



European Committee for Standardization
Comité Européen de Normalisation
Europäisches Komitee für Normung

CEN/ISSS Workshop eGov-Share

N009

Title : Draft minutes of the second meeting on 2008-06-12
Source : Secretariat CEN/ISSS Workshop eGov-Share
Date : 2008-07-08
Status : For approval
Note :

Secretariat: **Nederlands Normalisatie-instituut (NEN)**

Mr. T. Kniep
Vlinderweg 6
P.O. box 5059
2600 GB Delft
The Netherlands

Telephone: +31 15 2690 100
Telefax: +31 15 2690 242
E-mail: tim.kniep@nen.nl
WWW : <http://www.nen.nl>

DRAFT MINUTES
for the 2nd meeting of the CEN/ISSS Workshop on Discovery of and
Access to eGovernment Resources
on 12 June 2008, Brussels
10.00 to 17.00

1. Opening of the meeting

Mr Wessbrandt, Chair of CEN/ISSS WS eGov-Share opened the meeting at 10:30.

2. Roll call of participants

The participants that are present introduce themselves. An attendance list is attached.

3. Approval of the agenda

The draft agenda (N 007) was adopted without any changes. There will be two additional presentations under point four of the agenda.

The draft minutes of the previous meeting (N 005) were approved and accepted as the official minutes.

4. WS Mission and expectations

Mr Wessbrandt introduced the steering group to the workshop. The steering group participants are:

- Karl Wessbrandt, Chair (Verva)
- Tim Kniep, Secretary (NEN)
- Alain Dechamps, WS Manager (CEN)
- Arild Haraldsen (Norstella)
- Konstantinos Tarabanis (UOM)
- Max Craglia (JRC)

Mr Wessbrandt explained the mission of the workshop in his presentation. This presentation is available electronically as document N010. He explained topics as IDABC (a Programme Unit within DG Informatics), PEGS (Pan European Government Services), EIF, Interoperability Dimensions, Public Services Model, SEMIC.EU, Asset categories and CAMSS.

Mr Kolehmainen noted that in the late 90's EPHOS was an example of a huge effort that was undertaken to describe procurement. The eGov-Share workshop should keep the usability of the CWA as a primary requirement and not total coverage.

Mr Küster noted that the work that was done on exploring standardization issues in the focus group should be taken into account as it very useful for the current workshop. Some aspects that are described in the Focus Group Workshop are closely related to the current work. He suggested going through the first draft of the CWA to see if the work of the eGovernment Focus Group are taken into account.

Mr Wagner noted that different parties have very different needs. He will go through the produced information to see if this is taken into account in the CWA.

Mr Küster noted that the SEMIC asset clearing with respect to organization interoperability should be taken into account. SEMIC might be developing something that this workshop would be able to refer to. As soon as such information from SEMIC becomes available it

should be shared with this Workshop. Mr Wessbrandt explained that this is being discussed in the SEMIC work which is expected to become publicly available very soon.

a. Greek eGovernment Interoperability Registry

Mrs Lampathaki held a presentation to provide the workshop with an overview of the Greek eGovernment Interoperability Registry. This presentation is available electronically as document N011. The Greek eGIF Interoperability Registry is a web based collaboration platform that allows stakeholders and public authorities to:

- share a common understanding of services, documents, web services and information systems;
- navigate the process models;
- search the catalogues for core components and XML Schemas;
- download XML Schemas, web services descriptions;
- seek proposals for schemas and process models;
- post change requests.

The presented framework is similar to what is used in the UK. The framework includes specifications on electronic payments and web services. The documentation in Greece includes guidelines for process modeling, data modeling and web services. For modeling it is hoped to propose a set of metadata to provide a structure for governmental documents. In the same way, descriptions of services should be accompanied by workflow models. XML schemas should follow the UNCEFACT schemas.

Mrs Lampathaki expected to have English versions of the main points of the documents at the end of Juli 2008. The website of the interoperability framework is www.egif.co.gr. Organizations will also be able to access another system (such as UDDI) using web services that is currently under development. Each municipality can adopt their own template to their own needs. This is reflected in the isPartOf link in the onthology. BPMN models describe the execution of the models.

