PARTICIPANTS:			
Full Name	**Country**	**Organisation**	**E-mail**
Mick Cory	EuroGeographics	EuroGeographics	mick.cory@eurogeographics.org
Marjana Zelic	EuroGeographics	EuroGeographics	marjana.zelic@eurogeogrpahics.org
Angela Baker	EuroGeographics	EuroGeographics	angela.baker@eurogeographics.org
Carol Agius	EuroGeographics	EuroGeographics	carol.agius@eurogeographics.org
Dominik Kopczewski	EuroGeographics	EuroGeographics	dominik.kopczewski@eurogeographics.org
Saulius Urbanas	EuroGeographics	EuroGeographics	saulius.urbanas@eurogeographics.org
Derek Earnshaw	EuroGeographics	EuroGeographics	derek.earnshaw@eurogeographics.org
Rhian French	EuroGeographics	EuroGeographics	rhian.french@threetreespr.co.uk
Abigail Page	EuroGeographics	Eurogeographics	abigail.page@eurogeographics.org
Gerda Schennach	Austria	BEV	gerda.schennach@bev.gv.at
Pia Åbo Østergaard	Denmark	The Danish Geodata Agency	piaoe@gst.dk
Heli Ursin	Finland	National Land Survey of Finland	heli.ursin@nls.fi
François Chirié	France	IGNF	francois.chirie@ign.fr
Neil Sutherland	Great Britain	Ordnance Survey	neil.sutherland@os.uk
Ashley Wright	Great Britain	Ordnance Survey Great Britain	ashley.wright@os.uk
Eva Lucas-Harbula	Hungary	Government Office of the Capital City Budapest Department of Geodesy Remote Sensing and Land Offices	harbula.eva@fomi.hu
Tamás Palya	Hungary	BFKH	palya.tamas@fomi.hu
Hugh Mangan	Ireland	Ordnance Survey Ireland	hugh.mangan@osi.ie
Tony Murphy	Ireland	Ordnance Survey Ireland	tony.murphy@osi.ie
Ettore POGGI	Italy	Italian Military Geographic Institute	e2009poggi@alice.it
Valdis Berzins	Latvia	Latvian Geospatial Information Agency	valdis.berzins@lgia.gov.lv
Arvydas Dotas	Lithuania	State enterprise Center of Registers, Lithuania	arvydas.dotas@registrucentras.lt
Carol Valentino	Malta	Planning Authority Malta	carol.valentino@pa.org.mt
Tomas Martin Holtan	Norway	Norwegian Mapping Authority	tomas.martin.holtan@kartverket.no
Ewa Surma	Poland	Head Office of Geodesy and Cartogaphy	ewa.surma@gugik.gov.pl

Antonio Arozarena	Spain	Instituto Geográfico Nacional	aarozarena@fomento.es
Amalia Velasco	Spain	Spanish Directorate General for cadastre	amalia.velasco@catastro.minhap.es
Bobo Tideström	Sweden	Lantmäteriet, Sweden	bobo.tidestrom@lm.se
André Streilein	Switzerland	Swisstopo	andre.streilein@swisstopo.ch
Dick Eertink	The Netherlands	Kadaster	dick.eertink@kadaster.nl
Dmitry Akulenko	Russia	The Federal Service for State Registration, cadastre and Cartography	akulenko.dm@gmail.com
Maria Cabello	Spain	GHC/TC	mcabello@tracasa.es

AGENDA - 10th May2017		
Time	**Topic**	**Lead**
15:00	Opening and short introduction of each participant	Dominik Koptzewski/Ashley Wright
15:15	Chairs reports on previous actions of both KENs	Dominik Koptzewski/Ashley Wright
15:35	Head Office updates and representation	Mick Cory
15:45	New issues of interest - policy tracking record	Marjana Zelic
16:00	UN-GGIM / Europe and related activities	Carol Aguis
16:30	Report from Cadastre issues related to policy Task Force	Amalia Velasco
17:00	Report from Copernicus Task Force	Francois Chirie
AGENDA - 11th May 2017		
09:00	BIKEN issues/report/presentation and discussion	Ashley Wright
09:45	INSPIRE MIG-P - update Land and Poverty World bank conference 2017 – summary	Ewa Surma
10:00	Digital Single Market Task Force report and discussion	Neil Sutherland
11:00	Tour of the table – national issues, updates, issues for debate	All
12:15	AOB	All
12:30	Summary and closing remarks	Chair
NOTES DAY 1		

As one of the chairs, Dominik Kopczewski welcomed participants and introduced agenda and purpose of the meeting which is the identification of the cross cut of POLKEN and BIKEN; how to collaborate better; and how to improve cooperation with EUROSDR.

