

4th Questionnaire on 3D Land Administration: status December 2022



Finland

This questionnaire is an activity of the **FIG Working Group 3D Land Administration 2022-2026**. The purpose of the survey is to make a world-wide inventory of the status of 3D Land Administration Systems/ Cadastres at this moment (2022) and the plans/ expectations for the near future (2026).

This is the first time that the questionnaire 3D-Land Administration is conducted as a successor of the questionnaire on 3D-Cadastres that was conducted three times by the FIG working group on 3D-Cadastres. The first time was in 2010 to document the status in 2010 and expectations back then for 2014. This was followed by second questionnaire in 2014 (with status 2014 and expectations 2018) and the third one conducted in 2018 (status of 2018 and plans for 2022).

The earlier responses have been analysed and reported on [van Oosterom et al. 2011](#), [Karki 2013](#), [van Oosterom et al. 2014](#) and [Shnaidman et al., 2019](#). The results of the three earlier questionnaires are available via the participants pages of the 3D Land Administration Working Group website: <http://www.gdmc.nl/3DCadastres/participants/>.

The purpose of this survey is to make a **world-wide inventory of the status of 3D Land Administration** at the current moment and the plans/ expectations for the near future (2026). By sharing this information, it should be **possible to improve cooperation, learn from each other and support future developments**.

A few notes and suggestions, which shall be helpful when completing the questionnaire, are given below:

- The conceptual model used as background for the 3D Land Administration questionnaire is the **ISO 19152:2012 standard** (ISO, 2012), the **Land Administration Domain Model (LADM)**. A new edition of the LADM is **under further development in ISO/TC 211** and is being developed as multipart standard, comprised by the following parts: **Part 1** – Generic Conceptual Model; **Part 2** – Land Registration; **Part 3** – Marine Georegulation; **Part 4** – Valuation Information; **Part 5** – Spatial Plan Information and **Part 6** – Implementations.
- In this questionnaire the concept of 3D Land Administration with **3D parcels** (or 3D spatial units in LADM terminology) is intended in the **broadest possible sense**. However, what exactly is (or could be) a 3D parcel is dependent on the legal and organizational context of the specific country/ state/ province. Therefore, **3D parcels include land and water spaces, both above and below the earth's surface**.
- A more **formal definition**: A **3D parcel** is defined as *“the spatial unit against which (one or more) unique and homogeneous¹ rights (e.g. ownership right, lease or other land use right),*

¹ Homogenous means that the same combination of rights equally apply within the whole 3D spatial unit. Unique means that this is the largest spatial unit for which this is true. Making the unit any larger would result in the combination of rights not being homogenous. Making the unit smaller would result in at least 2 neighbour 3D parcels with the same combinations of rights (ISO19152:2012).

responsibilities or restrictions are associated to the whole entity, as included in a Land Administration system.”

- A **3D parcel is a ‘legal object’** describing a part of the space. Often there is a relationship with a real world/ physical object, which can also be described in 3D. Please be aware of the difference between these two types of objects and that the focus in the context of 3D Land Administration is on the spaces of the legal objects and not the registration of the physical objects as such.
- As the definition above is quite abstract, at the questions below, more specific and real-world examples are being used. Inspecting some of the completed 2010, 2014 and 2018 questionnaires from other countries might help when formulation the answers for your jurisdiction.
- If a certain question is not relevant or if you have no clue what to respond, do not spend any time on this (and leave the field blank).
- Similar to the earlier Questionnaires on 3D- Land Administration, the completed forms will be made available on website of FIG Working Group on 3D Land Administration.
- Please complete this questionnaire before 15 December 2022 and send it to E.Kalogianni@tudelft.nl (the word document completed, or the link with the google document completed) and state as email subject **“Completed FIG Questionnaire on 3D Land Administration 2022-2026 for xxx”** and at the “xxx” name the country.

The questionnaire has been prepared by Peter van Oosterom, Eftychia Kalogianni, Abdullah Kara, Rod Thompson, Sudarshan Karki, Anna Shnaidman, Alias Abdul Rahman, Hendrik Ploeger, Christiaan Lemmen. The questionnaire is grouped in various blocks. This has no meaning in the sense of priority, and it is often the case that a question could belong to multiple blocks. Please do not feel disturbed by this.

1. GENERAL/APPLICABLE 3D REAL-WORLD SITUATIONS

This part of the questionnaire refers to the **applicable 3D real-world situations to be registered by 3D parcels**. It also addressed the types of 3D geometries, which are considered to be valid 3D representations for these parcels.