Next Steps for the Greek eGIF Registry are to bind with the Central Governmental Portal, to train staff within public bodies for using and extending the registry, place more emphasis on the UDDI Interface and the Management of eGIF Standards. On the basis of these next steps lies the rationale that there are multiple registries being developed in Europe and that there will be interaction between such registries. The central portal in Greece is planned to become available in the end of this year.

Mr Dekkers asked who funds the project and who will pay for and perform the maintenance after it is completed. Mrs Lampathaki explained that the Greek ministry funds this and the NTUA has two contracting partners. The university will continue to run and support the project with funding from the Greek government.

Mr Küster noted that this presentation is very interesting and notes the links to the eGov-Share workshop. The workshop focuses on how to link registries together. The workshop needs standardized protocols to federate linked registries. The services ontology is very similar to what is developed in CEN in 2006. Even though the projects were separate, the general trend, in for instance the focus on the service, is the same, so a general reference model is very much possible.

Mr Jahns asked who creates the process models regarding the registrations of services. Mrs Lampathaki explained that for some part the NTUA were the ones who registered the services. In addition, the contractors of the services registered it. The NTUA tried to work together to validate such registries. The public authorities and the consultants are being trained to register the data themselves. Mr Wessbrandt thanked Mrs Lampathaki for her presentation to the workshop and gives the floor to Mr Green to give a presentation.

b. ePSIplus briefing

Mr Green asks the workshop participants to look through the slides (this presentation is available electronically as document N012) and the website on www.epsplus.net and to post comments on the website. Mr Green stated that the fifth theme in the presentation, the PSI:

public sector information management, standards and data quality will be the most relevant to this workshop. It is about:

- sharing good practice and building interoperability for discovery and access to PSI;
- encouraging the provision of PSI catalogues (asset registers);
- support for necessary public-private standards interoperability;
- consensus building on data quality issues.

Mr Green continued to explain the problem with PSI: if it is shared at all, it still is very compartmentalized. The users of the information do not know where to look for information. He believes that PAN-European standards are important and doable.

Mr Dekkers noted that Mr Green mentioned nothing about lingual issues. Mr Green explained that that is something might be discussed in coming meetings as it is missing at the moment. Mr Green suggested that the Workshop participants join in on Madrid on the 12 of September in the discussion on asset registers for pan-European standards and related initiatives such as the PAN-European navigator. Getting the right metadata might facilitate such access.

Mrs Rowlatt commented that it is important to look through the eyes of organizations that have to implement our products. These initiatives survive by the degree of which they are actually implemented by the organizations. These top-down projects are often overlapping with something they are doing and are thus not adapted. She pleads to take a minimalist approach in order to keep the users in mind. It would be clearer and less work for the users in this way. She continued to notice the striking similarity between what Greece and the UK are doing. However in the UK it is stalled as it is not adapted by the actual users. She pleads for consultation at the practical level by bringing the users into the standardization process.

Mr Dekkers explained that an initial top-down approach in the Netherlands is now matched with a bottom-up approach around a community of interest, the Metaforum. This way the practitioners understand why they are doing the work. The government should support and be involved to see the benefits of this approach.

Mr Pluke noted that it is not clear for the practitioners what the benefits for them are. Mrs Lampathaki answered that most public servants do not see the benefit but only as an extra burden. It would be nice if they see it as taking the burden from the citizen or another administration by doing it the way we suggest. If there is not a political pressure to adopt then they will probably not implement it in Greece. Mrs Rowlatt noted that because the local governments only have local interests, they will only spend on local initiatives.

Mr Dekkers stated that it is an issue of promotion. Because the local governments do not have the resources there should be an organization that relieves them of the burden. In the Netherlands the central organization supports the local governments by providing services that relieve the local government of specific technical developments.

Mrs Rowlatt states that there is starting to become more of a focus on information management. The new leaders are standing up and saying; we need to set up a central resource area to support all organizations. An efficiency case can be made around this.

