

INSPIRE D3.5 Network Services Architecture - Comments and Resolutions											
Comments are related to the D3.5 version 2											
Progressive comment number	SDIC ID	LMO/SDIC	Comment ID	Chapter, section or clause no./ Subclause No./Annex	Paragraph/Figure/Table/Note	Type of comment	Comment (justification for change)	Proposed change	Observations from Comments Resolving Committee	Action Taken	Paragraphs changed
109	Lenkungsgremium GDI-DE (Steering Committee GDI-DE) (explanation: GDI-DE = Spatial Data Infrastructure Germany)	LMO	4	1	3	G	missing word "unduly" like in reason (6) of the prologue of INSPIRE, without this word the following enumeration won't be necessary (see next sentence in (6))	that spatial data are made available under conditions that do not unduly restrict their extensive use;	accepted		1
110	Lenkungsgremium GDI-DE (Steering Committee GDI-DE) (explanation: GDI-DE = Spatial Data Infrastructure Germany)	LMO	5	2	5	E	Text: "In addition, the Network Services Implementing Rule in particular address: ..."	Change to: "In addition, the Network Services Implementing Rules in particular address: ..."			2

Progressive comment number	SDIC ID	LMO/SDIC	Comment ID	Chapter, section or clause no./ Subclause No./Annex	Paragraph/Figure/Table/Note	Type of comment	Comment (justification for change)	Proposed change	Observations from Comments Resolving Committee	Action Taken	Paragraphs changed
21	Met Office	LMO	MetO-03	3	Sc	G	The document implies, though does not comment, that INSPIRE data and services is restricted to the Network Services defined in Article 11.1(a to e). These are interpreted strictly as Web Services over the Internet, though the sentence after 11.1(e) that other appropriate means of communication are to be considered is referenced but not further commented-on. There are existing services which should be regarded as a fully compatible with the INSPIRE ethos (e.g. Meteoalarm http://www.meteoalarm.eu/ or WMO Public Weather Service http://www.wmo.ch/pages/prog/amp/pwsp/index_n.html which all are accessible from within Meteoalarm) which do use the Internet, but which do not use Web Services. Some guidance is needed as to the status of these non-Web Services, or services which do not use the Internet (e.g. Safety critical weather dissemination services over private lines, TV, satellite or fax). These are unlikely or impossible to change, yet whether or not it is intended that these be duplicated on web services is not made clear.	Please comment whether INSPIRE data and services are restricted to Network Services. Please comment on the status of existing services, either on the Internet but not using Web Services, or using other means of telecommunications. The document should not reference the last sentence of Article 11 without explaining the position and implications of this sentence.	Sentence: Handle pre existing services by INSPIRE proxy access; pointer to figure 7.2	Facades can be used to include pre existing or even future components into INSPIRE.	7
68	EA - Environment Agency for England and Wales	SDIC	1	4.2		E	The terms DTMD, DTDS and DTNS are used in the document, but are absent from the list of abbreviations.	Include DTMD, DTDS and DTNS in the list of abbreviations.	accepted	defined	4.2
111	Lenkungsgremium GDI-DE (Steering Committee GDI-DE) (explanation: GDI-DE = Spatial Data Infrastructure Germany)	LMO	6	4.2		E	Some more abbreviations would be helpful.	Add explanations for: DT, DT MD, DT DS, DT NS, MRD, TWG.	accepted; MRD, TWG not in the document	defined except from MRD, TWG	4.2

Progressive comment number	SDIC ID	LMO/SDIC	Comment ID	Chapter, section or clause no./ Subclause No./Annex	Paragraph/Figure/Table/Note	Type of comment	Comment (justification for change)	Proposed change	Observations from Comments Resolving Committee	Action Taken	Paragraphs changed
112	Lenkungsgremium GDI-DE (Steering Committee GDI-DE) (explanation: GDI-DE = Spatial Data Infrastructure Germany)	LMO	7	5	Figure 5-1	T	Metadata to services are kept in the "Service Registry" and in the "DT MD". It causes a redundant data storage and multiple requests for a query.	Metadata to services should only collect or submit by one point ("Data Source").	Clarify "DT"; better don't describe DTs but documents. Clarify: Registry don't store service metadata	"The figure 5-1 shows the components and responsibilities of the Drafting Teams." added to point out components and responsibilities. A direct link to a full document directory instead of DT would be desirable, but can not be given now.	5
102	Institut Géographique National	LMO	3	5	all	T	the upload services have disappeared, only download (besides, in some language like french the traduction of download is the same as that of upload)	explain why upload services have disappeared (they still appear in some documents or papers .. And obviously they are still relevant? Be sure that in local language like French, these services are not translated by ambiguous terms like 'téléchargement'.	No change in document Answer why upload is removed (upload is removed from the directive)	No change because upload is removed from the directive and is now part of discovery service	no change
94	United Kingdom Hydrographic Office	LMO	15	6		G	Is the view service presumed to be an OGC WMS? Is the download service presumed to be an OGC WFS? Is the transformation service presumed to be an OGC WPS? (Processing) Is the spatial service presumed to be an OGC WPS? (Portrayal)		Answer and point to other Irs	view service is seen as a WMS; download service will be seen partly as a WFS; transformation service will be seen as WPS with specific profile(s); the interpretation of spatial service is still open. For details see different implementing rules	no change
22	Met Office	LMO	MetO-04	6	all	G	The implication again, is that only Network Services under Art 11.1(a to e) plus some supporting registry services are to be regarded as INSPIRE services. There are other services, for example not using Web Services already in existence.	Please comment whether INSPIRE data and services are restricted to Network Services and the status of other services such as view services not using WMS http://www.metoffice.gov.uk/weather/uk/uk_forecast_weather.html or download service using ftp http://www.metoffice.gov.uk/wfcl/ .	Answer comment like Comment 3	non INSPIRE compatible services do exist, but an INSPIRE compatible "facade" needs to be added as figure 7-2 shows.	no change
182	FOSSDI - Free and Open Source Software for Spatial Data Infrastructure	SDIC	1	6.1	1	E	The statement "The goal of discovery is to support discovery" is tautological	first "discovery" should read "discovery services", second "discovery of data" or similar clearer wording	accepted	text adapted	6.2

Progressive comment number	SDIC ID	LMO/SDIC	Comment ID	Chapter, section or clause no./ Subclause No./Annex	Paragraph/Figure/Table/Note	Type of comment	Comment (justification for change)	Proposed change	Observations from Comments Resolving Committee	Action Taken	Paragraphs changed
69	EA - Environment Agency for England and Wales	SDIC	2	6.1	2	E	Sentence does not read correctly.	Replace "... search catalogues or the purpose of discovery..." with "...search catalogues for the purpose of discovery..."	accepted	text adapted	6.2
2	Royal Netherlands Meteorological Institute (KNMI)	LMO	2	6.1	2	E	Please change the first line of the 2nd alinea to 'The goal of discovery services is to support discovery ...'	Please change the first line of the 2nd alinea to 'The goal of discovery services is to support discovery ...'	s. Comment 10	s. 182	6.2
80	United Kingdom Hydrographic Office	LMO	1	6.1	2	E	typo	Change "or" to "for" in "manage and search catalogues or the purpose of discovery"	s. comment 11	s. 69	6.2
37	IACS-CAP - Integrated Administration and Control System (Common Agricultural Policy)	SDIC	2	6.2	1	E	not an accurate citation of Directive text	please separate Directive citation from opinion of DT, add references to article (sub-article) of Directive.	accepted	citation corrected	6.2
51	General Administration of Patrimonial Documentation	LMO	1	6.2	1	T	Possibility to search (query) is absent in the following sentence: "... view services making it possible, as a minimum, to display, navigate, zoom in and out, pan or overlay viewable spatial data sets and to display legend information and any relevant content of metadata."	... view services making it possible, as a minimum, to display, navigate, zoom in and out, pan, search or overlay viewable spatial data sets and to display legend information and any relevant content of metadata.	not requested by the directive; no "search" / "query" in the current version of the directive	56 no change	no change
56	FPGI / PFIG - Federaal Platform voor Geo-Informatie / Plate-forme Fédérale de l'Information Géographique	SDIC	1	6.2	1	T	Possibility to search (query) is absent in the following sentence: "... view services making it possible, as a minimum, to display, navigate, zoom in and out, pan or overlay viewable spatial data sets and to display legend information and any relevant content of metadata."	... view services making it possible, as a minimum, to display, navigate, zoom in and out, pan, search or overlay viewable spatial data sets and to display legend information and any relevant content of metadata.	not requested by the directive; no "search" / "query" in the current version of the directive	search (query) is not requested by the directive and by this not part of the architecture and the view service	no change
113	Lenkungsgremium GDI-DE (Steering Committee GDI-DE) (explanation: GDI-DE = Spatial Data Infrastructure Germany)	LMO	8	6.2	1	G	Misleading text: "Member States shall ensure that e-commerce" and geo right management "services are available" for view services if required.". Comment: This is not in accordance with Article 14 Number 4: "Where public authorities levy charges for the services referred to in points (b), (c) or (e) of Article 11(1), Member States shall ensure that e-commerce services are available."	Change to: "Where public authorities levy charges for view services, the Member States shall ensure that e-commerce services (including geo right management services) are available."	s. 17	citation corrected	6.2

Progressive comment number	SDIC ID	LMO/SDIC	Comment ID	Chapter, section or clause no./ Subclause No./Annex	Paragraph/Figure/Table/Note	Type of comment	Comment (justification for change)	Proposed change	Observations from Comments Resolving Committee	Action Taken	Paragraphs changed
114	Lenkungsgremium GDI-DE (Steering Committee GDI-DE) (explanation: GDI-DE = Spatial Data Infrastructure Germany)	LMO	9	6.2	2	T	What is meant by: "Multiple datasets" ?	Please explain.	align with view service IR	aligned with view service IR (for details see there)	6.2
115	Lenkungsgremium GDI-DE (Steering Committee GDI-DE) (explanation: GDI-DE = Spatial Data Infrastructure Germany)	LMO	10	6.2	2	G	missing definition of "Multilingualism", which languages and which subjects. Possibilities: CS DA DE EL EN ES ET FI FR HU IT LT LV MT NL PL PT SK SL SV. Maps or domestic digital data are difficult to translate.	language og member state plus EN, defined exactly which subjects have to be translated.	Multilingual discussion	Whole paragraph was reformulated. The support of the LANGUAGE parameter is mandatory, it is recommended to also provide english responses.	6,2 7,3
46	AGI - Association for Geographic Information	SDIC	AGI1	6.2		E	The term "implementation rules" is used	Change to "Implementing Rules"	accepted	text adapted	6.2
101	Institut Géographique National	LMO	2	6.2	all	G	the description is fuzzy. View is more specific than that when it comes to maps.	To state explicitly that the administrator of the view service will have to build the relevant layers based on available data (portrayed at correct resolutions).	This should be stated in the View Service IR.	text slightly adapted	6.2
81	United Kingdom Hydrographic Office	LMO	2	6.3	1	E	typo	remove redundant quotation mark from network"	accepted	text adapted	6.3
70	EA - Environment Agency for England and Wales	SDIC	3	6.3	1	E	Spurious quotation mark.	Replace e-comm"erce with e-commerce.	accepted; check for citation	text adapted	6.3
38	IACS-CAP - Integrated Administration and Control System (Common Agricultural Policy)	SDIC	3	6.3	1	E	not an accurate citation of Directive text	please separate Directive citation from opinion of DT, add references to article (sub-article) of Directive.	check citation	citation corrected; reference added	6.3
116	Lenkungsgremium GDI-DE (Steering Committee GDI-DE) (explanation: GDI-DE = Spatial Data Infrastructure Germany)	LMO	11	6.3	1	G	Expression too restrictive: "where public authorities levy charges for the download services"	omit: "the download"	it is the chapter on download	no change because this expression is done in the chapter on download.	no change

