

Minutes of the Initial Operating Capability Task Force
Vienna, 18-19 January 2010

Title	Minutes of the Initial Operating Capability Task Force Vienna, 18-19 January 2010
Creator	European Commission DG Joint Research Centre, Initial Operating Capability Task Force
Creation date	27/01/2010
Date of last revision	09/02/2010
Subject	INSPIRE Initial Operating Capability Task Force, network services technical guidance, discovery, view
Description	Minutes of the first meeting of the Initial Operating Capability Task Force held in Vienna, AT, on the 18-19 th January 2010.
Contributor	European Commission DG Joint Research Centre, Initial Operating Capability Task Force
Status	Draft
Publisher	European Commission DG Joint Research Centre
Rights	Public
Language	EN
Identifier	MInutes_IOCTF_Meeting_Vienna_19022010.doc

1. Welcome and approval of the agenda

The Host of the meeting and Chairman opened the meeting welcoming all the participants.

Mr. DI Maximilian Pock, Head of Division II / 10 “IACS, GIS” and Head of the INSPIRE/AT Programme gave a welcome speech.

The agenda was approved.

2. Status of the (Discovery and View) Service Team work

Wolfgang Tinkl, AT

Wolfgang Tinkl (AT) presented the status of the work done so far from the IOC Service Team including the discussions at the Ispra Meeting¹, and subsequent telecons.

3. Report from the Service Team meeting

Wolfgang Tinkl, AT

Wolfgang Tinkl (AT) reported on the discussions from the IOC Service team meeting that took place in Vienna on the 18th of January. Main points include:

Best practices on Security and GeoRM

- There were five presentations on best practices regarding security and GeoRM from Belgium, Denmark, France, Germany and Austria. Each Member State has different solutions but can be categorized in ticket-based approach, extending WMS request, and username/password authentication. Technologies commonly used include http (basic and Digest), Web keys, NTLM;
- In most cases security needs require only knowledge of who is accessing certain services and statistics of usage, but the tendency is to provide services to the users in a simple way.

Split up implementation in two phases

It was decided that the implementation of the regulation of network services is conducted in two phases:

- Phase 1 intends to run until the entry into IOC (in May 2011). This phase focuses at pragmatic solutions based on current standards and implementations for discovery and view services while ensuring that INSPIRE requirements are met. Dependencies with the other Implementing Rules (metadata and data specifications) will however be considered as part of the domain model activity;
- Phase 2 takes into consideration experiences from phase 1 and investigates further aspects such as requirements from e-government and GeoRM and their possible impact on recommendations for bindings. A full registry may also be implemented in phase 2.

Protocol binding

- Decided to follow the current specifications (including bindings) in the implementation of the discovery and view services. That is, http KVP for WMS (view service) and http POST/SOAP for CSW ISO Application Profile (discovery service);
- This decision is final and may be revisited in phase 2, based on additional requirements.

GeoRM including Authorisation and Authentication

- It is generally thought that a common GeoRM is out of scope for INSPIRE regarding the current requirements;

¹http://inspire.jrc.ec.europa.eu/documents/Network_Services/MInutes_IOCTF_Teams_Meeting_Ispra_10112009.pdf

- As a result phase 1 shall not include a recommendation for a common GeoRM approach due to the strict time schedule. Implication of this is that each member state has (or will have) their own solution and the Commission (INSPIRE geoportal) may be required to make bilateral agreements with all member states where required;
- A problem arises when multiple data owners in a single country have several different solutions. In a longer term there are several European initiatives or projects underway in this area, (e.g. e-ID, STORK) which may need to be explored;
- A question could also be that if the Commission establishes an identity provider will the member states then use such solution?

Link (discovery/view) service operation

- DK made a presentation on the interpretation of the link (discovery/view) service. It was agreed that link (discovery/view) service operation should be recommended implemented using the “Publish metadata” operation from the discovery service. In addition for the link discovery service operation it shall be possible also to implement it using a federated search as currently recommended in guidelines version 2.0;
- An interpretation document is planned to be produced including also examples and a NOT interpretation, leaving no space for ambiguousness;
- The Commission will be asked to clarify with legal services that this interpretation is not in infringement with the regulation.

Domain Model

DE presented the draft version of a conceptual model. The aim of this is to define the most important (technical) entities of INSPIRE (as of data, metadata, services) and their relationships. The current scope of the domain model is to enhance harmonization of Technical guidance documents. It was generally thought that this is a very useful document, to aid further development of the Technical Guidelines. Some of the issues identified include:

- FileIdentifier is required in the CSW specification for certain mandatory operations, but it is not mandated by INSPIRE metadata regulation;
- Define how the link to relevant metadata documents is realized through the view service capabilities.

