Open User Community Meeting Minutes

Publications Office – ESPD EDM

Meeting Date/Time:	2020-10-29 10:00 – 11:00

Attendee Name *(present)*	Organisation / Email
Sofia BERENGUER	OP
Marc Christopher SCHMIDT	DG GROW
Hector RICO	Everis
Maria FONT	Everis
Pedro SOTO	Everis
Andreea ANGHEL	Romania
Beata BALAGOVA	Slovakia
Florentina BOLBOACA	Romania
Simon BUSCH	Denmark
Delia IONICA	Romania
Asen KIRILOV	Bulgaria
Hilde KJØLSET	Norway
Ajda KOSTANJSEK	Slovenia
Aleksandra Jesenovec LJUBOJEVIC	Slovenia
Cathrine LUND	Norway
Maja MARINCEK	Slovenia
Foteini MICHAILIDOU	Greece
Alexandra RODRIGUEZ	Portugal
Francesco SCATTARETICO	Italy
Giampaolo SELLITTO	Italy

Summary of Meeting Objectives

- Summary of last meeting on 1st October 2020.
- Presentation of the GitHub issues with two purposes: informative and consultation.

Meeting Agenda

- Summary of the last meeting on 1st October 2020.
- GitHub Issues
  - #223: No need for Criterion #51: Subcontracted Proportion
  - #273: Criteria #25, 26 - extended - (trade and commercial registers).
  - #277: TOOP extension to describe evidence metadata within the ESPD-EDM
  - #280: Specific yearly turnover and Specific average turnover
  - #285: ESPD2.1.1 Schema & other discrepancies
- Next meetings

Summary of the last meeting on 1st of October
- A brief explanation of the previous Open User Community (OUC) Meeting.

GitHub Issues
- The issues were presented following the same logic as in the previous OUC.

- **#223:** No need for Criterion #51: Subcontracted Proportion
    - **Summary:** The issue aims to discuss the need for the "Subcontracting Proportion" within the Criteria Taxonomy.

This issue is still pending internal discussion by OP. Therefore, no formal proposed solution was presented to the OUC members. It was agreed to keep this under discussion for the moment.

- **#273:** Criteria #25, 26 - extended - (trade and commercial registers)
    - **Summary:** The issue reports a logical error on how criteria #25 (professional register) and #26 (trade register) require information about the EO Registered in Trade Registers and Professional Registers.

        Currently, the CA can include a requirement about in which professional and trade register should be registered an EO. This fact does not make sense, CA can ask or require the registration but not a specific register to be registered in.

    - **Proposed solution:** Remove the current requirements (name of the register and URL).
        In the case of the Professional Registries, the specification of the type of registry is provided as a requirement (e.g. Register Type).
        Include a question subgroup asking for the Name of the register, the URL, and the registration number. Moreover, keep the question "Why the economic operator is not registered?".
        Also, a new approach introduced in the OUC was to create the CL at a high level and also include the possibility for a buyer to provide the name in a text field if the entry is not in the list.

After asking participants, an agreement was reached for implementing this solution. Also, it is worth noting that all the stakeholders were encouraged to provide information for the set-up of the code list.

Agreed to collect CL from OUC members and apply it to the proposed solution.

- **#277:** TOOP extension to describe evidence metadata within the ESPD-EDM
    - **Summary:** This is the new version of the TOOP Requirements already addressed in the issue (#254), it is about the latest changes produced in the TOOP architecture due to the development of CCCEV new version.
        The TOOP team has provided an extension of the current usage of the evidence metadata within the ESPD-EDM, illustrating how could be enriched to appropriately reflect the TOOP Requirements.

    - **Proposed Solution:** Include the provided information by TOOP team in the online documentation to ensure that all the information is well provided.
        Also, use the relationship that exists between Evidence (cac:Evidence) and Signature (cac:Signature).

This was presented for further discussion, although it was confirmed that these elements will not have any impact on the current validations.

Furthermore, it was explained how automatic provided Evidence can be signed by the Service allowing to easily locate manually entered data.

In conclusion, ESPD will have more information on evidence and it will be possible that national databases can sign the content they provide.

- **#280:** Specific yearly turnover and Specific average turnover
    - **Summary:** This issue was raised as a consultation on *what is meant by business "Domain Description"*.
    - **Proposed solution**: There is no proposed solution, it was answered back in the issue the meaning and an example of what it means. The issue was already closed.

- **#285:** ESPD2.1.1 Schema & other discrepancies
  - **Summary:** The issue spots several inputs for the improvement of the documentation in terms of consistency and clarity.
  - **Proposed solution:** Since the online documentation is part of the new ESPD release, it will be taken into account for the improvement in terms of quality.

No comment was gathered from the group nor objections to the proposed solution. Therefore, the proposed solutions are to be implemented in the next release.

BASIC and EXTENDED ESPD model

Since ESPD-EDM v3.0.0 will be aligned with eForms only the EXTENDED model would be in use.

Additionally, the EXTENDED model offers more flexibility and avoids any issue related to having additional documentation attached to the BASIC model.

Annual Seminar

Quick overview of the topics in the Annual Seminar agenda.

No further comments from the OUC members.

Next Meetings
- The Annual Seminar is scheduled on the 3rd of December in the morning.