Questions	Status 2022	Expectations 2026
1.1. Are all 3D parcels (3D spatial units in LADM terminology) constrained to be within one surface 2D parcel?	No	No change
1.2. Are 2D and/ or 3D ambulatory ² boundaries permitted?	No	No change
1.3. Regarding the legal/ physical relation of 3D objects: (a) Is it allowed to have 3D parcels (spatial units) not related to physical constructs or objects? (e.g., airspace, subsurface volumes) (b) If 1.3.a positive: approximately what proportion of new 3D parcels (spatial units) would involve such cases (not related to physical object)?	a) Yes b) In formation process of the 3D parcel, no physical relations. Physical objects are constructed in other processes and according to spatial plans and permits.	No change
1.4. Are disconnected parts of a single 3D parcel allowed?	No, just one volume	No change
1.5. Spatial limitations – e.g., the 3D parcel ‘must be’ related to a closed volume or is it allowed to have ‘open’ or unbounded 3D parcels (e.g., towards the sky)?	Closed	No change
1.6. Are curved surfaces to bound the 3D parcels allowed?	Yes	No change
1.7. Must the curved surfaces (if allowed) be cylindrical sections, or any other constraint?	No	No change
1.8. Any other constraints – e.g., all surfaces must be horizontal or vertical?	No	No change

² An ambulatory boundary is a boundary of a land parcel which follows the movements of a natural feature such as a river. Its position determined at points of time (when a survey is carried out), but between such “fixes”, the definition of the property is the position of the real-world natural feature.

1.9. Is there legislation (law and/or regulations) for 3D descriptions of parcels? If so please, mention law and article(s).	Yes Real Estate Formation Act Real Estate Register Act	No change
1.10. Is the legal text available in original language? For example, professional or scientific papers/reports, which explain and justify the registration of 3D parcels.	Yes	No change
1.11. Is the legal text (relevant part) available in English translation at an official document?	No	No change
1.12. Do you have example descriptions of typical 3D parcels; either 'prototype' or 'operational'?	No, there are no typical 3D real estates, just case descriptions exist	No change
1.13. Is there a formal model for the 3D parcels (UML style); e.g., based on ISO TC211 series (especially LADM, ISO 19152)?	Yes	No change
1.14. Are natural resources (groundwater, mining rights, geo-thermal extraction and storage) shown in your land administration? If yes, are they considered as 3D parcels (spatial units) with RRRs attached? What about mining concessions (could be limited in time)?	No	No change
1.15. Are legally restricted spaces, above or below the earth's surface, such as polluted areas considered as 3D parcels?	No	No change
1.16. Are spatial plans considered as 3D parcels (so rights or restrictions are related to them)? Sometimes they are called 'spatial development plans', 'zoning plans' or 'physical plans' (land use, urban, regional, environmental, ...).	No	No change

1.17. Regarding the Marine Space: (a) Is there a Marine Cadastre established? And if so, are 3D parcels included in this registration? (b) Is the IHO Maritime Limits and Boundaries standard (S121) in use or under implementation? (c) Is there a Marine Spatial Plan established? And if so, are 3D marine parcels included in this registration?	a) areas inside Finnish territorial waters are registered as real estates and are under normal acts	No change
1.18. Is there any organised legal instrument for the management of common property? For example, does the law, regulations or systems recognize/require a specific right type for common property?	Yes, at least three ways (1) fractional co-ownership, 2) undivided ownership, e.g., an undistributed estate and some company forms, 3) joint properties, so owned by two or more real estates (Real Estate Formation Act, Act on Joint Property)	No change
1.19. Which agency is responsible for the recording of titles information?	National Land Survey of Finland	No change
1.20. Which agency is responsible for recording cadastral transactions?	Municipalities + National Land Survey of Finland	No change
1.21. Are transactions for standard 2D lots and 3D lots done by the same agency or titles office?	Yes, same	No change
1.22. Are there any 3D storage permissions recorded (e.g., underground storage of CO ₂)?	No	No change

1.23 Has there been developed any country profile based on LADM ISO19152³? (a) Does it support 2D spatial units? (b) Does it support also 3D spatial units? (c) Is there any provision to include/ align with the new LADM developments of the second Edition of the standard (inclusion of valuation information, marine spaces, spatial plans, interoperability/ reuse of BIM/IFC, ...)?	No	
1.24. Any other geometric issues related to 3D parcels?	No	

³ If yes, is it included at the index presented at the Table 1 of the publication Kalogianni et al. 2021? If it is included, are there any further developments/ publications related to it apart from those mentioned at the table? In case there are, could you please provide with a link of a relevant publication?

