

Open Geospatial Consortium

Submission Date: 2018-09-07

Approval Date: <yyyy-mm-dd>

Publication Date: <yyyy-mm-dd>

Reference URL for this document: www.opengeospatial.net/doc/IS/?

Internal reference number of this OGC ® document: 18-067r2

Version: 1.0

Category: OGC® Standard

Editor(s): Erwan Bocher, Olivier Ertz

OGC Symbology Conceptual Model: Core part

Copyright notice

Copyright © 2019 Open Geospatial Consortium

To obtain additional rights of use, visit <http://www.opengeospatial.org/legal/>.

Warning

This document is not an OGC Standard. This document is distributed for review and comment. This document is subject to change without notice and may not be referred to as an OGC Standard.

Recipients of this document are invited to submit, with their comments, notification of any relevant patent rights of which they are aware and to provide supporting documentation.

Document type:	OGC® Standard
Document subtype:	Conceptual Model
Document stage:	Draft
Document language:	English

Permission is hereby granted by the Open Geospatial Consortium, ("Licensor"), free of charge and subject to the terms set forth below, to any person obtaining a copy of this Intellectual Property and any associated documentation, to deal in the Intellectual Property without restriction (except as set forth below), including without limitation the rights to implement, use, copy, modify, merge, publish, distribute, and/or sublicense copies of the Intellectual Property, and to permit persons to whom the Intellectual Property is furnished to do so, provided that all copyright notices on the intellectual property are retained intact and that each person to whom the Intellectual Property is furnished agrees to the terms of this Agreement.

If you modify the Intellectual Property, all copies of the modified Intellectual Property must include, in addition to the above copyright notice, a notice that the Intellectual Property includes modifications that have not been approved or adopted by LICENSOR.

THIS LICENSE IS A COPYRIGHT LICENSE ONLY, AND DOES NOT CONVEY ANY RIGHTS UNDER ANY PATENTS

THAT MAY BE IN FORCE ANYWHERE IN THE WORLD. THE INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY IS PROVIDED "AS IS", WITHOUT WARRANTY OF ANY KIND, EXPRESS OR IMPLIED, INCLUDING BUT NOT LIMITED TO THE WARRANTIES OF MERCHANTABILITY, FITNESS FOR A PARTICULAR PURPOSE, AND NONINFRINGEMENT OF THIRD PARTY RIGHTS. THE COPYRIGHT HOLDER OR HOLDERS INCLUDED IN THIS NOTICE DO NOT WARRANT THAT THE FUNCTIONS CONTAINED IN THE INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY WILL MEET YOUR REQUIREMENTS OR THAT THE OPERATION OF THE INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY WILL BE UNINTERRUPTED OR ERROR FREE. ANY USE OF THE INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY SHALL BE MADE ENTIRELY AT THE USER'S OWN RISK. IN NO EVENT SHALL THE COPYRIGHT HOLDER OR ANY CONTRIBUTOR OF INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY RIGHTS TO THE INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY BE LIABLE FOR ANY CLAIM, OR ANY DIRECT, SPECIAL, INDIRECT OR CONSEQUENTIAL DAMAGES, OR ANY DAMAGES WHATSOEVER RESULTING FROM ANY ALLEGED INFRINGEMENT OR ANY LOSS OF USE, DATA OR PROFITS, WHETHER IN AN ACTION OF CONTRACT, NEGLIGENCE OR UNDER ANY OTHER LEGAL THEORY, ARISING OUT OF OR IN CONNECTION WITH THE IMPLEMENTATION, USE, COMMERCIALIZATION OR PERFORMANCE OF THIS INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY.

This license is effective until terminated. You may terminate it at any time by destroying the Intellectual Property together with all copies in any form. The license will also terminate if you fail to comply with any term or condition of this Agreement. Except as provided in the following sentence, no such termination of this license shall require the termination of any third party end-user sublicense to the Intellectual Property which is in force as of the date of notice of such termination. In addition, should the Intellectual Property, or the operation of the Intellectual Property, infringe, or in LICENSOR's sole opinion be likely to infringe, any patent, copyright, trademark or other right of a third party, you agree that LICENSOR, in its sole discretion, may terminate this license without any compensation or liability to you, your licensees or any other party. You agree upon termination of any kind to destroy or cause to be destroyed the Intellectual Property together with all copies in any form, whether held by you or by any third party.

Except as contained in this notice, the name of LICENSOR or of any other holder of a copyright in all or part of the Intellectual Property shall not be used in advertising or otherwise to promote the sale, use or other dealings in this Intellectual Property without prior written authorization of LICENSOR or such copyright holder. LICENSOR is and shall at all times be the sole entity that may authorize you or any third party to use certification marks, trademarks or other special designations to indicate compliance with any LICENSOR standards or specifications. This Agreement is governed by the laws of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. The application to this Agreement of the United Nations Convention on Contracts for the International Sale of Goods is hereby expressly excluded. In the event any provision of this Agreement shall be deemed unenforceable, void or invalid, such provision shall be modified so as to make it valid and enforceable, and as so modified the entire Agreement shall remain in full force and effect. No decision, action or inaction by LICENSOR shall be construed to be a waiver of any rights or remedies available to it.

Table of Contents

1 Scope	9
2 Conformance	10
3 Normative References	10
4 Definitions and Abbreviations	12
4.1 Definitions	12
4.1.1 Portrayal	12
4.1.2 Layer	12
4.1.3 Rendering engine	12
4.1.4 Render	12
4.2 Abbreviations	12
5 Core Conceptual Model	13
5.1 Overview	13
5.2 Class Style	13
5.3 Class Rule	14
5.4 Class Symbolizer	14
5.5 Class ParameterValue	15
5.6 Class Literal	16
5.7 UOM Codelist	16
5.8 Class Color	17
5.9 Class Fill	17
5.10 Class Stroke	17
5.11 Class Graphic	18
5.12 Class GraphicSize	19
5.13 Class Label	19
5.14 Class Font	20
6 Abstract Test Suite (Normative)	21
6.1 Implements the Style class	21

6.2 Implements the Rule class.	21
6.3 Implements the Symbolizer Class.	21
6.4 Implements the ParameterValue Class.	22
6.5 Implements the Literal class.	22
6.6 Implements the uom codelist.	22
6.7 Implements the Color Class.	22
6.8 Implements the Fill Class.	23
6.9 Implements the Stroke Class.	23
6.10 Implements the Graphic Class.	23
6.11 Implements the GraphicSize Class.	23
6.12 Implements the Label Class.	24
6.13 Implements the Font Class.	24
Annex A Example implementation	25
Annex B	
A redesign of OGC Symbology Encoding standard for sharing cartography	29

i. Abstract

This document presents the requirements for defining the Symbology Conceptual Core Model (SymCore), the conceptual basis to define symbology rules for the portrayal of geographical data. It is modular and extensible (one core model, many extensions), also encoding agnostic (one symbology model, many encodings). It contains a minimal set of abstract classes representing explicit extension points of the model.

Note, that this document does not define any extensions.

The SWG work that led to this proposal has been done in the continuation of the Symbology Encoding standard (SE 1.1). While **portrayal** concerns the complete picture of what can be called a “cartographic ecosystem”, the description of **symbology** rules rather concerns the subpart of it about the instructions to be applied by a rendering engine to symbolize geodata. That’s why this proposal has a focus on symbology versus concerns close to WMS Style Layer Descriptor profile (SLD) considerations. In other words, while a set of “layer **style**” describe the links between some geodata and some styles to build a map, each of these styles are built of a set of symbology rules in accordance with SymCore.

The overall motivation that lead to this proposal is related to the issue “*how to make richer the symbology abilities*”. The first answer is modularity which comes with extensibility. SE 1.1 is not modular per se, while this proposal is designed to be so with a core model extensible to host the diversity of such abilities in relation to various data models. It means that the core model is somewhat abstract and does not define concrete visualisations (e.g. red dashed line of wide thickness to draw features of type cable car).

The second answer that follows from the first is about extensions. As soon as the conceptual basis is set out in a specification document (this proposal), then extensions have to document the concrete symbology concepts to portray geodata structured according to a given data model. It is worth to notice that conceptually the core model is not related to any specific underlying data model to represent. It is up to an extension to define styling abilities in relation to a specific data model (e.g. FeatureTypeStyle).

Third answer is about encodings. As soon as the conceptual basis is set out, extensions packaged, then it is to define encodings to format the concrete conceptual symbology abilities.

In summary, SymCore concerns the first answer with a consistent approach to:

- provide the flexibility required to achieve adequate symbology rules for a variety of information communities; e.g. aviation symbols, weather symbols, thematic maps, etc, and;
- achieve a high level styling interoperability without encoding dependencies

As a consequence, this proposal follows the same motivation that split up SLD 1.0 (SLD 1.1 and SE 1.1). It is to put together parts that are not specific to any service (e.g. WMS), that is to be independent, and to allow the concepts to be reused by other standards willing to address aspects related to cartography. So a more general and portable symbology model is proposed for use across the broad OGC standards baseline, to be applied to geospatial datasets as well as online geospatial data and mapping services.

Potential implementations of SymCore are expected to enhance OGC standards such as the Web Map Service, Web Feature Service, GeoPackage, and others. By sharing a common core, and using an extension mechanism, integration of these standards for the purposes of cartographic representation could be greatly simplified.

ii. Keywords

The following are keywords to be used by search engines and document catalogues.

Ogcdoc, style, symbology, conceptual, core, modular, neutral, portrayal

iii. Preface

Attention is drawn to the possibility that some of the elements of this document may be the subject of patent rights. The Open Geospatial Consortium shall not be held responsible for identifying any or all such patent rights.

Recipients of this document are requested to submit, with their comments, notification of any relevant patent claims or other intellectual property rights of which they may be aware that might be infringed by any implementation of the standard set forth in this document, and to provide supporting documentation.

iv. Submitting organizations

The following organizations submitted this Document to the Open Geospatial Consortium (OGC):

Organization	Contact
HEIG-VD (School of Management and Engineering Vaud) https://heig-vd.ch	Olivier Ertz
CNRS (National Center for Scientific Research) http://www.cnrs.fr	Erwan Bocher
Strategic ACI https://www.strategicaci.com/	Matt Sorenson
IGN http://www.ign.fr/	Dimitri Sarafinof

All questions regarding this submission should be directed to the editor or the above listed contact points.

v. Other contributors

Comments on the content of this standard were given both informally and formally by members of the OGC. The OGC OAB (OGC Architecture Board) reviewed this document and made both types of comments. Written comments were submitted by the following individual members during the public review:

Name	Affiliation
Carl Reed	Carl Reed and Associates
Jeff Yutzler	Image Matters LLC
Chris Little	Met Office
Antony Cooper	University of Pretoria
Sean Eagles	Canada Centre for Mapping and Earth Observation
Patty Zhao	Canada Centre for Mapping and Earth Observation

1 Scope

This document presents the requirements that define the Symbology Conceptual Core Model (SymCore). The SymCore is an conceptual, modular, neutral model for the portrayal of geographical data. The model contains a minimal set of abstract classes representing explicit extension points of the model. Note, that this document does not define any extensions.

Even though the SymCore could be extended in many places (such as Color or ParameterValue), the abstract Style class must be considered as the root element for portraying a geographic data model and for defining a concrete style model, e.g. specific style dedicated to render 2D vector data or a style for 3D, Virtual Reality, Augmented Reality topics (Figure 1).

The SymCore is a new approach (Bocher E, Ertz O, 2018, see Annex B) :

- to provide the flexibility required to achieve adequate cartographic styling and fill the needs of a variety of information communities; e.g. aviation symbols, weather symbols, thematic maps, ...
- to achieve a high level styling interoperability without encoding dependencies.




Figure 1. The core model and its potential extensions

The figure 2 explains the relation between the core, the potential extensions and their encodings. A community style extension must be based on a core element and will be

encoding independent. An extension should have a concrete encoding. As the figure shows encoding could be implemented in various formats.




Figure 2. From core and extensions to encodings: principles of implementation

2 Conformance

This document defines a standardisation target for encodings that implement the OGC Symbology Conceptual Core Model. The goal is to allow different encodings to have equivalent content and semantics so that they can be interoperable. This document establishes a core requirements class with a URI of <http://www.opengis.net/spec/symbology/2.0/req/core>

Requirements and conformance test URIs defined in this document are relative to <http://www.opengis.net/spec/symbology/2.0>. All requirements in this standard are part of the core requirement stated above.

Conformance with this standard shall be checked using all the relevant tests specified in Chapter 6 of this document. The framework, concepts, and methodology for testing, and the criteria to be achieved to claim conformance are specified in the OGC Compliance Testing Policies and Procedures and the OGC Compliance Testing web site.

