

9th MIWP-6 sub-group meeting

Monday, 23 November 2015, 15:00-16:15 CET

[Connection details](#)

[Recording](#)

Agenda

[15:00-15:20] Updated content and presentation of the RoR and test registry

- RoR: <http://inspire-regadmin.jrc.ec.europa.eu/ror/>
- Test registry: <http://srv-aaashib-ext.jrc.it/registrytest/>

[15:20-16:15] Exchange format to be used

- see [Exchange_format.docx](#)

Minutes

Attendees

Andreas von Dömming (DE), Heidi Vanparys (DK), Alejandra Sanchez (ES), Willem van Gemert (OP EU), Christian Ansorge, Michael Noren (EEA), Lorena Hernandez, Andrea Perego, Michael Lutz, Daniele Francioli (JRC)

Updated content and presentation of the RoR and test registry

Daniele presented the updated content and user interface of the RoR and test registry.

Exchange format to be used

Based on the discussion at the previous meeting, Michael L presented a proposal for documenting an extension concept scheme and two alternatives for documenting a concept in the SKOS-based exchange format (see [Exchange_format.docx](#)).

Michael N remarked that in the example, it should read `dct:isPartOf` instead of `dcat:isPartOf` (i.e. DCMI Terms, not dcat).

Most participants agreed that, to express extension relationships between registers, instead of `skos:inScheme`, `dct:isPartOf` should be used. Michael L pointed out that the direction of the `dct:isPartOf` relation should be reversed (pointing from the register being extended to the extension).

The `skos:inScheme` relation should be used instead to declare that a concept is part of a concept scheme. A concept can have more than one `skos:inScheme` relations, but no such statements should be made about a register that is under the governance of another organisation.

Andrea points to the documentation of the current RDF representation of the central INSPIRE registry at <https://webgate.ec.europa.eu/fpfis/wikis/display/InspireMIG/Re3gistry+RDF+format>.

Michael N clarifies that the reason for keeping the proposal for an exchange format so compact is that we discussed that it should be minimal, but he said he would prefer the full format to the current implementation, because it provides better searching, and excludes the need for linking to each registry to get the useful info.

Willem suggested to agree on a common (mandatory) minimal core and optional attributes that extend the core. Michael N agreed that we should decide what the minimal exchange format is. The the full one could be recommended. The participants agreed on this and proposed to develop a proposal for mandatory and optional elements **[Action JRC]**.