

D05.01 20221125 Meeting Minutes: Webinar on the review of DCAT-AP

Project:	SEMIC: DCAT-AP	Meeting Date/Time:	25/11/2022 14:00 - 16:00
Meeting Coordinator:	Bert Van Nuffelen, Makx Dekkers	Issue Date:	25/11/2022

Meeting Agenda

1. Welcome
2. Context of DCAT-AP
3. Discussion on open issues
4. Short break
5. Alignment with W3C DCAT 3.0
6. Wrap up and next steps

Participants

Name	Initials	Organisation
Agnieszka Jasiczek	AJ	Publications Office, EU
Agnieszka Zajac	AZ	Publications Office, EU
Anastasia Sofou	AS	Trasys International, Greece
Anastasija Nikiforova	AN	University of Tartu, Latvia
Andrea Perego	AP	Luxembourg
Anja Loddenkemper	AL	GDI-NI, Germany
Anssi Ahlberg	AA	Digi- ja väestötietovirasto, Finland
Bart Hanssens	BH	DG Digital Transformation, Belgium
Casper Gras	CG	KOOP, the Netherlands

Christian Wittig	CW	GovData, Germany
Christoph Lange	CL	Germany
Daniele Rizzi	DR	EC, EU
Fabian Kirstein	FK	Fraunhofer FOKUS, Germany
Fabian Santi	FS	Federal Statistical Office, Switzerland
Fredrik Nordlander	FN	Sweden
Geraldine Nolf	GN	Digitaal Vlaanderen, Belgium
Giampaolo Sellitto	GS	ANAC / TOOP Semantics WG, Italy
Hagar Lowenthal	HL	Publications Office, EU
Igor Štefelin	IS	Sistat Database expert at SURS, Slovenia
Jakub Klímek	JK	Ministry of the Interior, Czech Republic
Joeri van der Velde	JvdV	University Medical Center Groningen, Netherlands
JRC	JRC	Joint Research Center
Kees Trautwein	KT	Ministerie van Binnenlandse Zaken en Koninkrijksrelaties, The Netherlands
Kuldar Aasaga	KA	Ministry of Economic Affairs and Communications, Estonia
Lina Molinas Comet	LMC	Fraunhofer FIT, Germany
Ludger Rinsche	LR]init[, Germany
Maik Roth	MR	Office fédéral de la statistique, Switzerland
Matej Alič	MA	Statistical Office, Slovenia
Matthias Palmér	MP	MetaSolutions, Sweden
Michèle Spichtig	MS	Bundesamt für Statistik, Switzerland
Nataliia Kovalchuk	NK	LIIP, Switzerland
Øystein Åsnes	OA	Digitalisation Agency (Digdir), Norwegian
Peter Lubrich	CL	BASt, Germany
Petros Likidis	PL	SCB, Sweden

Kristine Ulander	KU	DIGG, Sweden
Stefano Ambrogio	SA	Italy
Taavi Ploompuu	TP	Information System Authority, Estonia
Thomas Tursics	TT	FITKO, Germany
Thomas Weber	TW	Germany
Ulrika Domellöf Mattson	UDM	DIGG, Sweden
Miguel Alvarez	MA	EC-DG Connect, EU
Peter Burian	PB	EC-DIGIT, EU
Pavlina Fragkou	PF	EC-DIGIT, EU
Bert Van Nuffelen	BVN	SEMIC team, Belgium
Makx Dekkers	MD	SEMIC team, Belgium
William Verbeeck	WV	PwC Belgium
Jitse De Cock	JDC	PwC Belgium
Emidio Stani	ES	PwC Belgium

