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# Round table

# Introduction and objectives

This third meeting was the last working group meeting for this phase of the work. More meetings will be organised in the next phase of the development of the e-procurement ontology.

This meeting discussed the overview of the different issues raised and the feedback received in the past weeks.

All the issues were not addressed in the two new documents presented[[1]](#footnote-1) during the meeting but all the issues were kept in the GitHub issue tracker. The issues which were not solved were justified, e.g. not in the scope of the first phase. All the issues will be indicated appropriately in the two documents with a label specifying their status.

# D02.01 Specification of the process and methodology

## Conceptual data model

The main changes in the conceptual data model were briefly described and further discussed per issue in the D02.02 Project Charter part of the meeting.

Some discussions were still on going on GitHub concerning the utility of some classes, the distinctions between classes and the relationships between them. These discussions will be taken up in the next phase of the project or in an intermediary stage over the summer.

The working group members were requested to raise/reply to issues on GitHub so as to resolve and/or provide input to known issues or to identify issues currently not addressed.

It was decided that in the future each concept of the model will be discussed in the working group. The working group will receive in advance of such meetings a list of suggested terms and definitions tabled with the names and definitions of corresponding terms and definitions emanating from other sources eg. Directives, ubl, CEN BII, PPROC etc. The working group will then agree on the preferred formulation of terms and definitions. This decision is further detailed under **Issue 21**

## Comments addressed

As a general comment, working group members were asked to create a different issue for each separated topic to enable other members to easily react.

It was also mentioned that multiple labels could be used. PwC will verify whether participants could assign labels or not. A granular way of tagging could help avoid users to search for the relevant issues. Working group members can give suggestions on how to achieve such a granular categorisation.

**Issue 3**

Link: <https://github.com/eprocurementontology/eprocurementontology/issues/3>

Decision:

The discussion on the distinction between Contracting Authorities and Contracting Entities were still ongoing on GitHub.

A distinction between Procuring Entity and Buyer was made in the conceptual data model, this approach was questioned by the working group and it was agreed that this should be further discussed within the group. New classes were added to make a distinction between Contracting Authority and Public Undertaking or Other Contracting Entities. All new classes were modelled as subclasses of Buyer, it was also felt that these subclasses should be further discussed.

**Issue 4**

Link: <https://github.com/eprocurementontology/eprocurementontology/issues/4>

Discussion:

The objective of the remaining discussion on this GitHub issue is to make a distinction between the two parties signing the contract but without differentiating the label. One relationship could be used instead of the two in the model at the moment. It would simplify the model.

Decision:

All parties agreed to use ‘is Signed By’ instead of ‘is Contracted By’ and ‘is Contracted To’.

**Issues 5-6**

Links: <https://github.com/eprocurementontology/eprocurementontology/issues/5>

<https://github.com/eprocurementontology/eprocurementontology/issues/6>

Decisions:

The working group was invited to bring more comments on the following issues:

* Issue 5 about the relationship ‘is payment for’
* Issue 6 about different roles of Contracting Authority

**Issues 7 and 14**

Links: <https://github.com/eprocurementontology/eprocurementontology/issues/7>

<https://github.com/eprocurementontology/eprocurementontology/issues/14>

Discussions:

The solutions proposed for the issues 7 and 14 were presented, respectively to distinguish between Framework Agreements and Specific Contracts depending on further use cases (issue 7) and to make the domain and ranges more general (issue 14).

Decisions:

The current propositions were kept and the issues will be kept open to be further discussed in the next phase. The working group members were invited to comment the different issues.

**Issue 20**

Link: <https://github.com/eprocurementontology/eprocurementontology/issues/20>

Discussion:

The issue was discussed as to whether only resources should be modelled in the ontology or whether events the e-procurement process should also be modelled.

Some clarifications about the difference between resources and processes were brought up. The processes concern actions for which the following questions should be answered: who, what and when. The results of events in the processes are resources, for example data or documents. In the case of the PPROC ontology, they remained resource-oriented as the event-oriented approach is only useful for complex modelling.

Decision:

The working group was invited to bring more comments on this issue on the relationship between Contract Award Notice and Economic Operator.

A new issue should be created by PwC about the scope of the e-procurement ontology.

