|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| S-67 | UK |  |  | ge | The following UK comments made in Dec’17 (when reviewing v0.5) still apply, so have been repeated here. In addition, a few v0.6 editorial comments have been included. |  | Noted |
| S-67 | UK |  |  | ge | Fundamentally we consider it unnecessary to create a new standard.  The information would be better placed within S-66:  Facts about Electronic Charts and Carriage Requirements, to avoid readers having to refer to two different documents. |  | Please note NCWG4-07.2A, The UK has included a new section V on data quality in its new edition of publication 5011 published August 2018. |
| S-67 | UK |  |  | ge | Fundamentally S-66 (and S-67 if approved) are not standards.  We support the principle of creating a new group of “G” documents to provide guidance. |  | Discussed at HSSC meetings |
| S-67 | CAN |  | GENERAL COMMENT | ge | Canada notes the lack of clear text to cover the temporal aspect of the quality information in ENC, such as making it clear what the data in the ENC is only assessed at that point in time, and that the producing hydrographic office continuously assess its area of responsibly for events that negatively impact the data. An example that can be mentioned is the great earthquake in Japan in 2011 (Great East Japan Earthquake) after which most navigational charts in the area were simply wrong. JHOD asked DQWG for advice to how to encode CATZOC in this situation and the recommendation was to change all CATZOC to D (DQWG6-10A, DQWG6-10B, DQWG6 minutes). |  | Not all HOs degrade CATZOC over time in an area of unstable seabed. This should first be resolved before writing guidance to the mariner. |
| S-67 | NL |  |  | ge | S-66 section 3 lists the following training objectives:  safe operation of the ECDIS equipment  Proper use of ECDIS related information  Awareness of ECDIS related limitations.  Knowledge of legal aspects and responsibilities related to electronic charts | Assessment of ENC data quality indicators (for example CATZOC) is listed.The mariner must be familiar with the impact of things such as SCAMIN, overscale, update history, CATZOC, safety values and chart usage.  Suggest that these items are taken into S-67 to provide a framework of which CATZOC is one element. |  |
|  | NL |  |  | ge | S-66 - Facts about electronic charts and carriage requirements, is under the authority of the ENCWG. S-67 can only describe the existing system (S-57/S52) and these standards are frozen. Issueing a S-67 document at the moment that new Data Quality Indicators are being developed, creates the risk of confusion to the mariner. Once S-101 Ed 2.0.0 goes into production, an improved Quality of Bathymetric Data attribute is available. Symbology may be different from the current symbols used. | Consider holding the publication of S-67 until HSSC decides to use the advantages of new symbology into the current S-52 Presentation Library. (change of CATZOC symbol). |  |
|  | NL |  |  | ge | Aggregation of CATZOC values should be discussed and agreed upon in order to relate its issues with respect to overscale usage. | HOs should maintain a consistent world wide policy on the agrregation mechanism when going from large scale to lower scale charts. The minimum size of a CATZOC symbol should be agreed upon. | Issue to be transferred to IRCC and to be discussed by RHCs. |
|  | NL |  |  | ge | NIPWG-6 meeting, Stakeholder Forum on Presentation of Nautical Publication Information on future S-100-based ECDIS system, Chair Presentation on “Provision of Nautical Information” slide 5 gives a good overview of customer’s interest when planning an executing a voyage | S-67 should be limited to Uncertainty of depth information in Electronic Navigational Charts. Find dangers, Find Restricted and No Go Areas are included in the NIPWG presentation. Under Keel Clearance Management is done by a separate PT under the authority of NIPWG. | Discuss what elements should be in S-67 and which ones are covered by other IHO publications. |
| S-67 | PRIMAR | Whole document | Tables and figures | ed | Tables and figures are not numbered | Consider numbering Tables and figures. | To be done. |
| S-67 | FR |  | Front page |  | The document is actually a guide to CATZOC, but only as depicted in ENCs, the title and content should also reflect the use of ZOC in paper charts |  | See paper DQWG14-06C |
