

Validation Workshop

Initial issues

Marne-la-Vallée –2-3 June 2016

Validation process

- Help me in the construction of WMS and WFS services and respective metadata aiming to achieve **reasonable levels** of Inspire conformity
 - On existing (not yet harmonised) data

Validation process

- Get examples from others about validation process
 - Who is responsible?
 - Existing group or INSPIRE group?
 - Done once or in several steps?

Validation process and MIG

- Know more about MIG progress, assess how it might impact our validation (draft) process
- Difficulties to maintain conformity over time, especially because the progress of the validation tools (and the own MIF progress e.g. New upcoming version of the TG for implementing INSPIRE Metadata)
 - => Therefore, better ways of communicating changes in validation tools should be put in practice.

Uncomplete (automatic) validation

- Validation tools are not always checking all the items needed for claiming conformance (at conceptual level)
- The items which are not actually checked should be listed somewhere, to be aware of it.

Uncomplete (automatic) validation

INSPIRE components 'cross-cutting' validation

In the IRs and TGs there's the legitimate concern to ensure consistency of different INSPIRE SDI components. When a dataset is published, for example, a requirement is made that also valid metadata for the dataset are available and that the dataset is provided by means of interoperable network services and in accordance with styles and additional requirements. At least for the moment being, this mostly implies **manual validation** for those tests, even if in MIWP5 , proposal has been made for the creation of a “common validator” use case, enabling an “integrated” validation of the 3 components (metadata, datasets, services).

Uncomplete (automatic) validation

- Most validation tools only perform a so called "schema" validation.
- What about those INSPIRE requirements that cannot be expressed by means of XML schema grammar?

Validation tools users

- Missing tools for validating ATOM feed download services
 - No Web API
 - No GIS client
- ELF tools
 - Understand them (black boxes)
 - Make them work

INSPIRE Geoportal validator

- INSPIRE geoportal validator
 - The metadata validator raises errors for issues that are not mandatory before the end of 2017 (e.g. CRS)
 - Services that need authentication can't be validated
 - The Inspire Validator does not handle certificates, a severe limitation

INSPIRE Geoportal validator

- Metadata validation:
 - more detailed description of changes in European INSPIRE Geoportal
- Services validation:
 - issues connected with validation of GetCapabilities response in European INSPIRE Geoportal
 - coupled resource for the service has to be data set, but we have it as series and due to this issue the degree of conformity decreases
 - when we upload a GetCapabilities response as a file in some cases the degree of conformity of a metadata record of coupled resource is only 15 %
 - but when we use URL the result is OK (the degree of conformity of a metadata record of coupled resource is 100 %)

Validation inconsistencies

Within the European project EMODnet (<http://www.emodnet-hydrography.eu/>) bathymetric data is being provided on a yearly basis (<http://www.emodnet.eu/partners-map>) by all partners.

The **metadata is being transformed** (by a python script) to SeaDataNet Common Data Index (CDI) **and according to the “EMODnet Bathymetrie” organization they should be INSPIRE conform** (<http://www.seadatanet.org/Data-Access/Common-Data-Index-CDI>).

But, this is not the case.

In attachment a CDI metadatafile that was tested with the metadata Validator2 with as result an INSPIRE conformity of 23.53% regardless the assurance of the “EMODnet Bathymetrie” coordinator that they are INSPIRE compliant.

Validation tool users

- Need for executable test suites for validating INSPIRE services.
- Data validation:
 - is there any „official“ validator for inspire data sets?
 - testing data quality (especially consistency for network data sets)- is there any option/tool for this?

Validation tool users

- All tools
 - Huge room to improve validation tools
 - Reports not informative enough, error messages useful only for nerds
- Validation doesn't always ensure services will work
[coverage workshop]

Validation purpose

- In most cases GIS tools cannot handle GML files properly thus hindering the proficient usability of transformed GML datasets in GIS environment
- Too often gml datasets are empty boxes, with too many optional/voidable fields left empty.
- => **data may conform to INSPIRE but not to user requirements**

Data validation

- INSPIRE datasets can turn into huge GML files causing “Out of Memory “ issue in all validation tools.
- Will the ELF (extended) data be considered as conform to INSPIRE? What about other extensions?

Validation tool developers

- Difficult to interpret INSPIRE requirements
 - Different options when interpreting TG
 - Not clear where to fill data in the GML node hierarchy
- Many controls can't be done automatically
 - Lots to be checked manually