ELI-DL Feedbacks

*And how they were integrated in the new version of ELI-DL*

This document integrates all the feedbacks received at <https://joinup.ec.europa.eu/solution/eli-ontology-draft-legislation-eli-dl> during the period when the first draft version of ELI-DL was published (February 2019 – February 2020).

Feedbacks are listed in the chronological order they were received. For each of them, the choice and the associated decisions that were taken are given.

# Give an order to Legal Activity

*From Jean Delahousse – Switzerland use-case*

It would be useful to have a property enabling to link LegalActivity with next/previous relationships. Date is not enough to order them as several flows of activities can occur at the same time.

## Answer

ELI-DL already includes “was\_motivated\_by” to link LegislativeActivities with a causality relationship. This is precisely made for this use-case.

# use of created\_a\_realization\_of\_legal\_resource for LegalActivity

*From Jean Delahousse – Switzerland use-case*

At the end of the legislative process, a last LegalActivity is to publish the signed legislative resource in the official journal. It will be useful be be allowed to use the property  created\_a\_realization\_of\_legal\_resource (or equivalent) at LegalActivity level to indicate the legislative resource published by this activity.

*Additionnal comment by Jaroslaw Deminet*

There is a question if actions performed by some other (non-parliamentary) body should be included in the parliamentary LegislativeProject. I currently assume that our final stage is Presidential signature, which actually ends the legislative process. Actual publication would not constitute an action and the official journal is considered as a somehow “external” document, linked just by the created\_a\_realization\_of\_legal\_resource property.

## Answer

We acknowledge that the actual publication of the text in the Official Journal is not an activity of the Legislative Process itself, as it happens after the draft legislation has become an official legislation by signature or promulgation. The legislative process stops when the draft legislation becomes an official legislation. As such LegislativeProcess is no longer declared a subclass of F30\_PublicationEvent.

The domain of property “created\_a\_realization\_of\_legal\_resource” is broaden to “LegislativeActivity” so that any LegislativeActivity can be connected to a generated LegalResource, not just a LegislativeProcess. LegislativeProcess is also no longer a declared as a subclass of F28\_Expression\_Creation since it can exists prior to having led to the creation of an expression.

# URI template for LegislativeProject, LegalActivity and others classes of resources

*From Jean Delahousse – Switzerland use-case*

As we have URI template for ELI LegalResource, would it be possible to propose in the standard URI templates for LegislativeProject, LegalActivity and other classes of resources ?

*Additionnal comment by Jaroslaw Deminet*

Dear Colleagues,

in Poland we indend to extend ELI URI as follows. Our current URI is

<http://eli.gov.pl/eli/DU/2019/1481/ogl/pol>

where "DU" identifies the official journal and "ogl" means "as published".

Projects will be identified by the body which carries the procedure and by the natural identifier currently used, thus:

<http://eli.gov.pl/eli/Sejm/8/3858>

identifies the project in the lower chamber of the parliament ("Sejm") of the 8th term (2015-2019) that was initiated by a parliamentary document no. 3858. Legal activities will have their code appended, so

<http://eli.gov.pl/eli/Sejm/8/3858/1czyt>

will identify the first reading and

<http://eli.gov.pl/eli/Sejm/8/3858/1czyt/glos>

may identify the recorded voting results after the first reading.

Similarily

<http://eli.gov.pl/eli/RM/8/UD/476>

would identify the project that is proceeded by the government (council of ministers) during the 8th term of the parliament. UD/476 is the current identifier of governmental documents.

We will now try to use the ELI DL ontology to define ELI URIs for other artefacts (draft works etc.).

Please comment :-)

Jarosław Deminet

## Answer

Please refer to the ELI-DL URI components and guidelines documents.

URI for ELI-DL entities MUST all start with “/eli/dl” to distinguish them from ELIs of published legislation.

# Draft document published in the official journal (Switzerland use case)

*From Jean Delahousse – Switzerland use-case*

In Switzerland draft legislation is published in an official journal (feuille fédérale) for information of the citizens. It seems the model proposed does not allow to represent this link between the draft legislation and the official journal it is published in.

## Answer

The domain of eli:is\_part\_of is broaden to the class Work. This property can be used to indicate that a LegislationProcessWork is included in an Official Journal.

We note that such an “intermediate” publication of a draft legislation work does \_not\_ imply it becomes or generate a LegalResource, since it has not been signed into an official legislation.

# Indicate the expected type of the final legislation

*From Thomas Francart*

The LegislativeProject could indicate the expected type of the final legislation, once published. the reference should be to the same table as the document\_type table used in ELI.

Note that this expected type can change over time.

This would be particularly useful for EU legislation to know if it is a Directive, MS can prepare for transposition earlier.

*Additionnal comment by Jaroslaw Deminet (Poland)*

In Poland we intend that LegislativeProjectType would actually be the supertype of the ResourceType, thus the type of the final document is clearly defined. Maybe this is simpler than to separately define the procedure and the document type.

