

Policy Knowledge Exchange Network (POLKEN)

Meeting Minutes

Date: Tuesday, 11th February 2020

Time: from 11:00 to 15:30 CET

Venue: EGHO, Rue du Nord 76 Bruxelles, and first part via webinar

Chair: Mick Cory, SG&ED

Agenda

	Time	Topic	Lead
1.	11:00	Welcome and introduction from the Chair	Mick Cory
2.	11:30	High Value Datasets (HVD)	Martina Barbero from Deloitte
3.	12:00	Round table national reports	All including webinar
	End of live stream		
	13:00	Working lunch	
4.	13:15	UNGGIM update	Carol Aguis
5.	13:30	The shape of the new Commission and other EU bodies	Marjana Zelic
6.	13:45	Strategy and key topics of interest for 2020	Mick Cory
7.	14:15	The role of PolKEN - informing members of the committees on our views; receiving updates; creating position and briefing papers; roles and responsibilities of EGHO & members; logistics (frequency of meetings etc).	Mick Cory
8.	15:00	Discussion	All
9.	15:30	Close and AOB	Mick Cory

Main points of discussion

1. Welcome and introduction from the Chair

Mick welcomed and introduced participants. Brief overview of the agenda.

2. High Value Datasets (HVD)

Topic was presented by Martina Barbero from Deloitte, consultant appointed by the Commission, to perform study into High Value Data sets for the Open Data PSI Directive, to inform future Implementing Acts.

Martina introduced the study, concept, methodology and study team: Deloitte, Open data institute, The Green Land and Lisbon Council. Slides to be with permission of the Commission. **ACTION MZ**

Next 3 months are key for data collection activity in term of contacting key stakeholder like EG. Help is needed to identify who is the best person on the national level for interviews. Francesca de Chiara is contact for geospatial theme; she is a coordinator and there is a core team open for any questions and input in any form. Team will coordinate with Mick on what stakeholders are necessary to speak to. **ACTION MJC**

Public hearing is planned for the summer 2020 and first report and workshop in September 2020.

Q Berny: Are you also taking the developments of the INPIRE directive into account, on what have been produced over there?

A Deloitte: Yes, we should take it into account.

Q. Gerda: Implementation of the directive is expected within next 2 years and we need to define HVD now on national level. How is the interlink on what are you doing and in national level?

A Deloitte: MS will have one year of the implementation period after the publication of the Implementing act. You might have activities now, but you don't know what will be the content of the Implementing act.

Q Antonio A: On the global level we talk on fundamental data themes and we speak on the same topic for 10 years. The problem is the cost of the production accuracy and update and the 2 is to include end users of national level and have to be involved from the beginning.

A Deloitte: 6 different areas and value could be present in different ways. The Commission will be able to negotiate.

Q Hugh: Will competition issue be considered on EU or national level?

A Deloitte: IPR concerns, public private matters have to be specified. We are interested in cases you are aware of, please forward.

Q Dick: Are you looking as scope specifically at the INSPIRE themes or beyond? Combination of geospatial and personal data as different countries have different prospective of personal data?

A Deloitte: Scope is to be looked widely, not restricted to INSPIRE scope. Personal data is of special concern, they cannot be disclosed, it will be risk assessment. There should not be any conflict of HVD and personal data.

Q Olav: Any consideration to include marine data?

A Deloitte: Under consideration, not been discussed yet.

Q Morton: The scoping of task 4 doing the analyses is to assess European wide impacts and benefits of having HVD

A Deloitte: to develop economic reliable model which provide figures, and all countries will be in scope.

Q Eydis: Iceland made HVD as a test to their Ministry, it is more focusing on economy rather than environmental, is it ok?

A Deloitte: Economic value is one of the categories but is not the only one, environment is the important one. All benefits are equally important.

Q Anti: What is the relation between this study and newly published report on the Open data portal? Is there any connection? They somehow deal with same questions.

A Deloitte: This study is required by the Directive; this is regulatory requirement to have in-depth study on this issue.