Mr Küster explained that in Germany there is a movement towards a standard for process repositories with an attached registry. They see the benefits of having the same kind of process descriptions quite clearly. For services in the local communities it is seen that the same information has to serve different organizations. Organizations do not want to retain the same data twice and thus want structured information. There is increased understanding and political pressure for this.

Mrs Lampathaki explained that because each country has started to develop its own metadata and registries, there will be problems with the integration of such items into a PAN-European standard.

5. Introduction of Project Team and distribution of tasks

Mr Dekkers introduced the Project Team (PT) responsible for drafting the CWA. The presentation is available electronically as document N013. The objectives of the PT are:

- Multipart CWA in consultation with the workshop membership and wider community
- Reference implementation as proof-of-concept
- Recommendations for the future

The CWA should be ready to go out for public comments in November 2008 while the workshop is expected to finish by March 2009. The work is split up into five work packages (WP):

- WP0 – General editing and co-ordination
- WP1 – Description of eGovernment Resources
- WP2 – Federated Terminological Resources
- WP3 – Description of Cultural Elements
- WP4 – Evaluation and recommendations

The PT consists of:

- Sven Abels - Leader WP2, WP4
- Makx Dekkers - Leader WP0, participant WP1
- Marc Wilhelm Küster - Leader WP1, WP3
- Graham Moore - Participant WP1, WP2, WP4
- Mike Pluke - Participant WP3

The progress on the CWA can be publicly viewed at <http://www.egovpt.org/fg/>. The next open meeting is planned for October 2008. Mr Dekkers noted that the PT is very aware that the work should not disappear after it is completed. Efforts should be made to get the CWA adapted by the practitioners in the field.

Mr Kolehmainen noted that for CWA part 3 it says that it "will be elaborated in close collaboration with the Unicode Consortium, notably with the TC on the Common Locale Data Repository, and in continuous discussions with LISA." He noted that the only practical way that such collaboration will work is to address it in the UNICODE meeting in September. Mr Kolehmainen will present this work on September the 9th.

Mr Dekkers noted that WP3 will be in draft in August and thus we will be able to provide the WP3 draft before September. Mr Küster explained that it is an essential step to have it in Unicode in one text as Unicode is the main player in this domain. The acceptance of the CWA work in this area would make positive sign.

6. First CWA draft presentation

WS Project Team

Mr Dekkers explains that there are no textual documents at the moment as the PT is compiling the work done so far. The work consists of:

- Common introductory part
- Executive summary, background, objectives, approach, contributors
- Part 1 – Description of eGovernment Resources
- Part 2 – Federated Terminological Resources
- Part 3 – Description of Cultural Elements
- Part 4 – Evaluation and Recommendations

Additional points of focus are to:

- Keep the size of the document to a useful minimum
- Enhance the CWA with an annex with practical guidelines

Regarding WP3, this will explain how to use cultural elements and provide the guidelines for this. This will be the input for the cooperation with UNICODE. This is essential to perform this not different from UNICODE practice. If soft elements are not named in the CIDI of UNICODE, then they can be defined anew.

Mrs Rowlatt asked why repository and registry are both being used. Mr Abels responded that a repository actually has the data whereas a registry merely refers to it. Mr Küster added to this that a registry is a repository of metadata. A Repository might be the actual data and thus in this case not our concern.

Mr Dekkers continued that it is aimed to provide tools such as a model that describes how data can be referenced and searched, but not solutions as for instance distributed searches. The PT also looks outside of European countries such as the United States and New Zealand.

Mr Küster explained that the PT wants to make an overview of what is available using a low key approach. Parallel to this, the same agenda was pushed by the large content integrators in Europe. Mr Dekkers emphasized that it is not intended to make a registry of registries. What is within the scope is to have a use case that focuses on public service providers. End-user scenarios are not inside the scope of the project but can be described in addition to this project.

Mr Abels explained that regarding WP2, EBXML was incorporated in the work package plan, however it was left out in the new work. The current plan is to have a scenario to explain what it does. The demonstrator is part of the final reference implementation – this is still a limited program due to time limitations.

