



## GEOSTAT 4 May 2020 webinar

### Venue/time:

On-line webinar, 26-28 May 2020.

### Participants

Rina Tammisto, Antti Santaharju, Essi Kaukonen, Tuuli Pihlajamaa, Outi Ahti-Miettinen, Tapio Kytö, Jennika Leino, Nikolaos Roubanis, Marina Backer Skaar, Jerker Moström, Karin Hedeklint, Ingrid Kaminger, Ana M. Santos, Anna Slawinska, Arnaud Degorre, Igor Kuzma, Vilni Verner Holst Bloch, Marianne Vik Dysterud, Alexander Kowarik, Timo Aarnio, Franck Cotton, Vincent Loonis, Jørn Kristian Undelstvedt, Kathrin Gebers, Hanna Brenzel, Amelia Wardzinska-Sharif, Marie H el ene K erouanton, Thomas Burg, Pasi Piela, Marlene Weinauer, Davis Sousa, Simen Sommer, Arvid Lillethun, Rossano Figueiredo, Erik Engeli en

### The purpose of the meeting

The purpose of this three-day webinar was to gather the project group together to promote the work of each work package and to get a common understanding where we are at the moment with the project and how to proceed with the work.

In the original project plan it was planned to arrange a workshop in Vienna in May 2020 for the Geostat4 consortium. But because of the covid-19 pandemia, the travelling was not possible and the workshop was postponed to spring 2021. Instead an on-line webinar was arranged. The webinar included common sessions, small group discussions and work package (WP) meetings. In the common sessions the WP leaders presented the progress on their work packages and gave tasks to be discussed in the small groups. The participants were then grouped into small groups to work with the given tasks.

## Tuesday 26 May 2020

### Introduction and WP1, WP2 and WP3 presentations

The project manager Rina Tammisto welcomed all participants and noted that some new participants have joined the project. Rina gave first a short introduction of the GEOSTAT4 project and reminded the objectives and outputs of the project, which are, for example, to enhance the GSGF European model, draft the ESS methodological document, support the implementation with benchmark analysis, guidance, use cases, PoCs and business cases, propose an enhancement of the ESS QAF and provide quality indicators and ensure the continuity of the statistical geospatial community in Europe.

Rina presented also the agenda and the scope of this webinar. The objectives of the webinar were to promote the work of the WPs, get new perspectives on the issues under work and ensure the project is going to the right way.

Work package leaders Antti Santaharju (WP1), Jerker Mostr m (WP2) and Thomas Burg (WP3) gave each a presentation about the work that is going on in

their work packages and they had some questions to be discussed in the small groups.

### WP1 A Completed GSGF Europe

Antti Santaharju presented the work in task 1.2.1, the actors and task 1.1, GSGF Europe.

In the task 1.2.1 the goal is to identify and describe the actors and their roles in the European Statistical System that work in the integration of statistical and geospatial data. It is also important to document the interaction between the actors. The aim is to produce an actor map with four operational levels, internal (NSI, NMCA), national, European and global. Antti also presented how this work has been done in Statistics Finland.

In the task 1.1 the goal is to complete the GSGF Europe and produce the ESS methodological document. The GSGF Europe extends the GSGF with regional guidance tailored to European operating environment and is also more concrete guiding the implementation of the GSGF principles. The objectives of GSGF Europe are also for instance, to harmonise and standardise methods for the integration of statistical and geospatial information, modernise the ESS and strengthen the collaboration between the statistical and geospatial communities.

### WP2 Supporting the Implementation of the GSGF Europe

Jerker Moström presented the results from the GEOSTAT 4 /GISCO survey. The results indicate that the statistical-geospatial integration has progressed over the last five years and the data access situation has improved a bit as well in some countries. The sustainability of data management environments for geocoding and the integration of statistical and geospatial information are rated quite high in many countries.

The result show also the areas that need development. For example, the lack of interoperability caused by incomplete or poorly maintained data and semantic and technical interoperability issues between different data sources or cross data domains. In GEOSTAT4 project it could be possible to facilitate these challenges within the scope of this project. Other targets for development were the need for guidance and training.

