Draft DCEG 0.0.1 Review Comments Form (Please provide responses to julia.powell@noaa.gov and jeff.wootton@defence.gov.au by 08 November 2013.)

Date: 26 September 2013

Document: **Draft DCEG Edition 0.0.1**

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
	GB	1.2	Title	ge	The International Hydrographic Organization Electronic **Navigation** Chart Product Specification	The International Hydrographic Organization Electronic **Navigational** Chart Product Specification	OK
	GB	1.3.1	Enumeration	ge	enumeration A fixed list of valid identifiers of named literal values. Attributes of an enumerated type may only take values from this list (source: ISO 19136:XX, Geographic information — Geography Markup Language (GML))	show in alphabetical order; move enumeration with definition to sit between curve and feature	OK
	FR	1.3.1	Aggregation	ge	Current wording: "**Aggregation:** special form of **association** that specifies a whole-part relationship between the aggregate (whole) and a component (see composition)"	Remove "(see composition)" as no explanation for "component" or "Composition" exists in the document.	The list of terms and definitions is incomplete. Have noted for removal if "composition" is not in the final draft.
	FR	1.3.1	curve	ge	FR thinks a curve has a unique boundary	Replace "A boundary of a curve" by "The boundary of a curve"	OK
	FR	1.3.1	Geometric primitive	ed	Homogeneity of the document (points and curves are in bold)	In the NOTE: Write "**surfaces**" in bold characters	OK
	GB	1.3.1	Geometric primitive	ge	They include points, curves, surfaces and solids	add solid with definition (and boundary NOTE if required); solid missing - points, curves and surfaces defined (suggest remove solids)	have removed "and solids" from NOTE
	FR	1.3.1	maximum display scale	ed		Replace "the larger" by "the largest"	OK
	FR	1.3.1	minimum display scale	ed		Replace "the smaller" by "the smallest"	OK
	GB	1.3.1	Surface	ge	NOTE: The boundary of a point is the empty set	move NOTE to sit under point definition	OK

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.

Draft DCEG 0.0.1 Review Comments Form (Please provide responses to julia.powell@noaa.gov and jeff.wootton@defence.gov.au by 08 November 2013.)

Date: 26 September 2013	Document: **Draft DCEG Edition 0.0.1**

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 com‑ ment[2]	Comment (justification for change) by the CO[3]	Proposed change by the CO	Secretariat observations on each comment submitted
	GB	1.3.2	ECDIS	ge	Electronic Chart Display and Information System	Retain as Electronic Chart Display and Information System	Agree, however S-101 main document does not have the "and" (clause 1.3.3). Suggest that S-101 requires amendment.
	GB	1.3.2	GML	ge	**General** Mark-up Language	Geography Markup Language	OK
	GB	1.3.2	ISO	ge	International Organi**s**ation for Standardization	International Organization for Standardization	OK
	GB	1.4	Use of language	ge	"Should" indicates an**d** optional requirement, that is the recommended process to be followed, but is not mandatory;	"Should" indicates an optional requirement, that is the recommended process to be followed, but is not mandatory.	OK
	GB	2.1	Aggregated feature type	ge	Aggregated feature type – are features made up of component features	What are component features – need for a definition; add examples – bridge	Words amended – taken from S-101 main document. Note, however, **Bridge** as an aggregated feature type. Is currently a geo feature type. Discuss alternate name. **Bridge Aggregation**.
	FR	2.1	3rd §	ed	Homogeneity of the document	Replace "**Cartographic Feature type**" by "**Cartographic feature type**"	OK
	FR	2.1.1		te	Current wording: "If the true number of features is not known, the text "*more than one*" should be encoded using **information (text)**."	Propose to create a boolean sub-attribute of **multiplicity of features** to indicate that there multiple features exist (when the true number is unknown as well as it is known).	Amendment made to include attribute **multiplicity of feature**. Ongoing action FR and AU to finalise this proposal. Re-model as complex.
	FR	2.1.1		te	Current wording: "For the encoding of multiple, identical lights using the attribute **multiplicity of lights**, see table in clause X.X." Why keeping this specific attribute for only Light features? **multiplicity of feature** could also be used	Propose removing **multiplicity of lights** from S101, and using **multiplicity of features** in any cases Propose writing **multiplicity of features** (to be	OK. **Multiplicity of lights** replaced with **multiplicity of features** throughout the document. Final model dependant on finalisation of

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.

Draft DCEG 0.0.1 Review Comments Form (Please provide responses to julia.powell@noaa.gov and jeff.wootton@defence.gov.au by 08 November 2013.)

| Date: 26 September 2013 | Document: **Draft DCEG Edition 0.0.1** |

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 com-ment[2]	Comment (justification for change) by the CO[3]	Proposed change by the CO	Secretariat observations on each comment submitted
					here	consistent with **multiplicity of lights)**	FR and AU discussions and approval of Sub-WG.
1	JP	for example 2.1, 2.5		ge	There are two different words which have the same meaning, "dataset" (in 2.5) and "data set" (in 2.1).	to use the only one of them.	Amended to "dataset" throughout the document.
	GB	2.2	Table 2.1	ge	6.5 BRIDGE - Primitives: Point (struck through), Curve, Surface	Point, Curve, Surface shown in Table 2.1, previous Product Specification and UOC Ed 4.0.0 tracked changes which states point primitive does not display in an ECDIS - require a consistent approach for when point features do not display in an ECDIS, to either retain or remove.	TSMAD: Agreed to remove point as allowable primitive for **Bridge**. Table amended to reflect.
	GB	2.2	Table 2.1	te	Missing Buoy: Emergency Wreck Marking Buoy	Add Buoy Emergency Wreck Marking Buoy P to table	OK
2	JP	2.2		te	I withdraw the proposal to add "C" to Caution Area because there is an alternative method in 16.10.	nothing	OK
	GB	2.2	Table 2.1	ge	8.12 CRANES - Primitives: Point, Curve, Surface (as shown in Table 2.1)	Primitives: Point, Surface shown in previous Product Specification and UOC Ed 4.0.0 tracked changes. Confirm geometric primitives for CRANES.	DCEG Sub-WG: Agreed to add curve as allowable primitive for **Crane** (Need to confirm why this decision was made).
	GB	2.2	Table 2.1	ge	10.3 CURENT - Primitives: Point, Curve, Surface	Point, Surface shown in Table 2.1 and Point shown in previous Product Specification and UOC Ed 4.0.0 tracked changes. Confirm geometric primitives for CURENT.	Not sure why curve is listed at 10.3. Have removed from 10.3 to be consistent with Table 2.1. Need to discuss and check DCEG Sub-WG discussions. Amend to add curve.
	GB	2.2	Table 2.1	ge	8.11 DAMCON - Primitives: Curve, Surface	Point, Curve, Surface shown in Table 2.1, previous Product Specification and UOC Ed 4.0.0 tracked changes. Confirm geometric primitives for DAMCON.	TSMAD: Agreed to remove point as allowable primitive for **Dam**. Table amended to reflect.

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.

Date: 26 September 2013

Document: **Draft DCEG Edition 0.0.1**

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 com-ment[2]	Comment (justification for change) by the CO[3]	Proposed change by the CO	Secretariat observations on each comment submitted
	GB	2.2	Table 2.1	ge	8.16 FLODOC - Primitives: Point, Curve, Surface (as shown in Table 2.1)	Primitives: Curve, Surface shown in previous Product Specification and UOC Ed 4.0.0 tracked changes. Confirm geometric primitives for FLODOC.	S-57 extension to add point as valid primitive for **Floating Dock** – approved by DCEG Sub-WG. NOTE: Same also for **Pontoon**.
	GB	2.2	Table 2.1	ge	13.1 Foul ground - Primitives: Point, Curve, Surface (as shown in Table 2.1)	13.6.1 states Foul ground, over which it is safe to navigate but which should be avoided for anchoring, taking the ground or ground fishing, should be encoded using a Foul Ground feature of type surface or point. 24.153.1 (not otherwise checked) shows Point/Surface. Confirm geometric primitives for Foul ground.	Have added curve as valid primitive throughout.
	GB	2.2	Table 2.1	ge	8.19 GRIDRN - Primitives: Point (struck through), Surface	Point, Surface shown in Table 2.1, previous Product Specification and UOC Ed 4.0.0 tracked changes which states point primitive does not display in an ECDIS - require a consistent approach for when point features do not display in an ECDIS, to either retain or remove.	TSMAD: Agreed to remove point as allowable primitive for **Gridiron**. Table amended to reflect.
3	JP	2.2		te	Land Area has primitive "C", but Land Region doesn't.	to add "C" to Land Region.	Suggest line primitive not required. A point could always be encoded on a linear feature if required. Discuss. Agreed to add curve.
	GB	2.2	Table 2.1	ge	8.4 PILPNT - Primitives: Point, Curve, Surface	Point shown in previous Product Specification and UOC Ed 4.0.0 tracked changes, Point, Surface shown in Table 2.1. Confirm geometric primitives for PILPNT.	TSMAD: Agreed to add surface as allowable primitive for **Pile** (for area of piles). Table amended to reflect.
	GB	2.2	Table 2.1	ge	5.7 RAPIDS - Primitives: Point, Curve, Surface	Point, Curve, Surface shown in Table 2.1, previous Product Specification and UOC Ed 4.0.0 tracked changes which states point primitive does not display in an ECDIS - require a consistent	DCEG Sub-WG: Decision made that **Rapids** of type point should display in ECDIS – proposal required to

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.

