ELI-DL URI components

# Executive Summary

This note :

1. describes additional URI components of the core ELI framework components to identify entities in the Draft Legislation extension (ELI-DL);
2. give general guidelines and best practices on how to forge the URIs of Legal Activities and other entities in the ELI-DL extension;

It should be read by teams of the ELI Taskforce members wishing to implement ELI for Draft Legislation.

# ELI-DL URI components

The ELI core URI components are listed in the [Reference ELI template components document](http://publications.europa.eu/resource/cellar/c2f0e4f9-ed6f-11e8-b690-01aa75ed71a1.0001.03/DOC_2). ELI-DL defines the following additional URI components in the table below, similar to the ELI core URI component table.

Note that all existing ELI URI components remain applicable in the case of draft legislation, typically Agent, Point-in-Time, Sequence number, Jurisdiction, Language, Format, etc.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Category** | **Name** | **Comments** |
|  | /eli/dl | The “/eli/dl” root is used to indicate the URI of any entity related to draft legislation, as opposed to an ELI URI from the legislation corpus. |
| Legislative process | legislative process type | Nature of a legislation drafting process.  When the exact nature of the legislative process is not known, or is not applicable, a fixed value or code should be used to indicate that the URI identifies a legislative process. |
| legislative process identifier | An identifier, number or reference of the legislative process. |
| Activities | activity | Reference to an activity taking place in the course of a legislative process.  This can be decomposed into an activity type followed by a sequence number or an activity date, or use any other ways of referring to an activity, depending on requirements. |
| subactivity | The decomposition of a larger activity into smaller activities. |
| Documents produced within a legislative process | type of a legislative process document | The nature of a document produced during a legislative process.  When the exact nature of the document is not known, or is not applicable, a fixed value or code should be used to indicate that the URI identifies a document. |

# Guidelines for creating ELI-DL URIs

## “SHOULD” and “MUST” guidelines

Key words MUST, SHOULD in this document are to be interpreted as described in [BCP 14](https://tools.ietf.org/html/bcp14) :

* The key word MUST, when appearing in capital, mean that the definition is an absolute requirement.
* The key word SHOULD or the adjective "RECOMMENDED", when appearing in capital, mean that there may exist valid reasons in particular circumstances to ignore a particular item, but the full implications must be understood and carefully weighed before choosing a different course.

## Use the “/eli/dl” root

The URIs for legislative processes, activities and all related documents MUST all start with the “/eli/dl” path.

This is made to clearly separate the draft legislation corpus from the published acts; by looking at the URI one immediately knows in which world it belongs.

## Identify legislative processes

Legislative processes MUST be uniquely identified. Typical identification of legislative processes will use the {legislative\_process\_type} component. This can take a fixed value or code in the case a type is not applicable (e.g. “project”, “proj”, “bill”, “draft”, etc.).

*Example (fictitious) : if legislative processes are identified using a sequence number that starts over each year, a possible URI template can be* /eli/dl/proj/{year}/{legislative\_process\_identifier}

*Here,* proj *is a fixed value for the {legislative\_process\_type} component, right after the* /eli/dl *root.*

## Use the legislative process URI as root of activities URIs

The legislative process URI SHOULD be used as a root URI to identify activities that took place during the process, using the {activity} URI component.

*Example (fictitious) :* /eli/dl/proj/{year}/{legislative\_process\_identifier}/{activity}

*Note how the* {activity} *component follows the URI that identifies the process itself.*

## By default, identify an activity with an activity type plus a sequence number or a date

The identification of an activity depends on each country’s requirements; if there is no such requirement, it is suggested that the {activity} component is structured in {activity\_type}\_{sequence\_number} : the type of the activity, the “\_” (underscore) character, and the sequence number of the activity in the serie of activities. The {activity\_type}, when unknown or not applicable, can take a fixed value or code that indicate this URI identifies an activity (e.g. “activity”, “avt”, “event”, “evt”, etc. using “act” is discouraged to avoid confusion with a published act).

Instead of a {sequence\_number}, if it is known, the {activity\_date} can also be used, i.e. {activity\_type}\_{activity\_date}. The date SHOULD be formatted in YYYYMMDD.

In all cases, the URI identifier of an activity MUST be unique.