Progressive comment number	SDIC ID	LMO/SDIC	Comment ID	Chapter, section or clause no./ Subclause No./Annex	Paragraph/Figure/Table/Note	Type of comment	Comment (justification for change)	Proposed change	Observations from Comments Resolving Committee	Action Taken	Paragraphs changed
57	FPGI / PFIG - Federaal Platform voor Geo-Informatie / Plate-forme Fédérale de l'Information Géographique	SDIC	2	6.3	1	E	In addition, where public authorities levy charges for the download services, Member States shall ensure that e-comm ⁿ erce and GeoRM services are available.	In addition, where public authorities levy charges for the download services, Member States shall ensure that e-commerce and GeoRM services are available.	s. Comment 21	text adapted	6.3
52	General Administration of Patrimonial Documentation	LMO	2	6.3	1	E	In addition, where public authorities levy charges for the download services, Member States shall ensure that e-comm ⁿ erce and GeoRM services are available.	In addition, where public authorities levy charges for the download services, Member States shall ensure that e-commerce and GeoRM services are available.	s. Comment 21	text adapted	6.3
117	Lenkungsgremium GDI-DE (Steering Committee GDI-DE) (explanation: GDI-DE = Spatial Data Infrastructure Germany)	LMO	12	6.3	1	E	Typo: '... e-comm ⁿ erce'	Change to: '... e-commerce' '	s. Comment 21	text adapted	6.3
23	Met Office	LMO	MetO-05	6.3	1	E	e-comm ⁿ erce	e-commerce"	s. Comment 21	text adapted	6.3
3	Royal Netherlands Meteorological Institute (KNMI)	LMO	3	6.3	1	E	Spelling error in last line	please change e-comm ⁿ erce to e-commerce	s. Comment 21	text adapted	6.3
82	United Kingdom Hydrographic Office	LMO	3	6.3	1	E	typo	remove quotation mark from e-comm ⁿ erce	s. Comment 21	text adapted	6.3
118	Lenkungsgremium GDI-DE (Steering Committee GDI-DE) (explanation: GDI-DE = Spatial Data Infrastructure Germany)	LMO	13	6.3	2	E	Typo: '... provide ...'	Change to: '... provides ...'	accepted	text adapted	6.3

Progressive comment number	SDIC ID	LMO/SDIC	Comment ID	Chapter, section or clause no./ Subclause No./Annex	Paragraph/Figure/Table/Note	Type of comment	Comment (justification for change)	Proposed change	Observations from Comments Resolving Committee	Action Taken	Paragraphs changed
120	Lenkungsgremium GDI-DE (Steering Committee GDI-DE) (explanation: GDI-DE = Spatial Data Infrastructure Germany)	LMO	15	6.3	2	T	(If transformation exceeds transformation between different coordinate reference systems like UTM or Gauß-Krüger-Coordinates.) Transforming data between the "original schema" of the "local source" an the "harmonized schema" (of INSPIRE) on-the-fly implies that the content is "transformable". Therefore different requirements are necessary like standardization of classification and (content) description..		give an answer to this question; clarify that the realization of a INSPIRE conforming service is in the responsibility of the service provider Clarify last paragraph with respect to the transformation service discussion (case 1 and case 2)	Accepted in principle, it is clear that transformations in the sense of INSPIRE (e.g. schema transformation) raise important and difficult issues - as whether it is at all possible without reclassification in the field. The changed text proposed as resolution of comment 39 below should give alternative ways to address this problem.	6,3
119	Lenkungsgremium GDI-DE (Steering Committee GDI-DE) (explanation: GDI-DE = Spatial Data Infrastructure Germany)	LMO	14	6.3	2	T	"download of a complete dataset or datasets" require adequate resources like bandwidth, performance and capacity. For online access this has to be limited to a specific size (i.e. 50MB). "Oversized" data must be delivered by offline techniques.		Offline techniques are out of scope of network services. Every MS is allowed to do more than requested by the INSPIRE IR.	Accepted, delete the sentences "For online access this has to be limited to a specific size (i.e. 50MB). "Oversized" data must be delivered by offline techniques."	6,3
71	EA - Environment Agency for England and Wales	SDIC	4	6.3	3	E	This paragraph appears to contain editors' comments which must be removed.	Remove the text within brackets, amending the other text as appropriate.		Accepted, remove brackets and use both conceptual or application in the first sentence, only application schema in the second sentence since this is the most relevant term when we speak about transformation.	6,3
121	Lenkungsgremium GDI-DE (Steering Committee GDI-DE) (explanation: GDI-DE = Spatial Data Infrastructure Germany)	LMO	16	6.3	3	G	Unclear meaning: "It is worth to note that the conceptual or application (which to use – should not use logical?) schema of the local or national spatial data set may and will often differ from the INSPIRE harmonised specification of the spatial object types in the data specification. In this case a download service will transform queries and data between the conceptual or application (which to use?) schema of the spatial dataset and the harmonised schema on-the-fly.."	Please clarify the text in general. In addition, please state: Which tasks are to be performed by download services and which tasks are to be performed by transformation services. The normal case should be, that these two types of services are separate services.		Accepted, see comment above.	6,3

Progressive comment number	SDIC ID	LMO/SDIC	Comment ID	Chapter, section or clause no./ Subclause No./Annex	Paragraph/Figure/Table/Note	Type of comment	Comment (justification for change)	Proposed change	Observations from Comments Resolving Committee	Action Taken	Paragraphs changed
122	Lenkungsgremium GDI-DE (Steering Committee GDI-DE) (explanation: GDI-DE = Spatial Data Infrastructure Germany)	LMO	17	6.3	3	T	Extreme requirement: "... on-the-fly.."	Change to: "... on-the-fly, if possible."		Resolved by comment above.	6,3
83	United Kingdom Hydrographic Office	LMO	4	6.3	3	T	Question in document: "which to use – should not use logical?" I believe that both the conceptual and application schemas of the local/national datasets will often differ.	Replace "It is worth to note that the conceptual or application (which to use – should not use logical?) schema" with "It is worth noting that both the conceptual and application schema"		Resolved by comment above.	6,3
84	United Kingdom Hydrographic Office	LMO	5	6.3	3	T	Question in document: "which to use?" As above I believe that both the conceptual and application schemas of the local/national datasets will often differ.	see below		Resolved by comment above.	6,3
85	United Kingdom Hydrographic Office	LMO	6	6.3	3	T	The transform need not be "on the fly". (See D2.6 Section 5.3.1) Particularly where the conceptual schemas differ, the transformation may well be non-trivial, and the member state may prefer to transform national datasets in advance. See also subsidiarity: I don't believe this document should make that design decision for "on the fly" transformation.	Replace "In this case a download service will transform queries and data between the conceptual or application (which to use?) schema of the spatial dataset and the harmonised schema on-the-fly" with "In this case a download service may transform queries and data, on-the-fly, between the local or national schema of the spatial dataset and the harmonised schema. Alternatively, a member state may provide a download service based on derived datasets converted in advance of receiving the query."		Resolved by comment above.	6,3
86	United Kingdom Hydrographic Office	LMO	7	6.3	3	T	The final sentence only mentions a small subset of possible search criteria; the subject is covered more fully by the Metadata DT.	Delete "Search criteria need to support searching based on spatial and temporal extents.", or replace it with "Search criteria include spatial and temporal extents, and are described in the Implementing Rules for Metadata"		Partially accepted, suggested change: Search criteria need to support a variety of criteria, including spatial and temporal extents, metadata elements, and feature properties."	6,3

Progressive comment number	SDIC ID	LMO/SDIC	Comment ID	Chapter, section or clause no./ Subclause No./Annex	Paragraph/Figure/Table/Note	Type of comment	Comment (justification for change)	Proposed change	Observations from Comments Resolving Committee	Action Taken	Paragraphs changed
39	IACS-CAP - Integrated Administration and Control System (Common Agricultural Policy)	SDIC	4	6.3	3	T	In this case a download services will transform queries and data(?) between the schema of the dataset and the harmonized schema on-the- fly	??? Seems like a task of transformation services, see 6.4 - and btw not completely clear yet	s. 34	Accepted, we should write: " In this case a download services may be set up to transform between the schema of the dataset and the harmonized schema on-the- fly, if possible, or a transformation service (see 6.4) may be invoked. Alternatively, a member state may provide a download service based on derived datasets converted in advance of receiving the query." (the last sentence refer also to comment 85 below).	6,3
4	Royal Netherlands Meteorological Institute (KNMI)	LMO	4	6.3	3	E	Please remove TBD placeholders ('which to use') from the text. Please explain in the text if there are open issues and what the choices are. In the way it is mentioned now, it is not clear	Please remove 'which to use?' (2x)	s. 34	Resolved by comment above.	6,3
24	Met Office	LMO	MetO-06	6.3	last para	E	internal notes to authors	resolve internal notes.		See several comments above,	6,3
25	Met Office	LMO	MetO-07	6.3	last para	G	The implication again is that only INSPIRE transformed data through Download Services are INSPIRE services. Would that mean that existing services will have to be duplicated?	Please comment whether INSPIRE data and services are restricted to Network Services and on the status of other existing services, such as whether they must be duplicated.		Not quite clear comment, INSPIRE services are restricted to INSPIRE IR and INSPIRE themes, but obviously the same type of services can be used much more general. The architecture and the Irs are focusing on INSPIRE requirements, but does not restrict MS to operate other services and services on other data - on the contrary, such data services may be registered in the metadata.	no change

Progressive comment number	SDIC ID	LMO/SDIC	Comment ID	Chapter, section or clause no./ Subclause No./Annex	Paragraph/Figure/Table/Note	Type of comment	Comment (justification for change)	Proposed change	Observations from Comments Resolving Committee	Action Taken	Paragraphs changed
124	Lenkungsgremium GDI-DE (Steering Committee GDI-DE) (explanation: GDI-DE = Spatial Data Infrastructure Germany)	LMO	19	6.4	1	T	Generalisation services are not covered by the INSPIRE Directive. A generalisation service is not a transformation service that helps to achieve interoperability. Technically, generalisation is more a client function than a service function.	Add the adjoining text.	remove generalization	generalization sentence removed	6.4
72	EA - Environment Agency for England and Wales	SDIC	5	6.4	2	E	Paragraph contains uncertainty.	Reword the paragraph, removing ambiguity and doubt. Replace "theses" with "these".		Text edited to describe the service in more definitive terms	6.4
26	Met Office	LMO	MetO-08	6.4	2	E	verb structure is wrong on first sentence.	...is not completely clear and is still under discussion.		Sentence removed	6.4
125	Lenkungsgremium GDI-DE (Steering Committee GDI-DE) (explanation: GDI-DE = Spatial Data Infrastructure Germany)	LMO	20	6.4	2	T	The following issues should be treated separately: "Up to now the meaning of Transformation Services is not completely clear and under discussion. The actual understanding addresses web services that can be service-chained for schema transformation and coordinate transformation. These services are offered as "translating download service", where the translation is configured in the service and the client has (nearly) no control over the translation.	Please clarify the quoted text. Please discern in the text the following types of services: 1) Download of a dataset. 2) Access to data, e.g. through a WFS. 3) Hidden transformation services, with no client control except for the Coordinate Reference System, combined with download. 4) Hidden transformation services, with no client control except for the Coordinate Reference System, combined with WFS access. 5) Predefined chaining of download services with transformation services - and with client control. 6) Predefined chaining of access services with transformation services - and with client control. 7) Standalone transformation services - with client control. 8) Standalone transformation services - without client control, except for the Coordinate Reference System.		The service is now more concretely specified and roughly covers the proposed cases	6.4
123	Lenkungsgremium GDI-DE (Steering Committee GDI-DE) (explanation: GDI-DE = Spatial Data Infrastructure Germany)	LMO	18	6.4	all	T	Transformation Services are commonly used to change between different spatial "geoid" references (i.e. coordinate reference systems). Transformation Services that will exceed these purposes should not be discussed as the first approach (as it is done here).		s. Comments 46, 48	Text edited to restrict the service as proposed	6.4

Progressive comment number	SDIC ID	LMO/SDIC	Comment ID	Chapter, section or clause no./ Subclause No./Annex	Paragraph/Figure/Table/Note	Type of comment	Comment (justification for change)	Proposed change	Observations from Comments Resolving Committee	Action Taken	Paragraphs changed
126	Lenkungsgremium GDI-DE (Steering Committee GDI-DE) (explanation: GDI-DE = Spatial Data Infrastructure Germany)	LMO	21	6.5	1	T	Text unclear: "It also allows defining the external web service interface of the workflow or service chain".	Please clarify: "external web service interface".	It also allows the definition of a web service interface managing and accessing (executing) workflows or service chains.	Text reformulated	6.5
64	LMV - Lantmateriet, National Land Survey of Sweden	SDIC	4	6.5	2	T	"The Invoke Spatial Data Services..." need to be clarified. Is it one service or a series of services?	Please specify.	The "Invoke Spatial Data Service" service allows defining both the data inputs and data outputs expected by the spatial service and define a workflow or service chain combining multiple services. It also allows the definition of a web service interface managing and accessing (executing) workflows or service chains	No further change	
73	EA - Environment Agency for England and Wales	SDIC	6	6.5	3	E	Sentence does not read correctly.	Replace "...will require to precisely defining the interactions..." with "...will require to precisely define the interactions..." or similar.	accepted	Text adapted	6.5
63	LMV - Lantmateriet, National Land Survey of Sweden	SDIC	3	6.5		E	"," is missing in several places.	Add "," where necessary.	no missing "," found	Text adapted	no change
27	Met Office	LMO	MetO-09	6.5	last para	E	..require to precisely defining..	.. require to precisely define..	s. 52	Text adapted	6.5
103	Institut Géographique National	LMO	4	6.5	Title	E	Title "Invoke Spatial Service Services" is incorrect, and referenced as Invoke Spatial Data Service	Invoke Spatial Data Services	accepted	Text adapted	6.5
127	Lenkungsgremium GDI-DE (Steering Committee GDI-DE) (explanation: GDI-DE = Spatial Data Infrastructure Germany)	LMO	22	6.6	1	G	Document is of state "informativ" (see 3). Appeals with strong verbs like "are needed" are not necessary in a non-IR!	further services are recommended to run an interoperable spatial data infrastructure	accepted	Text reformulated; than deleted ...	6.6

