All Fields marked with * are mandatory.

Change Request #:	**247**
Assigned OGC Document #:	**12-131**
Name:	*Stephen Desmond
Organization:	*Land Information New Zealand
Email:	*sdesmond@linz.govt.nz
Document Name/Version:	*Web Feature Service 2.0 Interface Standard (also ISO 19142) / 2.0
OGC Project Document:	*09-025r1

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:ⓘ	* [WFS/FES } A Semantic Maturity Model for Web Feature Services
Source:ⓘ	*Land Information New Zealand
Work item code:ⓘ	
Category:ⓘ	* B (Addition of feature) ⇕

Reason for change:ⓘ	* This is a useful insight that deserves wider circulation.
Summary of change:ⓘ	* WFS developers have a choice between four approaches to choosing or > developing a GML schema. There are cost and benefit trade-offs for each one. > 1. â��Entry Levelâ��, using the Simple Features Profile. > 2. Using a locally developed one-off schema and middleware. > 3. Using a Community, but localised one-off schema. > 4. Using a Standardized schema such as CityGML
Consequences if not approved:ⓘ	Projects may choose an option not best suited to their > circumstances

---

Clauses affected:	* This could be a new Annexe in the next version of the WFS Spec, or a free standing document, "Best Practices Guide"
Additional Documents affected:	
Supporting Documentation:	
Comments:	
Status:	Assigned
Assigned To:	WFS/FES SWG
Disposition:	Referred and Posted