Q Ula: For geospatial domain, the value is when it is used as a reference data. Will any other indicators be considered in your study?

A Deloitte: Yes, we are looking to specific indicators for specific themes.

3. Round table national reports

Croatia

State Geodetic Administration of the Republic of Croatia is cooperating with the Information Commissioner of the Republic of Croatia, who is in charge for the implementation of the Open data and PSI directive. We are discussing the problem of defining high-value dataset and are following all activities on the European level. As a national contact point for INSPIRE in Croatia, we are trying to raise the awareness on this.

Slovakia

have established a so-called Data Office, which is in charge of matters related to informatisation and electronation of state administration. The Data Office is also responsible for activities related to the determination of High Value Datasets for our country. The office decided to create a questionnaire where they asked not only the stakeholders but also the professional public, which datasets they consider to be the HVD. The survey outcome was about 60 datasets in three categories - Geospatial, Meteorological and Earth observation and environment. Names of those datasets were translated and sent to the Commission within the deadline. Our institution (Geodesy, Cartography and Cadastre Authority) also participated in completing the questionnaire. We decided to suggest those kinds of

datasets which we already provide or intent to provide as open data. Majority of them fall within the INSPIRE scope but there is also other kind of geospatial data (see list below). In the house we agreed on these datasets:

1. Orthophoto
2. Digital elevation model
3. Geographical names
4. Topographic data from the whole Slovakia
5. Administrative units
6. Geodetic control
7. INSPIRE Cadastral Parcel
8. Digital model of quasigeoid - DMQSK2014-E (The model is designed to convert ellipsoidal heights in ETRS89 system determined by the GNSS method to the EVRS normal height system (EVRF2007))

The Netherlands

Dutch is in touch with a Ministry, have a good contact, and also with some other organisations such as chamber of commerce. We point that our data are already open, we use kind of platform. We don't have a mapping issue as our maps are open, but we are using a kind of platform, huge popular platform so we are discussing a side effect such as funding of services, not charging a data but huge use of data. Dick: We provided inputs to our national representative on the geospatial high value datasets. I sent a copy of these inputs in December. We used a rather 'quick and dirty' approach to this, just looking at the most used datasets in our portal. My observation from today's webinar is that some member states have taken a much more comprehensive approach to define 'their' high value datasets. I am wondering how the Commission will deal with this in respect to the study they have commissioned. I assume that the national inputs will feed into Deloitte's study, but I think it should be made clearer how these interrelate.

Germany BKG

We, the representatives of the Federal Agency for Cartography and Geodesy, have established a list of German geospatial datasets that we consider as High Value Data as the PSI-directive defines. We completed this task following the request of the Commission in November 2019.

The datasets identified on Federal level were sent as an answer to the Commission in December 2019 by the Federal Ministry of Economics.

We are in contact with the Federal Ministry of Interior and the Federal Ministry of Economics that is responsible on national level for the transposition of the Directive in national law and that represents Germany in the Committee on open data and the re-use of public sector information.

As most of the relevant geospatial data is held by the Länder the authorities on Federal level cannot dispose of these data. The Länder discuss the impact of the PSI-directive thoroughly at the moment. The Federal Agency tries to help as much as it can in this process- especially by spreading information.

France

Every French ministry has been asked to produce a list of high value datasets; the gathered lists will constitute the French contribution. Our ministry asked us to contribute. We agreed on a list of six datasets and submitted to the ministry. The list contains the following datasets: National Address

Database, orthoimagery, most themes from topological data, CRD (Core Reference Data) even though it's a prototype, terrestrial elevation data, administrative limits, and cadastre. For every theme, we stressed its connections with core data from UN-GGIM: Europe. It has been accepted and will be integrated into the French proposition for HVDs. Concurrently to the new PSI directive, the French government decided to open geospatial data from the public sector. As from 2021, almost every IGN dataset should be open and available for free, including the products at larger scale and the six themes on the list. Currently discussions are being held to define a sustainable business model taking into account the government's decision.

