

**Minutes meeting national CCR-co-ordinators
(or deputies)
Meertens Institute, Amsterdam
(23-03-2015)**

Ineke Schuurman & Menzo Windhouwer

Present: (Deputy) coordinators:

- AT: Matej Ďurčo
- CZ: Dan Zeman
- DE: Axel Herold
- DLU & NL: Ineke Schuurman (minutes)
- EE: Kista Liin
- NO: Oddrun Ohren
- PL: Marcin Oleksy

and especially for technical support (CLARIN ERIC)

- Menzo Windhouwer

Dorte Haltrup Hansen (coordinator DA) was not able to attend the meeting.

In the morning session Menzo Windhouwer gave a presentation on the background of the CLARIN Concept Registry (CCR). After that he gave a short technical presentation and

mentioned some issues, like the one on 'notation':¹ In CCR all notations within a specific are to be unique within a Concept Scheme (cf. ISOcat Profile). Just before lunch there was a hands-on session.

After lunch, Ineke Schuurman gave a presentation on the content of the registry, proposing that the CCR should cover all concepts used in the CLARIN community:

- components of (international) standards, especially those recommended by CLARIN,
- components of *de facto* standards,
- other concepts (legacy!)

The (preferred) English labels should cover one concept a time and consist of full words. Complex tags should be split up and written out in full.

As far as the definitions are concerned, the golden rule is

- Definitions should be
 - as general as possible
 - as specific as necessary

This means that definitions should not be made language and/or project specific (not “In Dutch a noun ...” or “In CGN a noun is ...”, etc.) Of course, when a specific theory or concept scheme really asks for a definition not yet available, a new entry is to be created. But in principle an existing definition (after our first clean-up (!), cf below) is to be adopted, if necessary after a small change.

Note that semantic changes are not allowed in order to keep CCR reliable. If needed a new concept can be created, and optionally the old concept can be marked as 'deleted' (deprecated/superseded). Future versions of the CCR might be enabled to store the successor relationship explicitly,

Furthermore, definitions should be concise and unambiguous. Concepts used in the definition should be linked to their URI (for example in the Note(s)) or via specific textual markup).

The proposals wrt the content of the CCR in the powerpoint-presentation were accepted by the other CCR coordinators. This approach asks for close collaboration between the people allowed to edit the CCR.²

¹cf. the ISOcat Identifier showing the name in camelCase.

²Unlike ISOcat, all changes are immediately public, i.e. visible for everybody.

It was therefore proposed to work with a spreadsheet in Google docs, which allows all of us to add comments etc.³ When new proposals are done, all coordinators in principle have up to two weeks to react.⁴ Ineke Schuurman was asked to take the lead (and she accepted).

We will start with a clean-up of the current content, not adding new entries until that has been done. Matej and Axel propose to start with the Concepts related to the revised VLO facets as proposed by the VLO Taskforce. These will soon become available. This is a limited set, and should already be in pretty good shape.

This proposal was accepted.

The meeting ended shortly after 16h.

PS We are currently working on the notations, which in CCR are to be unique per concept scheme. And Menzo already solved some of the technical bugs (like the default language).

³Menzo will come up with a design that allows a smooth upload in CCR.

⁴We will adapt this somewhat in the holiday season