

"SUPER KEN" WORKSHOP MINUTES

Date: 15 & 16 May 2019

Location: Leuven, Belgium

CHAIR: Carol Agius

AGENDA day 1

Topic	Lead
1. Welcome and Introduction to the Super KEN workshop The role of the EuroGeographics Research and Policy Officer	Angela Baker Marjana Zelic
2. Topic for Discussion: Space Regulation	Nuria Sanz Valcárcel
3. Topic Discussion: Data Harmonisation & Authoritative Data	KU Leuven

AGENDA day 2

Topic	Lead
4. Summary of Day 1 and Welcome to Day 2	Angela Baker
5. Topic Discussion: Digital Single Market & the Open Data Directive	Neil Sutherland

MAIN DISCUSSION POINTS day 1

1. Warm welcome by Angela, introduction of the panellists and agenda outline.
Marjana gave a presentation on her role as Research and Policy officer. See at [https://eurogeographics.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/11/Research and Policy for SuperKEN_MZ.pdf](https://eurogeographics.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/11/Research_and_Policy_for_SuperKEN_MZ.pdf)

Actions on the group are:

- Please contact Marjana if you would like to comments on the list of topics covered by out DODs reporting
- If you have an organisational view on a specific topic and would be willing to share this with other members, please let Marjana know, it is great to share experiences from one member to another
- If you do not already receive the policy news summary please contact MZ to be added to the list
- Please do log into the website and review the Representation section where you can find all the policy newsletters, briefings and tracking record

2. Nuria presented Space regulation and questions were raised through sli.do
Please see Nuria's presentation at: https://eurogeographics.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/11/Nuria_Copernicus3-1.pdf

Q: Netherlands: What is the condition on maps Copernicus want to use from NMCAs?

A: Nuria: Copernicus land service ask for full coverage of INSPIRE data, and ELS is not enough for them. In situ component maybe realized, but they cannot have full coverage. They could be thinking on national data from countries which are willing to provide it. They should combine it with open street data in the country. They are open for this combination.
Comment: EGHO noted that the EEA contractors are currently evaluating the Core Reference Dataset.

Q: Belgium: There are so many data requirements that are requested that are not included in CRD, and they want authoritative data from us, so what we can do in the KEN to support this request?

A: Nuria: The EuroGeographics membership are related to Copernicus in many different ways including being involved in the Copernicus Forum. There are several ways to improve the access to Copernicus national data. The KEN can facilitate this relationship to provide good ideas and good solutions. If not, Copernicus is going to ask each country for data.

Comment: Spain: For the last 5 to 10 years the EU has needed the information we have, we are the forum to find the solution, there is no other forum. The problem is as we don't satisfy their need for data. We have to comprise CRD as soon as possible, if not our future is dark.

Comment: Denmark: We did have the concept of using CRD as free and open data, firstly to test them, and received a nice response that they are not interested in one data set, they want harmonized datasets. There is a misconception by the Commission that we have to deliver a package and this is the first issue we have to address. We should look for the Commission to have an active role to combine our data.

Nuria: Copernicus is demanding, we should use it. We have to learn how to use sentinel data in our work. We should transform ourselves otherwise we'll be out of business in the future.

Belgium: If we do not provide, we will die but what we provided was heterogeneous. We need more detailed information and to sit together to look for a detailed specification. A step by step approach is needed in finding solution until we can meet the full requirements.

Actions:

The Copernicus KEN need to take an action and be active within the membership – Action EGHO

EGHO support activities but not leading, there is no KEN chair at the moment – Action: EGHO

Look at how we can respond properly to the Copernicus Requirements – Action EGHO / CoKEN

Please contact Angela if interested in chairing or joining the Coordinating Committee – Action: All members

We have to explain the regulation in more detail for members and raise awareness of it – Action EGHO

Space Agency - it is important to contact national representatives – Action: All members

3. Data Harmonisation & Authoritative Data

Representation is available at: https://eurogeographics.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/11/Authoritative-Data_Final-Presentation.pdf

Dominique Laurent presented a key topic for INSPIRE - Data Harmonisation. Please see presentation at:

https://eurogeographics.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/11/Data_harmonisation_D_Laurent.pdf

Q: Netherlands: Only datasets with a legal condition are authoritative datasets, everything else which is visible on the field is not by the definition authoritative?

A: KU Leuven: Different definitions apply in different countries this is not necessarily correct.

Discussion replies:

Belgium: If we consider a public authority, they cannot cover everything but it is the responsibility of the public sector to create authoritative data.

Spain: The collaboration between public and private sector is needed. Transport is a clear case where we explore this.