Points discussed and decisions taken

Topic discussed	Outcome
Discussion on open issues	
Issue 217 Data service > Format	Approved <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Approved definition option 2 ● Review conceptual model from PL. ● Take t synchronisation risk into account when duplication of information occurs.
Issue 177 Range of locn:geometry is locn:Geometry	Approved Apply proposition
Issue 175 Cardinality constraints spatial representations	Tentatively approved Discuss further on GitHub to formalise the

	details.
Issue 48 SHACL reformulation	Tentatively approved Discuss further on GitHub to formalise the details.
Issue 218 SHACL: codelist validation	Approved Apply proposition
Issue 209 Legal information	Tentatively approved Discuss further on GitHub to formalise the details.
Issue 228 Replace controlled vocabulary for Distribution status	Approved Apply proposition
Issue 207 dcat:themeTaxonomy	Approved <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Apply proposition • Clarify The usage of mandatory code lists
Issue 214 Bytesize	Approved Apply proposition
Issue 223, 187, 141 Reminder: identifiers guideline	To be reviewed review
Issue 116 Reminder: Cardinalities mismatch between DCAT and OWL representation in DCAT	Approved Apply proposition
Issues 163 Reminder: How to create DCAT profiles	To be resolved Wait on the resolution of issue in #1387 in W3C DCAT.
Alignment with W3C DCAT 3.0	
Issues 240 Reminder: How to create DCAT profiles	Approved Organise separate meeting to discuss dataset series and the relation to dataset services.
Issues 241 Versioning	Approved Apply proposition
Issues 242 Status (adms:status)	Tentatively approved Discuss further on GitHub to formalise the details.
Issues 243	Approved

Resource (dcat:resource) : impact assessment	Discuss how to distinguish datasets with W3C.
Issues 244 Checksum	Approved Apply proposition
Issues 239 Towards DCAT 3.0 alignment	Approved Apply proposition

Full meeting minutes

Topic	Discussion
Introduction	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Welcome by PF • Overview of the agenda
Objectives of DCAT-AP	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MD introducing himself and BVN • Reminder of what DCAT-AP is
New release DCAT-AP (slide 10)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MD explained what is included in the new release
ADMS (slide 11)	MD announced that the SEMIC team is looking into ADMS to “refresh” it. He invited the participants to visit the relevant GitHub page and give suggestions and feedback.
DCAT-AP	
Data service > Format (issue #217, slide 14-20)	<p>Issue</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use dcat:Distributions in dcat:Datasets, added to the dcat:DataService via dcat:servesDataset. • Suitable for DCAT-AP context? <p>Proposition</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3 use case options <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Filter/search for the data of datasets in a desired representation ○ Filter/search for data services that provide a dataset in a desired representation

- (automatically) detail the (representation) capabilities of a service
- 3 format definition proposals
 - The structure that is returned by querying the endpointURL
 - The structure that can be returned by querying the endpointURL
 - The structure that by default is returned by querying the endpointURL

Outcome: approved

- Approved format definition option 2
- Review conceptual model from PL
- Take into account synchronisation risk when duplication of information occurs

Discussion

KT mentioned they struggle to represent LD endpoints because of all the different formats that need to be included.

MP said the Swedish data portal is interested in use case 1 and potentially use case 2.

PL is from the transportation community. They use all 3 use cases. They use a custom extension to DCAT-AP. For those use cases they have been working on a way to capture and distinguish all of them. He proposed to collaborate closely on this development. PL will share their early conceptual model. They use the formats published by the Publications Office.

GN stated that Flanders uses a less detailed approach. They only describe formats and datasets, they leave the information on how a service is delivered in the capability of the service itself.

MD summarised the sentiment of the chat: use case 1 certainly, use case 2 potentially. And PL needs all 3.

BVN steered the conversation to the 3 possible format definitions.

ØÅ mentioned Norway has added dct:format (o..n) for dcat:dataservice in DCAT-AP-NO, which matches the most with definition 2.

JK asked whether all 3 definitions could be adopted? They all seemed to make sense to him.

MD clarified that they are mutually exclusive.

MP said that definition 2 would make sense, when considering WMS services.

MD highlighted definition 2 is the most general one.

MP clarified that in practice multiple format options occur therefore definition 2 would be best.

JK clarified his previous statement. He was considering adding a sub property of format to clarify which definition is used.

GN expressed the concern that information on the service would be duplicated in that case special care has to be taken to keep both in sync.

KT remarked that formats could differ for users accessing the information in different ways.