Date: 26 September 2013	Document: **Draft DCEG Edition 0.0.1**

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 com-ment[2]	Comment (justification for change) by the CO[3]	Proposed change by the CO	Secretariat observations on each comment submitted
						approach for when point features do not display in an ECDIS, to either retain or remove (inconsistent with WATFAL)	DIPWG.
	GB	2.2	Table 2.1	ge	6.14 ROADWY - Primitives: Point (struck through), Curve, Surface (as shown in Table 2.1)	Point, Curve, Surface shown in previous Product Specification and UOC Ed 4.0.0 tracked changes which states point primitive does not display in an ECDIS - require a consistent approach for when point features do not display in an ECDIS, to either retain or remove.	TSMAD: Agreed to remove point as allowable primitive for **Road**.
	GB	2.2	Table 2.1	ge	CTRPNT - Not shown as a Feature, appears only in Table 2.1 and in Distinction for LNDMRK (S57MD8) and Tanks, silos	Remove references as necessary	TSMAD: Agreed to remove **Control Point** as valid feature for ENC. Entire document updated to remove references.
	GB	2.2	Table 2.1	ge	5.11 VEGATN - Primitives: Point, Curve, Surface	Point, Surface shown in Table 2.1 and Point, Curve, Surface shown in previous Product Specification and UOC Ed 4.0.0 tracked changes.	Need to check why curve was removed from table for **Vegetation**, or whether this is just a typo? For now have re-inserted to be consistent with geo feature tables.
	GB	2.2	Table 2.1	ge	6.15 TUNNEL - Primitives: Point (struck through), Curve, Surface	Point, Curve, Surface shown in previous Product Specification and Table 2.1. UOC Ed 4.0.0 tracked changes states point primitive does not display in an ECDIS - require a consistent approach for when point features do not display in an ECDIS, to either retain or remove.	TSMAD: Agreed to remove point as allowable primitive for **Tunnel**. Table amended to reflect.
	FR	2.2	2nd §	ge	A spatial value may correspond to various instances	Each spatial value must be referenced by at least one feature instance	OK
2	US	2.2	2.1	ed	Would HOs chart a Coastguard Station has a surface if the ENC was of a large enough scale (should this be done by charting the buildings with a	Add surface to allowable geometric primitives for Coastguard station.	Given that the feature **Coastguard Station** is only used to encode the function,

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.

Date: 26 September 2013	Document: **Draft DCEG Edition 0.0.1**

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 com-ment[2]	Comment (justification for change) by the CO[3]	Proposed change by the CO	Secretariat observations on each comment submitted
					function)		consider surface not required. Discuss.
2	US	2.2	2.1	te	Should line be allowed for Quality of Non-Bathymetric Data. This would be the way to express the orientation uncertainly on the nav line or rec track.	Add Line to the allowable geometric for Quality of Non-Bathymetric Data	**Orientation uncertainty** is a sub-attribute for the **orientation** complex. Consider line not required for **Quality of Non-bathymetric Data**.
2	US	2.2	2.1	ed	In the current UML diagram for S-101 Data Quality curve is not allow for Quality of Survey. It has been discussed that curves should be added to the diagram. (Passage soundings)	Remove curve form table for Quality or Survey or discuss adding it to the UML diagram for Quality of Data	Would favour removing curve as allowable primitive. Is there any reason that a line of soundings in an ENC would be required to have quality information encoded? Suggest refer to DQWG.
	FR	2.4	2nd §	ed		Change for "Within this document, the allowable attributes are included"	OK
	FR	2.4.1	Entire document	ed	Homogeneity of the document	Replace all "sub attribute" by "sub-attribute"	OK
4	JP	2.4.2	TI	te	The latest version of ISO 8601 is 2004.	to change to ISO 8601:2004	Will depend on discussions on revision of S-100 at TSMAD27. Discuss.
5	JP	2.4.2	TI	te	Example descriptions don't indicate whether Geneva is earlier or later than UTC and whether New York is earlier or later than UTC.	to derive a new description	Agree. Will depend on discussions on revision of S-100 Temporal Model at TSMAD27. Discuss.
	FR	2.4.3	NOTE 3	ed		"… for any feature… that <u>has</u> more than one…"	OK
	FR	2.4.3	table	te	**Category of coverage** no longer exists in S101	For feature **Data coverage**, amend mandatory attribute **Category of coverage** for **Maximum display scale** and **Minimum display scale**.	OK

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.

Draft DCEG 0.0.1 Review Comments Form (Please provide responses to julia.powell@noaa.gov and jeff.wootton@defence.gov.au by 08 November 2013.)

| Date: 26 September 2013 | Document: **Draft DCEG Edition 0.0.1** |

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 com-ment[2]	Comment (justification for change) by the CO[3]	Proposed change by the CO	Secretariat observations on each comment submitted
	FR	2.4.4	1st §	ed	A mandatory attribute must be populated	Change for: "…the attribute must be populated…"	OK. Additionally, paragraphs repeated in 2.4.3 (before Table) have been deleted.
	FR	2.4.5		te	Add the attribute **In the water** in this paragraph, as being a portrayal attribute. .	Propose adding the following general statement: **In the water** - this Boolean must be set to *True* to indicate that the feature, located in or over navigable water, is to be included in the ECDIS Base Display. And remove all similar sentences all along the document.	OK
	FR	2.4.6		te		Add a sentence to explain that different ways to encode textual information : Using the attributes **information** or **textual description**, either on the feature itself or on the information type **Information** associated to the feature**.**	Consider that as this sub-section is specific to attributes, this is not required here. There is guidance in the features tables as to when to use the **Information Area** feature. Discuss.
	FR	2.4.6		te	The limitation for the sub-attribute **Text** to 300 characters should not be still useful in S101. This limitation comes from an ECDIS problem (pick report) which should be fixed in S101. See the minutes of TSMAD 25 (paper 4.6.3) and TSMAD 26 (ongoing action) *4.6.3 Auxiliary Files and S-101* *TR reported that there are a number of complications and shortcomings with the current method including and managing text and picture files in ENCs. These shortcomings have resulted in a variety of implementations between end user systems and it was therefore proposed that for S-101, the content of*	If a limitation has to be maintained, I propose to increase the limitation to 500 characters, and to allow formatting characters.	Do not agree. If we are going to increase the character limit for **text**, and include formatting characters, why retain **textual description**? Discuss.

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.

Draft DCEG 0.0.1 Review Comments Form (Please provide responses to julia.powell@noaa.gov and jeff.wootton@defence.gov.au by 08 November 2013.)

| Date: 26 September 2013 | Document: **Draft DCEG Edition 0.0.1** |

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
					the TXT and TIF files should be embedded directly into the ISO8211 dataset file (as long ASCII characters and binary data). JP reported that this will substantially increase the dataset size and the size of the exchange set. HB proposed that an information type could be used for this for text files, and there would be no need to make changes to the 8211 encapsulation format. However for picture files there would be big implications for S-100, including changing the data model and the 8211 encoding. The proposal was not accepted in its present form. As this proposal was written by the chair of the DPSWG, it was decided that the TSMAD chair should request the originator of the paper (DPSWG chair) to rework the proposal and resubmit it to TSMAD 26 taking into account the comments above. RF offered to assist the DPSWG chair. (See action item 33)		
	FR	2.4.6		te	Current wording: "The exchange language for textual information should be English. The sub attribute **language** must be populated with an appropriate value to indicate the language used."	As there are several English (old English, modern English, …) listed in ISO 639-3, I propose adding a statement to indicate in this clause that the value "eng" is the good one to be used for English.	This needs further discussion. Given that the "international" language of mariners is English, consider that **language** only needs to be populated for languages other than English. Also noticed that **language** has multiplicity [0,1], but there is a "must" in 2.4.6. My action to do some work on this.
2	US	2.4.7	Spatial attribute types	te	categoryOfTemporalVariation is an attribute in the informaltionType Spatial Quality, It is also an attribute on Quality of Bathymetric data. Is this attribute spatial in nature?		Discuss.

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.

