CHANGELOG W.R.T. LAST PROPOSAL OF EVERIS

DECOUPLE CCCEV FROM OTHER VOCABULARIES, IN PARTICULAR DCAT-AP

MOTIVATION

Coupling entities to existing vocabularies (e.g. by subclassing) is enforcing the superclass view on the entities. Often this coupling did not contributed to clarify the intended semantics of the CCCEV entities. The impact was more restrictive than necessary.

ACTIVITIES

Mostly a removal of dependencies of DCAT(-AP) except for Evidence.

Such dependencies are now part of discussions at the level of implementations.

ALIGN CCCEV WITH OTHER CORE VOCABULARIES

MOTIVATION

The SEMIC Core Vocabularies are build around a few external vocabularies. In particular for meta data aspects **dcterms** is the base reference.

ACTIVITIES

Replacement of uri mapping from cbc to dcterms.

This additionally reduces the mapping ambiguity that would arise from subclassing from dcat:Dataset.

SEMANTICAL CLARIFICATIONS

MOTIVATION

Many of the entities in the proposal did not had a formal definition, nor even an informal motivation for their appearance in the CCCEV data model

ACTIVITIES

Ensure that every term has a label/definition/mapped to an URI.

DISENTANGLING THE SEMANTICS FROM A (XML) SERIALIZATION NEEDS

MOTIVATION

Part of the modeling and uri mappings were heavily inspired from the perspective of the best practices for XML payload creation that are applied by the parties around the table.

Despite that usable XML payloads for the parties around the table was probably the main objective, this creates a data model were payload technicalities are mixed with a highlevel context. This conflicts with the objective of a Core Vocabulary which is as much as possible implementation neutral.

ACTIVITIES

The whole structure around concept and value has been severely reduced to minimal aspects to capture the semantics.

Value has been renamed to Supported Value and is now a response to an request instead of a dangling entity.

REMOVAL OF NOT MOTIVATED ENTITIES SUCH AS CCCEV:DOCUMENTREFERENCE

MOTIVATION

No clear semantics were provided. On the extended view of the proposal many explicit properties of DCAT are listed. Probably they result from discussions on describing discussed information items that the parties around the table would like to have covered. By listing them explicitly the proof has given that the CCCEV model is capable to capture the required notions. To introduce them in the CCCEV context the definitions and terminology of those properties should be contextualized to the CCCEV setting. Note that this contexualiation is anyhow a non trivial process as DCAT is an application profile for cataloguing entities. So the catalog is a key context setting for a dcat:dataset while CCCEV is not about cataloging.

However non of the properties have been motivated or explained that they form an integral part of the CCCEV. Lacking this motivation means that is not critical information that must be part of the Core Vocabulary level. It however means those properties will arise during implementation discussions.

Note that by subclassing Evidence to dcat:Dataset all the removed aspects are implicitly included. This implicit approach essentially creates a lot of freedom. And that makes that CCCEV is not usuable out-of-the box.

ACTIVITIES

Removing all non motivated properties. This has mostly as consequence that all dcat properties have disappeared.

CHANGES IN THE PREFERRED DIRECTIONALITY OF THE RELATIONSHIPS

MOTIVATION

Some relationships had a counter intuitive preferred relationship.

ACTIVITIES

cccev:hasConstraint -> cccev:constraints

cccev:isValueOf -> cccev :providesValueFor (name change + maintain only one direction)

ADDED PROPERTIES

MOTIVATION

New properties that enhance the application of CCCEV

ACTIVITIES

Cccev:issuedBy: Requirement -> Agent

Cccev:supportsValue: Evidence -> SupportedValue

RENAMING

MOTIVATION

Some entities or relationships do not use labels that immediately guides a reader into the desired semantics. Some even create confusion.

ACTIVITIES

Concept: confusion with skos:Concept. Maybe better Information Concept

Value: reads as if it is something very generic. Changed to SupportedValue

EvidenceTypeList: it is not a list, but actually an And-condition that should be fulfilled. (TODO: ongoing search for an improved name)

Cccev:isSpecifiedIn: should be optional (not mandatory), but also the existence of an Evidencetype is not dependent on participating is a combination.