|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| S-97 | BR |  |  | ge | For the best of my knowledge I have no issues to present. |  | Noted. |
| S-97 | JP |  |  | ge | No comments on the guidance document. |  | Noted. |
| S-97 | AU |  | Entire document | ge | Linking the concepts and practice is not straightforward.  In fact, the approach taken by the S-102 and S-101 project teams in regards to’ section 6 ‘Data Quality’ of the PS is completely different.  The S-102 seems to link better the theory and the tangible elements (features, attributes, etc) in the PS while the S-101 version is completely generic.  At this point in time I’m not convinced that there’s enough detail or real world examples in S-97 part C as to influence and standardise key quality outcomes that S-10x producers should focus on in order to improve compatibility and interoperability between products. | Recommend the DQWG to develop ‘real’ examples based on an existing PS where all the elements described in Figure 5.1 are linked to ‘identifiable’ elements in that PS.  Are there any key quality aspects we want to standardise to improve interoperability and compatibility of S-10x products ? | The Terms of Reference of the DQWG were changed at HSSC-9 to ensure that data quality aspects are harmonized across S-1xx PS. In the current situation S-101, S-102, S-121 have different approaches and measures.  Key quality aspects are to be discussed at DQWG-14 when comparing various S-1xx PS. |
| S-97 | CA |  | Entire document | ge | CA believes that PART C will serve as a useful guideline for those developing product  specifications under S-100. | No further comments are needed. | Noted. |
| S-97 | CA |  | Entire document | ed. | Footnotes are formatted inconsistently. | Recommend a single format is chosen. | Agree to recommendation. To be done by S-100WG. |
| S-97 | US |  | Entire Document | ge | Figures are not available. | Just need to validate the figures are actually available. | Needs to verify this with S-100 Edition 4.0.0. ISO 19152 has various figures that can be used. To be discussed at DQWG-14. |
| S-97 | DK | 1  2nd paragraph line 1 | Pg 1 | ed | Consider wording change of “can be a big challenge for groups with little experience **with** S-100” | Change part of sentence to: “can be a big challenge for groups with little experience **in** S-100” | Agree to recommendation. To be done by S-100WG. |
| S-97 | US | 1  3nd paragraph | Pg 1 | ed | The term e-Navigation eco-system in meant to encompass | The term e-Navigation eco-system is meant to encompass | Agree to recommendation. To be done by S-100WG. |
| S-97 | PRIMAR | 1  3nd paragraph | Pg 1 | ed | The term e-Navigation eco-system in meant….. | Change in to is | See above.. |
| S-97 | DK | 1  4th Paragraph line 5 | Pg 1 | ed | Remove comma from “Part B describes the overall process, specific activities**,** and tasks, and includes hints for solving specific problems” | Remove comma to read: “Part B describes the overall process, specific activities and tasks, and includes hints for solving specific problems” | Agree to recommendation. To be done by S-100WG. |
| S-97 | PRIMAR | 2  2nd paragraph | Pg 1 | ed | This Data Quality Checklist…. | This document has evolved from a checklist to a guideline, and should be referred to as such:  Change to This Data Quality Guideline…. | The word Checklist appears four times in this document. Agree to recommendation. To be done by S-100WG. |
| S-97 | PRIMAR | 2  2nd paragraph | Pg 1 | ed | …., the Data Quality Checklist will serve…. | This document has evolved from a checklist to a guideline, and should be referred to as such:  Change to …., the Data Quality Guideline will serve…. | See above. |
| S-97 | AU | 3 | Pg 2 | ge | S-102 should have its version 2.0.0 approved by MS by December 2018 | Consider adding S-102 Edition 2.0.0 to the References list as it was done for S-100 Ed 4 and S101 Ed 1  *S-102 Bathymetric Surface Product Specification, Edition 2.0.0 (draft) , December 2018* | S-102 Edition 2.0.0 has been rejected at this time by the MS. Only after final approval by the MS, the reference will be updated. |
| S-97 | PRIMAR | 3 | Pg 2 | ed | References made to both S-100 3.00 and 4.00. | Refer to latest version of S-100 only? | Awaiting the approval process, reference can be made to version 4.0.0. This guidance can only be approved by the MS after S-100 4.0.0 has been approved. |
| S-97 | DK | 4.1  All section | Pg 2 | ge | The terms defined in section 4.1 do not match the terms used in Figure 5.1 when Section 5 states that the terms have been defined in 4.1. They are similar but not the same. | Closer correlation between the Terms definitions and the terms used in Figure 5.1 e.g. Data Quality Element rather than Data Quality Overview Element. | Figure 5.1 shows 10 terms, paragraph 4.1 lists 7 terms. Recommend that these are aligned. |
| S-97 | CA | 4.1  Paragraph 3, line 1 | Pg 2 | ed. | Incorrect spelling: subelement | Change to: sub-element | Agree to recommendation. To be done by S-100WG. |
| S-97 | DK | 4.1  Paragraph 3, line 1 | Pg 2 | ed | Change wording of “An evaluation of a data quality **subelement**” | Change wording to: “An evaluation of a data quality **sub-element**”  Unless subelement is ‘model wording’, then leave as is. | Agree to recommendation. To be done by S-100WG. |
| S-97 | AU | 4.1 | Pg 2 | ge | The list of terms is incomplete when compared with Figure 5-1 as stated in section 5 paragraph 1. | Consider expanding the list of terms to include:   * Data quality * Data quality element (although it is defined in section 2) * Result scope * Metaquality | Figure 5.1 shows 10 terms, paragraph 4.1 lists 7 terms. Recommend that these are aligned. |