Date: 26 September 2013	Document: **Draft DCEG Edition 0.0.1**

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
	FR	2.5.2		ge	No text for this paragraph?	Add some text or delete 2.5.2	This is a placeholder. Words are required.
	FR	2.5.4		te	Current wording: "Dataset attributes contain metadata that apply to the whole dataset. Some attributes have designated ISO 8211 encoding subfields; other attributes use the ATTR subfield. See table below for details." **Which table is it?**	The wording in this clause should be reviewed to be clearer for encoders.	On-going DCEG Sub-WG action. Table needs to be inserted.
	FR	2.5.8	Last §	ed		Change for: "Feature Object Identifiers" (delete ')	OK
2	US	2.5.11	5	ed	May need to say that using a Land Region for a group of islands with the same name will result in the Land Region covering areas of water and that this is okay.		Perhaps this should be re-modelled to a named aggregation, with the name of the island group in **feature name** for the named aggregation?
	FR	2.5.11	Last §	te	At small scales, point geometry is preferable for many feature instances.	Propose to amend for: "In all instances, if the exact extent of the feature to be named is known, and if the scale is adapted, a surface feature must be created."	Discuss. Me to fix.
	FR	2.5.11.1 Name placement		te	Current wording: "The text attribute value determines which text attribute if more than one are present."	First comment: Is there another name than **Feature name** which may be concerned? Second comment: Propose adding a figure (either in this clause or in clause 3.10) to explain how the attribute **flip bearing** works.	This entire clause needs more work. Agree that a figure is required. Discuss. Discuss with Hans and Tom
	FR	2.6	Real World	ed		Change for: "Example of real world instance …"	OK
	FR	3		te	Current wording: "These meta features are in the following list:"	To make it clearer, amend this wording for : These mandatory meta features are in the following list:	OK

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.

Date: 26 September 2013	Document: **Draft DCEG Edition 0.0.1**

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 com-ment[2]	Comment (justification for change) by the CO[3]	Proposed change by the CO	Secretariat observations on each comment submitted
	FR	3	Data Coverage	ge	In the DCEG, there is no explanation of what the "Skin of the Earth" is. It may be not obvious for all readers.	Add a definition of "Skin of the Earth" in the DCEG, or refer to an external definition (ENC Specifications?)	Suggest this goes in the "Terms and Definitions" clause. Discuss.
	HA	3.1	Text Attribute		Text placement object: Perhaps instead of a 'Text Attribute' the placement could be for a 'class' of a label similar to CSS. We could define a set of text classes applicable to a given product or just specify that the portrayal needs to be able to match the class. Some text labels are not just an echo of a single text attribute. A buoy name is prefixed with 'By'. A light label is made up from characteristics and signal attributes which are not textual attributes. So if the text placement object could specify 'class' names such as 'buoyName' or 'lightCharacteristics', then the portrayal could look for text placements associated with these 'classes' of text. Sanity check is that it may be hard to find examples of cases where some text related to a feature would be placed separate from other text for the same feature. The intent of this text placement was to get text out of channels etc so do we need to identify what text, basically any text shown for the given feature should be placed within or around the centre point defined by the text placement. Either remove 'Text attribute' attribute or replace it with 'Text class'.	Text attribute doesn't seem to be applicable in many cases.	Discuss.
	2J	3.2			Feature: Data Coverage (M_COVR) Attributes: maximum display scale and minimum display scale	Allowable Encoding Values don't agree with values described on table in 3.2.1. Suggest making clauses 3.2 and table in 3.2.1 consistent	Suggest remove Table at 3.2.1 as it is not relevant to encoding (is there a reason to retain the "history?). Have made draft changes for

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.

Date: 26 September 2013	Document: **Draft DCEG Edition 0.0.1**

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
							discussion.
	FR	3.3.1	Third paragraph And Figure	te	In areas where local buoyage directions apply, **Navigational System of Marks** features may overlap **Local Direction of Buoyage** features (see clause X.X) (see Figure below). - First comment: The verb "may" is not correct, as when a local buoyage direction applies, these two features **always** overlap. - Second comment: The figure is relating to local buoyage direction, so keeping it only in clause 3.4.1 is enough.	As the direction of buoyage is now encoded using a specific feature, I propose removing this wording and the figure. I also propose adding a following Remark: If it is required to encode a local direction of buoyage, it must be done using the feature **Local Direction of Buoyage** (see clause X.X). Explanation given in clause 3.4.1 is enough.	OK
3	US	3.6.1	3	te	Should any object with a water level effect encoded be added to this list of objects that need to be split by Sounding Datum. For example Shoreline construction with a Water level effect of covers and uncovers should be split at the boundary of the Sounding Datum object.	Add a statment about splitting any object with a water level effect.	Disagree. **Water level effect** is indicative, not quantitative. Will a change in sounding datum really have an impact on water level effect? Discuss.
6	JP	3.8		te	An attribute "Survey authority" allows only English.	to add "Language" and "Name "to "Survey authority"	Given that **survey authority** is the name of an authority, is language important? Discuss.
7	JP	3.9		te	An attribute "Update description" allows only English.	to add "Language" and "Name "to "Update description"	Is identifying the language required? Discuss. Note also multiplicity [1,1]. Approved and done. Need to update Attributes Section.
	FR	3.9		ed	Where information has been deleted from **and** ENC the **Update Information** feature	Amend for "from an ENC…"	OK
	HA	3.9	Attributes		Add an additional attribute to Update information to provide a summary display/title of the update.	When browsing/previewing or selecting these update objects it is nice to see a short description	Consider that this is the purpose of **update**

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.

Date: 26 September 2013	Document: **Draft DCEG Edition 0.0.1**

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 com-ment[2]	Comment (justification for change) by the CO[3]	Proposed change by the CO	Secretariat observations on each comment submitted
					E.g. New rock in Barnicle bay S-101 Attribute Update title TE 1,1 Remarks: a short, one line, description or summary of the update	before going deeper into the details.	**description** (and the examples in the Attributes Section support this). Have added a statement to this effect in Remarks. Discuss.
	FR	3.10	IHO definition	te	IHO Definition: **TEXT PLACEMENT**. The Update information Feature is used to represent a change to the information shown.	Change the definition.	OK. Have had a go, but will need to be discussed.
	FR	3.10	Table - Raw: text attribute	te	See above comment relating to 2.5.11.1	Is there another name than **Feature name** which may be concerned by the text placement? Is this attribute useful? if no, remove it. If considered useful, this attribute should be mandatory (multiplicity 1,1)	The thinking behind this is that there may be multiple attributes with values that could be displayed, e.g. name, open and closed vertical clearance for a bridge. Discuss.
	FR	3.10	Remarks	te	Add a remark to indicate that the geometry (point) where the feature text placement has been encoded is the position used by the ECDIS to place the text (the point location of the centre of the text string). See 2.5.11.1		Have added some words. Should the attribute **text attribute** be mandatory? Discuss.
	FR	4.1	Table - Raw: scale minimum	te	Comment : SCAMAX is not an allowable attribute for the feature Magnetic variation	Remove : scale minimum > scale maximum	OK
	2J	4.1			Feature: 'Magnetic Variation' Attribute: 'Value of annual change in magnetic variation' (VALACM), 'Value of magnetic variation'(VALMAG); Allowable Encoding Value: "*+/- **decimal minutes.** *Positive (unsigned) value*	Not clear what "**decimal minutes**"? mean. Is it units of measure or resolution of attributes values. If it is the first it contradicts of Attributes description in the clause 24.161 and 24.163 correspondingly.	Have amended **value of magnetic variation** to "decimal degrees", which agrees with attribute resolution. **Value of annual change in magnetic variation** is correct as

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.

Date: 26 September 2013	Document: **Draft DCEG Edition 0.0.1**

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
					indices easterly. Negative value indicates westerly"	Suggest removing statement (**+/- decimal minutes**)	"decimal minutes".
	2J	4.2			Feature: 'Local Magnetic Anomaly' Attributes: 'Magnetic anomaly value maximum' (VALLMA), 'Magnetic anomaly value minimum'; Allowable Encoding Value: *anomaly value maximum < anomaly value minimum* (+/- **decimal degrees)**	Suggest removing statement (**+/- decimal degrees**). VALLMA attribute description gives units as minutes (')	Have amended to "decimal minutes" to be consistent with attribute resolution.
5	US	5.2		te	Is there such a thing as watched or un-watched Ice?	Remove un-watched and watched from Statues	Assume this is **Ice Area**? Have removed, but remember that watched/unwatched has been discussed in DCEG Sub-WG and for some reason it is still there. Discuss.
	FR	5.3.1	First paragrah	te	The feature Dock Area is also concerned by this rule and must be added. Reference clause 8.18.1 (second remark) and 11.7.4. (see also my comment for § 8.6.1 below)	Amend the wording to read: "The exception to this general rule is when a lake, river, canal, dock area or basin is not navigable at the maximum display scale for the ENC data, in which case the boundary of the lake, river, canal, dock area or basin must not be encoded as **Coastline** or **Shoreline Construction** as the boundary of these specific areas (**Lake**, **River**, **Canal, Dock Area, Lock Basin**) create the portrayal of the bank or shoreline."	Not 100% sure, but think the generic term "basin" refers to both locks and docks. Have added feature class **Dock Area**.
	FR	5.6 River		te	**Lake**, **River**, **Canal**, **Lock Basin** and **Dock area**	Add **Lake**, **River**, **Canal**, **Lock Basin** and **Dock**	This has been discussed

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.