| S-67 | NL | Whole document |  | te | Accuracy of depth information | Consider using the word uncertainty in stead of accuracy, as in S-101 DCEG, the definition of uncertainy is harmonized with S-44 and other S-1xx PS | To be discussed at DQWG14 |
| S-67 | AU |  | Pg 1 | ge | Title page | update dates | To be done. |
| S-67 | AU |  | Pg 2 | ge | Copyright notice | update year | To be done. |
| S-67 | NL |  | Pg 4 | te | Data Quality Indicators in an ENC. | Are we addressing all data quality indicators of just CATZOC? | To be discussed at DQWG14 |
| S-67 | NL |  | Pg4 | ed | The intended audience for the is publication are mariners | The intended audience for this publication are mariners | To be done. |
| S-67 | PRIMAR | Section 1-  1st sentence | Pg 5 | ed | Missing words, Language | Amend accordingly:  ….and completeness of the individual surveys that were used to develop ~~that~~ the charted depths. | Done in v0.8 |
| S-67 | NGA |  | Pg 5 | ed | “and at times will less completeness” | “and at times with less completeness.” | See comment PRIMAR |
| S-67 | UK | Section 1- 1st Paragraph | Pg 5 | ed | Minor editorial edits in red | All charts, whether paper or electronic, contain~~s~~ bathymetric data which varies in quality due to the age, accuracy and completeness of the individual surveys that were used to develop ~~that~~ the charted depths. | Done in v0.8 |
| S-67 | AU | Section 1 - 1st paragraph | Pg 5 | ge | Typing errors | add “of” and change to “the” | Done in v0.8 |
| S-67 | AU | Section 1 –2nd paragraph | Pg 5 | ge | Typing errors | remove “given above | Done in v0.8 |
| S-67 | NGA | 2nd paragraph | Pg 5 | ed | The details and interpretations often varied widely between nations, though most simply said how old a survey was, rather than how good. | The details and interpretations often varied widely between nations. Commonly noted was the date of survey, rather than the quality of the survey | To be discussed at DQWG-14 |
| S-67 | CAN | Section 1 - 2nd Paragraph | Pg 5 | ed | Typo? “…routes tend to be surveyed less frequently, and at times will less completeness”. | Change to “…routes tend to be surveyed less frequently, and at times with less completeness”. | Text changed, comment no longer valid.(v0.8) |
| S-67 | CAN | Section 1 – 2nd Paragraph 2 | Pg 5 | ed | Not necessarily true? “Areas of high commercial traffic are re-surveyed frequently to very high levels of accuracy” | Change to” “Areas of high commercial traffic tend to be re-surveyed frequently to very high levels of accuracy” | Text changed, comment no longer valid.(v0.8) |
| S-67 | UK | section 1 2nd Paragraph | Pg 5 | ed | Minor editorial edits in red | In general, remote areas away from shipping routes tend to be surveyed less frequently, and at times ~~will~~ with less completeness. | Text changed, comment no longer valid.(v0.8) |
| S-67 | PRIMAR | Section 1-  2nd paragraph 1st sentence | Pg 5 | ed | Missing words, Language | Amend accordingly:  …., and at time will have less completeness. | Text changed, comment no longer valid.(v0.8). |
| S-67 | NL | section 1 2nd Paragraph | Pg 5 | te | In general, remote areas away from shipping routes tend to be surveyed less frequently, less accurately, and with lower confidence that all features have been detected. | Considerations from a HO to survey a particular area within their EEZ tend to be a combination of 1) major shipping routes, shipping intensity 2) risk to the marine environment 3) general depth of an area. | To be discussed at DQWG14. |
| S-67 | PRIMAR | Section 1-  3rd paragraph 2nd sentence | Pg 5 | ed | Missing words, Language | Amend accordingly:  The details and interpretations often varied widely between nations, ~~though most simply said~~ like establishing how old a survey was… | Done in v0.8 |
| S-67 | NGA | 3rd paragraph | Pg 5 | ge | incomplete thought: “then applying a common-sense approach.” | Then applying a common-sense approach to safely navigate. | To be discussed at DQWG14. |
| S-67 | CAN | Section 1-  4th paragraph | Pg 5 | ed | ZOC is not ‘new’ - “International Hydrographic Organization developed and published a new international system” | Change to “International Hydrographic Organization developed and published the international system” | Done in v0.8 |
