Please find enclosed my comments on OGC API - Common - Part 1: Core (19-072). This is the first time I have commented on an OGC standard so I apologise if I have not approached it in the way that you would like, or if any of my comments are incorrect due to a misunderstanding of how the standards should be defined.

PART A  
  
1. Evaluator:  
         
Jo Cook [jocook@astuntechnology.com](mailto:jocook@astuntechnology.com)  
  
2. Submission:  
  
OGC API - Common - Part 1: Core 19-072:

PART B  
  
1. Requirement: [General, #] : Chapter 6. Conventions  
  
2. Implementation Specification Section number: [General, #]: 6.2. Identifiers  
  
3. Criticality: [Major, Minor, Editorial, etc.]: Minor  
  
4. Comments/justifications for changes: [Comments]: "The following rules should be used when interpreting the BNF for use with this standard:  \* scheme is assumed to be HTTP or HTTPS", but the example URI and components use foo as the scheme. For ease of use this should be changed to http or https.

5. Adjudication: recommended change has been applied  
  
 1. Requirement: [General, #]: Chapter 6. Conventions  
  
2. Implementation Specification Section number: [General, #]: 6.4. Linked relations  
  
3. Criticality: [Major, Minor, Editorial, etc.]: Editorial  
  
4. Comments/justifications for changes: [Comments]: "Link relation types identify the schemas a link". Presumably this should read "Link relation types identify the schemas of a link"?

5. Adjudication: Changed text to : “Link relation types identify the semantics of a link”  
  
1. Requirement: [General, #] : Chapter 8: Requirements Class "Core"  
  
2. Implementation Specification Section number: [General, #]: 8.1.8 Parameter Encoding  
  
3. Criticality: [Major, Minor, Editorial, etc.]: Editorial  
  
4. Comments/justifications for changes: [Comments]: The use of the term "kebab case" in Recommendation 8 is not well-known, so should be omitted, given that it's immediately followed by an explanation of what that means.

5: Adjudication: there are on-going discussions within the OGC about standardizing the letter cases used in OGC standards. The term “kebab” case commonly appears in these discussions. Since “kebab” case is likely to appear in OGC policy, it should be retained in this recommendation.   
  
1. Requirement: [General, #] : Chapter 8: Requirements Class "Core"  
  
2. Implementation Specification Section number: [General, #]: 8.1.8 Parameter Encoding  
  
3. Criticality: [Major, Minor, Editorial, etc.]: Minor  
  
4. Comments/justifications for changes: [Comments]: The statement below Requirement 7 states that "An empty list ("") can either be interpreted as a list containing no items, or as a list containing a single empty item, depending on the context". This seems ambiguous, given that the two behaviours have, for example, different counts (1 for the first and 0 for the second). Suggest that the two behaviours are depicted in different ways.

5: Adjudication: refereed to the SWG for resolution.  
  
1. Requirement: [General, #] : Chapter 8: Requirements Class "Core"  
  
2. Implementation Specification Section number: [General, #]: 8.1.8 Parameter Encoding  
  
3. Criticality: [Major, Minor, Editorial, etc.]: Editorial  
  
4. Comments/justifications for changes: [Comments]: Requirement 9 states that "Positive values are assumed is the leading sign is omitted.". Presumably this should read "Positive values are assumed if the leading sign is omitted."

5: Adjudication: recommended change has been made.  
  
1. Requirement: [General, #] : Chapter 8: Requirements Class "Core"  
  
2. Implementation Specification Section number: [General, #]: 8.2.1 API Landing Page  
  
3. Criticality: [Major, Minor, Editorial, etc.]: Editorial  
  
4. Comments/justifications for changes: [Comments]: Requirement 14, row B, fix text justification for /conformance bullet point

5: Adjudication: there does not appear to be a problem with the text justification in row B. There is a potential issue with the way word wrapping is rendered. We will keep this issue open while we investigate whether this is a general issue that needs to be resolved.  
  