Great Britain: My understanding of authoritative data is that it is a requirement by the government, which is our unique selling point. Trust is considered.

Great Britain: We need to try to distinguish the benefits one could get from an authoritative data. Quality may be the reason. Everybody uses the same data. GPS changed a lot, we got less strong selling point for authoritative data than ever before.

Q: If the data is provided by a private organization will they take the responsibility?

KU Leuven: If the private company has an authoritative data recognition, then that means it can be used for different purposes, then they are responsible and reliable for that data.

Q: Do we have such a case where private datasets being recognize as authoritative?

Austria: Technical content is not authoritative, cannot imagine satellite data being authoritative unless used for the authoritative purpose. In the case of outsourcing, the public institution can be responsible for checking the data that has been collected by a private organisation, thus that attribute always stay with public institutions.

Q: from sli.do: Threat by amazon, google etc??

Great Britain: Yes, in a way it is happening and this is what motivates NMCA's to do something, there is a competition there. However not in a sense if our data is certified, that is what make our data different, they are checked, verified, trusted.

Q: from sli.do: unique selling point??

Great Britain: That is what makes our business better than the competition, so the customer comes to me because we provide better data. This certifies our data and is our unique selling point – the quality.

Spain: A country has to have basic data which is paid by the tax payer. We consider it is not our data, it is responsibility of the government.

The Netherlands: Consider the music industry, a music CD is the best music you can imagine, but nowadays everybody is using you tube - free of charge, easy to use, convenient.

Q: from PolKEN: Can we harmonise?

France: We should share the problem, it is an INSPIRE obligation, the Commission is complaining but it is up to them to ensure the regulation is applied.

Belgium: Is it realistic – yes. We can look to the INSPIRE requirements, but we have to go beyond this.

MAIN DISCUSSION POINTS day 2

4. Angela provided a summary of day one and welcomed day two.

5. Digital single market and Open data & PSI directive

Neil Sutherland informed the forum on the final text of the Directive. The key issue is the next step – how is the Commission going to decide on what data will be free of charge and what will be our role in defining High Value Datasets.

Dominik Kopczewski provided the outcome of the questionnaire on Open data.

Olaf Eggert presented the Danish situation where many policies are pushing for Open data, please see presentation at: https://eurogeographics.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/11/Open-Data_Denmark.pdf

Carol Agius reported on the sli.do poll.

Q: Mick Cory: G8 Open data Charter agreed on open data and sharing of information. This trend is unavoidable. If we don't meet that, the users will find alternatives. Funding is a different problem from releasing the data for free. Our challenge is to figure out how we can provide data for Copernicus, their requirements will not change for some years. Why we say reuse only instead of use and reuse?

A: Neil Sutherland: Different in term use and reuse is probably historical. Actually, reuse includes use.

Comment: Spain: Agree with Mick, we have definition of open data from 2004. Spain's experience of open data is fantastic, everybody uses it, and usage had improved the quality.

Belgium: Data has to be open and easily accessible, but there are some technical challenges. A comparison by countries is needed. For example, when will EuroRegionalMap be open and free?

Latvia: We have to open data, that is the process needed for authoritative data but do we really want to open everything from the security point of view?

Denmark replied that the Commission do not see these limits, thus is a big topic to discuss, which type of data is sensitive. This is part of debate definitely.

EuroGeographics should have an influence on what is free and open.

Austria sees two challenges: Policy, and if we are ready to provide the needed data in term of interoperability. We need the policy in advance. Austria recognises the security issues as well.

Austria supported the renaming of the Open data directive, so the political support exists.

Talinn declaration is political support to open data.

A dialogue with national governments on implementation of data is needed.

Spain: The directive is good a opportunity for discussion with national governments.

Is open data the future?

Great Britain: Yes, the value of charging was not only money, but creation, and the relation with users to meet their need, but this argument is out of date now. When users pay, they have right to make demands.

Great Britain: The transition from producing product to producing data, and services for analysing data, we need analytic ready data.

Poland: Organisation is supplying data to gov, and meet their need, but the users need is second level.

Open data is way of accessing authoritative data.

The Netherlands: When data is open the use of data is increased. What other arguments are there to have open data but usage!

Spain: We need investment from the government to open the data so we go to the government with the case advising them on the benefits, and they realise that for every 1 euro they invest in cadaster is equal to 7 euros value for the municipality.

It is also about business model?

Denmark: We have a very big spreadsheet which the agency used to talk with Ministry of finance.

Great Britain: The impact assessment is one of the tools one can use to pursue government. It is a communication job.

