



**INSPIRE**

Infrastructure for Spatial Information in Europe

## Summary report of the 10th INSPIRE MIG expert group meeting, 20 June 2019, Brussels

---

<b>Title</b>	Summary report of the 10th INSPIRE MIG expert group meeting
<b>Creator</b>	DG ENV
<b>Date created</b>	25-06-2019
<b>Subject</b>	Summary report of the 10 <sup>th</sup> MIG meeting
<b>Publisher</b>	EC and EEA INSPIRE Team
<b>Type</b>	Text
<b>Description</b>	Summary, conclusions and actions of the 10 <sup>th</sup> MIG expert group meeting.
<b>Contributor</b>	EC INSPIRE TEAM
<b>Format</b>	MS Word (doc)
<b>Identifier</b>	Summary Report 10 <sup>th</sup> MIG meeting
<b>Language</b>	En
<b>Status</b>	Final

---

## 1 Approval of the agenda and of the minutes of previous meeting

*The meeting was opened and chaired by Joachim D'Eugenio, Deputy Head of DG ENV Unit E.4 Compliance and Better Regulation.*

The Chair presented the meeting agenda (*DOC1*) and the summary of the previous meeting (*DOC2*). The MIG had no comments on the meeting agenda and the summary of the previous meeting.

All meeting documents and presentations have been made available on the *collaboration platform of the INSPIRE Maintenance and Implementation expert Group (MIG)*<sup>1</sup>.

### Conclusions and Actions

*The meeting agenda and summary of the previous meeting were adopted.*

## 2 Nature of the meeting

The meeting was a non-public meeting and was attended by nominated experts of 27 EU Member States (MS), Norway, the Commission Services (DG ENV and JRC) and the European Environment Agency (EEA). Italy was not represented.

## 3 List of points discussed

### 3.1 Update on Commission initiatives (Information and discussion)

#### Introduction

The Commission presented information document (*DOC3*) and informed the MIG about the following ongoing Commission initiatives:

- Reporting Fitness Check – alignment proposal
- Study on improving national environmental information and harvesting data (reporting actions 4 and 5)
- Study of INSPIRE data sharing, access and use (Article17 and related provisions)
- Copernicus – latest developments
- Enforcement action

The European Environment Agency (EEA) informed the MIG about the status of Reportnet 3.0 and presented the overview and main conclusion from the 2019 Monitoring & Reporting exercise together with the Commission. All countries managed to submit their monitoring data by the deadline of 15 May 2019. There are some significant discrepancies between the official monitoring and the EU Geoportal numbers, especially what concerns the accessibility of the data through view and download services.

---

<sup>1</sup> <https://webgate.ec.europa.eu/fpfis/wikis/x/OCM8FQ>

The Chair congratulated the EEA colleagues for the work on Reportnet 3.0. The MIG was invited to contact their counterparts working on reporting (Eionet, National Focal Points) if they want to get closer involved in the Reportnet 3.0 project.

### Discussion

Member State experts raised questions related to the alignment proposal, the publication of as-is data sets and its impact on monitoring indicators, the availability of Copernicus multi-country data and the outcome of the monitoring and reporting exercise.

The Commission explained that the alignment proposal is a Regulation, is applicable immediately and does not require transposition by the Member States. If colleagues in the Member States have specific questions about the alignment proposal they are welcome to get in touch (mail to [ENV-INSPIRE@ec.europa.eu](mailto:ENV-INSPIRE@ec.europa.eu)) whether on the INSPIRE Directive or other.

On the publication of as-is data, several countries argued that this could negatively influence the indicator on the availability of interoperable harmonized data sets. If this would be the case then they consider removing the as-is data sets from the infrastructure once the harmonized data sets become available. Moreover, it was discussed whether as-is and harmonized data should be considered as different instances of the same data set or as different data sets.

The Commission stated that an as-is data set and a data set available in line with the interoperability rules (under harmonized conditions) are instances or representations of the same data set, not two data sets. There should be one metadata record saying there are two versions of the data set: the harmonised one and the as-is one (original). We need to further discuss how this should be appropriately documented in metadata to make sure data sets are correctly accounted for without negative impact on the relevant calculated indicator. The Chair proposed to further discuss this also involving the experts from the permanent technical subgroup of the MIG (MIG-T).