| S-67 | AU | Section 1 – 4th paragraph | Pg 5 |  | Comment 1: This is factually incorrect, particularly in relation to the example given within the paragraph referring to ‘spot soundings’. Firstly, S-58 check no.550 requires M\_QUAL everywhere that there are any or all of depth contour, sounding, underwater rock, obstruction. Secondly, the ZOC Table in S-57 puts unsurveyed areas in ZOC D – an unsurveyed area should therefore be assigned a CATZOC value, not excluded from M\_QUAL coverage, especially if there are a few spot soundings to make a mariner think that some level of information exists.  Comment 2: Conceptually, this publication is a guide for mariners who have not had chart accuracy in relation to ENC explained well to them during training (it is often skipped or reduced as a topic), not a guide for those who encode ENC, so should focus on what a mariner can see on screen, and be explained in easily understood layman’s terms, not by mis-quoting specialist cartographic encoding rules. The document is structured to gently lead the reader from enduring truths and historical practices to general concepts of what goes on now and how they should react to what they can see. To discuss a ‘Meta object’ before even explaining how the overall Zones Of Confidence system works is seriously discouraging a reader from reading further. | Delete the 4th paragraph | To be discussed at DQWG-14 |
| S-67 | NGA | 4th paragraph | Pg 5 | ed | CATOC | CATZOC | Agree, to be done. |
| S-67 | PRIMAR | Section 1-  5th paragraph 5th sentence | Pg 5 | ed | Missing words, Language | Amend accordingly:  Land areas ~~to~~ do not… | Removed by Mike Prince? |
| S-67 | PRIMAR | Section 1-  5th paragraph 6th sentence | Pg 5 | ed | Missing words, Language | Amend accordingly:  Unsurveyed areas ~~also~~ do not require an M\_QUAL object if there ~~was~~ is no depth information within ~~that unsurveyed~~ the area. | Check S-101 DCEG. |
| S-67 | PRIMAR | Section 1- Note 1 | Pg 5 | Te | The note states: …Other optional M\_QUAL attributes include the dates of a survey, the vertical or horizontal accuracy…..  The attributes VERACC and HORACC are not defined in S-57 to be used when encoding M\_QUAL. The vertical and horizontal accuracy are reflected in the choice of deciding a CATZOC value, meaning a reference already exist there.  POSACC and SOUACC could arguably be used for encoding additional information related to vertical and horizontal accuracy, but since the other available attributes VERACC and HORACC that actually defines the accuracy in question are not being used when encoding M\_QUAL, perhaps this sentence should be rewritten. | Consider rewriting to:  …Other optional M\_QUAL attributes include the dates of a survey, ~~the vertical or horizontal accuracy~~ the positional accuracy, the sounding accuracy or….. | Check S-101 DCEG. |
| S-67 | FR | Section 2- | Pg 5 |  | ……..and to assess the associated level of risk to navigate in a particular area…… | Ambiguous phrasing, as CATZOC is not the only indicator of risk, hence the additional part. CATZOC must not be understood as a go/no go indicator!!! | To be discussed at DQWG14. |
| S-67 | PRIMAR | Section 2-  1st sentence | Pg 5 | ed | Missing words, Language | Amend accordingly:  All S-57 ENCs use…. | Done in v0.8 |
| S-67 | NL | Section 2 3rd paragraph | Pg5 | te | to assess these risks | Risk assessment during voyage planning is a combination of depth, unexpected single objects that may endanger navigation, horizontal/vertical uncertainty and finally a check if the chart is a representation of the real world as it is today, (not at the moment of the survey). | To be discussed at DQWG14 |
| S-67 | NL | Section 3 | Pg 6 | te | This symbol is repeated throughout each area of equal quality. | That is actually not the case. The symbol is a staggered pattern, clear indication of separate areas is not visible. | See paper DQWG14-08C. |
| S-67 | NGA | Table 1 | Pg 7 | ge | Acronym: DGPS | Differential Global Positioning System (DGPS) | Agree, to be done. |
| S-67 | UK | Section 2-Table 1 | Pg 7 | ed | Under the table it reads: “The full version of this Table may be found in Section 7 at the end of this publication.”  However, there is no section 7. The full table is contained within Annex A. |  | Make consistent. |
| S-67 | FR | Section 2-Table 1 - D | Pg 7 |  | Poor quality data or unsurveyed . | Unserveyed but with some indication of depths, otherwise, there is no associated ZOC | Check S-101 DCEG. |
| S-67 | NL | Section 4 – bullit list | Pg 7 | te | individual assessment criteria are:  typical survey characteristics  seafloor coverage  position accuracy  depth accuracy | Suggest to re-order the bullits:  seafloor coverage  depth uncertainty  horizontal position uncertainty  typical suvey characteristics | See paper DQWG14-06B |
