

S-101PT comments and editorial observations

1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)	
Component	CO ¹	Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex (e.g. 3.1)	Paragraph / Figure/Tab le/Note (e.g. Table 1)	Type of comment ²	Comment (justification for change) by the CO ³	Proposed change by the CO	Secretariat observations on each comment submitted
Actions for Road Map to S-101 v1.1.0							
	IHO Sec	4.3.4.1	Figure 4	ed	This Figure is incorrectly numbered (there are 2 Figure 4's).	Amend to Figure 5. All following Figures and associated references will also need to be renumbered.	Applied. Full review required before final draft. DONE – Jeff Wootton Review in progress – any feedback may consider v1.1.
	7Cs	1.5	Identifier	ge	Is this the identifier to identify a data set?	Then it should be INT.IHO.S-101.1.0	I think this is the metadata identifier for the actual product specification, not for a dataset. [NOTE: If a change is to be made here, then should something similar be done for the DCEG (clause 1.2)?] For discussion of S-101PT. Leave as is for now, however Holger to investigate where this should be in S-100/S-101. June meeting: If Holger has not submitted input/answer, need to bring up at June meeting.

1 **CO** = Contributing Organisation (HOs should use 2 character codes e.g. FR AU etc.)
 2 **Type of comment:** **ge** = general **te** = technical **ed** = editorial
 3 Whilst not compulsory, comments are more likely to be accepted if accompanied by a proposed change.
NOTE Columns 1, 2, 4, 5 are compulsory.

S-101PT comments and editorial observations

1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)	
Component	CO ¹	Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex (e.g. 3.1)	Paragraph / Figure/Tab le/Note (e.g. Table 1)	Type of comment ²	Comment (justification for change) by the CO ³	Proposed change by the CO	Secretariat observations on each comment submitted
DPS	IC	3	Table 1	te	For high density detailed bathymetry 1:500 scale could be appropriate. This future-proofs this specification and reflects requirements for more detailed data.	Suggest add display scale values which are smaller than 1000.	Supported, however no values added at this stage. For consideration of S-101PT. Rejected for Edition 1.0.0, however will likely be required. Further investigation required. Tom Richardson?
	IHO Sec	4.5.3	First bullet	te	Discussion at S-100WG3 suggested removing the limitation on the maximum number of Data Coverage features allowed in a dataset.	Remove restriction on the maximum number of Data Coverage features allowed in a dataset.	Note that, if this change is approved, it will also impact on DCEG clause 3.4.1. For discussion of S-101PT. Decision: Agreed to remove the restriction for Edition 1.0.0, but will need to be carefully monitored with the intention of having some restriction in the future. – Restriction removal DONE – Jeff Wootton Careful monitoring to be done by testing

1 **CO** = Contributing Organisation (HOs should use 2 character codes e.g. FR AU etc.)
 2 **Type of comment:** **ge** = general **te** = technical **ed** = editorial
 3 Whilst not compulsory, comments are more likely to be accepted if accompanied by a proposed change.
NOTE Columns 1, 2, 4, 5 are compulsory.

S-101PT comments and editorial observations

Date: 07 Jan 2019

Document: **S-101 Ed 1.1.0 (Main)**

1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)	
Component	CO ¹	Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex (e.g. 3.1)	Paragraph / Figure/Table/Note (e.g. Table 1)	Type of comment ²	Comment (justification for change) by the CO ³	Proposed change by the CO	Secretariat observations on each comment submitted
	NOAA	11.5		te	Comment from Julia Powell included in draft document.	The S100WG need to think about how an exchange set with multiple types of products would work. There might need to be an OR in this statement that if the delivery mechanism includes other products than S-101 (eg S012) then the catalogue would be called S100ed4.CAT.	Discuss in relation to consideration of IC-ENC comment below. See below. Will need to be further evaluated/developed as a result of implementation feedback. Waiting implementation with other product specifications. Catalog.xml will be same for S-101 and S-10x. Breaks system?
	IHO Sec	B5.1.14	DTNM, DTID	ed	S-57 acronyms erroneously retained.	Replace S-57 acronyms with S-101 attribute name vertical datum .	Change made. For consideration of S-101PT. Post-meeting Holger comment: This needs a little more investigation. Should the vertical datum defined by an attribute value or by the enumerant from the meta data model. Have amended to agree with S-100 – 10a-5.2.2.6. Further investigation required. Further investigation relates to Holger's comment. IHO Sec comment resolved.

