

All Fields marked with * are mandatory.

| | |
|--|--|
| Change Request #: | 97 |
| Assigned OGC Document #: | 10-118 |
| Name: | *Leif Stainsby |
| Organization: | *Galdos Systems Inc. |
| Email: | *lstainsby@galdosinc.com |
| Document Name/Version: | *CSW-ebRIM Registry Service - Part 1: ebRIM profile of CSW / 1.0.1 |
| OGC Project Document: | *07-110r4 |
| If this is a revision of a previous submission and you have a Change Request Number, then check here: <input type="checkbox"/> | |
| Enter the CR number here: <input type="text"/> | |
| Enter the Revision Number that you are revising here: <input type="text"/> | |
| Title: | *Define a Registry Extension Package model |
| Source: | *L. Stainsby |
| Work item code: | |
| Category: | * C (Functional modification of feature) |
| Reason for change: | <p>*</p> <p>An Extension Package is a concept introduced during the writing of the CSW-ebRIM specification. While the Basic Package (OGC 07-144) offers a limited example, there exists no official definition for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">a) how to define an Extension Packageb) what elements should be present in an Extension Package (mandatory or otherwise)c) how a registry must handle an Extension Package once it is loaded into the registry. If there are constraints in an Ext. Pkg. how are they manifested, when are they enforced. Consider special cases such as:<ul style="list-style-type: none">* an Access Control policy extension gets loaded in an Ext. Pkg.* new Life-cycle models are loaded. <p>However, several communities have already defined Extension Packages (i.e. HMA-T, CIM, CRS etc.). Experience shows that these packages, while useful to their communities, have differences in implementation and in some cases lack components that would improve their overall utility.</p> |
| Summary of change: | <p>*</p> <p>Define a comprehensive model, with a complete ebRIM mapping, that can represent all of the components that can make up a CSW-ebRIM Extension Package.</p> |

| | |
|---------------------------------------|---|
| | As a second, but no less important, goal, the WG should write a Best Practices guide for the development of CSW-ebRIM Extension Packages. |
| Consequences if not approved: | Development of registry Extension Packages will remain limited and the quality haphazard, limiting the potentially significant gains that can be attained if a complete, and consistent, model for such packages existed. |
| Clauses affected: | * Consider the possibility of an entirely new document (or two). |
| Additional Documents affected: | May affect: * OGC 07-144r3, CSW-ebRIM Registry Service - Part 2: Basic extension package * OGC 08-103, CSW-ebRIM Registry Service - Part 3: Abstract test suite |
| Supporting Documentation: | Would request that this CR be actioned in time to satisfy the 3-week rule for the June 14th TC. |
| Comments: | |
| Status: | Assigned |
| Disposition: | Referred |