Luxembourg, 09 March 2018

Report on the 4th Working group Meeting of the eProcurement Ontology

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Project:** | eProcurement Ontology  | **Meeting Date/Time:** | **2018-02-23****09:30 – 11:15** |
| **Meeting type:** | 4th Working Group Meeting | **Meeting Location:** | Videoconference Webex (848392954@ecwacs.webex.com ) |
| **Chairperson:** | Manuela Cruz | **Issue Date:** | 2018-02-23 |

|  |
| --- |
| **Meeting Agenda**  |
| * Presentation of the Participants
* Introduction (*Manuela Cruz*)
* Current Status of Work (*Natalie Muric*)
* Glossary (*Laia Bota*)
* Wiki Content Management (*Enric Staromiejski*)
* Code lists (*Natalie Muric*)
* Conceptual Data Model (*Maria Font*)
* Technical Documentation (*Enric Staromiejski*)
* Planning of actions and tasks
 |

|  |
| --- |
| **List of Participants** |
| **Attendee Name** *(present)* | **Initials** | **Organisation / Email** |
| Paul BORODAY | PB | OCDS |
| Laia BOTA | LB | everis |
| Patrizia CANNULI | PC | IT Consip |
| Oscar CORCHO | OC | Universidad Politécnica de Madrid |
| Manuela CRUZ | MC | OP |
| Tim DAVIES | TD | OCDS |
| Kornelis DRIJFHOUT | KD | NL TenderNet |
| Maria FONT | MF | everis |
| Enrico FRANCESCONI | EF | OP |
| Virginia GOMARIZ | VG | everis |
| Olga GALUSCHKA | OG | Transparency International Ukraine |
| Cécile GUASCH | CG | ISA2 Contractor |
| Jáchym HERCHER | JH | DG GROW |
| Natalie MURIC | NM | OP |
| Eliza NIEWIADOMSKA | EN | EBRD |
| Dmitry PALAMARCHUK | DP | Transparency International Ukraine |
| Andrew ROBINSON | AR | OP Contractor |
| Claude SCHMIT | CS | OP |
| Enric STAROMIEJSKI | ES | everis |
| Oleksii YURCHENKO | OY |  Transparency International Ukraine |

|  |
| --- |
| **Summary of Meeting**  |
| **Presentation of the Participants**The particpants of the meeting presented themselves (see list of participants – in alphabetical order).**Introduction**During the introduction it was explained that for various reasons meetings had not taken place for sometime. However work had continued and the purpose of this meeting was to have an approval on the glossary and an agreement on the work foreseen for the future.**Current status of work**Work previously carried out by the working group meetings was described:1. Specifications & Methodology
2. 3 draft use cases
3. Basic illustrative: Conceptual model & OWL file

The working group was informed that work carried out between the working group meetings concentrated on the eNotification phase namely:1. Glossary
2. Data definition dictionary (DED)

The work foreseen to be carried out until June 2018 should cover the eNotification and eAccess areas of public procurement. The deliverables foreseen and to be presented in the meeting are:1. Data definition dictionary (DED)
2. Conceptual model
3. Proof of Concept
4. Use case testing
5. OWL file

**Glossary**How the glossary was created in synergy with the business terms of the future eForms was presented. An overall presentation of the glossary was made the glossary. The glossary can be found at:<https://github.com/eprocurementontology/eprocurementontology/wiki/eProcurement-Glossary>The working group requested more time to approve the glossary, an extension for receiving comments was made until 9 March 2018. Some participants felt they could not do a deep review during this period. It was pointed out that even if the glossary was approved future updates of concepts would be possible so as to enrich the ontology and to fully cover other use cases and evolutions. Working group members were also welcomed to provide any input on concepts and definitions that they felt were lacking.**Wiki Content Management**A new way of presenting the glossary in excel and commenting via the issues in github was presented. The naming convention for issues could be followed for other parts of the wiki. It was suggested that it would be a good practise to populate automatically the google spreadsheet from the GitHub issues (see org-id.guide platform: <http://docs.org-id.guide/en/latest/contribute/>);However, within this project it was not thought to be a good solution as * 1. there is the need of linking the glossary to the DED, and
	2. the proposal is using the GitHub issues workspace to debate about the Glossary entries and definitions before adopting a final decision and transposing this decision into a structured artefact.

A call to look into github good practices is to be arranged between the contractor and OCDS. It was explained that the github being presented would be uploaded onto the current github if the working group agreed to this way of working. There were no objections.**Code Lists**Work carried out by the Publications Office within the same ISA2 action covering code lists to be referenced in the ontology was presented. This presentation was given as a source of information, the governance of this work being different to that of the ontology, however any requirement for code list content or format would be most welcomed. The working group will be kept up-to-date on this work.**Conceptual data model**The DED and the conceptual data model were presented. The DED is an excel file used to identify the classes, attributes, relations and the cardinality of the Business Terms. Enterprise Architect (EA) tool is currently used to produce a graphic representation of the conceptual model, based on the DED;Working Group members showed concerns about the use of EA to model the Conceptual Model instead of an open source software. The reason for using EA was that the tool is used in other ISA2 projects such as the Core Vocabularies and therefore affording alignment with these other projects. Additionally, EA provides interesting features, like automatic generation of the documentation and exporting to open standard formats such as XMI. It was agreed that the EA model would be put on line along with an XMI version.It was highlighted that the DED is a useful intermediate artefact between the Glossary and the Conceptual model which facilitates analysis. **Technical Documentation**The technical documentation to be uploaded on the wiki was presented**Planning of actions and tasks**Concerns were raised as whether the work and in particular the use cases developed in ePO V1 would be discarded. The working group was assured that work previously done was to be integrated into the current work and the group was encouraged to develop further the work on the use-cases and competency questions. Finding ways of working together with projects such as TheyBuyForYou would be mutually beneficial and should be looked into.Future meetings are planned:28/03/2018 * To discuss the competency questions.
* Presentation of an updated conceptual model to ensure it is being developed in the right way
* Presentation of the PoC approach, the use case and the expected results

27/04/2018* Revision of the ontology, conceptual model and design considerations

01/06/2018* Revision of the ontology, OWL implementation and results of the PoC

The work to be presented in each meeting will generally be made available for the working groups’ information approximately one week before each meeting.The action points decided for the next meeting are listed below.  |
|  |
| **Action Points (AP):** |
| **AP#** | **Name****Description** | **Due Date** | **Who** |
| **1** | The wiki will be uploaded next week. | 27-02-2018 | everis |
| **2** | Deliver example Competency Questions for the WG to elaborate their own. | 09-03-2018 | OP / everis |
| **3** | WG Members to provide their revision of the Glossary. | 09-03-2018 | WG |
| **4** | WG Members to identify missing concepts and definitions. | 09-03-2018 | WG |
| **5** | everis to meet TD ASAP to learn from OCDS experiences. | 06-03-2018 | TD / everis |
| **6** | everis to provide the Conceptual Model as it stands as an XMI file on the GitHub as well as the source EA. | ASAP | everis |
| **7** | everis to provide the next draft of Conceptual Model  | 22/03/2017 | everis |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Proposed Agenda for Next Meeting:** | **Proposed Next Meeting Date:** | 2018/03/28 |
| 1. Approve changes introduced by WG since the last meeting;
2. Focus on the PoC approach / definition (competency questions);
3. Presentation of the updated Conceptual Model;
4. AOB
 |