3 Normative References

OGC 06-042, OpenGIS Web Map Service (WMS) Implementation Specification, Version 1.3.0 <http://www.opengeospatial.org/standards/wms>

OGC 05-078r4, OpenGIS Styled Layer Descriptor Profile of the Web Map Service Implementation Specification, Version 1.1.0 <http://www.opengeospatial.org/standards/sld>

OGC 05-077r4, OpenGIS Symbology Encoding Implementation Specification, Version 1.1.0 <http://www.opengeospatial.org/standards/se>

OGC 09-026r2, OGC Filter Encoding 2.0 Encoding Standard - With Corrigendum,
<http://www.opengeospatial.org/standards/filter>

OGC 08-131r3, The Specification Model - A Standard for Modular specifications.
https://portal.opengeospatial.org/files/?artifact_id=34762

IETF RFC 4646: Tags for Identifying Languages, <https://datatracker.ietf.org/doc/rfc4646/>

ISO 19117:2012, Geographic information - Portrayal
<https://www.iso.org/standard/46226.html>

The Unified Code for Units of Measure (UCUM), <http://unitsofmeasure.org/ucum.html>

W3C CSS Fonts chapter, <https://www.w3.org/TR/CSS2/fonts.html#font-styling>

Bocher E, Ertz O. (2018), A redesign of OGC Symbology Encoding standard for sharing cartography. PeerJ Computer Science 4:e143 <https://doi.org/10.7717/peerj-cs.143>

4 Definitions and Abbreviations

4.1 Definitions

4.1.1 Portrayal

The ISO defines portrayal as presentation of information for human. See ISO 19117:2012, Geographic information - Portrayal <https://www.iso.org/standard/46226.html>

4.1.2 Layer

A layer is an abstraction of reality specified by a geographic data model (feature, coverage, 3D objects...) and represented using a set of symbols (Style) to plot it.

4.1.3 Rendering engine

A rendering engine is an automated process that produces graphics using a pipeline of layers and styles as inputs. A rendering engine is commonly found in desktop or server-based geographic information systems.

4.1.4 Render

Conversion of digital graphics data into visual form. See ISO 19117:2012, Geographic information - Portrayal <https://www.iso.org/standard/46226.html>

4.2 Abbreviations

The abbreviated terms clause gives a list of the abbreviated terms necessary for understanding this document.

IETF Internet Engineering Task Force, <https://ietf.org/>

ISO International Organization for Standardization, <https://www.iso.org>

OGC Open Geospatial Consortium, www.opengeospatial.org

UML Unified Modeling Language, <http://www.uml.org/>

5 Core Conceptual Model

5.1 Overview

The requirements described in this section define the symbology core requirement class. The UML diagram (Figure 2) shows the fundamental concepts of the Symbology Conceptual Core Model.

Requirement Class: <http://www.opengis.net/spec/symbology/2.0/req/core>




Figure 2. UML Class Diagram of the Symbology core

Scope: All requirements in this subsection relate to the above requirement class.

Dependencies: None

Description: The Symbology conceptual model is shown in the UML Diagram below.

Each concept in the model can be extended according to two main extension principles:

- either globally related to an abstract class (in yellow)
- or locally related to the extension property defined within each class of the model

The role of each class and property in the model above is described in the tables below.

5.2 Class Style

Requirement ID: <http://www.opengis.net/spec/symbology/2.0/req/core/StyleClass>

Requirement Txt: Implementations shall support the encoding of all properties of the Style class and meet all of the tabulated constraints and notes.

This class is the root concept of the Symbology Conceptual Core Model. This class organizes the rules of symbolizing instructions to be applied by a rendering engine on a layer of geographic features (e.g., vector based spatial data or raster data). As an abstract class, it is designed to be extended (e.g., the FeatureTypeStyle extension for vector data).

Please note that the graphic pipeline of the rendering engine must be expressed unambiguously for each concrete implementation of a Style in order to enable cartographic portrayal interoperability.

The Style class properties are documented in the following table.

Name	Definition	Data type and value	Multiplicity
name	A string value to reference the Style	ParameterValue data type	Zero or one
title	Human readable title	ParameterValue data type	One
abstract	Human readable description	ParameterValue data type	Zero or one
rule	Rule(s) that drive(s) the rendering engine	Rule	One or more
extension	Any encoding should allow the user to extend the class to include custom items	Any	Zero or more

5.3 Class Rule

Requirement ID: <http://www.opengis.net/spec/symbology/2.0/req/core/RuleClass>

Requirement Txt: Implementations shall support the encoding of all *RuleClass* properties and meet all of the tabulated constraints and notes.

This core class describes the concept of a *rule* in the Symbology model. Rules are used to organize symbolizing instructions and potentially to define conditions of application of these associated symbolizers (e.g., feature-property conditions or map scales).

The RuleClass properties are documented in the following table.

Name	Definition	Data type and value	Multiplicity
name	A string value to reference the Rule	ParameterValue data type	Zero or one
title	Human readable title	ParameterValue data type	One
abstract	Human readable description	ParameterValue data type	Zero or one
symbolizer	Symbolize(s) to apply by the rendering engine	Symbolizer	One or more
extension	Any encoding should allow the user to extend the class to include custom properties	Any	Zero or more

5.4 Class Symbolizer

Requirement ID: <http://www.opengis.net/spec/symbology/2.0/req/core/SymbolizerClass>

Requirement Txt: Implementations shall support the encoding of all *SymbolizerClass* properties and meet all of the tabulated constraints and notes.

This class describes how to portray geographic data given a shape (e.g., area fill, line stroke, point marker, etc.) and graphical properties (e.g., color, opacity, font-family, etc.). As an abstract class, it is designed to be extended.

The *SymbolizerClass* properties are documented in the following table.

Name	Definition	Data type and value	Multiplicity
name	A string value to reference the Symbolizer	ParameterValue data type	Zero or one
title	Human readable title	ParameterValue data type	One
abstract	Human readable description	ParameterValue data type	Zero or one
uom	Unit of measure to apply to all graphical properties of a Symbolizer	uom code	Zero or one
extension	Any encoding should allow the user to extend the class to include custom items	Any	Zero or more

To understand what the symbolizer concept is, consider a “Lake” feature type represented by a Polygon that we want to symbolize as a “blue” filled polygon with its boundary drawn as a “black” line. As symbolizer is an abstract class a concrete extension, called here for example *AreaSymbolizer* must be provided to render an interior “fill” and an outlining “stroke”. Consequently the *AreaSymbolizer* extension will implement concrete extensions of the abstract *Stroke* and *Fill* classes of the conceptual model.

Depending on the type of geographical object, a set of symbolizer extensions can be conceived. For example a *LineSymbolizer* to draw a river, a *PointSymbolizer* to locate the “Hospitals” or a *LabelSymbolizer* to render the road name along a line.

5.5 Class ParameterValue

Requirement ID:

<http://www.opengis.net/spec/symbology/2.0/req/core/ParameterValueClass>

Requirement Txt: Implementations shall support the encoding of all *ParameterValue* parameters class and meet all of the tabulated constraints and notes.

The *ParameterValue* class represents a gateway that provides the value to be used by a parameter in a styling context of use (almost all styling parameters such as width, opacity, displacement, etc are "parameter-values"). This class has a similar meaning to Expression as defined in the OGC Filter Encoding 2.0 standard. As an abstract class, it is designed to be extended (e.g., Literal).

The ParameterValue properties are documented in the following table.

Name	Definition	Data type and value	Multiplicity
language	Language identifier for the ParameterValue element. (a)	Character String. This language identifier shall be as specified in IETF RFC 4646.	zero or more
extension	Any encoding should allow the ability to extend the class to include custom items	Any	zero or more

(a) The language identifier should offer a way to adapt the ParameterValue to a specified language, e.g., display the title of a Rule element both in English and French.

5.6 Class Literal

Requirement ID: <http://www.opengis.net/spec/symbology/2.0/req/core/LiteralClass>

Requirement Txt: Implementations shall support the encoding of all parameters of the Literal class and meet all of the tabulated constraints and notes.

The Literal class is a concrete implementation of the ParameterValue class. LiteralClass represents a typed atomic literal value as a constant explicitly specified. It was originally defined in the OGC Filter Encoding 2.0 standard section 7.5.1.

LiteralClass properties are documented in the following table.

Name	Definition	Data type and value	Multiplicity
value	A value for the literal data	Any	one

5.7 UOM Codelist

Requirement ID: <http://www.opengis.net/spec/symbology/2.0/req/core/UOMClass>

Requirement Txt: Implementations shall support the encoding of all properties of the *UOMClass* and meet all of the tabulated constraints and notes.

For styling parameters that define sizing and positioning of graphical objects (width, displacement, etc.) the unit of measure needs to be provided for the rendering engine. Therefore, for different levels of elements (eg. Symbolizer, Stroke, Fill, GraphicSize...) the model allows using different *uom* codes. Consequently, either the unit of measure is determined through the *uom* code directly associated to each element or it is determined by the innermost parent *uom* code (e.g., an uom code defined at the Symbolizer level implies that this unit is applied for all sizing and positioning values inside the Symbolizer).

Below is the list of allowed units of measure as per UCUM (except for pixel):

- portrayal units: pixel, millimeter, inch, percentage
- ground units: meter, foot

The portrayal unit “pixel” is the default unit of measure. If available, the pixel size depends on the viewer client resolution, otherwise it is equal to 0.28mm * 0.28mm (~ 90 DPI).

5.8 Class Color

Requirement ID: <http://www.opengis.net/spec/symbology/2.0/req/core/ColorClass>

Requirement Txt: Implementations shall support the encoding of all properties of the Color class and meet all of the tabulated constraints and notes.

The *ColorClass* allows the definition of color. As an abstract class and part of the base of the core graphical concepts, this class is a global point of extension for specifying concrete definitions of colors (e.g., RGBColor extension).

The ColorClass properties are documented in the following table.

Name	Definition	Data type and value	Multiplicity
extension	Any encoding should allow the extension of <i>ColorClass</i> with custom items	Any type	zero or more

5.9 Class Fill

Requirement ID: <http://www.opengis.net/spec/symbology/2.0/req/core/FillClass>

Requirement Txt: Implementations shall support the encoding of all properties of the *FillClass* and meet all of the tabulated constraints and notes.

FillClass defines the graphical symbolizing parameters required to draw the filling of a two-dimensional shape such as a polygon. As an abstract class and part of the base of the core graphical concepts, *FillClass* is a global point of extension for specifying concrete definitions for shape fill operations (e.g., the *SolidFill* and *GraphicFill* extensions).

The FillClass properties are documented in the following table.

Name	Definition	Data type and value	Multiplicity
uom	Unit of measure to apply to all graphical properties within a Fill	uom code	zero or one
extension	Any encoding should allow the extension of a Fill operation with custom items	Any type	zero or more

5.10 Class Stroke

Requirement ID: <http://www.opengis.net/spec/symbology/2.0/req/core/StrokeClass>

Requirement Txt: Implementations shall support the encoding of all properties of the *StrokeClass* and meet all of the tabulated constraints and notes.

StrokeClass defines the graphical symbolizing parameters for drawing an outline (e.g., for linear geometries or the exterior of a polygon geometry). As an abstract class and part of the base of the core graphical concepts, *StrokeClass* is a global point of extension to specify concrete ways to draw outlines (e.g., the *PenStroke* and *GraphicStroke* extensions).

The *StrokeClass* properties are documented in the following table.

Name	Definition	Data type and value	Multiplicity
uom	Unit of measure to apply to all graphical properties inside a Stroke	uom code	zero or one
extension	Any encoding should allow to extend a Stroke with custom items	Any type	zero or more

5.11 Class Graphic

Requirement ID: <http://www.opengis.net/spec/symbology/2.0/req/core/GraphicClass>

Requirement Txt: Implementations shall support the encoding of all properties of the *GraphicClass* and meet all of the tabulated constraints and notes.

The *Graphic* class defines the parameters for drawing a graphic symbol such as shape, color(s), and size. A *graphic* can be informally defined as “a little picture” and can be either a bitmap or scaled vector. (The term “graphic” is used instead of the term “symbol” to avoid confusion with *Symbolizer*, which is used in a different context in this model.) As an abstract class and part of the base of the core graphical concepts, *GraphicClass* is a global point of extension to specify concrete ways to draw “graphic symbol” (e.g. *ExternalGraphic* and *MarkGraphic* extensions).

The *GraphicClass* properties are documented in the following table.

