|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| APP\_C | UNH | Feature catalogue 4.12 | Sub-attribute | te | timeIntervalsByDayOfWeek – this is confusing how it is proposed. I would have expected the timeOfDayStart and timeOfDayEnd to be [0..7] {ordered} to **match** the dayOfWeek. (otherwise, how is it expected to know which start/end times belong to which days if there could be an infinite number of values?) | Change the multiplicity to [0..7] or clarify the timeOfDayStart and End on how to use the [0..\*] multiplicity and match with correct dayOfWeek. | | The encoding of schedules and time intervals is explained in the DCEG, with examples. XML version of example added in DCEG. No change to application schema needed. |
|  | UNH | Gml sample data file | Text information attribute | ge | I don’t like that the example s-127.gml file shows cases for using the “text” information attribute when those very examples could have been coded properly. I feel it unwise to include examples like this as it reinforces the lazy way to do the modelling instead of guiding towards the desired use of the fields. I even believe I saw somewhere in the PS that it said to limit use of this attribute and encode all items the best one could before ever using the info text attribute. | Only release example files that exemplify the BEST possible way to encode the data…the preferred way, avoiding the lazy route. | | No specific objects mentioned in comment. Some encodings of text updated in GML sample.  (The question of the BEST way has not been decided by SNPWG or NIPWG.) |
|  | UNH | Pilot Boarding Place & Pilot Service | schema | te | What about how to recognize the pilot vessel.  EX: a 48-foot long black-hulled , with the word PILOT on the side of the boat; displays International Code flag H by day and a white light over red light at night  Right now in the pilot boarding place it is just a text field named pilot vessel.  We have applicability which is REALLY vessel details. | I would like to see applicability be the association and Association renamed to vessel (or vesselInfo). That way I could encode all the pilot vessel details and associate it with the service (not the pilot boarding place…since the service is already associated with the pilot boarding place). | | pilotVessel is defined as “Description of the pilot vessel. The pilot vessel is a small vessel used by a pilot to go to or from a vessel employing the pilot's services.”  That clearly covers the example. The meaning and relationships of information type “Applicability” (see DCEG and PS) are not applicable to the case of describing a pilot boat. The information type “Applicability” is intended to define subsets of vessels according to vessel characteristics and dimensions. What if the description of the pilot vessel is less specific than the example in the comment column?  No action needed. |
|  | UNH | Pilot Boarding Place | schema | te | Comparing the S-101 Pilot Boarding Place shows there are 5 duplicated values in the S-127 model. Is it expected to populate the S-101 values with the S-127 values? In the S-101 it states:  “Because of the many variations in the service provided, the main source of information on pilotage must be in an associated publication or product.”  If this is the case how do we harmonize the data between the two features?  The Pilot Boarding place shows a multiplicity of [0..\*] for the geometry...to me it seems it should be mandatory to have a geometry otherwise where is the PILBOP located (as it is a geo-feature)? | Add an attribute to associate this pilot boarding place with the S-101 counterpart. | | Pilot boarding place location is not always specified in terms of coordinates (point or area), so geometry must be 0..  Cross-product associations are not yet permitted in S-100 data products.  No action needed. |
|  | UNH | communicationChannel | schema | te | How does the communicationChannel for the PilotageDistrict differ from the PilotBoardingPlace? Is there a district authority that covers multiple boarding places? I foresee issues with duplicating data here. | Write rules/best practices to help minimize data duplication | | No example of data duplication provided. The most specific data should be used for encoding. Clarification added to DCEG PILBOP clause re comm channel. |
|  | UNH | Pilot boarding area | schema | te | Boarding times/conditions are not represented:  EX: Pilots will board vessels day and night when weather and sea conditions permit.  Seems like this would be a good way to filter data | <serviceHours> informationType information attribute might take care of this. Maybe this could be used, but seems better to have it’s own attribute. | | That kind of thing is exactly why the attributes textContent or information are included in features and information types.  No change to application schema. |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | |  |
