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
	Furuno	Full document		ge	The S-101 will be based on machine readable principle, then there must be somewhere machine readable data which contain information which objects from the S-100 are allowed for the S-101. Further this machine readable structure shall include information if an allowed object belongs to scale dependent or scale independent data-set.	Specify missing items, for example as a new Annex	
PS Draft	UK	General		te	Should the feature and portrayal catalogues not also be referenced as Annexes?	Add annexes for Portrayal and Feature Catalogues.	
FC	2J	whole		TE	It seems the FC is built (in part to the revised FC model introduced at TSMAD22), numericCode is not included in that document, but is used in the FC.	It would be helpful to understand what versions of S-100 the documents are built on.	
S100 FC.XSD	2J	simpleAttribute, fc:Alias		TE	The Alias item under simpleAttribute is different from the modified FC model (from TSMAD22), where Alias is a characterstring. The construct used, is interesting, and should probably be repeated in fc:listedValue.	Clarify the intended use, and validate if FC model changes are needed.	
FC	2J	whole		TE	It would be helpful if the same unique code was not used for different element types (for example, 121 are used for both the attribute Pilot district and the feature type Seabed area).	Consider using unique codes for FC elements.	
S-101 Draft	CARIS	Entire doc		ed	Are we still using the term "cell". We seem to have more references to "dataset" then cell but "cell" is still being used a lot, what is the distinction between the two?	Suggest replace all "cell" with "dataset" or else provide a definition of "cell" that distinguishes it from any generic dataset. Perhaps the definition of a cell would be the entire dataset and it's meta data.	
S-101 Draft	CARIS	1.1	Para 1 3rd sentence and para 2	ed	Is the intention to introduce the spec or provide marketing for S-100? The examples referenced may not be the best. The new portrayal proposal will not make portrayal implementation any easier, especially	Why do we need richer data models in ENC? 1. To allow encoding of information for better use, reuse and validation.	

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

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

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

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

1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)	
Component	CO[1]	Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex (e.g. 3.1)	Paragraph/ Figure/Table/ Note (e.g. Table 1)	Type of com-ment[2]	Comment (justification for change) by the CO[3]	Proposed change by the CO	Secretariat observations on each comment submitted
					for the ECDIS and will be replacing internally optimized conditional procedures with a complex rules mechanism. Overuse of caution areas could probably be solved just by allowing some new classes and attributes in the S-57 Catalogue. Para 2 is referencing S-101 as a base layer that will interact with other layers but there is more work to do to make this a reality and such narrative probably belongs at a higher level within IHO communications, cover letters etc and not part of the intro to S-101.	2. To reduce the need for unstructured text in "Inform" attributes and attached text files. 3. To improve structure, validation and use of relationships between features and between attributes 4. Text placement What are other areas of improvement over S-57 1. More efficient and constrained geometry model 2. Improved exchange set structure and related meta data 3. Cell loading strategy included in specification 4. Specification designed to allow content , content definition(feature catalogue) and behaviour (presentation catalogues) to be updateable without breaking implementations. This will facilitate the ability to introduce new navigationally significant features.	
PS Draft	UK	1.1		ed	Section is not an introduction rewrite section to introduce the content and purpose of the product specification.	Suggest that this section is reworded to introduce the document and its purpose rather than highlight the benefits of S-101. This could be mentioned briefly in a final paragraph.	
PS Draft	UK	1.3.1		te	Should we explicitly state that only datasets which conform to all the musts within this document are valid ENCs?	Add sentence that only datasets which meet all musts are valid ENCs to make this explicit.	

