

All Fields marked with \* are mandatory.

<b>Change Request #:</b>	202
<b>Assigned OGC Document #:</b>	12-014
<b>Name:</b>	*Stephan Meißl
<b>Organization:</b>	*EOX IT Services GmbH
<b>Email:</b>	*stephan.meissl@eox.at
<b>Document Name/Version:</b>	*Web Service Common Implementation Specification / 2.0.0
<b>OGC Project Document:</b>	*06-121r9
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"/>	
<hr/>	
<b>Title:</b> ⓘ	*CapabilitiesBaseType vs. OWSServiceMetadata
<b>Source:</b> ⓘ	*WCS.SWG
<b>Work item code:</b> ⓘ	
<b>Category:</b> ⓘ	* F (Critical correction) ▾
<hr/>	

<b>Reason for change:</b> ⓘ	<p><b>*</b></p> <p>Clause 7.4.2 "Service metadata document contents" introduces the element "OWSServiceMetadata" which is never defined in the schemas. Instead "CapabilitiesBaseType" is defined (cf. clause 7.4.10 "Capabilities document XML encoding") looking very much like "OWSServiceMetadata" but omitting the reference to "OWSContents".</p> <p>The proposed resolution which has already been adopted by WCS 2.0 is to define an own "CapabilitiesType" extending the OWS "CapabilitiesBaseType" with a "Contents" element which itself is an extension of the OWS "ContentsBaseType".</p>
<b>Summary of change:</b> ⓘ	<p><b>*</b></p> <p>Remove "OWSServiceMetadata" and instead explain usage of "CapabilitiesBaseType".</p>
<b>Consequences if not approved:</b> ⓘ	<p>Different standards adopting OWS Common 2.0 may resolve the issue differently which circumvents its primary purpose.</p>
<hr/>	
<b>Clauses affected:</b> ⓘ	<p><b>*</b></p> <p>Clauses 7.4.2 and 7.4.10 as well as the schemas.</p>
<b>Additional Documents affected:</b> ⓘ	
<b>Supporting Documentation:</b> ⓘ	
<b>Comments:</b> ⓘ	
<b>Status:</b> ⓘ	Assigned ⌵
<b>Assigned To:</b> ⓘ	OWSCommon1.2SWG ⌵
<b>Disposition:</b> ⓘ	Referred and Posted ⌵