BVN stated that the intention would always be to keep the format field as an optional one.

MD summarised the concerns on definition 3: this option would not match with an open negotiation of the format.

KT remarked that he agreed with MD summarisation. 'Default' is not very useful especially if there can be more than one default. Letting users know all the available formats would be more useful allowing them to choose the one that fits the best with their use case.

MD identified the general preference to be definition 2, taking into account the risk identified by GN.

KT said they would like to include compressed files which may contain different formats inside them, which isn't possible in the current system.

	<p>BVN explained that a compression can have a ShapeFile and one could contact the PO to add this to the format options.</p> <p>TT proposes a bot could be used to automatically update descriptions if there is duplication, reducing the risk of sync issues.</p> <p>MD replied that some changes might be too complex for a bot.</p>
<p>Range of locn:geometry is locn:Geometry (issue #177, slide 21)</p>	<p>Issue</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In DCAT 2.0: rdfs:Literal • DCAT 3.0: aligned with Core Location 2.0 (locn) <p>Proposition</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To align with DCAT 3.0. <p>Outcome: approved</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Approved <p>Discussion</p> <p>LR thought that technically it is backward incompatible, but from the semantics of the location, it's not a different use.</p> <p>BVN agreed.</p> <p>JK added that in Czechia, they view packaging multiple files of different schemas and formats into one package as an anti-pattern. You cannot describe the individual files inside the package properly, unless it is a well-known package such as ShapeFile, GTFS, etc. with a clearly defined structure of the package.</p> <p>LR stated that the question is what we as AP would like (recommend) to get as locn:Geometry. Ideally it should be something the EDP can handle for visualisation.</p>
<p>Cardinality constraints spatial representations (issue #175, slide 22-23)</p>	<p>Issue</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A dataset can have multiple geographical coverages, each of them can be represented in various ways <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ By preference: using a bounding box or centroid ○ Alternatively using a broad range of geometry descriptions

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The cardinality constraint 0..1 on these spatial representations expresses that at most 1 representation for a single geographical coverage could be given. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ it is possible to encode the bounding box in different serialisations WKT, GML, ... using distinct CRS. This is similar to multi-language texts. <p>Proposition</p> <p>3 options</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Option A <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Add usage note explaining that <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Different Serialisations is only allowed if of the same polygon(geometry ■ Serialisations should be CRS aware ○ Lift the cardinality from 0..1 → 0..n ● Option B <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Limit the serialisations to a single representation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Including all characteristics (including the used CRS) ● Option C <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Impose a set of accepted serialisations with all characteristics (including the used CRS) but the publisher is free to choose. <p>Outcome: tentatively approved</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Option C is approved ● Discuss further on GitHub to formalise the details. <p>Discussion</p> <p>LR stated that he doesn't have a very strong argument for either variants and that this is something to discuss with our data providers. But maybe C is the most useful addition.</p> <p>BH, LMC and JRC voted Option C.</p> <p>MP voted B or C.</p> <p>MD proposed to move further discussion to GitHub.</p>
<p>SHACL reformulation (issue #48, slide 24)</p>	<p>Issue</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Current SHACL shapes combine multiple constraints into one expression, condensed representation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ No reference to individual constraint possible ○ Translations are not easy to make

	<p>Proposition</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Split in 3 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ :DataService_Shape ○ :DataService_Property_dct_title_nodekind ○ :DataService_Property_dct_title_minCount <p>Outcome: tentatively approved</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Approved ● Discuss further on GitHub to formalise the details. <p>Discussion</p> <p>MP asked if this is really correct? Can an AND-construct be used?</p> <p>BVN replied that normally this should be workable.</p> <p>LR also added that they have to be dereferenceable to add translations or deactivate them. For the next version it would be nice to use the official shapes and official URIs to add our translations.</p> <p>BVN replied that that's clear and we understand the requirement and the need for persistence.</p> <p>MD added that more discussion will take place on GitHub.</p>
<p>SHACL: codelist validation (issue #218, slide 26)</p>	<p>Issue</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Some codelists are not published as SKOS ● Some codelists are too large to be downloaded for validation <p>Proposition</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● To do a textual validation based on domain namespace rather than on membership of a Controlled Vocabulary. <p>Outcome: approved</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Approved <p>Discussion</p> <p>No discussion.</p>