1. Requirement: [General, #] : Chapter 10. OpenAPI 3.0 Requirements Class  
  
2. Implementation Specification Section number: [General, #]: 10.5 Service Metadata  
  
3. Criticality: [Major, Minor, Editorial, etc.]: Minor  
  
4. Comments/justifications for changes: [Comments]: If the service is to expose metadata then a standard such as Dublin Core should be at least recommended

5. Adjudication: this section is within the OpenAPI 3.0 Requirements Class. As such, the applicable standard is OpenAPI 3.0. The service metadata is defined by the “Info” element from that standard.   
  
1. Requirement: [General, #] : Annex A: Abstract Test Suite (Normative)  
  
2. Implementation Specification Section number: [General, #]: Abstract Test 9 /conf/core/query-param-value-decimal  
  
3. Criticality: [Major, Minor, Editorial, etc.]: Editorial  
  
4. Comments/justifications for changes: [Comments]: The Test Method (Server) section has a typo in 5b: "numereic" should read "numeric"

5. Adjudication: recommended change has been applied.  
  
1. Requirement: [General, #] : Annex A: Abstract Test Suite (Normative)  
  
2. Implementation Specification Section number: [General, #]: Abstract Test 10 /conf/core/query-param-value-double  
  
3. Criticality: [Major, Minor, Editorial, etc.]: Editorial  
  
4. Comments/justifications for changes: [Comments]: The Test Method (Client) section point 5 "Validate that encoded value is a correct represented of the numeric value (step 1)..."should read "Validate that encoded value is a correct representation of the numeric value (step 1)... "

5. Adjudication: recommended change has been applied.   
  
1. Requirement: [General, #] : Annex A: Abstract Test Suite (Normative)  
  
2. Implementation Specification Section number: [General, #]: Abstract Test 12 //conf/core/query-param-value-special  
  
3. Criticality: [Major, Minor, Editorial, etc.]: Editorial  
  
4. Comments/justifications for changes: [Comments]: Consistency of usage of "-nan" in Test Purpose, Test Method (Client) and Test Method (Server)

5. Adjudication: changed “-nan” to “nan”  
  
1. Requirement: [General, #] : Annex A: Abstract Test Suite (Normative)  
  
2. Implementation Specification Section number: [General, #]: Abstract Test 17 /conf/core/conformance-op  
  
3. Criticality: [Major, Minor, Editorial, etc.]: Minor  
  
4. Comments/justifications for changes: [Comments]: Test Method has an unmatched "ENDIF" statement at the end.

5 Adjudication: removed “THEN” – “ENDIF” pair.  
  
1. Requirement: [General, #] : General  
  
2. Implementation Specification Section number: [General, #]: General  
  
3. Criticality: [Major, Minor, Editorial, etc.]: Editorial  
  
4. Comments/justifications for changes: [Comments]: Check for consistency of naming "OAPI-Common Users Guide"

5. Adjudication: Changed to “OGC API – Common Users Guide” in two places.  
  
1. Requirement: [General, #] : General  
  
2. Implementation Specification Section number: [General, #]: General  
  
3. Criticality: [Major, Minor, Editorial, etc.]: Editorial  
  
4. Comments/justifications for changes: [Comments]: Check for consistency of the term implementor or implementor, it is used interchangeably throughout

5, Adjudication: changed all instances of “implementer” to “implementor”  
  
1. Requirement: [General, #] : General  
  
2. Implementation Specification Section number: [General, #]: General  
  
3. Criticality: [Major, Minor, Editorial, etc.]: Editorial  
  
4. Comments/justifications for changes: [Comments]: Check for correct usage of "that" and "which" pronouns throughout (eg "which" should follow a comma, whereas "that" should not).

5. Adjudication: corrected except for the phrase “for which”, standard OGC boiler plate, and quoted text.  
  
1. Requirement: [General, #] : General  
  
2. Implementation Specification Section number: [General, #]: General  
  
3. Criticality: [Major, Minor, Editorial, etc.]: Editorial  
  
4. Comments/justifications for changes: [Comments]: Incorrect usage of "its'" throughout- replace "its'" with "its"

5. Adjudication: corrected one instance. This may have been addressed by an earlier PR.

Thanks,

Jo Cook