Name	Definition	Data type and value	Multiplicity
uom	Unit of measure to apply to all graphical properties within a Graphic	uom code	zero or one
graphicSize	Rendering size of the graphic	GraphicSize data type	zero or one
extension	Any encoding should allow to extend a Graphic with custom items	Any type	zero or more

5.12 Class GraphicSize

Requirement ID: <http://www.opengis.net/spec/symbology/2.0/req/core/GraphicSizeClass>

Requirement Txt: Implementations shall support the encoding of all properties of the *GraphicSizeClass* and meet all of the tabulated constraints and notes.

The *GraphicSize* class determines the size of the graphic when it is rendered. As an abstract class, it is designed to be extended to support the various ways the size could be specified such as by a single value, a rectangular box, or by a three-dimensional cube.

The *GraphicSize* properties are documented in the following table.

Name	Definition	Data type and value	Multiplicity
extension	Any encoding should allow to extend a <i>GraphicSize</i> with custom items	Any type	zero or more

5.13 Class Label

Requirement ID: <http://www.opengis.net/spec/symbology/2.0/req/core/LabelClass>

Requirement Txt: Implementations shall support the encoding of all properties of the *LabelClass* and meet all of the tabulated constraints and notes.

LabelClass defines the graphical symbolizing properties for drawing a text label. As an abstract class and part of the base of the core graphical concepts, *LabelClass* is a point of extension to specify concrete ways to draw text label according to placement behaviours (e.g., a *PointLabel* or *LineLabel*).

LabelClass properties are documented in the following table.

Name	Definition	Data type and value	Multiplicity
uom	Unit of measure to apply to the affected graphical properties within a <i>Label</i>	uom code	zero or one
labelText	Text-label content to draw	ParameterValue data type String	one
font	Font definition to draw the text-label content	Font data type Default value: system-dependent	zero or one
fill	Filling style to draw the glyphs	Fill data type	zero or one
extension	Any encoding should allow to extend a <i>Label</i> with custom items	Any type	zero or more

5.14 Class Font

Requirement ID: <http://www.opengis.net/spec/symbology/2.0/req/core/FontClass>

Requirement Txt: Implementations shall support the encoding of all properties of the *FontClass* and meet all of the tabulated constraints and notes.

The *FontClass* describes the font properties to apply for the rendering of a text string. It refers to the W3C CSS Fonts chapter.

Name	Definition	Data type and value	Multiplicity
uom	Unit of measure to apply to the affected graphical properties within a Font	uom code	zero or one
fontFamily	Font family name (a)	ParameterValue data type CharacterString	zero or more
fontSize	Font size when applying the font to a text string (b)	ParameterValue data type Float	zero or one
fontWeight	Amount of weight or boldness to use for a font	ParameterValue data type CharacterString	zero or one
fontStyle	Style to use for a font	ParameterValue data type CharacterString	zero or one
extension	Any encoding should allow to extend a Font with custom items	Any type	zero or more

- (a) Any number of FontFamily parameters may be given and they are assumed to be in preferred order.
- (b) The size unit is specified by the uom code if defined or by the innermost parent unit of measure definition otherwise

6 Abstract Test Suite (Normative)

An Symbology Encoding implementation shall satisfy the following characteristics to be conformant with this specification.

The OGC URI identifier of this conformance class is:
<http://www.opengis.net/spec/symbology/2.0/conf/core>.

It is the root of the test identifiers described below.

6.1 Implements the Style class

Test ID: <http://www.opengis.net/spec/symbology/2.0/conf/core/StyleClass>

Test purpose:

To test requirement <http://www.opengis.net/spec/symbology/2.0/req/core/StyleClass>

Test method:

Review all rows of the Style class and confirm that an encoding rule is defined for each element in the encoding specification.

Check that at least one concrete class of the Style class has an encoding rule defined.

6.2 Implements the Rule class.

Test ID: <http://www.opengis.net/spec/symbology/2.0/conf/core/RuleClass>

Test Purpose:

To test requirement <http://www.opengis.net/spec/symbology/2.0/req/core/StyleClass>

Test Method:

Review all rows of the Rule class and confirm that an encoding is defined for each element in the encoding specification.

6.3 Implements the Symbolizer Class.

Test ID: <http://www.opengis.net/spec/symbology/2.0/conf/core/SymbolizerClass>

Test Purpose: To test requirement

<http://www.opengis.net/spec/symbology/2.0/req/core/SymbolizerClass>

Test Method:

Review all rows of the Symbolizer class and confirm that an encoding rule is defined for each element in the encoding specification.

Check that at least one concrete class of the Symbolizer class (defined by the symbology conceptual model) has an encoding rule defined.

6.4 Implements the ParameterValue Class.

Test ID: <http://www.opengis.net/spec/symbology/2.0/conf/core/ParameterValueClass>

Test Purpose: To test requirement

<http://www.opengis.net/spec/symbology/2.0/req/core/ParameterValueClass>

Test Method:

Review all rows of the ParameterValue class and confirm that an encoding rule is defined for each element in the encoding specification.

Check that at least one concrete class (defined by the symbology conceptual model) of the ParameterValue abstract class is implemented.

6.5 Implements the Literal class.

Test ID: <http://www.opengis.net/spec/symbology/2.0/conf/core/LiteralClass>

Test Purpose: To test requirement

<http://www.opengis.net/spec/symbology/2.0/req/core/LiteralClass>

Test Method:

Review all rows of the Literal class and confirm that an encoding rule is defined for each element in the encoding specification.

6.6 Implements the uom codelist.

Test ID: <http://www.opengis.net/spec/symbology/2.0/conf/core/UOMClass>

Test Purpose: To test requirement

<http://www.opengis.net/spec/symbology/2.0/req/core/UOMClass>

Test Method: Check that at least the pixel portrayal unit of measure is implemented.

6.7 Implements the Color Class.

Test id: <http://www.opengis.net/spec/symbology/2.0/conf/core/ColorClass>

Test Purpose: To test requirement

<http://www.opengis.net/spec/symbology/2.0/req/core/ColorClass>

Test Method:

Review all rows of the Color class and confirm that an encoding rule is defined for each element in the encoding specification.

Check that at least one concrete class (defined by the symbology conceptual model) of the Color abstract class is implemented.

6.8 Implements the Fill Class.

Test ID: <http://www.opengis.net/spec/symbology/2.0/conf/core/FillClass>

Test Purpose: To test requirement

<http://www.opengis.net/spec/symbology/2.0/conf/req/FillClass>

Test Method:

Review all rows of the Fill class and confirm that an encoding rule is defined for each element in the encoding specification.

Check that at least one concrete class (defined by the symbology conceptual model) of the Fill abstract class is implemented.

6.9 Implements the Stroke Class.

Test ID: <http://www.opengis.net/spec/symbology/2.0/conf/core/StrokeClass>

Test Purpose: To test requirement

<http://www.opengis.net/spec/symbology/2.0/conf/req/StrokeClass>

Test Method:

Review all rows of the Stroke class and confirm that an encoding rule is defined for each element in the encoding specification.

Check that at least one concrete class (defined by the symbology conceptual model) of the Stroke abstract class is implemented.

6.10 Implements the Graphic Class.

Test ID: <http://www.opengis.net/spec/symbology/2.0/conf/core/GraphicClass>

Test Purpose: To test requirement

<http://www.opengis.net/spec/symbology/2.0/conf/req/GraphicClass>

Test Method:

Review all rows of the Graphic class and confirm that an encoding rule is defined for each element in the encoding specification.

Check that at least one concrete class (defined by the symbology conceptual model) of the Graphic abstract class is implemented.

6.11 Implements the GraphicSize Class.

Test ID: <http://www.opengis.net/spec/symbology/2.0/conf/core/GraphicSizeClass>

Test Purpose: To test requirement

<http://www.opengis.net/spec/symbology/2.0/conf/req/GraphicSizeClass>

Test Method:

Review all rows of the GraphicSize class and confirm that an encoding rule is defined for each element in the encoding specification.

6.12 Implements the Label Class.

Test ID: <http://www.opengis.net/spec/symbology/2.0/conf/core/LabelClass>

Test Purpose: To test requirement

<http://www.opengis.net/spec/symbology/2.0/conf/req/LabelClass>

Test Method:

Review all rows of the Label class and confirm that an encoding rule is defined for each element in the encoding specification.

Check that at least one concrete class (defined by the symbology conceptual model) of the Label abstract class is implemented.

6.13 Implements the Font Class.

Test ID: <http://www.opengis.net/spec/symbology/2.0/conf/core/FontClass>

Test Purpose: To test requirement

<http://www.opengis.net/spec/symbology/2.0/conf/req/FontClass>

Test Method:

Review all rows of the Font class and confirm that an encoding rule is defined for each element in the encoding specification.

Annex A Example implementation

The Symbology Conceptual Core Model standard implies that a concrete style extension is implemented to control how the features of a certain data model are rendered. The following example is given for information only. It must be read and understood as a fictitious implementation of an extension.

Let us introduce the AreaFeatureTypeStyle extension which holds a simple and classical symbolizer, call it the AreaSymbolizer extension which describes the graphical parameters for drawing polygonal features with outlined and filled surface areas.

The figure 3 shows the fundamental concepts of the Symbology Conceptual Core Model that must be implemented to create the AreaFeatureTypeStyle extension.

Note that this extension doesn't contain any rule mechanisms as MinScaleDenominator and MaxScaleDenominator or/and filter operators.




Figure 3. UML Class Diagram of the AreaFeatureTypeStyle extension

AreaFeatureTypeStyle extension

The AreaFeatureTypeStyle extension defines the styling that is to be applied to a single feature type.

This class extends the abstract Style class described in the core. It defines the ability to portray of a Layer built of N instances of GML AbstractFeatureType (Portele, 2007) with the ability to access features according to Simple Feature SF-2 (Van den Brink et al., 2012).

The rendering engine is driven according to the following execution: all features are applied to each symbolizer in sequence as they appear nested in rule and following the “painters model” with the first item in a list being the first item plotted and hence being on the “bottom”.

Name	Definition	Data type and value	Multiplicity
featureTypeName	Identifies the specific feature type that the feature-type style is for	Literal data type	zero or one

To define the access to the exact feature type geometry to style, the extension adds a geometry property to the AreaSymbolizer with the related behaviours (described below for each requirement).

Name	Definition	Data type and value	Multiplicity
geometry	Geometry attribute or sub-element of a geometry attribute (a) added to the Symbolizer	ParameterValue data type Geometry ¹	one

- (a) Add to symbolizer the geometry attribute,
- (b) Features according GML Simple Feature (SF-2 Level).

AreaSymbolizer extension

An AreaSymbolizer is used to symbolize a geometry into an area including filling its interior and stroking its outline. It is typically used for a 2-dimensional geometry (e.g. Polygon).

Name	Definition	Data type and value	Multiplicity
fill	Filling style to draw the interior area	Fill data type	Zero or one
stroke	Stroke style to draw the outline	Stroke data type	Zero or one

- (a) If a geometry has “holes,” then they are not filled, but the borders around the holes are stroked in the usual way if a Stroke parameter is mentioned. “Islands” within holes are filled and stroked, and so on. If a point is used, then a small, square, orthogonal-normal area should be constructed for rendering. If a line is used, then

¹ from <http://www.opengis.net/doc/IS/SFA/6.1.2>

the line (string) is closed for filling (only) by connecting its end point to its start point, any line crossings are corrected in some way, and only the original line is stroked.

- (b) A missing Fill property means that the geometry will not be filled. A missing Stroke property means that the geometry will not be stroked. When both are used, the filling is rendered first and then the stroking rendered on top of the filling.

SolidFill extension

The SolidFill class is a concrete implementation of the Fill class and allows to formulate a filling of an area (e.g. a polygon geometry or any kind of symbol).

Name	Definition	Data type and value	Multiplicity
color	The color to fill the area	Color data type	zero or one
opacity	Opacity of the Color	ParameterValue type (Float) Value: [0;1] (1 means 100% opaque) Default value: 0	zero or one

Note : Any fill implementation can be imagined as for example a TextureFill extension to add a level of artistic control and realism to a surface. For a complex Texture properties a specific Symbolizer could be proposed.

PenStroke extension

The PenStroke extension is a concrete implementation of the Stroke class. It allows to draw a line (e.g. a 1-dimensional geometry, the outline of a marker, etc) analogously to how a pen is used with ink, that is to say by filling the area formed by the thickness of the line.

Name	Definition	Data type and value	Multiplicity
width	Thickness of the line which gives form to an area to fill (a)	ParameterValue data type (Float) Value: [0;+∞) Default value: 1px	zero or one
fill	The filling style to draw the linear area	Fill data type	zero or one

- (a) The Width parameter is in the context of a UnitOfMeasure code (that may be inherited from a parent element).

