

Is a linked data approach the way forward to streamline the environmental reporting processes?

Marc Olijslagers, KU Leuven

Natura 2000 Standard Data Form (SDF) and INSPIRE Protected Sites

- Member States report geometry twice
- Exercise to reuse INSPIRE geometry for Natura 2000
- Sometimes difficult to find the correct dataset
- SDF not well prepared for linking to INSPIRE, only 1 MAP_INSPIRE field
 - MAP_INSPIRE < > localID, namespace, version
- MS not well prepared for it. MAP_INSPIRE often empty
- Version is important: Date of the Natura 2000 report.

Is geometry as linked spatial data a solution?

- Use INSPIRE or Thematic ID?
- Availability of information in time?
- What about versioning? Version of geometry and thematic data must match (report=snapshot).
 - Linked data gives option to also get latest version?
- Are Member States ready for this? Can link to INSPIRE PS be an intermediate step?
- Other benefits? Or new issues to be addressed?

Wrap-up of the break-out discussions

First the common identifier issue must be solved

- Three possible solutions were proposed:
 - Change data flows/reporting processes in such way that the INSPIRE Identifier is known by the original data owner
 - Somehow reflect the Thematic Id (Natura 2000 Site Code) in the INSPIRE Id (or simple reuse the Site Code as INSPIRE localId). But real world <> spatial object?
 - Add a separate Thematic Identifier element to the INSPIRE PS data model
- Similar to other discussions, this underlines the value of a canonical identifier

Wrap-up of the break-out discussions

Benefits of a linked data approach (on feature level)

- Identifier as resolvable http(s) URI.
 - Direct access to the spatial object.
 - No need to first identify the correct data set.
- Use versioning mechanism. Link in Natura 2000 reporting to the INSPIRE spatial object version at the time of reporting.
- Use the W3C way: without version the most recent representation of the spatial object is available.