1 **CO** = Contributing Organisation (HOs should use 2 character codes e.g. FR AU etc.)

2 **Type of comment:** **ge** = general **te** = technical **ed** = editorial

3 Whilst not compulsory, comments are more likely to be accepted if accompanied by a proposed change.

NOTE Columns 1, 2, 4, 5 are compulsory.

S-101PT comments and editorial observations

1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)	
Component	CO ¹	Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex (e.g. 3.1)	Paragraph / Figure/Tab le/Note (e.g. Table 1)	Type of comment ²	Comment (justification for change) by the CO ³	Proposed change by the CO	Secretariat observations on each comment submitted

Actions for Road Map to S-101 v2.0.0

DPS	IC	4.4	Para 1	te	It is currently not clear if FOIDs must be persistent and some work on relating FOIDs to MRNs may be needed. Not sure if HOs appreciate the impact of this. It also affects the idea of converting S-57 data where FOIDs are not normally persistent. Para 2 seems to suggest it is optional to use universal FOIDs which persist.	Clarity is needed on para 4 and whether FOIDs must be persistent. Also should FOID link to MRN?	<p>Agree that this clause needs further work (see also IHO Sec comment below). For discussion of S-101PT. Decision: Agreed to leave as currently worded for Edition 1.0.0. Amendments may be required as a result of implementation. MRNs to be further discussed by S-100WG before implementation in S-101 (Edition 2.0.0).</p> <p>Key takeaway – need to see if there is confusion in implementation by industry with the wording that it is.</p> <p>May need further development may need to be considered between FOIDs and any other unique identifiers such as MRNs.</p>
-----	----	-----	--------	----	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

1 CO = Contributing Organisation (HOs should use 2 character codes e.g. FR AU etc.)
 2 Type of comment: ge = general te = technical ed = editorial
 3 Whilst not compulsory, comments are more likely to be accepted if accompanied by a proposed change.
NOTE Columns 1, 2, 4, 5 are compulsory.

1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)	
Component	CO ¹	Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex (e.g. 3.1)	Paragraph / Figure/Table/Note (e.g. Table 1)	Type of comment ²	Comment (justification for change) by the CO ³	Proposed change by the CO	Secretariat observations on each comment submitted
	IHO Sec	6.1	Entire	te	Amend clause to include introductory paragraph recommended by DQWG.	Insert introductory paragraphs as included in Data Quality Checklist (May 2018 version). Amend existing wording to account for addition of these paragraphs.	Introductory paragraphs inserted and associated amendments made. For consideration of S-101PT. Refinement required when Validation Checks have been fully developed (Edition 2.0.0). Placeholder: Validation Checks are target of Edition 2, (Annex C).
DPS	IC	6.1	N/A	te	To cover all information.	Suggest metadata quality should also be considered.	Perhaps a different subclause (6.1.5)? For discussion of S-101PT. NFA for Edition 1.0.0. IC-ENC to be invited to expand on this proposal for Ed. 2. Could be overtaken by events. 6.1.2 – 6.1.4 have been removed from main document due to being in DCEG in Section 3 (Metadata). Action: Jeff to check with Tom if this satisfy? Tom to expand on it.

1 CO = Contributing Organisation (HOs should use 2 character codes e.g. FR AU etc.)

2 Type of comment: ge = general te = technical ed = editorial

3 Whilst not compulsory, comments are more likely to be accepted if accompanied by a proposed change.

NOTE Columns 1, 2, 4, 5 are compulsory.

