The following questions and answers were collected by email and telecon as of 19-March-2012. Please send any corrections or additional questions to techdesk@opengeospatial.org by 23 March 2012.

Revision log:

2012-03-04	Nadine Alameh	First Draft
2012-03-09	OWS-9 IP Team	Updated with questions from bidders' telecon
2012-03-19	OWS-9 IP Team	Updated with questions from clarification session at TC (CITE question; CCI Provenance questions)
2012-03-23	OWS-9 IP Team	Updated with questions on the SSI thread, and GeoPackage question in the Innovations thread
2012-03-28	Nadine Alameh	Updated with correction of description of deliverable 7.3.4 in the Innovations Thread

1. General Questions

Q1. Can potential participants submit further questions by email?

A. Yes, by March 23, 2012 to techdesk@opengeospatial.org

Q2. Should we expect 100% cost recovery for our work?

A. In-kind contributions are not required, but are one of the criteria in the evaluation of the proposals. The exact percentage depends on various criteria.

Q3. Can we submit a proposal if we are not OGC members at the moment?

A. Application to OGC membership must be submitted with the proposal. Membership will need to be established prior to being invited to the kickoff.

Q4. Is kickoff attendance required?

A. Yes, funded organizations must have a representative at the kickoff. Webex and telecon arrangements may be established to make the kickoff accessible to additional persons from the attending organizations.

Q5. Where is the location of the kickoff?

A. At the George Mason University (GMU) campus, Fairfax, VA.

Q6. The closing date of the RFQ falls on Good Friday, which is an observed holiday in our country. Is it possible to submit the response later?

A. We encourage you to submit the response to the RFQ before Friday. But if it's not possible, then you have to submit your response by the morning of Monday April 9.

Q7. Can a participant propose against multiple tasks against the WBS in their proposal?

A. Yes participants can and are encouraged to propose against multiple tasks against the WBS in their proposal.

Q8. Will only one organization be selected for each task or can multiple participants work on the same task?

A. Multiple participants can be selected for one task.

Q9. Are the sponsors involved in the evaluation and selection process?

A. Yes, the sponsors are actively involved in the evaluation and selection process. That process as well as the evaluation criteria is detailed in the RFQ.

Q10. Is it possible to know which sponsors are involved in which threads?

A. **CITE**: NGA;
Aviation: FAA and EUROCONTROL;
CCI: NGA; AGC; CREAF-GeoViQua-EC; USGS; UK DSTL; GeoConnections NRCan;
SSI:NGA; LMCO;
OWS Innovations: NGA; NASA; UK DSTL; CREAF-GeoViQua-EC;

2. Sponsor-provided additions and corrections related to Annex B (None to-date)

3. CITE Clarifications

Q1. Where can I find information about related previous work for the CITE thread?

A. The CITE wiki (http://cite.opengeospatial.org) points to all the needed information, including a tutorial that will be conducted on March 20, during the TC meeting.

4. Aviation Clarifications

Q1. Is Semantic Mediation relevant to the Aviation Activities in OWS-9?

A. Yes, Semantic Mediation of Aviation data is part of OWS-9. It is a task within the CCI thread (see section 5.2.1.12 in Annex B) and will be coordinated with the Aviation thread. The goal of this task is to demonstrate how to query AIXM data based on terminology familiar to the pilots. The components required to support this task are listed in section 5.3 of Annex B, including for instance WFS/WMS for Semantic Mediation and client components.

Q2. Is there a clear separation of the semantic mediation work between the Aviation and the CC threads?

A. All the design and development of the semantic mediation work will be peformed in the CCI thread, to ensure that cross-community interoperability is achieved within a single thread. This also ensures that the semantic mediation approach is developed in a domain-independent fashion. However, there will be close coordination with the Aviation thread to ensure that the Aviation semantics are captured correctly.

Q3. Would the development/provision of a tool for independent testing and validation framework be of interest to the modeling work in Aviation and SSI?

A. Development of the required methodology for model to model mapping as well as model encoding rules in addition to an actual implementation to perform the mapping and encoding (as proof-of-concept) is of primary interest. However, a testing and validation framework to actually check that the tool output and created models are correct (according to the methodology and encoding rules developed in OWS-9) is also very important and seen to be very useful. Thus, a proposal including such a testing and validation framework is encouraged.

5. SSI Clarifications

Q1. What are the use cases for the Security Management section of the SSI thread?

