

Minutes

Title	4th workshop on Business Models (BM)
Date	4.6.2007
Location	Dortmund
Subject	Business Model (BM) concept for EuroGeoNames

1 Executive Summary

The main points to note from the meeting are:

- The role of EGHO in relation to VARs and NMCAs
- Administrative and economic task responsibilities for EGN to be assigned
- Pricing scheme not part of the business model, but necessary to detail such model
- NMCA motivation to participate crucial for success
- Additional discussion on details (half day) on BM necessary; planned in November

2 Participants

Nr	Name	Institution
1	Peter Meijer	Geodan, NL
2	Karsten Lessing	ESRI, DE
3	Lise Just	EGHO, FR
4	Axel Schäfer	ESRI, DE
5	Andrew Corbett	EDINA, UK
6	Jean-Sebastien Majka	IGN, FR
7	Jean-Christoph Guelat	Swisstopo, CH
8	Roman Stani-Fertl	BKG, DE
9	Reiner Retzek	BKG, DE
10	Jörn Sievers	BKG, DE
11	Pier-Giorgio Zaccheddu	BKG, DE
12	Walter Wurzer	BEV, AT
13	Bernhard Schneider	GeoTask/PRO DV, DE
14	Markus Ulrich	GeoTask/PRO DV, DE

3 Attachments

–none–

4 Agenda

TOP	Topic title
1	Introduction: Workshop objectives and agenda
2	Concepts: Presentation: Goods, services, actors Presentation: Conceptual framework
3	Presentation of Analysis of Questionnaires
4	Experience in the Consortium regarding Business Models BKG: Presentation & discussion ESRI: Presentation & discussion
5	First EGN Business Model Proposal Presentation: EGN BM Proposal / Freemium model Discussion
6	Summary of Workshop Outcome / next steps

5 Minutes and results of the discussion

Minutes	Action
<p>1 Introduction</p> <p><i>Ulrich</i> presented workshop agenda and organizational issues.</p>	
<p>2 Concepts</p> <p><i>Schneider</i> presented the introduction to concepts on business models using an introductory example for architecture and use of the EuroGeoNames (EGN) infrastructure (comprising the EGN Central Service as well as the connected EGN Local Services) by a touristic application. Explanations were given what we regard as goods, services and actors in relation to the EGN infrastructure.</p> <p><i>Sievers</i> stressed that the variant names/exonym database is part of goods offered by EGN.</p> <p><i>Just</i> pointed out that regarding the relationship between mapping agencies and VARs Eurogeographics acts as representative for the NMCAs. This shall guarantee that customers / VARs are not irritated by having to deal with lots of different actors. Nevertheless Eurogeographics is seen as more connected to the NMCAs than to EGN.</p> <p><i>Schneider</i> then presented the conceptual framework for the business model proposal concentrating on vision, strategy and the business model elements. The business model structure was clarified using said example use case from WP 2, the touristic application.</p>	