RGBColor extension

The RGBColor extension is a concrete implementation of the Color class where the color is expressed as three integer properties in conformance with the sRGB standardized color space.

Name	Definition	Data type and value	Multiplicity
red	The red value of the color	ParameterValue data type (Integer) Value: (0;255) Default value: 0	one
green	The green value of the color	ParameterValue data type (Integer) Value: (0;255) Default value: 0	one

blue	The blue value of the color	ParameterValue data type (Integer) Value: (0;255) Default value: 0	one
------	-----------------------------	--	-----

References

Portele C. 2007. OpenGIS® geography markup language (GML) encoding standard, version 3.2.1 (OGC 07-036) (accessed august 2018).

Van den Brink L, Portele C, Vretanos PA. 2012. Geography markup language (GML) simple features profile—with corrigendum (OGC 10-100r3) Wayland: Open Geospatial Consortium, Inc. Technical report (accessed august 2018).

Annex B

A redesign of OGC Symbology Encoding standard for sharing cartography

This annex integrates a paper which does help the reader to understand how the conceptual model can be extended to be realized (core and extensions approach).

Reference: Bocher E, Ertz O. 2018. A redesign of OGC Symbology Encoding standard for sharing cartography. PeerJ Computer Science 4:e143 <https://doi.org/10.7717/peerj-cs.143>

A redesign of OGC Symbology Encoding standard for sharing cartography

Erwan Bocher^{1,*} and Olivier Ertz^{2,*}

¹ CNRS, Lab-STICC Laboratory, UMR 6285, Vannes, France

² Media Engineering Institute, HEIG-VD, University of Applied Sciences and Arts Western Switzerland, Yverdon-les-Bains, Vaud, Switzerland

* These authors contributed equally to this work.

ABSTRACT

Despite most Spatial Data Infrastructures offering service-based visualization of geospatial data, requirements are often at a very basic level leading to poor quality of maps. This is a general observation for any geospatial architecture as soon as open standards as those of the Open Geospatial Consortium (OGC) are applied. To improve the situation, this paper does focus on improvements at the portrayal interoperability side by considering standardization aspects. We propose two major redesign recommendations. First to consolidate the cartographic theory at the core of the OGC Symbology Encoding standard. Secondly to build the standard in a modular way so as to be ready to be extended with upcoming future cartographic requirements. Thus, we start by defining portrayal interoperability by means of typical-use cases that frame the concept of sharing cartography. Then we bring to light the strengths and limits of the relevant open standards to consider in this context. Finally we propose a set of recommendations to overcome the limits so as to make these use cases a true reality. Even if the definition of a cartographic-oriented standard is not able to act as a complete cartographic design framework by itself, we argue that pushing forward the standardization work dedicated to cartography is a way to share and disseminate good practices and finally to improve the quality of the visualizations.

Subjects Spatial and Geographic Information Systems, World Wide Web and Web Science

Keywords Cartography, Spatial Data Infrastructure, Open standards, Portrayal interoperability, Open Geospatial Consortium

Submitted 31 May 2017
Accepted 1 December 2017
Published 8 January 2018

Corresponding author
Olivier Ertz, olivier.ertz@heig-vd.ch

Academic editor
Gabriella Pasi

Additional Information and
Declarations can be found on
page 27

DOI [10.7717/peerj-cs.143](https://doi.org/10.7717/peerj-cs.143)

© Copyright
2018 Bocher and Ertz

Distributed under
Creative Commons CC-BY 4.0

OPEN ACCESS

INTRODUCTION

Given how good geospatial technologies take advantage of the constant evolution of information and communication technologies, Spatial Data Infrastructure (SDI) appeared as a new paradigm in geospatial data handling. It extends desktop GIS (*Craglia, 2010*) where data collected by other organizations can be searched, retrieved and manipulated for several usages (*Tóth et al., 2012*). Many regional, national and international initiatives have setup well-defined access policies to promote the arrangement of SDI because location information is important in managing everything that a governance has to organize.

Currently, several SDI initiatives are particularly well implemented to encourage data discovery and sharing across different communities with various applications. Also service-based visualization of geospatial data is part of the SDI components. In the case of

INSPIRE, the infrastructure for spatial information in Europe, requirements are defined at a basic level according to *INSPIRE Drafting Team (2014)*, in section 16, and *INSPIRE Drafting Team (2008)* in section A.11, which defines only general portrayal rules as recommendations. As an example, we may notice the technical guidelines on geology (*INSPIRE Thematic Working Group Geology, 2013*) which does not specify styles required to be supported by INSPIRE view services (section 11.2) but only recommended styles, often simple to excess, just defining some color tables, stroke width and color, spacing for dashed lines and graphic patterns to repeat in a surface or over a line. These are relatively simple to render with current implementation standards in use. Extreme simplicity may be intentional for some cases, but it may also reveal limitations from these implementation standards as soon as styles resulting from a cartographic design are more complex (*Ertz, 2013*). As a consequence, according to *Hopfstock & Grünreich (2009)*, with cartographic rules defined at such a basic level, portrayal seems to be considered as a concern of second zone, almost ignoring “the importance of visualization for transforming spatial data into useful GI.” Even worse, some contemporary maps coming from SDI exhibit a serious lack of knowledge in cartography with many map-makers repeating some basic mistakes. Such as maps from *Eurostat/Regional Statistics (2017)* where population is represented as a choropleth map (e.g., population on 1st of January in NUTS 2 regions). *Field (2014)* points out that the current demand is for quantity, not for quality, and it is the Internet (not the discipline of cartography) which is reacting to this demand.

Hopfstock & Grünreich (2009) underline that poor map design results are the consequence of a “too technology- and/or data-driven approach” and propose improvements by making the cartographic design knowledge explicit and operational. Beside such a relevant proposition at the design level, this paper has a focus on the implementation level by making portrayal interoperability operational through the improvement of the open standards dedicated to cartography. Indeed, interoperability is key for SDI as interconnected computing systems that can work together to accomplish a common task. And the presence of open standards is required to allow these different systems to communicate with each other without depending on a particular actor (*Sykora et al., 2007*). The common task presently in question is about the ability for a user community interconnected by interoperable systems to share a cartography used for the authoring of a map. That is, not only the result of a cartographic rendering built of a set of pixels, but also the underlying cartographic instructions which describe how the map is authored. We can figure out how such an ability would participate to empower all types of users, from the cartographic professionals to data artists, journalists and coders (*Field, 2014*) to gain useful geographical information by means of cartographic visualizations. An ability that contributes to the power of maps, from tools which enable the sharing of spatial information and knowledge, to collaboration through shared creativity and skills transfer between “producers” for better decision making (*Bruns, 2013*).

For cartographic portrayal interoperability, many SDI policies, like *INSPIRE Drafting Team (2014)*, advise the use of standards from Open Geospatial Consortium (OGC) like the Styled Layer Descriptor (SLD) (*Lupp, 2007*) and Symbology Encoding (SE)

specifications (Müller, 2006), but it seems these standards were not able to bring to reality the above vision that goes as far as considering SDI as open participation platforms. We might blame the fact that moving from closed monolithic applications to open distributed systems is still under way (Sykora et al., 2007) and that cartography must take effect providing a methodology with a user-oriented approach (Hopfstock & Grünreich, 2009). But this paper wants to show how it is also important to have syntactic portrayal interoperability operational with a mature open specification able to standardize the cartographic instructions. We show that the current OGC SE standard does offer limited capabilities for describing cartographic symbolizations. Then, while we develop some recommendations to improve the situation through more capabilities to customize the map symbology, we also propose some good practices to favor the adoption of the standard by implementors so as to make it really operational for the long term. We believe that these propositions should lead to rich cartographic portrayal interoperability, going further than basic styles. There is no reason SDI users have to be satisfied with often unsuitable maps.

FROM MAP DESIGN TO PORTRAYAL INTEROPERABILITY

Clearly, many definitions and types of map exist. As Tyner (2010) writes “We all know what a map is, but that definition can vary from person to person and culture to culture.” However, many of them do share the idea of a map as an intellectual construction that is based on the experience and knowledge of the cartographer to manipulate data input according initial hypotheses and its capacity to play with graphic signs (Slocum et al., 2009; Tyner, 2010). Furthermore, even if the definition is hard to settle, cartographers have also worked to formalize map syntactics by developing symbol categories and rules to combine them. Visual variables are symbols that can be applied to data in order to reveal information. Largely based on the Bertin & Berg (2010) classification, several cartographic authors agree with a set of commons visual variables (Carpendale, 2003; MacEachren, 2004; Tyner, 2010): shape, size, hue (color), value, texture, orientation (Fig. 1).

To create a map, they are individually manipulated or piled up by the cartographer in the process to visually map information about point, line and area features to visual variables (MacEachren, 2004; Slocum et al., 2009). This visual mapping is an embellishment design to improve the aesthetic quality and express efficiently a message (Wood & Fels, 1992). Even if creating map is an aesthetical exercise it is also a science that must respect some rules to make sure that the representation is accurate. A de facto set of best practices based on visual variables has been accepted by the academy of cartographers (Montello, 2002; McMaster & McMaster, 2002). As Bertin & Berg (2010) explains, the choice of the “right” visual variable, which would be most appropriate to represent each aspect of information, depends on the type of geographical object but also its characteristics (MacEachren, 2004; Nicolas & Christine, 2013). For example, like the statistical nature of the data (qualitative, quantitative), raw data must be represented with proportional symbols and a density of values by an areal classification (i.e., a choropleth map).




Figure 1 The visual variables of symbols.

Full-size DOI: 10.7717/peerj-cs.143/fig-1

These map syntactics are the results of the mainstream cartographic theory and the related design knowledge that help to understand how and why certain displays are more successful for spatial inference and decision making than others. This subject is an important issue to improve map quality at the design phase (*Hopfstock & Grünreich, 2009*). But also at the implementation phase, the theory related to these visual variables to compose map symbols is suitable to drive the definition of a standardized styling language that must be functionally designed and implemented into the geospatial tools making up SDI.

In order to explain how such a standardized styling language is an essential piece to enable cartographic portrayal interoperability, let us clarify the related concept of sharing cartography. We consider four use cases typical of sharing levels:

- **Level 1: discover**

At this level, SDI users discover pre-styled and ready to be visualized map layers, eventually coming from different systems, they can combine to build a map. For example, it corresponds to the classical geoportal applications offering the user to discover and explore prepared maps and combine prepared layers from various thematics (e.g., map.geo.admin.ch). Typically, it does also match with the story of the fictive SDI user Mr Tüftel in the Web Portrayal Services book (*Andrae et al., 2011*). Mr Tüftel wants to unify on the same map the water pipes from his municipality but also the pipes from the municipalities in the neighborhood. These are different data sources he wants to combine in his everyday GIS tool. Finally, during the discovery of

some cartographic facets, the user gains knowledge of the potential of the underlying data sources hosted by the different systems.

- **Level 2: author**

Starting from level 1, the potential of the underlying data sources may give to the SDI user some ideas of analytical process which requires to create a new style different from the default. For example, this is useful for Mr Tüftel in the case he would like to create a unified map of water pipes, but with the problem of getting different visualizations of the pipes (e.g., different colors) from the different municipalities. He would then author a common style (e.g., same color) so as to take the control of the whole rendering process. Even further, Mr Tüftel may enrich the analytical process and take benefit of an extra underlying data that classifies each pipe according to its function (either wastewater or rainwater). He would then author a new style (e.g., orange color for wastewater pipes, blue color for rainwater pipes) so as to produce a suitable map to decide where to build the intercommunal water treatment plant.

Starting from level 2 some specific use cases become relevant:

- **Level 3: catalog**

It is about having at disposal style catalogs offering ready-to-use styles, often tailored for specific thematics, e.g., noise mapping color palettes (*EPA, 2011*). The ability to import such a specialized symbology into users' tool just avoid to reinvent the wheel in the sense of re-creating the style from scratch. By analogy, the catalog style use case is similar to how the OGC Catalog Service for metadata works.

- **Level 4: collaborate**

The context of this use case is wider and involves several SDI users into a collaborative authoring process. Several users contribute to the creation of a common map, each user having specialized skills to complement one another so as to tell stories as maps, each using her(his) own software (*Ertz, Julien & Bocher, 2012*). In other words, cartographic portrayal interoperability enable the freedom to the users to work with the tools they are most comfortable and productive with. Also, we may notice the educational capacity of this use case. Considering a team of people with different levels of skills in cartography, there are offered the chance to share them.