## Answer

The property “foreseen\_type\_document” is introduced in the model, with the following definition :

“Indicates the expected type of the legislation that will be the result of this legislative process.

The expected type of legislation can change over time.

The value must be taken in the ResourceType table, already used for the eli:type\_document property.”

The type of the legislative process \_cannot\_ be the supertype of ResourceType, as this confuses types of \_documents\_ with types of \_processes/events/activities\_. We think these should be 2 separate lists.

# Simplified person identification

*From Jaroslaw Deminet (Poland)*

I suggest that for LegalActivity there is also a data property to assign the name of a person involved. Currently there is only the object property *has responsible (participant) person*. Whereas this is feasible for organizations and maybe for some VIPs, it may be not for other persons involved. In Poland we have so-called “citizen projects”, where any person can be the representative, and we will not keep all of them In a controlled vocabulary. It is possible to use blank nodes, but something similar to *eli:publisher* and *eli:publisher\_agent* would be more convenient.

## Answer

The 4 following data properties are introduced on LegislativeActivity to capture the names of participant and responsible persons and organization :

* participant\_person\_label
* participant\_organization\_label
* responsible\_person\_label
* responsible\_organization\_label

# The organization that has submitted the project

*From Jaroslaw Deminet (Poland)*

We need an additional property for a LegislativeProject, subproperty of  *has participant organization*, to describe the organization that submitted the project to the parliament (this could be the government, the President , the Senate, a group of MPs, a parliamentary committee or a group of citizens). Such organization should be somehow distinguished from other participant organizations and at the same time it cannot be considered as the responsible organizations, since parliamentary bodies are responsible for all stages.

## Answer

The property “was\_submitted\_by” is introduced in the model, with domain LegislativaProcess and range Agent, with the following definition :

“

Indicates the organization or person that submitted a legislative project to the parliament (this could be the government, the President, the Senate, a group of members of the parliament, a parliamentary committee, a group of citizens, etc.).

“

It is declared as a subproperty of both P17\_was\_motived\_by and P11\_had\_participant.

# An extra status

*From Jaroslaw Deminet (Poland)*

It is not clear which status should be used for bills that have been successfully vetoed by the President: *Abandoned* or *Closed*? I feel that *Abandoned* corresponds to the case when the parliament itself decides not to proceed, and if it is *Closed* then one does not know if the project was finally successful. Maybe there should be additional status *Rejected* which would mean that some other body have rejected the bill.

*Comment from Thomas Francart*

Thanks. This deserves additionnal documentation in the model, but the intent is that "Closed" means "successfully went through and gave birth to a legislation" while "Abandonned" means it did not, for any reason.

I don't want to go too much in the legislative/legal details here, this is really a high-level view. If this property is causing too much trouble, we might as well consider removing it.

## Answer

LegislativeProcessStatus has been reworked and now contains only 3 values, with the following definitions :

1. Ongoing : The status of a legislative process while the drafting of the legislation is currently taking place and the outcome of the process is not known.
2. Successful : The status of a legislative process that has successfully "gave birth" to a LegalResource.
3. Abandonned : The status of a legislative process that was stopped without "giving birth" to a LegalResource, e.g. vetoed by the President.

Note that ELI-DL implementors are free to define additional statuses.

# Draft vs. DraftRelated

*From Jaroslaw Deminet (Poland)*

I have doubts about *LegalDraftWork* and *LegalDraftRelatedWork* classes. Our Senate can suggest amendments to a bill that has been passed by the Sejm (lower chamber). The Senate resolution contains the list of amendments and not the text of the bill itself, thus it is not clear if it can be considered a *LegalDraftWork* (although for now we want to consider it as such). On the other hand it has legal value and greater significance then e.g. some explanations.

*Comment from Thomas Francart*

The intent is that a LegalDraftWork is a document that contains a version of the legislation draft being drafted. So in your case the list of amendments would probably be considered a LegalDraftAmendmentWork.

We probably need to cope with this situation where a list of amendment is given, as this is a pretty common situation, it seems.

## Answer

The class AmendmentToDraftLegislation should be used to describe lists of amendments. The definition of AmendmentToDraftLegislation is modified as such :

“

An amendment created to amend a specific version of a legislation draft.

Amendments can be described and published even if they are not yet voted, or even if they were rejected.

This is meant to identify both a single amendment, or a document containing a list of amendments.

To describe a document containing a list of amendments, the relation has\_part can be used between the instance of AmendmentToDraftLegislationWork identifying the amendment list and each instance of AmendmentToDraftLegislationWork that identifies an individual amendment within the list.

“

# Current stage of a Legislative Project

*From Jaroslaw Deminet (Poland)*

I suggest that *LegislativeProject* has additional *latest\_stage* property that would indicate the stage of the last *LegalActivity*. It would replicate the information from *latest activity*, but would simplify searches. Currently one can use the *occurred at stage* property, inherited from *LegalActivity*, but that sound a little bit strange.

