All Fields marked with * are mandatory.

Change Request #:	62
Assigned OGC Document #:	10-043
Name:	*Peter Baumann
Organization:	*Jacobs University
Email:	*p.baumann@jacobs-university.de
Document Name/Version:	*Grid Coverage Service Implementation Specification / 1.0
OGC Project Document:	*01-004

If this is a revision of a previous submission and you have a Change Request Number, then check here: ☐
Enter the CR number here: [   ]
Enter the Revsion Number that you are revising here: [   ]

Title: ⊙	*Abandon Grid Coverage Service Standard
Source: ⊙	*Jacobs University
Work item code: ⊙	
Category: ⊙	* D (Editorial modification)

Reason for change: ⊙	*

```
This specification is standalone (ie, not embedded into today's OGC
spec world), not representing the state of the art and, most of all,
overlapping with existing specifications in a non-compatible manner.
Further, it has been adopted in 2001 and is not maintained now, nor
is any implementation known to me.

Below a summary of issues found.

Strategic issues:
- specification is superseded by WCS (and WPS)
- specification not crafted along modern OGC paradigms, such as
core/extension, GML compatibility, etc.

Functionality issues:
- all functionality (and much more) is available from WCS + WCPS +
WPS
- by requiring single calls for operation invocation there is a lot
of traffic; the language approach of WCPS allows to perform arbitrary
combination of such functions in a single round-trip
- does not represent the state of the art (adopted in 2001!)
- questionable interoperability; OTOH, WCS/WCPS/WPS are designed to
be interoperable (eg, WMS, SWE)
- functionality seems randomly picked in view of modern requirements,
such as from the metocean and sensor community

Further, it is not usable as it stands:
- no ATS
- does not seem to be maintained
```

Summary of change: ⊙	*

```
It is suggested to officially de-announce this specification, with a
hint to WPS, WCPS, and WPS which incorporate this functionality
```

	already.
Consequences if not approved: 🔵	OGC customers might use this specification, which will lead to non-interoperable implementations. OGC customers will be confused about overlapping, but incompatible specifications. According to my research there is no implementation existing, so no product is affected.

Clauses affected: 🔵	* all
Additional Documents affected: 🔵	none
Supporting Documentation: 🔵	
Comments: 🔵	
Status: 🔵	Assigned
Disposition: 🔵	Reffered