Draft DCEG 0.0.1 Review Comments Form (Please provide responses to julia.powell@noaa.gov and jeff.wootton@defence.gov.au by 08 November 2013.)

| Date: 26 September 2013 | Document: **Draft DCEG Edition 0.0.1** |

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 com-ment[2]	Comment (justification for change) by the CO[3]	Proposed change by the CO	Secretariat observations on each comment submitted
		5.9 Lake 8.8 Canal 8.12 Dock area 8.20 Lock 11.7.4			should be Group 1 features. This will avoid creating Unsurveyed Area or Land Area underneath. These two features have not been designed for this use. This will also avoid abnormal encoding, as point LNDARE within area LNDARE when encoding an islet situated in a river, or a jetty in a LNDARE.	**area** in the list of Group 1 features.	previously, but there has been no decision made. Requires full TSMAD discussion. FR will prepare a paper for TSMAD28/DIPWG6.
	2J	5.11			Feature: Vegetation (VEGATN) Attributes: Category of vegetation (CATVEG) Allowable Encoding Value: the value "11: reed" has been removed Multiplicity: "1,1"	Suggest reinstating reed to CATVEG since it has orientation features as well as for backwards compatibility with S-57. Suggest CATVEG Multiplicity to be upgraded to (1.*)since it is common to find vegetation that is mixed and diverse.	Reed was removed from **category of vegetation** as it was considered that it was not useful in a navigational ENC. Similar thinking behind retaining multiplicity [1,1]. Discuss. Reed re-inserted. Multiplicity rejected.
	FR	6.2 Building single		te	At SHOM we think that something is missing to correctly describe the positioning capability using Buildings. For this characteristic, we consider that a building (e.g a house) may be encoded on three different levels, but only the attribute CONVIS is currently available to differentiate these 3 kinds of buildings : 1 - A common building, which has been encoded, sometimes arbitrarily, to generally show that the place is a settlement area and cannot be used for positioning. In this case, at SHOM, we do not encode CONVIS. 2 - A building which can be used as a landmark, but cannot be considered as visually	Propose to add a complex attribute **Positioning** and a Boolean attribute **Positioning capability** to indicate that a building can be used for positioning or not. Complex attribute **Positioning** (0,1) simple sub-attr. **Positioning capability (**Bo) (0,1) simple sub-attr. **Visually Conspicuous (**Bo) (0,1) Proposed S101 encoding : Case 1 : **Positioning** not encoded (or encoded with the value *False* for both sub-attributes) Case 2 : **Positioning capability** = *true* and	Consider there are other ways of achieving this without making the modelling more complex, e.g. do not encode those buildings that do not have navigational significance, or if such buildings are encoded utilise SCAMIN to remove them from the display earlier as the mariner zooms out. However, warrants discussion. Re-model as enumerated

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.

Draft DCEG 0.0.1 Review Comments Form (Please provide responses to julia.powell@noaa.gov and jeff.wootton@defence.gov.au by 08 November 2013.)

| Date: 26 September 2013 | Document: **Draft DCEG Edition 0.0.1** |

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 com-ment[2]	Comment (justification for change) by the CO[3]	Proposed change by the CO	Secretariat observations on each comment submitted
					conspicuous at the compilation scale. In this case, we encode CONVIS = 2

3 - A building which can be used as a landmark and is considered as visually conspicuous at the compilation scale. In this case, we encode CONVIS = 1.

The problem is that the ECDIS display does not allow the mariner to distinguish the first and the second situations. | **Visually Conspicuous** = *false*

Case 3 : **Positioning capability** = *true* and **Visually Conspicuous = *true***

The portrayal should be adapted to display differently these three levels.

This new attribute positioning can also apply to other features which are concerned by the same issue (e.g silo/tank, crane). | attribute. |
| | FR | 6.5 Bridge

6.6 Span fixed

6.7 Span opening

6.11 Pylon/bridge support | tables | te | | Propose to indicate the association and the role "consist of" at the bottom of the tables of the features which may be components of a Bridge.

To be consistent with Associations Structure/equipment in tables relating to features Beacon ….and Buoy… | Consider that "consists of" infers a named aggregation. Have not worked out how to show named aggregations in the DCEG yet – hopefully can resolve at TSMAD27. |
| | 2J | 6.10 | | | Feature: 'Pipeline overhead' (PIPOHD)

Attributes: 'Category of pipeline/pipe' 'Product';

Multiplicity: "0,1" | It looks strange that these attributes cannot be listed, i.e. Multiplicity = "0,*". This feature type has the attribute 'Multiplicity of feature'. It means there can be several pipes in one place and they can have different purposes. I suppose there should be the same Multiplicity values as for the attributes in 'Pipeline submarine/on land' (PIPSOL) feature type. | Have amended multiplicity = [0,*] to be consistent with **Pipeline Submarine/On Land** |
| | FR | 7.1 | table | te | Remove the column building shape which is useless. There is no value indicated in the table for this attribute. | | Agree. Have removed from table. |
| 8 | JP | 7.2 | | te | The number of floating constructions such as a | to add an attribute "Water level effect" with 7 | Is the landmark floating or the structure on which the |

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.

Draft DCEG 0.0.1 Review Comments Form (Please provide responses to julia.powell@noaa.gov and jeff.wootton@defence.gov.au by 08 November 2013.)

Date: 26 September 2013	Document: **Draft DCEG Edition 0.0.1**

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 com-ment[2]	Comment (justification for change) by the CO[3]	Proposed change by the CO	Secretariat observations on each comment submitted
					floating tower is increasing.	(floating)	landmark is placed? Is it still a landmark if it is offshore? Is an on-going action for DCEG. Discuss. Richard and I to discuss.
	FR	7.5.1	Third remark	te	Current wording: "**Production/Storage Area** features of type point and having the mandatory attribute **category of production area** = empty (null) value do not display in ECDIS. Encoders wishing to display these features in ECDIS must consider alternate encoding options (e.g. using **Building**, **Landmark**, **obstruction**, or populating a value for **category of production area** from the enumerate list)."	Is this work-around still valid in S101? This portrayal issue should be fixed in S101.	Agree this should be sorted in portrayal. However, this has been discussed previously by DIPWG and rejected. TSMAD should refer back to DIPWG. Address in portrayal.
	FR	8.4.1	Second remarks	te	The value **category of pile** = 5 (piling), sometimes termed "row of piles" or "sheet piling", should only be used for **Pile** of type curve. Point primitive may be used for smaller maximum display scale ENC data.	Complete the rule to state that, in addition, the geometry of type curve should only be used to encode features **Pile** with **category of pile** = 5 (piling).	Have re-worded the bullet point to mandate use of curve only for piling.
	FR	8.4.1	Remarks	te	The new attribute value **Category of pile** = 6 (area of piles) has been added, and it is the only reason why the area geometry is now allowable for the feature **Pile**.	Add a new remark to explain the use of this attribute value and to state that the area geometry is only used for this case (similar than the above remark for piling)	OK
	FR	8.6.1 (see 5.3.1 above)	Last sentence	te	Dock Area is missing in this rule. Reference clause 8.18.1 (second remark) and 11.7.4.	Amend the sentence to read: The exception to this general rule is when a lake, river, canal, dock area or basin is not navigable at the maximum display scale for the ENC data, in which case the boundary of the lake, river, canal, dock area or basin must not be encoded as **Coastline** or **Shoreline Construction**	Consider that the generic term "basin" is used to describe docks and locks. See comment for 5.3.1 above. Note that this wording has been taken directly from the UOC. If TSMAD agrees to amend DCEG, then UOC should be amended as well.

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.

Date: 26 September 2013	Document: **Draft DCEG Edition 0.0.1**

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 com-ment[2]	Comment (justification for change) by the CO[3]	Proposed change by the CO	Secretariat observations on each comment submitted
							UOC needs to be amended.
	2J	8.14			Feature: 'Mooring facility' Attribute: TOPMAR is missing	Mooring facilities with CATMOR;7 Mooring Buoy need the TOMAR attribute. Suggest adding.	Mooring buoys with topmarks? How is a vessel supposed to moor up to these? Additionally, there is an on-going action to model "buoy non-navigational", and mooring buoy will likely be split out from **Mooring Facility** (having an attribute for a single type of mooring facility is not good modelling). 2J has use cases. Consider for buoy, non-navigational.
	2J	8.17			Feature: 'Pontoon' Attributes: 'Function' - removed;	This attribute was added to the object class 'PONTON' according to 7.Co.7 We suppose it is a mistake. We believe that the attribute is important for pontoons.	Tend to agree. However, this was removed at an early DCEG Sub-WG. Discuss.
	FR	8.18.1	First remark	te	Current wording : "If the dock is navigable at the maximum display scale of the ENC data, it must be encoded using the features **Depth Area** or **Dredged Area** (see clause X.X), …" Not consistent with 11.7.4 : " Where these areas are navigable at the maximum display scale for the ENC data, they must be encoded using the Skin of the Earth features **Depth Area**, **Dredged Area** or **Unsurveyed Area**,…"	Add **Unsurveyed Area** to read : : "If the dock is navigable at the maximum display scale of the ENC data, it must be encoded using the features **Depth Area, Dredged Area or Unsurveyed Area** (see clause X.X), …"	Have applied, but is it logical to have a navigable dock covered by unsurveyed area?
	2J	11.3			Feature: Sounding (SOUNDG) Primitives: Point.	S-101 Product Spec mentions the use of multipoint by the SOUNDG feature. We believe it will be better to add the primitives type 'Multipoint' value according to S101 Specification the clause	Discuss (TSMAD27). Note that "Multipoint" is not included as an allowable primitive in S-101 at DCEG

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.