### WP3 Quality of geospatial information management for statistics

WP leader Thomas Burg went through the proposed outcomes of WP3. The aim is to enhance the Quality Assurance framework (QAF) by proposing a catalogue of methods related to geoinformation, enhance the quality reporting and to produce a quality checklist. A GAP analysis of classification of indicators has already made and the purpose is to review it on the small groups. Based on these discussions, a propose for possible changes will be made.

In the quality reporting the goal is to include more geospatial information, for example, quality indicators Also examining if there are needs to improve ESS quality reporting (SIMS, QPI). The work with quality reporting has relations to WP2.

For the quality checklist the aim is to identify quality elements from the statistical production process where geospatial data is processed to be added in the checklist



## Small group discussions

The participants were grouped in four groups to discuss the matters the WP leaders had given them in their presentations. The results are presented later in this document.

## Wednesday 27 May 2020

### The future of the EFGS and WP6 presentation

Rina Tammisto opened the day and welcomed the participants. Work package 6 leader Igor Kuzma reviewed the visions of the EFGS and GEOSTAT projects and presented the EFGS strategy map. The mission of EFGS is to answer the needs user have for utilising the geospatial and statistical data in all domains. There are three main drivers that maintain the existence of EFGS in ESS. Firstly, the EFGS guides the statistical and geospatial data integration in the operational level in ESS. Secondly, it gathers a network of experts on integration of statistics and geospatial data, builds up capacity and promotes the benefits of the data integrations. The third driver is the need for cross domain collaboration and organisation for managing the statistical geospatial information.

For each driver the objectives, tools, outputs and impacts have been described. The small groups are encouraged to discuss whether other sub-divisions are needed, clearer definitions or terminologies should be done and any other suggestion or comments for the content comes up.

## Small group discussions

The WP discussions continued.

## Results

The small groups presented their findings for the given tasks. More detailed results can be found from the WP discussion excels.

## WP1

### Question 1. Actors in the GSGF

The small groups gave some examples of missing actors, such as space data or mobile data providers, on the global level it may depend of the point of view should UNECE and its sub-groups, World bank and other large organizations be named on the actor map as well as ESS quality group and EU itself. On the other hand, there are many kinds of users in different levels, so separating them could be relevant. It was also suggested that every country could create their own actor maps, for example by business cases.

### Question 2. Enhancing GSGF Europe

It was noted that the GSGF Europe should be high level document. ESS metodological manual should be more practical document, to focus in the implementation. It should be a very compact road map-like guide and maybe divided into methodological and technical divisions to help users in different levels to adopt it.



### WP3

#### Question 1. Grouping of CoP principles

The small groups presented some changes for the CoP principles grouping and it was noted that there is some conflict on principles 12 and 13. Some classification could be reconsidered as well.

#### Question 2. Quality of geospatial data, a global phenomena or more product related?

The small groups saw the quality issues in both institutional and product-wise aspects but it depends also from the point of view and differs between products.

#### Question 3. Quality reporting experiences.

Member countries have some experiences, from regular meetings with the mapping agencies about the indicators to source data evaluation and using check lists. From the source data for example, completeness, comparability, accuracy, resolution and the quality of metadata are revised among other aspects.

Thursday 28 May 2020

### Results

The presentation of results of the small group discussions continued.

### WP2

#### Question 1. How to mitigate the threads of integrating the data mitigation in GEOSTAT4 project?

The small groups presented tools to mitigate the threads: promoting and guiding the use of standards, providing good practice -cases and check lists, harmonizing the data.

#### Question 2. How to provide more guidance?

GEOSTAT4 project could provide for example, instructions which standards to use and how to use them (including TJS), best practices, FAQ section on the web pages and script libraries

#### Question 3. How to provide more training?

This project can gather topics and ideas for other instances to realise training. ESTP is one main instance to provide training and other ways are as well, small quick webinars, Youtube videos and workshops.