A. This will be a primary topic for discussion at the kickoff. In the meantime, refer back to the RFQ and the references listed there for this section. Another good reference is a recent presentation at the Austin TC https://portal.opengeospatial.org/files/?artifact_id=47848&version=1

Q2. The RFQ states that "the participant shall build on the OWS-6 security framework.." in the Security Management section of the SSI thread. With technologies and approaches having evolved since OWS-6, is it ok to propose other approaches for these requirements?

A. The goal is to advance the work that was done in OWS-6 and not be restricted by it. New approaches and technologies are encouraged.

6. CCI Clarifications

Q1. There are two Engineering Reports (ER) about provenance in OWS-9, one in Aviation and one in CCI. Can you clarify the scope of each?

A. The provenance approach used in both threads is expected to be the same. The Aviation provenance report will focus on Aviation-specific issues (e.g. applying/updating the draft metadata profile for AIXM) while the CCI provenance report will also capture the specific case of the conflation processing work.

Q2. The CCI thread refers to provenance about workflows. However no specific workflows (e.g. WPS) are mentioned? Can you clarify?

A. There are no explicit service workflows mentioned in the CCI thread, but it is expected that conflation services and other processes may be chained to make the data available to the client. Such processes should be properly documented and available while accessing the provenance of the data.

7. OWS Innovations Clarifications

Q1. For the Mobile App Client research in this thread, the RFQ / CFP describes secured data caching, data capture and geosynchronization as research topics. Is there any additional information available regarding envisioned use cases & scenarios? Or the domain(s) of focus (e.g., aviation and/or defense-oriented)? Or is the intention to discuss this during the initial phase of the project?

A. The OGC ipteam will work with the sponsors to identify some use cases and scenarios for working on at the kickoff. The domain of focus of these use cases and scenarios is defense-oriented

Q2. WMTS harmonization: are there any efforts underway to engage the big players in this arena.

A. OGC will promote this at the upcoming where conference. OGC also encourages several current OGC members considered big players (big data providers) to get engaged in this activity.

Q3. Is the OWS innovations thread a stand-alone thread or a cross-thread activity?

A. It's a stand-alone thread, but as with all threads close coordination across threads is expected on common requirements (e.g. Security)

Q4. Is this thread more about innovations or standardization?

A. This thread seeks input from industry on innovative approaches for addressing the cutting-edge topics of this thread, with a focus on capturing common requirements, and a common approach to implementing them, paving the way for proposals for standardization in those areas. On a more practical note, proposers are encouraged to pay particular attention to the titles of the deliverables as they indicate whether something truly experimental is expected vs. incremental advancement of existing specifications.

Q5. To what degree is the emphasis on processing of the information at the mobile client vs. caching of information?

A. The RFQ states the desire for caching all types of geospatial data. But ultimately the scope of this activity will be determined by the responses received and the final team selected. It is not expected that every type of geospatial data will be addressed in this testbed. 2D vector and raster data caching are highest priorities. Proposals that do not cover at least 2D vector data are not likely to meet the core requirements of this thread. Other than that, proposers are free to suggest a focus on topics such as client-side data

processing. Viewshed visualization and analysis is a common use case for 3D geospatial apps on a mobile device.

Q6. In the Defense & Intelligence DWG session at the Austin TC, the GeoPackage was presented by AGC as an integrated data structure for mobile devices, for which there is a plan to submit it as an OGC draft standard by the end of the year. We were wondering whether there is any relation to the Mobile App research in OWS-9, which also plans to perform R&D to define an integrated data structure for mobile devices; some of the requirements seemed aligned.

A. Indeed, we have been in communication with the GeoPackage team about the requirements alignment, and have invited them to send a representative to the OWS-9 kickoff in order to discuss how that work can be tested/evolved as part of OWS-9. They are very much interested in getting feedback on their draft engineering document during OWS-9 before they are ready to potentially submit it as RFC by the end of the year (which also coincides with the conclusion of the OWS-9 testbed). That said, as with any other area of OWS-9, GeoPackage will not be the only approach considered for this requirement. The final mix of approaches and requirements will be a function of the participants selected for this part of the Innovations Thread based on their proposals.

Q7. The description of Deliverable 7.3.4 OWS-9 OWS Innovations Map Tiling Methods Harmonization Engineering Report seems to be the same as that of Deliverable 7.3.5.

A. The description of Deliverable 7.3.4 has been updated in Annex B (https://portal.opengeospatial.org/files/?artifact_id=47797) and should read as follows

Engineering Report capturing (1) the review of web map tiling schemes, including but not limited to WMTS, Tile Map Service (TMS), MBTiles, and UTFGrid, and (2) justifications for developing and specifying an update to WMTS and/or profiles of WMTS to improve leverage of the best features from these technologies.