Progressive comment number	SDIC ID	LMO/SDIC	Comment ID	Chapter, section or clause no./ Subclause No./Annex	Paragraph/Figure/Table/Note	Type of comment	Comment (justification for change)				
41	IACS-CAP - Integrated Administration and Control System (Common Agricultural Policy)	SDIC	6	6.6	1	T	It is not clear from the text of paragraph the role of registry services for INSPIRE, except that that is important well-defined governance.	please address more precisely	CT asked: Different scenarios for the registry services; (1) Registry services are not part of NS IR therefore the DT may choose to delete the sentence completely. Figure 5-1 is ok since they refer to it as the INSPIRE overview architecture however figure 6-1 will need updating since it include registry services as part of INSPIRE service types;(2) Alternatively keep the sentence but making it clear that although Registry services have been identified as a component in the INSPIRE overview architecture they are out of scope of the NS IR. (3) Finally if it is still deemed necessary to have a sentence for registry services in this document, a clear rationale for the need, scope and role of the registry services together with some use cases is required (e.g. need of register and (if required) registry service for code lists for metadata, UML models etc). This may answer the questions of some SDICS/LMOs while it may clarify things for others.	Chapter 6.6 removed and registry services are removed from figure 6-1. Registry services are only mentioned in the overall architecture (and thereby in figure 5 1) and not in the NS architecture.	6, 6.6
128	Lenkungsgremium GDI-DE (Steering Committee GDI-DE) (explanation: GDI-DE = Spatial Data Infrastructure Germany)	LMO	23	6.6	2	G	If registry services are not explicitly asked for by the directive there is no need for an implementation. It is just a nice-to-have option and therefor members' affair.	delete paragraph	accepted	Paragraph deleted; see 41	6, 6.6
5	Royal Netherlands Meteorological Institute (KNMI)	LMO	5	6.6	2	G	The Registry Services are an essential component in the infrastructure and should be addressed accordingly in the infrastructure descriptions		registry services are adressed in the overall architecture, not in the network service architecture	s. 41	6, 6.6

Progressive comment number	SDIC ID	LMO/SDIC	Comment ID	Chapter, section or clause no./ Subclause No./Annex	Paragraph/Figure/Table/Note	Type of comment	Comment (justification for change)	Proposed change	Observations from Comments Resolving Committee	Action Taken	Paragraphs changed
42	IACS-CAP - Integrated Administration and Control System (Common Agricultural Policy)	SDIC	7	6.6	2	T	registry services will be implemented	by whom? Please specify type of governance: EC, MS, others	s. 41	s. 41	6, 6.6
183	FOSSDI - Free and Open Source Software for Spatial Data Infrastructure	SDIC	2	6.6		T	describes "registry services" as being separate from "discovery services", which is debatable or even misleading, as discovery services depend on a registry and repository being available. -	should provide clearer guidance as to how a "registry service" relates to storage of metadata and searching for data	remove registry services from NS architecture	s. 41	6, 6.6
40	IACS-CAP - Integrated Administration and Control System (Common Agricultural Policy)	SDIC	5	6.6	title	T	Further services in INSPIRE -paragraph contains only register services; it is not clear meaning of word 'further'	Registry services	Rename paragraph	Paragraph renamed	6.6
43	IACS-CAP - Integrated Administration and Control System (Common Agricultural Policy)	SDIC	8	7	1	E	different parties of the European Spatial Information Infrastructure	different parties of the European Spatial Data Infrastructure	accepted	Text adapted	7
129	Lenkungsgremium GDI-DE (Steering Committee GDI-DE) (explanation: GDI-DE = Spatial Data Infrastructure Germany)	LMO	24	7	1	G	Text does not mention the public: "Network services are necessary for sharing spatial data between the various levels of public authority in the Community.".	Change to: "Network services are necessary for sharing spatial data between the public authorities on various levels in the European Community and the public.".	accepted	Text adapted	7
130	Lenkungsgremium GDI-DE (Steering Committee GDI-DE) (explanation: GDI-DE = Spatial Data Infrastructure Germany)	LMO	25	7	1	T	On IT's point of view it doesn't make sense to compare a network service architecture with a term form OSI. GeoServices are applications, TCP/IP is the protocol.	delete sentence	accepted	"protocol" replaced by "interface";	7

Progressive comment number	SDIC ID	LMO/SDIC	Comment ID	Chapter, section or clause no./ Subclause No./Annex	Paragraph/Figure/Table/Note	Type of comment	Comment (justification for change)	Proposed change	Observations from Comments Resolving Committee	Action Taken	Paragraphs changed
184	FOSSDI - Free and Open Source Software for Spatial Data Infrastructure	SDIC	3	7	1	E	(describing figure 7.2) - states that public authorities in Member States do not have to comply with the INSPIRE Network Service Definitions (e.g. the IRs) if the Member State is running an INSPIRE-compliant portal with access to data services they provide	should provide a reference to where, in the INSPIRE Directive text or in any of the Implementing Rules, this exception to compliance is allowed.	answer comment add terms: - INSPIRE Network Service - MS Service	"INSPIRE Network Service" and "MS Service" defined in terms. MS service is any (geo) service of the MS, which not necessary is compliant to the INSPIRE rules.	4
185	FOSSDI - Free and Open Source Software for Spatial Data Infrastructure	SDIC	4	7	1	E	"INSPIRE service ... can be realised by a facade which cascades". The phrase "facade which cascades" has no clear or common technical meaning and should be explained.	Rewrite to expand, or remove, the facade statement.	remove "bridge", use facade define terms: facade; cascade	done	4, 7 (fig 7-2)
44	IACS-CAP - Integrated Administration and Control System (Common Agricultural Policy)	SDIC	9	7	3	E	the World Wide Consortium	the World Wide Web Consortium	accepted	Text adapted	7
75	Institute of Geodesy, Cartography and Remote Sensing	LMO	1	7	3	T	wrong terminology in "HTTP/GET and/or HTTP/POST as the messaging protocol"	HTTP messaging protocol with GET and POST methods,	accepted	Text adapted	7
76	Institute of Geodesy, Cartography and Remote Sensing	LMO	2	7	3	E	typo in "SOAP web service ensure"	SOAP web services ensure	accepted		7
6	Royal Netherlands Meteorological Institute (KNMI)	LMO	6	7	3	E	With 'World Wide Consortium', W3C is meant?		accepted	s. 44	7
191	FOSSDI - Free and Open Source Software for Spatial Data Infrastructure	SDIC	11	7	3	T	The claims made in favour of SOAP are an exaggeration of the capacity of this protocol to deliver "seamless integration" in a real-world, rather than test-case, environment. The following commentary on experience with SOAP in the wild was offered by the PSC chair of the GeoTools project which participated in an OWS-3 SOAP evaluation effort: http://wiki.osgeo.org/index.php/SOAP#OWS-3	Difficult to recommend specific changes pending results of further Commission consultation on this topic.	SOAP discussion	accepted in principle	no change

Progressive comment number	SDIC ID	LMO/SDIC	Comment ID	Chapter, section or clause no./ Subclause No./Annex	Paragraph/Figure/Table/Note	Type of comment	Comment (justification for change)	Proposed change	Observations from Comments Resolving Committee	Action Taken	Paragraphs changed
131	Lenkungsgremium GDI-DE (Steering Committee GDI-DE) (explanation: GDI-DE = Spatial Data Infrastructure Germany)	LMO	26	7	3	G	SOAP-Geoservices should not be defined as obliging, because the present level of development of SOAP is unsuitably for implementing.	Define SOAP as optional and fall back on the OGC standard as obliging.	SOAP discussion	Industries and OGC already support SOAP, especially Industry support is increasing, OGC demands a SOAP binding for all new service specifications. We expect the level of development to be suitable when IR's are to be transposed into software. See also new rationale in NS architecture document.	no change
132	Lenkungsgremium GDI-DE (Steering Committee GDI-DE) (explanation: GDI-DE = Spatial Data Infrastructure Germany)	LMO	27	7	3	G	the value and use of SOAP web services may not be widely known	give rationale about advantages/use of SOAP web services e.g. communication of applications running on different operating systems	SOAP discussion	accepted & done	7

Progressive comment number	SDIC ID	LMO/SDIC	Comment ID	Chapter, section or clause no./ Subclause No./Annex	Paragraph/Figure/Table/Note	Type of comment	Comment (justification for change)	Proposed change	Observations from Comments Resolving Committee	Action Taken	Paragraphs changed
135	Lenkungsgremium GDI-DE (Steering Committee GDI-DE) (explanation: GDI-DE = Spatial Data Infrastructure Germany)	LMO	30	7	3	G	The build-up of the spatial data infrastructure in Lower Saxony follows the specifications of the Open Geospatial Consortium consistently. The usage of SOAP is not specified within the OGC Services implemented in the SDI Lower Saxony, for example WMS 1.1.1	Usage of the established OGC Services with the protocols specified in this commonly used standards (like HTTP/GET within WMS 1.1.1)	SOAP discussion	Existing OGC Web Services (OWS) support a mix of protocols and technology bindings. These are Key-Value-Pairs send via HTTP/GET, XML send via HTTP/POST, SOAP via HTTP/POST and combinations. In addition the World Wide Web Consortium (W3C) suggests the usage of SOAP as a messaging protocol for web services. INSPIRE services should utilize one standard technology binding for all service types. In order to streamline integration and implementation as well as getting a maximum benefit from the offered services, a mix of technologies is to be avoided. Taking all requirements, opportunities and risks into account, the default communication-protocol and binding technology for INSPIRE services should be SOAP (document/literal); this is inline with OGC CSW ISO APP.	7
133	Lenkungsgremium GDI-DE (Steering Committee GDI-DE) (explanation: GDI-DE = Spatial Data Infrastructure Germany)	LMO	28	7	4	T	Text should not put OWS and SOAP as opponents.	Text should mention that OWS interfaces can be easily combined with SOAP, as shown e.g. in AP ISO 1.0.	SOAP discussion	Accepted & done	7

Progressive comment number	SDIC ID	LMO/SDIC	Comment ID	Chapter, section or clause no./ Subclause No./Annex	Paragraph/Figure/Table/Note	Type of comment	Comment (justification for change)	Proposed change	Observations from Comments Resolving Committee	Action Taken	Paragraphs changed
134	Lenkungsgremium GDI-DE (Steering Committee GDI-DE) (explanation: GDI-DE = Spatial Data Infrastructure Germany)	LMO	29	7	4	G	In view that we stand directly before 2009, a fundamental discussion between OGC-Service and SOAP is not opportune. Reasons, why authors prefers SOAP are unknown. Why not both standards? Results of the project should be published for all member states.		SOAP discussion	Accepted, reasons extended. "Both standard" will lead to a zoo of different implementations and interoperability between the different binding-supporting implementations is questionable. Some migration process is as well not possible as the directive will not provide the proper means to define and enforce such a migration strategy. The IR has to be clear in its statings.	7
77	Institute of Geodesy, Cartography and Remote Sensing	LMO	3	7	5	G	"all involved SDICs/LMOs are hereby requested to provide comments and reports on the usage of SOAP/WSDL in the frame of setting up an SDI"	REST versus SOAP debate rages on for years. See http://www.google.com/search?q=REST+v+s+SOAP . SOAP designed by commercial software vendors, SOAP development is driven by these vendors, in the interest of them. We discourage to use any temporarily popular technology, see the fate of CORBA, DCOM, RMI etc. REST is a sure bet.	SOAP discussion	REST and SOAP can't be compared. SOAP is a message protocol and REST an architectural style. Even worse, there are a lot of different interpretations of REST, ROA, RESTful, etc. The general applicability of Resource Oriented Architecture (ROA) and REST tendencies is examined in a JRC Scientific and Technical Report published by the European Commission.	no change
7	Royal Netherlands Meteorological Institute (KNMI)	LMO	7	7	5	G	Please regard delivery of large datasets (> Gbytes) in the SOAP WSDL context.		SOAP discussion	Not a problem with SOAP, binary transport (using Message Transmission Optimization Mechanism). Thats as well what OGC proposes.	no change