2. INFRASTRUCTURE/UTILITY NETWORKS

This refers to the situation where an **infrastructure network** is considered to be **defined within the land administration**. For example, in some jurisdictions, an underground network might be privately constructed for the purpose of leasing space in it for other organisations to run cabling. In this case, a network, or part of that network may be considered to be a real estate object.

Questions	Status 2022	Expectations 2026
2.1. Do you register utility networks as an entity in the land administration? (e.g., subterranean conduit networks)	Yes/partly, as a right-of-use unit	No change
2.2. If so, then: (a) can the network structure be viewed graphically in the land administration? (b) can the network structure be traced in the database(s)? (c) are networks registered by means of a cadastral identifier (such as a 'parcel number')? (d) are RRRs and parties attached to these network objects? (e) in which format are usually the utility networks submitted for registration (i.e., CityGML Utility ADE, IFC, MUDDI, shp, ...)?	a) Not structure, but geometry b) No c) Yes, a right-of-use unit identifier d) Basic property units (=real estates) are attached to the right-of-use units e) When parts of the electric utility network are registered (only as a right-of-use-units, not as real estates), the data is submitted as points, which describe the locations of electricity pylons	No change
2.3. Does the jurisdiction have private networks? If so please, mention law and article(s).	Yes, several laws	No change
2.4. If so, are they registered as 3D property parcels (spatial units)?	No	No change
2.5. Is the text of relevant laws or regulations (question 2.3) available in original language? If so, give references to relevant document(s).	Yes, e.g., Real Estate Formation Act	No change
2.6. Is the text of laws and regulations (relevant part) available in English translation of an official document?	No	No change
2.7. Do you have example descriptions of typical 3D parcels (spatial units) for networks; either 'prototype' or	No	No change

'operational'?		
2.8. If the network (legal) objects break at the surface parcel, how do you deal with intersecting networks or vertically parallel networks?	Right-of use units are at their own "level", different than the surface parcel (real estate), and they are restrictions for the surface parcel (real estate). Different right-of-use units can intersect.	No change
2.9. Any other geometric issues related to the registration of networks?	No	

3. CONSTRUCTION/ BUILDING UNITS

This refers to 3D properties that are related to **constructions and apartment (condominium) buildings**. The individual units are often defined by the actual walls and structure of a building, rather than by metes and bounds, e.g., “*unit 5 on level 6 of ... building*”.

Questions	Status 2022	Expectations 2026
3.1. Do you register legal spaces for 3D construction/ building units (separate from the land)?	Yes	No change
3.2. If so, what are the conditions for doing so, and what are the most important types? E.g., apartment units (at least 2 or more in building), or also other buildings or even more general constructions (infra related, such as bridge, tunnel or even other, such as windmills, ...)	Parking garage, housing above mall...	No change
3.3. Does the jurisdiction have construction/building units? If so please, mention law and article(s).	The buildings can be owned 1) by the real estate’s owner (landowner) or 2) by someone else. In the law of things: case 1) the building is a constituent part of the real estate, case 2) the building is a movable property. The buildings are not registered as real estates (in Real Estate Register). Neither the ownerships are registered in Land Register. The 3D parcels are registered as real estates (even if the building is “equal” to the parcel). Some information of buildings is recorded in population information system (so-called building part).	No change
3.4. Is the legal text available in original language?	yes	

3.5. Is the legal text (relevant part) available in English translation at an official document?	no	
3.6. Do you have example descriptions of typical 3D parcels; either 'prototype' or 'operational'?		
3.7. Regarding the boundaries' definition: (a) What would be typical 3D boundaries in an apartment complex: i) middle of the wall and floor/ceiling, ii) interior/ exterior of the wall or iii) walls, floor/ceiling as neutral/ shared 3D space? (b). Is it mentioned in any legislation or is it the convention?	a) No apartment level 3D	No change
3.8. Is common property inside the building registered? If so, how?	No	No change
3.9. Who owns the common property inside the building?	If the building is owned by housing association, the common property belongs to the housing association. In the building is owned by fractional co-ownership, the common property inside the building is owned according to the fractions. But it is possible to make an agreement over the control of spaces/rooms.	No change
3.10. Who owns the land on which the apartment is built?	Real estate's owner Can be e.g., the owner of the building, the housing association or someone else. Usually, the owner of the building has the right of tenancy.	No change
3.11. Do you allow sub-division of apartments or apartment blocks?	It is possible, but only according to city plans and other purposes than normal ownership cases. Housing association is the	No change