Mr Pluke explained that regarding WP3, Soft cultural elements are described in the CEN cultural diversity group, but this is not currently captured in for instance the UNICODE. Some of the hard subjects are already in there but the soft things such as 'interpretation' can vary from person to person. The PT has to produce something that can also be used and implemented in the UNICODE repository. The idea behind this resource is that it should be useful at a human level, but also at a machine level. The right words such as first and last names should be put in the right fields.

Mr Kolehmainen noted that it could not be on the level of LDML, as you would need the agreement of large organizations. What the CWA would be doing here is pre-standardization, making a suggestion for how such products could be used and implemented in the UNICODE in the future.

Mrs Rowlatt noted that public services and different setups and different names for such instances and the processes accordingly and asked how this is addressed in the work? Mr Küster answers that this was part of ADNOM. For instance the age to which children go to school are often very different. The only way to describe this would be with fuzzy relationships schemas such as EUROWOK (a classification scheme). This is the subject way of linking things in the architecture.

Mr Abels explained that regarding WP4 there are three different samples for testing. Furthermore, maintenance of the CWA will be addressed in WP4. Mr Dekkers stated that one of the outcomes of the work of the PT is a proposal to UNICODE to implement certain things in future standards.

7. Discussion on CWA draft

Mrs Rowlatt offers to put the document up on the ePSIplus website. She emphasized that a business case is very important to have the users actually adopt it. Mr Küster noted that WP0 will have to be aimed at the decision makers, while WP1 and 2 can cater for IT people. WP3 and WP4 would cater for both IT and more general people. The marketing of each part is very important. It is suggested to keep developing all parts together and look in the end whether they need to be formally separated and each get their own business case.

Mr Dekkers suggests to change the CWA outcome to focus more on an "output perspective" (what result would help the audience most) as opposed to an "input perspective" (which contractual bits need to be included). The proposed CWA structure can be viewed on http://www.egovpt.org/fq/CWA_framework?

8. Work Plan and Meeting calendar

Mr Wessbrandt stated that he received a request from the PT to have the open meeting in October instead of in September. The normal Workshop meeting planned for October will then be held in September. The Workshop approves to switch the open and the normal meeting.

Regarding the Workshop meeting in September, Mr Green offered to inform whether it is possible to have the meeting hosted in connection with the ePSIplus workshop on 11 September 2008 in Madrid.

The open Workshop that is now planned for October is planned to take half a day and will be organized in connection with the next ESIG2 Summit. This Summit is planned on 20 through 22 October 2008 in Rome. Mr Wessbrandt will approach the ESIG2 organization. Note from the Secretary: we have received confirmation from the ESIG2 organization that we can organize the workshop in collaboration with ESIG2.

Regarding the open Workshop meeting that is planned for January 2009, the Workshop would like to ask its members to inform the secretariat of related meetings or summits that the Workshop can connect to.

9. Any other business

Mr Brown explained that there are benefits to cooperate with OASIS on the issues that are addressed in this Workshop. It will be interesting to see what each member is doing with what kind of standard. Using the liaisons of this Workshop can provide valuable input for this workshop as well as for the liaisons.

The Workshop appointed the following members as Liaison contact persons:

- Unicode CLDR: Erkki Kolehmainen
- LISA: Mike Pluke
- ETSI: Mike Pluke
- OASIS eGov TC: Peter Brown
- ISO/TC37: Håvard Hjulstad (Marc)
- W3C eGov: vacant

Mr Wessbrandt noted that the workshop will need to become more visible. Mr Wessbrandt offers to inform the ADNOM, CAMS and SEMIC members and perhaps add them to the mailing list. Mr Dekkers offered to inform the DCGovernment member of the open meetings. These groups will have to be informed as soon as the dates are fixed for the September Workshop in Madrid and the Rome open Workshop in October. The secretary suggested that a small informative text is added to such an invitation to inform possible participants of our work. Mr Küster offered the Workshop to open up the Wiki in which the CWA is developed. The workshop approved this.

10. Closing of the meeting

Mr. Wessbrandt thanks Sven Abels and NESSI for hosting this meeting and closes the meeting.