<p>Legal information (issue #209, slide 27)</p>	<p>Issue</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Many data catalogue providers do not provide qualitative legal information in data.europa.eu. <p>Proposition</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To add a stronger statement about the FAIR principles, improve section 5.4 on licences with a recommendation to use the NAL http://publications.europa.eu/resource/dataset/licence if the Member State does not provide guidance from itself. <p>Outcome: tentatively approved</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Approved • Discuss further on GitHub to formalise the details. <p>Discussion</p> <p>MD told the rest that this discussion will be held on GitHub.</p>
<p>Replace controlled vocabulary for Distribution status (issue #228, slide 28)</p>	<p>Issue</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Replace controlled vocabulary <p>Proposition</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Replace controlled vocabulary adms:status with NAL distribution-status for the Class Distribution <p>Outcome: approved</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Approved <p>Discussion</p> <p>No discussion.</p>
<p>dcat:themeTaxonomy (issue #207, slide 29)</p>	<p>Issue</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Section 5.2 contains a table with the mandatory codelists to use for some properties. • Because dcat:theme imposes the use of the NAL data-theme, at least the value for this property is the NAL data-theme. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ This is a value constraint and not a codelist constraint <p>Proposition</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Remove the value constraint on dcat:themeTaxonomy in the table of section 5.2 • Adapt the usage note for the property to:

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ This property refers to a knowledge organisation system used to classify the Catalogue's Datasets. It must have at least the value NAL:data-theme as this is the mandatory controlled vocabulary for dcat:theme. <p>Outcome: approved</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Approved ● Clarify the usage of mandatory code lists <p>Discussion</p> <p>LR said he agrees but wondered how to handle mandatory codelists overall?</p> <p>MD answered for example for “theme” at least NAL data-theme needs to be used but we need to be more explicit in all cases where we make the use of codelists mandatory.</p> <p>LR highlighted that there is already an issue on GitHub about it.</p> <p>BVN agreed that this is a good point and that we will try to make it more clear.</p>
<p>Bytesize (issue #214, slide 30)</p>	<p>Issue</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Issue #214 = Question on the usage of numeric xsd:types in DCAT ● DCAT 3.0 changed range from <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ xsd:decimal to xsd:nonNegativeInteger <p>Proposition</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● To align with DCAT 3.0 <p>Outcome: approved</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Approved <p>Discussion</p> <p>No discussion.</p>
<p>Reminder: identifiers guideline (issue #223, #187, #141, slide 24)</p>	<p>Issue</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● In Q2 2022, webinars on the usage of identifiers took place. <p>Proposition</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Proposal is ready for review

	<p>Outcome: to be reviewed</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review <p>Discussion No discussion.</p>
<p>Reminder: Cardinalities mismatch between DCAT and OWL representation in DCAT (issue #116, slide 32)</p>	<p>Issue</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Refiled as issue in W3C DCAT • Proposal accepted by W3C and closed <p>Proposition</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To close this issue <p>Outcome: approved</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Approved <p>Discussion No discussion.</p>
<p>Reminder: How to create DCAT profiles (issue #163, slide 33)</p>	<p>Issue</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Importing the dcat.ttl definition, with an explicit subclass relation of dcat:Catalog to dcat:Dataset, creates unintended SHACL validation errors. <p>Proposition</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Posted as issue in #1387 in W3C DCAT. • Not resolved. <p>Outcome: To be resolved</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wait on the resolution of issue in #1387 in W3C DCAT. <p>Discussion No discussion.</p>
<p>DCAT 3.0 alignment</p>	
<p>Introducing DCAT 3.0 dataset series (slide 38, 39)</p>	<p>Discussion No discussion.</p>