	normal way to record the ownership.	
3.12. Can the land on which the building is built be sub-divided or sold or mortgaged without the consent of majority of the apartment owners?	Yes If the building owner and the landowner are not the same, the owner of the building usually has the right of tenancy (registered in the Land Register). This means the right to have the building on that land and some protection against the new owner of the land.	No change
3.13. What is the numbering convention for apartments (please specify in terms of cadastral parcel as well as street addressing)	Apartments are not numbered with cadastral identifiers, just normal street address system with number in the building	
3.14. Are there any mandates ⁴ that set specifications on the delivery of design/ construction drawing of properties in BIM-based format, when registering new 3D parcels (from design)?	No	
3.15. Are there any operational or in prototype stage platforms. implementations that reuse BIM information from design as cadastral/ land administration input?	No	
3.16. Any other geometric issues?		

⁴ That arise through legislation or from the procurement process.

4. COORDINATES

This refers to the use of **x, y coordinates** and the relevant issues.

Questions	Status 2022	Expectations 2026
4.1. Do the plans of survey guarantee X/Y coordinates? (And are they relative or in an absolute spatial reference system?)	Yes	No change
4.2. Are the cadastral database coordinates authoritative?	Yes	No change
4.3. If not, what is the authoritative source of X/Y coordinates?	-	-
4.4. Do you have parcels defined by the walls of a building (with no recorded geometry)?	No	No change
4.5. What is the spatial reference system for X/Y Coordinates? (Please, provide the EPSG)	EPSG3067 (= ETRS89)	No change
4.6. When owners receive or purchase a copy of the plan what can they see on the plan to help them identify their parcel/lot (e.g., bearings and distance, identifying corners or recovery marks, neighbouring lots, coordinates etc.)?	Boundaries	No change
4.7. Have there been any changes, w.r.t. the spatial reference system, made in the way cadastral information is recorded and represented from a historical point of view?	No	No change
4.8. Any other X/Y coordinate issues?		

5. REPRESENTATION OF 3rd DIMENSION: HEIGHT (OR DEPTH)

This section refers to the representation and registration of the **third dimension**.

Questions	Status 2022	Expectations 2026
5.1. Are the height values of 3D parcels relative to local ground?	No (but information if the real estate, under the ground or over the ground exists)	No change
5.2. Are height values reduced to a standard datum (absolute)? If so, what is the spatial reference system for this 3rd ordinate?	Yes, N2000 (national system)	No change
5.3. In principle, is it possible to store both relative and absolute height/depth values?	Not both	No change
5.4. Is the earth surface (elevation) explicitly stored (in the DCDB or other accessible register)?	Yes, as topographical data in another accessible database	No change
5.5. What is the source of height values for the 2D surface parcel?	2D parcels are on the ground level, there is no height value for them	No change
5.6. How is elevation information recorded in the cadastral plan or database?	Information if exists is in plans (e.g., city plan) in expressed in different ways	No change
5.7. Do you expect the elevation recorded in cadastral plans to be used for any other purpose (e.g., development of 3D city models or civil constructions etc.)?	No	No change
5.8. Are there any 3D City Model/ Digital Twin developments carried out at a national or city level that can be used for orientation or reference purposes?	Yes, 3D city models exist	
5.9. Any other 3 rd dimension ordinate value issues?		

6. TEMPORAL ISSUES (4th DIMENSION)

This section refers to the representation and registration of the **fourth dimension**.

Questions	Status 2022	Expectations 2026
6.1. Are temporal limits part of the definition of a parcel (2D or 3D)?	No	No change
6.2. Are moving parcels allowed?	No	No change
6.3. Are there any limitations on the range of temporal limits? (e.g., only on 3D apartments).	No	
6.4. Is there any attempt to integrate 3D space and temporal representations, into a single 4D space/time representation?	No	No change
6.5. In the case of tidal boundaries, what happens to the 3D ambulatory parcel if the 2D land parcel changes extent due to the movement of High-Water Mark?	No relevant	No change
6.6. In case 3D Marine Cadastre is present and moving boundaries are allowed, how is this represented? e.g., using 4D geometry and topology.	No moving boundaries	No change
6.7. Can time bound rights be created and extinguished in the title? (e.g., temporary titles created for a period and when the time is up it can be extinguished)?	No But limited rights (so-called special rights, not ownership) are mostly fixed-period or non-fixed-term rights.	No change
6.8. Is it possible to identify all the changes made by any operator to the cadastral plans or database and to rollback if there is an error made?	Yes	No change
6.9. For Cadastral transactions, how far in time do buyers need to make a search to ensure the title or deed is legal?	The register (Land Register) including titles is legal itself (no other documents needed). The validity is examined before admitting the title (so, not deed register, not	No change

	title by registration but registration of titles). This is called positive public reliability; the registered owner is lawful owner.	
6.10. Are there object classes in the registration that require both real-world (or valid) times and database load (or system) times, i.e. bi-temporal support?	Yes	No change
6.11. Any other temporal issues?		