### WP6

#### Question 1. Possible new drivers for the EFGS strategy map.

In the network point of view the importance co-operation of NSIs and NMAs was noted as well as the links outside of EFGS (formal agreements, memorandum of understanding). Everyone could join and the director general could be invited to conferences too. Maybe a sub-group to take care of the EFGS network should be set up?

#### Question 2. Possible changes for the driver definitions?

It was noted that the process part is missing and there could be tools for the Outcome column too. The website should be mentioned as well.



Question 3. Possible suggestions to define the impacts?

There could be marked if the influences are on different timelines or the impact is higher or lower. It was also noted that the impact of quality improvement should be stressed, and Thomas will send a development proposal to Igor.

## Conclusions

In the final session the WP leaders concluded the results they got for their work in the webinar.

### WP 1, Antti Santaharju

Actor descriptions were discussed in small groups. Based on the feedback from the groups, the descriptions are useful. Theoretical Descriptions should be revised to more generic role-based direction and each consortium country should define their own best practice actor description from their own national perspective.

WP1 presented its views on the content of the GSGF Europe document which were discussed in small groups. Consortium concluded that GSGF Europe is meant to be high level introductory document and extension to global GSGF document. It should follow the same structure, based on 5 principles as global GSGF document. Within the principles, the document is extended to the following perspectives: Processes, Governance/Actors, Data/Concepts/metadata and Methodology. ESS methodological document should be more concrete manual about how to produce geospatial statistics.

### WP 2, Jerker Moström

The presentation from the small group discussions demonstrated that many of the main issues that were raised in the GEOSTAT 4 survey can/will be addressed in the GEOSTAT 4 project, but to a various degree of depth and concretion. The work to fulfil the requests from the user community will be divided among most of the WPs of the project.

### WP 3, Thomas Burg

It was possible to agree on a further procedure how to come to an agreement on the distribution of the different principles of the Code of Practice as it regards the amount of possible changes within the Quality of Assurance Framework (QAF). It was further agreed The Statistics Austria as WP-leader will provide a proposal for the final distribution and some guidance (templates) in order to facilitate the work for this first task of the work-package.

The discussion on elements on quality relevant for geospatial aspects showed that it is necessary to develop a common language between the geospatial community and quality experts. It is obviously the case that for the purpose of producing quality reports there contacts and discussions on national level. A first brainstorming for possible elements on quality reports and quality indicators will take place in autumn this year and partners of the consortium active in QP2 will provide contacts of quality experts to be involved into this discussion.



## WP 6, Igor Kuzma

The first draft of the EFGS Strategy Map was discussed and many valuable comments, suggestions and feedbacks were received for continuation of the work. The webinar was a good opportunity to exchange opinions on the EFGS work between both, long time EFGS members and newcomers that provided valuable fresh views on this issue.

The group discussions improved the insight in relations between the Strategy Map and the work of other WPs. There is a particularly close link to the Actors Map from WP1. Relation between the EFGS and other groups and institutions will have to reflect in the Strategy Map as well since the number of activities towards the integration of statistical and geospatial information increased significantly during the last 10-15 years. The Strategy Map needs a background document that can ensure better understanding of the Strategy Map scheme. Since the EFGS Steering Committee has to be involved in the process, the next version of the Strategy Map will be delivered to the SC members till end of June, whereas the background document will be prepared during the Summer and delivered in September. One of very important messages for the future was also the commitment of the Eurostat to continue to support the activities of the EFGS.

EFGS is redefining its role and seeks new opportunities in a changing world!

## General, Rina Tammisto

The project manager concluded the webinar by expressing her contentment that the work has started in all work packages – despite the challenging pandemic situation. It was also noted that the work to be done in the project has a very strong base from the earlier GEOSTAT projects. The ways how to take advantage of a huge amount of information cleared during the three webinar days. Also, the project's outputs were defined in more detail and a common understanding was strengthened.

The webinar also gave more thoughts on what is the purpose of the EFGS and how its position and structure should be strengthened.

The challenging times will continue in Autumn. For that, the webinar gave ideas of joint working methods and, also further ideas for the EFGS Webinar in November.