| S-67 | NGA | Title/Header | Pg 8 | ed | Capatilization: The components of an assessment | The Components of an Assessment | Agree, to be done. |
| S-67 | PRIMAR | Section 4- 1st paragraph Last sentence | Pg 8 | ed | Missing words, Language | Amend accordingly:  One limitation of the ZOC system is ~~that it provides little~~ the lack of information… | Done in v0.8 |
| S-67 | PRIMAR | Section 4- 3rd paragraph last sentence | Pg 8 | ed | Missing words, Language | Amend accordingly:  …larger than any uncertainty ~~about~~ indicating how good… | Done in v0.8 |
| S-67 | AU | Section 4 – 3rd paragraph | Pg 8 |  | The guide is written for mariners, not instructions for hydrographic offices, so context within this paragraph requires correction. | The first factor considered is the typical survey characteristics. The planning of the survey, the techniques used and the datum used are considered initially when assigning ZOC. A well planned and conducted survey has much greater potential than a few historic isolated depths observed while on passage. | ? |
| S-67 | PRIMAR | Section 4-  1st bulletpoint | Pg 8 | ed | Add semicolon | Amend accordingly  …survey characteristics; | Done in v0.8 |
| S-67 | PRIMAR | Section 4- Underlined sentences | Pg 8 | ed | The beginning of chapter 4 mention assessments based upon four criteria.  When describing those criterias, continue use the word criteria and not factor. | Amend accordingly:  First ~~factor~~ criteria  The most important ~~factor~~ criteria  The next most important ~~factor~~ criteria  The least important ~~factor~~ criteria | Done in v0.8 |
| S-67 | PRIMAR | Section 4- Whole chapter | Pg 8 | ed | When discussing the criteria's, it makes more sense to start describing the most important one first and the least important last. | Consider changing the order of criterias. | See paper DQWG14-06B |
| S-67 | UK | section 4- Final paragraph | Pg 8 | ge | Regarding the suggestion of downgrading CATZOC in areas of mobile seabed, UKHO believes that knowing the date of the survey and the nature of the seabed is vital to the interpretation of CATZOC values and the impact on under-keel clearance.  It is better to give the facts to the mariner, together with advice on how to interpret the facts, rather than change what is provided.  This is a case where this guidance document is more directed to, and has an impact on, the data producer. It is vital to separate guidance to producers from guidance to mariners.  Care must also be taken not to modify the existing principles of CATZOC.  Any changes to the way CATZOC are encoded must be a revision to S-57 or wait for S-101. |  | Agree, see paper DQWG14-06B. In S-101, category of temporal variaition is a mandatory attribute and should be used as such. M\_SREL is optional and of less importance to the mariner.  To be discussed at DQWG14 |
| S-67 | FR | section 4- Final paragraph | Pg 8 |  | I’m agree with this policy. However, for the moment, S4 and UOC only urge to downgrade the ZOC after a major natural disaster. So, it’s strange to say that some HO’s do and others not if there is no rules for. |  | See DQWG ToR, to provide guidance on data quality aspects to hydrographic offices, in particular  to ensure harmonized implementation; |
| S-67 | NGA | Title/header | Pg 8 | ed | Capatilization: Typical survey characeristics. | Typical Survey Characteristics | Agree, to be done. |
| S-67 | NGA | Title/header | Pg 8 | ed | Capatilization: Seafloor coverage | Seafloor Coverage | Agree, to be done. |
| S-67 | NGA | 2nd paragraph | Pg 9 | ed | The question of whether are there are any undetected dangers in an area affects the majority of the world’s coastal and oceanic waters – it only once there is confidence that nothing has been missed (and therefore nothing left of the chart) that the question of how close a ship can pass to the charted seabed becomes relevant. | The question of whether there are any undetected dangers in an area affects the majority of the world’s coastal and oceanic waters. Only once there is confidence that nothing has been missed ( and therefore nothing left of the chart) that the question of how close a ship can pass to the charted seabed becomes relevant. | Agree, to be done |
| S-67 | NGA | 2nd paragraph | Pg 9 | ed | This is the most important factor in assessing... | Seafloor coverage is the most important factor in assessing ... | To be discussed at DQWG14 |
