

Summary of the GeoMapFish User-Group - 11.03.2021

Summary

1.	General information	2
2.	More autonomy for users	2
2.1.	Improve documentation.....	2
2.2.	Getting Started	3
3.	Future of GeoMapFish.....	3
3.1.	Strategies for replacing AngularJS.....	3
3.2.	Reflections in progress	3
3.3.	Proposed scenario	4
4.	Tour de table	5
5.	GMF Version 2.6	8
5.1.	Current state	8
5.2.	Demo	8

1. General information

- Contact Email: contact@geomapfish.org. Can be used for any question about the GMF project, inside and outside the User-Group.
- User-Group Email: geomapfish-users@googlegroups.com. Can be used by all members of the User-Group to communicate with other members of the User-Group.
- GitHub repository for Feature Requests: <https://github.com/camptocamp/GeoMapFish>.
- GeoMapFish Website: <https://geomapfish.org>.

2. More autonomy for users

2.1. Improve documentation

The following parts of the GeoMapFish documentation can be improved:

- nGeo: improving documentation doesn't make sense, because it is still based on AngularJS and will be soon replaced.
- c2cgeoportal: improving the documentation could be interesting, but it's not the priority today.
- Admin interface: good point to improve, because it will provide a better understanding of what all fields of administration are used for
- Yaml files: improving the documentation could be interesting, but it's not the priority today.
- Migration documentation (changelog): improving the Migration documentation is important.

The priorities are the improvement of the administration documentation, and the improvement of the migration documentation.

For the Admin: The goal is to transfer the existing documentation directly into the administration interface, in the form of contextual help. Each field will be directly documented, including metadata and functionalities.

This will be made in the version 2.6.1.

For the Changelog: The goal is to be able to better identify what has changed from one version to another, what needs to be done during the migration. It will be possible to better evaluate the effort required for a migration.

This contains the following changelogs:

- How to migrate from 2.4 to 2.5
- How to migrate from 2.5 to 2.6

Extra: The Website has been updated as well. It now contains a new tab with all links to useful documentation.

2.2. Getting Started

A “Getting Started” is an important feature of the documentation, because it will allow any user to create a new GeoMapFish application from scratch, without the help of anyone.

A first version was created by the PSC, and is available at https://github.com/geomapfish/getting_started.

Feedbacks will really be appreciated.

3. Future of GeoMapFish

The client part of GeoMapFish is based on the AngularJS framework, which is reaching End Of Life at the end of December 2021. It has to be replaced in the next years.

3.1. Strategies for replacing AngularJS

There are 4 scenarios:

- Stay on AngularJS as long as possible, and pay for extended support.
- Make a big 1 to 1 migration. All at once.
- Make a progressive migration.
- Switch to another library, such as QGis WebClient.

Pros and Cons of each scenarios are listed in the powerpoint presentation of the User-Group.

3.2. Reflections in progress

Scenario analysis:

Staying on AngularJS for a while only postpones the problem, and it's not sure that there will be better opportunities to migrate in the 2 next years. No one wants to finance new developments on AngularJS. Furthermore, we would like the community to grow, and this won't happen while we are on AngularJS.

Switching to another library, such as QGis-WebClient can be complex. We would lose a very big part of what was developed until now, and we are not sure it can be connected to the existing configuration (admin, mapfiles, printing, shortlinks, ...). There is doubt concerning usability and performance.

Therefore, the two best options are the 1to1 migration, and the progressive migration.

Costs:

CampToCamp asked for an offer to an US company that could do the 1to1 migration. The offer is about 185 000 \$ for the migration of 53 000 lines of code.

The following tasks must be added:

- Proofs of Concept
- Refactoring of nGeo/Gmf components
- Project management costs
- Testing costs.

A 1to1 migration will cost approximately 250 000 CHF.

A progressive migration will probably be more expensive, but no cost analyse was made yet

This migration will require about 2 years of financial investment.

It would really be great if all the members of the User-Group could find an agreement with the scenario to be followed, and could participate financially to this migration.

3.3. Proposed scenario

Step 1: GMF Version 2.7 LTS.

Release a version 2.7 of GeoMapFish that includes some jobs that need to be done in both cases, for a 1to1 migration and for a progressive migration, and that is compatible with Custom WebComponents.

More explanations about what are web components can be found here:

<https://www.ionos.com/digitalguide/websites/web-development/web-components/>

The goal is to have a version 2.7 still with AngularJS, which is ready for a migration, and that supports standard Web Components. The users that decide to migrate to the version 2.7 will be able to rewrite their custom developments to Web Components, and therefore to be prepared for the removal of AngularJS.

Step 2, option 1:

Do a 1 to 1 migration of all that remains, and remove AngularJs from GeoMapFish.

- Replace completely AngularJS with a new framework (Angular, VueJs, React, ...)
- Mostly a technical migration, no integration of new features
- The new version is linked to a new framework

GeoMapFish 3.0 will be released in 2023.

Step 2, option 2:

Start a gradual migration of the remaining components.

- Convert step by step the GMF components into standard Web Components
- Integration of new features with each release
- Keep AngularJS a little longer
- The new version uses the new framework as few as possible

GeoMapFish 2.8 will be released in 2023 with new functionalities and a little less AngularJS.

GeoMapFish 2.9 will be released in 2024 with new functionalities and a even a little less AngularJS.

GeoMapFish 3.0 in 2025 without AngularJS any more.

