

Topics discussed at NAP/NB workshop on 30 October 2019 in Utrecht

Private and international organizations

- How to get **private organisations** to make their data available at NAP?
- Strategies to get **more organizations** to provide data at the NAP
- How do you **involve** the private stakeholders?
- How to get third parties (data owners) on board? The **big players!**
- Together identify **global players** and facilitate their connection
- What about inter-/**multinational** organizations?
- How to address **International** Organizations
- We should stand shoulder to shoulder and apply pressure on the Commission to help us get data from the **car manufactures** and all other parties having relevant safety related data, in order to implement the data that the EU-legislation intent ... Perhaps by making a **common EU Access Point**, so the big data owners only need to apply data in one access point.
- Too high data governance demands may **scare** some data owners away.
- NB setup, responsibility of NB to **search** for ITS directive targeted stakeholders

National Body processes and self-declarations

- The benefit of a **self-declaration**?
- How other national bodies do **random checks**/inspections to the declarations and in which scale
- Do other national bodies get the declarations by **asking for them** or do they get them automatically
- how to find workable solution for the requirements concerning **assessment** of compliance and self-declarations for both data owners and data users
- NB: Random inspections of self-declarations; **Quality** assessment of data sets and services; Self declaration form for Priority Action A
- National Body approaches to data **checks**
- Did you establish a **legislation** in order to **punish** the stakeholders which do not publish their data on the NAP?
- How to report the status of 'A' in December? What should the report include? Which format?
- Does it cost money to give a declaration?
- Technical checks, content checks?

Data Standards, especially new MMTIS data categories

- Required formats for **transit** data.
- **Standards** for MMTIS (action A) data
- Centralising **Air Transport** data at a European Level.
- Maximising reuse through a standardization of **licences**?
- **Metadata standard**
- **Open data** initiative and NAP
- **CKAN** and NAP? What about **dynamic** data? And PUSH delivered data?
- Data exchange → DATEX II
- Common profiles?
- Elementary service profiles
- Static data standards (e.g. minimum attributes)?

NAP architecture

- A 'logical' (i.e. Non-physical) blueprint **architecture** will help the Member States' NAP become more uniform, with the appropriate attention to keeping the mandatory core functionality small but allow for description of optional functionality as well.
- Benchmarking the total cost of building a NAP.
- Did you **integrate all the NAPs** (RTTI, SRTI, MMTIS, Truck parking) into one NAP? Which difficulties did you encounter?
- **EU NAP** that harvest other NAPs
- NAP: Connecting existing similar data sets **cross border**
- Harmonisation on which level?
- Ways of querying NAP data
- Linked open data, NAPs and open data portals

Miscellaneous

- Embed NAP context in the evolving field of **Open Data**, E-Government, transparency of governmental data etc.
- Did you make the publication of **dynamic data** mandatory in your country?
- We would like to extend our portal with **payment service** as well. I would like to know how it works for other NAPs.
- How to make good **data governance** that secures good **data quality**? We want to delegate the task to the data owner (data provider) as much as possible! But will work? How can we best support the data owner? Will a great FAQ be enough? Good design of the user interface can of course help. Should we make frequently quality tests?
- Collaboration Platform
- Political ambitions with the NAP?
- KPIs?