Germany AdV

According to the Constitution of Germany, the Laender are responsible for national mapping and cadastre. Many of these 16 Competent Authorities of the Laender are set up very differently: Some already have all their data as Open Data, others are depending on revenues and are waiting as long as possible with implementing the PSI directive. The Laender representatives have held a special plenary session in November 2019 to elaborate a statement for the mapping and cadastral authorities that was handed over to the Ministries on federal level competent in the field of the PSI directive

Denmark

Open data directive and HVD is being discussed internally in the Ministry responsible for cadastral and maritime data and with the digitising organisation. They are developing the list which might be considered HVD. Most datasets are already freely available, in that sense is not so much the issue of financing of data, but of course the maintenance of datasets has an economic implication.

Poland

is working close together with respective Ministry, made a proposition of data which be considered HVD, there is a progress in contact.

Spain IGN

for many years producing data which are included in fundamental data themes, Copernicus, it is important to stress that we are spending a lot of money to produce accurate datasets – and is used in Spain but not in Europe where data from the private sector is used.

Island

is involved in making the list of geospatial related HVD. It is created inhouse and become quite large way beyond INSPIRE data themes. Focus is more on society and economy rather than on environment.

Sweden

has a mission from Ministry to coordinate work for all six categories thus created national working groups with national and local representatives. They have proposal now for 300 datasets spread over all six categories. Challenge is a business model which has to be changed.

Austria

set up a Task Force at Federal Ministry for Digital and Economic Affairs with all authorities and institutions or interest groups who might be obliged to provide HVD. Discussion is now on how to define and to make them compatible, financing of the infrastructure and sustainable maintenance is challenging.

Ireland

is involved in open data advisory group, progress in work. Funding the maintenance, and competition are key issues of discussion.

GB

Presented methodology looks right, like the one Geospatial Commission use. Have an early indication on non-transposition of PSI directive into national law. But no formal notice yet.

Norway

most of datasets are open already, the question is on marine data now.

Finland

Ministry of finance is in charge and they have been quite inactive. Our portals are open. Probably they are thinking that this directive is not affecting them much, but for us this is very important issue. Our important issue is how API will be implemented.

Luxemburg

All datasets are open. First contact has taken place and have a very good relationship with person in charge for HVD. Have concern on future AI applications on various datasets and GDPR.

Belgium

still has a part of the income from digital data sales for commercial purpose. Analyse is needed, not only on HVD list but machine-readable requirement as well.

Cyprus

Open data in Cyprus is managed by the Ministry of Finance. For this purpose, a Government open data portal exists, which among others includes open INSPIRE geospatial data sets and e-services. The Department of Lands and Surveys (DLS) has a close cooperation with them, as it was decided to open all INSPIRE datasets and services for free, both for viewing and downloading through DLS Geoportal. Challenge is timely availability, maintenance and sustainability. Users prefer national geospatial data over INSPIRE data, because they are richer in content.

Spain Cadastre

provide INSPIRE data and almost no one is using it. Open all data and study shows that we are boosting economy by doing it as our data is used for taxation.

4 UNGGIM update

5 and the Shape of the new Commission and other EU bodies

Carol and Marjana presented EGHO activities and its role in the overall representation. For more details please see presentations at the members only PolKEN meeting webpage.

6 Strategy and key topics of interest for 2020

Mick presented key topics for 2020 and the future role of PolKEN highlighting the role of national representatives and how we use the MS and clarify messages, coordinating the view ensuing we are aligned.

7 Discussion on the role of PolKEN

Difference between national and EG interest is a political issue. One of the most important topic for EG is to demonstrate at Member State, EU and UN level, the risk of not using the same information at all levels, to explain and demonstrate advantages, disadvantages and risks to international bodies about not using NMCA data. Second point is to facilitate access to information; besides this the accessibility and the quality of the data is important.

It was mentioned that EEA and Eurostat will both attempt to produce pan-European datasets. So, there will be two pan-European datasets - demonstrate the political and economic risk of doing this.

Data policy and the quality of data are the key issues.