On the availability of pan-European data through Copernicus, the EEA explained that some data will be publicly available in CORDA. Some data is only made available by Member States for the Copernicus emergency service. The purpose of CORDA is not to serve a wider audience with in-situ data.

### Conclusions and Actions

*The MIG and the MIG-T will further discuss data set accounting for as-is and harmonized data published in the geoportal in view of the related monitoring indicators.*

*The Commission will keep the MIG informed on any progress made on the presented initiatives.*

## 3.2 Revision of Implementing Rules (Information and discussion)

### 3.2.1 Possible revision of Data Specifications

#### Introduction

The Commission presented (DOC4) – “Possible revision of Implementing Rules on data interoperability – Draft amendment text”.

The Chair congratulated the JRC for the high-quality work on the revision. The Commission will share the overview of all feedback received and changes applied to the implementing act with the MIG. A draft revision scrutinized by the Commission services should be available in November 2019 and will be shared for commenting with the MIG. Depending on the feedback and the maturity of the revised text, a final draft could be tabled in the Committee end of November 2019 for discussion and voting.

#### Discussion

The MIG had no questions or comments on the presented document.

#### Conclusions and Actions

*The Commission will share the overview of all feedback received and changes applied to the implementing act as soon as possible.*

*The Commission will keep the MIG informed about the further procedure. After an internal validation, the Commission will share the draft revision with the MIG for a final round of feedback.*

## 3.3 Upcoming Events

### Introduction

#### 3.3.1 INSPIRE Helsinki 2019

The Finnish expert presented the INSPIRE Helsinki 2019 event. It will be a three-day event. The goal of the event is to have a look at how latest technologies and spatial data can improve both decision-making and the daily life of everyone. There is room for 150 participants and the registration is open. Main content of the event are data challenges and workshops.

More information is available on the event website: <https://www.inspire-helsinki-2019.fi/>

**The chair invited the organisers to report on the outcome and experiences in the 11<sup>th</sup> meeting of the MIG in November 2019.**

#### 3.3.2 Conference 2020

The Croatian expert presented the progress on the organisation of the INSPIRE 2020 Conference that will take place in Dubrovnik, Croatia.

The 2020 conference will focus on sustainable digitalisation (digital transition) and digital sustainability (social, economic and environment). Moreover, the conference will look at how digitalisation could help us move towards a more sustainable Europe, but will also dig into

possible environmental issues and risks that come with the digital transition. **The call for proposals for the conference will open on 15 October 2019 and registration will be possible as of mid-January 2020.**

More information is available on the event website:

<https://inspire.ec.europa.eu/conference2020>

### 3.3.3 Workshop “Future of INSPIRE”

The Commission shared some last minute logistic information on the workshop on the “Future of INSPIRE” that was organised back to back with the 10<sup>th</sup> meeting of the MIG on 21 June 2019.

The workshop will address the successes and failures of the past, the mid-term landing zone and new trends in policy, technology and society that might influence the existing legal framework. For ideas about the development of a vision for the future, participants were encouraged to think beyond the existing framework taking emerging socio-economical and technical changes into consideration.

**The outcome of the workshop will be reported to the MIG.**

#### Discussion

The MIG had no questions or comments on the presented information.

#### Conclusions and Actions

*The chair invited the organisers of the INSPIRE Helsinki event to report on the outcome and experiences in the 11th meeting of the MIG in November 2019.*

*The Commission will report the outcome of the workshop “Future of INSPIRE” to the MIG.*

## 3.4 Maintenance and Implementation Work Programme

### 3.4.1 MIWP Action progress, review and discussion including agreement of next steps

**a) 2016.5 Priority list of EU high value datasets: status update and monitoring of progress, including data and service linking**

#### Introduction

The EEA and the Commission updated the MIG on the progress of MIWP action 2016.5 - Priority list of eReporting datasets. Statistics on the publication and accessibility of priority data sets per country and per legislative act were presented (DOC5).

In general, the numbers of published metadata are stable and slightly more download services have been made available. A few countries made progression; there are still countries that have not provided anything. The EEA and the Commission continued their work on aligning reporting obligations and INSPIRE implementation in collaboration with the environmental reporting community. Recently, work has been done on the development of common reporting models based on INSPIRE data specifications for the following legal acts: Industrial

Emissions Directive, Marine Strategy Framework Directive, Environmental Noise Directive, Floods Directive and Invasive Alien Species Regulation.