## Answer

Good idea. This is a shortcut for the full path elidl:latest\_stage/elidl:occurred\_at\_stage.

The property current\_stage is introduced, from LegislativeProcess to LegislativeProcessStage.

This can used to indicate the current stage of a LegislativeProcess even if its subactivities is not known.

# Naming considerations

*From Office of Publications*

* Change “used\_work” (which comes from FRBRoo naming) into something more explicit;
* LegislativeProject 🡪 LegislativeProcess
* LegalActivity 🡪 LegislativeActivity
* LegislativeProjectWork 🡪 LegislativeProcessWork
* LegalDraftWork 🡪 DraftLegislationWork
* LegalDraftAmendmentWork 🡪 AmendmentToDraftLegislationWork
* LegalDraftRelatedWork 🡪 RelatedWorkToDraftLegislation (or RelatedToDraftLegislationWork)

## Answer

* “used\_work” is renamed to “involved\_work”
* LegislativeProject is renamed to LegislativeProcess
  + Consequently, all properties starting with legislative\_project\_xxxx are renamed to legislative\_process\_xxx
  + Consequently, the classes LegislativeProjectStatus, Type and Stage are renamed to LegislativeProcessXxxxxx
* LegalActivity is renamed to LegislativeActivity
* LegislativeProjectWork is renamed to LegislativeProcessWork
  + Consequently, the properties legislative\_project\_work\_number, legislative\_project\_work\_version, legislative\_project\_work\_date, legislative\_project\_work\_description, legislative\_project\_work\_type and creator are renamed to legislative\_process\_work\_xxx
  + Consequently, LegislativeProjectWorkType is renamed to LegislativeProcessWorkType
* LegalDraftWork is renamed to DraftLegislationWork
* LegalDraftAmendmentWork is renamed to AmendmentToDraftLegislationWork
* LegalDraftRelatedWork is removed from the model (generic class LegislativeProcessWork should be used instead)

# Be able to distinguish documents based on their status (“preparatory” vs. “final”) in addition to their nature

*From Office of Publications*

The class hierarchy (LegislativeProjectWork 🡪 LegalDraft Work, LegalDraftAmendmentWork, LegalDraftRelatedWork) separates the documents by their *nature (or type of content)*, but it is also useful to separate them by their *status*, in particular to indicate if something is in “preparatory” phase or if it is in “final” version. E.g. an amendment to the draft legislation can itself be in preparatory status, as well as any other related document to the draft legislation.

It was suggested to not mix both point of views (content and status) in the same class hierarchy, but add the status as an orthogonal information. E.g. a document can be classified under “LegalDraftAmendmentWork” if it is an amendment, and at the same time under (to-be-introduced) “PreparatoryWork” if it is a preparatory status, or “FinalWork” if it is a tabled amendment.

## Answer

The literal property “legislative\_process\_work\_version” on class LegislativeProcessWork is turned into an object project. It can be used to indicate the version of a work. This can be used to indicate the status of any document in the legislative workflow. 2 values are proposed : “Preparatory” and “Final”. The list of possible document statuses/versions can be extended by implementors.

# Works of unknown nature

*From Office of Publications*

Sometimes it is unclear whether a document corresponds to a new version of the legislative draft (LegalDraftWork), an amendment (LegalDraftAmendmentWork), or another related document (LegalDraftRelatedDocument).

Sometimes also the same document can contain mixed content : a new version of the legislation plus a related explanatory memorandum.

To cope with these situtations, ELI-DL allows to use the superclass (LegislativeProjectWork) when the nature is unknown, or give multiple types to a single document, if needed.

Sometimes it can be clear that the document is a not a new version of the legislative document, but it is not possible to say whether it is a related document or a amendments. In that case it is suggested to have a broader category that encompasses both related documents and amendments

## Answer

* If the exact nature of a document is unknown, use the generic class “LegislativeProcessWork”.
* It is possible to assign multiple types to an entity
* For composite documents, it is possible to describe their subparts as independent works, with their own description, and related to the main document with eli:is\_part\_of. The domain of eli:is\_part\_of is broaden to the class Work.

# Related documents should always relate to a version of the draft legislation

*From Office of Publications*

Related documents (LegalDraftRelatedWorks), as well as amendments (LegalDraftAmendments) should in principle always relate to a specific version of the draft legislation (LegalDraftWork), even though this information is not always easy to find.

## Answer

We acknowledge this, however we believe it should not be enforced formally in the model as a mandatory constraint.

# Change in properties

*From Office of Publications*

It is suggested to introduce a single date on activities, instead of start\_date / end\_date, as this date has a legal value;

## Answer

“activity\_date” is introduced in the model to capture a single date on an activity.