**Issue 21**

Link: <https://github.com/eprocurementontology/eprocurementontology/issues/21>

This issue about the primary source of definitions was presented and discussed at the beginning of the meeting under the point ‘Conceptual data model’.

Decision:

As from the next phase, each concept of the model will be discussed in detail by the working group in dedicated meetings, as listed in the project charter. Concerning the sources to be used to define the entities, the Directives will be kept as a major source which will need to be respected by the definitions, but, as the definitions can differ from one Directive to another and the e-procurement ontology could be used within a wider scope than the directives (ie at national level below the thresholds), the editor with the working group will have to generalise the entities and definitions found in the Directives. The working group will have to agree on the preferred formulation of the terms and definitions.

**Issue 24**

Link: <https://github.com/eprocurementontology/eprocurementontology/issues/24>

Decision:

The class Lot will be more discussed on GitHub and will be treated in the future.

**Issue 25**

Link: <https://github.com/eprocurementontology/eprocurementontology/issues/25>

Discussion:

The class Monetary Value could be represented in other ways and the Invoice class may be too general. Invoice line could be needed to define the entities at a lower level of details. In the current document, the definition of Invoice includes the sentence: “Note: it may be necessary to define smaller parts of Invoices in cases where an invoice contains ‘invoice lines’ related to specific items.”

Decision:

There will be a detailed discussion during the dedicated meeting in the next phase which will probably be the fourth working group meeting, as described by the table 6 of the Project Charter.

**Issue 26**

Link: <https://github.com/eprocurementontology/eprocurementontology/issues/26>

Discussion:

This issue pointed two classes missing in the current model, i.e. Order and Delivery Note, but which do not appear in the 3 use cases defined in this phase.

Decision:

The next phase of the development of the e-procurement ontology will see more use cases being specified and new classes, properties and relationships being proposed and discussed on GitHub or in the meetings. It will be the responsibility of the working group to decide whether the proposed concepts should be part of the ontology or not.

**Issue 27**

Link: <https://github.com/eprocurementontology/eprocurementontology/issues/27>

Discussion:

There is now a distinction between the Procuring Entity (which could be a Central Purchasing Body) and the Buyer. If the situation can occur that the Call For Tender is published by more than one organisation, there may need to be a 1..n relationship between Call For Tender and Procuring Entity, or a particular type of Procuring Entity might be a grouping of organisations.

The working group was invited to bring more comments on this issue.

Decision:

This issue will be further discussed in the next phase and the working group will decide whether or not to include a relationship between Call for Tender and Procuring Entity. What is more it is to be decided whether the concept of Procuring Entity is correct or not.

**Issue 28**

Link: <https://github.com/eprocurementontology/eprocurementontology/issues/28>

Discussion:

In [CCCEV](https://joinup.ec.europa.eu/asset/criterion_evidence_cv/asset_release/core-criterion-and-core-evidence-vocabulary-v100), Evidence is related to Criterion. Criterion implies Requirement which is met by Evidence. The important point is the definition of the class[[2]](#footnote-2). The attendees were invited to look at the page 15 of the CCCEV specification: <https://joinup.ec.europa.eu/catalogue/distribution/core-criterion-and-evidence-vocabulary-version-100-0> for a description of how Evidence is related to Criterion.

Some participants were not sure if there is a need for such additional complexity with Evidence and Payment. An example was shared for the city of Zaragoza: <http://www.zaragoza.es/api/recurso/sector-publico/factura/62?rf=html>

Evidence and Payment are part of the use case but if the working group decides that there are not needed, it could be removed.

Another point of discussion concerned Payment which can be made to other party than Economic Operator. A new issue could be created for this point.

It was clarified that the Economic Operator linked to Payment is not automatically the same Economic Operator than the one related to the Contract.

Decision:

The relevance of Evidence will be commented on the current existing issue (#28).

PwC will create a new issue for the relationships between Payment and Economic Operator or other parties.

**Issue 29**

Link: <https://github.com/eprocurementontology/eprocurementontology/issues/29>

Decision:

The working group will discuss further in future phases of the project if a superclass Notice could be created in a new version of the model.

