MIWP Action 2.3.1: Governance of INSPIRE artefacts

JRC INSPIRE Team

74th MIG-T meeting – April 28, 2023

Status update

- Overview of new change proposals:
  - Application schemas: #61
  - Technical Guidance documents: #72, #77
- Request for additional feedback
- Conversion of TGs to AsciiDoc
- Vote on new change proposals

European Commission

Change proposals to schemas

The following change proposals have been approved by the Sub-group 2.3.1:

https://github.com/INSPIRE-MIF/application-schemas/issues?q=is%3Aissue+is%3Aopen+label%3A%22for+INSPIRE+MIG-T%22

Change proposal to schemas - #61

- **#61**: TN-A_Nodes_inherit from TransportPoint instead of TransportNode

sMorrone commented 2 weeks ago • edited ▾   (Member) •••

Dear all,
in the context of the END reporting, a discussion has been posted on the INSPIRE helpdesk about how to provide major airport sources (only point geometry, no transport link information) under INSPIRE TN . It contains the following proposal which is relevant to the issue being discussed here.

The proposal is based on the use the AerodromeNode with 'significantPoint' set to false.
Copy/pasting from the discussion:

The significantPoint is an attribute of the AerodromeNode *"which indicates whether the air node is or is not a significant point"* i.e., *a specified geographical location used to define an ATS route, the flight path of an aircraft or for other navigation/ATS purposes.* The AerodromeNode could either simply represent the aerodrome location (**significantPoint = false**) or act as transport node for connectivity (**significantPoint = true**).
Transport links should be mandatory only when significantPoint is set to true.

This option would not require a change in the IR /in the UML model, but only a clarification note in the TG (and a related change in the INSPIRE Validator test).

What do you think? Could this be a viable solution to the 'faced issue' of this change proposal?

☺

The conclusion of the last meetings was: "*support by thematic experts is required for this change proposal*", but a **new proposal for a possible solution came in.**

Change proposals to TGs

The following change proposals have been approved by the Sub-group 2.3.1:

Change proposal to TGs - #72

- **#72 (#86)**: Metadata contactInfo: onlineResource as alternative to electronicMailAddress

  - Already discussed in the last meeting

  - Requested MIG-T support in the last meetings → No feedback received

  - New change proposal was opened requesting the same change

European Commission

Change proposal to TGs - #77

- **#77**: Quality of service codelist URL's incorrect in TG dataset and service metadata

  - Related issue in the Validator helpdesk (#880) requesting change in the ATS

  - The right codelist URL was already agreed (issue #432)

  - INSPIRE Registry already shows: https://inspire.ec.europa.eu/metadata-codelist/QualityOfServiceCriteria

Change proposals to TGs – Additional feedback required

- **[#84](#)** - GeographicalName: sourceOfName

  - The sub-group decided to bring this change proposal directly to the attention of the MIG-T to ask for feedback.

Conversion of INSPIRE TGs in AsciiDoc

- The following TGs will be included in the v.2023.2 release (due by July 31st) and will contain the related change proposals endorsed by the MIG before that date.

11	Technical Guidance for the implementation of INSPIRE Discovery Services			June 2023
12	Utility and governmental services		Yes	"
13	Species distribution		Yes	"
14	Land cover		Yes	"
15	Administrative units		Yes	"
16	Statistical units		Yes	"
17	Orthoimagery		Yes	"
18	Geology	Yes		"

- Some of them are already available in the *2023.2 branch*, comments and/or pull requests are more than welcome.

Voting on change proposals

Thank you!