Q-Ken, Paris Oct 2016

Wednesday 19th Oct

Intro; Jonathan Holmes unable to attend for personal reasons; wi-fi pass: Z@XkenE!$1

General introduction by attendees for the benefit of new members

Change to agenda:

Terminology – Tomas

ELF – Dominique Laurent

Review of Action Log

23 – Complete

40 – as per action log

57 – Continue to work on identifying contact within member organisations

58 – Closed

79 – in Progress

81 – Closed

91 – Discussed at last CC meeting in Budapest, Sept 2016; in progress

96 – On agenda

97 – Closed

98 – Closed

99 – Complete

100 – On Paris agenda

News from Head Office:

Overview of Eurogeographics

Common Vision Conference 2016 – good reports;

Inspire KEN – June 2016

9th Regional Conference on Cadastre & Spatial Data Infrastructure – June 2016

Technical Producers 2016 – pan-European products (EBM, ERM, EGM)

Eurogeographics General Assembly 2016

Rapid Access to Authoritative Maps for Emergency Services

UN-GGIM: Europe Secretariat

Communications – YouTube – private channel for Eurogeographics; newsletter; Eurogeographics Facebook page

ELF – Eurogeographics taking ownership of the ELF 'product'

KEN – 8 networks

KEN review – consultation process with all Member Orgs from CEO to member

Head Office Team

ELF – ELS; ELF is a funded project; ELS is a service that sustains itself.

Future Meetings:

Next meeting (Spring) in Ljubljana, Slovenia – Wed 5th – Fri 7th April 2017

Autumn meeting – Frankfurt, Germany – October 18th – 20th (dates to be confirmed)

Action: PH to discuss hosting spring 2018 Q-KEN in Dublin meeting with CEO.

Status of ISO 19100 Guidelines:

Chapter 5 – send documentation to organisations to update their information

Action: Gunhild to send docs to contributing orgs to update information; also send doc to group for review

National Reports:

11 reports:

Belgium (in absentia); IGN France; BKG Germany; NMCA SA Greece; Land Reg, England & Wales; OS, GB (in absentia); FÖMI, Hungary; OSi, Ireland; SLS, Latvia; IGN, Spain; Landmäteriet, Sweden;

Selection of Presentations:

Open Data – IGN France

MRDS – OSi

Document digitising project – Land Reg. England & Wales

1 pres from France; BKG; Latvia; OSi; Land Reg, England & Wales

Webinar: OSGB; more discussion on Friday am.

Host Presentation: IGN Deputy Director General Sylvain Latarget

Following is the content of his welcome speech:

/START

IGN is happy to receive you in its premises and welcomes you.

I would like to share with you IGN's view about the reasons why the Quality-KEN is very useful to help National and Cadastral Mapping Agencies (NMCAs) to better meet the requirements from their governments and from all their users.

First most of the exchanges of good practices that take place within EuroGeographics show that a very important requirement from most governments is the following: the data and services supplied by NMCAs should be authoritative. This is all the more important as geospatial data and services supplied by Internet Giants as well as by crowd sourcing initiatives are not authoritative.

In this respect an issue is that NMCAs should prove that their data and services are authoritative. This requires NMCAs to prove the quality of their products and services.

Such evidence involves the certification of ISO9001 quality management in order to demonstrate that the agency can continuously provide effective and sustainable products and services that meet the user requirements, with continuous improvement.

It also requires an assessment and a control of the quality of our products. You will have a presentation Thursday on the methods used by IGN in this respect.

Besides, NMCAs are now facing a new challenge due to the generalization of the 3D data linked with the building information model (BIM). It is now clear that such 3D data have a high value for example to manage public infrastructures. This is why many NMCAs including IGN are investigating their possible responses to this challenge. I am therefore pleased that you will also have a working session on this topic.

Furthermore, the exchanges of good practices that take place within EuroGeographics show that the European NMCAs have to move from products to services, because such move brings major benefits to users by simplifying access to and use of data. However such move to services means the NMCAs will face the following significant challenges:

- *encapsulating the data inside applications enabling processing and analysis;*
- *seeking out new business models; designing downstream application services that require skills on the uses.*

All these challenges require NMCAs to become able to specify and to prove the quality of their services. In this respect IGN will welcome the good practices that will be highlighted by the Quality-KEN

You see that the process of reflection of the Q-KEN as well as of other Eurogeographics knowledge exchange networks are important and useful in order to help NMCAs to better achieve their missions

and better meet the requirements from their users. As regards quality, I am sure that these few days in Saint-Mande will allow us to progress together.

Beyond these useful exchanges of good practices, I would like to mention the more general objectives that are targeted by NMCAs in the framework of EuroGeographics. In IGN's view, the most important of these objectives are the following:

- *Facilitate a unified and continuous access to member states geospatial data in the framework of the INSPIRE infrastructure and the ELF platform;*
- *Improve harmonization of NMCAs data and services; increase the status and the reuse of NMCAs data and services at European level.*

It is clear that quality is indispensable for NMCAs to achieve these general objectives. I am confident that Quality-KEN reflections will help NMCAs to go forward in this direction, and I thank you for contributing to this joint work.

/END

Presentation: Document System for Data Specifications - Gunhild

MadCap – FLARE (http://www.madcapsoftware.com/)

Presentation: GMS: Quarantine job – Peter - recorded

Presentation: Visual inspection of Ortho-imagery – Ioannis – recorded

Presentation: ELF- Hungarian Implementation – Tamás

? Who is downloading ELF data

? Why are they

? Is it fit for purpose

Presentation: ISO Standards Questionnaire – Gunhild

Action: Gunhild will send the questionnaire to Carol for distribution to the Permanent Correspondent of each member organisation.