| DCEG | UNH |  |  | ge | The programmers will be looking to the DCEG for guidance while developing and I’m a programmer looking to the DCEG and want valid GML examples for use and clarification. | | Make the examples GML/XML based. | Based on email exchange, this presumably concerns the DCEG example about time schedules. XML example added. |
| APP\_B | UNH | Pilotage diagram |  | te | The serviceProvisionArea is shown with two lines.  I guess just technically then, I am curious as to how the rules are enforced. |  | | Lines are between different pairs of features. No action needed here (next comment continues). |
| APP\_B | PS | Pilotage diagram |  | te | I don't think there is a check for that in the 1.0.0 package. | It should be enforced with a validation check, and encoded in the distribution package as a Schematron rule (implementations are allowed to implement validation checks in other languages). | | Validation check added in Appendix E and Schematron file. |
| FC | RM | categoryOfPilotBoardingPlace |  | ed | Missing definition | Definition added (as defined in S-101 & registry): “Classification of pilot boarding method.” | | Note that this is slightly different from the SNPWG Wiki. |
| FC;  GML schema |  | categoryOfRestrictedArea |  | ed | Missing definition of “port security area” | Definition of “port security area” added (from registry). | |  |
| FC;  GML schema |  | jurisdiction |  | ed | Unused attribute. | Definition of simple attribute “jurisdiction” removed (this attribute is not used anywhere in S-127).  Application schema updated accordingly. | |  |
| FC;  GML schema |  | restriction |  | te | Unused listed value “use of spuds prohibited” | Unused listed value removed from FC: “use of spuds prohibited”. Also, the registry indicates it originated in Inland ENC domain.  Application schema also updated. | |  |
| FC;  GML schema |  | status |  | te | Unused listed values “extinguished” and “historic”. | Unused listed values “extinguished” and “historic” removed.  Application schema also updated. | |  |
| FC |  | ContactDetails |  | te | Attribute radiocommunications not included among attributes in FC. | Complex attribute “radiocommunications” added. | |  |
| FC |  | RestrictedAreaNavigational attribute restriction |  | te | Other potentially listed values for permitted list for attribute restriction from GI registry and included in S-127 1.0.0 FC but not used in 1.0.0.  28: overtaking prohibited  29: overtaking of convoys by convoys prohibited  30: passing or overtaking prohibited  35: turning prohibited  36: restricted fairway depth  37: restricted fairway width | Added to permitted list for restriction in RestrictedAreaNavigational. | | TBD whether S-101 1.1/2.0 will add them. |
| FC |  | SignalStationWarning |  | te | Listed values included in category attribute attribute definition but not used anywhere  16: vertical clearance indication  17: high water mark  18: depth indication | Added to list of permitted values in FC. | |  |
| GML schema |  | S127.xsd |  | te | Conformance to arrangement of S-100 XSD file distribution. | | Import statements changed to conform to current layout of S-100 XSD files in S-100 schema distribution (see S-100 GitHub) |  |
| Sample GML data |  |  |  | -- | Refinements, extensions, stricter conformance to allowed values. | Updated to use finer-grained encoding of some information types; add geometry for pilotage districts; extend encoding of pilot services; update 2 RestrictedAreaNavigational to add names and remove listed values designated for use by only RestrictedAreaRegulatory. | | Consider proposing “subsurface activities restricted” (Def: An area in which underwater activities are restricted”) as a new listed value for attribute “restriction”. |
| PS |  | various | various | ed | Update UML diagrams containing the updated elements mentioned above. Also update Figures 4 & 5 for clarity (separating overlapping links for ServiceProvisionArea at PilotService). | Updated figures: 4, 5, 22 | |  |
| DCEG |  | 5.19 | Restricted Area Navigational attributes | ed | Update UML diagrams containing the updated elements mentioned above. |  | |  |
| App B |  | various | various | ed | Update diagrams with modified elements and remove unused elements, as listed above. | Updated Figures: 4, 6, 20  Deleted section 1.3.119 (jurisdiction) and renumbered following sections in 1.3  Listed values: 1.3.124 (restriction) – deleted listed value for “use of spuds prohibited”  1.3.126 (status): deleted listed valued for “extinguished” and “historic” | |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | |  |