Draft DCEG 0.0.1 Review Comments Form (Please provide responses to julia.powell@noaa.gov and jeff.wootton@defence.gov.au by 08 November 2013.)

Date: 26 September 2013	Document: **Draft DCEG Edition 0.0.1**

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
						4.8.1.	clause 2.2. Multipoint will be removed from S-101.
11	US	11.4.1	Remark 5	te	category of zone of confidence in data (CATZOC) is no long an attribute in Quality of Bathymetric Data	Remove the term "category of zone of confidence in data" from the remark.	OK
11	US	11.5.1	Remark 6	te	If it is accepted that Quality of Bathymetric Data objects can overlap then Swept areas should be able to overplay. An area that has been swept to different depths by different techniques, and of differing Quality.	Change remark to "**Swept Area** features may overlap"	Do not agree. I can understand why there may be interest in different qualities of bathymetric data by depth, but surely the mariner is only interested in the deepest swept depth? Discuss. Will be discussed at DCEG Sub-WG5.
	FR	11.6	figure	ed	Sounding value 2 within an intertidal rocky area	Amend value *2* for *2*	Noted.
	FR	11.7.2	Figure	te	The figure does not show the normal encoding.	For the record : Modify the figure to create a new Depth area (10/20) above the 10 m depth contour)	Noted.
	FR	11.7.3	Figure	te	The figure does not show the normal encoding.	For the record : Modify the figure to create a new Depth area (8/10) between the 8 metre depth contour and the 10 metre depth contour)	Noted.
	FR	11.7.4	Title	ed	1 - See comment above to add **Lake**, **River**, **Canal**, **Lock Basin** and **Dock area** in the list of Group 1 features. 2 - The word "locks" is missing in the title.	Amend the title of this clause for: **Rivers, canals, lakes, basins, locks**	See previous comments regarding "basin"
	FR	11.7.5		te	Areas of continual change : Add a statement to explain the use of the attribute value Category of	For the record: Need to await DQWG results.	Have added some alternate words, pending feedback

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.

Date: 26 September 2013	Document: **Draft DCEG Edition 0.0.1**

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 com-ment[2]	Comment (justification for change) by the CO[3]	Proposed change by the CO	Secretariat observations on each comment submitted
					temporal variation = 3 (likely to change) on the feature Quality of Bathymetric Data.		from DQWG. Ensure that references to temporal variation are referred to M_QUAL.
	FR	11.8 Depth-nobottom found	Table	te	The features Depth - no bottom found are generally situated in areas investigated using lead-line.	Add Technique of sounding measurement = 5 (found by lead-line) in the list of allowable values.	OK
	FR	11.9.1		te	Current wording : "Areas with little or no bathymetric survey information, and falling within a meta feature **Data Coverage** surface with attribute **category of coverage** = *1* (coverage available), must be encoded using the feature **Unsurveyed Area**." The attribute **category of coverage** no longer exists.	Amend to read : "Areas with little or no bathymetric survey information, must be encoded using the feature **Unsurveyed Area**."	OK
11	US	11.9.1.		te	Paragraph has the attribute **category of zone of confidence in data** in it. This is no longer valid	Remove **category of zone of confidence in data** and statement referring to new attributes in **Quality of Bathymetric Data**	Have added some words, but will need input from DQWG.
11	US	11.9.1.1		te	Paragraph has the attribute **category of zone of confidence in data** in it. This is no longer valid	Remove **category of zone of confidence in data** and statement referring to new attributes in **Quality of Bathymetric Data**	Have added some words, but will need input from DQWG.
11	US	11.9.2		te	Paragraph has the attribute **category of zone of confidence in data** in it. This is no longer valid	Remove **category of zone of confidence in data** and statement referring to new attributes in **Quality of Bathymetric Data**	Have added some words, but will need input from DQWG.
	FR	11.9.3		te		For the record : create meta-feature Minimal depiction area (Jeppesen action)	Is an on-going action from DCEG Sub-WG.
	FR	13.6.1	Remark relating to	te	Current wording : "Subsurface Fish Aggregating Devices (FAD) must	1 - Amend this remark relating to FAD to read : If it is required to encode a ~~Subsurface~~ Fish	Incorrect. A fish haven by definition is designed to attract fish for fishing

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.

Date: 26 September 2013	Document: **Draft DCEG Edition 0.0.1**

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 com-ment[2]	Comment (justification for change) by the CO[3]	Proposed change by the CO	Secretariat observations on each comment submitted
			FAD		be encoded as **Obstruction**, with **category of obstruction** = *13* (fish aggregating device (FAD)), unless the FAD is a vessel that has been deliberately sunk to form a fish haven, which should be encoded as a **Wreck** feature (see clause X,X)." First comment: This is not consistent with clause 13.9.1 *(Fish aggregating devices (FAD), whether under water or floating, must be encoded, where required, as **Obstruction** features (see clause X.X)*. Second comment: In my view, a FAD cannot be a fish haven. A FAD is a device to concentrate fishes so that they can easily be fished, whereas a fish haven is a device to attract fishes to protect them, mainly for the restocking.	Aggregating Device (FAD)), whether under water or floating, it must be done using **Obstruction**, with **category of obstruction** = *13* (fish aggregating device (FAD)).. If the FAD is marked by a string of coloured floats the feature **Obstruction** should be populated with **category of obstruction** = *19* (buoyed). A buoy marking a FAD must be encoded as a **Buoy Special Purpose/General** feature (see clause X.X) 2 - Add the following new remark relating to fish haven encoding (and remove clause 13.10.2 - see below) : If it is required to encode a Fish haven, it must be done using **Obstruction**, with **category of obstruction** = *5* (fish haven), unless the fish haven is a vessel that has been deliberately sunk, which should be encoded as a **Wreck** feature (see clause X,X).	purposes (see definition for **category of obstruction** = *5* in the Attributes Section. AU has an action to develop a proposal regarding FAD's.
	FR	13.10.2		te	A fish haven is not a Marine farm/culture feature.	Remove clause 13.10.2 which is not relating to the feature Marine farm/culture. Move the wording as a new remark (or a new clause) in §13.6.1 relating to obstructions (see comment above for §13.6.1)	See comment for 13.6.1 above.
	FR	14.1.1	Third remark	te	Current wording : "Platforms may carry lights (see clause X.X), fog signals (see clause X.X), flare stacks (see clause X.X) and helicopter landing pad (see clause X.X). Where fitted, lights should be encoded as described in clauses X.X to X.X, with the **Offshore Platform** being used as the structure feature for the light	1 - Amend the remark to read : Platforms may carry lights (see clause X.X), fog signals (see clause X.X), flare stacks (see clause X.X) and helicopter landing pad (see clause X.X). Where fitted, lights should be encoded as described in clauses X.X to X.X, with the **Offshore Platform** being used as the structure	OK

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.

Date: 26 September 2013	Document: **Draft DCEG Edition 0.0.1**

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 com-ment[2]	Comment (justification for change) by the CO[3]	Proposed change by the CO	Secretariat observations on each comment submitted
					equipment feature(s)."	feature for the light equipment feature(s). 2 - Add the following new remark : If it is required to encode a flare stack carried by the platform, it must be done using the Boolean attribute **flare stack**.	
	FR	14.4 Cable area	table	te	Multiplicity for **Category of cable** should be 0,* , as both power and telecommunication cables may exist in a cable area.	Amend multiplicity for 0,*	OK
	2J	14.7			Feature: 'Offshore production area' Attribute: Product; Allowable Encoding Value: the value 23: "electricity" has been omitted	As far as we understand the product of the "1 : offshore wind farm; 2 : wave farm; 3 : current farm" is electricity. It is strange that it has been omitted in the list of allowed values of the attribute 'Product'	OK
	2J	14.7			Feature: 'Offshore production area' Attribute: Restriction;	Attribute RESTRN=27 "speed restricted" seems to be missed. If it is not an error consider reinstating.	Typo. Value re-inserted.
	2J	14.7			Feature: 'Offshore production area' Attribute: Category of offshore production area; Allowable Encoding Value: the value "Tank farm" has been omitted	DCEG describes the area of oil and gas extracting in the point 14.7.1. It explains that there are many places with floating tanks for oil storage. We then need the value "tank farm" or "floating tank farm" in the attribute "Category of offshore production area"	Tank farm (**category of production area** = 8) has definition beginning "A tract of land occupied by ….". This is not suitable for a feature **Offshore Production Area**. Discuss. Adapt DGIWG definition to remove land reference.
	FR	15.1.1 15.3 15.4.2		te		Remove acronyms C_AGGR and C_ASSO from the document and rewrite all the rules relating to feature associations to be in accordance with the S101 data model.	Subject of an on-going action to complete associations and include named aggregations in the document. References to C_ASSO and C_AGGR will

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.