Details are included in the attached draft document.

Technical Guidance docs updating and testing

- Testing shall be performed between Member States and EC (INSPIRE geoportal) to identify issues in the implementation of current specifications and address identified issues. Testing scenarios will have to be defined; Austria to coordinate the creation of a test board in collaboration with Greece.
- The next version (2.1) of the technical guidance documents will be based on a selection of issues from the current issues list that require no further investigation (bindings, link service, editorials). It was agreed to aim to have version 2.1 ready for end of April;
- Version 2.2 shall be based on the testing findings and remaining issues. The aim is to have this version ready for June 2010, in time for the INSPIRE conference in Krakow;
- Both versions will be made public making clear however their status. Version 2.1 shall explicitly state that it is not final and a 2.2 version is expected subject to testing.

Language parameter

- Language parameter does not mean that other languages need to be supported;
- Extra language parameter is problem for clients;
- Ability to add language parameter in getCapabilities of services;
- Germany to make a proposal for the implementation of the language parameter;

- Commission shall clarify whether the proposal is compliant with the requirements of the regulation;

Metadata

- The question was raised how to deal with not INSPIRE required Metadata in the services of the MS;
- A proposal on filtering shall be sent to the drafting team.

4. IOC TF Discussion

In the discussion that followed the IOC TF approved the proposals made by the Service Team.

In addition it was agreed that:

Issues list

- A new version will be made available based on the resolutions made (e.g. KVP, REST, SOAP, GeoRM, editorial issues);
- Add new issues (discussion on ISO/OGC schemas, default SRS, authentication-authorisation-EC identity framework);
- Scope has to be limited to INSPIRE requirements;
- If an issue has been introduced based on a newer version of the standards than the one referred by the TG, the issue will be promoted to a standardisation issue;

TestBoard

- Define use cases and test scenarios. Select categories, subcategories and issues from issue list that could be covered by testing. Testing shall cover view and discovery services. Get list of available/testable view and discovery services.
- AT assisted by GR will define use cases and scenarios.
- The primary focus of the TestBoard is testing the minimal requirements enforced by INSPIRE;
- Additional test cases in between Member States can be agreed upon. Candidates for additional testing are: WMTS, SAML (authentication, authorization).
- These also should be documented and made public as information/best practices.
- Issues in the domain model are input for testing use cases and testing results are feedback to the domain model;
- Since all three actions (TG Review, Domain Model, TestBoard) depend on each other, central coordination and good communication are essential for reaching the goals set by the Task Force.
- A code repository for publishing coding best practices may be needed.
 - EC proposed the use of the Open Source Observatory and Repository for EU public administrations (<http://www.osor.eu/>)

Architecture and Domain Model

- Work on the domain model will be continued in a subgroup of the network services, allowing external experts to join. Several expert meetings on this issue will take place in February, and a meeting with the View Service Team is planned Feb./March. NL proposed to hold a meeting on the 25th of February to further develop the domain model. For this meeting the Chairs of the former metadata and data specifications drafting teams will be invited.
- From this subgroup a separate architecture group might be formed when / if an architecture analysis in a more detailed level is required (e.g. phase 2).

- AT suggested that according to the timeframe we need an operating system for IOC, the testing is the main focus and all Member States should try to have a service to test. The architecture group is good for the global picture but not so for the operating picture;
- It was generally agreed that there is a need for harmonisation and dependencies with other technical chapters;
- BE proposed to re-evaluate in June whether an architecture group is needed. For the time being the work on the domain model continues.

5. Presentation on S/W used for the INSPIRE geoportal

Gianluca Luraschi, European Commission, Joint Research Centre

- EC presented the software architecture of the current version of the prototype geoportal and the way it accesses current discovery and view services. The presentation is attached to the minutes;
- UK asked whether the software is available for sharing with the Member States;
- EC explained the plans to release the software under the EUPL license, in the coming months;
- Current version supports CSW ISO AP, OGC WMS 1.1.1, ISO 19128 (OGC WMS 1.3);
- FR requested to perform tests with tiled cache version of WMS (OGC WMTS is still a draft).

6. Linked Data and INSPIRE (UK)

- UK presented the current developments in UK with regards Linked data to raise awareness and to highlight the relationship of Linked Data and INSPIRE and location data;
- The UK data.gov.uk is launched to open up data for re-use;
- BE: How to map OGC specifications to resource references?