Furthermore, a common methodology for a more detailed assessment of implementation progress targets is under development. The document “Methodology for evaluation of progress of INSPIRE priority list of datasets for eReporting” that was discussed in the 2016.5 MIG subgroup already sets the scene for this common methodology. This document is now updated with additional criteria that include some country specific considerations when defining implementation progress targets.

The Chair presented an EU overview of the implementation progress on the list of priority data sets and opened the floor for discussion.

#### Discussion

Several Member State experts stated that the geoportal does not reflect all available data sets and indicated that work is ongoing for further improving the offering of priority data sets in the geoportal. It was also reiterated that the linking of spatial data sets and services remains a challenge.

The Chair explained that efforts and discussion on the implementation of the list will be continued. The list of priority data sets satisfies all the legal scoping requirements of the INSPIRE Directive and these listed data sets should already have been made available and accessible under the INSPIRE Directive years ago. In view of the argued incomplete coverage of available priority data sets by the geoportal, Member State experts were invited to share additional information on their availability.

#### Conclusions and Actions

*The MIG was invited to share information with the Commission on the availability of priority data sets that are not accounted for in the geoportal.*

### **b) 2018.1 Monitoring and Reporting 2019**

#### Introduction

The Commission presented the status of MIWP action 2018.1 “Monitoring and Reporting 2019” and the guidance document for calculation of indicators in support of the new Commission Decision as regards monitoring and reporting (*DOC6*).

The guidance document for calculation of indicators will guide the implementation of the calculation logic in the new monitoring process. The development and the testing with pilot Member States of the new monitoring process will start in September 2019. A first release is targeted for begin of November 2019.

#### Discussion

Following issues were raised by Member State experts:

- “Endpoints” should be changed in “access points”. Endpoints could be all different versions of the service, while an access point represents the general access to the service. The change proposal was agreed.
- Countries will not be able to document conformity statements for network services. There is a difference between self-declared conformity and reality. An automated validation through the official validator tool was suggested as preferred approach.
- The guideline does not clearly explain how you will calculate indicators based on metadata. More transparency and details on the calculation of the indicators is needed e.g. for NSi2 (Percentage of spatial data sets for which a view and download service exist) data sets can be viewable and downloadable by many services and vice versa, how will the numbers be calculated?
- Will the calculation of the indicators rely on geoportal logic or reference validator logic?

The Commission explained that the use of conformity statements will allow the countries to report through their published metadata. Online validation of all available resources through the validator tool is not feasible for the moment. Ideally, countries should use the reference validator to validate the conformity of their resources (harmonised data sets, network services) and document the achieved conformity in metadata. More detailed information on how resources are assessed can be found in the Annex of the document where a link is provided to the abstract test suite definitions that hold all the detailed business rules. Regarding the accounting of network services, the Commission agreed that this indicator definition should be further elaborated. The business logic for the calculation of indicators in the portal and reference validator will be the same.

Seen the urgency to move forwards with the development and testing of the new monitoring process, the Chair proposed to take the comments of the MIG on board and recirculate the document for further comments. This document will then be used to start testing the new monitoring process. The outcome of the testing will be documented in the document and the Commission will present the revised document to the MIG in November 2019 for endorsement.

The Chair invited the MIG to send their written comments on *DOC6* by 15 July 2019 and to inform the Commission of possible participation in the testing phase.

#### Conclusions and Actions

*The Commission will circulate an updated version of the guidance document for calculation of indicators in support of the new Commission Decision as regards monitoring and reporting (DOC6).*

*The Chair invited the MIG to send their written comments on DOC6 by 15 July 2019 and to inform the Commission of possible participation in the testing phase.*

*The Commission will document the outcome of the testing of the monitoring process in DOC6 and present the revised document to the MIG in November 2019 for endorsement.*

### **c) 2019.2 Improving data availability – good practices**

#### Introduction

The Commission presented the progress on MIWP action 2019.2 “Improving accessibility of data sets through network services” (*DOC7*). This action was endorsed in the last MIG meeting to improve availability and accessibility of spatial data in the geoportal.

