

## INSPIRE Core Data

### Questionnaire for EuroGeographics Cadastre & Land Registration KEN members

#### 1. Theme Buildings

Q21: do you have a building database?

- Yes
- No

In case of negative answer, it is end of questionnaire. In case of positive answer, could you please consider the following questions

**Czech:** Not in all cases, the changes are registered only for buildings touched by any kind of building proceeding. All these attributes are stored in RÚIAN and interconnected with ISKN as mentioned before.

**Georgia:** Not full coverage, but the process is underway

**Latvia:** The State Land Service has not separate building database. Information (data) about buildings are registered and maintained in the Cadastre Information System.

##### 1.1 Connection to utilities

The extended INSPIRE model includes attributes “connectionToElectricity”, “connectionToGaz”, “connectionToSewage” and “connectionToWater”.

Q22: do you have these attributes in your data base?

	Yes	No	Comment
connectionToElectricity	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
connectionToGaz	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
connectionToSewage	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
connectionToWater	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	

Q23: are there restrictions (e.g. due to privacy) regarding the delivery of these attributes?

**Austria:** Yes – only for governmental use

**Cyprus:** Utility companies maintain their own systems and databases.

**Denmark:** *Not for these attributes. There are restrictions for energy consumption of buildings.*

**Estonia:** These attributes are maintained in Register of buildings (look Q25). Data lacks completeness but it is open data so there are no restrictions.

**Georgia:** The utility companies are private in our country and due to their business interests, certain barriers exist and it is more difficult to deal with them than with state owned companies.

**Iceland:** This information is vital for any sort of planning in both the public and private housing sector. It is very easy to access this information on registered housing here in Iceland, as well as most industrial buildings. Cottages and other recreational housing is not as thoroughly registered, but it would not be too difficult to assemble data on those in one place. Where access to these utilities is not as a “given thing” as here, I guess it would be very beneficial to gather them in one place for all to access, especially for the purposes of highlighting lacking areas.

**Latvia:** Yes, in our case the State Land Service considers these attributes as core data. The State Land Service does not see any difficulties in data collection and it has some influence on cadastral value.

**Finland:** In Finland connections to sewage and water are attributes of the building registered by Population Register Centre (PRC), where the data is updated by municipalities. However also National Land Survey provides Information service on this national level building data by PRC. A permit provided by PRC is required to become a user of on-line services.

---

Q24 (facultative): UN-GGIM WG A envisages to consider these attributes related to connection to utilities as core data. Do you consider it as relevant idea? What might be the benefits and the difficulties?

**Cyprus:** It will be very difficult to coordinate all utility companies to provide this data. Some of the data may not be readily available. Different reference systems and methods are used.

**Czech:** Difficulty – there is a lot of missing information in our database, reliable information we get for new or reconstructed buildings.

**Finland:** Yes for the developing countries might be relevant but on the other hand electricity, sewage and water are currently provided sufficiently without any connection to networks with advanced technical solutions - so it should or could be enough to have the fact e.g. by crowdsourcing on these.

**Georgia:** We agree on such recommendation. Moreover, we are working to that direction in accordance with our strategic plan. However, certain difficulties exist (see answer to Q23).

**Latvia:** Yes, in our case the State Land Service considers these attributes as core data. The State Land Service does not see any difficulties in data collection and it has some influence on cadastral value.

**Lithuania:** We support the idea. If the proposed attributes are considered as core data of buildings it will allow calculating the average market value of buildings in a more fair and accurate way. These data are important to the persons involved in the real property market and for taxation of real property

**Spain:** It is an important information, but its update and harmonization with the rest of the themes can complicate the model. Due to the fact that it is not public information, this information should be included as core, but not be part of it.

It should be just one responsible of this theme

## 1.2 External reference

The INSPIRE data model includes the attribute “external reference” that enables to make the link between a given building represented in different data bases (e.g. cadastral map, topographic map, statistical data base, local database).

However, implementing this potential link may be difficult as there are not always official identifiers for buildings (in opposite to cadastral parcels).

Q25: in your country, are there several data bases with building data?

- Yes
- No

If “yes”, could you please list the ones you are aware of?

**Austria:** The Austrian Building Register “GWR”

**Belgium:** GAPD, NGI, Regional ones, ...

**Cyprus:**

- a) Registered buildings included in the cadastral database.
- b) Buildings included in the topographical database.

**Czech:** RÚIAN – Register of territorial identification, addresses and real estate

ISKN – Information system of the cadastre of real estate

ZABAGED – Fundamental base of geographic data

Reference data about buildings are administered in RUIAN (ISÚI-information system of territorial identification). RÚIAN and ISKN basically share the buildings (included identical building identifiers in the database). The buildings in the ZABAGED were originally derived from the map in 1 :10 000. Within the process of data refinement in all databases, all the data are being step-by-step interconnected, which means that the attribute of buildings in ZABAGED will be prospectively its identifier in RÚIAN.