Progressive comment number	SDIC ID	LMO/SDIC	Comment ID	Chapter, section or clause no./ Subclause No./Annex	Paragraph/Figure/Table/Note	Type of comment	Comment (justification for change)	Proposed change	Observations from Comments Resolving Committee	Action Taken	Paragraphs changed
8	Royal Netherlands Meteorological Institute (KNMI)	LMO	8	7	5	G	Can Inspire play a role in the uniformization between OGC and ISO standards regarding service descriptions? It will be important not to have two standards		SOAP discussion	This is not the task or an objective of INSPIRE; WSDL is containing all needed syntactical/structural information whilst ISO & Capabilities provide the semantics stuff. Unfortunately, there is a small overlap for syntactical information (e.g. service endpoint urls)	no change
137	Lenkungsgremium GDI-DE (Steering Committee GDI-DE) (explanation: GDI-DE = Spatial Data Infrastructure Germany)	LMO	32	7	6	T	Unclear text: "Another view on the INSPIRE Network Services is to see them as a mediator between the services provided by the member states or offered by third parties and their EU-level usage for example via the INSPIRE geoportal."	Please clarify, e.g. like: "Services in the member states are not required to be changed because of INSPIRE. INSPIRE just requires that data and services in the member states are made available through INSPIRE-conformant network services. Technically, this can either be done by chaining an INSPIRE-conformant service to an existing service - or by establishing an INSPIRE-conformant service linked to the existing data source."	add text	Text added	7
144	Lenkungsgremium GDI-DE (Steering Committee GDI-DE) (explanation: GDI-DE = Spatial Data Infrastructure Germany)	LMO	39	7	8	E	Typo: "conform"	Change to: "conforming"	accepted	Text adapted	7
148	Lenkungsgremium GDI-DE (Steering Committee GDI-DE) (explanation: GDI-DE = Spatial Data Infrastructure Germany)	LMO	43	7	10	E	The term "service layer" ist not defined clearly. (...every service-layer...consists of service layer)	The definition should follow figure 5-1 INSPIRE technical architecture overview.	clarify that there is only 1 service layer which consists of a single service or a complex service cascade (fig 7.3)	clarified: one service layer consisting of 1 or more services	7
147	Lenkungsgremium GDI-DE (Steering Committee GDI-DE) (explanation: GDI-DE = Spatial Data Infrastructure Germany)	LMO	42	7	10		Unclear: "The next one (or more) layers are service layers, which represent services and service cascades. Every service layer (see figure 7-3, 7-13) typically consists of: • if needed: the GeoRM layer as the overall workflow control ..."	Please clarify that GeoRM does not have necessarily the overall workflow control. GeoRM may be working under another overall control in some cases.	remove "the overall workflow control"	workflow control removed	7

Progressive comment number	SDIC ID	LMO/SDIC	Comment ID	Chapter, section or clause no./ Subclause No./Annex	Paragraph/Figure/Table/Note	Type of comment	Comment (justification for change)	Proposed change	Observations from Comments Resolving Committee	Action Taken	Paragraphs changed
74	EA - Environment Agency for England and Wales	SDIC	7	7		T	Bullet point 2 states that "it is not required that a member state provides a portal of its own". Article 15(2) states that "Member States may also provide access to those services [in the Community level INSPIRE geo-portal] through their own access points." This therefore implies that member states need not provide either portals or access points. If this is the case, how can they "establish and operate" services as required by Article 11? (Even if an access point to the EC portal were provided, this would not be service operation.) This needs clarification.	Clarify the minimum required for member states to meet the requirements of Article 11.	MS are requested to provide Discovery, View & Download Services for the data themes listed in the Annexes.	MS are requested to provide Network Services (Discovery, View & Download) for the data themes listed in the Annexes. They are not requested to provide own access points (portals / client applications).	no change
47	AGI - Association for Geographic Information	SDIC	AGI2	7		T	The arguments in favour of SOAP are not persuasive.	The study of whether a SOAP/WSDL based approach is feasible for the INSPIRE network services should be expanded to consider approaches to web services that look at alternatives to SOAP, including the current initiatives around the REST architectural approach.	SOAP discussion	see #77: The general applicability of Resource Oriented Architecture (ROA) and REST tendencies is examined in a JRC Scientific and Technical Report published by the European Commission (JRC Scientific and Technical Report "Resource Oriented Architecture and REST - Assessment of impact and advantages on INSPIRE" to be published June 2008).	no change

Progressive comment number	SDIC ID	LMO/SDIC	Comment ID	Chapter, section or clause no./ Subclause No./Annex	Paragraph/Figure/Table/Note	Type of comment	Comment (justification for change)	Proposed change	Observations from Comments Resolving Committee	Action Taken	Paragraphs changed
104	CNIPA- Centro Nazionale per l'Informatica nella Pubblica Amministrazione	LMO	1	7	G		<p>"... there are only a few attempts to use SOAP/WSDL for geoinformation services ..." ...</p> <p>"... the European Commission will launch a project to study in detail whether a SOAP/WSDL based approach is feasible for the INSPIRE network services...". As requested to SDIC/LMO to provide comments and reports on the usage of SOAP/WSDL in the frame of setting up an SDI, the SPC model, described in the next comments, can be, in general, a useful case study. In fact, a service agreement is a well-specified XML document that regulates an application service between a supplier and a client in the following aspects: (i) service interface (WSDL), (ii) conversations admitted by the service (WSBL – Web Service Behaviour Language, new language stemming from previous standard proposals, WSCL - Web Service Conversation Language, and academic ones, WSTL - Web Service Transition Language); (iii) access points (WSDL), (iv) Service Level Agreements – SLAs; (v) security characteristics (vi) descriptions of the semantics of the service (OWL or WSMML/WSMO).</p>	<p>This is not a proposed change of the document. But it is the proposal to participate to the study the European Commission want to launch and to considerate Italian SPC model as a pilot experience in the context of network services. For this, on website of CNIPA, at URL http://www.cnipa.gov.it/site/it-IT/In_primo_piano/Sistema_Pubblico_di_Connettivit%c3%a0_(SPC)/Servizi_di_interoperabilit%c3%a0_evoluta_e_cooperazione</p>	SOAP discussion		no change

Progressive comment number	SDIC ID	LMO/SDIC	Comment ID	Chapter, section or clause no./ Subclause No./Annex	Paragraph/Figure/Table/Note	Type of comment	Comment (justification for change)	Proposed change	Observations from Comments Resolving Committee	Action Taken	Paragraphs changed
						<p>Actually a specific Working Group, established within the Italian PAs Committee for Technical Rules on Geographic Information (Comitato per le regole tecniche sui dati territoriali delle Pubbliche Amministrazioni), is coming to define the implementation of Service Agreements in order to enable public authorities to access to cadastral data and related services. The results of this activity will be extended to other kinds of agreements between public administrations for the exchange of spatial data and the access to services. Moreover, art. 59 of the "Digital Administration Code" (Decree n. 82, March 7 2005) established "Spatial Data National Catalogue" (RNDT, "Repertorio Nazionale Dati Territoriali"). RNDT will be a Discovery Service operated into the most general interoperability framework of the Public Internetworking System (SPC, Sistema Pubblico di Connettività).</p>	<p>_applicativa/, you can find more detailed technical informations about SPC model. Moreover, the upcoming activities of Working Group mentioned will provide, if you want, an updated detail about the application of Service Agreements to the cadastral data and services.</p>		<p>no change needed</p>		
136	Lenkungsgremium GDI-DE (Steering Committee GDI-DE) (explanation: GDI-DE = Spatial Data Infrastructure Germany)	LMO	31	7	T	<p>The usage of WSDL is not necessarily a consequence of using SOAP. This must be stated more clearly. SDI Germany (GDI-DE) has established an architecture based on ISO 19119 service descriptions. A change to WSDL does not seem feasible.</p>	<p>Text should treat the question of using WSDL instead of ISO 19119 separately.</p>	SOAP discussion	<p>ISO and WSDL do not conflict each other. WSDL is containing all needed syntactical/structural information whilst ISO & Capabilities provide the semantic stuff. Unfortunately, there is a small overlap for syntactical information (e.g. service endpoint urls).</p>	no change	

Progressive comment number	SDIC ID	LMO/SDIC	Comment ID	Chapter, section or clause no./ Subclause No./Annex	Paragraph/Figure/Table/Note	Type of comment	Comment (justification for change)	Proposed change	Observations from Comments Resolving Committee	Action Taken	Paragraphs changed
181	METEO-FRANCE	LMO	Météo-France_1	7		T	SOAP is very hard to implement. It requires huge developments to make data interoperable. By comparison, Representational State Transfer (REST) is much easier to implement; it allows developing APIs that can make data interoperable; it allows licensing more easily. REST is much more used than SOAP in WWW world (e.g. Amazon, Google...). Météo-France has developed very few products under SOAP. If it were to develop more products under SOAP, Météo-France will have to acquire new knowledge, whereas such knowledge related to REST exists already and is well mastered.	SOAP must be replaced by REST.	SOAP discussion	see #77 for REST; We do not see a difficulty in implementation: SOAP will be used as binding for existing OGC service interfaces; those are generally simple. In contrast, the benefit derived is high: seamless technology, no zoo; alignment with OGC standards, infrastructure management functionalities, support for asynchronous workflows. The service infrastructure targets on European Bodies/Institutions, Member State and Public Authorities. Mass market technologies can be applied in addition without problem.	no change
95	United Kingdom Hydrographic Office	LMO	16	7		T	Current OGC implementations do not support SOAP. It is only a change request and the possible detail of any implementation is not known. Ref. http://portal.opengeospatial.org/files/?artifact_id=9541 . It will be difficult to define a system architecture when the underlying standards are subject to an investigation.		SOAP discussion	OGC CSW ISO App has a mandatory SOAP binding; in addition, there is a decision by OGC OGC 06-135r1 (http://portal.opengeospatial.org/files/?artifact_id=17566) that requires an optional SOAP binding per new OWS spec or future revision.	
96	United Kingdom Hydrographic Office	LMO	17	7		T	A huge amount of work will be required to redevelop services and clients that work on SOAP rather than HTTP GET/POST. Should INSPIRE look to use both delivery mechanisms, moving to a more secure SOAP based system as the technology matures?		SOAP discussion	See #134, #135	no change

Progressive comment number	SDIC ID	LMO/SDIC	Comment ID	Chapter, section or clause no./ Subclause No./Annex	Paragraph/Figure/Table/Note	Type of comment Comment (justification for change)	Proposed change	Observations from Comments Resolving Committee	Action Taken	Paragraphs changed
97	United Kingdom Hydrographic Office	LMO	18	7	G	How will data classification, access, authorisation and verification be handled if SOAP is not a viable standard for OGC web services on final INSPIRE architecture delivery? INSPIRE is relying on the timeliness of the OGC to create specifications for SOAP and GeoDRM, will they be delivered in time, will it be industry best practice to use them in time for this project?		SOAP discussion	See #95 for SOAP and OGC. For timelines/lifecycles: For each service two normative documents will be provided: - the IR, with a general content (abstract view of the service) WHAT - the guidance documents, with instructions HOW to implement the IR (mainly a reference to a standard, with explanations about INSPIRE specifications). This document could be updated according to the inevitable changes of the technology and has a different lifecycle than the IR.	no change

Progressive comment number	SDIC ID	LMO/SDIC	Comment ID	Chapter, section or clause no./ Subclause No./Annex	Paragraph/Figure/Table/Note	Type of comment	Comment (justification for change)	Proposed change	Observations from Comments Resolving Committee	Action Taken	Paragraphs changed
33	Ministère des transports, de l'équipement, du tourisme et de la mer	LMO	1	7	SOAP/WSDL for geographic services)	G	Original OGC Web Services (WMS, WFS, CSW) were RESTful-minded : HTTP GET or POST with KVP encoding. We think this has contributed to their wide adoption because they were simple to understand, to use and to debug. SOAP binding may give these services a more strict data typing. But it would be much more complicated to build tools exploiting them. Moreover, the document says that ORCHESTRA project has indicated a lack of support of SOAP by current tools. Where is the benefit to add several layers of complexity and mandatory - but missing - tools where a simple HTTP GET-POST protocol would do well ? In addition, having to give a WSDL definition for a geographic services makes it defined three times, in three different manners : - as an OGC Capabilities - as an ISO 19115-19119 - as WSDL This redundancy can bring confusion, errors, complexity	Do not limit the announced in-detail study about SOAP/WSDL to feasibility, but extend it to a general value analysis of this technology.	SOAP discussion	Accepted in principle	no change
142	Lenkungsgremium GDI-DE (Steering Committee GDI-DE) (explanation: GDI-DE = Spatial Data Infrastructure Germany)	LMO	37	7	2nd enumeration to figure 7-2	G	If a member state geo-portal is not required for its own and portals exist, a definition will be missing, how those portals be embedded in the framework conceptually?	definition the importance of national portals and their embeddings	answer comment	Portals are (only) Internet sites, or equivalent, providing access to the services referred to in Article 11(1); (definition added in 4.2). By this portals are not embedded. See also 29.	4