As public authorities we are in conflict as we have mandate to our government and no direct mandate for EU.

Just to wait for money from the commission is not a good idea.

It will be good to know what country has what? When they ask data, we were not ready.

We have to intermediate and bring initiatives together like on this meeting.

There is no common geospatial policy at EU level – if EG convince the commission that one unit is needed.

New initiatives which are not spatially related are also important – how do we cope with artificial intelligence and Data Now. Energy performance – topic to be tracked.

It is important to exchange our national positions.

Building a use cases – GISCO is one and Copernicus is another.

Sustainable funding is key.

We should know what the quality of data of the countries is.

EG needs to know what every country has, for many years members were selling the data or did not have it. So, the impression has to change.

Next GISCO/Eurostat will present a new strategy in term of complying and harmonising pan-european data directly from MS. At the last meeting with BKG they confirmed that they would like the direct contact with NMCA. EG as supporting association for this network – this is a new challenge.

Forum is needed to get the position clear on. Geospatial focus point at the commission and we need to be ready for the answers at different levels.

EG should lobby for a clear home of GI policy in Europe.

The tender for Copernicus was mentioned and use of opensource data. A 'friendly' letter as written asking that they use official data next time. And they came across as being reluctant and that it was very complicated. Thinks that HVD can be positive in that regard, as a signal. A value proposition, a focused message in order to penetrate.

Demonstrate the value of a geospatial voice is by highlighting use-cases. The role of PolKEN is to identify the advocates and help articulate and clarify the message.

8. Next steps

- Mick to ask EU heads for contact person for communicating Deloitte and supporting study team. **ACTION MJC**
- Possibility of the high-level letter after Data strategy document is published. Content of the letters to be submitted through national representative as well. **ACTION EGHO**
- Consensus of importance of the new format of PolKEN.
- agreed that special attention is required at national level by our members and providing feedback to EG.
- Meetings will continue; two physical and two online per year.
- Points for the next agenda: practical running of the PolKEN – work in between meetings.

Participants			
Name		Organisation	Contact details
1.	Andreas Hadjiraftis	The Department of Lands and Surveys, Cyprus	ahadjiraftis@dls.moi.gov.cy
2.	Berny Kersten	Cadastre, Land Registry and Mapping Agency, The Netherlands	berny.kersten@kadaster.nl
3.	Bernard REISCH	Administration du cadastre et de la topographie, Luxembourg	bernard.reisch@act.etat.lu
4.	Matt Goodman	Ordnance Survey GB	Matt.Goodman@os.uk
5.	Hugh Mangan	Ordnance Survey Ireland	hugh.mangan@osi.ie
6.	Pier-Giorgio	BKG Germany	Pier-Giorgio.Zaccheddu@bkg.bund.de
7.	Amalia Velasco	Spanish DG for Cadastre	amalia.velasco@catastro.minhafp.es
8.	Marcus Wandinger	AdV Germany	AdV.GS@ldbv.bayern.de
9.	Morten Nordahl Møller	Agency for Data Supply and Efficiency, Denmark	momol@sdf.dk
10.	Johanna Fröjdenlund	Lantmäteriet Sweden	johanna.frojdenlund@lm.se
11.	Antonio Arozarena	IGN Spain	aarozarena@fomento.es

12.	Olav Petter Aarrestad	Kartverket, Norway	olav.petter.aarrestad@kartverket.no
13.	Antti Kosonen	NLS Finland	antti.kosonen@nls.fi
14.	Clément Godin	IGN France	Clement.Godin@ign.fr
15.	Eric BAYERS	IGN Belgium	eric.bayers@ngi.be
16.	Gerda Schennach	BEV, Austria	Gerda.Schennach@bev.gv.at
HEAD OFFICE TEAM			
17.	Mick Cory, Chair	EGHO	mick.cory@eurogeographics.org
18.	Carol Aguis, KE Coordinator	EGHO	Carol.Agius@eurogeographics.org
19.	Marjana Zelic, PolKEN Secretary	EGHO	marjana.zelic@eurogeographics.org