All Fields marked with * are mandatory.

Change Request #:	**364**
Assigned OGC Document #:	**14-090**
Name:	*Francisco J. Lopez-Pellicer
Organization:	*University of Zaragoza
Email:	*fjlopez@unizar.es
Document Name/Version:	*Semantic annotations in OGC standards / 2.0
OGC Project Document:	*08-167r2

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: 🌐	* [Semantics] RFC 5899 as alternative for a unique annotation
Source: 🌐	*fjlopez@unizar.es
Work item code: 🌐	
Category: 🌐	* B (Addition of feature) ⇕

Reason for change: 🌐	* RFC 5899 offers a standard and harmonised way to annotate semantically resources in some scenarios without requiring the modification of existing OGC core schemas because it operates at the protocol level. RFC 5899 enables two cases for the implementation of semantic annotations in exchanged messages: annotations in entity headers (Link headers) and annotation in entity bodies (several ways). The main difference is that Link headers are annotations about the whole resource that the exchanged message is about (e.g. WFS Service metadata, data model encoded in XML schema, resultset encoded in the format predefined by a data schema). The best practices document describes semantic annotations in entity bodies but does not deal with annotations in entity headers. Changes should address how and when should be added these annotations at the protocol level (KVP, XML,

REST and SOAP).

Summary of change:	* The document should address that today there are two scenarios for the implementation of semantic annotations in exchanged messages: annotation in entity headers and annotation in entity bodies. The current discussion about the semantic annotations at three different levels is only focused on annotation in entity bodies. It should be extended, probably by adding a first section presenting the two scenarios for the technical realisation of semantic annotations. The section should introduce RFC 5899 and explain that link headers provide typed relations with resources identified by URIs. For example, a same-as relation shall mean that the remote URI is identifies the same resource and that it can be dereferenced to a machine processable description of the resource, and, a described-by relation shall mean that the remote URI is a metadata record providing additional information about this resource. Finally, the discussion for existing GIS standards should add a section discussing how Link headers annotations such be used depending on the protocol used for OWS requests (KVP, XML, REST and SOAP). Appendixes should be updated accordingly.
Consequences if not approved:	Without OGC guidance, for example, developers of REST-based geoapplications may use link relations only for describing the semantics of transitions in the system.
Clauses affected:	* v. Normative References, Section 2, Section 3, Appendixes.
Additional Documents affected:	
Supporting Documentation:	[1] Schade, S., Granell, C., & Díaz, L. (2010). Augmenting SDI with Linked Data. Presented at the Workshop On Linked Spatiotemporal Data, in conjunction with the 6th International Conference on Geographic Information Science (GIScience 2010). [2] Lopez-Pellicer, F. J., & Barrera, J. (2014). D15.1 Call 2: Linked Map requirements definition and conceptual architecture. PlanetData. http://www.planet-data.eu/sites/default/files/PD%20D15.1.pdf
Comments:	The use of this kind of links is seldom documented in literature. [1] proposes its use for linking OWS with ISO metadata records. [2]

proposes its use for linking OWS with alternate representations in
RDF.

Status: ⊘

Assigned ⇅

Assigned To: ⊘

Semantics ⇅

Disposition: ⊘

Referred and Posted ⇅