Change Request #:	1
Assigned OGC Document #:	**09-070**
Name:	*Chuck Morris
Organization:	*Northrop Grumman
Email:	*chuck.morris@ngc.com
Document Name/Version:	*Web Map Service (WMS) Implementation Specification / 1.3.0
OGC Project Document:	*06-042

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: ⓘ	*OWS-6: Clarify interval value format in GetMap requests
Source: ⓘ	*OWS6 CITE thread
Work item code: ⓘ	
Category: ⓘ	* C (Functional modification of feature)

Reason for change: ⓘ	* The WMS 1.3.0 specification is inconsistent regarding how to specify an interval value for a dimension in a GetMap request. Section C.3.2 says that when an interval is used in a TIME or ELEVATION request, the form is "start/end without a resolution". However, example 2 in C.3.6 does use a resolution. Also, C.3.3 says that for other dimensions, the form in table C.2 should be used, and the form in the table does include a resolution. It doesn't seem like the interval form for TIME and ELEVATION should be different from other dimensions.
Summary of change: ⓘ	* The suggested fix is that for all of the dimensions including TIME and ELEVATION, resolutions should be allowed, but not required. If the resolution is specified, the server steps from the lower boundary to the upper boundary by the resolution and generates a frame for each step. The frame may be blank if the server doesn't contain data for that step unless the the dimension declaration includes a

	nearestValues attribute. If resolution is not specified, the number of intermediate frames to return is at the discretion of the server.
Consequences if not approved:	There will be widespread confusion regarding how the server should interpret requests involving an interval dimension value and whether the resolution should be included in the interval or not.

Clauses affected:	* Annex C, particularly C.3.2 and C.3.3 and C.3.6
Additional Documents affected:	
Supporting Documentation:	This file contains suggested wording to replace the existing C.3.2 and C.3.3. c3.2.rtf
Comments:	
Status:	New
Disposition:	Accepted