



OGC™ - The Missing Link

or

Where have all the ~~flowers~~ services gone?

Martin Daly
Technical Director
Cadcorp
OGC Best Practice Seminar
BGS
25th January, 2007



Agenda

- UK OGC Exemplars
- Debunking some OGC myths
- Where next?

UK OGC Exemplars

- GML
 - Ordnance Survey MasterMap[®]
- W*S
 - Commercial
 - BlueSky, DottedEyes, eMapSite.com Limited “Plans Ahead”, Getmapping “Imagexpress WMS”, Infoterra
 - Academic
 - BADC (NERC Centres for Atmospheric Sciences), EDINA (Edinburgh University Data Library), ICEDS (University College London), MIMAS (The University of Manchester)
 - Government
 - Forth Valley GIS / Angus Council, Surrey Heath / Surrey County Council
- Er, that’s it

Ordnance Survey MasterMap®

Apic®

Assist Applications

Autodesk® Ltd

By Design

Bentley Systems (UK) Ltd

Cadcorp®

dhp11

eMapSite.com Limited

Dotted Eyes

ESRI (UK)

GE Network Solutions

GDC

GGP Systems Ltd

Innogistic

Intergraph® UK

KeyTERRA-FIRMA Ltd

Kingswood MapMechanics

KOREC™

Laser-Scan Ltd

MapInfo Ltd

Northgate Information Solutions®

Safe Software

SIA Limited

Snowflake Software

TENET IT Mapping

Track Access Solutions Limited

Source - <http://www.ordnancesurvey.co.uk/oswebsite/products/osmastermap/information/technical/software.html>

That's it?

- Not quite
 - That's all that I knew about, or could find
- For example BGS et al, as described earlier
- Several test-beds, pilot projects and demonstrations
- Lots of people *say* they are going to W*S-enable their data

OK Cadcorp. If you're such OGC experts, show us where your UK users have deployed W*S services.

- Errrr...
- Emmmm...
- SeaZone Solutions Ltd
 - “SeaZone is creating a spatial database which supports ... the use of geographic information by end users, as often the data can be made directly accessible (via WMS/WFS etc) ...”
- Derby FRS
 - “Testing setting up a WFS to share data with Notts FRS”
- From earlier
 - Forth Valley GIS / Angus Council
 - Surrey Heath / Surrey County Council

Why so few?

- Typical “reasons”
 - OGC has a US bias
 - The specifications have not been widely implemented
 - The specifications are not mature

UK OGC Membership

Category	Members
Strategic	0 (5)
Principal Plus	0 (0)
Principal	0 (13)
Technical Committee	6 (60)
Associate Membership	8 (83)
Commercial / Government National Organisation	0
Government Local	0 (10)
Government Subnational	2 (20)
Research Institute / Not for Profit Institute	1 (20)
Small Company	1 (33)
University / Research Centre	7 (92)
Total	19 (175)
All	25 (336)

A US bias?

Region	Members
Africa	2
Asia Pacific	35
Australia	16 (17)
Japan	11 (3)
Europe	142 (0)
France	11 (7)
Germany	36 (5)
Netherlands	10 (23)
UK	25 (6)
Middle East	6
North America	150
Canada	19 (11)
United States	131 (1)
South America	1

Not widely implemented?

Total	Compliant	Specification / Version
161	37	Web Map Service (1.1.1)
127	0*	Web Map Service (1.1)
88	0*	Web Map Service (1.0)
39	17	Web Feature Service (1.0)
38	0*	Geography Markup Language (2.1.1)
38	16	Filter Encoding (1.0)
34	0*	OpenGIS® Geography Markup Language (GML) Encoding Specification (3.0)
34	0*	Geography Markup Language (2.1.2)
31	0*	Geography Markup Language (2.0)
27	0*	Geography Markup Language (1.0)

* No test available

Source - <http://www.opengeospatial.org/resource/products/stats>

Not mature?

- 1997
 - Simple Features
- 1999
 - Grid Coverages
 - Catalog Interface
- 2000
 - Coordinate Transformation Services
 - Web Map Service
- 2002
 - Styled Layer Descriptor
 - Geography Markup Language
 - Web Feature Service
 - Filter Encoding
- 2003
 - Web Map Context Specification
- 2004
 - OpenLS
 - Web Coverage Specification
 - Catalogue Service
- 1996
 - ESRI Shape
 - HTTP 1.1
 - Multimap
- 1998
 - Google
 - XML 1.0
- 2000
 - SOAP 1.0, 1.1
- 2001
 - XML Schema
 - Keyhole, Inc
- 2002
 - Oracle 9iR2
- 2004
 - XML 1.1
- 2005
 - Google Earth
 - Google Maps

The Real Reasons?

- Inertia
- Lack of clear policy on data sharing
- Fear of the unknown
- Fear of breaking data licensing terms

In summary

- The specifications are
 - Functional (enough)
 - Mature (enough)
 - Widely (enough) implemented
- The policy is
 - Sporadic
 - Disjoint
 - Slow to change

Where next?

- Technology is not enough
- Software suppliers cannot force policy changes
 - But national mapping agencies and similar large data suppliers can
- Ultimately...
 - (Without being complacent)
 - What else are you going to use?