**Estonia:**

Estonian topographic database (Land Board)

Register of buildings (Ministry of Economic Affairs and Communications)

**Finland:** Population Register Centre (PRC), municipalities (but not the small ones), tax authority (national), rescue authorities, probably insurance companies... many

**Latvia:** The Real Estate Market Database, the Digital Documents Repository, cadastral map, ProjectWise graphical plans repository and the State Address Register.

**Netherland:** *Databases containing building data:*

- *Key register (medium and small scale) Topography*
- *Key register Large Scale Topography*
- *Key Register Buildings*

**Spain:** Cadastre has a complete database of buildings already transformed to INSPIRE local, regional and national institutes have also data of the buildings. We are planning to complete the INSPIRE cadastral data of buildings with some attributes of topographic maps as building nature or height, and also to complete the data set with other constructions of the topographic data.

**Switzerland:**

- Building and Housing Register GWR (by Federal Office of Statistics)
- Building Addresses (by cadastral surveying)
- Geopost (by postal services, private company)

---

Q26: in your country, among the data providers about theme Buildings, is there one responsible to provide some “official” identifier of buildings? If “yes”, what is the responsible organization?

**Austria:** Statistics Austria

**Belgium:** BUNI project

**Cyprus:** There are several organisations maintaining building databases.

**Czech:** ČÚZK

**Denmark:** *Municipalities are responsible for building registration. Those of a property included buildings are allocated a sequential number. The largest buildings and buildings of relatively large value are assigned the lowest numbers.*

**Estonia:** Yes, Register of buildings

**Finland:** Yes - Population Register Centre (PRC) currently - probably National Land Survey will publish new building-ids as httpURIs with the new TDB in future.

**Georgia:** Unfortunately, there isn't any responsible organization in Georgia.

**Iceland** : *Registers Iceland is the provider of the official identifier of buildings. The line between a real-property identifier and a building identifier is somewhat fuzzy at the moment, but an updated data model is being developed where cadastral parcels, real-property, buildings and building parts will each have a unique identifier within a clearer hierarchical order.*

**Latvia**: The State Land Service is institution, which is responsible to provide “official” identifier of buildings

**Netherland**: *Yes, municipalities are the responsible organisations to provide official identifiers of buildings.*

**Spain**: Spanish Directorate general for Cadastre

**Switzerland**: Federal Office of Statistics

---

Q27 (facultative): UN-GGIM WG A envisages to include “external reference” in core data and so, to recommend official identifiers. Do you consider it as relevant idea? What might be the benefits and the difficulties?

**Cyprus**: This is a good idea. However, it will be very difficult to implement.

**Czech**: Yes. Difficulties concern errors in matching due to different definition and accuracy of buildings location in different databases.

**Estonia**: It is a reasonable idea.

**Finland**: The idea is most relevant for decentralized data updates and data delivery, and is under implementation for our new TDB. Also a “National recommendation for the unique identifiers for spatial data” was initiated and chaired by NLS, approved as a national recommendation to public administration in September 2015.

**Georgia**: In view of our case, implementation of such recommendation will be difficult (almost impossible), as it will require fundamental changes to the legislative basis and this is unrealistic.

**Iceland** : Yes, I think having an official identifier for buildings as core data is very useful for registration of rights and duties, as well as planning of housing and access to utilities. The most difficult part of implementing a common official identifier for INSPIRE will be settling on a common definition of the building concept (as in building vs. building part).

**Latvia**: Yes, it is a good idea, because it will allow data providers share more data about buildings.

**Lithuania**: In case it is impossible to achieve that one organisation is responsible for registration and we support such recommendation.

Spain: Very much benefits. Cadastral buildings data has many other information very useful that it is not included in the INSPIRE model (owner, legal information etc....)

		Austria	Belgium	Czech	Cyprus	Denmark	Estonia	Finland	Georgia	Germany	Greece	Iceland	Latvia	Lithuania	Macedonia	Netherlands	Romania	Slovakia	Spain	Sweden	Switzerland	UK	Summary	Comments
Existence of BU data		yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	no	no	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	no	no	yes	yes	yes			
Connection to utilities	Electricity	no	no	yes	no	yes	no	no	yes			no	yes	yes	no	no			no	no	no			
	Gaz	no	no	yes	no	yes	no	no	yes			no	yes	yes	no	no			no	no	no			
	Sewage	no	no	yes	no	yes	no	yes	yes			no	yes	yes	no	no			no	no	no			
	Water	no	no	yes	no	yes	no	yes	yes			no	yes	yes	no	no			no	no	no			
Restriction issues		yes		no		no	?	yes?			no	no	no	N/A					N/A	N/A				
Connection to utilities as core				no			?	yes			yes	yes	yes	yes					?					
Several BU databases		yes	yes	yes	yes	no	yes	yes	no			no	yes	no	yes				yes	yes	yes			
Responsible for official identifiers of BU		yes	yes	yes	no	yes	yes	yes?	no			yes	yes		no	yes			yes	yes	yes			
official identifiers as core				yes	yes?		yes	yes?	no			yes	yes	yes	yes				yes	yes	yes			