

From models to data: a prototype Query Translator for the cadastral domain

Bamberg, Workshop on Standardization in the Cadastral Domain, 9-10 December 2004

Claudia Hess and Marian de Vries

21 December 2004

1



Overview

- Introduction
- Information integration
- Query Translator prototype
- Evaluation
- Conclusions
- Recommendations



Introduction

- This paper
 - 'Query Translator' between cadastral data models
 - Practical tests with 'real' Dutch and Greek cadastral data (spatial and legal)
 - Use the core cadastral model as 'mediator' model
- Work in progress, first conclusions
- Aim: be able to access a cadastral database in another country with a query interface based on one's own national system



Information integration

- One of the challenges of the European and global SDI
- Also true for the cadastral domain
- At present
 - No (easy) information exchange between national cadastral systems
 - E.g. finding the real estate of some person in another country, or his/her mortgage debts



Cadastral domain

- EULIS (web portal)
 - access to different cadastral registrations/databases 'as they are' (as first step)
- ArcCadastre (desktop application)
 - standardized storage model
- 'Core cadastral domain model' initiative (other presentations)
 - 'Core' information model for common classes, attributes etc. in cadastral systems



'Pan'-European selection queries

- Ultimate goal: 'parallel' selection queries over different national cadastral databases from one (Web) application

“select all real estate property owned by person with this name and birth date in Greece, Italy, Switzerland, Holland”



Overview

- Introduction
- Information integration
- Query Translator prototype
- Evaluation
- Conclusions
- Recommendations



Query Translator prototype

- Translation between
 - 'query model' (as presented to user)
 - and 'local' storage model of data source
- Query model can be
 - The core cadastral model (one step)
 - or other national cadastral model (two step, via core model)
- Options
 - Only 'lexical' translation (synonyms)
 - Also structural translation (type/subtype, attributes, associations)



Uses cases / selection queries

- Simple case (class and attribute names, 'lexical')

Greek model

```
Select * from natural where lname = ...
```

Dutch model

```
Select * from mo_subject  
where gesl_naam = ...
```



Use cases / selection queries

- More complicated (associations between classes)

```
select name, address, type_of_right
from person, right
where person.id = right.person_id
and municipality = ...
```



Define 'equivalence' between concepts in both models (with OWL)

- `<owl:Class rdf:about="greek_cad.owl#STATE_RESTRICTION">
 <owl:equivalentClass rdf:resource="core_cad.owl#PublicRestriction" />
</owl:Class>`
- `<owl:DatatypeProperty rdf:about="greek_cad.owl#BENEFICIARY_BEN_ID">
 <owl:equivalentProperty rdf:resource="core_cad.owl#Person_SubjID" />
</owl:DatatypeProperty>`



Overview

- Introduction
- Information integration
- Query Translator prototype
- **Evaluation**
- Conclusions
- Recommendations



Evaluation

- Easy
 - Terms/concepts that are synonyms
- More difficult, but can be solved
 - Associations (-> joins between tables)
 - Different (super)type – subtype hierarchies
- Fundamental issues
 - System boundaries of the models
 - Conceptual versus Technical models
 - 'Real word' differences: Name, Address



Conclusions

- Core model offers a good starting point for cadastral data integration
- Get the priorities right
 - What are the most important **selection** attributes ?
 - First concentrate on these classes and attributes
- There **are** 'real world' differences
 - Look at 'localization' theory and technology
 - Incorporate other standards ('Address')



Recommendations

- Core model should also contain 'administrative' classes
 - Address, PostalAddress, VisitorsAddress
 - Name, NaturalPersonName, OrganizationName
- Or ... incorporate classes from other standards (European and global Address-standardization, Name conventions)
- These can be 'Abstract' classes without attributes as placeholders in model structure



Recommendations #2

- Not only standardize 'structure' but also 'content'
 - 'enumeration types' for important selection attributes -> drop-down lists to assist user
 - 'hidden' subtypes can be found and solved this way
- Capture the legal process in UML or work flow language (e.g. property transactions)
- Not only test **in** countries, but also **between** countries

