



GeoPackage

Results of a preparatory meeting to the 63rd MIG-T meeting (with participants from AT, BE, DK, ES, NL and EEA)



Status

- We think it is too early to have a common INSPIRE GeoPackage encoding rule.
 - Flattening of the model should be taken into account as well.
- The GeoPackage standard in itself is mature enough.



Way forward (1)

- Could we have a (“light”) ad-hoc group where we can share experiences?
 - Note: GeoPackage is in scope of the next work programme, see action 1.1 task 4.
 - We need a common place where we can provide input and discuss. GitHub?
 - Part of the output should be integrated into the repository on alternative encodings.
- We probably need a theme-by-theme approach.
 - How do we ensure that the approaches are not too divergent?
 - How do we ensure that e.g. the GeoJSON and GeoPackage encoding of the same dataset are not too divergent?



Way forward (2)

- Could we do a survey among MIG-T members?
 - Plans for using GeoPackage?
 - national data
 - INSPIRE data
 - Issues experienced?
 - E.g. in tools.
 - E.g. with regards to user-friendliness?
 - Is GeoPackage an alternative to GML? Or an additional encoding?
 - How about raster data in GeoPackage? Experiences?
- Other topics briefly discussed:
 - GeoPackage's metadata extension
 - How to validate a GeoPackage file (if possible/feasible)?