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

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

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

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

1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)	
Component	CO[1]	Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex (e.g. 3.1)	Paragraph/ Figure/Table/ Note (e.g. Table 1)	Type of com-ment[2]	Comment (justification for change) by the CO[3]	Proposed change by the CO	Secretariat observations on each comment submitted
PS Draft	UK	1.3.2		ed	Are definitions for ENC dataset and ENC product specification required?	Suggest these are not required.	
PS Draft	UK	1.4	Abstract	ed	Primary function or purpose?	Suggest use 'purpose' in lieu of 'function'.	
PS Draft	UK	1.4	Content	ed	Reworded to enhance readability, removed use of application schema to simplify wording and avoid confusion. Do not consider it necessary to refer to the portrayal catalogue here.	Propose the following modified wording; "The Product Specification defines all requirements to which ENC data products must conform. Specifically it defines the data product content in terms of features and attributes within the feature catalogue. The DCEG provides the guidance on how the data product content must be captured."	
101	US	1.4	Spatial Extent	GE	Is this a good idea, Most GIS systems that produce ENC cannot build them across 180. No problem cutting cells at 180.	Remove	
	JP	1.4 11.3.1		te	Although described as 'Data Sets may cross the 180° meridian.', we think that a dataset must not cross the 180° meridian.	A dataset must not cross the 180° meridian.	
101	US	1.4	Purpose	GE	And Vessel route planning	Add text	
FC and S-101	2J	1.5.1		TE	To be able to comply with rules set out under 1.5.1, the FC must contain reference to the version of the FCD items it uses. Without these references the FC becomes a living document, which will break the versioning rules for the product specification.	Add reference to FCD items. The reference must include which version of the FCD item is referenced.	
PS Draft	UK	1.5.1.2		ed	Specialise to this document. Wording is based on S-100 and other standards. Should be made to reflect changes which may occur to this product specification to remove ambiguity.	Revise wording to suit this product specification.	
FC and	2J	1.5.1.3 1.5.1.4		TE	Currently there are no restrictions on deleting items from a FC or PC during maintenance. This result in a	Add to 1.5.1.3: Changes in a revision are minor and promise backward compatibility with 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.

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
S-101					need to obtain and keep all possible catalogues under the same edition of the product specification, unless all producers migrate to the new revision or clarification version simultaneously and all data compliant to older versions is simultaneously terminated (a very unlikely scenario). Suggest adding a restriction to revisions and clarifications that they must be backwards compatible within the same major version. This should enable systems to only keep the latest version of the FC and PC under the same edition of the product specification.	previous versions within the same Edition. Newer revisions, for example, introduce new features and attributes. Within the same Edition, a dataset of one version could always be processed with a later version of the feature and portrayal catalogues, and a portrayal catalogues can always rely on earlier versions of the feature catalogues. Add to 1.5.1.4: Changes in a clarification are minor and promise backward compatibility with the previous versions within the same Edition. Within the same Edition, a dataset of one clarification version could always be processed with a later version of the feature and portrayal catalogues, and a portrayal catalogues can always rely on earlier versions of the feature catalogues.	
PS Draft	UK	3		ed	"will be identifiable by the discovery metadata" prefer the following wording; "can be identified by its discovery metadata"	Suggest use of alternate wording to enhance readability.	
PS Draft	UK	3		te	Spatial resolution should this explain that ENCs define a scale range within which the dataset is intended to be used. The values must be from the following table.	Propose add wording to reflect that "An ENC dataset must carry values for minimum and maximum display scale these define a scale range within which the dataset should be used. Values must be taken from the following table."	
S101	FR	3		te	Tables in clauses 3 (table 1), C.3 (table 1) and DCEG should be identical.	Spatial resolution : substitute "Minimum and Maximum display scales" for "Optimum Scale" in the text and in table 1.	
PS Draft	UK	4.2		te	Needs rewording to reflect that the S-101 application schema is realised in the feature catalogue and the product specification only contains examples from it.	Suggest reword, also should say conforms to the S-100 GFM not 'uses'.	

