OGC and Other Standards Organizations Interactions

- OGC support to SDOs
  - OGC role: collaborate consistent conceptual approaches for location and geospatial topics across multiple SDOs
    - IETF
    - W3C
    - OMA
    - ISO
    - IEC/ISO JTC1 WG7
    - OASIS
    - NENA
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GML 3.1 and IETF PIDF Location Object (LO)

- Presence Information Data Format (RFC 4119 and revisions)
  - The PIDF LO RFC extends PIDF to allow the encapsulation of location information within a presence document (Prisms, ellipses)
  - (PIDF) is a common presence data format for CPP-compliant presence protocols, allowing presence information to be transferred across CPP-compliant protocol boundaries without modification, with attendant benefits for security and performance.
- GeoPriv Working Group in IETF developed a GML GeoShape Application Schema for use in internet standards.
  - Approved as OGC Best Practices paper, December 2006
- Now a mandatory or will be mandatory requirement for expressing location in a variety of internet standards (RFCs)
  - RADIUS, SIP, ECRIT, LoST, HELD etc
Issues

• Due to implementation impacts, not sure about moving from 3.1.1 to a more recent version.

• Do not use Feature – too heavy and complex

• For more focused payloads, such as a dynamic object, decided not to use GML due to complexity and “schema overload”
Use of GML by OASIS

• There is now a GML 3.2 Oasis Simple Features profile for use in a variety of OASIS standards. This application schema was developed by OGC staff and members and submitted to OASIS.
  – Is now being used in HAVE (2d point)
  – Is now being used in EDXL-RM as a payload extension
  – Both CAP and EDXL (DE, RM, SA, etc) revisions will incorporate this work.
Issues

• Size of payload

• At first decided to use GML Simple Features with technical note

• Then decided to develop a restricted subset of GML SF.
  – To reduce size of payload
  – To reduce perceived implementation complexity
  – Did not want to use Schematron
Augmented Reality Community

- Discussion of use of CityGML in the AR community (Workshops and AR Standards email list)

- Early stages – Education is really important!

- Positioning of CityGML and other perceived competing standards (Collada, X3D). Lot’s of misunderstanding

- Worry of document size
W3C Point of Interest

• Using GML as the preferred encoding.

• Using GML/ISO as the abstract model for the location elements

• Issues
  – Like GML BUT lack of educational and tutorial references is a real hindrance.
  – The actual standard is too hard to read and understand. “Forced” to look at schema examples
Summary

• Perception that GML is too complex for simple encodings

• Issue of large geo payloads, especially for mobile applications

• Education Support!