Date: 26 September 2013	Document: **Draft DCEG Edition 0.0.1**

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 com-ment[2]	Comment (justification for change) by the CO[3]	Proposed change by the CO	Secretariat observations on each comment submitted
		18.8.1 15.10.1 15.11.1 15.20.1 15.21.1 15.22.1 15.24.1 20.3					be removed as part of this action.
	FR	15.3		te	Amend the legend DWRTPT in the south-west angle of the figure to read Traffic separation scheme boundary. In addition, replace all the S57 acronyms	For the record : A complete document diagram review has to be done.	Noted.
15	US	15.3,15.8 & 15.10		ed	Does a Feature Association need to be defined for TSS features, Two-way routes and Deep Water route?		More likely a named aggregation. On-going action.
15	US	15.4		ed	Does a Feature Association need to be defined for measured distance system?		As above.
	2J	15.5			Feature: Recommended track (RECTRC) Attributes: Orientation Multiplicity: "1,1"	The attribute 'Orientation' for RECTRC should be conditional mandatory. This attribute may be omitted for recommended tracks not based on fixed marks, where it is not straight line. In this case its multiplicity should be written as '0,1'. "This conditionality should be described in clause 15.5.1	Do not agree. How is a mariner supposed to follow a recommended track that does not have legs which are straight? If there is an affirmative answer to this, consider this would be an exception rather than a rule, in which case **orientation** can be populated as "empty

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.

Draft DCEG 0.0.1 Review Comments Form (Please provide responses to julia.powell@noaa.gov and jeff.wootton@defence.gov.au by 08 November 2013.)

| Date: 26 September 2013 | Document: **Draft DCEG Edition 0.0.1** |

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 com-ment[2]	Comment (justification for change) by the CO[3]	Proposed change by the CO	Secretariat observations on each comment submitted
							(null)". Discuss.
	FR	15.12	IHO definition	ed		Amend "routing" for "routeing" (in addition, correct all instances in the whole document)	OK
	FR	16.2.1	Second paragraph And table in clauses 16.16 and 16.25	te	In this case, the disputed area should be encoded with separate **Territorial Sea Area** and **Exclusive Economic Zone** features, with Boolean attribute **in dispute** set to *True.*and the mandatory attribute **nationality** populated with the country codes (conforming to ISO 3166) of the disputing states (see clause X.X).	1 - Remove full stop after the word True. 2 - As disputed areas must have the mandatory attribute **nationality** populated with the country codes of the two (or more) disputing states, the attribute **nationality** for **Territorial Sea Area** and **Exclusive Economic Zone** features must have a multiplicity of 1,*.	OK As **nationality** is populated for each of the areas that overlap (not multiple times on a single feature), multiplicity [1,1] is OK. Amend to [1,*] (same for CONZNE).
16	US	16.8		ed	International boundaries that are encoded as Administration areas can be disputed.	Add the attribute In dispute to feature	Is this an issue in terms of navigation? Discuss. Add.
16	US	16.10		ed	Should Caution areas be limited to surfaces, given that point caution areas would not set off any alarms and therefore be hard for the mariner to find. For reasons of safe navigation caution areas points should be encoded has small surfaces.		Point caution areas symbolise in ECDIS. Why would there be no ECDIS alarm?
9	JP	16.10	3 (Remarks)	ed	The subject is "Caution area" in this paragraph.	to change **information area** to **caution area**	OK
10	JP	16.11		te	An object "Information area" needs an attribute "Pictorial representation" for users.	to add "Pictorial representation" to "information area"	OK
11	JP	16.12		te	An object "Information" needs an attribute "Pictorial representation" for users	to add "Pictorial representation" to "information"	**pictorial representation** should be populated for the feature(s) that the **Information** feature is associated with. Discuss. Agreed to add.

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.

Draft DCEG 0.0.1 Review Comments Form (Please provide responses to julia.powell@noaa.gov and jeff.wootton@defence.gov.au by 08 November 2013.)

| Date: 26 September 2013 | Document: **Draft DCEG Edition 0.0.1** |

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
16	US	16.13		ed	Contiguous Zones can be disputed	Add the attribute In dispute to feature	OK
	FR	16.16 Exclusive Economic Zone	Table Remarks	te	See above (comment for clause 16.2.1)	1 - Amend multiplicity of attribute **nationality for** 1,* 2 - Add a new remark : For guidance regarding the encoding of linear maritime jurisdiction features, see clause X.X.	As for comment at 16.2.1.
12	JP	16.23		te	There is an oil barrier which is underwater, but is afloat if necessary in Japan.	to add an attribute "Water level effect" with 7 (floating)	The definition includes "floating". Consider that if it is submerged it is an obstruction, not an oil barrier, but becomes an oil barrier when it is floated. Discuss.
	FR	16.25 Territorial Sea Area	Table Remarks	te	See above (comment for clause 16.2.1)	1 - Amend multiplicity of attribute **nationality for** 1,* Add a new remark : 2 - For guidance regarding the encoding of linear maritime jurisdiction features, see clause X.X.	As for comment at 16.2.1.
	FR	16.27.1.4	First paragraph	ed	"Speed is often limited inside harbours in order to prevent wakes. If it is required to encode this restriction, it must be done using a **Restricted Area** feature, with the attribute **category of restricted area** = *24* (no wake area) or **restriction** = *13* (no wake)." Both attributes, **category of restricted area** = *24* (no wake area) and **restriction** = *13* (no wake), may also be encoded.	Amend the wording to read "…with the attribute **category of restricted area** = *24* (no wake area) **and/or restriction** = *13* (no wake)."	Disagree. Expect the only reason that **restriction** = *13* (no wake) exists is that it may be populated for features other than **Restricted Area** having **restriction** as a valid attribute (the definitions mean virtually the same thing). Could we just retire **category of restricted area** = *24*? Discuss. Me to fix. Add new speed

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.

page 24 of 35

Draft DCEG 0.0.1 Review Comments Form (Please provide responses to julia.powell@noaa.gov and jeff.wootton@defence.gov.au by 08 November 2013.)

| Date: 26 September 2013 | Document: **Draft DCEG Edition 0.0.1** |

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 com-ment[2]	Comment (justification for change) by the CO[3]	Proposed change by the CO	Secretariat observations on each comment submitted
							limit attribute (perhaps a complex). Consider multiple limits by vessel type.
	FR	16.27.1.5		te	"If it is required to encode a restricted anchoring area, it must be done using a **Restricted Area** feature, or using other features with the attribute **restriction** (see clause X.X), where **restriction** = 1 (anchoring prohibited), 2 (anchoring restricted) or 7 (entry prohibited)." Even if anchoring is logically prohibited in an area where entry is prohibited, the attribute value Restriction = 7 encodes a restriction which goes beyond.	Remove value restriction = 7 from this clause. May be a general remark could be added in 16.27.1, to indicate that when the attribute value **restriction** = 7 (entry prohibited) is populated, it is useless to encode any other obvious prohibitions or restrictions.	OK Have not added a remark – wouldn't this be stating the obvious?
	FR	17.2	First paragraph	ed		Move the words "both a structure and an equipment feature." above the figure.	OK
	FR	17.2	Figure	te	.	Add a legend with an arrow in the figure to indicate that the Structure/equipment association is only the one that is shown in the rectangle	Noted
	FR	17.2	Second paragraph, 2nd and 3rd sentences	te	Current wording: "…Alternatively, a **Pile** feature of type point or a **Beacon Special Purpose/General** feature may be encoded as the structure feature at the same position as the equipment features. When the nature of the base structure in the water is unknown, an ECDIS Base or Standard Display feature (see S-52, Annex A, clause 13.2), e.g. **Pile** feature of type point or a **Beacon Special Purpose/General** feature, must be encoded as the structure feature at the same position as the equipment features."	Remove the reference to S-52, and amend the wording to be in line with §18.1.8 (see below). "When a light is located in the water with no indication on the source of the structure feature, regardless of the height of the light, a **Pile** or **Beacon Special Purpose/General** feature should be encoded as the structure feature. This will ensure that a symbol will be shown on ECDIS systems when the light features are not displayed during daytime navigation."	OK
	FR	17.3.1	Third	te	Current wording:	Amend the wording to read :	OK

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.

Date: 26 September 2013	Document: **Draft DCEG Edition 0.0.1**

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 com-ment[2]	Comment (justification for change) by the CO[3]	Proposed change by the CO	Secretariat observations on each comment submitted
			paragraph		"…**Local Direction of Buoyage** features must not overlap, but in areas where local buoyage directions apply, **Local Direction of Buoyage** features may overlap **Navigational System of Marks** features (see Figure below)." For this situation, there is no other possibility, these two features always overlap. So remove "may".	"…**Local Direction of Buoyage** features must not overlap, but in areas where local buoyage directions apply, **Local Direction of Buoyage** features always overlap **Navigational System of Marks** features (see Figure below)."	
	FR	17.3.1.1	tables	ed	Concerned raws : Special purpose beacon and Special purpose topmark.	Amend feature names "**Beacon, Special Purpose**" for "**Beacon, Special Purpose/general"**.	OK
	FR	17.3.1.1	Tables Last raw	te	For Emergency wreck marking topmar, the feature to be used must be **Emergency wreck marking buoy.**	Amend **Beacon, Special Purpose** for **Emergency wreck marking buoy**	OK
	FR	18.1.3		te	This clause is empty (text missing).	Add rules to explain the encoding of colours of lights. For instance: Only features encoding alternating lights may have the attribute Colours populated with more than one values.	On-going DCEG action. Noted.
	2J	18.2			Feature: 'Light all around', 'light sectored' Attribute: Colour; Multiplicity: 1,*	Suggest the multiplicity be '1,*(ordered)'. It is important for lights with alternating characteristic.	OK
	2J	18.2			Feature: 'Light all around' Attribute: Light visibility; Allowable Encoding Values: 1 – High intensity; 2 – Low intensity.	Mistake in 'Multiplicity'. If there can be values 1 and 2 only, obviously they cannot be both, i.e. multiplicity=0,* is incorrect. It should be changed to the value '0,1'.	OK

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.