7. RIGHTS, RESTRICTIONS AND RESPONSIBILITIES (RRRs)

This section refers to the **RRRs and their registration at the LA system**. At a vast majority of the countries, the restrictions and the responsibilities are not registered at the LAS.

Questions	Status 2022	Expectations 2026
7.1. Please provide the range of RRRs on 3D parcels. If there is an online depository, provide the link.	Numerous amount	No change
7.2. Are there any limitations on the range of rights related to 3D spatial units? (e.g., subterranean parcels must be owned by Govt).	Same rights as 2D (only difference that 3D is allowed to do in city plan areas)	No change
7.3. Are there any limitations on the range of restrictions or responsibilities related to 3D spatial units? (i.e., currently in use and related to 2D spatial units, but that would not be applicable to 3D).	Most of RRR are same for 2D and 3D parcels	No change
7.4. Are there RRRs that are only allowed in 3D (and not valid for 2D)	Yes	No change
7.5. Is there specific legislation (laws, regulations) defining 3D RRR types? If so, provide details, e.g., references to documents/ articles.	Yes	No change
7.6. Can 3D sub-surface/above-surface parcel be owned by someone other than the person owning the land parcel?	Yes	No change
7.7. What applications do you foresee for 3D land administration?	Same software for 2D and 3D, another application to view the 3D parcel	No change
7.8. Are the administrative source documents (source of RRRs) title or deed based?	Proving of the ownership (RRR) is based on title, and deed only cases when the ownership is not yet registered as a title. RRR (other than ownership) are registered in the e.g., subdivisions and base on different information (as needs of the parties, law, agreements mentioned in	No change

	the deed).	
7.9 Who is responsible for the correctness of the specified 3D boundaries in spatial source documents (which authority)?	Municipalities mostly	No change
7.10. Is registration of 3D parcels done inside the cadastral mapping agency, the land registry or elsewhere?	Municipalities mostly	No change
7.11. Are 3D registrations handled by the same organisation that handles traditional (2D) land administration?	Yes	No change
7.12. Do you supply paper-based titles or deeds or proof of ownership? If yes, does this contain depictions of the 2D or 3D parcel?	Yes, yes	No change
7.13. Is the 3D registry separate or integrated with the 2D registry?	Integrated	No change
7.14. Any other RRR issues?	The identification of the rights for 3D unseparated parcels might be unclear.	

8. THE CADASTRAL DATABASE (Digital Cadastral Database - DCDB)

This section refers to the **structure and functionalities of the cadastral database**.

Questions	Status 2022	Expectations 2026
8.0. Is the database schema LADM based?	Mostly	No change
8.1. Does the DCDB contain representation of 3D parcels (in any form)?	Yes	No change
8.2. If so, how are they represented (in the DCDB)?	CityGML-model	No change
8.3. If so, how are they presented on cadastral “maps” (including screen presentations)?	2D-presentation	No change
8.4. Are there possibilities to store geometry of 3D parcels in the DCDB?	Yes	No change
8.5. Is it possible to manage a 3D topological structure in the DCDB?	No. 3D parcels are projected onto the ground level and this 2D topology is managed.	No change
8.6. Are constraints/rules defined for valid 3D objects (closed volume, no overlap, no gap in 3D)? What about rules for a mix of 2D and 3D representations?	Yes	No change
8.7. How can internal and external user query and visualize the 3D content supporting rotating, slicing, transparency, perspective (3D web/view service, 3D pdf documents, ..)?	Web-application for information services, can be used for viewing	No change
8.8. What Spatial DBMS software do you use? Any 3D capabilities included and used?	Smallworld GIS No proper 3D capabilities and not used	No change
8.9. Do you have any validation rules for 3D representation in the database?	Yes	No change
8.10. What (GIS/CAD) software is used for updating, editing, analysis, and visualization of the cadastral data? Any 3D capabilities included and used?	Smallworld GIS No proper 3D capabilities and not used	No change
8.11. What web software is used for		

remote data access/distribution and visualization? Any 3D capabilities included and used?		
8.12. Is your DCDB organised as Multi-Layers or Object Oriented or some other data model?	Object Oriented	No change
8.13. How do you query 3D objects in your DCDB?	Attribute based queries for 3D parcels are done like 2D queries. Spatial based queries for 3D parcels are possible only in 2D ground level	No change
8.14. Is it possible to query neighbourhood parcels to a 3D object, vertically as well as horizontally?	No	No change
8.15. Any other DCDB issues?		