S-101PT comments and editorial observations

Date: 07 Jan 2019

Document: **S-101 Ed 1.1.0 (Main)**

1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)	
Component	CO ¹	Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex (e.g. 3.1)	Paragraph / Figure/Tab le/Note (e.g. Table 1)	Type of comment ²	Comment (justification for change) by the CO ³	Proposed change by the CO	Secretariat observations on each comment submitted
	7Cs	9.2	Portrayal Catalogue	ge	In the schema at the end of the clause rules are described as XSLT files. If LUA is chosen as the portrayal mechanism this should change to LUA files. In general there is nothing that specifies which method is used for this product.	This needs some discussion.	For discussion of S-101PT. Considered to be partly resolved as a result of the application of the below comment. However will require further work pending implementation.
DPS	IC	11.3.2	N/A	te	Update to reflect proposal to S-100WG3.	This section does not seem to have been updated to reflect proposal to S-100WG3	Amendments made based on decisions from S-100WG3. NOTE: Country code has been retained as 2 letter ISO 3166 Codes, as the producing agency will be defined in the dataset metadata. For consideration of S-101PT. Further editing applied during discussion. Agreed that the “country code” should be “producer code” and this would be 4 characters (as agreed at S-100WG3 – see PRIMAR comment below). Need to follow discussions on S-62 and the Producer Code Register for Edition 2.0.0. Done during S-101PT3, placeholder to ensure consistency in this and country codes in register.

1 **CO** = Contributing Organisation (HOs should use 2 character codes e.g. FR AU etc.)

2 **Type of comment:** **ge** = general **te** = technical **ed** = editorial

3 Whilst not compulsory, comments are more likely to be accepted if accompanied by a proposed change.

NOTE Columns 1, 2, 4, 5 are compulsory.

S-101PT comments and editorial observations

1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)	
Component	CO ¹	Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex (e.g. 3.1)	Paragraph / Figure/Tab le/Note (e.g. Table 1)	Type of comment ²	Comment (justification for change) by the CO ³	Proposed change by the CO	Secretariat observations on each comment submitted
	IHO Sec	12.1.2	protection Scheme	ed	Refer to IC-ENC review comment for clause 11.6.1	Replace "S-63" with "S-100" in Remarks column.	Change made. For consideration of S-101PT. Change approved, however out of scope for Edition 1.0.0. For Ed 1 dataProtection can be populated as "Unencrypted". To be developed for Edition 2.0.0. Been done. In Ed. 1, there is now digital protection scheme from S-100 (input to S-100 Ed 4). For Ed 1, can be unencrypted. For Ed 2 will be mandatory and TRUE (encrypted).
	7Cs	12.1.2	digitalSign ature	ge	According to S-100 Part 4a this item describes whether the data set has a digital signature or not. There is no item for the signature itself which should be digitalSignatureValue	Reconsider the meta data for digital signatures. They are not very consistent.	For discussion of S-101PT. Out of scope for Edition 1.0.0. For Ed 1 can be populated as "Null". To be developed for Edition 2.0.0. Resolved, reviewed and updated now consistent with S-100 Ed4. Action for Ed 2: Encryption to be finalized.

1 **CO** = Contributing Organisation (HOs should use 2 character codes e.g. FR AU etc.)
 2 **Type of comment:** **ge** = general **te** = technical **ed** = editorial
 3 Whilst not compulsory, comments are more likely to be accepted if accompanied by a proposed change.
NOTE Columns 1, 2, 4, 5 are compulsory.

S-101PT comments and editorial observations

1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)	
Component	CO ¹	Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex (e.g. 3.1)	Paragraph / Figure/Tab le/Note (e.g. Table 1)	Type of comment ²	Comment (justification for change) by the CO ³	Proposed change by the CO	Secretariat observations on each comment submitted
DPS	IC	B7.1.1	PROF	te	In S-57 an edition value of 0 was used to indicate a cancellation but the opportunity exists to have a dedicated cancellation message. It would seem logical to have a specific profile for this update type.	Both update and cancellation sections have the same PROF value. Should a cancellation update be considered a 3 rd profile? If so amend value.	Support this proposal. For discussion of S-101PT. Agreed that this should be done. To be developed for Edition 2.0.0. Jeff to follow up with Tom on taking lead.

1 **CO** = Contributing Organisation (HOs should use 2 character codes e.g. FR AU etc.)
 2 **Type of comment:** **ge** = general **te** = technical **ed** = editorial
 3 Whilst not compulsory, comments are more likely to be accepted if accompanied by a proposed change.
NOTE Columns 1, 2, 4, 5 are compulsory.