All Fields marked with * are mandatory.

Change Request #:	**301**
Assigned OGC Document #:	**13-064**
Name:	*Clemens Portele
Organization:	*interactive instruments
Email:	*portele@interactive-instruments.de
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:	* Corrections and simplifications in the Basic WFS conformance class
Source:	*WFS SWG telecon on 2013-06-12
Work item code:	
Category:	* F (Critical correction)

Reason for change:	* In WFS 2.0 the Simple WFS conformance class was introduced to lower the bar for implementing Web Feature Services. With Simple WFS no requirement exists to support ad-hoc queries and only one or more stored queries need to be implemented. The idea of the Basic WFS conformance class was to similarly require the minimum capabilities of a simple Web Feature Service that supports ad-hoc queries. However, feedback and implementation experience shows that too many requirements are included in this conformance class. For example, if someone has a simple dataset based on a single database table there is no need to implement local resolve.
Summary of change:	* Currently Basic WFS has the following requirements and dependencies: ** Requirements in WFS 2.0 in addition to the Simple WFS conformance class (see A.1.2)

Support for GetPropertyValue (this probably should be a separate conformance class and Basic WFS should only require support for GetFeature queries)

A.2.11.2 - Versioning, Version navigation (Not OK - this should not be part of Basic WFS and since there is a Feature versions conformance class this is clearly a bug)

A.2.12 - XPath subset (For discussion - for a really basic WFS this may not even be required and could also be a separate conformance class)

A.2.13 - Predicate encoding (Generally OK, but should there be a caveat that KVP or XML encoded predicates only need to be supported if the WFS supports the HTTP GET or HTTP POST/SOAP conformance classes? As it is, this seems to require both HTTP GET and HTTP POST in all implementations)

A.2.19 - Standard response parameters (OK, but it should be clarified that A.2.19.2.2.2 Paging response applies only when the Response Paging conformance class is supported)

A.2.20.1 - Response Paging - Declaring support to response paging (Not OK - Response Paging is a separate conformance class, this must be a bug)

A.2.20.2 - Response Paging - Processing (same as A.2.20.1)

A.2.22 - Query expressions (Not OK, many parts of A.2.22 are part of separate conformance classes, only the following should be included in Basic WFS: A.2.22.1.1 typeNames parameter, A.2.22.1.4 srsName parameter, A.2.22.4 Stored queries. I.e. the following should be excluded:
A.2.22.1.2 schema-element() function (Part of a separate conformance class)
A.2.22.1.3 aliases parameter (Should be part of the Join conformance classes, see below)
A.2.22.1.5.3 resolvePath parameter (Introduce local resolve conformance class in addition to remote resolve conformance class, there is already a CR for this; note that "none and "local" can already be distinguished in the capabilities)
A.2.22.1.5 Projection clause (For discussion, but projection could well be a separate conformance class, too)
A.2.22.2.1 Standard join (Part of a separate conformance class)
A.2.22.2.2 Spatial join (Part of a separate conformance class)
A.2.22.2.3 Temporal join (Part of a separate conformance class)
A.2.22.3 Sorting clause (Introduce separate Sorting conformance class with a dependency to the Sorting conformance class in Filter)

** Requirements in Filter 2.0:

A.2 Ad hoc Query (OK)

A.4 Resource Identification (OK)

A.5 Minimum Standard Filter (OK)

A.6 Standard Filter (not OK, Minimum Standard Filter should be sufficient)

A.7 Minimum Spatial Filter (OK)

A.12 Sorting (Not OK, should not be required for Basic WFS; note that sorting can be difficult to implement for complex features)

A.14 Minimum XPath (For discussion, see WFS 2.0 A.2.12 above, should probably also not be part of Basic WFS)

** Requirements in GML 3.2:

B.4 Test case for reading GML (OK)

	In addition, the Simple WFS conformance class needs a corrections, too: A.2.5 Response to XML and KVP encoded requests (Not OK as this essentially makes both HTTP GET and HTTP POST required)
Consequences if not approved:	Implementation of basic WFS capabilities is more complex than it should be.
Clauses affected:	* Clause 2, Annex A
Additional Documents affected:	
Supporting Documentation:	
Comments:	
Status:	Assigned
Assigned To:	WFS/FES SWG
Disposition:	Referred