As an outcome of the geoportal workshop in January 2019 a new harvesting component was developed and launched taking into account the recorded Member States requirements. In addition, a linkage checker tool has been developed and made available in June 2019 to help Member States to identify issues with links between data and services. Details on how links are being checked are described in the documentation for the tool made available by the Commission.

Seven Member State experts joined the Commission in testing the approach to simplify linking between network services and data. From the discussions and exchanges in this test group, the Commission concluded that the simplification is considered only as an alternative option and commitment for further development of the simplified approach was limited.

The commission invited the MIG to endorse the outcome of the first phase before initiating the second phase of the action. The second phase will focus on improving the data accessibility (e.g. continue monitoring, developing geoportal frontend with new filtering options e.g. filter by feature types, continue support for multilingualism, support metadata version 2.0, support for WCS and SOS, API developer documentation, publish new monitoring indicators calculated values ...).

The Chair asked the MIG to reflect on the usefulness of further developing the simplified approach for linking network services and data. If there would be only limited interest in continuing this exercise, no further resources would be allocated to this. The Chair opened the floor for questions and comments.

#### Discussion

Two Member State experts indicated they would not use the simplified approach and asked the Commission to continue the support for the existing solution. Most Member State experts expressed strong support for further developing the simplified approach. Moreover, several Member State experts stated that this action was endorsed by the MIG and that it is not within the remit of the subgroup to question the mandate.

The Chair congratulated the team for all the work already realised and concluded that there is a clear commitment from the MIG to continue the action until the end of the year. The action will continue along the lines presented in *DOC7* and prioritisation will be done in view of



available resources. End of November, the Commission will present the progress made in phase two and the further roadmap for 2020.

### Conclusions and Actions

*The MIG endorsed the outcome of the first phase of MIWP action 2019.2, gave its approval to initiate phase two and continue the work until the end of 2019.*

*The Commission will present the 2020 roadmap for MIWP action 2019.2 to the MIG in November 2019.*

#### **d) 2017.2 Alternative encodings**

##### Introduction

The Commission presented the outcome of the completed work on “Alternative encodings for INSPIRE data” under MIWP action 2017.2 (DOC8). The main driver behind this action was to facilitate and simplify the use of INSPIRE data in client applications. The most popular alternative encoding proposed was GeoJSON. The subgroup decided to pilot this alternative encoding and focus on two themes: addresses and environmental monitoring facilities and observations.

A generic INSPIRE UML to GeoJSON mapping tool and a list of simplification rules to support theme specific mapping were developed. These building blocks were used to build the alternative encodings for the selected themes (AD, EMF).

The outcomes were documented on GitHub and presented in a webinar in the beginning of May (140 participants from 20 countries).

The Commission decided not to table the encoding as a good practice document for endorsement by the MIG. One of the main criteria for a good practice document is that it is not a theoretical exercise only and that there is evidence of practical use and implementation in a number of organisations. Since this alternative encoding has not been implemented in different organisations yet, this is not the case.

The Commission invited the MIG to promote the outcome of the work and to bring this into the organisations for implementation. Once being used in practice this alternative GeoJSON encoding can be promoted to a good practice.

The Commission asked the MIG to endorse the outcome of MIWP action 2017.2 and to close the action.

The Chair congratulated the subgroup on the outcome and opened the floor for discussion.

##### Discussion

The MIG expressed its support for the outcome of MIWP action 2017.2 and agreed to close the action. Member State experts asked questions about resolution of open issues after the

closure of the action and existing software support for the GeoJSON encoding (e.g. easy publication with GeoServer).

The Commission explained that the purpose of the group was to develop one example (in this case for GeoJSON) to show how an alternative encoding can be developed following the ISO-19118 standard on the encoding of geographic information. With this example other parties in the INSPIRE stakeholder community can develop their own alternative encodings and build implementation experience for becoming a good practice. It was certainly not the objective of the subgroup to go on infinitely with developing different alternative encodings.

The Commission also clarified the notions of alternative versus additional encodings used by the subgroup. Alternative encodings were defined as an encoding that fully satisfies all the legal requirements in the implementing rules, hence can be used as an alternative for the preferred default encoding in GML. In some other cases, an encoding is only an additional encoding because it does not meet all the requirements of the implementing rules. In that case, you still have to provide an alternative encoding, but you can always publish data in an additional encoding to meet user needs.

