# ICEG Public Organisation & Public Services
## *Workshop #2*

**Date**: 12th August 2021

# Agenda

The objective of this second workshop was twofold; (i) introduce the updated version of the models by using life-like examples and (ii) discuss open points, highlight missing concepts and related use cases.

- Welcome and objectives
- Process, input and timeline
- Presentation of changes for PO & PS
- Use cases for PO & PS
- Next steps

# Action Items

| Action | Owner | Due Date |
|---|---|---|
| Publication of the updated specifications on the GitHub | PwC | 03/09/2021 |
| Review meeting report and share feedback, if any | Working Group | 08/09/2021 |
| Review the updated specification and share feedback using the *GitHub issue* feature | Working Group | 08/09/2021 |
| Share use cases, examples or models to be further looked at | Working Group | 08/09/2021 |
| Involve domain experts from the different (and relevant) public administrations for the next Workshop | Working Group | 09/09/2021 |

# Meeting Minutes

1. Agent is supposedly limited to the description of an actor (company X, person Y), but it doesn't match all the use cases. Generalisation is needed as there is not necessarily a possibility to name all companies or persons.

2. Agent and Agent class are confusing, better naming could help, e.g., 'profile' or 'agent profile'

3. Certain public services consume their own output. Therefore, there should be an additional relationship between output and evidence.

4. Similarly to public organisation, services can either be public or private. In that situation, it would be wise to ensure the model is abstract enough to allow connections between or types of services (private and public), i.e., elements such as cost, requirements, etc. should be connected to service and only elements relevant to the public service should be described in the public service class.

5. hasLegalResource should be bound.

1. What about historical data? Historical changes can be captured in the model, but it is more a technical issue than a semantic one, i.e., when implementing the model.

2. The model should foresee the possibility to have different levels of Organizational Units, e.g. in Brussels and Wallonia there are reportedly more than 3 levels of Organizational Units. For instance, a sub organizational unit relationship could be created.

3. It should be noted that the Organizational Units can be seen as a department of the Organization and is therefore not a legal entity.

4. Contact point and address should be related to the Organization. In the same vein, the modelling approach should be more abstract where public organization is a type of organization and thus having additional attributes that differentiate it from the Organization. The same remark goes for document.

5. The model should foresee multichannel contact points, similarly to public services, as well as opening days.

6. It would be interesting to look at the model of KBO, and see what is specific for public organization in that model, i.e. what are the differentiating characteristics between public organizations and private organizations. The core model should primarily focus on the concepts of an organization, as there is not much difference between a public and a private organisation on a semantic level. A public organization is a classification of an organization. In summary, the modelling approach is too detailed, while it should be more abstract (basic ontologies).

7. Attributes should be added to describe the form of organization, e.g., fondation act emanating from an authority (framework to describe a PO).

8. In future sessions, the group should investigate what is distinctive between a public organization and an organization, e.g., legal resource, administrative territorial unit. It is also important to know which level of government a public organization responds to. The main elements considered as specific to a Public Organization were:

   ○ Legal Resource (the fact that a Public Organization must have a legal basis to exist)

   ○ The ATU (as jurisdiction)

   ○ Some people mention the mandate (the description of the mission/services the PO provides). To be seen if this is not covered already by the Legal Resource.

9. In regards to the administrative territorial organization, work is being done on URI and Identifier for location. It is to be decided what authoritative source should be used for codelists. It was proposed to use a persistent identifier (which is stable, with NIS code) instead of NUTS.