4. Tour de table

In the speaking order:

Jura:

- Currently using GeoMapFish version **2.5**
- Expectations / Fears: **mobile is important for the future**
- Opinion regarding the documentation changes: -
- Opinion on the proposed migration scenario: **agrees**
- Plan to participate financially to the migration: **yes**

Pully:

- Currently using GeoMapFish version **2.5**
- Expectations / Fears: **for now use the new features of 2.5**
- Opinion regarding the documentation changes: **this is the right way**
- Opinion on the proposed migration scenario: **agrees**
- Plan to participate financially to the migration: **yes, same budget as the past years**

Graubünden:

- Currently using GeoMapFish version **2.4**
- Expectations / Fears: **Too many changes for a small team.**
- Opinion regarding the documentation changes: **ok with the changes. Today it's difficult to find the right documentation.**
- Opinion on the proposed migration scenario: **agrees**
- Plan to participate financially to the migration: **has to be discussed internally first**

Kanton Jura:

- Currently using GeoMapFish version
- Expectations / Fears:
- Opinion regarding the documentation changes:
- Opinion on the proposed migration scenario:
- Plan to participate financially to the migration:

Techplus (Tirol/Austria):

- Currently using a very custom version of GeoMapFish.
- Expectations / Fears: **insert custom plugins in the core of GMF. A better user-management, where user can give rights to other users.**
- Opinion regarding the documentation changes: -
- Opinion on the proposed migration scenario: **probably won't migrate**
- Plan to participate financially to the migration: **no**

Tessin:

- Currently using GeoMapFish version **2.4, currently in testing**
- Expectations / Fears: -
- Opinion regarding the documentation changes: -
- Opinion on the proposed migration scenario: **agrees**
- Plan to participate financially to the migration: **has to be discussed internally first**

Geocommunes:

- Currently using GeoMapFish version **2.4**
- Expectations / Fears: **for now the features of 2.6 are expected**
- Opinion regarding the documentation changes: -
- Opinion on the proposed migration scenario: **agrees**
- Plan to participate financially to the migration: **yes, same budget as the past years**

Luxembourg:

- Currently using GeoMapFish version **2.3 with a fully custom frontend.**
- Expectations / Fears: **would like to share code with geoadmin, is therefore interested in vue.js.**
- Opinion regarding the documentation changes: -
- Opinion on the proposed migration scenario: **aims to replace AngularJs by 2025, and is interested in the progressive migration.**
- Plan to participate financially to the migration: **yes, if we can agree on a common target.**

As Luxembourg does not regularly participate in the User-Group, it has been decided to invite them to the next PSC meeting, in order to discuss the migration together and to find how we could collaborate on it.

Schwyz:

- Currently using GeoMapFish version **2.4**
- Expectations / Fears: **The last migration was too difficult for a small team. More collaboration would be great. Would like more stability in Geomapfish.**
- Opinion regarding the documentation changes: **finds good.**
- Opinion on the proposed migration scenario: **agrees, but can't migrate too often.**
- Plan to participate financially to the migration: **not decided yet.**

Neuchâtel:

- Currently using GeoMapFish version **2.5 in four different geoportals and many custom plugins**
- Expectations / Fears: -
- Opinion regarding the documentation changes: **ok**
- Opinion on the proposed migration scenario: **agrees**
- Plan to participate financially to the migration: **yes**

Morges:

- Currently using GeoMapFish version **2.5**
- Expectations / Fears: **More stability in Geomapfish, simpler migration.**
- Opinion regarding the documentation changes: **this is the right way.**
- Opinion on the proposed migration scenario: **agrees**
- Plan to participate financially to the migration: **yes**

Yverdons:

- Currently using GeoMapFish version **2.5**
- Expectations / Fears: **interested in the integration of custom web components. Needs a nice visual Roadmap.**
- Opinion regarding the documentation changes: -
- Opinion on the proposed migration scenario: **agrees**
- Plan to participate financially to the migration: **yes**

Nyon:

- Currently using GeoMapFish version **2.4**
- Expectations / Fears: -
- Opinion regarding the documentation changes: **ok**
- Opinion on the proposed migration scenario: **agrees**
- Plan to participate financially to the migration: **yes**

Vevey:

- Currently using GeoMapFish version **2.5**
- Expectations / Fears: -
- Opinion regarding the documentation changes: **ok**
- Opinion on the proposed migration scenario: **agrees**
- Plan to participate financially to the migration: **yes**

Basel-Land:

- Currently using GeoMapFish version **2.1**
- Expectations / Fears: **Happy with current features. Don't know at the moment what they will do in the future with GeoMapFish.**
- Opinion regarding the documentation changes: **ok**
- Opinion on the proposed migration scenario: **agrees**
- Plan to participate financially to the migration: **not for the moment**

Basel-Stadt:

- Currently using GeoMapFish version **2.3 and 2.4 with custom developments**
- Expectations / Fears: -
- Opinion regarding the documentation changes: **ok**
- Opinion on the proposed migration scenario: **agrees**
- Plan to participate financially to the migration: **yes**

5. GMF Version 2.6

5.1. Current state

All developments for the version 2.6 are done.

The integration tests have started in Vevey, and will start soon in Neuchâtel.

Planned release Date for GeoMapFish 2.6: end of april 2021.

5.2. Demo

CampToCamp presented the following new features:

- 2.6.1 - Redlining arrows
- 2.6.22 - Editing dropdown lists sorting
- 2.6.29 - PDF legend improvements
- 2.6.46 - Click tolerance per layer
- 2.6.56 - Mapillary integration

The user-group was closed at 3:50 p.m.

The date for the next user-group has not yet been set.