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**Reason for change:**

In the course of helping define the WMTS specification, I discovered something surprising about the OWS Common specification (all versions). Nowhere does it mention that unknown/unrecognized parameters in KVP requests must be ignored. This has been standard practice in all OGC Web Service implementation specifications, and is a very important trait for all OGC Web Services to have because it allows for the non-intrusive use of vendor-specific and/or experimental parameters. Furthermore, it makes no mention that KVP parameters must be accepted in any order. This, too, has been standard practice in all OGC Web Service implementation specifications, and is typical CGI behaviour. Are these dictates intentionally absent from the OWS Common specification, or is their absence an oversight?

**Summary of changes:**

My recommendation is to add the following clauses:

11.5.3 Parameter ordering

   Unless specified otherwise by the implementation specification, parameters in a KVP-encoded request may be specified in any order.

11.5.4 Vendor-specific and extraneous parameters
A server shall be prepared to encounter additional request parameters that are not part of the implementation specification. In terms of producing results per the implementation specification, a server shall not require such parameters. A server shall ignore unrecognized parameters.

When request parameters in a KVP-encoded request are duplicated with conflicting values, the response from the server may be undefined. This specification does not mandate which of the duplicated values sent by the client are to be used by the server.

**Consequences if not approved:** The ambiguity caused by the lack of these dictates will likely cause interoperability problems.

**Clauses affected:**

11.5.3 and 11.5.4 (both new)

**Additional Documents affected:**

Below are the relevant clauses as they exist in the various OWS implementation specifications. It would be a shame for future implementation specifications to have to go on cutting-and-pasting these clauses. They should really be built in to OWS Common as per the above-suggested clause.

---

**WMS 1.0.0, section 6.2.5.1.4:**

Parameters in a request may be specified in any order.

A Map Server must be prepared to encounter parameters that are not part of this specification. In terms of producing results per this specification, a Map Server shall ignore such parameters.

---

**WMS 1.1.0, section 6.4.1:**

Parameters in a request may be specified in any order.

An OGC Web Service must be prepared to encounter parameters that are not part of this specification. In terms of producing results per this specification, an OGC Web Service shall ignore such parameters.

---

**WMS 1.1.1, section 6.4.1:**

Parameters in a request may be specified in any order.

An OGC Web Service shall be prepared to encounter parameters that are not part of this specification. In terms of producing results per this specification, an OGC Web Service shall not require such parameters.

---

**WMS 1.3.0, section 6.8.1:**

Parameters in a request may be specified in any order.

When request parameters are duplicated with conflicting values, the response from the server may be undefined. This International Standard does not mandate which of the duplicated values sent by the client are to be used by the server.

A WMS shall be prepared to encounter additional request parameters
that are not part of this International Standard. In terms of producing results per this International Standard, a WMS shall not require such parameters.

---

WFS 1.0.0, section 13.2.1:

Parameters in a request may be specified in any order.

An OGC Web Service must be prepared to encounter parameters that are not part of this specification. In terms of producing results per this specification, an OGC Web Service shall ignore such parameters.

---

WCS 1.0.0, section 6.3.2.2:

Parameters in a request may be specified in any order.

An OGC Web Service must be prepared to encounter parameters that are not part of this specification. In terms of producing results per this specification, an OGC Web Service shall ignore such parameters.

---

WMTS 1.0.0 draft r7v26, section 7.2.2.2:

If the client sends a request using unknown parameters (for example time, elevation or any other dimension that are not advertised in the ServiceMetadata document) these unknown parameters SHALL be ignored by the server and will not cause an exception to be generated.

Comments: I apologize for the quick revision of this change request. I had drafted out the wording of the suggested clause months ago (with input from others in the OGC community), but accidently cut-and-pasted the wrong version into the original version of this change request.
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