<p>Reminder: How to create DCAT profiles (issue #240, slide 40,41)</p>	<p>Discussion Proposal to organise a separate meeting to discuss dataset series and the relation to dataset services (general consensus in the chat).</p>
<p>Versioning (issue #241, slide 42)</p>	<p>Discussion No discussion.</p>
<p>Status (adms:status) (issue #242, slide 43)</p>	<p>Discussion GN said dataset series is a collection of datasets sharing the same product specification. MD told GN there is an issue on GitHub about this where we are happy to further discuss any comments.</p>
<p>Resource (dcat:resource) (slide 44)</p>	<p>Discussion No discussion.</p>
<p>Resource (dcat:resource) : impact assessment (issue #243, slide 45)</p>	<p>Discussion LR mentioned that he thinks that "catalogue should not be empty" is not a useful rule. MP said that a dataset series is a subclass of dataset, so he thinks it is not necessary as you will have the typing to distinguish them. MD said we can discuss it further with W3C.</p>
<p>Checksum (issue #244, slide 46)</p>	<p>Discussion No discussion.</p>
<p>Towards DCAT 3.0 alignment (issue #239, slide 47)</p>	<p>Discussion No discussion.</p>
<p>General comments</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There should be a discussion on dataset series to see impact on portals. • There was not sufficient discussion about dataset series.

Wrap-up and next steps	<p>Discussion</p> <p>KA asked if DIGIT has any ideas on creating extended guidelines or best-practice repositories (not directly on DCAT-AP)? So that the implementers are prevented from making mistakes.</p> <p>MD said that this was discussed in the past too and that there is a collection of guidelines on JoinUp as well, but in some cases it is very hard to think from the perspective of a user in a particular country. We can set up something and see if there is any interest from the member states to contribute to this.</p>
-------------------------------	--

Informal discussion on HVD

Participants

Name	Initials	Organisation
Daniele Rizzi	DR	EC, EU
Pavlina Fragkou	PF	EC-DIGIT, EU
Bert Van Nuffelen	BVN	SEMIC team, Belgium
Makx Dekkers	MD	SEMIC team, Belgium
Jitse De Cock	JDC	PwC Belgium
Emidio Stani	ES	PwC Belgium
William Verbeeck	WV	PwC Belgium
Matthias Palmér	MP	MetaSolutions, Sweden
Igor Štefelin	IS	Sistat Database expert at SURS, Slovenia
Jakub Klímek	JK	Ministry of the Interior, Czech Republic
Kuldar Aasaga	KA	Ministry of Economic Affairs and Communications, Estonia
Christian Wittig	CW	GovData, Germany
Øystein Åsnes	OA	Digitalisation Agency (Digdir), Norwegian
Ludger Rinsche	LR]init[, Germany
Hagar Lowenthal	HL	Publications Office, EU

Discussion

Discussion HVD (After Webinar)

Discussion

DR said that we need the translations in 24 languages, then a formal process to have commission adoption by the end of this year or beginning of 2022. Member states will have 16 months to implement obligations, so do not wait until the last minute to implement the APIs.

BVN mentioned that the regulation asks for a number of high-value datasets, with sufficient metadata, a distribution which is downloadable and an API that provides access to the data. The data should follow certain schemas.

DR told us that they are now launching the idea to flag datasets which are high-value datasets, without obligation, and that this is something to be discussed during the meeting of 15 November (Open data directive).

MP asked if there is a link where he can see what is included? Since he has not followed all the details and has earlier only seen the categories to be covered.

BVN responded that this is part of the implementing act and that all details are listed there.

DR agreed to this and also said that we need to have a certain degree of regionalisation. We are not just saying generic datasets on a certain indicator, we are more specific than that.

MP asked if there is already something online or that it still needs to be published?

DR replied that there is nothing online because they could not make anything public before it passes the committee.

MP answered that if he asked his local representative, they would probably have it.

MA wondered if there would be any examples of how the data should be displayed? Is there any guidance on how data should be structured and prepared?

DR replied that that is certainly not in the regulation and out of scope, but it could be that eventually we agree with the Member States to work on some guidelines.

BVN proposed the possibility that we have as a community, to maintain the metadata and to provide the means for reporting that is needed by our policy officers in the different Member States. It might not be complete but at least it enables the synchronisation as a basis of that reporting. What do people think about working towards this idea?