As pointed out by *Iosifescu-Enescu, Hugentobler & Hurni (2010)*, “the use of standardized exchange languages is commonly considered as the most practical solution for interoperability especially when it is required to collate resources, like data, from various systems,” but also when it is to take the control of a distributed cartographic rendering process. Definitely, starting from level 2, the definition of a standardized styling language is essential to share cartography: that is the underlying cartographic instruction, what we call the symbology code which constitutes a style that describes how a map is authored. Such a definition can be achieved in the same way *Iosifescu-Enescu & Hurni (2007)* try to define a cartographic ontology by considering that “the building blocks for digital map-making are the primary visual variables (color, opacity, texture, orientation, arrangement, shape, size, focus) and the patterns (arrangement, texture, and




Figure 2 The four stages of the cartographic map design, inspired from *Nicolas & Christine (2013)*.

Full-size DOI: 10.7717/peerj-cs.143/fig-2

orientation).” Also, another starting point is to consider a map (either general-purpose maps, special-purpose maps or thematic maps) as being composed of some graphic elements (either geometric primitives or pictorial elements). This approach matches the OGC SE standard which is the standardized styling language (*Lupp, 2007*) in question here: a style is applied on a dataset to render a map considering a composition of possible symbol elements (called Symbolizer) that carry graphical properties (equivalent to visual variables).

So as to complete the definition of cartographic portrayal interoperability, *Fig. 2* shows that such a styling language is at the core of the third stage of the cartographic pipeline, the one dedicated to the style rendering. Thus it is to notice that the map layout design which configures a title, a legend, a north arrow, a scale bar, etc. (*Peterson, 2009*), is out of our scope, as well as the preprocessing stage which is dedicated to the preparation of the dataset to visualize. As an example, building an anamorphic map requires a preliminary processing to generate consistent geometries with preserved shape and topology before styling them.

The next part does focus on the technical aspects about how current open standards are able or not to fully meet the conditions of such a cartographic portrayal interoperability.

OPEN STANDARDS FOR SHARING CARTOGRAPHY

Given the concept of sharing cartography defined by the above four use cases, let us see what are the possibilities and limits to implement them using OGC standards.




Figure 3 Discovery of ready to be visualized map layers with OGC WMS standard.

Full-size DOI: 10.7717/peerj-cs.143/fig-3




Figure 4 Visualization of the grid of map sheets of Switzerland (1:25,000) through a default cartographic style showing a choropleth symbology based on the year of edition of the sheet.

Full-size DOI: 10.7717/peerj-cs.143/fig-4

Use case “discover”

The OGC Web Map Service (WMS) standard (*De la Beaujardiere, 2006*) is currently the only widely accepted open standard for map visualization which standardizes the way for Web clients to request maps with predefined symbolization (*Iosifescu-Enescu, Hugentobler & Hurni, 2010*). This ability, as illustrated with *Fig. 3*, does match the use case level 1 allowing to discover ready-to-visualize map layers and to combine them to build maps.




Figure 5 Authoring of user style to visualize map layers with OGC WMS/SLD and SE standards.

Full-size DOI: 10.7717/peerj-cs.143/fig-5

Just send a simple GetMap request to the Swisstopo WMS server to get a predefined colored map layer to overlay in your web mapping application (Fig. 4):

<https://wms.geo.admin.ch/?SERVICE=WMS&VERSION=1.0.0&REQUEST=GetMap&FORMAT=image/png&LAYERS=ch.swisstopo.pixelkarte-pk25.metadata-kartenblatt&SRS=EPSG:21781&STYLES=&WIDTH=1895&HEIGHT=1185&BBOX=475000,68000,854000,305000>

The WMS GetMap operation allows to choose one of the internal styles prepared for a layer by a map-maker (parameter STYLES). Each style is related to one or more datasets attached to the WMS server and ready to be used by an end-user.

Use case “author”

The analysis of the use case level 2 described in chapter 2 shows that it is required to establish an open framework able to facilitate decision making through customized maps. *Iosifescu-Enescu (2007)* does underline that the WMS standard combined with the SLD profile and the SE is able to fulfill such a requirement. The ability to drive remotely the authoring of visualizations is fundamental for this use case, for example to fulfill the cartographic requirements of Mr Tüftel. He does not want to download the spatial data, he just wants to adjust the visualization according to his specific needs (Fig. 5).

Just send the below WMS/SLD request which has a reference to a style file. This latter includes some SE instructions which allow to get a customized visualization (Fig. 6):

<https://wms.geo.admin.ch/?SERVICE=WMS&VERSION=1.0.0&REQUEST=GetMap&FORMAT=image/png&LAYERS=ch.swisstopo.pixelkarte-pk25.metadata-kartenblatt&SRS=EPSG:21781&STYLES=&WIDTH=1895&HEIGHT=1185&BBOX=475000,68000,854000,305000&SLD=http://my.server/style.sld>

The WMS/SLD GetMap operation allows to reference a style authored by the user client, either hosted on an external server (parameter SLD) or directly sent with the WMS request (parameter SLD_BODY).

```
<?xml version="1.0" encoding="UTF-8" standalone="yes"?>
<StyledLayerDescriptor version="1.0.0"
  xmlns="http://www.opengis.net/sld"
  xmlns:ogc="http://www.opengis.net/ogc"
  xmlns:xsi="http://www.w3.org/2001/XMLSchema-instance"
  xsi:schemaLocation="http://www.opengis.net/sld
  http://schemas.opengis.net/sld/1.0.0/StyledLayerDescriptor.xsd">

  <NamedLayer>
    <Name>ch.swisstopo.pixelkarte-pk25.metadata-kartenblatt</Name>
    <UserStyle>
      <Name>LabelBlattnummer</Name>
      <FeatureTypeStyle>
        <Rule>
          <PolygonSymbolizer>
            <Fill>
              <CssParameter name="fill">#FFFF00</CssParameter>
            </Fill>
            <Stroke>
              <CssParameter name="stroke">#333333</CssParameter>
              <CssParameter name="stroke-width">2</CssParameter>
            </Stroke>
          </PolygonSymbolizer>
          <TextSymbolizer>
            <Label>
              <ogc:PropertyName>Blattnummer</ogc:PropertyName>
            </Label>
            <Font>
              <CssParameter name="font-family">arial</CssParameter>
              <CssParameter name="font-size">18</CssParameter>
            </Font>
            <Fill>
              <CssParameter name="fill">#000000</CssParameter>
            </Fill>
          </TextSymbolizer>
        </Rule>
      </FeatureTypeStyle>
    </UserStyle>
  </NamedLayer>
</StyledLayerDescriptor>
```


by the above use case levels. These standards are quite largely adopted by server-side rendering systems. It can be explained because SLD is a WMS application profile which is web service oriented. Indeed, [Andrae et al. \(2011\)](#) redraws the OGC portrayal model by showing clearly SLD as the web interface to take control of the rendering engine behind the WMS service. But in 2005, the WMS/SLD 1.1 profile has been released in particular with the aim to extract the symbology instructions into a dedicated standard, the SE standard (SE 1.1). As a consequence, while the SLD profile stays strongly related to WMS service, it is no longer the case for the symbology instructions which can now be used by any styling software component, not only by WMS/SLD.

Nonetheless, at the desktop-side there are only few software which correctly and completely implement SE standard together with a graphical user interface to (re)work styles. Indeed, according to [Bocher et al. \(2011\)](#) many implementations have a conformance that is often not fully observed leading to interoperability defects in term of rendering quality. Apart from inherent bugs and dysfunctions of a tool, several reasons can explain this general situation.

- Due to a partial implementation—see MapServer implementation ([McKenna, 2011](#)), there are unimplemented symbology instructions, e.g., linejoin and linecap of LineSymbolizer;
- Due to the existence of two versions of symbology instructions between SLD 1.0 and SE 1.1, these tools may not check this correctly which causes parsing problems of the XML encoding;
- Due to the divergent reading of what the SE 1.1 standard tries to specify which may result in different graphical visualizations (it means there are uncomplete or ambiguous explanations in the specification—like the MarkIndex capability which doesn't specify anything on how to select an individual glyph);
- Related to the previous point, there is currently no substantial testsuite within the OGC Compliance and Interoperability Testing Initiative (“CITE”) to help to disambiguate and test the graphical rendering conformance of an implementation. Beyond encoding validity and level of conformance of an implementation (range of supported capabilities), visual interpretation is essential (see Annex A in [Müller \(2006\)](#)). For instance, by comparing the output of a system to test with the output of the reference implementation.

While the above arguments do show how it is essential to have a common styling language (currently in the name of OGC SE 1.1), this importance is accentuated by the fact that many changes and proposals have been received by the standard working group (SWG), in particular from the scientific community ([Duarte Teixeira, De Melo Cuba & Mizuta Weiss, 2005](#); [Cooper, Sykora & Hurni, 2005](#); [Sykora et al., 2007](#); [Dietze & Zipf, 2007](#); [Sae-Tang & Ertz, 2007](#); [Schnabel & Hurni, 2007](#); [Mays, 2012](#); [Iosifescu-Enescu, Hugentobler & Hurni, 2010](#); [Bocher et al., 2011](#); [Rita, Borbinha & Martins, 2012](#); [Bocher & Ertz, 2015](#)). All these works share a common claim about enhancing SE. It seems the communities of users were frustrated because no substantial new symbology capabilities

have been introduced with the release of SE 1.1 except transformations functions. Moreover, [Bocher et al. \(2011\)](#) and [Bocher & Ertz \(2015\)](#), explain that these only new and few capabilities (interpolate, recode, categorize functions) cause confusions and even some regressions.

For instance, despite all the good intentions, there are several limits that come out from the introduction of the categorize function (defined by SE 1.1 standard as the transformation of continuous values to distinct values, e.g., useful to build choropleth maps):

- The definition seems to only match a requirement emphasized by Jenks ([Slocum et al., 2009](#)) that classes must cover all the possible values of the dataset and must not be discontinuous. However, such a definition has limits considering optimal methods like the Jenks–Fisher classification or Maximum Breaks classifications that may produce intervals with gaps ([Slocum et al., 2009](#)) and that it is often better to use the lowest value of the dataset as the minimum value of the first interval rather than negative infinity;
- The categorize function is redundant with the concept of Rule of the SE standard. Moreover, the latter does offer wider possibilities to define precisely value intervals (minimum/maximum values instead of negative/positive infinite, non-contiguous intervals, interval as singleton);
- Similarly, the RasterSymbolizer concept used to control the styling of raster data has been reduced because of the ColorMapEntry concept from SLD 1.0 has been replaced by the categorize transformation function;
- Finally, the introduction of categorize function has also removed from SLD 1.0 the capability to associate a label to an interval when it is an important requirement to have such an information to build a map legend.

Along the same lines, the many proposed extensions of SLD and SE standards have to be analyzed. The purpose is to identify how these cartographic enhancements are relevant for the redesign of the SE standard. By way of other examples, [Sae-Tang & Ertz \(2007\)](#) describe four new possibilities to generate thematic maps (CategoryThematicSymbolizer, SimpleThematicSymbolizer, MultiThematicSymbolizer, ChartThematicSymbolizer). A similar approach appears in [Dietze & Zipf \(2007\)](#) (DiagramSymbolizer and ChoroplethSymbolizer) and in [Iosifescu-Enescu, Hugentobler & Hurni \(2010\)](#) to support various diagram types (e.g., pie charts, bar diagrams) to fulfill the complex visualization requirements coming from environmental management.

Also, the specific options introduced within the XSD schemas by some off-the-shelf geospatial software (e.g., “GeoServer”) have to be considered. Of course the extensible nature of XML is convenient to add cartographic capabilities to implement in the software, but it may at the same time also create some non-interoperable defects. Clearly, it seems SE 1.1 has never been designed with modularization and extensibility in mind and there are no explicit extension points defined in the underlying symbology model. Moreover, the SE standard does currently only offer one XML-based encoding and strongly linked to XML modeling principles ([Fig. 9](#)). As a consequence, it may be




Figure 9 The physical symbology model of SE formalized with XML Schema Definition.

Full-size  DOI: 10.7717/peerj-cs.143/fig-9

difficult for cartographic communities and developers having different encoding preferences (e.g., CSS-like or JSON-based) to get a chance to observe conformance. Indeed, while there is a general trend to dislike XML, other encodings seem to be in fashion, like the YAML-based YSLD styling language proposed by *GeoServer (2017)* in addition to the support of OGC SLD standard, or the CSS-derived styling languages MapCSS (*OpenStreetMap, 2017*) or CartoCSS styling language from *Mapbox (2017)*, although it seems already old-fashioned (*MacWright, 2016*). Also, there are major proponents of an encoding which would make a wider use of relevant and famous graphical standards like SVG, just like OWS Context does use the famous Atom syndication format (*Brackin & Gonçalves, 2014*). Beyond the trends, there is no consensus by now.