7. Scope of IOC TF re-visited (Discussion)

Following up from the Rotterdam meeting a discussion started on whether the scope of the IOC TF needs to be updated to include also the other INSPIRE technical chapters.

- The IOC TF agreed to keep the current scope of the IOC TF, that is, focus on discovery and view services. It is realized that consistency with the other Implementing rules is important, however for the time being the activity on domain model suffices;
- NO commented that there will be interoperability issues in Data Specifications, already seen in various FP7 projects. Is there a need to set up additional Task Force to tackle the other chapters? With potentially different composition? But nevertheless an instrument such as this is required to deal with interoperability issues during the implementation phase;
- EC commented that there is not yet a solution for the other chapters, as it is not built in the other implementing rules;
- What is missing is a group to represent the data and metadata. The IOC TF can act as the coordinating structure for all these;
- Need more relation between NS and DS. Use of data in NS is important. To be re-discussed in the next meeting in June 2010;
- Poland informed that it takes time to identify the appropriate people to assign in a group. It also takes time to organize the group, so it may not be practical to have more groups to address other aspects of the implementing rules;
- BE note that the overall architecture needs to be tackled despite the fact that Drafting Teams are dormant.

The scope of the IOC TF will be re-visited in the June meeting.

8. Summary and Next Steps

The Commission proposed June 2010 as date for the next IOC TF meeting to coincide with the INSPIRE conference in Krakow, Poland.

Other meetings include:

- Domain model subgroup to meet 25th of February in NL;
- IOC Service Team to discuss domain model (NL - March 2010)

The chairman thanked the participants, and closed the meeting.

9. ACTIONS

No.	What	Who	When
1	Proposal for the implementation of the language parameter	DE	05/02/2010
2	Confirm language parameter proposal	EC	12/02/2010
3	Definition of test scenarios	AT/GR	12/02/2010
4	Link service operation proposal	DK	DONE
5	Confirm Link service operation	EC - JRC	12/02/2010
6	Technical guidelines 2.1 version	IOC Service team	April 2010
7	Technical guidelines 2.2 version	IOC Service team	June 2010
8	Domain model update	DE	DONE
9	Updated Issues list following decisions taken	BE	DONE
10	Workshop on the domain model involving also people from the metadata and data DTs.	NL	25/02/2010
11	Proposal on filtering to be sent to NS DT		
12	To make available a high level document for the INSPIRE geoportal incl. the use cases that were presented by GL.	EC	25/02/2010
13	Identify how the technical guidelines for metadata and data specifications will be further developed and maintained	EC	25/02/2010
14	Investigate the use of the EC authentication system together with those from MS to provide access to European Officials	EC	31/03/2010
15	Release INSPIRE geoportal S/W	EC	Pending EC decision on OS S/W

10. List of Participants

Country	Task Force Member	Organisation
AT	Wolfgang Tinkl Markus Jobst	Land-, forst- und wasserwirtschaftliches Rechenzentrum GmbH, Bundesamt für Eich- und Vermessungswesen
BE	Bart Cosyn Joeri Robbrecht	Flemish Geographical Information Agency (AGIV)
CZ	Jiri Kvapil, Jitka Fauknerova Stepan Kafka	CENIA, česká informační agentura životního prostředí
DK	Anders Friis-Christensen	Ministry of the Environment National Survey and Cadastre, Spatial Data Infrastructure Department
FI	Jani Kylmäaho	National Land Survey of Finland
FR	Jean-Jacques Serrano Didier Richard	BRGM IGN
DE	Andreas von Dömming Jan Grohmann	Federal Agency for Cartography and Geodesy Federal Agency for Cartography and Geodesy
EL	George Mourafetis	Hellenic mapping and Cadastral Organization
IE	Miuiris de Buiteléir Gareth John	Department of the Environment, Heritage and Local Government
LV	Arvidis Ozols	Latvian Geospatial Information Agency
NL	Michel Grothe Linda van de Brink	Geonovum
NO	Olaf Østensen	Norwegian Mapping and Cadastre Authority
PL	Marek Brylski	
SK	Martin Koska, Marek Ziacik	SAZP - Slovak Environmental Agency
ES	Emilio López-Romero	Ministry Housing
SE	Frederik Persäter	Lantmäteriet, The Swedish Mapping and Land Registration Authority
UK	Keith Murray Timothy Duffy Peter Whybrow	Defra BGS Defra
EC	Ioannis Kanellopoulos, Gianluca Luraschi, Michel Millot Ekkehard Petri	EC JRC DG EUROSTAT