Mick Cory supports this opportunity of joint work stating that the policy landscape is a very diverse in every country and there are EU policies influences beyond EU: accession countries, partnership, etc.

Some of the policy areas are covered but there are areas with policy implications such as automated vehicles, Copernicus and wider space policies which are relevant and also have implications to our members, e.g. Galileo, GNSS, DSM has to remain in focus as well as ISA[2] and Horizon 2020.

The importance of the work of this group was recognized through its previous work as this group did represent members on Copernicus legislation, some of our words are in the regulation.

Marjana gave an overview of the EuroGeographics policy tracking activities and topics list.

Please see Marjana's presentation at http://www.eurogeographics.org/sites/default/files/Marjana.pdf

Carol Agius gave a presentation on "UN GGIM Europe a year in review".

Please see Carol's presentation at http://www.eurogeographics.org/sites/default/files/Carol.pdf

Francois Chirie presented a new framework partnership agreement.

Please see Francois' presentation at http://www.eurogeographics.org/sites/default/files/Francois.pdf

NOTES DAY 2

The co-chair Ashley represented on "Cooperation and coordination and what we can bring to our membership"

Please see Ashley's presentation at http://www.eurogeographics.org/sites/default/files/Ashley.pdf

Presentation was introduction to the overall discussion, bringing briefly:
- We were close to merging in the stage of pricing and licensing of our products, but joint meetings are fine and KEN chair talking to each other and discussing topic for agenda would contribute to mitigate duplication
- It is opportunity of networking; there is greater benefits if we cooperate; however we have to find how is best to progress this cooperation
- It is smart to collaborate, but we have to focus on one thing at a time. For example the greater use of our data should be the main focus for the BiKEN.
- All KENs do not cover everything that goes on in our organisation, for example distribution and development, and technical part is also of our interest. KENs are not only for exchange of knowledge, they are for practical support / work as well e.g. POLKEN has implementing role in the representation, BIKEN can do defining in pricing & licensing; we have to be aware of the new requirements. Merging will not be the solution for solving the challenges.   Merging would be a risk as we could become too narrow, we should keep wider.
- POLKEN should be more strategically oriented s; there are many policy topics which are not business issues at this stage. It is a risk if strategy comes only from POLKEN, we have to look at the trends and what our customer needs are, how do we store the data and how we make society to use our data – that is the main reason how to do; we look at the potential of new usage and new customers.

- Having open data we might discuss if we need pricing and licensing model as EuroGeographics. Maybe new KEN could be option.
- Creating and maintaining the KEN work plan is quite important, it would then be easier to see what the other KENs are up to. We can work with any KEN, but most of focus is one or two specific KENs. We can make a POLKEN summary and go to INSPIRE KEN for example.
- It will be useful to have conclusions of the KENs work in the newsletter.
- Users do not care in which KEN the question is raised, so the list of the topics would be appreciated.
- We should be discussing what is going on around, to encourage people to come back to the meeting as they find it useful, specific info could be through webinar, newsletter, or document, if it is only through presentations it will not get anywhere.
- The most useful level is if you know how important it is for your organization
- Policy could be driver for business activities.
- POLKEN and BIKEN should not merge, BIKEN should be focussed on business outcomes
- There are confusing messages about European Location Services – it is critical but how should the NMCA's be responding, is it immediately. European Location Services have not been mentioned in any of the KEN reports, and therefore it is not clear what the focus is from EuroGeographics and the links to its core activities.
- Networking is really important, specifically to understand the challenges that other organisations are facing. For example, OSI meet with LPS NI and OS GB regularly to understand what is coming and how they are going to manage it. Would like POLKEN and BIKEN to go into more depth to find out what is coming and share experiences. Achieving good levels of participation is important. If the content was more in depth would people devote more time for participation? Do the outcomes from meetings like this drive the participation from members?

Ewa Surma gave presentation on Land and Poverty World bank conference 2017 – summary and update on INSPIRE MIG – P.

Please see Ewa's presentation at http://www.eurogeographics.org/sites/default/files/Ewa.pdf

Neil reported on Digital Single Market developments.

Please see Neil's presentation at http://www.eurogeographics.org/sites/default/files/Neil.pdf

TOUR OF THE TABLE

DENMARK

Have free and open data of cadastre, interesting business model where made partnership with private company who want to use us a quality stamp – is the issue of main concern. Participant wanted to hear more about this but has not, found the topics interesting regardless.

NORWAY

Data is open. Have made a partnership with Incubator (private) to run the community events (like hackathons to children) as it was getting too large. We must know our users and what they want to use the data for, and in which technology. Thinks technology is driving the development not policy. Wants to see more about what technologies are the driving forces in driving data, wants to more proactive not reactive. Wants to be more prepared for this. Also wants to get the whole organisation to think more innovatively as well which is hard. This is all under innovation and development. Also has this innovation across the Nordic countries (KrisGIS). Need to get this working and this will be the use case.