Draft DCEG 0.0.1 Review Comments Form (Please provide responses to julia.powell@noaa.gov and jeff.wootton@defence.gov.au by 08 November 2013.)

| Date: 26 September 2013 | Document: **Draft DCEG Edition 0.0.1** |

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 com-ment[2]	Comment (justification for change) by the CO[3]	Proposed change by the CO	Secretariat observations on each comment submitted
					Multiplicity: 0,*		
	FR	18.2.1 All around lights	Table and Fourth remark	te	Current wording: "If it is required to encode the purpose of a marine spotlight, it must be done using **information**." There is an inconsistency between the definition of the feature Light All Around and the definition of spot light *(a powerful light **focused** so as to illuminate a small area).*	The attribute value Category of light = 11 (spotlight) is allowable for the feature Light All Around. Is it normal?	Not sure what to do with this one. A spotlight is not a marine aid to navigation (as a light – this would be a directional light(?)). Discuss. new feature non-navigational light.
	FR	18.2.1 All around lights	Seventh remark	ed	Current wording: …using the complex attribute **feature name** on at least the largest ~~scale~~ maximum display scale ENC data.	Remove scale	OK
	2J	18.3, 18.3.1 & 26.10			Remark 18.3.1 contradicts feature model structure in 18.3. As per 18.3 Light Characteristic can only be encoded under complex attribute rhythm of light. There is no option to encode light characteristic under light sector as the text says. 26.10 also contradicts table 18.3 as per light characteristic attribute.	To be discussed by TSMAD27	**Light characteristic** has been moved to the **light sector** complex. Refer to lights Paper TSMAD27-4.5.2B.
	HA	18.3	Attribute model of light sectored		Consider multiplicity of Rhythm of light and light sectors inside each Rhythm complex Rhythm group(s) 1,* Light characteristic 1,1 Signal group 0,* Signal period 0,1 Signal sequence 0,*	It is common that most light sectors share same Rhythm. Model to reduce duplication of content	Refer to lights Paper TSMAD27-4.5.2B. Cover as part of this general discussion.

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.

Date: 26 September 2013	Document: **Draft DCEG Edition 0.0.1**

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 com-ment[2]	Comment (justification for change) by the CO[3]	Proposed change by the CO	Secretariat observations on each comment submitted

					Signal duration 1,1
					Signal status 1,1
					Light sector/direction 0,*
					   Colour 1,*
					   Directional character 0,1
					      Moire effect 0,1
					      Orientation 1,1
					         Orientation uncertainty 0,1
					         Orientation value 1,1
					Light Visibility 0,*
					Sector limit 0,1
					   Sector limit one 1,1
					   Sector limit two 1,1
					Value of nominal range 0,1
					
					So a light with all sectors using same Rhythm would have only one Rhythm group with multiple sectors applicable to that Rhythm so the Signal info and light characterics would only be entered once. If there are different Rhythms then multiple Rhythm entries and each with the appropriate sector(s) defined.		

	HA	18.3	Directional Attribute		Boolean attribute Directional is redundant. If optional Directional Character complex attribute is populated then the sector is directional in nature.	Simplify model	As above.
	2J	18.3			Feature: 'Light sectored'	Suggest the multiplicity be '1,*(ordered)'. It is	OK

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.

Draft DCEG 0.0.1 Review Comments Form (Please provide responses to julia.powell@noaa.gov and jeff.wootton@defence.gov.au by 08 November 2013.)

| Date: 26 September 2013 | Document: **Draft DCEG Edition 0.0.1** |

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 com-ment[2]	Comment (justification for change) by the CO[3]	Proposed change by the CO	Secretariat observations on each comment submitted
					Attribute: Colour; Multiplicity: 1,*	important for lights with alternating characteristic.	
	FR	18.6 Light Sectored	Table	te	We may have to indicate that a sectored light is a leading light, a subsidiary light, a front light or an emergency light, or …, but **Category of light** is not allowable for the feature **Light Sectored**.	Propose to add Category of light as an allowable attribute for the feature Light Sectored. If agreed, keep the attribute value **Category of light =** 1 (directional function) as allowable, and remove the new Boolean attribute **Directional**.	As above.
	FR	19.5	Table of attributes	te	See below, comment for FAD in clause 19.5.1	Category of special purpose mark: Amend the meaning of value 59 (floating fish aggregating device (FAD) to read "~~floating~~ fish aggregating device (FAD) mark"	See comment for 13.6.1 above. Subject of ongoing action.
	FR	19.5.1 Special purpose /general buoys	Remarks	te	For this feature there is a mix of special purpose buoys (e.g IALA) and buoys which cannot be encoded using another existing feature class. It should be possible for a software to easily differentiate which marks are special purpose marks an which ones are general marks. In order to improve the encoding and facilitate the testing, a previous proposal (Australia) proposed to split this feature in two different classes "Special Purpose buoys" and "General buoys". It was accepted.	As this previous accepted proposal seems to be ignored in S101, alternatively, I propose to impose that the encoder clearly indicates that the mark is, or is not, of a defined system (IALA or other). Two solutions seem to be possible : 1 - creating and using a new Boolean attribute **Special purpose mark (of a defined system)** 2 - using the existing attribute **Marks navigational – system of** If this second solution above is adopted, add the following new remark : - If the navigational aid is a general mark which does not conform to a defined system, it must be encoded with the attribute value **Marks navigational – system of** = 9 (no system).	Have added a remark regarding marks navigational – system of = *9*. There is an ongoing action for AU to develop a proposal for **Buoy Non-Navigational**.

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.

Date: 26 September 2013	Document: **Draft DCEG Edition 0.0.1**

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 com-ment**[2]	**Comment (justification for change) by the CO**[3]	**Proposed change by the CO**	**Secretariat observations** on each comment submitted
	FR	19.5.1 Special purpose /general buoys	Table Last raw (FAD)	te	See 13.9.1 (second remark): "Fish aggregating devices (FAD), whether under water or floating, must be encoded, where required, as **Obstruction** features (see clause X.X)." So, floating FAD must be encoded using the feature **Obstruction**, and only navigational buoys marking FAD must be encoded using Special purpose buoys.	First column (Feature): Amend the wording "Floating Fish Aggregating Device (FAD)" for "Fish Aggregating Device (FAD) mark". Sixth column (other attributes): Amend the wording " Subsurface FAD encoded as **Obstruction** (see clause x.x) " for " FAD encoded as **Obstruction** (see clause x.x) " . In the first raw, I propose to amend "Other attributes" for "Other attributes and comment".	See comment for 13.6.1 above. Subject of ongoing action.
	FR	19.5.1 Special purpose /general buoys	Third remark	te	Amend this remark "Subsurface Fish Aggregating Devices (FAD) and Ocean Data Acquisition System (ODAS) equipment must be encoded, where required, using an **Obstruction** feature (see clause X.X)." to be consistent with the table in §19.5.1 and with §13.9.1 (second remark).	Amend the remark to read : "~~Subsurface~~ Fish Aggregating Devices (FAD) and subsurface Ocean Data Acquisition System (ODAS) equipment must be encoded, where required, using an **Obstruction** feature (see clause X.X)."	See comment for 13.6.1 above. Subject of ongoing action.
	FR	19.5.1 Special purpose /general buoys	Fourth remark		Amend the second sentence of the remark "... A buoy intended to permanently mark a wreck as an danger must be encoded, where required, as a **Buoy Special Purpose/General** feature, with attribute **category of special purpose mark** = 60 (wreck mark)." Reason: A buoy intended to permanently mark a wreck may also be a cardinal, a lateral or an isolated danger buoy.	Amend the wording to read : "... A special purpose buoy intended to permanently mark a wreck as **a** danger must be encoded, where required, as a **Buoy Special Purpose/General** feature, with attribute **category of special purpose mark** = 60 (wreck mark)."	OK
	FR	19.6.1	Second remark	te		Amend the second remark to: "~~The **topmark** complex attribute should be populated with sub-attributes **topmark shape** = 8 (upright cross (St George's cross)) and **colour** = 6 (yellow).~~ An IALA compliant emergency wreck marking buoy topmark should be encoded using	OK

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.

