

# Meeting Minutes RRMV Working Group 20 November 2024

| Organiser of the meeting | Date of the meeting |
|--------------------------|---------------------|
| RRMV Working Group       | 20/11/2024          |

### Attendees

- Davide Audrito, DIGIT
- Cecile Guasch, DIGIT
- Alessio Nardin, DIGIT
- Fernando Nubla Durango, DIGIT
- Joao Diogo Nunes Cartaxo, DIGIT
- Monica Posada, DIGIT
- Georges Serrano, DIGIT
- Tomas Vagner, DIGIT
- Celina Valverde, DIGIT
- Jean-Christophe Willain, DIGIT
- Giuseppe Ascone Modica, OP
- Tamas Schlemmer, OP
- Cristina Ioana Condurat, SG
- Koen Tzeni Myriam, SG
- Serge Le Gal, SG
- Stefan Paduraru, SG
- Cristina Stanciulescu, SG
- Mario Tenreiro, SG
- Vidas Daudaravicius, JRC-ISPRA
- Lorena Hernandez, JRC-ISPRA
- Robin Smith, JRC-ISPRA
- Kuban Michal, CNECT
- Christine Damnet, European Parliament
- Jesus CERRO GINES, European Parliament
- PERISTERAS Vassilios, European Council
- Monica Palmirani, University of Bologna
- Andrea Giovanni Nuzzolese, University of Bologna
- Tomas Slangen, SEMIC PwC

Bert Van Nuffelen, SEMIC PwC  
Zsófia Dudás, SEMIC PwC  
Alexander Potlout, SEMIC PwC

## **Agenda**

1. RRMV
2. SEMIC PwC Analysis
3. Change requests
4. Organisational measures
5. Roadmap and next steps

## **Meeting summary**

The Reporting Requirements Metadata Vocabulary (RRMV) community meeting, held on November 20, 2024, was initiated by Alessio Nardin from DIGIT B.2. He outlined the agenda and introduced the presentations from Monica Palmirani of the University of Bologna, and Zsófia Dudás and Bert Van Nuffelen from the SEMIC PwC team. The working group aimed to discuss the development of the RRMV specification with the broader community, focusing on recommendations and change requests made by the SEMIC team.

Monica Palmirani presented the project's background (i.e. the SORTIS model), focusing on the need for tracking and monitoring reporting requirements within legislation. She highlighted the importance of extracting and modeling specific clauses to maintain control over these requirements and ensure their consistency over time. Monica also discussed the use of ontologies, machine learning, and other techniques to extract and model knowledge from legislation, stressing the importance of using existing ontologies like Eli to ensure consistency and interoperability. She also mentioned the need to calculate forecasting reports and requests, especially in situations like the COVID-19 pandemic.

### **Separate code list from the model to make their lifecycle management independent**

- Bert Van Nuffelen suggested separating code lists from the model for independent lifecycle management.
- DIGIT proposed incorporating a closed vocabulary into an application profile to enable unified queries for retrieving general concepts. This approach would allow for a closed foundational vocabulary while managing code lists independently.
- Monica Palmirani initially disagreed, citing risks to the vocabulary and ontology's contents. However, the final decision was to maintain separate code lists and vocabulary, allowing for a closed foundational vocabulary while managing code lists independently.

## Reduce the number of connectors and associated classes by using attributes

- A discussion arose about the request from the SEMIC team to replace classes with attributes for a more lightweight model.
- Monica argued against this, highlighting the importance of status and the temporal model in line with the Akoma Ntoso standard.
- Andrea Nuzzolese clarified that the data model should remain intact to properly map all concepts and instances, ensuring semantic expressivity.

## Consider “Request” as a separate entity from eli:LegalExpression

- Monica mentioned that a request is not a subclass but rather a portion of the provision, incorporating various sources. A request is not, consequently, a subclass of eli:legislation.
- DIGIT added that a request has a specific meaning within the context of legislative measures, which Monica supported.

## Tackling the implementation layer of Agent

- Both foaf:agent and eli:agent should be incorporated into the data model. The second label should be used to reflect the concrete actors involved/affected in the implementation of requests within the execution layer.
- Monica warned that eli:agent is used for legally-oriented, institutional agents. Adopting also foaf:agent would be a mistake from a mere legal-philosophical perspective. However, foaf:agent will be introduced within the execution layer of the data model.

The meeting concluded with a discussion on the roadmap and next steps. Alessio outlined the need for creating specific online spaces for collaboration, regular virtual meetings, and collecting additional change requests from stakeholders. The goal is to release the first version of the specification by mid-2025.

## Decisions

|  |            |
|--|------------|
| <p><b>1. Change requests:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>i. <b>Accepted:</b> Include a minimum requirement of tags and notes, including a definition, a label, a URI</li><li>ii. <b>Accepted:</b> The model contains URIs, however, they are not persistent. (We requested to the OP Core vocabulary services a pURI: 2qy)</li><li>iii. <b>Accepted:</b> Include semantic versioning of the model (x.y.z)</li><li>iv. <b>Accepted:</b> Separate information on usage of a concept from the definition to a usage note</li></ul> | SEMIC Team |
|--|------------|

- v. **Accepted with a comment\***. Separate code list from the model to make their lifecycle management independent  
\* The code lists used in the model will need to be kept in sync with the model lifecycle and particular attention should be made on the fact that they are to be kept as a closed list of values – in order to preserve the legal validity and relevance of information such as « Status », as well as others.
- vi. **Accepted**: Improved definitions
- vii. **Partially accepted\***: Reduce the number of connectors and associated classes by using attributes  
\* only for the hasTopic -> .topic
- viii. **Partially accepted\***: Consider “Request” as a separate entity from eli:LegalExpression.  
\* Request isPartOf: LegalExpression
- ix. **Accepted**: Introduction of the ExecutionRequest, ExecutionAction and ExecutionActionResult
- x. **Partially accepted\***: Tackling the implementation layer of Agent.  
\*We will investigate possibility to have eli:Agent for the legal layer and foaf:Agent or another class for the implementation layer
- xi. **TO DO**: The relationships isRealizedBy and isEmbodiedBy have wrong directions
- xii. **TO DO**: Increasing the clarity of the cardinality of the source of the relationship in the UML diagram
- xiii. **TO DO**: Increasing the clarity of the replacement of the hasFrequency relationship with two relationships: hasUnit and hasValue
- xiv. **TO DO**: Replacing the subclass dct:isPartOf with an attribute
- xv. **TO DO**: Identifying further use-cases for specific subjects and organizations
- xvi. **TO DO**: Against attributes in place of classes and relationships
- xvii. **TO DO**: Avoiding generic dct concepts
- xviii. **TO DO**: UML diagram inconsistencies

## 2. Timeline:

- i. Implementing the change requests agreed for the 0.1.0 release
- ii. Gather additional change requests for the 0.1.1 release by 23/12/2024
- iii. Process new change requests by 15/02/2025
- iv. 0.1.1 release foreseen around the 15/03/2025
- v. Propose use cases showing RRMV – local and national level until 15/05/2025

- vi. 0.2.0 release extending the RRMV specification to enable interoperability with standards for the digital dimensions of a legislative proposals (LFDS, IOPA) expected around 15/06/2025
- vii. Expected 1.0.0 release later in 2025

## **Actions**

1. Schedule regular virtual meetings with community.
2. Implement agreed change requests.
3. Create online space for collaboration (Alessio created a dedicated Teams channel-previous SORTIS channel on 21/11/2024).
4. Collect additional change requests from stakeholders.
5. Plan future meetings (DIGIT and SEMIC PwC) to discuss processed change requests/updates of the model.