NETHERLAND

Concern is data protection, GDPR regulation, we are implanting that at the same it is implemented in national legislation, and there are implications on cadastre and land registry.
At strategic level are trying to use the SDG of the UN to define the strategy. This is important because it comes down to societal value. In terms of technology, working on linked data as a new method of access to their data; currently available building, addresses, topo objects and cadastral parcels. Curious about how this will be received by users. Working on providing access through API services. Also give more possibilities to manage the service use and be able to charge for relatively high use services.

Are there any experiences within your organisations with charging for services on Open Data? Trying to develop pricing strategy on these open data services. ACTION: All to contact Dick if relevant.

Blockchain is also interesting, it is felt that land registry will be managed with this technology. They don't think this will fully replace the land registry for the upcoming decades but already see that there are live applications of the blockchain for real property. This is really interesting to see and might be a first step into the future where ownership will be managed differently. Taking small steps into exploring this technology, pilot was finished a month ago and made a live implementation using Blockchain for checking if information was delivered at a certain point in time from their registers, and if it would be changed (change in the data) over time. It proved that this could be quite simply implemented in a blockchain and thinking of using this functionality in an application for building permits to prove that people used the correct info at the time of application. Now working together in a national blockchain coalition where they are trying to come to some agreement on digital identities of people but also objects.

Also developing a 3D topo model. Need to understand user possibilities and how to make this sustainable.

What3words: trying to have uniform address system across the world, grid of 3x3m and each grid is identified by 3 words…https://what3words.com/ May be useful in countries where there is no uniform way of defining addresses.

Second question: The Open ELS project needs to collect research materials on the economic effects of implementing open (spatial) data. ACTION: If you have any knowledge of research done on this topic in your country then please contact Dick. AW reminded DE of the link with Delft University.

POLAND

Adopted a program for open public data in 2016, not only spatial data, but budget, education etc. Spatial data – national register of geographical names are on the 2nd place of use - popularity, as well as data on polish monuments, protected sites.

On-going cadastral project ZSIN (Integrated Real Estate Information System) - repository of cadastral data, National database of utilities networks - K-GESUT and Centre of Spatial Analysis for Public Administration –CAPAP. Also on-going works on 3D data models.

Since January this year there is a change on coordination level in terms of SDI - the coordinator of the entire infrastructure is the minister of digital affairs (former was the minister of public administration)

SWEDEN

Has research on the value on Open data and will soon be reporting to the government on benefits and value. The researcher has not looked into anything about innovations and growth. Found that the value is higher than the cost. But the data at the moment is complex and expensive. Are building delivery systems based on complex business models?

Also looking into Blockchain with regards Land register.

LATVIA

Country with two million inhabitants, very small country so agency is only one. Tasks and functions then very wide; responsibilities including military projects, international projects, responsible for INSPIRE directive, etc. Challenge is Open data as well. Need to calculate real benefits in money but it may be impossible. They are only at the beginning.

SPAIN

In Spanish Cadastre they have a new director. Have three very big plans:

1. Improving cartography with a lot of investment, difficult as it is cadastre. Have money from government to do this. Are now working to see in which areas the cartography is not as good as it should be.
2. Have to define a system to evaluate the whole country in terms of real estate
3. Are now working together with Land Registry and the result is Digital First, before it was in parallel. So it meant that there was sometimes different data. Now the process is defined that begins with the digitisations of the parcel, and this is going to the all other agencies first, and it only goes with 16 digits, and all info is in Cadastre's system. Need to have a flexible digital model for the buildings.
ACTION: Would like EuroGeographics to investigate BIM as they think this will be the future as sometimes this is obligatory for the constructors. There is a lot of BIM activity in the UK.

LITHUANIA

New director starting soon. He highlighted that he is interested in open data. Main issue is the understanding what is open data, what value does it bring etc. Have started on open data initiatives and have participated in hackathons, with good results (new ideas, solutions and specifications).

Valuable partnership with researches University who are using our data and they are providing a lot of interesting ideas. The funding and data management is the key issue. Welcome opportunity to share ideas today.

AUSTRIA

Have an open data, but not for free, data are accessible for everyone, but there are fees, we changed our pricing

regime couple years ago, we are more focusing on providing services rather than data which is also demand from private sector.

GREAT BRITAN

Impact of Brexit is not yet clear, but no immediate impact on OS; we are not directly affected having not a lot of customers or suppliers in Europe. Structured reorganization is underway, three new customer facing units: public task (to be known as OSGB), commercial oriented (OS Ventures) and consumer unit.

Bidding for roles in Smart cities, 5G, connected and autonomous vehicles, packages of innovative activities.