| S-67 | UK | Section 4.2- Paragraph 1 | Pg 9 | ed | Minor editorial edits in red | “The question of whether ~~are~~ there are any undetected dangers in an area affects the majority of the world’s coastal and oceanic waters” | Done in v0.8 |
| S-67 | AU | Section 4.2- 1st paragraph | Pg 9 | ge | Typing error | Typing error: add “is” | Done in v0.8 |
| S-67 | PRIMAR | Section 4.2-1st paragraph 4th sentence | Pg 9 | ed | Missing words, Language | Amend accordingly:  The question of whether ~~are~~ there are… | Done in v0.8 |
| S-67 | CAN | Section 4.2-1st Paragraph | Pg 9 | ed | Typo? “…The question of whether are there are any undetected dangers…”. | Change to “…The question of whether ~~are~~ there are any undetected dangers”. | Done in v0.8 |
| S-67 | PRIMAR | Section 4.2-1st paragraph last sentence | Pg 9 | ed | Missing words, Language | Amend accordingly:  It is only ~~once~~ when there is confidence… | Done in v0.8 |
| S-67 | NL | Section 4.2  6th paragraph | Pg 10 | te | The hydrographic office responsible for the chart will have (or should have) made their assessment based upon the quality of the survey, the depth of water and the size of vessels using the area | In an ECDIS system the default value for safety contour and safety depth is the 30m depth contour line. DQWG is invited to discuss if this value should be taken into consideration when assigning CATZOC values. | To be discussed at DQWG14 |
| S-67 | NGA | All | Pg 10 | ed | more information is available in the .... section of this publication | Hyperlinking it witiin the document should be done to achieve quick referencing or header number information (5.3, 5.4 etc) | Once document becomes final. |
| S-67 | NGA | Title/header | Pg 11 | ed | Capatilization: Position accuracy | Position Accuracy | Agree, to be done. |
| S-67 | NGA | 2nd paragraph | Pg 11 | ed | While some parts of a chart will be based upon modern surveys,away from the most critical areas most charts still rely on upon surveys doen with progressively older systems. | While some parts of a chart will be based upon modern surveys, most parts of a chart reply upon surveys with older survey systems further away from the most critical areas. | To be discussed at DQWG14 |
| S-67 | AU | Section 4.3 | Pg 11 |  | Two groundings in 2017 (Roebuck Bay and Kea Trader) highlighted that allowing for appropriate horizontal displacement from a danger needs to be emphasised. A diagram has much greater impact than just words (also requested by the Australian Maritime safety Authority). | Added new diagram and amended text to match diagram | To be discussed at DQWG14 |
| S-67 | PRIMAR | Section 4.3- Last paragraph 1st sentence | Pg 11 | ed | Missing words, Language | Amend accordingly:  …charted feature~~s~~ is only part of assessing ~~how far to stay clear of~~ the safety distance needed when encountering a potential danger. | the safe distance needed when encountering. |
| S-67 | NL | Section 4.3 – figure at bottom of page | Pg 11 | te | The uncertainty of todays GNSS position is better than 20m world wide. The impact of poor position of the vessel is much smaller than the poor position of areas of CATZOC C, D or U | Key factor in avoinding groundings is to raise to awareness of charted features with a high horizontal position uncertainty | To be discussed at DQWG14. |
| S-67 | NGA | Title/header | Pg 12 | ed | Capatilization: Depth accuracy | Depth Accuracy | Agree, to be done. |
| S-67 | NGA | Title/header | Pg 12 | ed | Capatilization: Impact of ZOC categories upon mariners | Impact of ZOC Categories Upon Mariners | Agree, to be done. |
| S-67 | NGA | Title/header | Pg 12 | ed | Capatilization: An alternative way to understand ZOC | An Alternative Way to Understand ZOC | Agree, to be done. |
| S-67 | NGA | 2nd paragraph | Pg 13 | ed | or near reaf or rocky areas | or near a reef or rocky areas OR or near reefs or rocky areas | To be discussed at DQWG14 |
| S-67 | FR | Section 5 1st sentence | Pg 13 | te | …..navigate with confidence…. | Confidence in regards to the information depicted on the chart : a ZOC A1 area might well be impossible to navigate for certain ships. | Suggestion: navigate safely in areas with ZOC A1 and A2 classification, based on charted depth and draught of the vessel. |