In terms of software support, the company wetransform is planning to implement the GeoJSON encoding in their "hale Studio" software product. The Commission was not aware of planned support by other software tools and vendors.

Most of the open issues emerged in the initial requirement/feedback gathering phase, have no more relevance, and will be closed. The remaining relevant issues will be addressed and support will be available through the INSPIRE helpdesk.

The Chair concluded that MIWP action 2017.2 is closed and its outcome endorsed. New ideas can go into a new action for the future work programme. The MIG was invited to share any concrete ideas for future work for further discussion. The Commission will keep the MIG updated on implementation evidence for the alternative GeoJSON encoding.

#### Conclusions and Actions

*The MIG endorsed the outcome of MIWP action 2017.2 and agreed to close the action.*

*The MIG was invited to promote the alternative GeoJSON encoding.*

*The MIG was invited to share any concrete ideas for future work on alternative encodings for further discussion.*

*The Commission will keep the MIG updated on implementation evidence for the alternative GeoJSON encoding.*

### 3.4.2 MIWP Action progress and review (without discussion)

**e) 2016.4 Theme specific issues (I)**

**f) 2017.1 Master Guidance (I)**

**g) 2017.3 Improved client support (I)**

**h) 2017.4 Validation & Conformity (I)**

#### Introduction

The Commission presented an information document (*DOC9*) on the progress of several MIWP actions (2016.4, 2017.1, 2017.3, 2017.4).

#### Discussion

The MIG had no questions or comments on the presented information document.

#### Conclusions and Actions

*The MIG took note of the information shared by the Commission on the progress of MIWP actions 2016.4, 2017.1, 2017.3 and 2017.4.*

## 3.5 Spatial data governance at EU level

### 3.5.1 1) The new Open Data and Public Sector Information (PSI) Directive and the Implementing act on high-value datasets

#### Introduction

The Commission (DG CNECT) presented the new Open Data and Public Sector Information (PSI) Directive and the status of the Implementing act on high-value datasets (*PRES3*).

The Chair thanked DG CNECT for the presentation, emphasized the importance of the good collaboration between Commission services to create synergies and opened the floor for questions.

#### Discussion

The following topics and questions were raised by the MIG:

- The initiative on high-value data sets will clearly contain high-value environmental data, but should also take the data needs of the environmental domain into consideration. The Commission was asked to take an ambitious approach on the identification of high-value data sets.
- How to deal with charging? Lots of enterprises providing public services are private (e.g. energy sector). How will they be convinced to open up their data.
- The Commission was asked to share the links to the final versions of the relevant documents.

- What will be the impact of the GDPR on this new Directive and how will this be managed?
- How can MIG members get involved and provide input to the process of the development of the implementing act on high-value data sets?

The Commission explained that it is the ambition to have a certain number of data sets under each category. In this the Commission will not only rely on data sets that are freely available. Also the ones that are charged for will be considered. The expert group on Business to Government (B2G) data will look into scenarios in which data can be asked from private companies e.g. a lot of energy data should already be available.

On the possibility for collaboration on the further development of the legal framework, the Commission was aware that more frequent interaction between national bodies from different relevant domains should be stimulated. No formal procedure was in place that would allow direct input from different stakeholders in different domains. The best way to get involved is by contacting your national PSI expert group member. A reference to the members of the PSI expert group<sup>2</sup> was included in the presentation.

The Commission further explained that the impact of GDPR and how to manage this was discussed by the PSI expert group. Only some leading principles were proposed as outcome of that meeting. Main rule is to always make a balance between the interest of data subjects (persons that are identifiable in a data set) and the interest of the public to have access to the data and products derived from it. Reuse could happen under conditions that are more restricted. There definitely needs to be some body of rulings and court cases to be able to define a more consistent framework of guidelines. This topic is still developing and the Commission proposed to touch upon this issue next time and share the findings of the PSI expert group. The MIG was invited to share any relevant experiences and findings in this matter.

