovum.

Angelos Tzotsos: GML would be more CSW friendly

Stijn Goedertier - PwC: (for the minutes) Andrea perego: please provide your feedback online on the issue tracker: <https://joinup.ec.europa.eu/node/141755> . We can agree on this later.

Angelos Tzotsos:and would fit better in XML

Stijn Goedertier - PwC: (for the minutes) Andrea Pereog: CKAN is keen on GeoJSON. GeoSPARQL is more keen on WKT.

Stijn Goedertier - PwC: (for the minutes) Angelos: it may be awkward to include GeoJSON inside RDF... here having GML in RDF XML may be more appropriate.

Stijn Goedertier - PwC: (for the minutes) Andrea Perego: the geometry will be a literal (CDAT)...

Martin Seiler, DE: actually the WKT seems to 'look cleaner' in the turtle serialization...

Angelos Tzotsos:+1

Udo Einspanier:+1

Martin Seiler, DE: +1

Georges CHARLOT:+1

Hans Overbeek (NL):+1

Stijn Goedertier - PwC: DECISION: the encoding using dct:Location for the bounding box is agreed. Which encoding to use (or recommend) for geomotry will be dicussed further .

Stijn Goedertier - PwC: date of publication

Udo Einspanier:+1 to all

Martin Seiler, DE: +1

Angelos Tzotsos:+1

Georges CHARLOT:+1

Hans Overbeek (NL):+1

Stijn Goedertier - PwC: DECISION: the proposed syntax bindings for the properties on temporal extent (publication date, etc) are accepted.

Stijn Goedertier - PwC: Discussion: conformity

Martin Seiler, DE: +1 if the other cases covered by extension.

Udo Einspanier:+1

Angelos Tzotsos:+1

Stijn Goedertier - PwC: (for the minutes) Andrea Perego: only a partial syntax binding is possible for GeoDCAT-AP core, as DCAT-AP does not provide possibility to encode the 'not evaluated' or 'not conform' case.

Stijn Goedertier - PwC: DECISION: the proposed partial binding for conformity and conformity specification has been accepted.

Hans Overbeek (NL):+1 no strong opinion on this at this moment

Martin Seiler, DE: +1

Stijn Goedertier - PwC: (for the minutes): Martin Seiler: on the conformity specification: it may be good to have a URI to identify the specification

Stijn Goedertier - PwC: discussion: conditions for access and use

Stijn Goedertier - PwC: (Andrea Perego) In your experience: did you use other bindings, e.g. dct:license?

Stijn Goedertier - PwC: (Martin Seiler): Is this for use only, or also for access rights?

Stijn Goedertier - PwC: (Anrea Perego) You are right, INSPIRE goes further then ISO19115 and also is about access rights, in addition to usage rights.

Stijn Goedertier - PwC: (Andrea Perego) However, for GeoDCAT-AP Core, DCAT-AP does not foresee any property for access rights...

Stijn Goedertier - PwC: (Andrea Perego) In the GeoDCAT-AP Extended profile, there is a proposed syntax binding for access rights.

Stijn Goedertier - PwC: (Marting Seiler): for GeoDCAT-AP Core, it should be make clear that Only the use limitation and use constraints could be covered. Access restrictions are not covered.

Stijn Goedertier - PwC: TODO

Martin Seiler, DE: +1

Hans Overbeek (NL):+1

Udo Einspanier:+1
Stijn Goedertier - PwC: DECISION: the proposed syntax binding for conditions of access and use is accepted (with the necessary clarification that it excludes access rights).
Stijn Goedertier - PwC: discussion: responsible party
Angelos Tzotsos:yes, I think this is the best solution
Stijn Goedertier - PwC: See also the issue on Joinup: 141757 - How to express the different responsible party roles supported in ISO 19115 / INSPIRE <https://joinup.ec.europa.eu/node/141757>
Udo Einspanier:+1
Martin Seiler, DE: +1
Hans Overbeek (NL):+1
Lorena:+1
Stijn Goedertier - PwC: (Andrea Perego): also the statistical domain has its own roles. The syntax binding proposed for the GeoDCAT-AP extended is rather generic and based on the PROV ontology. This could be a relevant solution in also other domains.
Stijn Goedertier - PwC: DECISION: the proposed partial syntax bindings for 'responsible party' and the INSPIRE roles for GeoDCAT-AP Core are accepted.
Martin Seiler, DE: when is the next call?
Stijn Goedertier - PwC: For the next call, we still need to close the Doodle poll:
<http://doodle.com/9c6kiksgpa3h8nqx>
Udo Einspanier:ok for me
Angelos Tzotsos:ok for me too
Georges CHARLOT:no, sorry i will be out of office on the 29
Martin Seiler, DE: 29th is good for me.
Hans Overbeek (NL):For me 29th is OK
Hans Overbeek (NL):Thank you Andrea, you did a great job!
Andrea Perego (JRC):Thanks a lot, Hans!
Martin Seiler, DE: Yes, I can't on the 30 :(
Georges CHARLOT:only in the morning the 30
Georges CHARLOT:sorry...
Martin Seiler, DE: Thanks Andrea and all!
Angelos Tzotsos:thanks all
Martin Seiler, DE: cu, bye.
Georges CHARLOT:thanks all !
Stijn Goedertier - PwC: Thank you everybody
Hans Overbeek (NL):Byebye
Lorena:Bye
Kostas Patrourmpas (Athena RC):Thanks, good bye!