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

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

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

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

1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)	
Component	CO[1]	Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex (e.g. 3.1)	Paragraph/ Figure/Table/ Note (e.g. Table 1)	Type of com-ment[2]	Comment (justification for change) by the CO[3]	Proposed change by the CO	Secretariat observations on each comment submitted
PS Draft	UK	4.3.2.1.1		ed	Explain that the feature types listed are the skin of the earth features.	Add to first para "the Skin of the Earth Feature Types are listed below:"	
PS Draft	UK	4.3.2.2		ed	Could now have more than one data coverage wording needs to reflect this.	Reword to make clear that more than one data coverage feature could be used.	
S-101	2J	4.3.3 4.3.5.3.1 4.6 6.1.2		ED	Reviewers not familiar with the status of DCEG work, wondered where the named aggregations, associations are, and why only generic aggregations and associations are in the FC.	For items where the product specification (PS) and FC are not harmonized (for whatever reason), a note should be added in the PS to explain that one is ahead of the other, and maybe a small comment of why.	
PS Draft	UK	4.3.3		ed	Should this cover information types?	Propose amend to object relationships explain that feature and information types may be related etc etc	
	FR	4.3.3.2		te		Add the statement : Meta attribution on individual feature overrides attribution on meta features.	
PS Draft	UK	4.3.4	Figure 4	Ed	Figure 4 suggest a better example is used. Such as a note regarding safe clearances which is referenced to multiple overhead cable features.	Use a different example.	
PS Draft	UK	4.3.5		Te	Should we list the attribute value types here? Suggest these are pretty fundamental. Or refer to the DCEG	Add list of the attribute value types used in S-101.	
PS Draft	UK	4.3.5	Figure 5	Ed	Suggest the new complex attribute for topmark would be a better example.	Amend figure.	
	JP	4.3.5.3 12.2		te	It should be described that the BOM (Byte Order Mark) must not be used. Because the character strings must be used UTF-8 in S-101 and it is described by Unicode Standard, Ver. 6.0 (Chapter 2.6 Encoding Schemes Page.30) as follows.	To add this sentence to 4.3.5.3 and 12.2. A BOM (byte order mark) must not be used.	

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

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

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

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

1 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 com- ment[2]	(6) Comment (justification for change) by the CO[3]	(7) Proposed change by the CO	Secretariat observations on each comment submitted
					'Use of a BOM is neither required nor recommended for UTF-8.' Reference The Unicode Standard, Ver. 6.0 (URL: http://www.unicode.org/versions/Unicode6.0.0/)		
PS Draft	UK	4.3.5.3.1		Te	Text placement needs review to reflect further discussions on this subject.	Revisit at TSMAD 24.	
S-101 Draft	CARIS	4.3.5.3.1	Text Placement	ed	Would be good to have a diagram that shows how position relates and how flip bearing works Do we need to limit the number of text placements for a given feature. May want multiple texts or to have placements for different scales. UML shows 0..1	Wasn't there a diagram from the breakout at TSMAD 23 Change UML to 0..n text placements on a feature.	
S-101	2J	4.3.5.3.1	Fig. 6	TE	Whether attribute textString works depends on the exact rules governing it, it might not even work as intended, e.g., which displayed attributes does it override – just the name string? What about other attributes which are displayed as text (e.g., attribute COMCHA, INFORM. What about datasets with names in multiple languages?	TSMAD is requested to review how this attribute interacts with the new model of text attributes and explain the logic of textString in more detail	
101	US	4.3.5.3.1	Text Placement	ED	Guidance is need to unsure scaleMinimum on the TextPlacementOveride feature and scaleMinimum on the main feature are not the same or are a factor of each other.	A reference to the Data Classification and Encoding Guide where this guidance is given.	
101	US	4.3.5.3.1	Text Placement	ED	Can the TextPlacementOveride feature have move attributes to give HOs move control over placement.	Possibly add horizontal shift, vertical shift, masker, and override other text.	
PS Draft	UK	4.3.5.4-4.4		Te	The DCEG introduction covers these items, Suggest that contents needs to be aligned.	Align with 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.