IRELAND

Engaged in linked data, boundaries collaboration with central statistical office.
Open data sets - have to fund operation single licence for public sector bodies, we still licence to big companies.
Capability to deliver GIS.
Considering pricing mechanism to move from fixed prices to more fluid.
Investing in positioning networks.

FRANCE

French government is pushing for the data, but they cannot compensate us. Proposed new licence to open data but only for public tasks, research, and education.

MALTA

We have all GI data which is available for free for viewing on our geoportal - http://www.pa.org.mt/mepa-mapserver.

Full coverage is subject to Contractual Agreements and Annual licence fees depend on the usage and number of users.

ITALY

Also in 2017 we have to cope with another 5% reduction of funds granted by our superior Authorities for international cooperation (i.e.: subscription fees, activities and missions).

Nowadays, we have the primary need to solve some internal problems: manpower reduction, production costs and funding and, in particular, regulatory legal aspects regarding licensing for the use of our final data produced. The most important issue to be accomplished, indeed, is to create a unique license model able to mediate all the different constraints imposed by the various data providers (Regions) for their data we use to make our National Synthesis Data Base (DBSN).
This license model, when achieved, may arrive to be very articulated in order to surely meet the above already mentioned different needs and last but not least also the Administrative regulations of our Ministry of Defense.

EG Members can be better supported in reaching their governments and national and European decision makers and in building their awareness on possibilities, needs and risks arising from new trends and projects**.**
Pol-KEN, BI-KEN as well as all the other EG KENs are representing, for sure, useful "tools" to members and to our Association's MB, but it is important <u>not</u> to forget that only the MB is the right "arena" where the already identified

topics can be considered more or less important. When they are considered very important**,** so there is an emergency on going, those topics should be passed, without losing valuable time (i.e.: using again the "bottom-up" approach), by the EG MB members and the EG SG & ED to the UN-GGIM: Europe Executive Committee in order to be discussed and to make possible the needed quickest reactions/outcomes within the different (UN) European Member States. For UN-GGIM:Europe (taking care of the best kind of geospatial information management) and surely for its European National Representatives, as a matter of fact, will be easier to reach the attention of the same national Authorities that charged them to represent their own countries' interests in this field as well as to make also possible the most appropriate links / approaches to their MEPs or other national VIPs operating within the European Institutions.

The above already mentioned actions (i.e.: to choose finally the different approach "top-down"), can also help, in the future, to reduce or fully avoid problems of speed between EG members in reacting to the new trends and projects as it has not been possible to be done for ELF and/or still for ELS.

If for some unknown circumstances, it will not be possible to reach what suggested within the above point nr.3, it is always possible to start thinking to transform EG in an European Geographic General Directorate or Office, like Eurostat already is for the statistics matters. This will immediately allow EG, as another new operational body of the European Commission not to miss any future opportunities relating to be tasked for all the geospatial data production (Copernicus in situ reference data included). Moreover in this way also EG and all its projects and activities shall be automatically funded by EC. Founds that can be distributed by the future new EG to its linked and dependent NMCAs (European and not… but, with the most appropriate legal and administrative formula, somehow always associated).

It would be good to consider also the possibility to organize all the future October General Assemblies in Bruxelles, where MEPs and other EU representatives can be more easily invited to attend. In this way EG shall be more visible to them and at the same time savings can be made in terms of costs and organization of the events.

AOB and Conclusions

The main outcome is that we should run an open data workshop where we look at Open Data Policy and the economic benefits. This could link in with some of the Open ELS activities that we need to deliver in terms of Open data Policy, licensing etc. We need to think about it more but perhaps we could have an aim of coming up with an EG Open data policy out of the event, that could then be given to members to help them develop their own national policies, and would help us with our Open ELS deliverable. We need to chat more but I think this is all tying in nicely together.

BIM also seems quite interesting and we could easily arrange an event on this.

Proposal for next meeting of the PolKEN

> 1 Nov 2017 Dublin in the premises of the Ordnance Survey Ireland.
> Rationale: on 2-3 November 2017 in Dublin the European Forum for Geography and Statistics organizes its annual Conference in cooperation with the Central Statistics Office Ireland and Ordnance Survey Ireland. This conference intends to showcase the current work in the integration of statistics and geography under the following categories:

- Open and Linked Data,

- Visualisation of official statistics,
- The United Nations Agendas for the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) and Global Geospatial Information Management (GGIM),
- INSPIRE,
- Big Data and the Environment,
- Census 2020 geography.

Holding the PolKEN meeting in Dublin prior to the EFGS Conference would allow our members to take part in both events.

Having in regard that 1st of November for many of us is a holiday in order to commence further arrangements we would kindly ask for filling doodle survey regarding the dates that will suit your preferences

http://doodle.com/poll/mntn5u6iakvkdtey