**Participants:**

Bettina Klimek (BK)

Stefania Racioppa

Matteo Pellegrini

Fahad Khan

Julia Bosque-Gil

Max Ionov

Jakub Šimek

**Agenda**

1. **Summary decomp vs. morph module chairs meeting**

→ develop morph module independent of existing docomp/vartrans vocabulary for dedicated purpose of representing generated morphological language data

* add disclaimer as in lexicog module: only use morph if you know that you are doing
* as long as both modules are used for different use cases there is no problem (no superseding, overlap or incompatibility) - we have to make clear for what use case decomp and morph are applicable and that morph is more complex
* no integration of the morph module into decomp/vartrans but keep all separate for different use cases (and define them clearly)
* allows for different views on morphology (morph allows the same view but with more granularity than decomp, and also different views)

1. **Update and refinement of representation needs**

* representation needs updated on <https://www.w3.org/community/ontolex/wiki/Morphology>
* some information not finished, e.g. language example and required vocabulary
* extend required vocabulary information during 1. evaluation round

N2: keep prefix, suffix, circumfix out of morph module

John: subclass specifications to morph:Affix can be added to the lexinfo vocabulary if required (<https://github.com/ontolex/lexinfo>)


N5: try to merge with another derivational morphology need

N6: KDictionary property “display” tag to select an ontolex:Form (or Morph) resource together with ontolex:LexicalEntry - look into TEI lex vocabulary solution

property that links LexicalEntry to morphs

Nx (new modeling need): ordering: generic ordering with rdf property insufficient. ordering needs to be explicit for the LexicalEntry and Form resources that are segmented, LiLa solution: datatype property on derivational relation with integers (position in rule is 1, 2)

**3. Current morph module draft images**

****

