

All Fields marked with * are mandatory.

Change Request #:	191
Assigned OGC Document #:	11-174
Name:	* Enrico Boldrini
Organization:	* CNR/IIA
Email:	* enrico.boldrini@cnr.it
Document Name/Version:	* ISO Metadata Application Profile / 1.0.0
OGC Project Document:	* 07-045
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/>	
Title:	* Ambiguity in GetRecords TypeName parameter
Source:	* CNR-IIA
Work item code:	
Category:	* F (Critical correction)
<hr/>	
Reason for change:	* Change is necessary in order to clarify the specification, affecting content of capabilities document and GetRecords requests correctness, in regard to the correct name for the parameter typeName ("typeName" or "typeNames").
Summary of change:	* There is ambiguity in the specification regarding to the correct name of parameter TypeName of GetRecords operation ("typeNames" or "typeName"). Summing up, we have the following occurrences in the specifications:

typeNames
OGC 07-006r1 pag.144 (describing the KVP)
OGC 07-006r1 pag.146 (describing the XML encoding)
OGC 07-006r1 pag.149 (describing the typeNames parameter)
OGC 07-006r1 pag.150 (describing the ElementName parameter)
OGC 07-045 pag.46
OGC 07-045 pag.68 (describing the KVP)
OGC 07-045 pag.71

typeName
OGC 07-006r1 10.7.4.2 pag.140 (describing the ParameterName parameter)
OGC 07-006r1 10.8.1 pag.142 (describing the GetRecords operation)
OGC 07-006r1 10.8.4.1 pag.147 (describing the NAMESPACE parameter)
OGC 07-006r1 10.8.4.9 pag.150 (describing the ElementName parameter, 9 occurrences)
OGC 07-006r1 Annex D pag.200 (describing the Capabilities document)

OGC 07-045 7.2.4 pag.46
OGC 07-045 8.2.1.1 pag.63
OGC 07-045 8.2.2.1.1 pag.71
OGC 07-045 Annex E pag.114 (describing the Capabilities document)
OGC 07-045 Annex G.1 pag.122

However, the parameter it is for sure encoded as "typeNames", both in KVP and in XML schema, so perhaps it would be better to amend the specification accordingly.

Consequences if not approved:

Clauses affected:

*

OGC 07-045 7.2.4 pag.46
OGC 07-045 8.2.1.1 pag.63
OGC 07-045 8.2.2.1.1 pag.71
OGC 07-045 Annex E pag.114 (describing the Capabilities document)
OGC 07-045 Annex G.1 pag.122

Additional Documents affected:

Supporting Documentation:

Comments:

Status:

Assigned

Assigned To:

Cat 3.0 SWG

Disposition:

Referred and Posted

