

---

## GEOSTAT 3 project – Minutes from coordination meeting

**Date:** October 15, 2018

**Venue:** Statistics Finland, Helsinki

### Participants

#### *Coordinators*

Jerker Moström, Statistics Sweden

Karin Hedeklint, Statistics Sweden

#### *Project team*

Ana M Santos, Statistics Portugal

Anna Sławińska, Statistics Poland

Erik Engelién, Statistics Norway

Ingrid Kaminger, Statistics Austria

Marianne Dysterud, Statistics Norway

Marja Tammilehto-Luode, Statistics Finland (pt. 1-2)

Niek van Leeuwen, Statistics Netherlands

Pieter Bresters, Statistics Netherlands

Rina Tammisto, Statistics Finland

Vilni Verner Holst Bloch, Statistics Norway

Ülle Valgma, Statistics Estonia

#### *Consultants*

Arvid Lillethun, the Norwegian Mapping Authority

(Kartverket), Norway (pt 6, by Skype)

Marina Backer Skaar, EFGS secretary

Pier-Giorgio Zaccheddu, Federal Agency for Cartography and Geodesy (BKG), Germany

#### *Eurostat*

Ekkehard Petri

## Agenda/index of minutes

1. Welcome
2. WP-4; EFGS conference 2018
3. WP-3; EFGS website
4. WP-2; Results from SDG indicator tests
5. WP-2; Table joining services
6. WP-1; Work through GSGF Europe draft
7. WP-1; Good practise cases
8. WP-5; Upcoming meetings
9. GEOSTAT 4
10. Summing up from detailed planning
11. List of actions

Slides from presentations are annexed to the minutes.

### 1 Welcome

Ekkehard Petri welcomed all participants.

### 2 WP4; EFGS conference 2018

Marja gave us the latest news of the conference, that was starting the next day. There would be almost 230 participants from 46 different countries. The program consisted of 10 sessions, with approximately 50 presentations.

The Finnish mapping agency was the host of the conference dinner. When organising the conference, the mapping agency had one representative in the project group, which helped getting more participants from that sector. Statistics Finland have had a long tradition of cooperation with the Finnish mapping agency.

### 3 WP3; EFGS website

Anna gave us a report of the latest updates on the website. We also got statistics of visitors to the site, regarding number of visitors and their location.

Anna had worked on the feasibility study, regarding the possibilities to use the CROS portal for the EFGS information, in comparison to the current EFGS website ([www.efgs.info](http://www.efgs.info)). Anna had studied the two websites thoroughly, by comparing different aspects of them; for example the calendars, search systems, project information, news, possibilities to put different sorts of media on the sites. The results from the testing were:

1. It is more complicated to update and put new information on the CROS portal, than it is to do the same things at the current EFGS website.
2. It is difficult to find the information that you are looking for on the CROS portal. It is made for collecting documents of separate projects, as the GEOSTAT projects. But there is no space to gather all information of EFGS.
3. There is a risk that people will leave the site when they do not easily get the information they want.
4. The current EFGS website is easy to find when googling. It is also easy to find the information you want there, as the projects have actively worked on improving the site and continuously update the information.

The conclusions are that the current EFGS website is the best choice, considering user needs. The CROS portal cannot replace efgs.info, but we should be more active on the portal, by setting up interlinks between the two sites. Also, the information about the GEOSTAT projects needs to be updated. Anna will fix that, by using the project information that we already have on efgs.info.

Finally, we discussed the nearest future of the EFGS website. Statistics Poland will be maintaining it during 2019, since they will get financing from Eurostat until March 2020. After that it is not decided yet how the maintenance of the website will be financed.

## 4 WP2; Results from SDG indicator tests

Statistics Norway have summarized the testing results in a report. We discussed what could be improved with that. These were the suggestions:

1. Add more information about the process of choosing indicators, most specifically that we were inspired by the choices of UN-GGIM Europe.
2. The chapter *Clarifications regarding metadata*; Move some of the main findings to this chapters, i.e. information that is common for all indicators.
3. The texts about each indicator should be more clear about the purpose of the tests and about each part of the testing; regarding data, methods etc. Information about individual tests and results could be put in a table, to make it more clear which methodology that have been used in each country. That would make it easier to see both differences and common aspects.

4. We could give the readers some short information about the results, i.e. the statistics of the indicators. To make it short, it could be put in a table that summarizes the most important information.
5. The report could give a suggestion of how to proceed with the information that will be reported to UN.
6. When discussing the SDG metadata, there should be references to UN-GGIM Europe's documents about this. However, those documents need to be uploaded on a website, so that we can have interlinks to them. Pier-Giorgio will discuss this with his colleagues in UN-GGIM Europe.
7. The chapter *Experiences relating to the GSGF principles*: the text should be compressed, by only containing results that are common for all indicators. Remove the discussions of each separate indicator.
8. The report that contains the individual country reports, in full test, should be shorter. The descriptions that are common between the reports could be summarized.
9. If time for that is available, Ingrid will try to look into indicator 11.2.1, to change the calculation of 300 meters to 500 meters.