MP said that he was thinking that all of this is the same thing and that we are just adding some metadata on the dataset. But what if this is actually about someone making an informed decision and making this into a marking on the dataset saying “Yes, this one is high quality”. Anyone could claim they have high-value datasets, I just wanted to raise this issue.

BVN answered that this is a good point.

DR replied that in general he doesn’t know how to guarantee quality rules compliance. On top of that, regulations are defining a minimum set of high-value datasets, you can make more if you want and flag them as high-value datasets.

MP replied that of course there are mechanisms to root out misuse in the data portal and that you can tell people to correct their data or metadata. But maybe this high-value dataset is on another level in the sense that it is not just incorrect. Metadata, if you add it, maybe it becomes very valuable for people to search for and check the checkbox or maybe even checked by default. This might erode the idea of high-value data sets.

BVN proposed to see what is the best way, but good to have alternative views.

IS asked if there is any possibility that Eurostat collects data/metadata over SDMX (we already sent all this data) and that Eurostat exposes high-value datasets to users over API? Or should every member country look for their own solution? Talking about statistical datasets, we already expose our data/metadata to open data portal but not within a structured description of data, we use .px format.

BVN replied that it comes down to Member State responsibility.

PF also stated that Eurostat wants to collect data and metadata and publish them in their portal and at this moment there are some updates on the Estat point of view.

BVN mentioned that Eurostat's endpoint was not the intended API for the Member States endpoint in the context of high-value datasets, and also stated that he is making an assumption here. Also, there is no obligation to share the report using DCAT-AP. The goal is to create something in the context of DCAT-AP that would facilitate the implementation of the directive both by stimulating more APIs and datasets to be published.

DR agreed on the fact that there is no obligation.

BVN answered that he agreed and that it was just a response to Igor.

KA said that adding the possibility of highlighting a high-value dataset is an option of the standard. How to fill the information is a question of applying the standard in the application.

BVN asked a question pointed at portal owners in DCAT: do you have access to your policy officer? I hope everyone can reach out to their policy officer.

General consensus: Yes.

BVN resolved the unclarity on his proposal on what he called an application profile.

MP replied that he thinks the need for an AP depends on the number of properties you need to implement.

BVN agreed.

KA added that when you are in the list of high-value datasets, you need to have an API.

CW stated that different topics have different requirements and that this makes it complicated especially when topics are moving.

He also wanted to emphasise that it could be helpful to consider the implementation in data portals and also validation and that for now they are still struggling with SHACL validation.

BVN concluded that reporting, validation and testing should go hand in hand.

OA asked if SEMIC has any activities beyond metadata? If a file or an API is accessible, it doesn't solve the interoperability issues.

Bert clarified that this discussion ends at the level of metadata, not on harmonisation of the actual data itself.

MP suggested to maybe discuss some suggestions in the issue thread

LR added that he thinks a subclass would be useful.

To which BVN replied that for the community, we try not yet to introduce subclasses. On the topic of DC type vs theme: he reasoned that it would be wiser to avoid adding another controlled vocabulary value to DCATtheme. In that sense introducing it as a type is more useful/easier.

MP agreed, maybe provide it as a boolean?

According to LR it is not possible to be of more than one category.

BVN corrected that and said that you can be of multiple categories.

LR clarified that he was talking about high-value datasets.

BVN replied that he thinks at this moment it's not possible, but in practice it might be. We'll have to look into it.

DR added that there are certainly overlaps.

Question from BVN: Which place will they get on the portal? Are there some ideas already? In a special list? Or is this still open?

HL replied that it is still open.

BVN then asked the reverse question: are there any expectations?

JK said that he would expect some kind of filter to filter out all high-value datasets in a certain topic across different member states.

MP and CW agreed.

LR question about the timeline, is it realistic?

BVN replied that the kickoff is the first of January, then there are sixteen months to support, in our case.

PF added that on the 15th of December there is a PSI group meeting.

Other issues will be treated on GitHub.