Figure 10 Recommendation for a minimal symbology core.

Full-size DOI: 10.7717/peerj-cs.143/fig-10

To conclude this chapter, while there are clear possibilities to implement the four levels of sharing cartography, it is also clear that a revision of the common styling language played by the SE standard is required. Three major requirements have to be considered:

- Enrich the standard with new cartographic capabilities inline with the evolution of the needs coming from the map-makers community;
- Redesign the underlying symbology model of the standard so as to be modular and extensible for the long-term;
- Consider the possibility to have other encodings than XML.

The next chapter does develop some proposals to fulfill these requirements.

PROPOSALS

The overall purpose is to make standards dedicated to cartography (in particular SE) more attractive by turning them into “a really useful (cartographic) engine,” quoting the nod to Thomas the Tank Engine alluded by the OGC “Specification Model—A Standard for Modular specifications” document (*Policy SWG, 2009*), called the modular spec in below.

Before compiling all the Change Requests collected by the SLD/SE SWG, one question does arise: how to plug a new requested ability in the standard? One first and fundamental recommendation is then to consider the modular spec whose release 1.0 has been edited in 2009, at the time the SE standard was already released and thus not in compliance with. Indeed, the modular spec specifies generic rules to organize the internal logical structure of the standard in a modular way so as to strengthen the guarantee of a useful and worth standard easy to implement but also to extend.

Modular structure: one symbology core, many symbology extensions

The modular spec fittingly suggests modularity with the idea of a standard built of one simple core and many extensions which expand the functionality of the specification. Applied to a new revision of the SE standard, the definition of a symbology core requires first to “reverse design” the underlying symbology model of SE 1.1. After which, the concrete symbology capabilities have to be extracted and split into many relevant extensions while taking care of dependencies. The proposed minimal symbology core illustrated by [Fig. 10](#) is partially abstract and defined according to the following concepts:

- The Style concept, in charge of the cartographic portrayal of a collection of features stored within a Layer by applying at least one symbology Rule. A feature is described as an abstraction of real world phenomena as defined by GML standard (*Portele, 2007*);

- The rendering does run feature per feature using a “one drawing pass” engine;
- Each Rule may be scale filtered and does hold at least one Symbolizer;
- Each Symbolizer does describe the graphical parameters for drawing the features (visual variables);
- The Style, Rule and Symbolizer concepts hold parameters which are literal values.

Some of the concepts are defined as abstract (in yellow and with italic names in Fig. 10) so as to be considered as extension points. Actually, regarding this, we may notice that [Craig \(2009\)](#) does request a similar concept by the use of XML abstract elements which may than be considered as extension points.

Now that the core is ready, some surrounding extensions may be defined so that the engine is really able to perform a rendering. Indeed, alone, the core does not concretely “do” anything. As an example, let us introduce the AreaSymbolizer extension which holds a simple and classical symbolizer, call it the AreaSymbolizer concept which describes the graphical parameters for drawing polygonal features with outlined and filled surface areas. The aim of the below explanations is to illustrate with a simple example the extension mechanism and how extension points are expanded.

At first, it is defined that the AreaSymbolizer extension has a dependency with the FeatureTypeStyle extension and the related concepts:

- The FeatureTypeStyle specialization of the Style core concept;
- The portrayal of a Layer built of N instances of GML AbstractFeatureType ([Portele, 2007](#));
- The ability to access features according to Simple Feature SF-2 ([Van den Brink, Portele & Vretanos, 2012](#));
- The geometry parameter to each Symbolizer extension that depends on this extension (in this case the AreaSymbolizer extension).

Then, given that the geometry parameter is defined with a dependency on the ValueReference extension, the ValueReference specialization of the ParameterValue core concept is introduced. In a general way, when a parameter has to be assigned with a value, ValueReference does introduce the ability to reference the value extracted from a data attribute of a feature. This is useful when a FeatureType does hold many geometry properties and allows to reference the one to be used by the renderer.

Finally, the AreaSymbolizer extension itself is required, holding the AreaSymbolizer specialization of the Symbolizer core concept. Called PolygonSymbolizer in SE 1.1 and correctly renamed AreaSymbolizer by [Craig \(2009\)](#), it does introduce:

- The symbology ability to draw a surface area according to a filling and an outline;
- The dependency on the FeatureTypeStyle, Fill and Stroke extensions;
- The ability to reference the geometry data attribute to be drawn (by means of its dependency on the FeatureTypeStyle extension).




Figure 11 Concepts to implement so as to observe conformance with the AreaSymbolizer extension. Full-size [DOI: 10.7717/peerj-cs.143/fig-11](https://doi.org/10.7717/peerj-cs.143/fig-11)

In consequence, an implementation that wants to observe conformance with the AreaSymbolizer extension requires to implement and drive its rendering engine according to all the concepts of the core (thin outline in Fig. 11) and the AreaSymbolizer concept with all the other concepts required by dependencies (bold outline in Fig. 11).

Nonetheless, even at this point, a rendering engine would neither concretely “do” anything. Indeed, the implementation has then to offer choices related to the filling and the outline. Some more concrete capabilities have to be implemented, for instance with (dashed outline in Fig. 11):

- The SolidFill concept, a Fill specialization which introduces the graphical ability to define a solid color value combined with an opacity;
- The PenStroke concept, a Stroke specialization which introduces the graphical ability to draw a continuous or dashed line with or without join and cap;
- The dependent abstract Color concept (and again a concrete choice of color definition has to be done, like with the RGBColor concept which defines a color in the sRGB color space with three integer values).

Having this modularity approach for long term extensibility applied to all the symbolizer concepts, past, present and future, an implementation can with ease manage step by step the evolution of the conformance level of its technical implementation of the standard.

One encoding-neutral conceptual model, many encodings

Currently, SE 1.1 offers a physical model using XML Schema Definition and, at the same time, a natural encoding based on XML. The initial motivation explaining the below recommendation is related to the fact that there is not only XML, but also many other flavors of encoding, JSON-like, CSS-like, YAML-like among many others it is possible to imagine. The important for portrayal interoperability is not the encoding, it is rather the




Figure 12 Extract of the proposed symbology model.

Full-size DOI: 10.7717/peerj-cs.143/fig-12

symbology model. That is why the “one encoding-neutral model/many encodings” approach is promising to favor a large adoption of the standard.

This approach has on one side the encoding-neutral model formalized using UML notations, it can be considered as conceptual. With a class diagram, it does describe the portrayal concepts, their relationships, the modular organization, the extension points and the dependencies. We may notice that UML is often preferred when some work is about the design of portrayal concepts. In *Zipf (2005)*, a simplified version of the underlying symbology model of SE 1.1 is depicted as an UML class diagram. Moreover, *Craig (2009)* does suggest to avoid the XSD attribute concept in the XML encoding so as to be more portable to other structuring languages which do not have the unusual attribute concept of XML Schema, UML in particular. These are more arguments that are in favor of defining at first a conceptual and encoding-neutral model (Fig. 12).

Consequently, doors are open to offer a variety of encodings. Each encoding does translate into a format the UML notations according to mapping rules. At least one

default encoding and following the OGC tradition, XML may be this default encoding. It is up to the SWG to define the mapping rules to translate the semantic of the conceptual model into XML Schema definitions. Indeed, as noticed by [Lonjon, Thomasson & Maesano \(2006\)](#), the translation from UML to XML requires a thoughtful analysis of the conceptual model so as to define the global mapping rules (e.g., translate a specialization relationship using static or dynamic typing? how to translate a concrete class, an abstract class, the various types of associations? when using attributes or elements?, etc.). Thus, UML and XML are together a winning combination two times inline with the modular specification which recommend UML “If the organizing mechanism for the data model used in the specification is an object model” and XML “for any specification which has as one of its purposes the introduction of a new XML schema.”

Of course, all these questions related to the mapping rules have to be considered for each encoding offered with the standard. We may notice that the OWS Context SWG adopted a similar approach, offering the default encoding based on XML Atom and planning to provide an OWS Context JSON Encoding soon, according to [Brackin & Gonçalves \(2014\)](#).

Style management and parametrized symbolizer

Beyond the tempting recommendation to reintroduce the WMS/SLD GetStyles and PutStyles methods, the management of a catalog of styles has to be expanded. Thus, [Craig \(2009\)](#) does suggest the introduction of a mechanism to reference the definition of a Symbolizer hosted within a catalog. Moreover, the report does enrich the referencing with a symbolizer-parameterization mechanism so as to offer complete symbolizer re-usability between different, incompatible feature types. It consists of a list of formal-parameter names and an argument list.

It is to notice that such a mechanism does fit the one specified by [ISO \(2012\)](#) in term of parameterized symbol built of dynamic parameters. Thus, in a general way, it is recommended to consider what ISO has already specified concerning the concepts of “collection of symbols and portrayal functions into portrayal catalog.”

Concerning this aspect of style management, the proposal suggests to continue the conceptual work by blending together all these recommendations: reintroduce GetStyles/PutStyles and introduce the mechanism of symbolizer-parameterization inline with [ISO \(2012\)](#).

New symbolization capabilities

Among the many symbology capabilities that can be extracted from the pending Change Requests at OGC and the research works, we list below (non exhaustively) some relevant ones. Considering the modular structure (see A), each of these capabilities is an extension (e.g., HatchFill is an extension of the Fill abstract concept, just as SolidFill):

- UnitOfMeasure: current SE 1.1 standard does only offer two ground units (meter and foot) and one portrayal unit (pixel, which is also not an absolute unit of measure).

It may be relevant to add at least three additional units to make measurements more

portable between styling representations and rendering environments: portrayal millimeters and inches as printing measurements, and portrayal (printer's) points commonly used for font sizes;

- Transformations: currently, SE 1.1 standard does offer only locally few transformations capabilities (translation of a polygon or graphic, rotation of a graphic). It may be relevant to spread out all kind of general affine transformations like Translate, Rotate, Scale, Matrix using homogeneous coordinates on geometries and graphics;
- Functions: currently, SE 1.1 standard does extend the concept of ogc:expression inherited from the deprecated Filter Encoding 1.1 standard ([Vretanos, 2001](#)) to adequately support the needs of symbolization in transforming (categorization, recoding, and interpolation) and editing data (formatting numbers, strings and dates). It may be relevant to directly use the function definition mechanism of Filter Encoding 2.0 standard ([Vretanos, 2010](#)) rather re-inventing such a mechanism ([Craig, 2009](#));
- CompoundStroke: current SE 1.1 standard does offer simple stroke just like with a pen (optionally with dash pattern) or the linear repetition of a graphic. It may be relevant to allow multiple graphic and/or simpler strokes to be combined together along the linear path. It is interesting to produce complex stroke styles such as rendering a sequence of graphic icons along a line or drawing simple dashed lines between boat-anchor icons ([Craig, 2009](#));
- CompositeSymbolizer: currently, grouping of symbolizers is only possible in relation with a rule, eventually driven by a filter. It may be relevant to manage descendant symbolizers as a single unit separately from the definition of a rule. Having a dedicated concept for grouping symbolizers does make the logical grouping more explicit and allows a group of symbolizers to be remotely referenced (see the SymbolizerReference concept in [Craig \(2009\)](#));
- HatchFill: currently, SE 1.1 standard allows one color filling and the repetition of a graphic to fill an area. It may be relevant to add cross hatching, a method of area filling which is often used and has so simple parameters that it should be established as another filling variety. It is required to allow the configuration of such a filling in a way conventional in cartography, otherwise the user would be forced to emulate cross hatching by fiddling with the GraphicFill concept;
- DiagramSymbolizer: current SE 1.1 standard does allow the use of graphics generated externally (e.g., static image) or well-known shapes or font glyph whose color can be set internally. It may be relevant to allow the internal definition of more complex diagram symbolization of geographic features like "Pie," "Bar," "Line," "Area," "Ring," and "Polar" charts. Indeed, it is a usual and effective way of visualizing statistical data ([Iosifescu-Enescu, 2007](#));
- Multiple drawing pass: current SE 1.1 standard does describe a one drawing pass rendering (driven by applying symbolizers in the order they are defined by the style and according to rules and filters). It may be relevant to better control the rendering with the capabilities to order the level of symbol rendering (e.g., to draw nicely connected highway symbols).




Figure 13 OrbisGIS dynamic module system with OSGi.

Full-size DOI: 10.7717/peerj-cs.143/fig-13

REFERENCE IMPLEMENTATION

The OrbisGIS platform has been used to prototype an implementation of the symbology model all along the standardization work by iterations with tests and validations (Bocher & Petit, 2015). In the long term, this platform might be adopted as a reference implementation at the OGC (“CITE”).