Date: 01. March 2012	Document: **S-101 Product Specification Phase 3**

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
	Furuno	4.3.5.4	2nd para	te	This clause specify that all mandatory attributes are identified in the Feature catalogue and summarized in Annex B – data classification and Encoding Guide The reviewer is confused as the Annex B of this document is for another topic: "Data product format". Anyhow as the S-101 will be based on machine readable principle, then there must be somewhere machine readable data which contain information which attributes are mandatory or alternative (in S-57 alternative means that one of the alternative attributes is mandatory). The basic S-100 do not contain such information as in general the products derived from the S-100 are not required to share equal rules of allowed, alternative and mandatory attributes for each object.	Specify missing items, for example as a new Annex	
	Furuno	4.3.5	Full clause	te	There is a need for machine readable data to define for each object allowed for the S-101 which attributes are a) mandatory, b) alternatively mandatory and c) allowed	Specify missing items, for example as a new Annex	
S-101 Draft	CARIS	4.4	FOID para 2 sentence 1	te	"For ENC the Feature Object Identifier may be used to identify multiple instances of the same real world feature within a single cell or across multiple cells." I believe that we intended to allow a single feature to reference multiple disjoint spatials via the SPAS field which should mean that a feature cut by the dataset limit would only need to have one instance within the dataset. In other words we should not need to allow duplicate FOIDs in a dataset.		

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

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

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

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

1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)	
Component	CO[1]	Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex (e.g. 3.1)	Paragraph/ Figure/Table/ Note (e.g. Table 1)	Type of com-ment[2]	Comment (justification for change) by the CO[3]	Proposed change by the CO	Secretariat observations on each comment submitted
S-101 Draft	CAR IS	4.4	Para 3	te	If a feature is deleted from a dataset can the same feature be restored, using the same FOID. What if a buoy is moved and new position is outside of the dataset and then is moved back again. One update would have to delete the buoy and another add it back with the same FOID.	Clarify that FOID may not be reused by another feature even when the other feature has been deleted.	
PS Draft	UK	4.5.1		Te	Dataset structure do we mean this or do we mean how datasets interact through the scales? 'The can be'?	Clarify wording.	
PS Draft	UK	4.5.4		Te	SI items need review, paper for TSMAD 24 refers.	Review following paper to TSMAD 24.	
S-101 Draft	CAR IS	4.5.4	Max/min scale	te	Why restrict min/max scale. Why not just allow the dataset to cover a range of scales that spans multiple base datasets. Could it be desirable to have for example 2 Si datasets, one that works with large-medium scale base data and one for small scale datasets?	Seems that really the scale dependent and scale independent are just variations on ranges of applicable scales. It might be better to identify he datasets as complete or incomplete in the sense of useable for navigation. Then define how the dependencies will be managed to allow an ECDIS to combine datasets to acquire a complete set usable for navigation. Perhaps individual datasets be marked not for navigation or use for navigation only if combined with dataset X.	
S-101 Draft	CAR IS	4.5.4.1			If we are fixing what can go in what dataset then perhaps give it a proper name.	Base dataset + Navinfo dataset Can be combined in one dataset or delivered as separate combinable and updateable datasets.	
	JP	4.5.4.1	Table 2	Te	We request to add the following objects and a geometric primitive type. To Add objects FAIRWY (A) MIPARE (P,A)		

