Attendees

- Kris McGlinn (TCD)
- Pieter Pauwels (UGent)
- Jakob Beetz (TU Eindhoven)
- Mads Holten Rasmussen (DTU, Denmark)
- Erika Mata (IVL Swedish Environmental Research Institute, Sweden)
- Kiril Tonev (KIT)
- Ana Roxin (Univ. Burgundy, France)
- Sandra Gannon (IBM)
- Walter Terkaj (ITIA-CNR)
- Hendro Wicaksono (KIT)
- Zohreh

Date and time

- 06/12/2016
- 11:00 CET

Agenda

1. outside news and overall management
    a. Moving the mailing list to the LBD, please if you are not already a member join here - https://www.w3.org/community/lbd/
2. list of participants
    a. https://www.dropbox.com/s/s7489wxh8j4usj9/BDW_Members.xlsx?dl=0
3. revision of the charter
    a. http://phaedrus.scss.tcd.ie/buildviz/lbdw/
4. progress around the core building topology ontology (BOT) and how it can connect with other data sets (Pieter, Mads)
    a. https://github.com/w3c-lbd-cg/lbdw

Minutes

Brief introduction of members

Agenda Items 1, 2:
Future Calls have at a later time for American interest?

Sandra - Could you have a split time meeting? I wouldn't be available in the afternoon usually.

Pieter: Lets try and make it work with a core group at 10:00 or 11:00, they are usually more efficient.

Agenda Item 3:
Sandra: I will look at the charter and provide some comments

Ana: We should look more at the alignment of our standards with existing standards, perhaps we could have some additional candidates for alignment. Maybe WGS84, we could mention or consider in internal work.

Pieter: Yes, of course. We also have relationships dependencies, etc. We must mention them and work on them. We need the balance between scope and industrial needs.

Ana: Is there interest in ontologies for classification, e.g. omniclass, etc.

Sandra: Customers tend to deviate, so we have to be flexible, so might be better not to delve too deeply.

Pieter: Yes, let's first see where we go stepwise, and we can add those details relevant to industry.

Pieter: Connection of the charter and the development of BOT. We have Kiril, Hendro on the call who take similar approach.

Mads: Looking at bridging the gap between architecture and
BIM around building services
Link to presentation - (tbd)
Highlights need for linking between many data stores
Many ontologies redefine concepts like Building
    Make a simple Building ontology, very minimal and very general

Define linking approaches

Ana: You redefine two elements, adjacent and contains? Do we have ontologies that have those predicates described
We also need to decide if equivalent class is best, or could we use skos, if it does not introduce too much complexity?
Pieter: We invited developer of BIMSO, we need to determine what are the best approaches for linking for all the different ontologies we have discussed.

Ana: Maybe we could have this discussion in a separate meeting

Walter: Link between building and location? Is it planned to define it @ t-box level by way of restrictions?

Mads: We would define it in the t-box of geo ontology (for example). BOT building is in the domain hasLocation? Would result in all geo:hasLocation being inferred as building---future discussion.

Ana: Perhaps have some guidelines, if you want to use it this way then import this type of model and adapt to specific use cases.

Mads: Extend in the HVAC domain.

Ana: Is this a collective effort?

Pieter: Push into GIT repository. Let's see how this will go?

Jakob: You should also look at GbXML, there have been many attempts at simplifying things like 2D geometry for example. The risk is that we have yet another ontology, and we are splitting up implementation methods for vendors.

Mads: GbXML is not suited for my demands...I see BOT as a baseline, gbXML is an extension.

Pieter: Phil mentioned this, the group should not be only about ontologies, should be about also XML, JSON, etc. Preference towards RDF, but there is openness to other formats.
Open question: how do we link to geometry?

Sandra: From my perspective, if we are to create a working group. We also need to look at where in the building process these standards are to be used. I am not seeing and reference to commercial use cases. If we are to look to industry, we need to define the scope and prioritise that list based on the time frame. Focus on areas where the perceived benefit is, or where it addresses an existing gap.