OrbisGIS is a Geographical Information System designed by and for research (Bocher & Petit, 2013) which is the main advantage for research communities comparing to other GIS. Indeed, OrbisGIS does not intend to reproduce classical GIS functionalities. It is designed to explore new issues or questions in the field of geospatial techniques and methods (such as language issues to query spatial information and issues on cartography about standardization, semantics and user interface design). To address these challenges, the OrbisGIS architecture (object and data model) and its user interface are frequently redesigned. This approach is fundamental to test the concepts and the ideas related to the ongoing standardization process of symbology standards at OGC. Furthermore, the fact that we have a common set of GIS features organized with the dynamic module system OSGi to access to the geodata, library to use simple features functions, layer model, rendering engine, etc. (OSGi, 2014), gives flexibility to plug some experimental code without breaking the platform and the user can easily switch from one to another plugin (Fig. 13). More importantly, the usage of OSGi technology does offer a way to implement the modularization principles depicted in the above (i.e., one OSGi bundle per symbology extension).

Another motivation is related to the license. OrbisGIS is an open source software, distributed under the GPL3 license and therefore grants four freedoms (1) to run the program for any purpose, (2) to study how the program works and adapt it to your needs,




Figure 14 Main sequences of the rendering engine. [Full-size](#) DOI: 10.7717/peerj-cs.143/fig-14

(3) to redistribute copies so you can help your neighbour, and (4) to improve the program, and to release your improvements to the public, so that the whole community benefits (*Steiniger & Hunter, 2012*).

This aspect is essential in order to have a reference implementation available for the community of implementers of a standard, guiding them better in the understanding of a specification. Given the core principle of science that having open source code available does enable reproducibility (*Ertz, Rey & Joost, 2014*), we argue that this is also valid for open standards. On one side, it is easy for other researchers and businesses to verify and re-use new developments and adapt them to their needs (*Steiniger & Hunter, 2012*). Furthermore, having the code of the rendering engine, the user interfaces and all the tests fully accessible should facilitate the understanding and the dissemination of standards for portrayal interoperability while minimizing interoperability defects. In the following we describe the main aspects covered by OrbisGIS to implement the proposed redesign of the symbology model.

XML encoding/decoding

In the context of a prototyping iteration, the symbology model presented in the chapter 4 has been transposed to a XSD schema (*Maxence et al., 2017*). The Java Architecture for XML Binding (*Ort & Mehta, 2003*) library is used to generate the XSD schema-derived Java binding classes. Finally, a Java Style Object Model is built. Thus, symbology instructions are stored in a style file using XML encoding and is parsed prior to be applied by the rendering engine.

Rendering engine

The rendering engine is a OSGi bundle whose mechanism is divided into 12 sequences (*Fig. 14*):

- (1) User interface event to draw a map.
- (2) The renderer engine gets the style file that contains the symbology instructions.

- (3, 4 and 5) The style file is read by the XML parser to create the Java Style Object Model composed of rules and symbols.
- (6) The renderer engine starts to draw the style object looping over each rules.
- (7) Each rule is scanned to check if a filter must be applied. The filter condition (e.g., select all values greater than . . .) is prepared for each symbolizer of the rule.
- (8) The renderer engine starts to draw all symbols available in the Java Style Object Model.
- (9) Each symbol reads the data source on which the style must be applied.
- (10) A set of features according to the potential filter constraint of the symbolizer is returned (including geometries and data attributes).
- (11) The symbols are filled with the features properties to create the graphic elements and visual variables.
- (12) Finally, the renderer engine displays the style as a map image.

User interfaces

OrbisGIS offers two kind of user interfaces for configuring the map styles using the capabilities of the underlying symbology model (Fig. 15):

- At first some productivity tools organized around a set of widgets each dedicated to common thematic maps. The possibilities are limited to what these widgets are able to configure related to what they have been built for. Nonetheless, the second tool can then be used in an expert mode to go further.
- Secondly, rather intended for an expert who want to tinker and tweak. As an advanced style editor, it is a flexibility tool which allows to manipulate all elements of the symbology model (Rule, Symbols, visual variables). A good knowledge of the symbology model is required because each elements of the style must be set individually. Consequently, the user can express without any limitation (except the limits of the symbology model itself) all her(his) creativity to build cartographic visualizations.

To illustrate some results rendered with OrbisGIS we present two maps extracted from the “Wall of Maps” (Bocher & Ertz, 2016). The first one shows a bivariate map to display the number of building permits in Europe in 2005 compared to 2014 (Fig. 16).

Bivariate map is a common technique to combine visual variables. The map uses the same type of visual variable to represent two values (as half circles). The main symbology elements used to create this bivariate map are:

- The style element contains two rules named A and B;
- Rule A contains one symbolizer element (AreaSymbolizer) to display the stroke of the European countries;
- Rule B defines the bivariate proportional symbol with two elements of PointSymbolizer (for readability, we present only the instructions for the left half-circle visual variable);

- The PointSymbolizer contains several sub-elements:
 - The geometry element allows specifying which geometry attribute is to be rendered;
 - The ST_PointOnSurface is an OGC filter function ([Vretanos, 2010](#)) used to have a point geometry guaranteed to lie on the surface. This new point derived from the input geometry is the location where to anchor a MarkGraphic, otherwise the symbol might be applied on all the vertices of a geometry;
- the MarkGraphic is defined by:
 - The symbol shape identified by a well-known name, HALFCIRCLE (right side);
 - The size of the shape varies according the height of its view box;
 - To have the shape size proportional with the number of building permits in 2015:
 - * An interpolate function is applied on;
 - * It uses a ValueReference that points to the attribute named permits2005;
 - * The interpolation is defined by two interpolation points chosen along a desired mapping curve (here the minimum and maximum values);
 - * For each interpolation point the height of the view box is specified with a specific unit of measure;
 - Because the half-circle shape is drawn to the right side, a 180° rotation is operated;
 - To finish, the MarkGraphic is filled with a RGB color.

The second map shows a combination of several visual variables: shape, size, color, patterns and orientation ([Fig. 17](#)). The style is organized around six filtered rules that correspond to the biogeographic regions in Switzerland. We present two Rules (A and B) that use the HatchFill and GraphicFill concepts which are extensions of the Fill abstract concept of the symbolizer model.

CONCLUSION

Considering the fundamental works of [Bertin & Berg \(2010\)](#) and successors, the community of map makers has constantly investigated questions about cartographic visualizations in term of design using the appropriate visual variables and combining them together with relevancy. Despite an important body of principles and practices, the community did not grasp the questions about standardization. However, given the multiplicity of software used to flood the world with maps, these questions are nowadays a strategic challenge to be considered in relation with operational requirements.

Even if the definition of a cartographic-oriented standard is not able to act as a complete cartographic design framework by itself, we argue that pushing forward the work aiming at the creation of dedicated standards for cartography is a way to share and disseminate good practices. Indeed, too much SDIs do merely accept the limits of the current standards and consequently poor map design and quality. While they have to apply OGC standards, it is essential to build standards so as to be able to enrich their




Figure 15 (A) The screenshot shows the list of productivity tools available in OrbisGIS. (B) The screenshot shows the user interface of the productivity tool dedicated to choropleth maps. (C) The screenshot shows a prototype of advanced style editor.

Full-size DOI: 10.7717/peerj-cs.143/fig-15




Figure 16 (A) Some redesigned symbology instructions (YAML encoded for the ease of reading). (B) A bivariate proportional symbol map coming out from the rendering engine using these instructions. [Full-size !\[\]\(d20e69ae2c387f5ef2b39e0f86fbec8f_img.jpg\) DOI: 10.7717/peerj-cs.143/fig-16](https://doi.org/10.7717/peerj-cs.143/fig-16)




Figure 17 (A) Symbology instructions showing how to combine visual variables (YAML encoded for the ease of reading). (B) A map of the biogeographic regions in Switzerland coming out from the rendering engine using these instructions. [Full-size !\[\]\(c222c8cb422ba01efa861bda897e11f5_img.jpg\) DOI: 10.7717/peerj-cs.143/fig-17](https://doi.org/10.7717/peerj-cs.143/fig-17)

cartographic capabilities at long-term, to make grow up the good practices and finally to improve the quality of the visualizations. In this sense, we have identified some use cases showing how it is important to make portrayal interoperability operational for sharing cartography, from discovery to collaboration activities, by way of authoring and cataloging activities.

From research results in link with the dedicated SLD/SE OGC SWG ([Ertz & Bocher, 2010](#)), this paper does extract some recommendations to enable portrayal interoperability. They invite to improve the OGC SE standard based on principles and practices in cartography. We start from a functional definition of a map translated into a set of visual variables which are combined to create symbols and finally a map style. The proposed recommendations do observe this functional definition which is already at the heart of how SE standard has been specified by OGC.

Now, in the long term, it is recommended that a design approach is driven by a conceptual definition of the model and unconstrained by specific encoding aspects, and, as soon as the model is ready, then a default encoding is offered (e.g., XSD/XML). Following from this approach of dissociation, it does allow the definition of other encodings according to the various flavors within the communities.

Given that the cartographic requirements will progress over time due to practices growing up and according to domain specific features, the offered symbology model is empowered so as to be extensible and ready to offer new cartographic methods. Moreover, such a modular approach allows implementations to be compliant step-by-step. As a consequence the adoption of the standard should be favored.

Finally, we claim to a testsuite within the OGC CITE so as to help to disambiguate and test the visual conformance of the implementations. While it shall be associated to reference implementations, having at least one open source is also essential for the community of implementers, guiding them even more in the understanding of the standard. In this sense, OrbisGIS is an open source platform that has been used to prototype an implementation of the symbology model all along the standardization process by iterations with tests and validations. It might become an open source reference implementation.

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION AND DECLARATIONS

Funding

The authors received no funding for this work.

Competing Interests

The authors declare that they have no competing interests.

Author Contributions

- Erwan Bocher conceived and designed the experiments, performed the experiments, analyzed the data, contributed reagents/materials/analysis tools, wrote the paper, prepared figures and/or tables, performed the computation work, reviewed drafts of the paper.

- Olivier Ertz conceived and designed the experiments, performed the experiments, analyzed the data, contributed reagents/materials/analysis tools, wrote the paper, prepared figures and/or tables, performed the computation work, reviewed drafts of the paper.

Data Availability

The following information was supplied regarding data availability:

GitHub repository with the OrbisGIS platform, containing a partial implementation of the Symbology Rendering model: <https://github.com/orbisgis/orbisgis>.

REFERENCES

- Andrae C, Graul C, Over M, Zipf A. 2011.** *Web Portrayal Services: OpenGIS Web Map Service, Styled Layer Descriptor, Symbology Encoding und ISO 19117 Portrayal vorgestellt und erläutert. OpenGIS Essentials: die Geo-Standards von OGC und ISO im Überblick.* Berlin: Wichmann. OCLC 846108747.
- Bertin J, Berg WJ. 2010.** *Semiology of Graphics: Diagrams, Networks, Maps.* First Edition. Redlands: ESRI Press.
- Bocher E, Ertz O. 2015.** Towards cartographic portrayal interoperability—the revision of OGC symbology encoding standard. In: *Proceedings of the 1st ICA European Symposium on Cartography, Vienna, Austria.* Vol. 1, 116–119.
- Bocher E, Ertz O. 2016.** OGC symbology model and encodings—the wall of maps. Available at <http://se.orbisgis.org> (accessed 27 September 2017).
- Bocher E, Ertz O, Laurent M, Hégron G, Petit G, Rappo D. 2011.** Cartographie et standard: du modèle à l'utilisateur. In: *Proceedings of the 25th International Cartographic Conference Paris, 3–8 July 2011.* Paris: ICCOCLC.
- Bocher E, Petit G. 2013.** ORBISGIS: geographical information system designed by and for research. In: Bucher B, Ber FL, eds. *Innovative Software Development in GIS.* Hoboken: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 23–66.
- Bocher E, Petit G. 2015.** Cartography—OrbisGIS manual 5.1 documentation. Available at <http://orbisgis.readthedocs.io/en/latest/users/cartography.html?highlight=symbology> (accessed 27 September 2017).
- Bocher E, Petit G, Gueganno A, Fortin N, Gourlay A, Ertz O. 2012.** Séminaire de restitution du SOGVILLE (Système d'Observation Géographique de la Ville). Technical report. Available at <https://halshs.archives-ouvertes.fr/halshs-01141548> (accessed 27 September 2017).
- Brackin R, Gonçalves P. 2014.** OGC ows context conceptual model. Technical report. Wayland: Open Geospatial Consortium, Inc. Available at <http://www.opengeospatial.org/standards/owc> (accessed 27 September 2017).
- Bruns A. 2013.** *From Prosumption to Prodsusage.* Cheltenham: Edward Elgar, 67–78.
- Carpendale MST. 2003.** Considering visual variables as a basis for information visualisation. Technical report. Calgary: University of Calgary.
- Cooper M, Sykora P, Hurni L. 2005.** The role of cartography within distributed software systems: what can we contribute? How can we prosper? In: Lapaine M, Association IC, eds. *22nd International Cartographic Conference and 13th General Assembly of the ICA.* A Coruña: International Cartographic Society.
- Craglia M. 2010.** Building INSPIRE: the spatial data infrastructure for Europe. *ArcNews* 32:1–6.

