

NSDI Cooperative Agreements Program Integration with Web Mapping Services

Agreement Number: 04HQAG0162

Indicate interim or final report. **Final**

Organization: Strategic Consulting International 1323 E 71st St Ste 102 Tulsa OK 74133
www.scigis.com

Project Leader: Dave Lowther 405 227 9051 dlowther@scigis.com

Project Narrative: SCI is providing several WMS services to serve the public of Oklahoma. We have made available via WMS the 2003 NAIP color aerials, as well as B/W aerials from 1995 and seamless DRG layers for the state. In addition, SCI has created a data viewer for accessing these WMA layers via web client.

Status of your Clearinghouse Node

- maps.scigis.com

- How many metadata entries? 3

- How many metadata entries with OGC WMS references in them? 0

- Issues in metadata management and service:

We initially had some firewall issues for making the port available to the Internet.

This issue has been resolved.

Status of your Web Map Service

- Software type and version used: ArcIMS 9.0 with WMS connector

- Status/Issues with the OGC WMS setup: Our WMS setup is complete with no issues.

The WMS connector for ArcIMS is very easy to configure and works off of existing map services.

- Provide URL to your WMS "getCapabilities" request:

[For Public Data Viewer showing WMS Services:](#)

<http://maps.scigis.com/fgdc/>

For Color Aerials:

http://maps.scigis.com/wmsconnector/com.esri.wms.Esrimap/WMS_COLOR_DOQQ?request=getcapabilities&service=WMS&version=1.1.1

Deleted: ¶

For B/W Aerials:

http://maps.scigis.com/wmsconnector/com.esri.wms.Esrimap/WMS_OK_DOQQ?request=getcapabilities&service=WMS&version=1.1.1

For DRGs:

http://maps.scigis.com/wmsconnector/com.esri.wms.Esrimap/WMS_OK_DRG?request=getcapabilities&service=WMS&version=1.1.1

Sample WMS Requests:

2003 Color (geographic NAD83):

http://maps.scigis.com/wmsconnector/com.esri.wms.Esrimap?REQUEST=GetMAP&SERVICE=WMS&VERSION=1.1.1&LAYERS=1&SRS=epsg:4326&width=200&height=200&format=image/jpeg&BBOX=-103.6991001859,32.9732748616,-93.9022339237,37.778332337&servicename=WMS_COLOR_DOQQ

1995 B&W (USGS Albers):

<http://maps.scigis.com/wmsconnector/com.esri.wms.Esrimap?REQUEST=GetMAP&SERVICE=WMS&VERSION=1.1.1&LAYERS=1&SRS=epsg:102039&BBOX=-620735.738120234,1160040.50594959,149698.261879766,1573486.50594959&width=200&height=200&format=image/jpeg>

Describe what types and coverage of data are present:

- [2003 Color Orthophotography – 1 Meter](#)
- [1995 Black and White Orthophotography – 1 Meter](#)
- [24K USGS DRGs](#)

Deleted: -

Formatted: Bullets and Numbering

Deleted: Color and

Deleted: B/W aeriels,

Integration

- Provide status of Clearinghouse or geodata.gov search portal to access your maps through the metadata (URL): Our metadata is currently available through the Clearinghouse and through geodata.gov. It is also accessible through any Z39.50 client by going to maps.scigis.com. [The server does not respond to ping and therefore appears inaccessible in the clearinghouse.](#)

- Successes and Problems: We have been very successful and pleased with the Z39.50 service add-on to ArcIMS. It is able to utilize our existing ArcIMS Metadata services and serve up data using open source metadata clients. [Current firewall technology prevents us from being able to respond to ping.](#)

- Recommendations: As a new National Map partner, we will be adding our customer's metadata as they allow

Deleted: ¶

Next Steps N/A

Feedback on Cooperative Agreements Program:

What are the program strengths and weaknesses? We had some initial problems getting the necessary paperwork taken care of due to technical problems on the FGDC website, but those have since been resolved.

Where does the program make a difference? It allows SCI to leverage OGC partnerships and provide additional value to our customers with the enhanced offerings of WMS services and FGDC metadata.

Was the assistance you received sufficient or effective? Yes, the assistance was more than sufficient.

What would you recommend doing differently? It would be helpful to have all forms sent as Adobe Acrobat forms that can be filled out and e-mailed back. All forms could be provided in a single zip file so that relying on web form submission isn't necessary.

Are there factors that are missing or need to consider that were missed? Not that I am aware.

Are there program management concerns that need to be addressed? None.

If you were to do this again, what would you do differently? We would like to first identify any of our existing customers who would like OGC compliant services and publish their data so that they can benefit first hand and showcase their projects and data.