9. PLANS OF SURVEY (INCLUDING FIELD SKETCHES)

This section poses questions about the data acquisition process and **cadastral survey plans**.

Questions	Status 2022	Expectations 2026
9.1. Do the survey plans carry 3D parcel representations?	Process is 1. 3D plot division made by the city and after that 2. land surveying (with registration) -> no need for separate 3D cadastral map	No change
9.2. If so, how are they represented?	2D printouts taken at several levels, every corner has x,y,z coordinates	No change
9.3. Is there specific legislation (regulations) describing the requirements for Plans of Survey in 3D? This could cover: (a) accuracy/ quality, (b) 3D survey method, (c) conceptual information model survey plan, (d) portrayal rules for graphic representation, (e) format or encoding for submission. If so, please give link to the relevant documents.	No, the same accuracy/quality as 2D within detailed planned areas	No change
9.4. Is sketch level allowed (low geometric quality, but in principle enough to indicate the 3D object)?	No	No change
9.5. Is it possible to define a 3D parcel by referring to other 3D real world objects/ topography (and not specifying coordinates)?	No	No change
9.6. In what format are the 3D parcels submitted for registration; attached to legal document in a single pdf (which has good 3D capabilities) or in an extension of (city) GML for 3D parcels, or....?	XML/GML-message	No change
9.7. Are the 3D parcels somehow checked for spatial validity, e.g., volume is closed, does not overlap with neighbour volume (and also	Yes	No change

no unwanted 3D gaps)?		
9.8. Do you have examples of (prototype or production) 3D survey plans available?	Yes, production	
9.9. Are any reference objects visible on the survey plan (e.g., real buildings, roads, that is 3D topography)?	Normally In the neighborhood, yes but not in the observed place (e.g., site area). According to regulation, existing buildings must be visible.	No change
9.10. What form of 3D data acquisition is used (CAD, terrestrial surveying, sketches, stereo/oblique images, laser scanning, ...)?	All possible methods	No change
9.11. What software do you use for creating and processing survey plans? Any 3D capabilities included and used?	Trimble Locus (Case Espoo, Kuopio, Kajaani), Microstation (Case Tampere, Lempäälä)	
9.12. Can 3D parcels be subdivided, consolidated or nullified?	Yes	No change
9.13. Is there any existing technical circular or directive to assist Surveyors in 3D data collection in the field?	No	No change
9.14. Are the surveyors required to undertake a field survey for 3D cadastral data?	No	No change
9.15. Are building construction plans used to compile 3D cadastral information for apartments?	Yes	No change
9.16. Is 2D/3D field survey done by private licensed surveyors or by government surveyors?	No field surveys	No change
9.17. Are plans of survey created for each new 2D/3D parcel or are they updated in an index map or a cadastral database.	Yes, 1) new plot division plan is made and 2) that information is updated in the cadastral database when land parcelling and registration is done	No change
9.18. Do you show dimensions or isometric views of 3D parcels on survey plans (do you also store this in a database)	Yes. In the plot division plan is shown the extent and dimensions, this product is archived. In the land parcelling is the reference to	No change

	the plot division.	
9.19. Do the cadastral survey plans differentiate between different types (e.g., volumetric plans, building plans and standard 2D plans)?	Not yet relevant	No change
9.20. What are the usual elements shown on the plan (e.g., North Arrow, Marks table, Observation table, administrative data, Plan face and dimensions etc.?)	Normally: cadastral boundaries, 3D basic information, buildings rights, spatial plan identifier, spatial plan regulations, coordinate list	No change
9.21. Are authoritative cadastral surveys carried out by government surveyors or private licensed surveyors or both?	Civil servants	No change
9.22. What is the legal description of a cadastral boundary (e.g., coordinates or bearing and distance or lines on plan or any other)?	In the plot division phase x,y,z coordinates in every corner, in the land parcelling phase cube (the largest extent)	No change
9.23. How much time does it usually take for a subdivision process to complete?	2,5 months in the municipalities, 7 months in the National Land Survey	
9.24. What is the legal source for cadastral representation (e.g., cadastral plans, or DCDB or index plans or descriptive sketch/text etc.?)	Nationwide cadastral index map (legal), more information when needed in official documents of cadastral surveys (recorded resolutions which are based on city plans, documents, measurements, law etc.)	No change
9.25. What is the positional accuracy of the cadastral plans (e.g., boundaries may be accurate but may not be referenced in datum properly)?	Nowadays very accurate	
9.26. Any other survey plan issues?		