To conclude, the Chair brought the Digital Europe programme and the Big Data Test Infrastructure initiative to the attention of the MIG. The digital Europe programme is a new programme that is still pending budget approval but preparations have already started. The program will be a very interesting one. There will be opportunities for financing. If everything continues as scheduled, the first calls for projects could already go out next year. Under the Connecting Europe Facility (CEF), “the Big Data Test Infrastructure” is already in place as a building block. This is a sandbox environment to test advanced machine reading / learning/ harvesting technologies. It is build as open source and can be tested and reused. The Commission will share a presentation on the Big Data Test Infrastructure.

The Chair concluded that it was very helpful to have this discussion. As the roadmap is becoming clear, there will be opportunity to become more concrete. The collaboration

---

<sup>2</sup> <https://ec.europa.eu/digital-single-market/en/news/public-sector-information-group-main-page>

between the expert groups could be beneficial beyond the high-value data sets. There is an interaction that goes both ways.

The Commission will share links to relevant documents with the MIG.

#### Conclusions and Actions

*The MIG took note of the information shared by the Commission on the new Open Data and Public Sector Information (PSI) Directive and the Implementing act on high-value datasets.*

*The MIG experts were invited to get in touch with their national PSI expert group counter parts to get involved in the further development of the legal framework.*

*The Commission will keep the MIG informed on any progress and will share links to relevant documents with the MIG.*

### 3.5.2 2) Ad hoc requests for spatial data under COMMISSION REGULATION (EU) No 268/2010

#### Introduction

The Chair presented a status update on the formal process for ad hoc requests for spatial data under COMMISSION REGULATION (EU) No 268/2010. The Commission is exploring possible ways to formalize the process and will report to the MIG once the procedure is further clarified. The geoportal will play an important role in setting up a governance mechanism for managing future data requests.

The MIG was invited to send feedback on the shared template (*DOC10*) by 15 July 2019.

#### Discussion

A Member State expert inquired whether this procedure would be used to request as-is or harmonised spatial data.

The Chair explained that the ad hoc request is case-driven. In cases where there is no harmonised data available, as-is data will be requested.

#### Conclusions and Actions

*The MIG was invited to send feedback on the shared template by 15 July 2019.*

*The Commission will inform the MIG about any progress on the formal process for ad hoc requests for spatial data under COMMISSION REGULATION (EU) No 268/2010.*

### 3.6 Exchange of experiences and good practices by Member States.

#### Introduction

Belgian experts from the Flemish Information Agency (AIV) and the Inter-university Centre for Micro-Electronics (IMEC) presented (*PRES4*) a hands-on project dealing with the use of smart and sustainable life data in a virtual digital simulation to balance the costs of data management between data providers and data re-users and build capacity for real-time simulations in support of policy- and decision-making. The experts presented a video on how

data from different sources are fused in a digital twin. Starting from real-time data on the number of cars on the freeway (using traffic loops and license plate recognition), real-time data measuring air quality and noise pollution was added. Using traffic models, the car distribution across the city is calculated. This car distribution feeds then into air quality and noise simulation models e.g. you can place a virtual nose wall in the simulation and see the direct impact of this decision based on real-time data.

The Chair thanked the Belgian experts for their presentation and opened the floor for discussion.

### Discussion

The MIG was interested to learn more about the benefits of INSPIRE for this digital twin, the governance of unique identifiers, how semantic interoperability is dealt with and how to deal with personal data from a General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) perspective.

The Belgian experts explained the use of INSPIRE based on a practical example. When they started in 2011 there were no linked address data. They took the model from INSPIRE and fused this with the model from W3C. They extended the model from INSPIRE and mapped it to the international concept of address representation. They embrace existing standards but link them together so that different policy domains can become interoperable without changes to existing, adopted standards.

Regarding governance, the Belgian experts explained that there is a governance body in Flanders under the form of a regulatory steering committee in which public, private, and academic sectors are represented. Standards from 20 domains are published on a dedicated website and there is a formal process in place for publishing URI's. All regions in Belgium work with similar constructs allowing for interregional and federal collaboration.