*Example (fictitious) :* /eli/dl/proj/2019/123/avt\_2

*Note how the activity is identified using a fixed value* avt *and the sequence number* 2*, indicating this is the second activity that occurred during the process.*

*Example (fictitious) :* /eli/dl/proj/2019/123/opinion\_20200214

*Note how the activity is identified using an activity type* opinion *and the activity date* 20200214*, indicating the date at which the activity took place.*

## Nest subactivities in the hierarchical structure of the URI

Subactivities can be identified by nesting them in the hierarchical structure of the URI, typically {activity}/{sub-activity}/{sub-sub-activity}.

Each activity and subactivity can be identified using the default identification scheme described above, or any other way of identifying an activity depending on each country’s requirement.

*Example (fictitious) :* /eli/dl/proj/2019/123/parl\_2/vote\_1

*In this example the activity* vote\_1 *is a subactivity of* parl\_2*.*

## Use the legislative process URI as root of document URIs

The legislative process URI SHOULD be used as a root URI to identify documents that have been written in the course of the process, using the {type\_of\_legislative\_process\_document} and any other suitable URI components.

*Example (fictitious) :* /eli/dl/proj/{year}/{legislative\_process\_identifier}/{type\_of\_legislative\_process\_document}/{document\_identifier}

*Note how the* {type\_of\_legislative\_process\_document}/{document\_identifier} *part follows the URI that identifies the legislative process itself.*

## When possible, give a specific type to the drafted act and amendments

If possible, the drafted act SHOULD be identified with a proper value for the {type\_of\_legislative\_process\_document} component, like draft\_act, or an equivalent code in another language.

*Example (fictitious) :*

.../eli/dl/proj/2019/123/draft\_act

*This URI identifies the draft act of legislative process 123 of 2019, independently of one of its temporal version.*

If possible, the amendments to the drafted legislation SHOULD be identified with a proper value for the {type\_of\_legislative\_process\_document} component, like amendment, or an equivalent code in another language.

*Example (fictitious) :*

.../eli/dl/proj/2019/123/amendment/commission\_abc

*This URI identifies an amendment with the identifier “commission\_abc”, in the legislative process 123 of 2019 (independently of the potential temporal versions of this amendment).*

When known, proper values SHOULD be used for the {type\_of\_legislative\_process\_document} (e.g. opinion, report, etc.)

*Example (fictitious) :*

.../eli/dl/proj/2019/123/opinion/XYZ

*This URI identifies an opinion document, with the identifier “XYZ”, in the legislative process 123 of 2019 (independently of the potential successive temporal versions of this opinion document).*

Knowing the type of every document that is produced or used in the course of a legislative process may not be possible. In that case, a default value MUST be used for the {type\_of\_legislative\_process\_document} component, like doc, or an equivalent code in the country’s language. The objective is to clearly distinguish a URI that identifies a document from a URI that identifies an activity.

*Example (fictitious) :*

.../eli/dl/proj/2019/123/doc/XYZ

*This URI identifies a document with the identifier “XYZ”, in the legislative process 123 of 2019 (independently of the potential temporal versions of this document).*

## Identify temporal versions of the drafted act (typically using point-in-time)

The (existing) {point-in-time} component SHOULD be used to identify temporal version of the draft act itself.

*Example (fictitious) :* /eli/dl/proj/2019/123/draft\_act/20190922

*This URI identifies the draft act of legislative process 123 of 2019, as it was on the 22nd of september 2019.*

## Provide direct access to the latest version of the draft act

The URI of the draft act without a {point-in-time} identifies the “abstract” draft act, meaning the draft act independently of one of its specific version.

Such a URI SHOULD return the most recent version of the draft act.

*Example (fictitious) :* /eli/dl/proj/2019/123/draft\_act

*This URI identifies the draft act of legislative process 123 of 2019, independently of a specific version, and should return the most recent version of the drafted act when accessed.*

## FRBR structure remain applicable for documents (to identify language variants and format variants)

The FRBR structure, with Expressions identifying language variants of a document, and Formats identifying format variants of the same content, remains applicable for any legislative-process-related document. They typically use the existing {language} and {format} existing URI components.

{point-in-time} remains also applicable if there is a need to identify temporal versions of a document.

*Example (fictitious) :* /eli/dl/proj/2019/123/doc/abc12/spa/html

*This URI identifies the HTML format of the Spanish variant of a related document number abc12 in the legislative process 123 of 2019.*