

# 8th MIWP-6 sub-group meeting

Friday, 30 October 2015, 10:00-11:30 CET

[Connection details](#)

[Recording](#)

## Agenda

10:00-10:10 Welcome and approval of the agenda (Michael Lutz)

10:10-10:20 [Minutes of the previous meeting](#) (for discussion and agreement) (Michael Lutz)

- review of open action items

10:20-10:45 RoR prototype (Daniele Francioli, Emanuela Epure)

- Demo/presentation of prototype: <http://inspire-regadmin.jrc.ec.europa.eu/ror/>
- Feedback and discussion
- Next steps

10:45-11:10 Proposal exchange format for the federation (Christian Ansorge, Michael Noren)

- Presentation of the proposal [Registry\\_federation\\_example\\_scenarios\\_EEA\\_v1.docx](#)
- Feedback and discussion
- Next steps

11:10-11:30 Status & future of MIWP-6

- Status compared with MIWP-6 action description and sub-group ToR (Michael Lutz)
- Possible proposal(s) to MIG-T
  - time extension
  - stopping the activity
  - re-scoping the activity

## Draft Minutes

### Attendees

Alejandra Sánchez (ES), Andreas von Dömming (DE), Willem van Gemert (OP), Jesus Barrera (ES), Norbert Pfaffinger (AT), Chris Schubert (AT), Esa Tiainen (FI), Christian Ansorge (EEA), Michael Noren (EEA), Hannes Reuter (ESTAT), Lorena Hernandez (JRC), Daniele Francioli (JRC), Emanuela Epure (JRC), Michael Lutz (JRC)

### Welcome and approval of the agenda

No comments on the agenda.

### Minutes of the previous meeting and report from informal meeting at the INSPIRE/GWF conference

The [minutes of the previous virtual meeting](#) were approved as currently on the wiki.

Action A6.9 (EEA to check internally if they can contribute with a test instance of Data Dictionary) may no longer be relevant - since probably real examples from the data dictionary can be used.

Action A6.10 (JRC to investigate whether we can set up a test environment with different tools (Re3gistry, UK-LDReg, EEA data dict tool, others?)) can be closed, since a test registry has been set up by JRC at <http://srv-aaashib-ext.jrc.it/registrytest/registry/>. This is using the Re3gistry software. If during the further development of the RoR testbed the need arises to try out different software tools, the action can be reopened.

The following actions are still open:

- A6.12: JRC to update the [Architecture scenarios](#) section on the wiki according to the slides
- A6.13: JRC to discuss possible testbed example data with participants
- A6.15: JRC to implement RoR prototype for search use case
- A6.16: EEA to propose common exchange format for extensions
- A6.18: JRC to update the glossary
  - replace "element" with "item" in definition of "subset"
  - add definitions for "item" and "element"
  - add a figure illustrating "extension", "subset" and "profile"

### RoR prototype

Daniele presented the RoR prototype developed at JRC and available at <http://inspire-regadmin.jrc.ec.europa.eu/ror/>. The RoR will just store the references to registers and registries as well as the relations between registers. The federated search functionality has not yet been implemented. The RoR points to the central INSPIRE registry as well as a test registry (based on the re3gistry software) available at <http://srv-aaashib-ext.jrc.it/registrytest/registry/> containing an example of an extension of the themes register with 2 additional themes.

Emanuela presented a number of minor changes to the URI patterns and user interface that are already planned to be implemented (see [RoR\\_planned\\_minor\\_changes.pptx](#)), including an additional register of item classes.

The prototype was well received by the group. It was agreed that the proposed additional register of item classes will be a useful addition. This register should be built over time when registers are added to the RoR.

Willem pointed out an error in the display of the register names (where the *registry* names are shown).

It was agreed to start with a simple list of relationships to be expressed in the RoR, that can be extended in the future. The relationship concepts should be identified through URIs as well. It is still an open question whether the relationships will be stored only at the level of the RoR in the local registries /registers as well.

Hannes asked whether the RoR prototype supports also https: connections, e.g. to connect to the SDMX register (<https://registry.sdmx.org>). Daniele Francioli confirmed that this will also be supported.

**All sub-group members are invited to have a closer look at the prototype and provide further feedback to JRC [Action A6.19].** JRC will continue work on the prototype, so the site may be unavailable at times.

## Proposal exchange format for the federation

Christian Ansoorge and Michael Noren presented their proposal for an exchange format for the federation (see [Registry\\_federation\\_example\\_scenarios\\_EEA\\_v1.docx](#)).

The discussion focused on the question on how to express using SKOS vocabularies (mainly the inScheme relationship) that a set of register items B is an extension of another set of register items A. In particular, the cases where A is non-empty and where A is empty were discussed.

It was agreed that the extension should be expressed by stating that B contains all items of A plus the additional items, but that it should not be stated that the additional items are contained in A (see an example below).

[blocked URL](#)

Extensions of an empty register A should work in the same way (as in the example below). Thus, in this case, there is no way to derive that CLC extends LandCoverClassValue, and there is therefore the need to express in some other way that the code list CLC <extends> the code list LandCoverClassValue.

[blocked URL](#)

**Willem, EEA and Esa will investigate whether, for this purpose, the SKOS inScheme relation can formally also be used between two concept schemes (rather than between a concept and a concept scheme) and/or whether this is common practice, and, if not, propose an alternative way to express this. [Action A6.20]**

Section [3.2 Re-using and Extending Concept Schemes](#) and [5.3 SKOS, RDF Datasets and Information Containment](#) in the SKOS primer (<http://www.w3.org/TR/skos-primer/>) may be useful references.

**All sub-group members are invited to review the document and provide further feedback [Action A6.21].**

As next steps for the testbed, it was agreed to **add the CLC/LandCoverClassValue and possibly code list extensions from ELF as further examples to the RoR and have a discussion how the information included in the RoR could be harvested based on the proposed exchange format. [Action A6.22].**

## Status & future of MIWP-6

Michael pointed out that the group is close to the deadline set out in the Terms of reference (31/12/2015), but has not yet reached its goal. He proposed to extend the deadline to 30/06/2016 and to scope down the tasks of the group to work on the RoR prototype and federation testbed (including documentation). In June, there should then be a discussion in the group and with the MIG-T whether the planned guidelines are needed in addition and whether the group should keep working. The MIG-T and MIG-P would have to endorse this proposal, since it means a change in the MIWP. The attendees were in favour of this proposal.

**Michael will draft a revised MIWP action description and sub-group terms and reference and send it to the sub-group for comments. He will then present the proposal to the MIG-T for endorsement at the Rome meeting. [Action A6.23]**