Regarding the impact of GDPR, the Belgian experts used the example of the implementation of a low emission zone in the city of Antwerp. License plates from individual vehicles are recorded and fused with regional and federal data ( type of vehicle, taxes paid, disabled driver, military vehicle, owner of the vehicle ... ). All this data is temporally fused to assess whether the vehicle should be granted access to the city or whether the vehicle owner should be fined. Personal data is only gathered for certain processes in which the use of this data has been approved by the central or sectoral Privacy Commission. In most case the acquisition and the use of personal data is avoided by using targeted techniques e.g. setting up video camera feeds as black boxes with limited access and the use of heat matrix sensors to identify human shape rather than identity.

The Chair informed about the main takeaways and lessons learned that should be considered when thinking about the future of INSPIRE.

The Belgian experts explained that it is becoming increasingly easy to find data sets that are in correspondence with certain standards such as GeoJSON, which is encouraging. Even just that makes data a lot more accessible. A lot of communities are taking data sharing seriously, they

make a lot of data accessible and they also start making catalogues of data available. One of the biggest bottlenecks is the capability and capacity to host data. Acquiring data in projects is not so difficult, but keeping data online available and archiving this data is still a real challenge. Helping communities on that area will be necessary if we don't want to be at risk of losing a lot of data. Enriching the data that we are gathering towards linked data will increase the value and the possible reuse of the data without necessarily breaking the initial encoding (e.g. JSON vs JSON-LD).

#### Conclusions and Actions

*The MIG appreciated the Belgian contribution and took note of the information presented.*

*The MIG was invited to propose new topics for the item on sharing experiences.*

### **3.7 News from the standardisation bodies (Information)**

#### Introduction

The Commission shared an information document (*DOC11*) on new developments and activities relevant to INSPIRE maintenance and implementation from the following standardisation bodies: "ISO/TC 211", "Open Geospatial Consortium (OGC)" and "World Wide Web Consortium (W3C)". The MIG members were invited to distribute this information among their networks and share any feedback or questions on the presented topics with the EC INSPIRE team.

#### Discussion

The MIG had no questions or comments on the presented information.

#### Conclusions and Actions

*The MIG took note of the information shared by the Commission on new developments and activities by relevant standardisation bodies.*

*MIG experts were invited to share this information in their networks and provide feedback (mail to [Michael.Lutz@ec.europa.eu](mailto:Michael.Lutz@ec.europa.eu), [ENV-INSPIRE@ec.europa.eu](mailto:ENV-INSPIRE@ec.europa.eu) in CC).*

### **3.8 Any other business**

#### Introduction

The Commission informed the MIG about the call for experts and information launched by the Body of European Regulators for Electronic Communications (BEREC) for the development of guidelines for spatial representation of telecommunication infrastructure.

#### **BEREC Guidelines on Geographical surveys of network deployments**

Art. 22 (1) of the Electronic Communications Code (EECC) establishes that National Regulatory Authorities (NRAs) and/or Other Competent Authorities (OCAs) shall conduct a geographical survey of the reach of electronic communications networks<sup>[1]</sup> capable of delivering broadband ('broadband networks') by 21 December 2023<sup>[2]</sup>. This geographical survey (GS) may also

include a forecast of the reach of broadband networks, including very high capacity networks, for a period determined by the relevant authority.

Geographical survey refers to the need for data to be collected with reference to sufficiently granular “geographical locations”, this is either data with spatial reference (without coordinates or with a specified geographical information system (GIS)).

The guidelines should give guidance, while being software neutral, regarding technical elements of the **GIS**:

- the specification of a GIS formats<sup>[3]</sup> (i.e. dedicated for telecom) and some key elements of its underlying databases;
- web map reference (e.g. Open Street Map, Google Maps)
- a projection system recognized at EU level;
- the available spatial analysis tools

**REQUEST:** The request is to identify **projects, organisations and experts** on **GIS representation of telecom infrastructure** based on approaches that are in line with the **INSPIRE directive** with a view to make the information available to the relevant BEREC working group working on the guidelines to inform/advice on relevant **GIS issues: existing practices, relevant standards, applications, tools/applications etc.**

#### Conclusions and Actions

*MIG experts were invited to share this information on "BEREC Guidelines on Geographical surveys of network deployments" in their networks and provide feedback (mail to Michael.Lutz@ec.europa.eu, ENV-INSPIRE@ec.europa.eu in CC).*