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

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

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

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

1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)	
Component	CO[1]	Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex (e.g. 3.1)	Paragraph/ Figure/Table/ Note (e.g. Table 1)	Type of com-ment[2]	Comment (justification for change) by the CO[3]	Proposed change by the CO	Secretariat observations on each comment submitted
					MARCUL (P,L,A) To Add primitive type RDOCAL (P) => RDOCAL (P,**L**). And we found out a mistake. There are two PILBOP in listed.		
1	DE	4.5.4.1	Table 2	te	We would not consider following object classes scale independent: BUISGL , CGUSTA, MORFAC, PILPNT, SISTAT, SISTAW,		
S-101	2J	4.5.4.1		ED	The meaning of P/A/L are not given	Add legend stating P=Point, L=Line, A=Area	
S-101	2J	4.5.4.1		ED	Table uses alpha codes, but no alpha codes in the FC.	Consider harmonizing the two.	
	FR	4.5.5		te	Add "maximum" in the sentence	Scale dependent datasets with the same **maximum** display scale may overlap.	
PS Draft	UK	4.6.1		Ed	Reword 'mosiac and spectra', complex words unclear to those for which English is not a first language.	Recommend ENCs form a seamless coverage in ECDIS which covers different areas with different scales of data.	
	Transas	4.6.1.1	Graphic frames are created 50-60 times per second according to Mariners Selected Viewing Scale (MSVS).	te	Does it mean that ECDIS display should be redrawn with 60 Hz frequency? If this is the case, it will overload ECDIS chart engine and actually such frequency is not required for navigation. 1 Hz or one redraw per second is enough.	Additional clarification or change is required	

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

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

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

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

1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)	
Component	CO[1]	Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex (e.g. 3.1)	Paragraph/ Figure/Table/ Note (e.g. Table 1)	Type of com-ment[2]	Comment (justification for change) by the CO[3]	Proposed change by the CO	Secretariat observations on each comment submitted
	Transas	4.6.1.1	Loading and unloading algorithm	te	Purpose of ordering of DataCoverage objects by percentage of coverage is not well described According to the algorithm, chart engine should analyze several DataCoverge and associate all other chart objects with certain DataCoverage	It will be more effective to assign Minimum and Maximum Display Scale values to each of the chart objects within the dataset	
2	DE	4.6.1.1		te	The value for MINDSC should be a rounded scale value −1. It should be handled similarly to SCAMIN. For the system it must be evidently clear if a dataset should be loaded or not or shown with overscale pattern at a specific display scale. Other paragraphs explaining cell loading and unloading philosophy must be changed accordingly.		
S-101 Draft	CARIS	4.6.1.1	Figure 7	te	This bit about graphic frames "Graphic frames are created 50-60 times per second according to Mariners Selected Viewing Scale (MSVS)." Seems rather implementation specific. Is it needed to describe the concept of combining various scales of data in a defined draw order?	Replace "Graphic Frames" with "dataset drawing order" or "graphic planes"	
PS Draft	UK	4.7.1		Ed	.3 mm should be 0.3 mm to be more clear.	Amend .3mm to 0.3 mm	
	FR	4.7.1		te	Reason: see S57clarification 1.Cl.33	Amend "must" for "should" in the sentence " Linear features **should** not be encoded at a point density greater than .3mm at optimum display scale".	
3	DE	4.7.1	Para 9	ed	What is meant by .3? I think 3mm point distance is a bit much or is it 0.3?		
	Transas	4.7.2	The first sentence in the	ed	Masking has nothing to do with length of symbolized line.	Remove the first sentence from the paragraph	

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: 01. March 2012	Document: **S-101 Product Specification Phase 3**

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				
PS Draft	UK	5.2		Te	Should we specify the minimum accuracy to which something should be referenced to WGS-84? We do not state how accurately data is referred to WGS-84.	Add clause to cover minimum accuracy to WGS-84. Refer to DQWG?	
	Transas	5.3	Vertical SRC	te	1. Is vertical datum supposed always be the same as sounding datum, i.e. will the same vertical CRS be used for depths and heights on land? 2. Different vertical datums are allowed for the dataset. This will cause difficulties for constructing bottom model and applying water level values. 3. Vertical datum should also be applied to depth contours, isolated dangers	Add requirement to use the same vertical datum at least for overlapped datasets covering the same geographical area. Look into a possibility to use corrective values to assign depth data obtained from various datasets with different vertical datums.	
PS Draft	UK	5		Te	We state units are in metres but this is not defined within the 8211 encoding.	Propose add attributes to the dataset attributes to carry units.	
PS Draft	UK	6.1.1		Te	Do not consider it sufficient to solely refer to S-58 here. Data quality is a much larger concept which S-58 only addresses certain elements of.	Propose reword to reflect ISO 19157 (draft).	
S-101	2J	6.1.2	para 4	ED	Reference to Fig 11 wrong	change to Figure 13	
PS Draft	UK	7.1		Ed	Use of shall. Futhermore may need to clarify that datasets must conform to musts within the DCEG and producers are encouraged to ensure data conforms to shoulds at the next opportunity?	Use 'should' in lieu of 'shall'.	
PS Draft	UK	8		Ed	Notices to mariners, should not refer to notice to mariners. Could expand to say that ENCs should include T/P information?	Propose use ENC Updates rather than Notices to mariners.	

