



Deliverable 3.5

Review report on service specification

Project no.	636329
Project acronym:	EfficienSea2 EFFICIENSEA2 – efficient, safe and sustainable traffic at sea
Funding scheme:	Innovation Action (IA)
Start date of project:	1 May 2015
End date of project:	30 April 2018
Duration:	36 months
Due date of deliverable:	1 November 2016
Actual submission date:	26 October 2016
Organisation in charge of deliverable:	Danish Maritime Authority (DMA)

DOCUMENT STATUS

Authors

Name	Organisation
Rasmus Madsen Jensen	Danish Maritime Authority

Document History

Version	Date	Initials	Description
0.1	23.08.2016	RMJ	First draft
0.2	03.10.2016	RMJ	Added some extra review results

Review

Name	Organisation

Approval

Name	Organisation	Signature	Date



Table of Contents

- 1 Introduction..... 4
- 2 Review process 4
 - 2.1 Service specification document review..... 4
 - 2.1.1 Review results..... 4
 - 2.2 Workshop in Copenhagen May 2016 4
 - 2.2.1 Review results..... 5
- 3 Conclusion..... 5



1 Introduction

This report constitutes deliverable D3.5 of the EfficienSea2 project. The report describes the process and result of the review of deliverable *D.3.4 - Service specification* from WP3 task T3.2.

2 Review process

The review of the service specification was done as two different tasks – a regular document review and a hands-on workshop trying to use the service specification guidelines. Each task is described in detail in the subsections below.

2.1 Service specification document review

There has been a continuous discussion of the different elements in the service specification by the partners in WP3 of the EfficienSea2 project. Finalizing the process was an internal review from the WP3 partners.

After the internal review and discussions, the documents were send back to Frequentis (the authors of the document). Furthermore, the Danish Maritime Authority (DMA) tried to use the guidelines for a real life example (a service for providing Notices to Mariners and Navigational Warnings).

2.1.1 Review results

The key points of the review and discussions were:

- A need for a new level describing a Technical Design
- A template for the Service Technical Design level was needed
- A template for the Service Instance level was needed

Furthermore, it was also clear that the service specification needed a stronger and more clear connection to the IHO S-100 standard. For this process, UKHO was consulted and helped with describing the compatibility between the service specification and the S-100.

2.2 Workshop in Copenhagen May 2016

As part of the one-year project meeting in Copenhagen may 2016, there was a workshop day, with the sole purpose of trying the service specification guidelines in real world examples by important and relevant partners in the EfficienSea2 and STM validation projects. The workshop participants were divided into 6 groups, each responsible for making a service specification for a specific service. In each group there was a member of a WP3 partner, noting problems and successes in the process.



2.2.1 Review results

The workshop raised a lot of questions and notes, not all relevant for the service specification documents per se, but relevant for the whole process of the Service Registry and the Maritime Cloud.

The following lists the key points that were noted in the workshop together with a description of the action to be taken.

Question / Observation	Action
Struggling to find the right level of detail to put into the documents.	More thorough examples and templates for the different levels Specification, Technical Design, Instance.
Who is going to pay for using the Service Registry?	Question to be transferred to WP1, as this is a governance issue.
Difficulties to decide how big a service shall be.	No action taken – this is an architectural question and not in the scope of the service specification guidelines to dictate.
Not forcing all registries to use a certificate issued by the Maritime Cloud, but allow them to use their own.	Question transferred to the Identity Registry developers.
A new data exchange pattern was needed. The ability to have an asynchronous request-callback.	The new data exchange pattern was added to the service specification.
A PortID (or something similar) should be used instead of location, when looking up service instances at a certain port	A choice between different location-based parameters should be possible.

3 Conclusion

A lot of the feedback was more of a general unclear understanding of exactly what the Maritime Cloud is, and how the whole concept of services and identities should be understood in the view of the Maritime Cloud. In the context of EfficienSea2, the review/evaluation of the service specification method has been completed. Further discussions / iterations will be made outside EfficienSea2, for instance in IALA's e-navigation committee to which the documents will be submitted.