All Fields marked with * are mandatory.

| Change Request #: | 342 |
|---|---|
| Assigned OGC Document #: | 14-011 |
| Name: | *Panagiotis (Peter) A. Vretanos |
| Organization: | *CubeWerx Inc. |
| Email: | *pvretano@cubewerx.com |
| 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 SWG] WFS 2.0, GetFeatureById, exception codes and HTTP status cod |
|---|---|
| Source: ⓘ | *even.rouault@mines-paris.org |
| Work item code: ⓘ | |
| Category: ⓘ | * [ C (Functional modification of feature)  ⇕ ] |

| Reason for change: ⓘ | * |
|---|---|
| | There are a few surprising things in the WFS 2.0 spec regarding the exception codes and HTTP status codes. |
| | When a GetFeatureById request fails to retrieve a feature because the provided ID has no match, the invokeGetFeatureByIdWithUnknownID() test of the CITE WFS suite expects a OperationProcessingFailed exception to be returned, and currently tests that the the HTTP status code is 403 (following Table D.2 of the WFS spec) or 404. |
| | In that case, OperationProcessingFailed doesn't seem to be an appropriate exception code. There's technically no processing error (if the request is translated to a SQL request, then it is just an empty result). Should not it be introduced a NotFound exception code that would map to "404 Not Found" ? |
| | An alternative would be to return an empty <FeatureCollection> document and no error. It is indeed a bit strange that a GetFeatureById returns an exception while a GetFeature request with a RESOURCEID returns an empty <FeatureCollection> |
| | In other cases where OperationProcessingFailed would be emitted, should not it be mapped to "500 Internal Server Error". For 2 reasons : |

- In http://www.w3.org/Protocols/rfc2616/rfc2616-sec10.html the phrase for 403 is "Forbidden", but an OperationProcessingFailed has little to do with Forbidden
- The HTTP reason phrase in Table D.2 for OperatonProcessingFailed is "Server processing failed". But server errors in HTTP should be in the 5XX range, not 4XX.

There are a few other oddities :
- OperationNotSupported is currently mapped to "400 Not Implemented". Shouldn't it be mapped to "501 Not Implemented"  ?
- Same for OptionNotSupported
- LockHasExpired is mapped to 403, which is also surprising. Shouldn't it be mapped to 400 like done for InvalidLockId ?

| | |
|---|---|
| **Summary of change:**🌐 | *<br><br>Review codes to make sure that they are appropriate for the exception being raised as per the HTTP standard. |
| **Consequences if not approved:**🌐 | |
| | |
| **Clauses affected:**<br>🌐 | *<br><br>T.B.D. |
| **Additional Documents affected:**🌐 | |
| **Supporting Documentation:**🌐 | |
| **Comments:**🌐 | |
| **Status:**🌐 | Assigned ⬍ |
| **Assigned To:**🌐 | WFS/FES SWG ⬍ |
| **Disposition:**🌐 | Referred and Posted ⬍ |