10. DISSEMINATION OF 3D LAND ADMINISTRATION INFORMATION

This section refers to the **dissemination of 3D LA-related information** and the advances in this domain.

Questions	Status 2022	Expectations 2026
10.1. Is there a general-purpose web-based dissemination of 2D cadastral (graphical or text) information (e.g., a portal for the public or for professionals)? If yes, please provide the link and refer it includes 3D data?	Yes	No change
10.2. Are there specific file formats or standards used to distribute 3D LA/ Cadastral information? (e.g., LandXML, CityGML, BIM/IFC, 3D pdf...)	XML/GML	No change
10.3. Are there specific cartographic styling rules for representing 3D cadastral plans, or to represent 3D cadastral objects on 2D cadastral maps?	Yes	No change
10.4. Are there specific cartographic styling rules for 3D cadastral maps (models, e.g., as disseminated in 3D pdf)? If yes, are there 3D specific cartographic rules developed or being developed?	Yes, special rules how to visualize 3D parcels on 2D ground level	No change
10.5. Is the 3D Cadastral information accessible in integrated manner with the 2D Cadastral information?	Yes	No change
10.6. Are there specific symbols on the 2D cadastral map (paper, digital or web-based) indicating the presence of 3D Cadastral objects (and in web-context perhaps even linked)?	Yes	No change
10.7. Is the legal information (RRRs and Parties) available in integrated manner in dissemination portal with the 3D Cadastral objects? (Even if source of legal data may be a different organization, but then use information infrastructure	Yes	No change

approach)		
10.8. Are 2D/3D cadastral data available to the general public or just to the relevant parties?	Yes, open	No change
10.9. Any other 3D cadastral information dissemination issues?		

11. STATISTICAL INFORMATION

This part of the questionnaire refers to **statistical information** (and is most relevant for jurisdictions with parts of 3D Cadastre registration operational, but all are encouraged to complete this section, and especially the expectations for 2022).

Questions	Status 2018	Expectations 2022
11.1. What is the smallest 2D and 3D parcel that is present/ allowed to be registered in the land administration?	No limits	No change
11.2. What is the largest 2D and 3D parcel that is present allowed to be registered in the land administration?	No limits	No change
11.3. What is the typical (or average) size of 2D and 3D parcels which are registered in the land administration? Subdivide by nature of 3D parcel when relevant (e.g. related to building, apartment, airspace, tunnel,...)	2D real estates: median total size 5000 m ² (Notice: In Finland size of the real estate can consist of 0 to many polygons) 3D real estates, footprints: median is 1550 m ² and the average is 2830 m ²	
11.4. How many 2D and 3D parcels do you currently have in your land administration?	2D cadastral units 2,9 million (3,7 million separate areas) 3D real estates: 16	
11.5. Which year did you start registering 3D parcels in the land administration?	2018	
11.6. What is the ratio of 3D parcels in rural vs. urban areas?	City plan areas, mainly urban areas (e.g., case Lempäälä is shopping centre near a motorway, not really "urban area")	
11.7. Please specify names of cities or towns or suburbs or regions or locations where there are significant numbers of 3D parcels.	Espoo (9), Tampere (3), Kajaani (2), Kuopio (1), Lempäälä (1)	

11.8. Please provide the following data: (a) Size of jurisdiction in square kilometres (b) Current number of 2D parcels (c) Current number of 3D parcels (d) Current population	Case Espoo 312 km² land population 305000 2D real estates 34252 3D real estates 9 Case Tampere 525 km² land population 249000 2D real estates 30563 3D real estates 3 Case Kajaani 1834 km² land population 36000 2D real estates 14623 3D real estates 2 Case Kuopio 3241 km² land population 123000 2D real estates 45976 3D real estates 1 Case Lempäälä 270 km² land population 25000 2D real estates 45976 3D real estates 1	
11.9. Approximately what are the proportions of various types of the 3D parcels (related to apartments, subsurface parking, subsurface shopping centres, bridges, tunnels, airspace, utility networks, etc)?	Not relevant	
11.10. Approximately what surface area of the jurisdiction is affected by 3D parcels (the total area of all the footprint of all 3D parcels).	Footprints: Espoo 13159 m² Tampere 23206 m² Kajaani 2137 m² Kuopio 197 m² Lempäälä 6586 m²	