Progressive comment number	SDIC ID	LMO/SDIC	Comment ID	Chapter, section or clause no./ Subclause No./Annex	Paragraph/Figure/Table/Note	Type of comment	Comment (justification for change)	Proposed change	Observations from Comments Resolving Committee	Action Taken	Paragraphs changed
29	Met Office	LMO	MetO-11	7	all	G	We recognise that this document has to address MS portal interaction with EU portal because otherwise there might be a subsidiarity issue in addressing internal MS infrastructure. Even although the figure 7.3 conceptualises this, it understates that many if not MOST individual organisations in each MS will have to deliver the interface as a Web Service, rather than deliver the non-INSPIRE formatted data and leave the configuration to the MS server. This is certainly true for real-time data because mixing real-time data and static data causes basic design as well as operational problems. Systems optimised for one are inappropriate (and consequently much more expensive) for the other. Knock on effects which impact costs (such as security issues) are therefore likely to be underestimated.	Please comment more fully on practical implementation issues, such as mixing real-time and static databases and the likely circumstances where figure 7.3 will be required, rather than the central interface of 7.2.	there is no interaction between portals. Architecture is abstract and don't give specific implementation details.	On portals see 142. There is no interaction between portals. The architecture is abstract and don't (can't) give specific implementation details.	no change
30	Met Office	LMO	MetO-12	7	below request	T	Comment on the view that INSPIRE Web Services are a mediator between MS and EU usage. This raises issues of scaling and implies that current services must be duplicated with an INSPIRE Web Service front end. It is not conceivable that current Weather Services can be fronted by Web Services. Some may be, but these are likely to be carefully chosen and certainly not applied across the board.	Please comment on the status of existing services, either on the Internet but not using Web Services, or using other means of telecommunications. It is not conceivable that all such services will be fronted by a WS. There will have to be careful selection for those data services which are delivered also with Web Services.	we see this problem, but the MS (and from the MS for example Met Office) is requested to deal with this challenge.	We see this problem, but the MS (and from the MS for example Met Office) is requested to deal with this challenge.	no change
145	Lenkungsgremium GDI-DE (Steering Committee GDI-DE) (explanation: GDI-DE = Spatial Data Infrastructure Germany)	LMO	40	7	Explanation of figure 7.3	E	The explanation of "service layer" is not clear: "Every service layer (...) typically consists of (...) the service layer (...)"	Matching between figure and explanation.	accepted	s. 148	7

Progressive comment number	SDIC ID	LMO/SDIC	Comment ID	Chapter, section or clause no./ Subclause No./Annex	Paragraph/Figure/Table/Note	Type of comment	Comment (justification for change)	Proposed change	Observations from Comments Resolving Committee	Action Taken	Paragraphs changed
146	Lenkungsgremium GDI-DE (Steering Committee GDI-DE) (explanation: GDI-DE = Spatial Data Infrastructure Germany)	LMO	41	7	Ex pla na tion of fig ur e 7-3	T	Data sources are not part of the service layer.	Delete this last point of the enumeration.	accepted	put point out of enumeration	7
139	Lenkungsgremium GDI-DE (Steering Committee GDI-DE) (explanation: GDI-DE = Spatial Data Infrastructure Germany)	LMO	34	7	Fig ur e 7-2	G	Unclear: "User"	Change to: "EU Geoportal User"		user is intentionally abstract (unclear); a user can use as well the EU portal as any MS access point (portal)	no change
140	Lenkungsgremium GDI-DE (Steering Committee GDI-DE) (explanation: GDI-DE = Spatial Data Infrastructure Germany)	LMO	35	7	Fig ur e 7-2	G	Unclear: "Geoportal, Applications"	Change to: "EU Geoportal, EU Applications"		not only EU Geoportal or EU applications are intended	no change
141	Lenkungsgremium GDI-DE (Steering Committee GDI-DE) (explanation: GDI-DE = Spatial Data Infrastructure Germany)	LMO	36	7	Fig ur e 7-2	G	Unclear: "Provider"	Change to: "Provider 1", "Provider 2"		done	7
138	Lenkungsgremium GDI-DE (Steering Committee GDI-DE) (explanation: GDI-DE = Spatial Data Infrastructure Germany)	LMO	33	7	Fig ur e 7-2	G	the role of MS services and MS access points is raised	that is important, as for non-national, governmental institutions to recognize their role in the INSPIRE network services. We propose to separate this topic as an own subchapter.	term & def: access point no definition of role of non-national gov. Institutions; no subchapter	defined "access point" in terms no definition of role of non-national gov. Institutions; no subchapter	4

Progressive comment number	SDIC ID	LMO/SDIC	Comment ID	Chapter, section or clause no./ Subclause No./Annex	Paragraph/Figure/Table/Note	Type of comment	Comment (justification for change)	Proposed change	Observations from Comments Resolving Committee	Action Taken	Paragraphs changed
149	Lenkungsgremium GDI-DE (Steering Committee GDI-DE) (explanation: GDI-DE = Spatial Data Infrastructure Germany)	LMO	44	7	Figure 7-4	T	Unclear workflow in Figure 7-4. The publishing step is performed at another time. It is not part of the Find-Bind pattern	Depict "Publish" separately from the Find-Bind process, or omit "Publish" in Figure 7-4.	it is the publish / find / bind pattern with different actors for the different steps	different actors depict for different phases, good comment! Figure 7-12 needs to be changed because it was derived by 7-4	7, 7-4, 7-12 changed
150	Lenkungsgremium GDI-DE (Steering Committee GDI-DE) (explanation: GDI-DE = Spatial Data Infrastructure Germany)	LMO	45	7	figure 7-4	G	missing registry if there are more than one UDDI nodes expected (see e-government notes)	definition of registry service	no UDDI in the document registry services don't store (ISO) service metadata. Registers are a part of the basis of the INSPIRE infrastructure and maintained by anybody (for example EC).	no UDDI intended. Registry services don't store (ISO) service metadata. Registers are a part of the basis of the INSPIRE infrastructure and maintained by anybody (for example EC).	no change
143	Lenkungsgremium GDI-DE (Steering Committee GDI-DE) (explanation: GDI-DE = Spatial Data Infrastructure Germany)	LMO	38	7	paragraph beneath figure 7-2	G	missing technical requirements for cascading services and which services have to cascade	definition of technical requirements which have to be fulfilled by the member states	requirements for cascades is not scope of the document. Cascades are only mentioned as a technique to integrate existing (or slightly adapted) services to the INSPIRE implementing rules.	Requirements for cascades is not scope of the document. Cascades are only mentioned as a technique to integrate existing (or slightly adapted) services to the INSPIRE implementing rules.	no change

Progressive comment number	SDIC ID	LMO/SDIC	Comment ID	Chapter, section or clause no./ Subclause No./Annex	Paragraph/Figure/Table/Note	Type of comment	Comment (justification for change)	Proposed change	Observations from Comments Resolving Committee	Action Taken	Paragraphs changed
67	Finnish Meteorological Institute	LMO	1	7	Request for comments on SOAP/WSDL	G	SOAP bindings will make it more difficult to put up our services, it would be better to start with OGC standards.	Remove mandatory SOAP bindings from the Draft.	SOAP discussion	no change, see #134, #135, #95, #181	no change

Progressive comment number	SDIC ID	LMO/SDIC	Comment ID	Chapter, section or clause no./ Subclause No./Annex	Paragraph/Figure/Table/Note	Type of comment	Comment (justification for change)	Proposed change	Observations from Comments Resolving Committee	Action Taken	Paragraphs changed
28	Met Office	LMO	MetO-10	7	re qu est for co m me nts on S O A P /W S D L	T	Not a very good place to ask for specific comments, but here are comments from our SOA team. We can elaborate if required, but the first response is typical.	Ad-hoc comments on SOAP/WSDL. "SOAP is overblown - it adds considerable complexity for little benefit" (Met Office IT Architect) "The Met Office have used SOAP/WSDL for several large projects. SOAP does provide a straightforward way of building in security, etc. However for our attempts to use the OGC web services so far, we've relied on simple HTTP GET and POST, and put security in via another layer (for two nearly operational pilots). We seem to be going more towards simple web services (and potentially even further toward very simple REST-type web services), perhaps because the use of SOAP (or other more complex web services) results in more work in building client software. The use of WSDL has mirrored that of SOAP; the perception of the team is that although WSDL describes the syntax of the web service, because it can't capture the semantics, it does not aid interoperability as much as might be thought." (Met Office designer)	SOAP discussion	no change as there is no proposal. For the general statement on the binding technology used, see the other REST/SOAP/OGC answers above, the updated NS Architecture document and the SOAP and ROA/REST papers from the EC/JRC.	no change
45	IACS-CAP - Integrated Administration and Control System (Common Agricultural Policy)	SDIC	10	7.1	2	E	Although the INSPIRE directive draft text	Although the INSPIRE Directive (adopted 2007) text		Accepted, write "Although the INSPIRE Directive ..."	7,1
155	Lenkungsgremium GDI-DE (Steering Committee GDI-DE) (explanation: GDI-DE = Spatial Data Infrastructure Germany)	LMO	50	7.1	2	E	Outdated text: "Although the INSPIRE directive draft text ..."	omit: "draft text".		Accepted, write "Although the INSPIRE Directive ..."	7,1

Progressive comment number	SDIC ID	LMO/SDIC	Comment ID	Chapter, section or clause no./ Subclause No./Annex	Paragraph/Figure/Table/Note	Type of comment	Comment (justification for change)	Proposed change	Observations from Comments Resolving Committee	Action Taken	Paragraphs changed
9	Royal Netherlands Meteorological Institute (KNMI)	LMO	9	7.1	7	G	Please provide examples which can show the context.			The context should be clear, both the figure 7-5 and the principles below the figure are relevant to INSPIRE and fully corresponding to INSPIRE although in a more general setting. It is not easy to find short examples that will fit the context here.	no change
10	Royal Netherlands Meteorological Institute (KNMI)	LMO	10	7.1	7	E	What is IDA? Please add to the list of abbreviations and provide some explaining in text besides the URL.			IDA stands for "Interchange of Data between Administrations" and both IDA and IDABC are concepts and programmes belonging to the European eGovernment policies, as should be explained by the whole paragraph.	4,2 7,1
11	Royal Netherlands Meteorological Institute (KNMI)	LMO	11	7.1	9	E	What is the expected publishing date of the Gartner report, as the one mentioned is 'only a preliminary version without any authority'?			The report is published, and I propose to change the paragraph to: "The interoperability framework is now under revision. The Gartner Inc. has been contracted to make a report and recommendations for such a revision. The final report is on http://ec.europa.eu/idabc/en/document/6227 and direct link to the report is http://ec.europa.eu/idabc/serviets/Doc?id=29727 . The EIF version 2.0 is still under work. eGovernment activities are relevant for interoperability and horizontal services and harmonization of INSPIRE services with EIF should be a long term ambition."	7,1

Progressive comment number	SDIC ID	LMO/SDIC	Comment ID	Chapter, section or clause no./ Subclause No./Annex	Paragraph/Figure/Table/Note	Type of comment	Comment (justification for change)	Proposed change	Observations from Comments Resolving Committee	Action Taken	Paragraphs changed
154	Lenkungsgremium GDI-DE (Steering Committee GDI-DE) (explanation: GDI-DE = Spatial Data Infrastructure Germany)	LMO	49	7.1		G	The presumed and in 7.1 described linkage between INSPIRE and E-Government is not part of the INSPIRE directive and therefor must not be part of the network services architecture.	Delete 7.1 or shorten these passages		Not accepted, see comment 11 above, and the fact that we for instance have to interact with e-commerce services. The SOAP argument is also based upon integration with eGovernment.	no change
48	Instituto Geográfico Português	LMO	1	7.1	E-Government Integration	E	To ensure the "Use of Open Standards" and "Assess the benefits of Open Source Software" should be mandatory principles, as stated in this point. Unfortunately these principles are not observed in the present documents!			As seen, these principles are part of European eGovernment, but not directly addressed in INSPIRE - except open standards.	no change
151	Lenkungsgremium GDI-DE (Steering Committee GDI-DE) (explanation: GDI-DE = Spatial Data Infrastructure Germany)	LMO	46	7.1	paragraph before figure 7.7, figure 7.9	G	if EIF has any influence on INSPIRE or INSPIRE on EIF, it is highly recommended to harmonize both efforts on EU-level; INSPIRE should be more than a third party application	harmonization with EIF on EU-level		Accepted, see comment 11 above.	7,1