<p>3 Presentation of Analysis of Questionnaires</p> <p><i>Schneider</i> presented the analysis of questionnaires on existing experience on business models sent out in preparation of the workshop.</p> <p><i>Meijer</i> wanted to know whether individual questionnaire answers will be published instead of an aggregated analysis. <i>Sievers</i> suggested to publish more detail (e.g. that the institution type of the sender is NMCA) but omitting the individual respondent.</p> <p><i>Just</i> pointed out that it is interesting how many respondents are interested in EGN as an approach for a european-wide network instead of national business.</p> <p><i>Zaccheddu</i> asked whether pricing schemes have been indicated in detail and by all NMCAs, which was not the case. <i>Lessing</i> stated that from ESRI experience very different kinds of understanding towards pricing schemes in geonames data distribution exists between partners.</p> <p><i>Sievers</i> raised the question whether NMCAs are interested in free distribution as an offer within EGN. <i>Schneider</i> stated that the questionnaire answers did not indicate such an interest.</p> <p><i>Corbett</i> wanted to know about the planned usage rights for educational institutions with regard to VAR applications, i.e. whether they would be free to use for the academic community like with geonames data. <i>Schneider</i> clarified that this decision should be completely left to the VARs.</p> <p><i>Zaccheddu</i> asked whether the Inspire guidelines had been mentioned in conjunction with pricing schemes, which <i>Schneider</i> denied. <i>Majka</i> wanted to know if a market sizing estimation has already been done. <i>Schneider</i> pointed out that this was already done within the cost-benefit-analysis. <i>Zaccheddu</i> will provide the NMCAs with the cost-benefit-analysis - since it's not confidential – by uploading the document to the EGN website.</p>	<p>Schneider to prepare a summary report</p>
<p>4 Experience in the Consortium regarding Business Models</p> <p><i>Zaccheddu</i> presented the BKG experience with business models with focus on the new design for AdV-Kostenrichtlinie as the foundation of the business model.</p> <p><i>Lessing</i> stated that business models of data distribution by state agencies should include a revenue share model for income generated by VARs with data providers. <i>Corbett</i> inquired if there is a residual charge if developers of commercial applications pass on BKG data to another developer integrating the commercial applications into their offering. <i>Sievers</i> clarified that it is mandatory to state this as a proposed use of this data and that there is a charge then.</p> <p><i>Lessing</i> inquired the exact definition and extent of “settlement” within BKG geonames data. <i>Zaccheddu</i> explained that this includes postcodes and the point-coordinates of that postcode but is limited in resolution.</p> <p><i>Lessing</i> then presented ESRI's view on business models by the example of</p>	

ArcWebServices. He indicated the need for keeping in mind issues like load-balancing and performance requirements when running a web service.

Corbett asked, whether a local storage concept for the data from data providers that are part of the ArcWebServices offering exists. Alternatives would be a federated service (handover request to data provider and delivering result back to customer). *Lessing* explained that ESRI uses a federated service model if the data provider guarantees certain high availability standards. *Corbett* wanted to know how ESRI refunds customers when information purchased via ArcWebServices is not longer actual. *Lessing* explained that the company refers to database update cycles and time of last update – if changes have taken place since the time of the customer access ESRI can of course not deliver a refund.

Sievers asked whether credits are charged per advance of ArcWebService usage, which *Lessing* confirmed. ESRI-specific charge policies can also be based on specific service usage (individual agreement with customer) as a flatrate model (according to a pre-calculation whether this is economically feasible for ESRI). *Zaccheddu* pointed out that there is a big hurdle considering precautions for availability issues and keeping in line with the Inspire guidelines. *Lessing* again stressed that guaranteed availability is of utmost importance for sales success. He suggested an infrastructure solution for EGN with availability tackled at the EGN central service host by storing data locally there with 100% availability and updates by NMCAs. *Zaccheddu* repeated that this has been already considered but unfortunately Inspire guidelines do not allow such a solution. *Corbett* suggested that an offering of file downloads of Geonames data might help tackling the issue.

5 First EGN Business Model Proposal

Ulrich presented the EGN Business Model Proposition.

Just stated that EuroGeographics might not be able to take over all tasks and full responsibilities of a future “EuroGeoNames institution or body”. The necessary resources are not available at EuroGeographics. Who will take over the administrative and economic tasks of EuroGeoNames remains an open question. *Zaccheddu* made clear that BKG will host the EGN Central Service and, thus, will take over the technical part of EuroGeoNames.

All agreed upon that it is clarified in the discussion that the future EuroGeoNames institution will bill the VARs for using the EGN infrastructure. *Sievers* and *Zaccheddu* in response to a question of *Schaefer* clarified that during the EU-funded project duration of 30 months, only the Reference Application (WP7) and the Application in a Commercial Context (WP8) will have access to the EGN infrastructure. However, there is the possibility of negotiation if there will be other applications or services of other VARs that request access to the EGN Central Service. The situation will be different after the project has ended. *Schaefer* pointed out that it is planned in WP8 to implement an extension for ESRI's desktop GIS ArcMap to allow accessing the EGN service. This, however, will request that not only pre-defined applications from servers with well-known IP addresses need to be able to access the EGN service, but also arbitrary computers with unknown IP addresses.

All noted that it is necessary to circulate the existing document containing the cost structure in order to enable the NMCAs to agree to it. *Ulrich* will prepare an executive summary to the existing cost-benefit analysis and send it out.

Executive
Summary of
cost-benefit
analysis to be