11.11. Any other interesting statistical fact(s)?	Number of real estates: 3D / 2D Espoo 9 / 34252 Tampere 3 / 30563 Kajaani 2 / 14623 Kuopio 1 / 45976 Lempäälä 1 / 45976	
---	--	--

12. REFLECTION

This section is only relevant in case also one of the previous questionnaires for your jurisdiction (2010, 2014 and/ or 2018) was completed (otherwise skip this section).

Statements	Remarks
12.1. Compared to the 2010, 2014, 2018 and 2022 expectations, which 3D land administration developments did go faster than expected?	The chosen solution to manage 3D parcel was “light”. The reality is that until now there are quite a few 3D parcels. So maybe the low investment has been suitable for few needs.
12.2. Same question, but now, which developments did go slower than expected?	-
12.3. If some (limited) form of 3D Land administration functionality has become available, what are the observed benefits? And for who?	The most benefits have been for the financiers of the constructions. Functionality is not important in the cadastral administration.
12.4. What are the (top 3) challenges of issues to be addressed to realize further 3D Land administration progress?	There is a need for 3D right-of-use-unit
12.5. In case of not, yet, fully operational status, were there any 3D LA/ Cadastre registration pilots to take steps towards a more complete implementation?	-
12.6. In case of known legal barriers, have there been made progress in creating and adopting new legislation to support 3D land administration?	Jurisdiction exists, no need for urgent changes
12.7. Any other reflections?	-

13. OTHER ISSUES

At this section, please include any other issues that may be of interest in an international context (for example, in some foreign jurisdictions 3D parcels can only be separated by horizontal planes).

Contact Details & other issues	Remarks
13.1. Country (State, Province)	Finland
13.2. Name	Tarja Myllymäki, Markku Markkula
Function/ Position	
Organization	National Land Survey of Finland
13.3. Contact details:	
Address	
Email	tarja.myllymaki@nls.fi
Telephone	
13.4. Other issues	

REFERENCES

- ISO 19152:2012 'Geographic information - Land Administration Domain Model (LADM), http://www.iso.org/iso/iso_catalogue/catalogue_tc/catalogue_detail.htm?csnumber=51206.
- Kalogianni, E., Janečka, K., Kalantari, M., Dimopoulou, E., Bydłosz, J., Radulović, A., Vučić, N., Sladić, D., Govedarica, M., Lemmen, C.H.J. and van Oosterom, P.J.M. (2021). Methodology for the development of LADM country profiles, In: Land Use Policy, Elsevier, 105(105380), pp. 1-12, 2021. Available at: http://www.gdmc.nl/publications/2021/LUP_CountryProfile.pdf
- Karki, S. (2013). 3D Cadastre Implementation Issues in Australia. MSc Thesis, University of Southern Queensland (Master of Spatial Science Research), 162 p., Available at: http://eprints.usq.edu.au/23560/1/Karki_2013_whole.pdf.
- Shnaidman, A., van Oosterom, P.J.M., Lemmen, C.H.J., Ploeger, H., Karki, S. and Abdul Rahman, A. (2019). Analysis of the Third FIG 3D Cadastres Questionnaire: Status in 2018 and Expectations for 2022, Proceedings FIG Working Week 2019: Geospatial Information for a Smarter Life and Environmental Resilience. Available at: <https://repository.tudelft.nl/islandora/object/uuid%3A1c65db49-404c-4b88-8b78-11dca1bc151b>
- van Oosterom, P.J.M., Stoter, J., Ploeger, H., Thompson, R. and Karki, S. (2011). World-wide Inventory of the Status of 3D Cadastres in 2010 and Expectations for 2014. presented at the FIG Working Week 2011, Marrakech, 21 p. Available at: http://www.gdmc.nl/3DCadastres/literature/3Dcad_2011_02.pdf.
- van Oosterom, P.J.M., Stoter, J., Ploeger, H., Lemmen, C.H.J., Thompson, R. and Karki, S. (2014), Initial Analysis of the Second FIG 3D Cadastres Questionnaire: Status in 2014 and Expectations for 2018, In: Proceedings 4th International Workshop on 3D Cadastres, pp. 55-74, Available at: http://www.gdmc.nl/publications/2014/Second_FIG_3D_Cadastres_Questionnaire.pdf.