

GEOSTAT 3 project – Minutes from Coordination meeting

Date: January 16, 2019

Venue: Web meeting

Participants

Ana Santos, Statistics Portugal
Ekkehard Petri, Eurostat
Erik Engeli, Statistics Norway
Ingrid Kaminger, Statistics Austria
Jerker Moström, Statistics Sweden
Karin Hedeklint, Statistics Sweden
Marina Backer Skaar, MdMapping
Niek van Leeuwen, Statistics Netherlands
Pier-Giorgio Zaccheddu, BKG Germany
Rina Tammisto, Statistics Finland
Ülle Valgma, Statistics Estonia
Vilni Verner Holst Bloch, Statistics Norway

Agenda

1. Discussion of the documents that will be delivered to Eurostat by the end of January:
 - a) GSGF Europe – implementation guide
 - b) GEOSTAT 3 Annex2_Good practice examples_v1
 - c) GEOSTAT 3 Automated linking SDMX files and maps v1.0
 - d) GEOSTAT 3 WP2 summary report V07

2. A.O.B.

1 Deliveries to Eurostat

a) GSGF Europe – implementation guide

- References in Requirement 4.5 (page 51 in draft 1.0):
Decision: Be more clear about what changes we recommend and what is required.
- Suggestion that the pyramid could be displayed in the heading of the chapters that explain the principles, so that it is more clear what part of the pyramid the text concerns.
Decision: Jerker will decide what is possible to do.
- The main report could be reviewed by a an editor, concerning the English writing.
Comment after meeting: There is no funding for this activity, so it will not be done.

b) GEOSTAT 3 Annex2_Good practice examples_v1

- Suggestion that each case should have a more clear reference to the recommendation that it is connected to. It could be explained in a short sentence just below the title of each example.
Decision: Each author of an example will add this information to their example. Send it to Jerker, latest by January 23.
- Each case should have more general contact information to the organisation that is concerned, i.e. a common e-mail address to the whole organisation.
Decision: Each author of an example will add this information to their example. Send it to Jerker, latest by January 23.
- We discussed how to number the examples.
Decision: The numbers should have clear references to the principles. We should not use more numbers, instead use the letter C, to clarify that it is a case study. The numbering will then be: C.1.1; C1.2 etc.

c) GEOSTAT 3 Automated linking SDMX files and maps v1.0

Suggestion that Figure 11 should place all the countries in their geographically correct position.

d) GEOSTAT 3 WP2 summary report V07

The individual case reports, of the SDG testing, should be published on the EFGS website, with links to the summary report. That would be enough for the Eurostat delivery of the case studies in WP-2.

The acronym “SDG” should be included in the title of the report.

2 A.O.B.**a) SP-3: Feasibility study of CROS portal.**

Jerker has sent us Anna’s draft. Send your comments to Anna, as soon as possible.

b) WP-4: Delivery of conference report

The conference report should be a summary of the content and the main discussions at the conference. It should be published at the EFGS website as soon as possible. Thus, Statistics Finland can send it to Anna.

The financial information of the conference is needed for the final management report. Thus, Statistics Finland can send it to Karin.

c) WP-0: Management report

Karin will write the management report, aiming for a delivery during February. All project members may send their financial information to Karin and other information that they would like to include in the report. The grants money will be delivered when Eurostat has approved the management report.