|  | UK | Section 5 | Pg 13 | ge | Section 5 gives advice on appropriate levels of under-keel clearance, including specific clearance values.  This information would be expected to be specified by each shipping company’s Safety Management System (SMS) and local maritime/port authorities.  It would be dangerous for IHO to imply any liability by suggesting values. |  | Under Keel Clearance Management is under the responsibility of the NIPWG -> UKCMPT. Under keel clearance management is out scope for S-67. |
| S-67 | PRIMAR | Section 5.1- 2nd paragraph | Pg 13 | ed | Consider removing whole paragraph referring to six and three-star hotels.  This is a guidance for accuracy of depth information, not for hotel review.  I believe this was also reported upon during the first comments round of this document. | Consider removing whole paragraph | Agree. |
| S-67 | FR | Section 5.1- 2nd paragraph | Pg 13 |  | See the France comments for v0.5 |  | Please repeat the exact comments. |
| S-67 | NGA | 3rd paragraph | Pg 14 | ed | Capatilization: pilot | pilot | Agree, to be done. |
| S-67 | FR | Section 5.2- Table | Pg 14 | te | Comments for all the secheme in 5.X  Be careful, this scheme don’t take into account the horizontal uncertainty ! Mariners should look the lowest charted depth in the area covers by this uncertainty (and more – see the end of §54.3) |  | See DCEG page 6: There is no method within ENC to indicate to the mariner that a feature has not been encoded in its true position, therefore it is considered important for features to be encoded in their true position to provide the mariner with an accurate representation of the real world. |
| S-67 | FR | Section 5.2- 5th paragraph | Pg 14 | te | So, the CATZOC must be B and not A1 or A2…  This type of “particular case” should not be presented in the paper.  It’s seems logical that if the Harbour master said that there is a danger and the chart doesn’t reflect it, mariners have to follow harbor master.  The part of §6 on this subject is sufficient. |  | To be discussed at DQWG14 |
| S-67 | FR | Section 5.2-  last paragraph | Pg 14 | te | I think it’s not the paper to talk about that (if the paper ifs for “mariners” in general). Harbour master / Pilot has a better knowledge of this subject than a mariners |  | Responsibility issue, to follow the official publised chart or directions from Pilot or Harbour Master? |
| S-67 | CAN | Section 5.2-  last paragraph | Pg 14 | ed | Comment – “This will be the result of what is known as a ‘Special Order’ survey.”  This is the only place ‘Survey Order S44” is discussed in this document. While this statement it true, the rest of the document does not make reference to Survey Order – should we have a section on Survey Order and how it related to ZOC – or have the entire document maintain the more layman terminology used in the rest of the document? | Add/develop a relational table that cross references S44 Survey Order(s) to CATZOC (appendix?) or remove reference to “Special Order” in this paragraph. | See paper DQWG14-4A |
| S-67 | CAN | Section 5.2-  last paragraph | Pg 14 | ed | Comment – “If the Master considers that there is the possibility of undetected features, such as in an area where depths may have recently changed, it may be wise to allow another 2m safety margin.”  The 2m safety margin seems arbitrary – perhaps a better explanation of how 2m was derived is required | “2m safety margin” is mentioned in 5.2 ZOC A1 as well as 5.3 ZOC A2 - the number does not seem to be derived from a mathematical formula – more clarification is required. | To be discussed at DQWG14 |
| S-67 | PRIMAR | Section 5.3 Figure – last bulletpoint - | Pg 15 | ed | Align to Annex A | Amend accordingly:  …approximately 1.2 – ~~1.4~~ 1.6m | Agree, to be done. |
| S-67 | FR | Section 5.3- last paragraph | Pg 15 | ed | See comments in §5.2 |  |  |
| S-67 | CAN | Section 5.4- 1st paragraph | Pg 16 | ge | Comment – “ZOC B typically includes well conducted coastal surveys prior to the late 1990s”  It may be inappropriate to relate ZOC B to a specific time frame – general comment should relate more to sensor and survey technique (controlled single beam vs multibeam/lidar) | Add/develop a relational table that cross references S44 Survey Order(s) to CATZOC (appendix?) to help the Mariner understand how the source data Survey Order (techniques/accuracies) relate to CATZOC encoding on the product. | See paper DQWG14-4A |