The Netherlands: We have a lot of open data, it costs money but there are other sources for financing. As the use is increased the Ministry see that as a success story. They then had to negotiate for an increase of the budget to support the increased use. The customer pays for live services and use of the infrastructure but not for data. For some customer it is benefit as they don't use their infrastructure. The cost for production is concern, process is to talk to gov.

Q: from sli.do: What does it mean for products of EuroGeographics?

EGHO: If we really want to demonstrate the value of your data, we should it make it open and free, the cost is small and income is smaller. The value is not economic, it is political. It is a big challenge to achieve that. It has an impact and we have to address it.

Belgium: We are interested in using pan-European products; the idea is to promote it to all federal portal. Great Britain hasn't availed the use of pan-European products, but recently they realised the need for the ferry boat routes to the continent.

Actions:

It would be a good idea to arrange a coffee with your government department who is responsible for this –

Action: All member

How can EuroGeographics help? Provide papers to take to your relevant department explaining the issues and give general support when asked – Action EGHO / PoIKEN

Decide how to respond to all the sli.do questions that were raised in the session, and consider some kind of forum – Action EGHO

To circulate minutes – Action EGHO

ATTENDEES

1. Mick Cory, EGHO	mick.cory@eurogeographics.org
2. Angela Baker	angela.baker@eurogeographics.org
3. Marjana Zelic, EGHO	marjana.zelic@eurogeographics.org
4. Dominik Kopczewski, GUGIK	mailto:dominik.kopczewski@gugik.gov.pl
5. Neil Sutherland, OS UK	Neil.Sutherland@os.uk
6. Carol Aguis, EGHO	carol.aguis@eurogeographics.org
7. Amalia Velasco, Spain	amalia.velasco@catastro.minhap.es
8. Pier – Giorgio Zaccheddu, BKG Germany	pier-giorgio.zaccheddu@bkg.bund.de
9. Johanna Frojdenlund, LM Sweden	Johanna.frojdenlund@lm.se
10. Heli Ursin, NLS Finland	heli.ursin@nls.fi
11. Gerda Schennach, BEV Austria	gerda.schennach@bev.gv.at
12. Nathalie Delattre, NGI Belgium	Nathalie.Delattre@ngi.be
13. Karin Mertens, NGI Belgium	karin.mertens@ngi.be
14. Sanja Zekušić, DGU Croatia	Sanja. Zekusic@dgu.hr
15. Veronika Kusova, Czech Republic	veronika.kusova@cuzk.cz
16. Olav Eggers, Denmark	oe@gst.dk
17. Pia Åbo Østergaard, Denmark	piaoe@gst.dk
18. Dominique Laurent, IGN France	dominique.laurent@ign.fr
19. Clément Godin, IGN France	Clement.Godin@ign.fr
20. Martin Lenk, BKG Germany	Martin.Lenk@bmu.bund.de
21. Alicja Karpinska, OS GB	alicja.karpinska@os.uk
22. Jonathan Holmes, OS GB	Jonathan.Holmes@os.uk
23. Kenny Crawford, Registers of Scotland	kenny.crawford@ros.gov.uk
24. László Szilvási, Hungary	laszlo.szilvasi@lechnerkozpont.hu
25. Eva Lucas-Harbula, Hungary	harbula.eva@bfkh.gov.hu
26. Hugh Mangan, OSI	hugh.mangan@osi.ie
27. Marco Morelli, Italy	marco.morelli2@esercito.difesa.it
28. Mārtiņš Liberts, Latvia	Martins.Liberts@lgia.gov.lv

29. Kārlis Šķērstens, Latvia	karlis.skerstens@lgia.gov.lv
30. Bert Beentjes, The Netherlands	Bert.Beentjes@kadaster.nl
31. Ad van Houtum, The Netherlands	Ad.vanHoutum@kadaster.nl
32. Olav Petter Aarrestad, Norway	Olav.Petter.Aarrestad@kartverket.no
33. Adriana Poggi, Romania	adriana.poggi@ancpi.ro
34. Fedor Shkurov, Russia	inter-dep@rosreestr.ru
35. Nuria Valcarcel Sanz, Spain	nvalcarcel@fomento.es
36. Antonio Arozarena, Spain	aarozarena@fomento.es
37. Maria Cabello, Spain	mcabello@tracasa.es
38. Lars Hägg, Lantmäteriet Sweden	lars.hagg@lm.se
39. Robert Balanche, Switzerland	robert.balanche@swisstopo.ch
40. Daniel Steudler, Switzerland	daniel.steudler@swisstopo.ch
41. Liudmyla Shemelynets, Ukraine	ir@land.gov.ua
42. Dmytro Makarenko, Ukraine	dmakarenko89@gmail.com