| S-97 | DK | Figure 5.1, Table B.1 and Table 7.1 | Pg 4 | ed | Formatting and positioning of header for figures and tables is inconsistent across document | Standardised formatting and positioning for all figures and tables. | Agree to recommendation. To be done by S-100WG. |
| S-97 | DK | 6  Paragraph 1, line 1 | Pg 5 | ed | Remove hyphen from “ISO**-**19157” – inconsistent with use throughout the rest of the document. | Change wording to read “ISO 19157” | Agree to recommendation. To be done by S-100WG. |
| S-97 | DK | 6  Logical Consistency Line 2 | Pg 6 | ed | Double use of hyphen in between “S-100 -**-** Part 1” – remove hyphen | Change wording to “S-100 – Part 1” | Agree to recommendation. To be done by S-100WG. |
| S-97 | DK | 6  Positional Accuracy, Line 5 | Pg 7 | ed | Delete unnecessary full stop from “Point set data includes a coordinate direct position for each point in the point set**.** (points/curves).” | Delete unnecessary full stop to read “Point set data includes a coordinate direct position for each point in the point set (points/curves).” | Agree to recommendation. To be done by S-100WG. |
| S-97 | IN |  | Pg 7 | ed | Recommended standard circular Error  (=0.7071\*SQRT(SD(X)+SD(X)) | (=0.7071\*SQRT(SD(X)+SD(X))) | Agree to recommendation. To be done by S-100WG. |
| S-97 | US | Eivond (E) Comment 1, Raphael (R) Comment 2 | Pg 7 | Response |  | I can understand both comments. The first two bullets show actual methods to calculate the error/confidence level. The S-101 bullet is more of a description of the factors within the equation.  S-101 bullet may actually need a calculation to be aligned with the other examples, along with a description. Also, S-102 is mentioned but doesn’t have a bullet. | This demonstrates the misalignment between various PS regarding the computation/wording of positional accuracy. The word accuracy and uncertainty are also used mixed. To be discussed at DQWG-14 (ref action point DQWG12/12). |
| S-97 | Chair | Raphael Comment 2 | Pg 7 | te | Question for Rogier. I think the real issue is whether they should be called “calculation methods” or something else. They are “DQ results” but that term may not be obvious in this context even though it is defined in the Terms section. | They examples are all providing the same data quality measure (Positional Accuracy-absolute or external accuracy). They are just different methods of computing them. There is also the DQ measure Relative or internal accuracy. I assume that within S-1xx we by default mean the external accuracy. There are different ways of computing the external accuracy. The aim is that within S-1xx all PS use the same default method (95% confidence interval) and add other methods as deemed appropriate. | To be discussd at DQWG-14 that the 95% Confidence Interval is to be harmonized among S-1xx. Also to be discussed if the word accuracy or uncertainty is to be used. See above. |
| S-97 | US | E3,R4 | Pg 8 | te |  | I would keep in line with the S-101 DCEG where the spatial information is tied within the feature type. Sub bullet? | To be discussed at DQWG-14 with the TSSO. |
| S-97 | US | E5,R6 | Pg 8 | te |  | It should include attributes as well.ThematicClassificationCorrectness in the table on Page 12 mentions “Comparison of the classes assigned to features OR THEIR ATTRIBUTES to a universe of discourse.” | See S-100 Edition 4.0.0 Part 3, page 6, par. 3.5.2.8. Reference to S100\_GF\_AttributeType to be made. Attributes to be included. |
| S-97 | Chair | 6, recommendation 10 | Pg 10 | te | Paragraph “Introduction to data quality” to be used by all S-100 based Product Specifications. | Paragraph “Introduction to data quality” to be used as a template by all S-100 based Product Specifications. | Agree. See decision HSSC10/36: HSSC agreed that the level of authority of Data Quality Checklist for Product Specifications is a recommendation, which can be adapted as necessary by WGs, under the condition that it will not create any potential interoperability issue. |
| S-97 | AU | 6  Last section | Pg. 10 | te | ‘Introduction to data quality’  Bullet points one and nine sound very similar. | Consider deleting bullet point nine: ‘Anything specifically required for the specified product’. | Anything specifically required for the specified product could be a quality measure which is not included into any of to the Recommendations 1 to 9. The proposed change to be discussed at DQWG-14. |
| S-97 | AU | 7 | Table 7.1  Pg. 10 | te | Title of the first column seems to be incorrect. | According to previous definitions (see list under Fig. 5.1) the column should be named ‘Data quality measure’.  According to section 2 ‘Data quality element’ is a ‘quantitative’ component ….. | S-100 Ed. 4.0.0. Appendix 4c-C has as title: “Hydrographic Quality Metadata Attribute Definitions”. Agree that definitions should be aligned. Suggest to discuss Table 7.1 at DQWG-14 to come to list of Data Quality measures that are recommended and common for all S-1xx PS. |
| S-97 | DK | 7  Table 7.1, column 1 and column 4 | Pg 10 | ed | Expand columns 1 and 4 so that words are not split between rows e.g. rows 19& 20 in column 1 Measures is split across two rows. Likewise , in column 4 in multiple rows the word dataset is split across two rows. | Expand columns 1 and 4 so that words are not split between rows | Agree, layout to be improved. To be done by S-100WG. |
| S-97 | US | R7 | Pg 10 | te |  | I am assuming that where the <this Product Specification> is the only change that the S-100 Spec should make to the template? Otherwise, keep the remainder of the information. | There are already draft PS like S-102 and S-121 who have used a different template. To be discussed at DQWG-14 |