Thursday 20th October:

Presentation: Quality assessments of IGN products – Thierry + David (expert from QC unit)

Address updates are shared with Open Street Map

Presentation: Production and Quality Control of ERM – Alexander

Eurostat main customer for ERM

Demo of web page (http://ebrm.bkg.bund.de/pms)

Presentation: UN-GGIM update – Carol

Presentation: UN-GGIM:Europe Core Data – Dominique Laurent

Friday 21st October

Presentation: Long term plan – Tamás

Presentation: Visual Quality control of Transport Network – Ana

Feedback Questionnaire: - Carol

Check if webinars are available on-line;

Report back to group on participation in webinars and downloads/hit to webinar recordings;

Data Quality issues – Cadastre;

Group Work

Theme: Collecting the 3rd Dimension

Presentation: Collecting the 3rd Dimension – Carol

Overview of Prime2 SoE concepts – Peter

Overview of Land Registry process – Gareth

Notes:

- Not just the building – but what is going on in different floors
- Not all applications/software can handle the 3rd dimension; databases can store it but cannot spatially analyse using the 3rd dimension – until this is possible does this warrant capturing 3D objects; 2.5/2.75 current model

OSi Prime2 SoE Concepts:

- SoE concept: tapestry of topologically consistent polygons that do not overlap and there are no gaps.
- Consists of 5 classes – Artificial; Exposed; Vegetation; Water; Way;
- In reality these classes can overlap; e.g. Way & Water
- Z-order was set based on a bird's eye view, i.e. z-order of object on top set to 0; and all covered SoE objects to the appropriate negative value
- Z-Order value is used to define the relative height of the SoE object i.e. a value of -1 indicated that there is 1 SoE object above. No relationship between these objects.
- What does the customer/user expect the building height to be? – the corners or the apex of the roof
- Split level building – what height should the building be given
- Object model – each individual object can have individual z value
- INSPIRE data model for buildings

- No reason not to have multiple geometric representations of the same object linked by object ID, i.e. geometry is a property of the object, like any other property
- Is there a user demand for 3D object capture?
- Need an end goal, not just a will to capture 3D objects because we can
- What does full 3D mean – SoE are represented by polygons, do you need to build a TIN of you SoE?
- As NMCAs, we are only interested in boundaries/outlines – if there is an internal change, e.g. a hole in a field, this will change your elevation/TIN model
- What are the user needs?
- Cadaster (Land Registry) laps over NMA data- so with no topographic data they will get 'stuck'
- Problem of height is difference between small and large scale – in large scale no longer is cartography but city modelling
- This is almost in BIM territory - must represent our point of view
- What is the end goal? Is there an actual need for this
- Need for partnership rather than ownership of who can/should capture the data
- Having a partnership with different stakeholders will help see the bigger picture
- Different objectives; capture different bits – done in collaboration

HMLR presentation:

- Cartographic v. object model
- Map = 2D representation of a 3D world
    - BIM
    - CityGML
    - indoorGML
    - LADM?
- HMLR- don't do 3D – are interested but feel it should be driven by user/customer
- HMLR are a land registry, not a cadaster
- 3D are cool – but maybe networks (transportation), obstacle height is more important
- Update
- Quality of data (attributes, etc.) could be more important
- 3D sounds like a good business opportunity – however is there a need for it?
- Can the applications/analyses handle this
- It's a lot of data
- What is the added value for the user
- Be selective in what is captured in 3D – maybe buildings are more important (ht value)
- Are not just 3D (height) – what about depth? – under the ground, under water
- Simplify the model (less complexity) but have better quality

Are other orgs thinking about the (3D)?

- Thinking about it, but need a strong use case to implement
- Should not discount researching the problems but only implement if needed
- Some looked at INSPIRE concepts – which can be implemented

- Current data capture is a mixture of roof top, building footprint
- Scale makes small scale objects in 3D simple to represent
- The model is less complex and requires less accuracy
- Land registry – data capture is from roof tops – but LR needs footprint
- IGN France experimenting with mobile terrestrial LiDAR
- Use cadaster to update topographic data & use LiDAR to extract and populate the building height
- Mobile mapping in Hungary – Rigel – using LiDAR and car sensors
- BIM & GIS
    - Will they come together
    - They can be linked because they are compatible
    - Linked data is the thing bridging all the separate work, that everyone is doing, together
    - BIM is more complex than GIS – using GIS as part of BIM, but BIM more than GIS
    - OS do what they do; architects do what they do & the challenge (& importance) is linking the two together
    - Merging of interests, but they will still be separate
- we should be building/capturing our data to satisfy our citizens needs
- …….

General notes:

- Difference between topographic & cadaster view
- What does 3D mean
- User requirements – who are the users, is there a need for 3D
- Data must fit the purpose
- It is a challenge
- Scale – the more simple it is the easier to provide 3D. the larger the scale – less cartographic- more BIM & architect orientated
- Linked data – info from specialized communities come together through linked data
- Not so much work on 3D in NMCAs – but experiments going on (not necessarily on building data)
- Taking the person out of the equation the more accurate the data needs to be, but also relative to the use of the data – users may not be traditional customers
- Use of EPRS? codes (oil exploration codes) in the data model