MT - Did you see the servicegroups concept which helps allow clients to organize adding what could be 10s of services into logical groups? thats a favorite of ours (along with the background maps)

Sent: 12/7/2011 2:20 PM From: Raj Singh

I've had a look at this and I see three main areas that OWC hasn't addressed:

1) the idea of a set of "background maps". OWC is neutral on whether any of the map services (probably WMS or WMTS) are background or not (i.e. whether some maps can't be shown at the same time as another, right?). Personally, I'm also neutral on this concept. Seems easy enough to support and you have a use case for it, so I guess OWC should strongly consider it.

MT: #1 - you nailed it - sometimes a background map is one service or multiple services (a pseudo mashup)

2) Layout Configuration: this seems to be about hints for the user interface to set some initial state. Adding this kind of UI metadata makes sense to me, especially since most of these seem to be very universal to most mapping clients.

MT - #2 this is of great interest [...]

3) Security: you have some security hints in here. I like the idea, and I think we've only avoided it so that we don't get too complex. What you do here seems reasonable, but does it work for an international audience? If so, I strongly support adopting it.

MT - #3 was an NGA Palanterra feature that they use.

Although this spec seems to cover simpler use cases (smaller variety of service and data types) than OWC is addressing, I hope our simpler use cases can look this simple!

p.s. In your "Services Example" on page 4, should "map_indices" be a child of "services"? I was confused because of the indentation. Maybe you just need another tab in front of "map_indices".

MT - map indices is a USGS map service... may be a cut and paste error on my part (was a pain)
On Nov 30, at 2:00 PM, Matt Tricomi wrote:

Raj

Great Idea! I took our Documentation on our Configuration file and did 3 things:
1. Highlighted which sections are base context which are the sections we are most interested in consideration for OWS Context as it progresses. Also, these are the sections NGA Palanterra x3 team is working on migrating to the OWF Rest Specification in JSON currently. The other configuration items are unique to the Palanterra x3 viewer for hooking in tools, tasks, etc., and not looking to be part of the base context.

2. I added an Appendix A to 2 working examples of the JSON configuration and links to what viewer/client being supported so you can see the context, then what it looks like via the client. We have a project across USGS working on reading this context (once in the OWF spec) in Openlayers, and also saving the context from JSON2KML to open in KML viewers.

3. Also added Appendix B of our basic interview guide for creating a context on how we gather the user requirements for each instance of a context.

Date: 11/28/2011 05:30PM From: Raj Singh <rsingh@opengeospatial.org>

Matt, could you share some sample files showing key functionality that needs to be supported?

On Nov 28, at 4:03 PM, Matt Tricomi wrote:

Glenn Guempel suggested I jump in and follow up on and note in favor of David's last note (mostly the last couple sentences).

As noted in the Boulder meetings, at USGS, we are pushing for JSON encoding due to our public highly used read-only web apps/services for science or natural hazard event support apps or foundational data delivery points. At the National Geospatial program, since re-working our services in 2009, they have seen 10-fold usage increase, and growing use in other tools and in many mashups.

In our birds of feathers cross-collaboration groups (USGS Community for Data Integration (CDI)), at this time, we haven't heard any user stories or needs for any implementation for XML or qualities such as transactional, security, enterprise exchange, etc. Then again, that might not be completely fair, as we haven't explicitly asked encoding questions. We've more asked where the sharing, re-use, interoperability pain points are.

The user story that has come up consistently since our requirements collaboration since 2009 is "I want to take a mashup I made in some viewer and open in one-click in my thick client like ArcMap. Right now if I make a mashup in a web viewer or Gaia and then want to open in GlobalMapper or ArcMap, I can't - they all save in their own proprietary or just different ways. Help me shift time configuring service setup so I can get on to analytics, modeling, etc."
To solve that currently, we are working with NGA on moving from the custom JSON context profile we've had since 2008 towards being compatible with the OWF GeoServices REST Services Profile (aka ESRI compatible). Timing is likely spring pending NGA's schedule, but, either way, we've of course prefer to have an OGC-backed JSON version. This is being coordinated with the CDI effort, and we plan to work in ESRI APIs, OpenLayers APIs, and KML to help show we can save contexts in multiple formats and can be read in multiple and easily be plugged into your favorite viewer API. Also, the recently migrated geo.data.gov has yet to implement the Save As X profile or Open In Y popular viewer, but it is a requirement being coordinated with FGDC/geoplatform.gov.

Maybe an upsell, but given the above, but a timely released JSON encoding profile could influence the next context profile for geo.data.gov, nationalmap.gov, nationalatlas.gov and supported by geoplatform.gov efforts which at least in the Federal space, may help get a ball rolling on adoption and mass appeal.

I'm not sure if that helps, but thought we would re-iterate those notes.

Date: 11/28/2011 09:01AM From: "Rosinger, David S (IGS)"
<david.rosinger@IntergraphGovSolutions.com>

David, thank you for putting up that new example. Makes much sense.

[David] Thanks. I thought it might be useful to explore the possibility of patterning WFS Context after WMS Context. (I am not necessarily urging the group to move in this direction but I’ll end my response with some questions.)

My main comments are:
- I notice the max/min scales are part of the owc:Content (here in the featureCollection). Is this a replacement or complementary to having them in the entry itself?

[David] I placed the max/min scales within FeatureCollection because in WMS Context they appear within Layer. For example, see the final Layer here: http://schemas.opengis.net/context/1.1/context.xml

My thinking is also that owc:content would not necessarily serve as a container for only service-related metadata.

- Likewise, when the style is meant for the client, I think it should be out the owc:content, because it can be used just as well for non-Service content (inline vector data f.i.)