Progressive comment number	SDIC ID	LMO/SDIC	Comment ID	Chapter, section or clause no./ Subclause No./Annex	Paragraph/Figure/Table/Note	Type of comment	Comment (justification for change)	Proposed change	Observations from Comments Resolving Committee	Action Taken	Paragraphs changed
							<p>"...It is therefore highly recommended that the INSPIRE architecture aligns with more general framework of eGovernment services ...". In Italy, the Law Decree n. 42 (February 2005) establishes the scope, the sectors of interest, the technical rules, the concept and the scope of a national shared infrastructure, the governance, the management and the governing board. In particular, the Law Decree n. 42 establishes two important principles: (i) the cooperation among administrations is exclusively carried out on SPCOOP, with its tools and according to its technical rules; it has legal value and no further decree or official publication (e.g., on the Gazette) is needed (e.g., when defining standard XML formats for data exchange); (ii) the public ICT managers need to organize their information systems, including organizational and management aspects, in order to accommodate SPCOOP rules. Therefore SPCoop is not only a software framework, but also a technical and organizational platform whose aim is to create the conditions for a long-lived legally valid</p>				

Progressive comment number	SDIC ID	LMO/SDIC	Comment ID	Chapter, section or clause no./ Subclause No./Annex	Paragraph/Figure/Table/Note	Type of comment	Proposed change	Observations from Comments Resolving Committee	Action Taken	Paragraphs changed
						<p>cooperation among administrations. It is based on four pillars which are leading edge in terms of technologies, best practices and organization: (i) formalization, and then publication, of service agreements between PAs; (ii) definition of a federated identity management system for access control; (iii) definition of the metadata about the effective data to be used for cooperating, of the semantics and of domains' ontologies; (iv) open and continuous update of the SPCOOP model, by taking into account the latest progress in technologies and standards. The cooperation model is a technological infrastructure, called "Public Connectivity System (SPC, "Sistema Pubblico di Connettività"), with which the several systems/organizations "provide" and "exchange" their own data and services. This model is based on following principles: • Cooperation between Administrations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The Administrations cooperate through the supply and use of application services; these services are provided by the Administration through an unique (logical) element of its information system called "Domain Gateway" 				

Progressive comment number	SDIC ID	LMO/SDIC	Comment ID	Chapter, section or clause no./ Subclause No./Annex	Paragraph/Figure/Table/Note	Type of comment Comment (justification for change)	Proposed change	Observations from Comments Resolving Committee	Action Taken	Paragraphs changed
105	CNIPA- Centro Nazionale per l'Informatica nella Pubblica Amministrazione	LMO	2	7.1	G	<p>(Porta di dominio). The fruition of the application services is carried out through the exchange of messages, whose format is formally specified in the Italian standard referred to as e-Gov Envelop. Such a standard is basically an extension of SOAP; • Responsibility context - Every cooperating Administration has the responsibility about services and data provided, creating, in this way, a single Application Services Domain; • Agreements – An application service is based on agreements between at least two subjects (provider and user). The implementation of the agreement is called "Service Agreement" (Accordo di Servizio), based on XML language. The Service Agreements are registered in the Registry Service, implemented through UDDI (extended) standards; • Cooperation technologies – The application services are provided/used through Web Services technologies and standards; • Cooperation between Administrations – A group of Administrations cooperating to provide composed application services is called "Cooperation Domain" (Dominio di Cooperazione).</p>	Take into account the Italian model.		Very long and comprehensive comments, needs study beyond the scope of this process. Then one need to look into the Italian approach in view of EIF, further activity is up to the Commission.	no change

Progressive comment number	SDIC ID	LMO/SDIC	Comment ID	Chapter, section or clause no./ Subclause No./Annex	Paragraph/Figure/Table/Note	Type of comment	Comment (justification for change)	Proposed change	Observations from Comments Resolving Committee	Action Taken	Paragraphs changed
							<p>The service provided by the Cooperation Domain is described trough an extension of Service Agreement named Cooperation Agreement (Accordo di Cooperazione). The SPC cooperation model is based on the SOC (Service Oriented Computing) paradigm and it is organized as a SOA (Service Oriented Architecture). The SPCOOP framework includes the following set of infrastructural components: 1) Agreements Repository is the software component used to register and to maintain the Cooperation/Service Agreements. It can be considered as the "database" of the cooperation. This component offers functionalities for the registration, the access, the update and the search of the agreements. The UDDI standard is the core of this component; however this standard does not offer all the required functionalities, therefore it has been extended. 2) Schemas/Ontologies Repository is the software component offering functionalities to deal with the service and information semantics, in order to find out services that are more suitable to provide required functionalities.</p>				

Progressive comment number	SDIC ID	LMO/SDIC	Comment ID	Chapter, section or clause no./ Subclause No./Annex	Paragraph/Figure/Table/Note	Type of comment	Comment (justification for change)	Proposed change	Observations from Comments Resolving Committee	Action Taken	Paragraphs changed
							This component acts as a structure to store ontologies and conceptual schemas, offering functionalities of registration, access, update and reasoning on them. 3) Federated Identity Management is used to authorize and control the access to application services over SPCOOP; the federation is needed to reuse the already in-place identity management systems of regional and national authorities. Integration is to be done through specific interfaces supporting SAMLv2.0. 4) Monitoring Service is in charge of monitoring the respect, by the different services, of the Service Level Agreements (SLAs) declared in the Service Agreements. Its development is planned for the future (i.e., it has not been included in the currently active tender), as standards and technologies for the definition and the enforcement of SLAs (e.g., WSLA or WS-Agreement) are considered not yet mature.				
156	Lenkungsgremium GDI-DE (Steering Committee GDI-DE) (explanation: GDI-DE = Spatial Data Infrastructure Germany)	LMO	51	7.2	1	E	Typo: "applications"	Change to: "application"		done	7,2
157	Lenkungsgremium GDI-DE (Steering Committee GDI-DE) (explanation: GDI-DE = Spatial Data Infrastructure Germany)	LMO	52	7.2	1	E	Typo: "§"	Change to: "Article"		done	7,2

Progressive comment number	SDIC ID	LMO/SDIC	Comment ID	Chapter, section or clause no./ Subclause No./Annex	Paragraph/Figure/Table/Note	Type of comment	Comment (justification for change)	Proposed change	Observations from Comments Resolving Committee	Action Taken	Paragraphs changed
158	Lenkungsgremium GDI-DE (Steering Committee GDI-DE) (explanation: GDI-DE = Spatial Data Infrastructure Germany)	LMO	53	7.2	1	E	Grammar: "prior"	Change to: "prior to"		done	7.2
160	Lenkungsgremium GDI-DE (Steering Committee GDI-DE) (explanation: GDI-DE = Spatial Data Infrastructure Germany)	LMO	55	7.2	2	E	Text: "The implicit functions of ..."	omit implicit	implicit was not sufficient due to no explicit statement. Therefore the three GeoRM function categories (establishment, management and gatekeeping) need to be described.	function categories were described and the mentioned text was changed to "gatekeeping function"	7.2
163	Lenkungsgremium GDI-DE (Steering Committee GDI-DE) (explanation: GDI-DE = Spatial Data Infrastructure Germany)	LMO	58	7.2	2	E	Typo: "... licence ... ticket id ..."	Change to: "... license ... ticket-id ..."	accepted	accepted	7.2
165	Lenkungsgremium GDI-DE (Steering Committee GDI-DE) (explanation: GDI-DE = Spatial Data Infrastructure Germany)	LMO	60	7.2	2	E	Text: "Like most services some data needs ..."	Change to: "As with most services some data need..."	accepted	accepted	7.2
161	Lenkungsgremium GDI-DE (Steering Committee GDI-DE) (explanation: GDI-DE = Spatial Data Infrastructure Germany)	LMO	56	7.2	2	G	Text: "GeoRM services were called ..."	Change to: "GeoRM services are called ..."	former expression, now GeoRM only	no action	no change
164	Lenkungsgremium GDI-DE (Steering Committee GDI-DE) (explanation: GDI-DE = Spatial Data Infrastructure Germany)	LMO	59	7.2	2	G	Text: "possibly adapted..."	Omit: "possibly". Change to: "accepted"	intention may be also manipulation, therefore adapted is used and not just accepted	no action	no change

Progressive comment number	SDIC ID	LMO/SDIC	Comment ID	Chapter, section or clause no./ Subclause No./Annex	Paragraph/Figure/Table/Note	Type of comment	Comment (justification for change)	Proposed change	Observations from Comments Resolving Committee	Action Taken	Paragraphs changed
186	FOSSDI - Free and Open Source Software for Spatial Data Infrastructure	SDIC	5	7.2	2	T	suggests applying an empty GeoRM filter to services which have no restrictions (all Discovery Services and most View Services according to the Directive text. The performance impact of this is unknowable and may provide a severe bottleneck for services. Does not take into account common practises in "caching" content from view services (TMS, WMTS), how will a GeoRM filter be cached along with an imagery tile, by potentially unknown hosts?	There is no formal GeoRM specification yet - the document goes on to state that it is "early state-of-the-art". Its inclusion in a reference architecture is pre-emptive.	make clear that in the case of non-restricted access no filter is applied. The issue of GeoRM in combination with caching needs further investigations. INSPIRE protects (mainly) access to services (not data).	done, with three sentences	7.2
162	Lenkungsgremium GDI-DE (Steering Committee GDI-DE) (explanation: GDI-DE = Spatial Data Infrastructure Germany)	LMO	57	7.2	2	T	Text: "conceptually passed ..."	Change to: "conceptually present ..."	rejected	no action	no change

Progressive comment number	SDIC ID	LMO/SDIC	Comment ID	Chapter, section or clause no./ Subclause No./Annex	Paragraph/Figure/Table/Note	Type of comment	Comment (justification for change)	Proposed change	Observations from Comments Resolving Committee	Action Taken	Paragraphs changed
12	Royal Netherlands Meteorological Institute (KNMI)	LMO	12	7.2	5	G	The early state-of-the-art of GeoRM is a potential risk. Please also consider alternative solutions based on existing AAA services. Security is something which needs to be built in well from the start. It is not something which can be easily added later.		Point 1: we agree that there is a risk. A large number of alternative AAA solutions in INSPIRE will also create a major risk of incompatibility between multiple provider, e.g. in a cascade, destroying full compatible provider cooperation (keyword SDI roaming, roaming contracts), because the "agree" phase is in the middle of the publish-find-(agree)-bind workflow (keyword: interoperability trap). Therefore the introduction of multiple, incompatible AAA solutions within the single infrastructure should be avoided. A compromise between the fact of the early stage of GeoRM and the risk of AAA incompatibility is the definition of GeoRM keys for the gatekeeping GeoRM functions. This approach is already well known and used. A discussed consequence is also the establishment of a not normative INSPIRE GeoRM document similar to the architecture document. Point 2: Although security (and IPR management) should "be built in well from the start", most INSPIRE actors did focus on the main functions of spatial services first. Therefore embedding strategies are needed, but are also possible	new paragraph introduced to cover the comments 10/06/2008 Discussed during comments resolution workshop. Geospatial Digital Rights Management Reference Model (GeoDRM RM) (06-004r3) is an approved standard. Proposed approach is to enable interoperability at the GeoRM level -- using "RightsManagementKey".	7.2
159	Lenkungsgremium GDI-DE (Steering Committee GDI-DE) (explanation: GDI-DE = Spatial Data Infrastructure Germany)	LMO	54	7.2		T	Wrong sequence: "... the user and its application is transferred to the find or agree phase ..."	Omit: "find or"	rejected, both ways are valid. In the case of a right-managed resource, a user may not go for contracting and search another resource	no action	no change