## **4 Conclusions/recommendations/opinions**

The 10th meeting of the INSPIRE Maintenance and Implementation Group (MIG) was a short meeting that was heavily packed with agenda items and information. It was an intensive and interactive meeting with good discussions. The availability of environmental priority datasets is increasing but further work and investment is needed in most MS. The MIG had a good discussion on data set accounting in view of compliance indicators and the possible impact on the data set publication strategy in the Member States. It was agreed to continue this discussion in the MIG and its permanent technical subgroup (MIG-T). The endorsement of the alternative GeoJSON encoding was considered an important step in facilitating and simplifying the use of the spatial data by end-user applications. The MIG also renewed its support for MIWP action 2019.2 on improving accessibility of data sets through network services. The presentation on the new Open Data and Public Sector Information Directive was much appreciated and it was considered very helpful by the MIG to seek further collaboration between INSPIRE and PSI expert groups.

Furthermore the MIG:

- Approved the meeting agenda and summary of the previous meeting.



- Agreed to further discuss data set accounting for as-is and harmonized data published in the geoportal in view of the related monitoring indicators.
- Endorsed the outcome of the first phase of MIWP action 2019.2 on “Improving accessibility of data sets through network services” and approved to initiate the second phase and continue the work until the end of 2019.
- Endorsed the outcome of MIWP action 2017.2 and agreed to close the action.
- Took note of the information shared by the Commission on:
  - The progress of MIWP actions 2016.4, 2017.1, 2017.3 and 2017.4.
  - The new Open Data and Public Sector Information (PSI) Directive and the Implementing act on high-value datasets.
  - New developments and activities by relevant standardisation bodies.

The more specific conclusions per agenda item have been highlighted under 3) "List of points discussed".

Agenda, documents and presentations are available on *the collaboration platform*<sup>3</sup>.

## 5 Next steps / actions

*The MIG was invited to:*

- Share information with the Commission on the availability of priority data sets that are not accounted for in the geoportal.
- Send their written comments on the guidance document for calculation of indicators by 15 July 2019 and to inform the Commission of possible participation in the testing phase for the development of the new monitoring process.
- Promote the alternative GeoJSON encoding.
- Share any concrete ideas for future work on alternative encodings for further discussion.
- Get in touch with their national PSI expert group counterparts to get involved in the further development of the legal framework for the new Open Data and Public Sector Information (PSI) Directive and the Implementing act on high-value datasets.
- Send feedback on the shared template for ad hoc data requests by 15 July 2019.
- Propose new topics for the item on sharing experiences.
- Share the information on “BEREC Guidelines on Geographical surveys of network deployments” in their networks and provide feedback (mail to Michael.Lutz@ec.europa.eu, ENV-INSPIRE@ec.europa.eu in CC).

**The organisers of the INSPIRE Helsinki event** were invited to report on the outcome and experiences in the 11th meeting of the MIG in November 2019.

*The Commission will:*

---

<sup>3</sup> <https://webgate.ec.europa.eu/fpfis/wikis/x/CjHNEQ>

- Keep the MIG informed on any progress made on the presented Commission initiatives.
- Share the overview of all feedback received and changes applied to the interoperability implementing regulation as soon as possible.
- Keep the MIG informed about the further procedure on the review of the interoperability implementing regulation and will share the draft revision with the MIG for a final round of feedback.
- Report on the outcome of the workshop “Future of INSPIRE” to the MIG in November.
- Circulate an updated version of the guidance document for calculation of indicators in support of the new Commission Decision as regards monitoring and reporting.
- Document the outcome of the testing of the new monitoring process and present a revised guidance document for calculation of indicators to the MIG in November 2019 for endorsement.
- Present the 2020 roadmap for MIWP action 2019.2 to the MIG in November 2019.
- Keep the MIG updated on implementation evidence for the alternative GeoJSON encoding.
- Keep the MIG informed on any progress regarding the new Open Data and Public Sector Information (PSI) Directive including the Implementing act on high-value datasets and will share links to relevant documents.
- Inform the MIG about any progress on the formal process for ad hoc requests for spatial data under COMMISSION REGULATION (EU) No 268/2010.

## **6 Next meeting**

The 11<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the INSPIRE Maintenance and Implementation expert Group is tentatively scheduled for 28 and 29 November 2019 in Brussels.