

Attendees

- Sandra Gannon [IBM]
- Emilio Sanfilippo [ISTC-CNR Laboratory for Applied Ontology]
- Pieter Pauwels [Ghent University]
- Jakob Beetz [TUEindhoven]
- Gonçal Costa [ARC, La Salle]
- Kris McGlinn [ADAPT-TCD]
- Walter Terkaj [ITIA-CNR]
- Gene Ting-Chun Kao [Ed. Zueblin AG]
- Hojoong Chung [Ed. Zueblin AG]

Excused

- Ana Roxin
- Wendelin Sprenger [Zueblin]
- Georg Ferdinand Schneider [Fraunhofer]
- Francisco Forns-Samso [Granlund]
- Michel Böhms [TNO]

Date and time

- 28/06/2017
- 12:00 CEST

Agenda

1. Short review of past activities (Pieter)
2. A case for industry
3. Plan for an industrial interest and support group (Sandra)
4. Outlook towards TPAC 2017

Minutes

0. Prequel:

Emilio Sanfilippo: Introduces upcoming workshop around formal ontologies in industry (FOMI - <http://www.loa.istc.cnr.it/workshops/FOMI2017/home.html>). This workshop is part of a larger set of Joint Ontology Workshops (JOWO - <http://www.iaoa.org/jowo/2017/>). It would be great if practical examples and ongoing research work are presented here to represent the building domain.

1. Short review of past activities (Pieter)

Pieter introduces the LBD group again to the attendees, discusses the separate sub-groups and the need to align these, also giving the rationale for the call and the need to explore business use cases.

Relevant sources:

- <https://w3c-lbd-cg.github.io/lbdw/>
- <https://www.w3.org/community/lbd/>

2. A case for industry

Pieter: Our Community Group consists of three kinds of subgroups:

- Domain Ontology Groups:
<https://www.w3.org/community/lbd/domain-ontology-groups/>
- An Ontology Alignment Group:
<https://www.w3.org/community/lbd/ontology-alignment-group/>
- Business Case Groups:
<https://www.w3.org/community/lbd/business-case-groups/>

In our previous calls, we focused almost exclusively on the first two (mostly the first). We now have a list of ontologies and documentation for a number of domains. We need to turn back to industry (business case groups), simply to make sure that this ontology work can be used in support of demands and needs in industry.

Therefore, we intended to have someone in industry (not academic) to present needs and demands coming from industry. Most invited people could not make it to the call, however. So, our original plan will not succeed in this call.

Gene Ting-Chun Kao: We are working in a research project that looks at the usage of semantic web and data storage techniques. We are looking at the RDF format, and at how to store 3D construction data with RDF. We are in touch with RDF limited (Peter Bonsma), looking a lot at data formats related to geometry. One of the use cases can be a concrete ordering tool that utilizes a browser based web application.

Pieter: What are the KPIs for industry?

3. Plan for an industrial interest and support group (Sandra)

Sandra: What we observed is that the academic groups are progressing, and we feel that we need to revisit the business use cases. As part of this process we need to identify common requirements across industries. So, we need to look at the ontology use cases and really have a bridge between the two, so the academic work is supporting use cases.

We need to specify a call specifically for industry and a specific industrial interest and support group (ISG) that provides the content there.

Who are using the software, what are their pain points, can we identify common issues or themes. This would help the work from an academic perspective.

Sandra: If you have a list of participants, I can reach out to the guys on the call. If we have a prioritised list based on the impact, we can work through that list in terms of the high priority use cases. Would be good for academia to identify what work can potentially result in greatest impact.

Pieter: Emilio is organising a workshop aiming to bring ontologies to industry. Do you have particular companies in mind that could provide use cases?

Emilio: I think it is relevant to understand what are the modelling needs, typical scenario, typical data, is an interesting strategy. A problem I see, is whether companies are willing to share data. This is something we should consider.

Sandra: We would be naive to believe companies will make data available. They may provide generic data, example data. A question for this group is that across the building life cycle, are there stages where data has not been digitised sufficiently. There is still huge potentially in areas, such as IoT, FM, maintained model back into design. Again identify the gaps/pain points. We can then approach different companies based on where we see these, and where they may be able to help. We need to brainstorm, create a list, and prioritise. See who comes to the table, and what they will share.

Pieter: I agree. Furthermore, I think we should maybe aim at the software companies who support the different companies in construction practice. Something we need to take into account.

Sandra: At the national construction summit in Dublin, listened to presentations, walked around the floor. Builders are not focused on digital data. Until there is an Irish mandate, builders and contractors will not adopt. So we need to push standards, engage with those who see the opportunity. Even those working on large national projects, and we may not get their time (currently). Not just about software, also contracting, and other aspects of the building process.

We need to show how processes can be made more efficient to get people interested.

Assess whether this is realistic in the long term.

Sandra: will organise these ISG meetings with industry participants.

4. Outlook towards TPAC 2017

Pieter: We need to communicate again with the W3C, there is a summit in November (<https://www.w3.org/2017/11/TPAC/>) in California. Members of W3C can register and engage in

having 2-hour community group meetups. In this summit, we need to present what we have done so far and discuss what next steps can be with W3C advisors. There was an originally idea to set up a working group (TPAC summit 2016). W3C said it is too early, you need some content that has a chance to land as a standard.

As it stands, we can look to present the discussed ontologies and corresponding documentation as material that could flow into standardisation (material in <https://w3c-lbd-cg.github.io/lbdw/>). We should clean this up, make it consistent, and present it to them along with an outlook in industrial use cases (ISG), and get W3C advice on where to go from here.

Sandra: This would help focus the group, what has been achieved, and what it wants to achieve. Beneficial to have milestones like this.

Previous minutes

Next Call