Progressive comment number	SDIC ID	LMO/SDIC	Comment ID	Chapter, section or clause no./ Subclause No./Annex	Paragraph/Figure/Table/Note	Type of comment	Comment (justification for change)	Proposed change	Observations from Comments Resolving Committee	Action Taken	Paragraphs changed
153	Lenkungsgremium GDI-DE (Steering Committee GDI-DE) (explanation: GDI-DE = Spatial Data Infrastructure Germany)	LMO	48	7.2	2nd paragraph beneath figure 7-13	G	if GeoRM are necessary on EU-site like on member state site, defining of details will be mandatory.	defining in detail GeoRM	GeoRM is not necessary on EU-site or MS site. GeoRM (like) infrastructure is just enabled by transferring an (generic) GeoRM-Key (however this key is interpreted). Seamless integration (INSPIRE principle 2) requires also seamless GeoRM interoperability with the main focus for the GeoRM gatekeeping functions. The definition and usage of a GeoRM key is already well known and will be described in detail to insure cross provider interoperability also via GeoRM function in the delivery case. The establishment and management of GeoRM functions have a lower priority for interoperability.	no action because actions of comment 12 solves this issue	7,2
152	Lenkungsgremium GDI-DE (Steering Committee GDI-DE) (explanation: GDI-DE = Spatial Data Infrastructure Germany)	LMO	47	7.2	figure 7-13	G	registry service should be defined earlier; if metadata service controlled by GeoRM-Service, definition in national CSM necessary, see http://www.uddi.org/pubs/uddj_v3.htm in spite of leaving uddi by Microsoft, IBM and SAP in 2005	registry service definition which services are controlled by GeoRM	in general the provider has the choice to operate GeoRM services for the production services. A potential registration of providerID, GeoRM Gatekeeper Service URL may be subject of registries. That reference to the open discussion about registries.	done	7,2
34	Ministère des transports, de l'équipement, du tourisme et de la mer	LMO	2	7.2	GeoRM	T	GeoRM layer should be non-existent in the case of publicly accessible data or services, for at least two benefits : - GeoRM non-compatible products could access these data - unnecessary performance bottleneck could be removed	Describe an alternative architecture for distributing unrestricted data or services without GeoDRM	comment similar to #5; see above	no action	no change
35	Ministère des transports, de l'équipement, du tourisme et de la mer	LMO	3	7.2	GeoRM	T	The document says GeoRM is in an early state-of-art. So, existence or quality of tools designed to use or manage them is not guaranteed.	(same as previous)	in general accepted. The usage of keys for control is very common, therefore the adjustment for an GeoRM key should be minor. Tools for establishment and management of contracts and accounts are available in general, but integration is to be done.	no action	no change

Progressive comment number	SDIC ID	LMO/SDIC	Comment ID	Chapter, section or clause no./ Subclause No./Annex	Paragraph/Figure/Table/Note	Type of comment	Comment (justification for change)	Proposed change	Observations from Comments Resolving Committee	Action Taken	Paragraphs changed
167	Lenkungsgremium GDI-DE (Steering Committee GDI-DE) (explanation: GDI-DE = Spatial Data Infrastructure Germany)	LMO	62	7.3	2	G	Unclear text: "... maps may be always returned in their native language".	Change to: "... maps may be returned in their native language only".	Multilingual discussion	accepted & done	7,3
13	Royal Netherlands Meteorological Institute (KNMI)	LMO	13	7.3	2	T	Please explain how the multilingual support will be provided? And in which languages? Who will be responsible for this? Please clarify.		Multilingual discussion	see comment 115	7,3
187	FOSSDI - Free and Open Source Software for Spatial Data Infrastructure	SDIC	6	7.3	3	G	"The service usage is always mono-lingual". This will not be the case in areas of Europe where there are 2 or more administrative languages available in a national-level interface, for example Catalan and Castellano, or Flemish and Walloon nor at the EU level.	This assumption should be removed.	Multilingual discussion	Sentence seems misleading and is removed	7,3
169	Lenkungsgremium GDI-DE (Steering Committee GDI-DE) (explanation: GDI-DE = Spatial Data Infrastructure Germany)	LMO	64	7.3	3	G	there is no recommendation, which languages are preferred or proposed by INSPIRE	defining mandatory languages for example English, French, German	Multilingual discussion	see comment 115	7,3
166	Lenkungsgremium GDI-DE (Steering Committee GDI-DE) (explanation: GDI-DE = Spatial Data Infrastructure Germany)	LMO	61	7.3		G	missing definition of "Multilingualism", which languages and which subjects. Possibilities: CS DA DE EL EN ES ET FI FR HU IT LT LV MT NL PL PT SK SL SV. Maps or domestic digital data are difficult to translate.	language og member state plus EN, define exactly which subjects have to be translated.	Multilingual discussion	see comment 115	7,3
168	Lenkungsgremium GDI-DE (Steering Committee GDI-DE) (explanation: GDI-DE = Spatial Data Infrastructure Germany)	LMO	63	7.3		G	Multilingual aspects in discovery should be treated in greater detail. The given passages are rather unclear.	Clarify the existing text. Please add a text passage on how keywords will be translated on-the-fly during a metadata search in metadata delivered by services from different member states.	Multilingual discussion	see comment 115	7,3
61	LMV - Lantmateriet, National Land Survey of Sweden	SDIC	1	7.3		G	The IR is focussing on SOAP, which is a new technique, but not much implemented yet.	Use SOAP as an example but implement it step-by-step, which should be described.	SOAP discussion	IR's will be accompanied by a guidance document which will provide exactly what was requested.	no change

Progressive comment number	SDIC ID	LMO/SDIC	Comment ID	Chapter, section or clause no./ Subclause No./Annex	Paragraph/Figure/Table/Note	Type of comment	Comment (justification for change)	Proposed change	Observations from Comments Resolving Committee	Action Taken	Paragraphs changed
49	Instituto Geográfico Português	LMO	2	7.3	Multilingual aspects	T	If "For maps multilingual support is not requested how it will be possible for certain users to "read" legends and map inscriptions like toponyms write in Greek or Cyrillic alphabet?"		Multilingual discussion	accepted in principle, but no change	
87	United Kingdom Hydrographic Office	LMO	8	7.4	4	E	Language	Replace "The simultaneosity of requests is defined" with "The capacity of the service is defined"	accepted		7.4
88	United Kingdom Hydrographic Office	LMO	9	7.4	5	E	Typo	Replace "As such, there are" with "As such, they are"	accepted		7.4
89	United Kingdom Hydrographic Office	LMO	10	7.4	6	G	This paragraph overlaps with the recommendation made in the document "Network Services performance guidelines" section 5.2, that performance be measure at the MS server level, exactly to avoid issues of bandwidth. However, there should be someway of encouraging member states to invest sufficiently in the bandwidth available at their server.	Replace paragraph with "Performance perceived by users and client systems depends on a range of factors outside of the suppliers control. Performance of INSPIRE services shall be measured at the servers, but Member States (and other service providers) should ensure sufficient bandwidth in the network segments under their control."	Rejected: Architecture document is not an Implementing Rule. As such, it cannot provide regulations for the EU MS.		no change
58	FPGI / PFIG - Federaal Platform voor Geo-Informatie / Plate-forme Fédérale de l'Information Géographique	SDIC	3	7.4	7	E	As an example, 99% represents 3.7 days of "out of service" per year, 99.9% represents less than 9 hours, ...	As an example, 99% represents 3.7 days of "out of service" per year, 99.9% represents less than 9 hours, ...	accepted		7.4
53	General Administration of Patrimonial Documentation	LMO	3	7.4	7	E	As an example, 99% represents 3.7 days of "out of service" per year, 99.9% represents less than 9 hours, ...	As an example, 99% represents 3.7 days of "out of service" per year, 99.9% represents less than 9 hours, ...	See 145		7.4

Progressive comment number	SDIC ID	LMO/SDIC	Comment ID	Chapter, section or clause no./ Subclause No./Annex	Paragraph/Figure/Table/Note	Type of comment	Comment (justification for change)	Proposed change	Observations from Comments Resolving Committee	Action Taken	Paragraphs changed
90	United Kingdom Hydrographic Office	LMO	11	7.4	8	G	This paragraph contradicts the recommendation made in the document "Network Services performance guidelines" section 5.2, that performance be measure at the MS server level. However, having a reference test suite seems useful; perhaps it could provide performance information, which could be used for diagnosis. It may be best not to use it to give a pass/fail result for services.	Replace "They will be useful for making sure these requirements are fulfilled" with "These measurements will be useful for monitoring levels of service, and may be useful for indicating potential problems"	accepted		7.4
176	Lenkungsgremium GDI-DE (Steering Committee GDI-DE) (explanation: GDI-DE = Spatial Data Infrastructure Germany)	LMO	71	7.4	9	G	The actuality of the metadata is a task of the dataproducers, a control is not necessary.	Delete these facts.	Accepted in principle. Not found in the text!		7.4
177	Lenkungsgremium GDI-DE (Steering Committee GDI-DE) (explanation: GDI-DE = Spatial Data Infrastructure Germany)	LMO	72	7.4	9	T	The up-to-dateness of the data is in the responsibility of the providers. Information about will be made available within the metadata, the need to control is not given.	Delete this sentence.	Accepted in principle. Not found in the text!		7.4
18	Royal Netherlands Meteorological Institute (KNMI)	LMO	18	7.4	10	G	Please add a reference to the Inspire pilot MORE (monitoring feasibility test)		Reference to Monitoring and Implementing rules introduced.		7.4
91	United Kingdom Hydrographic Office	LMO	12	7.4	11	G	I cannot understand what this paragraph is trying to say.		Rejected, no proposal		no change
14	Royal Netherlands Meteorological Institute (KNMI)	LMO	14	7.4		E	Please change chapter title to 'Quality of Service requirements' as it covers the chapters content better		accepted		7.4
175	Lenkungsgremium GDI-DE (Steering Committee GDI-DE) (explanation: GDI-DE = Spatial Data Infrastructure Germany)	LMO	70	7.4		E	"Regulatory" is an adjective, that makes no sense standing alone. A noun is missing.	Add an appropriate noun.	Accepted : compliance instead of regulatory		7.4

Progressive comment number	SDIC ID	LMO/SDIC	Comment ID	Chapter, section or clause no./ Subclause No./Annex	Paragraph/Figure/Table/Note	Type of comment	Comment (justification for change)	Proposed change	Observations from Comments Resolving Committee	Action Taken	Paragraphs changed
174	Lenkungsgremium GDI-DE (Steering Committee GDI-DE) (explanation: GDI-DE = Spatial Data Infrastructure Germany)	LMO	69	7.4		T	Capacity: The different types of services must be discerned. Capacity must be defined for each type of service and maybe different tasks, eg. getMap or getFeatureInfo	Differentiate and describe accordingly.	Rejected. Architecture document is about generic outcomes. The IR addresses per operation performance minimum requirements		no change
31	Met Office	LMO	MetO-13	7.4	all	T	There is no mention that 24x7 services such as Weather Services require scheduled down-time or contracted up-time. Availability does not cover accessibility, where network outages or Denial of Service (not necessarily through an attack, but through high public usage).	Performance requirements can only be computed on contracted up-time, giving leeway for scheduled down-time. Comment is also needed on network outage and DoS episodes.	Accepted. But again architecture document is not IR		7.4
170	Lenkungsgremium GDI-DE (Steering Committee GDI-DE) (explanation: GDI-DE = Spatial Data Infrastructure Germany)	LMO	65	7.4	Table	E	The table is not numbered; the definitions for "Reliability" and "Availability" have been interchanged.	Number the table and change the definitions.	accepted		7.4
65	LMV - Lantmateriet, National Land Survey of Sweden	SDIC	5	7.4	Table	E	The definitions of Availability and Reliability are mixed.	Please correct.	accepted		7.4
66	LMV - Lantmateriet, National Land Survey of Sweden	SDIC	6	7.4	Table	E	The definitions does not follow ISO standard notation	Use ISO standard notation, i.e. small first letter and no "."	accepted		7.4
32	Met Office	LMO	MetO-14	7.4	table	E	Reliability and Availability are mixed up	transpose Reliability and Availability	accepted		7.4
15	Royal Netherlands Meteorological Institute (KNMI)	LMO	15	7.4	table	E	Please add name and number to the table		accepted		7.4
16	Royal Netherlands Meteorological Institute (KNMI)	LMO	16	7.4	table	E	The definitions of Reliability and Availability are switched		accepted		7.4