| S-67 | FR | Section 5.4- 3th paragraph | Pg 16 |  | That is a problem. Especially if you pass from one ENC to another made by a different country but with different views on CATZOC…  It is probably safer not to mention any figure here if it is not a shared view within hydrographic offices  It is also an issue in deep water : ZOC values become a bit irrelevant… (In 4000m depths it is very unlikely that a dangerous feature should exist, even in an area covered with a “loose” survey.) |  | In S-101 DCEG, HOs can classify an area as Oceanic > 200m deep. In shallower areas, it is up to the interpretation of the HO to assign the correct value. See paper DQWG14-06B. |
| S-67 | PRIMAR | Section 5.4- Figure – last bulletpoint | Pg 16 | ed | Align to Annex A | Amend accordingly:  …approximately 1.2 – ~~1.4~~ 1.6m | Agree, to be done. |
| S-67 | NGA | bullits | Pg 17 | ed | Capatilization: relative, older, passage | Relative, Older, Passage should all be capatilized beginning the bullits (as they appear in the ZOC D section) | Agree, to be done. |
| S-67 | AU | Section 5.5 – diagram | Pg 17 | ge | Typing error | correct text within diagram to “500 metres”. | Done in v0.8 |
| S-67 | PRIMAR | Section 5.5- Figure 2nd bulletpoint | Pg 17 | ed | Align to Annex A | Amend accordingly:  …better than 500 metres. | Done in v0.8 |
| S-67 | PRIMAR | Section 5.5- Figure – last bulletpoint | Pg 17 | ed | Align to Annex A | Amend accordingly:  …approximately ~~2.0m~~ 2.5 – 3.5m | Agree, to be done. |
| S-67 | CAN | Section 5.6- 1st paragraph | Page 18 | ed | Comment – “soundings collected on an opportunity basis by ships undertaking routine passage”  MBES data collected during a routine passage? Full seafloor search within the swath (which can be considerable) – could this change the CATZOC? |  | See paper DQWG14-06B, to be discussed at DQWG14. |
| S-67 | PRIMAR | Section 5.6- Figure 2nd bulletpoint | Pg 18 | ed | Align to Annex A | Amend accordingly:  …~~better~~ worse than 500 metres. | Done in v0.8 |
| S-67 | AU | Section 5.6– diagram | Pg 18 | ge | Typing error | correct text within diagram to “worse than 500 metres”. | Agree, to be done. |
| S-67 | NGA | bullits | Pg 19 | ed | Capatilization: newly, the, the | Newly, The, The should all be capatilized beginning the bullits (as they appear in the ZOC D section) | Agree, to be done. |
| S-67 | FR | Section 5.7- 1st paragraph last sentence | Pg 19 |  | Shom has some systematic rules leading to a CATZOC U : for instance, an intertidal area with no depth shown is coded as Unassessed. |  | See paper DQWG14-04A, to be discussed at DQWG14 |
| S-67 | FR | Section 6- 1st paragraph 1st sentence | Pg 19 |  | Confidence in regards to the information depicted on the chart |  | To be discussed at DQWG14 |
| S-67 | FR | Section 6- 2nd paragraph last sentence | Pg 19 |  | The case “If the Master considers that there is the possibility of undetected features, such as in an area where depths may change due to silting” could be explain here too. |  | To be discussed at DQWG14 |
| S-67 | NGA | Header | Pg 20 | ed | Capatilization: Zones Of Confidence Categories | Zones of Confidence Categories (this is actually pretty sporadic between uppercasing the Of or lowercasing within the document) | To be decided at DQWG14 |
| S-67 | CAN | Note 1. | Pg 20 | ed | Comment – “ZOC categories reflect a charting standard and not just a hydrographic survey standard”  ZOC is not a hydrographic survey standard | Change to “ZOC categories reflect a charting standard and not ~~just~~ a hydrographic survey standard” | To be discussed at DQWG14 |
| S-67 | CAN | Note 1, 2 | Pg 21 | ed | Comment – remove the term ‘error’ and replace with ‘uncertainty or uncertainties’ | Example: Change “not only survey uncertainties but also other uncertainties introduced in the chart production process” | Agree, in S-101 DCEG the word error or accuracy is no longer used. It is now vertical uncertainty and horizontal position uncertainty. To be commonly used throughout any guidance. |
| S-67 | AU |  | Pg 22 |  | Feedback from the two 2017 groundings (one each in Australia and New Caledonia) clearly shows that the risks and potential consequences of over-scale display of an ENC in ECDIS when near an isolated danger are not understood. This content has been requested by the Australian Maritime Safety Authority to address the risk that at least some mariners mistakenly believe that continuing to zoom in beyond compilation scale gives greater accuracy. | Add Annex B on the version labelled “v0.7 (+Iso dangers)” | Issue could be resolved by the proposal in paper DQWG14-08C. |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |