D05.01 202304025 Meeting Minutes: Webinar on ADMS/ADMS-AP

Project:	SEMIC	Meeting Date/Time:	25/04/2023 13:00 - 15:00
Meeting Coordinator:	Bert Van Nuffelen, Makx Dekkers	Issue Date:	23/05/2023

Meeting Agenda
1. Welcome 2. ADMS Vocabulary: introduction and proposal for the road ahead 3. ADMS controlled vocabularies 4. ADMS-AP: an application profile on top of ADMS 5. Wrap-up and next steps

Meeting Slides
LINK

Participants		
Name	**Initials**	**Organisation**
William Verbeeck	WV	SEMIC Team
Bert Van Nuffelen	BVN	SEMIC Team
Jitse De Cock	JDC	SEMIC Team
Anastasia Sofou	AS	SEMIC Team
Pavlina Fragkou	PF	SEMIC Team
Makx Dekkers	MD	SEMIC Team
Csongor Nyulas	CN	SEMIC Team

Eugeniu Costetchi	EC	SEMIC Team
Hector Rico Lorenzo	HRL	NTT DATA
Enric Staromiejski	ES	NTT DATA
Geraldine Nolf	GN	Digitaal Vlaanderen
Fidel Santiago	FS	European Land Registry Association
Mantas Sekmokas	MS	External Adviser - European Commission
Thies Mesdag	TM	Kadaster, The Netherlands
Joachim Nielandt	JN	Digitaal Vlaanderen
Giorgia Lodi	GL	Institute of Cognitive Sciences and Technologies of Italian CNR
Hans Overbeeck	HO	Dutch Publications Office
Pascal Derycke	PD	Sciensano
Ludger Rinsche	LR	]Init[
Matthias Palmér	MP	MetaSolutions for Agency for Digital Government in Sweden (DIGG)
Touré Lanciné	TL	OIITID
Willem van Gemert	WvG	Publications Office of the EU
Kees Trautwein	KT	Logius
Riitta Alkula	RA	Finnish Digital Agency
Ana Rosa Guzmán	ARG	Secretariat General for Digital Administration of the Spanish Government
Ales Cernivec	AC	XLAB
Alberto Abella	AB	Fiware
Ilias Dimopoulos	ID	Joinup team
Irène Kesisoglou	IK	Sciensano
Italo Mairo	IM	Joinup team

Mihai Paunescu	MP	Publications Office of the EU
Jim Yang	JY	Norwegian Digitalisation Agency
Peter Bruhn Andersen	PBA	Digitaliseringsstyrelsen, Agency for Digitisation, Ministry of Finance
Peter Lubrich	PL	Federal Highway Research Institute
Petro Dudi	PD	Trasys

Summary		
13:00 - 13:10	Welcome	Slides 1 - 7
13:10 - 13:55	ADMS Vocabulary	Slides 10 - 27
13:55 - 14:00	Break	
14:00 - 14:10	Controlled Vocabularies	Slides 28 - 32
14:10 - 14:40	ADMS-AP Community	Slides 34 - 43
14:40 - 14:45	Wrap-up	Slides 44 - 48

Points discussed and decisions taken

Topic discussed	Outcome
Issue #3: Range of ADMS:sample	The range of adms:sample will become rdfs:Resource
Issue #4: Typo ADMS:schemaAgency	Both the typo and the correctly spelled URII be kept to ensure backwards compatibility. Only the correctly spelled (normative) URI will be used.
Other issues will be treated on GitHub.	

Full meeting minutes

Welcome	PF welcomed the participants, presented the agenda and explained the objective of the webinar. BVN elaborated on the context and history of ADMS

ADMS Vocabulary	and explained the ADMS vocabulary.
	BVN mentioned that the goal is to have ADMS as a broad vocabulary. Therefore the profiling aspect will be moved to a real application profile. BVN elaborated on the proposal of the decoupling, stating that there is no impact on the current use.
	Mathias Palmer argued that the need for ADMS has decreased and wondered what the main benefit is of keeping ADMS as a separate vocabulary. BVN replied that the focus was on keeping the current vocabulary as it is being used. Looking at the usability, certain terms will be deprecated. Regarding semantic assets, if we want to maintain information about semantic assets and we can define it quite well. ADMS as vocabulary, could be where we define it more precisely. If not, it will be slowly degrading in usage. MP wondered if we should make a big effort in transforming it into a separate vocabulary.
	MS suggested to mark ADMS as owl:deprecated while keeping it alive for the URLs. BVN replied that the impact of doing this would be bigger than what we actually want to do. MD added that this might be an option for later, but not for this point in time.
	WvG asked if there is indication of the ADMS usage? BVN answered that this question will be tackled in the last part of the webinar.
	ARG asked why you should use semantic assets instead of any asset? BVN replied that this is the history part, previously the focus was on semantic assets, however the word asset indicates something broader. GL added that ADMS defines asset as a class.
	ID wondered if the Asset Catalog is completely removed from the layers? BVN replied that in ADMS it is called asset repository.
	Proposal:

	Range of ADMS:sample = rdfs:Resource → Accepted **Proposal**: use the HTML URI as normative URI **New proposal** Keep them both but point to the normative one not the deprecated one. → Accepted CN mentioned that there are some usages of ADMS:schemeAgency. PBA added to the discussion that sameAs is for individuals, and suggested using equivalentProperty. → equivalentProperty not sameAs CN agreed to **deprecate the old one, and point to the new one.** No need for sameAs, in this case. It would not need to be mentioned in HTML. GL followed the statement of CN and general consensus to deprecate the old one and to use equivalentProperty instead of sameAs. CN suggested to make a reference to DCAT in the introduction of ADMS (and other vocabularies that might be more appropriate for certain use cases). This way, newcomers can choose the vocabulary that best fits their needs. IM questioned if this duplication is needed. MD replied that we will come back to that in the second part.
ADMS Controlled Vocabularies	GL asked for clarification about the maintenance of URIs. BVN replied that URIs will still be maintained. The usual practice is that the original URIs will be maintained. ARG Stated that she still sees ADMS as a vocabulary to describe any asset and, maybe, an AP to describe semantic assets, like DCAT as an AP to describe datasets. MD replied that this question will be tackled after the break. LR wondered if the AP will force properties to use these vocabularies or only recommend them? BVN clarified that we will recommend the EU vocabularies.

	WvG confirmed that the Publications Office is willing to support on maintaining the codelists. MP mentioned that there is no connection between AssetRepository, Asset and AssetDistribution within ADMS. This makes him feel that ADMS is not a standalone vocabulary. Moreover, reusing dcat:dataset and dcat:distribution will not be possible unless we want to keep the notion that the classes are subclasses of the corresponding DCAT classes. Therefore he wondered if it is possible to introduce some ADMS specific connecting properties, perhaps pointing from AssetDistribution to Asset and from Asset to AssetRepository (e.g. ADMS:isPartOf or encourage the reuse of dcterms:isPartOf for this purpose). BVN replied that he made the same observation and added that it is a good moment to see what the future of the vocabulary is and how to invest in it. BVN asked MP to write this down on Github.
Break	
ADMS-AP	BVN elaborated on ADMS-AP. GL gave an explanation about the Italian ADMS and ADMS-AP specifications and use cases. MP summarised that we are dividing what previously was only ADMS into an AP and vocabulary, stating that this is a quite new way to do things, which he likes. But he suggested clarifying this to the community. MD agreed with the comment of MP. IM the new Web Architect of Joinup stated that the ADMS data model looks a little bit misaligned with the evolution of Joinup. BVN clarified that ADMS-AP does not have the intention to disconnect from DCAT. BVN asked all participants of the webinar if they actively use ADMS and/or ADMS-AP. MP replied that they have extended PROF with properties from ADMS when describing standards/specifications. KT answered that they are looking into using ADMS. However, they have not yet done so due to the lack of recent updates. JY mentioned that in Norway they use ADMS only as a vocabulary (e.g. ADMS:status). For the controlled vocabularies they use SKOS and DCAT as open data.

	PBA mentioned they only use ADMS, not the application profile. ARG replied that they are using ADMS-AP to federate solutions in their Center of Technology Transfer (CTT) with JoinUp. LR said they only use the properties which are used by DCAT-AP.
	GL emphasised the importance of ARG's comment, since they have one platform for all assets and we have different platforms. For each asset they have specific metadata that captures their peculiarities. Therefore, GL believes having ADMS as a standalone is a good idea, then there is the possibility to have different profiles for specific assets. ARG added that CTT assets also have some associated documentation.
	BVN summarised that currently there is not enough motivation for a profile to be built. At the level of the vocabulary, we can add these two properties in order to make it more coherent. MD ended the discussion by moving it to Github.
Wrap-up and next steps	BVN wrapped up the meeting and thanked the participants for the feedback.