Attendees

- Kris McGlinn (TCD)
- Pieter Pauwels (GhentU)
- Phil Archer (W3C)
- Markus Helfert (DCU)
- Maxime Lefrancois (Univ. Lyon)
- Mohamad Kassem ()

Date and time

- 28/11/2016
- 11:30 CET

Agenda

- Discuss management of information for organisation (dropbox folder, google docs)
  - Lets try and keep the amount of shared info to a minimum, with at most two shared folders.
    - Dropbox - main shared folder with contacts, deliverables (all final drafts), ontology development, webpage, etc.
      - https://www.dropbox.com/sh/hmf43pj6jb6atgw/AAAsfNitU-gV_cr7xWewy_Z8a?dl=0
    - Google docs - for working drafts and minutes
      - https://drive.google.com/drive/folders/0B3aGbDKGwEGEM3NJQmM5WG1xd1U?usp=sharing
- Update on list of interested people
  - All contacts to be stored in excel sheet found in shared dropbox folder
    - Direct link -
      - https://www.dropbox.com/s/s7489wxh8j4usj9/BDW_Members.xlsx?dl=0
- Revision of the online charter
  - How to make updates? - make suggestions during week, discuss during regular teleco and make updates
- Next to do items
  - Confirm status of industrial partners
    - Essential we have commitment from W3C industrial partners

Minutes

Call started off with general introduction to group and a review of the agenda by Kris.

General comments provided by Phil Archer:

Phil - Need to put initial deliverables together - probably a year's development before you are ready for a WG.
W3C can provide a namespace.

Pieter: Our plan was to wait six months for the beginning of the WG (ok, now 12 months)?

Phil: You will not get through the charter process until you already have a lot of the ontology drafted and published as a report.
Another group (ODRL licensing language) has had two iterations in the WG before reports.
Standardisation doesn't lead, it follows - so standardise around what is already being done.
Deliver something the web offers that they don't already have.

Phil: You will need to have an initial ontology developed. Create a github for developing our ontology

Phil - We intend to set up a spatial data interest group, this might be a future vehicle to support the building data on the web WG. Joint publications between OGC and W3C make sense.

Pieter: Our plan is to develop a simplified ontology, which covers building topology, building products. Look at existing proposals (several exist) and the result would be the building topology ontology.

Discussion of charter and comments:

- Comments regarding charter to be addressed (red ink taken from e-mails):
    - Raul: In the beginning you mention several ontologies but later you say that the scope is only on building topology and building product data, so the ontologies mentioned before are not so relevant anymore, since some of them do not deal with that.
        - Pieter: I would just state the ontologies in scope and maybe comment elsewhere that other relevant ontologies will be taken into account.
    - Discussion of name: **BOT**, BTop, BTO?
        - BOT is current suggestion

- Raul/Maxime: SAREF is already an standard in ETSI, there is no need to standardise it again. Maybe mention that the ontologies will be aligned as much as possible with existing standards (e.g., SAREF).
  - Kris <AP Update>
- Raul: DogOnt. I would only include this deliverable if there is a firm commitment from the developers to participate.
  - Kris <AP contact developers>
- Raul: QUDT - might be difficult to introduce into the discussion.
  - Pieter: Keep it at a distant for the moment...develop central ontology first
  - Maxime: Quantities not relevant to building topology
    - Maybe better to use O&M Ontology
- Raul: Change deliverable names - * Building topology ontology, * Building objects ontology, then in the text mention in the text mention the ontology where the inspiration comes from.
  - Maxime: We need to have the developers within the group, and whether they will modify their ontology to align with the WG developments. Best to describe the BOT ontology, and then as side notes describe links.
  - Pieter: We should have a pointer
  - Maxime: Needs to be made clear it is a mapping to the proposed ontology
- Raul: Vocabulary Success Criteria. I would remove the second sentence; analysing the reuse of all the previous work is a hard work and will not influence the process.
- Raul: Milestones. I would change the things related to the 3rd task. And clarify whether you plan to identify ontologies or to standardize them. (Also check the section numbers).
- Raul: Relationship with BuildingSMART International. What is missing here is the deliverables from the BuildingSmart group, to show that they are different (even if complementary).
  - Pieter: Let's first see what happens with the development of the BOT. See how far we get, and whether it aligns with the other ontologies and have some strong example implementations to demonstrate use.
- Raul: Other Groups & Projects. INSPIRE?
  - Maxime: SEAS-Club
- Maxime: I think it could be interesting to go further than just alignments with existing ontologies, but also to describe ways to translate RDF graphs from one ontology to another ? These could be described using SPARQL Update queries

- Maxine: in the notes, give descriptions how to switch from BOT to SAREF (for example). SPARQL update queries, RDF Data Cube, reference it in the charter? First need to list schemas we focus on. Then go into these mappings.
  - Maxime: add SEAS in the list of existing ontologies
  - Maxime: Section 3, deliverables...add a section about the SEAS ontologies - https://w3id.org/seas/ ?
  - Maxime: section 3.1 best practice success criteria
    - Apparently the best practice document would just be a note, not a recommendation. This makes me question the relevance of this section
  - Maxime: section 4.3 other groups and projects:
    - the SEAS project will turn into a "SEAS club" that will carry on the SEAS ontologies development support. When this group will be created, one could mention it in the section liaison.
  - .Maxime: add references to Semantic Web related W3C notes ?
    - https://www.w3.org/TR/ld-bp/
    - https://www.w3.org/TR/cooluris/
    - https://www.w3.org/TR/swbp-vocab-pub/
  - Maxime: Who is contact at DogOnt ? who is the contact at QUDT ?
    - <Kris - AP Make contact with DogOnt developers>

Next action items

- Update the charter <Kris>
- Create list of existing ontologies for basis for simpleBIM, some basic information <Kris>
  - Identify those people who have existing topologies for building topology
- Contact DogOnt <Kris>
- Create GitHub repository <Maxime, Kris>

Next Call

- Tuesday 6th December/11:00 CET