Latest by November 13, Statistics Norway will need additional comments on the report.

We discussed how to present the result to users. UN-GGIM Europe has noticed that countries have different approaches to how they work with the indicators; regarding method, data and time of reporting. There are few examples describing how to deal with the indicators in practise, so our reports will fill an information gap for countries that have not yet started this work. Therefore, it is important that we make the information easily available to the users.

In addition to the paper reports, we could put the result on the EFGS website, with interlinks from summary to separate country reports. Every country report should be put as separate cases or news on the website.

We could change the current structure of the case reports at the website, to adapt it to a structure that is more up to date according to current work within this project and the SDG reporting. We would then need a new section under the headline *Information base* → *Case studies*. The design should be open, so we can easily change it again according to more current issues within the next few years. Anna will try to arrange and prepare the structure of the website, according to our proposals.

We discussed this suggestion of structure:

- [www.efgs.info](http://www.efgs.info)
  - Information base:
  - Case studies:
    - UN SDG indicators:
      1. Landing site with introduction and interlinks to Eurostat, UN-GGIM Europe etc
      2. Summary report, containing:
        - a) Metadata
        - b) Evaluation of result
      3. Indicator 11.2.1, report from each country in separate pages:
        - a) Estonia
        - b) Sweden
        - c) ....
      4. Indicator 11.3.1, report from each country:
        - a) Sweden
        - b) Portugal
        - c) ...
      5. Indicator 11.7.1, report from each country:
        - a) Estonia
        - b) Sweden
        - c) ....

We need a template for the country reports, so that they have the same structure. Marianne and Erik will provide us with a draft for a template, latest by November 13. It should be more simple than the current one, in order to better fit the website layout. The new country reports need to be finished by December 5.

## 5 WP-2; Table joining services (TJS)

Niek and Pieter reported from their project to test and develop TJS, in order to put SDMX files together. The purpose of the study is to produce a guideline for the 2021 Census. The benefits of using TJS is that you make the join as close as the source as possible, which is according to the GSGF principle 4.

In the tests, there have been different approaches in different countries, since the work have been done either on national servers or by the help of Statistics Netherlands.

---

Now, the project needs a solution for how to handle and create metadata for each dataset. It also needs to be more clear how the data should be published. Statistics Netherlands will look into that.

The result should be a central solution, that can be used for the whole area of Europe. Then we need solutions for border pixels. We also need a solution for multiple variables. In the future, this type of service could be used for other Inspire themes, for example the ones in the Human health theme and the rest of the population variables.

We discussed this project's relation to the main report of the GEOSTAT3 project. There should be a reference to the relevant GSGF principles in the report of this sub-project. Niek and Pieter will write that.

## **6 WP1; Work through GSGF Europe draft**

We discussed the draft for GSGF Europe, i.e. the technical report of this project. Jerker had received feedback from UN-GGIM Europe and the GEOSTAT3 project members. We went through the more general proposals, that needed joint decision from us.

In summary, there were a lot of good and clear proposals, both on what is good with report and what needs to be more worked on. The main issues were:

1. The political framework of the report; do we address only EU and EFTA countries or a wider Europe? We have tried to be clear about this, but the comments show that it should be even more clear. One option is to restrict the receivers to only EU and EFTA countries and then leave other European countries out. That would make our focus more clear, but we do not want to narrow the focus in such a way. Instead we aim at being even more clear about this, by writing some extra lines about it in an introduction. Our main objective is to address countries that have obligations to Inspire and other EU regulations, but the document should also be relevant for a wider group of countries.
2. We have made an attempt to be more clear about what kind of institutions the framework concerns; if it is only for statistical offices or also other sorts of authorities. To make it more clear, we have put that information in the summarizing table, in the back of the report. There it is specified for every recommendation. We also have a separate section discussing this.

3. The length of the document is a problem, but is hard to get around when we try to answer all the needs of clarifications. Instead of making the text shorter, we could try to use more tables and highlights in order to make the most important parts more visible.
4. The text about the global framework, that is now in the introduction, will be moved to chapter 2.
5. Concerning the implementation of the framework, the project only have the mandate to make general recommendations. It is for Eurostat to decide about the future of the framework and the project's result. This could be an issue for the GEOSTAT 4 project. We have made that more clear in the text. We could also write something about what will happen to the report within the next year.
6. We discussed how the framework is presented visually. Is the pyramid the best illustration, or should it be a flow structure instead? We agree that the pyramid and the names of the principles are not perfect and should be more worked through. However, it is not in the scope of this project to change the basic structure of the framework. The task would be too big for this project. It could be done in a future step, in the GEOSTAT 4 project.  
  
Arvid will make an attempt to illustrate the framework in a new structure. If we think that we have room for it in this report, we could use it. Otherwise it will wait until the next GEOSTAT project.
7. Statistics Sweden will elaborate more with the colours of the pyramid.
8. The connection between the principles should be more clear in the text, by putting more references between them.
9. Some comments suggested that we should recommend national action plans. This is also in the scope of GEOSTAT 4. Nevertheless, we could elaborate a bit more on target groups in our report.
10. We need to write more about our vision and what we see as the practical result of the process. We could look into what earlier visions we have had in earlier GEOSTAT projects.
11. In order to make the document more long-lived, we should be careful with recommending very specific methods, that might not be used in just a few years. Those could be put in the good practise annex instead. An example of that is the text about ELF.

