

Attendees

- Alberto Pavan
- Ana Roxin
- Anna Wagner [TU Darmstadt]
- Fangzheng Lin
- Forns-Samso Francisco
- Georg-Ferdinant Schneider [Fraunhofer IPB]
- Gonçal Costa [LaSalle University]
- Joel J. Bender [Cornell]
- Jun Wang [Curtin University]
- Kris McGlinn [TCD-ADAPT]
- Mads Holten Rasmussen [DTU / Niras]
- Maxime Lefrançois [MINES StEtienne]
- Odilo Schoch [ETH Zurich]
- Oraskari Jyrki []
- Pieter Pauwels [Ghent University]
- Phil Stacey
- Richard Pinka [CTU-Prague]
- Seppo Törmä [VisuaLynk]

Date and time

- 07/11/2018
- 15:00 GMT

Agenda

1. Overview of TPAC meeting
 - Link to the presentation -
<https://w3c-lbd-cg.github.io/lbd/presentations/out/TPAC2018.pptx>
 - Give the conclusion of Dave
2. Next Steps based on feedback -> WG constraints
 - Garnering Support from W3C, strategy going forward
3. Tutorial on the W3C tools and procedures

Minutes

1. TPAC

- Pieter recaps presentation of TPAC

- To move towards a working group, the group must be organized more clearly
- Decision that no additional mailing list will be used anymore, participants must register on the community group's homepage
- Use of IRC (supported within W3C) to enable voting on decisions.
- Out of scope: geometry, geospatial, infrastructure
 - Goncal: will this be permanent? Or may these topics be in our scope in the future?
 - Pieter: It should be fixed for this group. Instead, other (working or community) groups should/could be created to address these
 - Seppo: Does this also exclude city models
 - Pieter: I think so
 - Kris: Our goal is to create alignments to those ontologies - this could and should be our scope
 - Pieter: Best practice for publishing building data on the web includes those alignments - but we do not want to reinvent the CityGML ontology
- Overview of currently stated use cases
 - Pieter: please keep this document (link in the presentation) updated - add new use cases and fill blanks in existing ones
- Presentation of ontology
 - OPM and GEOM not exactly our scope - instead focus on topology, product and properties
- FoI, properties and values
 - More on generic level - not talking about the namings, rather the modelling approach (3 levels, OPM)
- Products
 - Aim to create a W3C Recommendation with domain specific example taxonomy (e.g. IFC, CCS, SfB)
 - Product hierarchy on generic level (see results from LDAC in Dijon)
- Questions / Remarks from the attendees of the call:
 - Georg: How was the feedback to the plan for focussing on those topics and relating them to existing standards?
 - Pieter: Generally well received, mostly W3C members themselves, who like alignment and links to existing groups/recommendations/schemas. If we would include a complete taxonomy into our scope, we needed to prove after 2 years that it has been implemented in at least 2 reference ontologies. Challenge remains to make other groups creating taxonomies and also publishing them. → group notes for example implementations that can be used to persuade stakeholders
 - Maxime: Move on to the next steps on how to get the support from the industry
 - Seppo: does the W3C want industry support?
 - Pieter: yes.
- Links to other groups of the W3C to align with them

- Seppo: plans for a working group based on the web of things also focusing on building data: have you heard of this?
 - Maxime: not heard of this
 - Pieter: it's a rumour, it could be this working group
- Close relation to Automotive working group, same problems: geometry, sensors, geospatial,...
 - Question came up if there could be a project to combine our group with them (e.g. car automatically driving through the city to a parking spot in a building garage)
 - Also worthwhile to include infrastructure → infrastructure working/community group needed (not in our scope)
 - Supported by Siemens
 - Georg: There is a benefit from working with these groups on both sides including the possibility to gain support from industry, while we still focus on building data
 - Pieter: yes, we could also reuse approaches, not just ontologies. We should invite members of those groups to present their work in our group
- Links to existing standardization groups needed
- Demonstration of implementations
 - We should use them to show other industry partners what they could to → gain support by them
- What do we need?
 - Support of 20-25 W3C members
 - If we work together with the automotive working group and they are supporting us, we fulfill this requirement
 - Scope must be refined
 - Next steps
 - Which members of this community group is already a W3C member? List in spreadsheet/doc
 - Kris will set up a document and share it with the group
 - Who is member?
 - Ana: We should discuss what the consequences are for becoming a working group: upcoming fees for members of institutions which are not yet members. We should define a deadline to fill out the spreadsheet - including a voting if that step should be made in resp. of the consequences
 - Ana: We also need a partner from the industry before thinking about taking the next step
 - Pieter: indeed. We should ask every member if they can and or will join the working group. Deadline should be as soon as possible. A complete

up-to-date list of W3C members can be found here:

<https://www.w3.org/Consortium/Member/List#xG>

- Ana: there is the possibility to invite singular members as experts into working groups
See
<https://www.w3.org/Consortium/Legal/2007/06-invited-expert>
 - Maxime: prepared
<https://docs.google.com/forms/d/e/1FAIpQLScsn5SNlkJ01DI5jWMFYOnSfIU2zdJ9xx1W5S4MNfXe3iY9UQ/viewform> , please comment before we send it out to the world
 - Aaron: is the fee only for the ownership?
 - Pieter: no, the meetings are also closed for non-members. This would include probably half of the members. We could still communicate and talk to those people but not within the community group
 - Maxime: You can contact the W3C to help to convince companies and institutions to join the W3C
 - Pieter: We could contact the companies supporting buildingSMART to give them the opportunity to support our working group. The fees for W3C are lower than for bSI. This might be easier to achieve with a liaison with bSI, the organizations could then discuss the fees with each other.
- Call for support to W3C members
 - Call for industry partners to gain the needed support
 - Re-define our scope/working documents
- Conclusion
 - Goal of the next meeting should be to summarize who will be able and motivated to join the working community
 - Maxime: Next meeting I will explain how IRC and the workflow for working groups should be used

Previous minutes

Next Call

28.11.2018, 15:00 GMT