Are we talking about architects, construction, what stages of the life cycle does it address? Everyone should put their requirements on the table and prioritise.

Pieter: Yes, we need these industrial use cases. What we have here is a simple reference ontology, and then these linked to many other ontologies which address specific use cases.

Sandra: We should build standards around the BIM life cycle. When we talk about BIM we are talking about complex infrastructure. What about other infrastructure? E.g. airports. From my experience, AEC is where we do not see innovation, collaboration, etc. This is the part of the industry that could benefit from what we do.

Pieter: Ok, thanks. Any input from your perspective would be very useful for us.

Ana: We might need to make this more relevant to industry, make some images/figures. Demonstrate our techniques (without going to deep) we could help collaboration. Put it into industrial language in the Charter?

Sandra: What I find with customers, even with BIM, owners of buildings get lost, they are switching off. We need natural language, so an owner could find this document and process it.

Pieter: An industrial chair would be good for the group. For the charter, we use internally. Maybe another document for external communication?

Ana: We need to make something more accessible for external communication.

Sandra: Yes, an industry facing document.

Pieter: We could use github to generate the public document <AP, All, generate public facing document>

Zohreh: Very important to consider industrial concerns, I am not sure how to invite them to contribute to this project. They are looking for something very interesting in this area. Not sure how to convince them?

Mads: In EU, we can only specify requirements of product and not properties?

Sandra: Our approach is based on design thinking. Essentially, talking to the people we are creating the standards for and asking them about their experiences. Identifying from that broad list what we can focus on. Where we can help them. There are a number of use cases we can create which are relevant to this sector. Currently they don’t have this information, so by developing standards we make this data available.

How can we promote the work we are doing so they can reach out to us, can we publicise this work, are there groups etc. Within IBM I work with a core team of customers and partners, and as scenarios are created they are validated to determine if they are realistic. Have to determine our goal in terms of industry adoption.
Erika: need to connect with the building construction lifecycle in the use cases we aim at

Pieter: We need reference implementations, done within an industrial context.

Sandra: The success of this working group will be in the adoption within the industry. We need to address the design stage, and insure that the standards are adhered too. Something industry can use and verify. We need to reach out to various stakeholders and their pain points, and what they really need. In IBM we look for reference customers identifying what is the minimal viable product - without these, industry cannot adopt.
We must track the metrics and show the success of the work. So in favour of having design person on board, or at least reaching out and getting their input.

Ana: We need to have some demos to help define use cases. Some will be easier than others to implement proof of concept. The scope defined for our group is “enable all stakeholders in the building life cycle to access and query required data to support their business use cases using web technologies”. So we can aim first at the use cases that are the most easy to adapt into demonstrators or POC ?

Action items

- Add document for providing use cases to GitHub <Kris>
- Add Use Case to GitHub <All>
    - https://github.com/w3c-lbd-cg/lbdw/blob/gh-pages/use_cases/use_case_template_and_examples.md
- Create external facing document to attract industrial partners <Kris>
    - https://docs.google.com/document/d/1ucKVBtWLz05-17zXco6FnIQ-mplew7f0Xw2sXyHdqs0/edit
- Being adding content to external facing document <All>
- Invite and update contacts list <All>

Previous action items

- Update the charter <Kris> (ONGOING)
    - http://phaedrus.scss.tcd.ie/buildviz/lbdw/
- Create list of existing ontologies for basis for simpleBIM, some basic information <Kris> (Going to use BOT as Basis)
    - Identify those people who have existing topologies for building topology
        - Mads will be presenting some initial ideas about BOT

- Contact DogOnt <Kris> (COMPLETE)
    - Dario Bonino has demonstrated interest and will be joining the group
- Create GitHub repository <Maxime, Kris> (COMPLETE)
    - https://github.com/w3c-lbd-cg/lbdw

Next Call

- 13/12/2016 11:00 CET @ gotomeeting