

Attendees

- Alberto Giretti (Università Politecnica delle Marche - UNIVPM)
- Kris McGlinn (TCD-ADAPT)
- Gonçal Costa [LaSalle University]
- Aaron Costin
- Al-Hakam Hamdan
- Odilo Schoch [ETH Zurich]
- Joel J. Bender (Cornell University)
- Pouya Zangeneh
- Mathias Bonduel [KU Leuven]
- Pieter Pauwels [UGent]
- Anna Wagner [TU Darmstadt]
- Richard Pinka [CTU Prague]
- Seppo Törmä (VisuaLynk)
- Ana Roxin (UBFC)

Date and time

- 27/11/2018
- 15:00 GMT

Agenda

1. Review “Letter of Support” -
<https://docs.google.com/document/d/1kPUrd9GfEpF1zJtVzoyFEJfvGGD7esmVUPOa11Zqog0/edit?usp=sharing>
2. Review form for indicating support -
<https://docs.google.com/forms/d/e/1FAIpQLScsn5SNikJ01DI5jWMFYOnSflU2zdJ9xx1W5S4MNfXe3iY9UQ/viewform>
3. Information Brochure -
<https://drive.google.com/file/d/15Dq6Z0QmkkRVs6VnTlqAw8tPsxsuanDt/view?usp=sharing>
4. Review of charter - <https://w3c-lbd-cg.github.io/lbd/charter/>

Minutes

- Review “Letter of Support” -
<https://docs.google.com/document/d/1kPUrd9GfEpF1zJtVzoyFEJfvGGD7esmVUPOa11Zqog0/edit?usp=sharing>
- Review form for indicating support -

- <https://docs.google.com/forms/d/e/1FAIpQLScsn5SNikJ01DI5jWMFYOnSflU2zdJ9xx1W5S4MNfXe3iY9UQ/viewform>
 - - Do (will?) you support the formation of a Building Data on the Web Working Group? yes/no
 - - Do (will?) you take part in a Building Data on the Web Working Group as an active W3C Member? yes/no
 - Should be send to companies and industry partners - ideally beginning with the ones that are already W3C members and those closely related to our Community Group
 - List of companies that are members of the W3C exists already. Those companies should be contacted with the brochure and asked to answer the survey.
 - Pieter: This should also go through the Community Group (and external W3C members) - which members would support the working group, have already membership status and so forth
 - People can join in two ways: Say they support but don't take part or actively join and join the calls and do the work - this should also be a question in the form
 - We also need external members
 - Kris: This survey should go out before christmas - the sooner the better.
 - (silent agreement)
- Information Brochure - <https://drive.google.com/file/d/15Dq6Z0QmkkRVs6VnTlqAw8tPsxsuanDt/view?usp=sharing>
 - Should go along with the letter of support as attachment
 - Still work in progress, **please share** comments or ideas on the leaflet.
 - Mathias: How will the communication between working group members and external (former community group members) be realised?
 - Pieter: They will get the meeting reports (unsure)
 - A certain number of active (10) and supporting members (20) are needed
 - Supporting members should be the members of W3C? => yes
 - For some members of the community group, the entrance fee for the W3C is too costly (e.g. universities or Trimble)
 - Pieter: W3C and bS are currently talking to each other on management level - in the future it could be possible that companies supporting bS can join the W3C for a small additional fee (has already been done for the OGC, but it took 2 years to happen).
 - Seppo: How many reference implementations are also needed?
 - Pieter: 2
 - Pieter: we have 5 deliverables (after review of charter). Ontologies must be implemented twice for validation (thus, the definition of the product ontology as a note, not as ontology)

- Review of charter - <https://w3c-lbd-cg.github.io/lbd/charter/> (link to original version)
 - Maxime created a commented version last week
 - Originally inspired by spatial data on the web working group
 - Currently 5 deliverables (3 notes and 2 recommendations)
 - Comments:
 - Name: Linked Building Data vs. Building Data on the Web
 - Pieter: preferably Building Data on the Web (more than just Linked Data)
 - Ana: disagree - there is already a group with a similar name (Building the Web of Data - (sub?)title of the W3C Data Activity)
 - Same scope? IoT, LD, Web
 - Pieter: Difference should be clear by looking onto the website
 - Ana: Changing the name should bring more visibility, and picking this one has the opposite effect (we create misunderstanding)
 - Aaron: Name should fit the scope of the working group (e.g. LBD too broad)
 - Kris: run it by some people in the W3C and get their feedback
 - Pieter: Add this question to the survey
 - Pieter: Lines above the table (about community group that will be gone by then) should be removed
 - Introduction:
 - 4.4
 - Kris: Should we add the OPM (so the management of properties over time) to the scope? Pieter: Is already part of 4.4. "Product and Property Evaluation ontology"
 - Ana: What will be evaluated for properties?
 - Pieter: The property's value
 - Ana: The word evaluation may be badly chosen
 - Mathias: based on the seas:Evaluation (Ana: seas is for energy evaluation, this does not fit to the context of properties and products; change it for approximation?)
 - Pieter: same goes for Feature of Interest
 - Ana: Check with Maxime what he thinks (he added this)
 - Mathias: switching between 3 levels possible - Add according sentence to the document?
 - 4.5
 - Ana: What is this about? It could include support for property management.
 - Pieter: non standardised building taxonomy. Being a note, this delivery is optional. These taxonomies should be published by the owners (e.g. buildingSMART). Indeed, they should be aligned.

- Ana: Where would regulation checking (which would be based on 4.4) go to? 4.5 as taxonomy? Maybe add a new deliverable (4.6.)?
 - Kris: just mentioned regulation checking as a motive for 4.4.
 - Ana: industrial interest here - we should/could add this to our scope
 - Pieter: this goes very far, it could be a bad idea to add this to our deliverables. With level 3 of 4.4 we also prepare the base for addressing the topic of regulation checking
- Feature of Interest for a building element - any opinions?
 - Ana: broader meaning and wider range, link to the GIS community
 - Kris: Adding this to geospatial level might be feasible, but on smaller levels, e.g. screws, this might become weird
 - Mathias: Fol is very generic and can be applied to anything disregarding its granularity (screw as well as bridge)
 - Pieter: Should define if we use it (personally against it). Instead we should use the term products?
 - Maxime (via Ana): replace it with Zone or Element (from BOT) for project ontology
- Project: At some point there was a proposal to include a project ontology. It is currently included as non-normative result that may occur, but unsure where. Does anyone have an idea about this?
 - Seppo: original proposal of project ontology included high level concepts (e.g. risk factor). This might not fit all into one ontology, instead multiple, more specific ontologies would be feasible
 - Pieter: This should be run over Pouya to evaluate the usefulness
 - Ana: very complex, but if there is a strong interest, we should add it
 - Pieter: If it's just about the building itself, one could use BOT, project management could be based on OPM (assumptions turning into decisions)...
- End of call
 - We should dedicate another call to this topic, meanwhile everyone should go through the charter until then.
 - The group members should already fill out the form (survey)
 - Next call (11.12.2018)
 - Anna & Mathias will present their work on geometries
 - Review of changes to the charter document
 - Agenda is open - if someone has a request feel free to enter it

Previous minutes

<https://docs.google.com/document/d/1SXjROsqGqyL6bbnUIHCLbSmeBhBU29HNftCEy-vEcFM/edit>

Next Call

- 11/12/2018
- 15:00 GMT