**Issue 30**

Link: <https://github.com/eprocurementontology/eprocurementontology/issues/30>

Discussion:

Whether the class [Catalogue Request](http://docs.oasis-open.org/ubl/os-UBL-2.1/UBL-2.1.html#T-CATALOGUE-REQUEST) could be foreseen as a generalisation of Tendering Terms from UBL for specific calls for tender.

Decision:

An issue will be created on GitHub about the class Catalogue Request from UBL.

**Issue 31**

Link: <https://github.com/eprocurementontology/eprocurementontology/issues/31>

Discussion:

It is described in the Specification document ([D02.01](https://joinup.ec.europa.eu/asset/eprocurementontology/document/d0201-specification-process-and-methodology)) that code lists are reused if they include concepts with URIs or are Controlled vocabularies. Some participants expressed their support to reuse code lists and that those code lists should be as much as possible represented in skos.

A list of NUTS codes are defined as skos concepts. The interest of URIs is in the further amount of information available. Thanks to URIs, the classes are linked together: one class in the ontology would be related to a code list. An example was shared: <http://vocab.linkeddata.es/datosabiertos/kos/urbanismo-infraestructuras/tipo-via/CALLE>

It was also mentioned that CPV codes have been uploaded to VocBench.

Decision:

The current modelling does not use 'code lists' in the sense of short strings like ISO 3166-1 country codes, CPV codes or NUTS codes, but works from the principle that the things that the codes stand for are identified by URIs. It could be further discussed in future phase of the project.

**Issue 32**

Link: <https://github.com/eprocurementontology/eprocurementontology/issues/32>

This issue about the description of classes, properties and relationships was presented and discussed at the beginning of the meeting under the point ‘Conceptual data model’.

Discussion:

The latest conceptual model and supporting tables include the proposed definitions for all classes and properties.

Decision:

In this meeting, it was decided under the point D02.01 Specification of the process and methodology that

* The definitions and terms proposed for the different entities in the e-procurement ontology will be discussed in the future phases.
* Synonyms to the terms can be added as soon as the definitions will have been agreed by the working group.
* Before each working group meeting, a list of suggested terms and definitions will be shared to be discussed during the meeting. This list will include different alternatives from other sources than the one used.

The working group was invited to bring more comments on this issue.

The definitions could be linked to the information requirements in future phases. This will need to be decided at the start of the next phase by the working group.

**Issues 39-40**

Link: <https://github.com/eprocurementontology/eprocurementontology/issues/39> and <https://github.com/eprocurementontology/eprocurementontology/issues/40>

Decision:

The working group was invited to bring more comments on these two issues:

* Should the model foresee direct relationships? E.g. Call For Tender 'is procured for' Buyer and Contract Award Notice 'is procured for' Buyer
* Should the model foresee both Procuring Entity and Buyer?

**Other discussions related to the specification document**

An OWL file was created on the basis of the conceptual data model. It will be made available on GitHub. Domains and ranges are not defined yet as discussions are still on-going and entities were kept as general as possible.

The review of the OWL is not the most important document in this phase but it is available and if the working group members have questions about it, PwC and the Publications Office would be happy to answer.

# D02.02 Project Charter

## Comments addressed

**Issue 19**

Link: <https://github.com/eprocurementontology/eprocurementontology/issues/19>

Discussion:

A column was inserted in the table 6 of the Project Charter to include the different milestones and activities of the working group meetings of the next phase.

Decision:

Each meeting of the working group will be focusing on a pre-defined shortlist of terms and definitions as described in the table 6 of the Project Charter.

## List of use cases to be developed

The additional use cases identified in this phase are documented in the annex of the Project Charter. The attendees were asked to share any direct feedback on each of the additional use case. The list of additional use cases is available in Annex I – List of additional use cases. The discussions concerning some of the use cases are summarised below.

**Analysing e-procurement procedures**

Link: <https://github.com/eprocurementontology/eprocurementontology/issues/11>

Decision:

The submitted description can be reviewed by the working group.

José Felix can be contacted concerning this use case to collect more information.

**Buyers need to buy things, which means following the e-procurement phases, and**

Link:<https://github.com/eprocurementontology/eprocurementontology/issues/36>

**Other public entities are directly involved in the e-procurement phases.**

Link: <https://github.com/eprocurementontology/eprocurementontology/issues/37>

Discussion:

Concerning the two previous use cases, it was discussed that depending on the needs identified and the scope of the e-procurement ontology (i.e. resource-oriented over event-oriented for the time being), the short description available on GitHub could be further described in a more granular way. The important point is to have information in the use cases describing useful actions for reusers of the ontology as use cases are relevant to convince people to implement the ontology. It is also why the use cases should not be too precise but understandable by a broad public.