---

All additional comments should be sent to Jerker, included in the draft with track changes. Rather than just make a comment, write a suggestion on how to change the text.

## **7 WP1: Good practise cases**

We went through the Excel sheet with the overview of examples that we want to include in the annex. There should be at least one example for each recommendation. Some examples have already been provided. We looked at what else is needed. The result of the discussion was documented in the Excel sheet.

We concluded that different examples of grid systems should be put in the annex. The main report should only focus on the Inspire grid, as it is the most important one.

## **8 WP5; Upcoming meetings**

### **8.1 GEOSTAT 3 project meetings**

We have planned one WebEx meeting every month, until the end of the project in January. Karin has send meeting requests for these dates:

- November 20, 13:00-14:30 CET
- December 12, 10:00-11:30 CET
- January 16, 13:00-14:30 CET

### **8.2 Meetings with related projects or conferences**

- There are not yet any plans for the upcoming meetings for UN-GGIM Europe.
- November 19-23 2018 in Beijing, global UN-GGIM and expert meetings. GEOSTAT3 will not be represented there, but EFGS will. We will make the last draft of our report available to Martin Brady, so that he may use it in the discussions in Beijing.
- March 28-29 2019 in Luxemburg: GISCO meeting, where the project's result will be presented.
- May 14-16 2019 in Belgium; Extra ordinary general assembly of EuroGeographics.
- May 15 2019 in Geneva: UNECE meeting on data integration
- June 2019: UN-GGIM plenary meeting



## 9 GEOSTAT 4

The GEOSTAT project is planned to start in 2020, with a call during the first part of 2019. That project will probably have to involve the methodology departments at the statistical agencies, for example people working with peer reviews. It is not decided yet if the website and EFGS conferences will be included in GEOSTAT 4, or if they will have separate projects.

## 10 Summing up from detailed planning

One task that we have left to do, according to our detailed planning, is to identify key terms that is not included in the glossary on the EFGS website. Statistics Sweden will look into the glossary, whether it needs an update.

The final technical report should be send to Eurostat 60 days before the closing of the project, i.e. in the end of November. Statistics Sweden will notify Eurostat, in a formal request, that it is not possible.

## 11 List of actions

WP	ACTIVITY	PERFORMER
WP-1	Improve the report of GSGF Europe, according to the list in these minutes, chapter 6 page 6-7.	Statistics Sweden
WP-1	Make an attempt to illustrate the framework in a new structure.	Kartverket
WP-1	Latest by November 13, provide Statistics Sweden with additional comments on the GSGF Europe draft.	All
WP-1	Latest by December 5, provide Statistics Sweden with additional good practise examples, according to plan in Excel sheet.	All
WP-1	Put examples of grid systems in the annex. The main report should only contain details of the Inspire grid.	Statistics Sweden
WP-1	Identify key terms that is not included in the glossary on the EFGS website.	Statistics Sweden
WP-1	Notify Eurostat, in a formal request, that we cannot send them the technical report 60 days before the closing of the project, i.e. in the end of November.	Statistics Sweden

WP-2	Improve the report of the SDG testing results, according to the list in these minutes, chapter 4 page 3-4.	Statistics Norway
WP-2	Discuss with colleagues in UN-GGIM Europe, whether the documents about their SDG testing could be uploaded on a website, so that we can make references to them.	BKG
WP-2	Indicator 11.2.1: Change the calculation of 300 meters to 500 meters, if time for that is available.	Statistics Austria
WP-2	Arrange and prepare the structure of the website, according to our proposals in these minutes, chapter 4 page 4-5.	Statistics Poland
WP-2	Latest by November 13, create a draft template for the country reports, that is more simple than the current one, in order to better fit the website layout.	Statistics Norway
WP-2	Latest by November 13, provide Statistics Norway with additional comments on the WP-2 testing report.	All
WP-2	Latest by December 5, provide Statistics Norway with new country reports according to new template.	All
WP-2 TJS	Look at solution for how to handle and create metadata for each dataset. Consider how the data should be published.	Statistics Netherlands
WP-2 TJS	Try to find a solution for the usage of this TJS in the whole area of Europe. Consider how border pixels and multiple variables should be handled.	Statistics Netherlands
WP-2 TJS	Write a report of the results within this sub-project, with references to the relevant GSGF principles.	Statistics Netherlands
WP-3	Update information of GEOSTAT2 and 3 projects, on the CROS portal. Use the project information that we already have on efgs.info.	Statistics Poland
WP-4	Write a short summary report of the 2018 EFGS conference.	Statistics Finland
WP-5	Make the last draft of our report available to Martin Brady, so that he may use it in the discussions in Beijing.	Statistics Sweden