- Craig B. 2009.** OGC® sld-6 symbology encoding (se) changes (OGC 09-016). Technical report. Wayland: Open Geospatial Consortium, Inc. Available at http://portal.opengeospatial.org/files/?artifact_id=33515 (accessed 27 September 2017).
- De la Beaujardiere J. 2006.** OpenGIS web map server implementation specification (OGC 06–042 Version 1.3.0). Open Geospatial Consortium Inc., 85. Available at http://portal.opengeospatial.org/files/?artifact_id=14416 (accessed 27 September 2017).
- Dietze L, Zipf A. 2007.** Extending OGC styled layer descriptor (SLD) for thematic cartography—towards the ubiquitous use of advanced mapping functions through standardized visualization rules. In: *4th International Symposium on LBS and TeleCartography, Hong Kong*.
- Duarte Teixeira M, De Melo Cuba R, Mizuta Weiss G. 2005.** Creating thematic maps with OGC standards through the web. In: *Proceedings of the GML and Geo-Spatial Web Services Conference, Vancouver*. Lemmer, The Netherlands: GIM International.
- Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). 2011.** Guidance note for strategic noise mapping: guidance note for strategic noise mapping for the environmental noise regulations 2006. Technical report. Wexford: Environmental Protection Agency. Available at [https://www.epa.ie/pubs/advice/noisemapping/EPA%20Guidance%20Note%20for%20Strategic%20Noise%20Mapping%20\(version%202\).pdf](https://www.epa.ie/pubs/advice/noisemapping/EPA%20Guidance%20Note%20for%20Strategic%20Noise%20Mapping%20(version%202).pdf) (accessed 27 September 2017).
- Ertz O. 2013.** Feasibility study about Swiss geological symbols using the system-independent OGC SLD/SE standards. Technical report. Available at <https://drive.switch.ch/index.php/s/d6AFtdEaslej3wa> (accessed 27 September 2017).
- Ertz O, Bocher E. 2010.** Styled layer descriptor and symbology encoding 1.2 SWG. Technical report. Wayland: Open Geospatial Consortium, Inc. Available at <http://www.opengeospatial.org/projects/groups/sldse1.2swg> (accessed 27 September 2017).
- Ertz O, Julien LG, Bocher E. 2012.** Collaborative authoring and polypublication of cartographic content. In: Ertz O, Joost S, Tonini M, eds. In: *OGRS2012 Symposium Proceedings*. Yverdon-Les-Bains: OGRS.
- Ertz O, Rey SJ, Joost S. 2014.** The open source dynamics in geospatial research and education. *Journal of Spatial Information Science* **8**:183–193 DOI 10.5311/josis.2014.8.182.
- Eurostat/Regional Statistics. 2017.** Population on 1 January by broad age group, sex and nuts 3 region, females, total. Available at <http://ec.europa.eu/eurostat> (accessed 27 September 2017).
- Field K. 2014.** A cacophony of cartography. *Cartographic Journal* **51**(1):1–10 DOI 10.1179/0008704114z.000000000120.
- GeoServer. 2017.** Geoserver 2.11.x user manual. Available at <http://docs.geoserver.org/stable/en/user/styling/ysld/index.html> (accessed 27 September 2017).
- Hopfstock A, Grünreich D. 2009.** A user-oriented map design in the SDI environment using the example of a European reference map at medium scale. In: *Proceedings of the 24th International Cartographic Conference*. Santiago de Chile: ICC.
- INSPIRE Drafting Team. 2008.** D2.6: methodology for the development of data specifications. Available at http://inspire.ec.europa.eu/reports/ImplementingRules/DataSpecifications/D2.6_v3.0.pdf (accessed 27 September 2017).
- INSPIRE Drafting Team. 2014.** D2.5: generic conceptual model. Available at http://inspire.ec.europa.eu/documents/Data_Specifications/D2.5_v3.4.pdf (accessed 27 September 2017).
- INSPIRE Thematic Working Group Geology. 2013.** D2.8.II.4 INSPIRE data specification on geology—technical guidelines. Available at <http://inspire.ec.europa.eu/id/document/tg/ge> (accessed 27 September 2017).
- Iosifescu-Enescu I. 2007.** Se implementation specification change request—extensions for thematic mapping (OGC cr07-105). Technical report. Wayland: Open Geospatial Consortium,

- Inc. Available at https://portal.opengeospatial.org/files/?artifact_id=23359 (accessed 27 September 2017).
- Iosifescu-Enescu I, Hugentobler M, Hurni L. 2010.** Web cartography with open standards—a solution to cartographic challenges of environmental management. *Environmental Modelling & Software* **25(9)**:988–999 DOI [10.1016/j.envsoft.2009.10.017](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envsoft.2009.10.017).
- Iosifescu-Enescu I, Hurni L. 2007.** Towards cartographic ontologies or how computers learn cartography. In: *Proceedings of the 23th International Cartographic Conference*. Moscow: ICC.
- International Organization for Standardization (ISO). 2012.** ISO 19117:2012—geographic information—portrayal. Available at <https://www.iso.org/standard/46226.html>.
- Lalonde W. 2002.** Styled layer descriptor profile of the web map service implementation specification (OGC 02-070). Technical report. Wayland: Open Geospatial Consortium, Inc. Available at <http://www.opengeospatial.org/standards/sld> (accessed 27 September 2017).
- Lonjon A, Thomasson J-J, Maesano L. 2006.** *Modélisation XML. Architecte Logiciel*. Eyrolles Edition. Paris: Eyrolles.
- Lupp M. 2007.** *Styled Layer Descriptor Profile of the Web Map Service Implementation Specification (OGC 05-078r4)*. Wayland: Open Geospatial Consortium, Inc.
- MacEachren AM. 2004.** *How Maps Work—Representation, Visualization, and Design*. New York: Guilford Press.
- MacWright T. 2016.** The end of cartocss. Available at <https://blog.mapbox.com/the-end-of-cartocss-da2d7427cf1> (accessed 27 September 2017).
- Mapbox. 2017.** Cartocss. Available at <https://carto.com/docs/carto-engine/cartocss> (accessed 27 September 2017).
- Maxence L, Olivier E, Erwan B, Sylvain P. 2017.** OGC SE custom JAXB. Available at <https://github.com/orbisgis/ogc-custom-jaxb> (accessed 27 September 2017).
- Mays J. 2012.** Using SLD definitions to display charts in a deegree WMS. In: *FOSS4G 2008 Conference*. Cape Town: Open Source Geospatial Foundation.
- McKenna J. 2011.** Mapserver 7.0.6 documentation: OGC support and configuration. Available at <http://mapserver.org/ogc/sld.html> (accessed 27 September 2017).
- McMaster R, McMaster S. 2002.** A history of twentieth-century American academic cartography. *Cartography and Geographic Information Science* **29(3)**:305–321 DOI [10.1559/152304002782008486](https://doi.org/10.1559/152304002782008486).
- Montello DR. 2002.** Cognitive map-design research in the twentieth century: theoretical and empirical approaches. *Cartography and Geographic Information Science* **29(3)**:283–304 DOI [10.1559/152304002782008503](https://doi.org/10.1559/152304002782008503).
- Müller M. 2006.** *Styled Layer Descriptor Profile of the Web Map Service Implementation Specification (OGC 05-078r4)*. Wayland: Open Geospatial Consortium, Inc.
- Nicolas L, Christine Z. 2013.** Espon cartographic language—mapping guide. Technical report. Paris: UMS RIATE, Université Paris Diderot. Available at http://f.hypotheses.org/wp-content/blogs.dir/1381/files/2014/02/Task4_final_ECL_MappingGuide_dec13.pdf (accessed 27 September 2017).
- OpenStreetMap. 2017.** Mapcss 0.2. Available at <http://wiki.openstreetmap.org/wiki/MapCSS/0.2> (accessed 27 September 2017).
- Ort E, Mehta B. 2003.** Java architecture for xml binding (JAXB). Available at <http://www.oracle.com/technetwork/articles/javase/index-140168.html> (accessed 27 September 2017).

- OSGi.** 2014. The OSGi alliance OSGi core. Technical report. San Ramon: OSGi Alliance. Available at <https://osgi.org/download/r6/osgi.core-6.0.0.pdf> (accessed 27 September 2017).
- Peterson GN.** 2009. *GIS Cartography: A Guide to Effective Map Design*. First Edition. Boca Raton: CRC Press.
- Policy SWG.** 2009. The specification model—a standard for modular specifications (OGC 08-131r3). Technical report. Wayland: Open Geospatial Consortium, Inc. Available at <http://www.opengeospatial.org/standards/modularspec> (accessed 27 September 2017).
- Portele C.** 2007. OpenGIS® geography markup language (GML) encoding standard, version 3.2.1 (OGC 07-036). Technical report. Wayland: Open Geospatial Consortium, Inc. Available at <http://www.opengeospatial.org/standards/gml> (accessed 27 September 2017).
- Rita E, Borbinha J, Martins B.** 2012. Extending SLD and SE for cartograms. In: *GSDI 12 World Conference*. Singapore: Global Spatial Data Infrastructure Association.
- Sae-Tang A, Ertz O.** 2007. Towards web services dedicated to thematic mapping. *OSGeo Journal* 3:30–34.
- Schnabel O, Hurni L.** 2007. Diagram markup language—a new model for symbolization in internet maps. In: *Proceedings of the 23th International Cartographic Conference*. Moscow: ICC.
- Slocum TA, MacMaster RB, Kessler FC, Howard HH.** 2009. *Thematic Cartography and Geovisualization*. Third Edition. Upper Saddle River: Pearson Education.
- Steiniger S, Hunter AJS.** 2012. *Free and Open Source GIS Software for Building a Spatial Data Infrastructure*. Berlin: Springer, 247–261.
- Sykora P, Schnabel O, Enescu II, Hurni L.** 2007. Extended cartographic interfaces for open distributed processing. *Cartographica: The International Journal for Geographic Information and Geovisualization* 42(3):209–218 DOI 10.3138/carto.42.3.209.
- Tóth K, Portele C, Illert A, Lutz M, Nunes de Lima M.** 2012. *A Conceptual Model for Developing Interoperability Specifications in Spatial Data Infrastructures*. Luxembourg: European Commission Joint Research Centre.
- Tyner JA.** 2010. *Principles of Map Design*. New York: Guilford Press.
- Van den Brink L, Portele C, Vretanos PA.** 2012. Geography markup language (GML) simple features profile—with corrigendum (OGC 10-100r3). Technical report. Wayland: Open Geospatial Consortium, Inc. Available at <http://www.opengeospatial.org/standards/gml> (accessed 27 September 2017).
- Vretanos P.** 2010. OpenGIS filter encoding 2.0 encoding standard (OGC 09-026r1 and ISO/DIS 19143). Technical report. Wayland: Open Geospatial Consortium, Inc. Available at <http://www.opengeospatial.org/standards/filter> (accessed 27 September 2017).
- Vretanos PA.** 2001. Filter encoding implementation specification. Technical report. Wayland: Open Geospatial Consortium, Inc. Available at <http://www.opengeospatial.org/standards/filter> (accessed 27 September 2017).
- Wood D, Fels J.** 1992. *The Power of Maps. Mappings*. New York: Guilford Press.
- Zipf A.** 2005. *Using Styled Layer Descriptor (SLD) for the Dynamic Generation of User- and Context-Adaptive Mobile Maps—A Technical Framework*. Berlin: Springer, 183–193.

Annex C: Revision History

Purpose	When	Who
Update abstract to be more comprehensive	2019-08-21	E. Bocher (CNRS) O. Ertz (HEIG-VD)
Edits considering received and answered comments	2019-03-29	E. Bocher (CNRS) O. Ertz (HEIG-VD)
Release for early public comment (18-067)	2018-09-07	E. Bocher (CNRS) O. Ertz (HEIG-VD)
Initial document	2018-06-05	E. Bocher (CNRS) O. Ertz (HEIG-VD)