Decision:

Each use case does not necessarily need to be too detailed. What is not covered in the use cases can be identified at the conceptual data model level and integrated at this stage.

# Next steps

The different documents will be updated by mid-June and will indicate which issues need to be further discussed in the next phase.

NM proposed that, during the summer, the editor/chair could organise small meetings with a few people active on specific issues. The objective over the summer for the editor and chair and/or the Working Group is to:

* Propose a list of definitions for all classes and properties in the ontology. The input from the Working Group can be provided via GitHub.
* Elaborate on the use cases

The attendees agreed with the approach and agreed to remain active on GitHub by reading and reacting to the issues raised.

The attendees also agreed that the editor will have a bigger role in the next phase of the project.

# Actions and tasks until the next phase

Table 1: General tasks

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Task | Responsible | Timeline |
| PwC will verify whether participants could assign labels or not on GitHub issues.  Update: the labels cannot be assigned by contributors of the GitHub repository except for the administrators. | PwC | 2017-06-07 |
| Working group members can give suggestions on how to achieve a granular categorisation of issues on GitHub. A granular way of tagging could help avoid users to search for the relevant issues. | WG members | 2017-07-01 |
| PwC will update the two documents: D02.01 Specification and D02.02 Project Charter and propose it for review to the Publications Office. | PwC | 2017-06-15 |
| A new issue should be created by PwC about the scope of the e-procurement ontology. | PwC | 2017-06-07 |
| The working group members will read and comment the issues which will be specified as relative to the second milestone on GitHub. In particular, they will look at the issues 5, 6, 20, 21, 27, 29, 32, 39-40. | WG members | From 2017-06-07 until 2017-09-01 |
| PwC will create a new issue for the relationships between Payment and Economic Operator or other parties. | PwC | 2017-06-07 |
| PwC will create an issue on GitHub about the class Catalogue Request from UBL. | CG | 2017-06-07 |

# Annex I – List of additional use cases (Not discussed in the meeting)

* e-tendering process: <https://github.com/eprocurementontology/eprocurementontology/issues/8>
* Increase cross-domain interoperability in terms of (financial) exclusion grounds among Member States, <https://github.com/eprocurementontology/eprocurementontology/issues/13>
* Public understandability (Use case to be derived from interviews with transparency watchdogs and similar stakeholders)
* Monitor the money flow, <https://github.com/eprocurementontology/eprocurementontology/issues/9>
* Detect fraud and compliance with procurement criteria, <https://github.com/eprocurementontology/eprocurementontology/issues/42>
* Alerting services, <https://github.com/eprocurementontology/eprocurementontology/issues/10>
* Introduce automated classification systems in public procurement (not a real use case but a set of ideas for classification systems to be gathered)
* Businesses need to participate in procurement, <https://github.com/eprocurementontology/eprocurementontology/issues/35>
* Regulators (ministries, review bodies, etc.), citizens, journalists, NGOs, academics, buyers, etc. use the data to answer policy-relevant questions, <https://github.com/eprocurementontology/eprocurementontology/issues/38>.
* Analyse the success rate of the procurement process and the reasons for failure, as well as estimate the costs associated, <https://github.com/eprocurementontology/eprocurementontology/issues/33>
* Long term analysis about the evolution of procurement activities in the EU Institutions, <https://github.com/eprocurementontology/eprocurementontology/issues/34>
* Providing information for Contract Registries, <https://github.com/eprocurementontology/eprocurementontology/issues/22>
* Enable the publication of notices as linked open data to enable the exploitation of the corresponding data through the semantic web in ways yet to be envisaged, <https://github.com/eprocurementontology/eprocurementontology/issues/23>

1. D02.01 Specification of the process and methodology and D02.02 Project Charter. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. In CCCEV: Evidence is any resource that can document or support a Requirement response. The Evidence class contains information that proves that a Criterion requirement exists or is true, in particular Evidences are used to prove that a specific Criterion is met. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)