Progressive comment number	SDIC ID	LMO/SDIC	Comment ID	Chapter, section or clause no./ Subclause No./Annex	Paragraph/Figure/Table/Note	Type of comment	Comment (justification for change)	Proposed change	Observations from Comments Resolving Committee	Action Taken	Paragraphs changed
17	Royal Netherlands Meteorological Institute (KNMI)	LMO	17	7.4	Table	E	Please rephrase the definition of Availability to: 'Availability is the probability that the system is up'		accepted		7.4
172	Lenkungsgremium GDI-DE (Steering Committee GDI-DE) (explanation: GDI-DE = Spatial Data Infrastructure Germany)	LMO	67	7.4	Table	T	Response time should not contain delays at the requestors network, etc.	Define more clearly, between which points in the network the response time shall be taken.	Accepted. The measurements are taken on MS servers side without taking into account network delays.		7.4
173	Lenkungsgremium GDI-DE (Steering Committee GDI-DE) (explanation: GDI-DE = Spatial Data Infrastructure Germany)	LMO	68	7.4	Table	G	it is highly recommended to define default values which have to be reached by the software firms else software development will find no end on user side	defining concret values for the paramters like performance, reliability, capacity, availability, security regulatory	Rejected – See 152		no change
171	Lenkungsgremium GDI-DE (Steering Committee GDI-DE) (explanation: GDI-DE = Spatial Data Infrastructure Germany)	LMO	66	7.4	Table	E	As "Performance" is the overall term in the title of 7.4 it should not reappear as a performance criteria denomination.	Change term "Performance" in the table to: "Response time".	Rejected. The clause is now on QoS, the performance is kept for the criteria		no change
188	FOSSDI - Free and Open Source Software for Spatial Data Infrastructure	SDIC	7	7.4	Table 1	E	"reliability" should read "availability" and "availability should read "reliability"	"reliability" should read "availability" and "availability should read "reliability"	accepted		7.4
78	Institute of Geodesy, Cartography and Remote Sensing	LMO	4	7.4	Table 1	T	wrong definition: "how fast a service request can be completed" means speed, not performance; these are complementary definitions	Speed: The speed of a web service represents how fast a service request can be completed, it is the reciprocal of the time to completion (v = 1/t). Performance: The performance of a web service represents how many service requests can be completed in a given time interval. The difference between the two definitions is clearly seen when parallel processing of requests is assumed.	accepted		7.4

Progressive comment number	SDIC ID	LMO/SDIC	Comment ID	Chapter, section or clause no./ Subclause No./Annex	Paragraph/Figure/Table/Note	Type of comment	Comment (justification for change)	Proposed change	Observations from Comments Resolving Committee	Action Taken	Paragraphs changed
108	Lenkungsgremium GDI-DE (Steering Committee GDI-DE) (explanation: GDI-DE = Spatial Data Infrastructure Germany)	LMO	3			G	A description and definition of all types of services referred to in Article 11(1) of the directive is necessary before details of the implementation of single services are specified. In particular clear definitions are necessary between view services, download services and invoke services for technical reasons but as well for legal reasons. Such definitions are essential for suppliers who are obliged to apply charges for the use of their data beyond the viewing. In connection with the INSPIRE architecture a definition is also necessary between the services according to the directive and applications.	Prior to the publishing of Implementing Rules "Discovery and View services" the Implementing Rules for the "Network Service Architecture" must be published.		"Network Service Architecture" is not an implementing rule but is published prior or together with the "Discovery and View service" IR.	no change
36	IACS-CAP - Integrated Administration and Control System (Common Agricultural Policy)	SDIC	1			G	document doesn't display INSPIRE document header, neither page numbers	please check settings	accepted	header und page numbers added	header
189	FOSSDI - Free and Open Source Software for Spatial Data Infrastructure	SDIC	8	A	3	E	"The INSPIRE Directive recognises the critical importance of public authorities property rights" - this strongly-worded statement about critical importance is untrue to both the letter and the spirit of the Directive text, which merely states that it should not affect the existence or ownership of public authorities' intellectual property rights.	The statement should be reworded or removed.		updated the wording based on the directive.	A

Progressive comment number	SDIC ID	LMO/SDIC	Comment ID	Chapter, section or clause no./ Subclause No./Annex	Paragraph/Figure/Table/Note	Type of comment	Comment (justification for change)	Proposed change	Observations from Comments Resolving Committee	Action Taken	Paragraphs changed
190	FOSSDI - Free and Open Source Software for Spatial Data Infrastructure	SDIC	9	A	7	E	It is not correct to state that CC licensing options are made available for "essentially static content". The definition of static is not clear, and there is clear precedent for CC licenses being used for information that changes frequently, for structured data in general and for geographic data sets maintained by European public authorities. IGN, Spain's NMA for example, are publishing the PNOA dataset or aerial imagery under a CC-BY-SA-NC license. Other CC-inspired models such as Science Commons' CC0 proposed data license, and the Open Database License which takes into account European database rights law as well as copyright law, are certainly not limited to "static" content.	This statement should be reworded or removed.		accepted.	A
178	Lenkungsgremium GDI-DE (Steering Committee GDI-DE) (explanation: GDI-DE = Spatial Data Infrastructure Germany)	LMO	73	A		G	No requirements are to be stated in an annex. Annex A is not marked as "informative".	Annex A should be marked as "informative".		Rejected. The whole document is informative - it is redundant to say the annex is informative as it might imply that the body of the document is normative.	no change
179	Lenkungsgremium GDI-DE (Steering Committee GDI-DE) (explanation: GDI-DE = Spatial Data Infrastructure Germany)	LMO	74	A	Figure A-3	G	Emergency Access Terms are not specified in directive.	delete option, if not, then emergency case has to be defined mandatorily for all member state		Rejected. The digram is for illustrative purposes only - and does not imply that these access terms are mandated by the directive.	no change
180	Lenkungsgremium GDI-DE (Steering Committee GDI-DE) (explanation: GDI-DE = Spatial Data Infrastructure Germany)	LMO	75	A	Scenario 5	G	there is no legal definition in INSPIRE directive for implementing a through-right for EU or other organisations in case of emergency, disaster or catastrophe	delete emergency case		Rejected. The scenario is for illustrative purposes only - and does not imply that these access terms are mandated by the directive.	no change

Progressive comment number	SDIC ID	LMO/SDIC	Comment ID	Chapter, section or clause no./ Subclause No./Annex	Paragraph/Figure/Table/Note	Type of comment	Comment (justification for change)	Proposed change	Observations from Comments Resolving Committee	Action Taken	Paragraphs changed
20	Met Office	LMO	MetO-02	all	all	G	<p>Security is mentioned in Section 2, 7.1 (two bullet points in two lists), table in 7.4, more fully in penultimate para in 7.4. It is mostly treated as informational security, although it is mentioned to be more a wider IT criterion in 7.4. We consider that this is not a sufficient weighting. Security issues cannot be underestimated in terms of time support and the costs of the service. While we recognise that this architecture addresses MS portals interfacing with EU portals because of subsidiarity issues, for most data services it will be the distributed INSPIRE services of figure 7.3 which will have to be implemented at main sites. such circumstances, both the data security as well as system security issues will be increased. In the Met Office, as part of the UK Ministry of Defence, we are not permitted to have Web Service requests penetrate our security firewalls. To access our main databases, we are having to design DMZ systems which bear the brunt.</p> <p>Because our main data dissemination is real-time data, the bridges across the firewalls are extremely difficult and costly to design and implement with sufficient security.</p>	Please increase the document's consideration of security issues, particularly for system security rather than informational security. This should be emphasised in the light of Figure 7.3.		Rejected: System security is the responsibility of the member state.	no change
19	Met Office	LMO	MetO-01	all	all	E	document requires page numbers	please format with page numbers	accepted	s. 36	header
50	Instituto Geográfico Português	LMO	3	ent Me	Form at	G	It is considered important to refer that, as a principle, the format of the Document is MS Word (doc) should evolve to the use of ODF instead, .doc as this is Microsoft proprietary format and ODF is an ISO (ISO/IEC 26300) format.		CT asked	The format in the document metadata should refer to the format of the actual document, not of the draft. We will continue to publish the documents in Adobe PDF format, but will also investigate ODF format.	no change

Progressive comment number	SDIC ID	LMO/SDIC	Comment ID	Chapter, section or clause no./ Subclause No./Annex	Paragraph/Figure/Table/Note	Type of comment	Comment (justification for change)	Proposed change	Observations from Comments Resolving Committee	Action Taken	Paragraphs changed
59	FPGI / PFIG - Federaal Platform voor Geo-Informatie / Plate-forme Fédérale de l'Information Géographique	SDIC	4	A	3	E	... wider sharing of spatial and services while recognising the intellectual property rights of those public authorities'.	... wider sharing of spatial and services while recognising the intellectual property rights of those public authorities.		Done	A
54	General Administration of Patrimonial Documentation	LMO	4	A	3	E	... wider sharing of spatial and services while recognising the intellectual property rights of those public authorities'.	... wider sharing of spatial and services while recognising the intellectual property rights of those public authorities.		Done	A
92	United Kingdom Hydrographic Office	LMO	13	A	3	E	Typo	Remove redundant apostrophe at end of paragraph, i.e. replace "public authorities" with "public authorities"		Done	A
60	FPGI / PFIG - Federaal Platform voor Geo-Informatie / Plate-forme Fédérale de l'Information Géographique	SDIC	5	A	18	E	First, In order to make scenarios more concrete ...	First, in order to make scenarios more concrete ...		Done	A
55	General Administration of Patrimonial Documentation	LMO	5	A	18	E	First, In order to make scenarios more concrete ...	First, in order to make scenarios more concrete ...		Done	A
93	United Kingdom Hydrographic Office	LMO	14	A	21	E	Typo (duplicated words)	Replace "able to able to" with "able to"		Done	A
98	United Kingdom Hydrographic Office	LMO	19	A		T	There seems to be much reliance on GeoRM and DRM. These technologies are not yet standards within the OGC specifications but the OGC do have a GeoRM WG in discussion and a draft model. These proposed standards are based on user access, a gate keeper relating the user to a list of held licences, whereas true DRM wraps the data and only lets the user use it and only for a specific purpose or limited number of accesses. Restriction of access and e-commerce implies some sort of user authentication and authorisation, how is this to be done internationally? What about classified data? Who will govern this access?			Discussed during comments resolution workshop. Geospatial Digital Rights Management Reference Model (GeoDRM RM) (06-004r3) is an approved standard. Proposed approach is to enable interoperability at the GeoRM level – using "RightsManagementKey".	7.2 A

Progressive comment number	SDIC ID	LMO/SDIC	Comment ID	Chapter, section or clause no./ Subclause No./Annex	Paragraph/Figure/Table/Note	Type of comment	Comment (justification for change)	Proposed change	Observations from Comments Resolving Committee	Action Taken	Paragraphs changed
99	United Kingdom Hydrographic Office	LMO	20	A		T	Should INSPIRE consider Geospatial eXtensible Access Control Markup Language (GeoXACML)?			Discussed during comments resolution workshop. INSPIRE GeoRM proposed solution does not prevent Member States from using GeoXACML. GeoXACML is a geo-specific "Policy Language" extension to the OASIS standard "eXtensible Access Control Markup Language (XACML), Version 2.0". GeoXACML is not designed to be a Rights Expression Language. It does not support electronic licensing, necessary for automating licence creation, delegation and enforcement	no change
106	Lenkungsgremium GDI-DE (Steering Committee GDI-DE) (explanation: GDI-DE = Spatial Data Infrastructure Germany)	LMO	1	all		E	Page header missing	Add page header	accepted	s. 36	header
107	Lenkungsgremium GDI-DE (Steering Committee GDI-DE) (explanation: GDI-DE = Spatial Data Infrastructure Germany)	LMO	2	all		E	Page numbers missing	Add page numbers	accepted	s. 36	header
1	Royal Netherlands Meteorological Institute (KNMI)	LMO	1	all		E	Please insert Header and footer information, containing page numbers and version information		accepted	s. 36	header
62	LMV - Lantmateriet, National Land Survey of Sweden	SDIC	2	all		G	The use of a specific language is not mandatory	Specify English as the mandatory language to be used in descriptions, and allow additional, voluntary (national and other) languages. Otherwise the whole concept of Inspire is in danger.	Multilingual discussion	see comment 115	

Progressive comment number	SDIC ID	LMO/SDIC	Comment ID	Chapter, section or clause no./ Subclause No./Annex	Paragraph/Figure/Table/Note	Type of comment	Comment (justification for change)	Proposed change	Observations from Comments Resolving Committee	Action Taken	Paragraphs changed
79	Institute of Geodesy, Cartography and Remote Sensing	LMO	5	all	AL L	E	There aren't any page numbers in the document	Please insert the page numbers	accepted	s. 36	header
100	Institut Géographique National	LMO	1	all	all	G	there is the presupposition that a homogeneous model of layers (at different resolutions) and of styles for europe will be yielded. By who? Will it be enough to generate maps. Depending on the objective of the map, the same feature will not be portrayed based on the same representation anyway.	Define a working group dedicated to the definition of relevant cartographic layers (and combination rules). This working group should consider all themes together because there is much dependencies in the way to portray different themes on one map.	CT asked	No change required. Portrayal needs to be addressed by TWG only if conventions are already existing. For these cases, a template for the data specification for the default portrayal rule will be provided.	no change