Date: 26 September 2013	Document: **Draft DCEG Edition 0.0.1**

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
						the **topmark** complex attribute populated with sub-attributes **topmark shape** = *8* (upright cross (St George's cross)) and **colour** = *6* (yellow)." And move this remark it to be the third one, just before the remark relating to the other equipments.	
19	US	19.7 & 2.2	Geometric primitives	te	19.17.1 States: If it is required to encode radar reflectors on curve features (e.g. overhead cables), this must be done using the feature **Radar Reflector**. But curve is not an allowable type in section 2.2 or 19.7	Add Curve to Radar Reflector in section 2.2 and 19.7 or change '**must be done using the feature Radar Reflector** to **must be done by using the attribute Radar conspicuous**'.	This means encoding a point **Radar Reflector** on the curve. The intention is that the mariner knows the point along the linear feature that will provide a radar return.
	FR	19.12.1 Special purpose /general buoys	Remarks	te	See my first comment above for § 19.5.1 For this feature there is a mix of special purpose beacons (e.g IALA) and beacons which cannot be encoded using an another existing feature class.	As the previous accepted proposal (from Australia) seems to be ignored in S101, alternatively, I propose to impose that the encoder clearly indicates that the mark is, or is not, of a defined system (IALA or other). Two solutions seem to be possible : 1 - creating and using a new Boolean attribute **Special purpose mark (of a defined system)** 2 - using the existing attribute **Marks navigational – system of** If this second solution above is adopted, add the following new remark : - If the navigational aid is a general mark which does not conform to a defined system, it must be encoded with the attribute value **Marks navigational – system of** = 9 (no system).	Have added a remark regarding marks navigational – system of = *9*. There is an ongoing action for AU to develop a proposal for **Beacon Non-Navigational**.
	FR	19.12.2	Remark	te	The following text does not relate to signs and notice	Remove this text.	Not sure what happened in the draft. The text is not in

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.

Date: 26 September 2013	Document: **Draft DCEG Edition 0.0.1**

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 com- ment[2]	Comment (justification for change) by the CO[3]	Proposed change by the CO	Secretariat observations on each comment submitted
		Signs and notice boards			boards: "**Isolated Danger**. A beacon marking a wreck for other purposes must be encoded, where required, as a **Beacon Special Purpose/General** feature, with attribute **category of special purpose mark** = *60* (wreck mark)."		my "working" version.
	2J	19.13			Feature: Daymark (DAYMAR) Attributes: 'Pictorial representation' (PICREP) is omitted	Feature type 'Daymark' does not include the attribute 'Pictorial representation'. There are a lot of cases where image of the day mark is encoded especially when 'Daymark' encodes a structure object. In such cases it is used as a beacon but all features type of beacons have the attribute 'Pictorial representation'. Suggest adding this attribute back.	**Pictorial representation** is not a valid attribute for **Daymark** in S-57, and this has not previously been raised. Have added pending discussion.
	FR	19.14.1 Light floats	First remark	te		Amend the remark to: If it is required to encode a light float or a topmark that has more than one colour, the attributes **colour** and **colour pattern** must be encoded, according to the rules laid out in clause X.X.	OK
	FR	20.1 AIS	Table	te	See the IMO draft document NAV 59/WP.9/Rev.2 First comment: An AIS AtoN may be of a different type from those listed as allowable values for the attribute **AIS aid to navigation type**. This attribute is mandatory. Second comment: Only two categories (physical and virtual) are mentioned in the IMO document.	First proposal: I propose to extend the list of the attribute values to cover all possibilities, or to amend the multiplicity **1,1** of this attribute for **0,1** to make it optional. Second proposal: Remove the attribute value **Category of AIS aid to navigation** = 2 (synthetic)	Have removed **category of AIS aid to navigation**. Do not agree with amending multiplicity to [0,1]. This attribute is intended to drive portrayal. Discuss.
	2J	24.88 vs. 20.2			Feature: Radio Station Attribute: Estimated range	20.2 describes Estimated range while 24.88 states Estimated range of transmission. Descriptions must me unified.	Have amended table entries to **estimated range of transmission**. However, there is an attribute **value of**

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.

Draft DCEG 0.0.1 Review Comments Form (Please provide responses to julia.powell@noaa.gov and jeff.wootton@defence.gov.au by 08 November 2013.)

| Date: 26 September 2013 | Document: **Draft DCEG Edition 0.0.1** |

1 Component	2 CO[1]	(3) Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex (e.g. 3.1)	4 Paragraph/ Figure/Table/ Note (e.g. Table 1)	5 Type of comment[2]	(6) Comment (justification for change) by the CO[3]	(7) Proposed change by the CO	Secretariat observations on each comment submitted
							nominal range, which may be used in all cases of signal transmission (visual or radio/radar). Should this be used in all cases? Discuss.
	FR	20.3 Radar beacon	Third remark Last sentence	te	Current wording: "The features making up the range system **must** be aggregated using the collection feature **C_AGGR** (see clause X.X)." This rule is not consistent with the rules given for other range systems (see §15.1.1, §15.24.1, §20.3.1) for which the aggregation is optional.	Amend the wording to: "The features making up the range system should be aggregated using the collection feature **C_AGGR** (see clause X.X)."	Have amended to be consistent with other guidance. Will be further reviewed as part of ongoing named aggregations.
20	US	20.3.1	Remark 3	te	Does a Feature Association need to be defined for measured Radar Transponder Beacon?		Is there such a thing? Discuss.
21	US	21.3		ed	Would HOs chart a Coastguard Station has a surface if the ENC was of a large enough scale (should this be done by charting the buildings with a function) see above comment section 2.2		**Coastguard Station** only encodes the equipment. See comment for 2.2
21	US	21.3, 21.4, 21.5, 21.6 & 21.7		ed	Can the sub-attribute **Communication channel** stand-alone without the complex attribute **Communication information;** Does the clause in remarks explain this?	Add the complex attribute **Communication information** with the sub-attribute **Communication channel** only	Where a complex attribute is defined, it cannot have its sub-attributes changed where it is used in another feature.
	FR	21.5.1		te	Current wording: "The nature of traffic signals varies from country to country and even from port to port. For charting purposes traffic signals can be considered to include: • Port entry and departure signals; • Lock, docking and berthing signals; • Bridge signals; • International traffic signals." The list given above is different from the allowable	Make consistent the two lists, or remove the one which is given in § 21.5.1.	This is intended as general introductory text for traffic signals. The values of **category of signal station traffic** are all equivalent/sub values of the generalised description. Do not consider that any change is required. Discuss.

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.

Draft DCEG 0.0.1 Review Comments Form (Please provide responses to julia.powell@noaa.gov and jeff.wootton@defence.gov.au by 08 November 2013.)

| Date: 26 September 2013 | Document: **Draft DCEG Edition 0.0.1** |

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
					values of the attribute **Category of signal station traffic.**		
	FR	21.7.1	Fourth remark	te	Current wording : "If it is required to encode a covered terminal into which ships can go, this should be done using **Harbour Facility** with the purpose of the terminal defined by **category of harbour facility**. The roof of the terminal may be encoded using the attribute **nature of construction**, and the maximum height and/or draught of vessels able to use the terminal encoded using the complex attribute **information**. Alternatively, the roofed structure may be encoded using a **Building** feature (see clause X.X)." Nothing in the proposed encoding clearly indicates that the terminal is roofed.	Propose to create a Boolean attribute **Covered terminal** to clearly indicate that the terminal is roofed. This new attribute should be optional.	**Building Single** has the system Boolean attribute **in the water**, therefore do ot consider that this proposed attribute is required. Consider with "structures" action.
13	JP	24.34	25)	te	Japan will provide a definition of Torii.	a gate located in a Shinto shrine	OK. Definition at left included as place holder in current drsft.
	FR	24.138.1	Table	te	Feature **Depth contour**	Remove reference to S-52	Done. However, should this be in the table at all, given the safety depth is set by the mariner (i.e. is there a requirement in S-101 ECDIS to have the default ECDIS system safety depths having a **scale minimum** value set to a higher value than other contour values? Personally do not think so. Discuss.
14	JP	24.154		te	There is no description about character limit.	to add description about character limit if it exists	OK

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.

Date: 26 September 2013	Document: **Draft DCEG Edition 0.0.1**

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 com- ment[2]	Comment (justification for change) by the CO[3]	Proposed change by the CO	Secretariat observations on each comment submitted
25	US	25.2			te	CATZOC is no longer an attribute	Remove this attribute	OK, however still awaiting conclusion of DQWG investigations.
	2J					Feature: all features containing colourPattern Attribute: Colour Pattern; Multiplicity: 0,1	In S57 the attribute COLPAT is 'List' type. List type was intended for features with complex pattern. It is widespread the use of stripe patterns with border stripe. Suggest changing multiplicity to 1,*	Needs discussion. Unfortunately this is one of the circumstances where there is a "conditional" mandatory attribute dependant on the attribute **colour** being populated with more than one value. If **colour pattern** is made mandatory, then in all circumstances where **colour** is only populated with more than one value, then **colour pattern** must be populated with an empty (null) value. Previous DCEG Sub-WG decision was that **colour pattern** having multiplicity greater than [0,1] was not required for navigation. Add guidance regarding main pateern.
0	JP	4.3.3.2 (S-101 latest version)	Figure 2	ed	I'm sorry to treat S-101 at this time, but there is one editorial error.	to change <<Lights>> and Feature Type to Lights and <<Feature Type>>	Julia to address.

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.