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: 01. March 2012	Document: **S-101 Product Specification Phase 3**

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	8		ed	Remove one of the redundant statements relating to S-58.	Production Process: Data Producers should follow their established production processes for maintaining and updating datasets. ~~Datasets shall be checked against S-58 (equivalent)~~. Data is produced against the DCEG, **checked against S-58** and encapsulated in ISO/IEC 8211.	
101	NO	8	Maintenance and Update Frequency	ge	ENC updating mechanisms must include both Notice to Mariners and New Editions. For me NtM is a mechanism for updating the Paper Charts. We produce several ERs not published in the NtM, where the level of detail makes them not applicable for correcting the paper chart. A Ntm for the Paper Chart may also trigger a new edition in the ENC for technical reasons.	Remove link to paper chart world by not assuming NtM=ER? I also realize that this sentence may be interpreted that mechanisms for caretaking **at least** NtMs and New Editions must be present, so maybe just some rewriting or clarification?	
PS Draft	UK	9.1		Te	Should reference S-100 here and not repeat the structure. Only items which are specific to S-101 should need repeating.	Add reference to S-100 Portrayal.	
	Furuno	10	Version control		The machine readability of the s-100 object catalogue, S-100 attribute catalogue, S-101 product catalogue (this defines allowed, mandatory etc. for objects and attributes), S-101 presentation catalogue etc. require that the ECDIS software is able to perform version control between all machine readable catalogues and END data files. The version control is required to detect possible mismatch, in case of downward everything is ok (downward compatibility) but in case of upward it will be unknown how to operate correctly. In the upward situation the ECDIS is assumed to request the end user to update the machine readable catalogues to be compatible with every ENC loaded into the	Simplest way to support version control is that the DSID field of the ENC chart will contain the version number for which that ENC chart has been produced. Version number of S-101 is as defined in the clause 1.5.1.5. The 3 integer numbers of the version should be added into the DSID field.	

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

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

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

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

1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)	
Component	CO[1]	Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex (e.g. 3.1)	Paragraph/ Figure/Table/ Note (e.g. Table 1)	Type of com-ment[2]	Comment (justification for change) by the CO[3]	Proposed change by the CO	Secretariat observations on each comment submitted
					ECDIS.		
PS Draft	UK	11.1		Ed	Figure has no title	Add title to figure "Figure 14 – Exchange set structure"	
PS Draft	UK	11.2		Ed	Support file attributes need updating	Amend to new attributes.	
101	NO	11.2	Optional elements	Ge	Feature and portrayal catalogues listed as optional elements in the exchange set while datasets are mandatory elements. This means it is not possible to distribute a feature or portrayal catalogue update without including at least one dataset? In most cases there will be a dataset triggering the updates of the feature or portrayal catalogues, but will there be a need of distributing only a feature catalogue or portrayal catalogue update without any dataset?	Probably not an issue... Guess in most cases the FC/PC updates will be attached to the normal dataset distribution anyway.	
S-101	2J	11.2		ED	Reference to NTXTDS is made obsolete by new model of text attributes – the "N" attributes won't be needed	delete NTXTDS, and change alpha codes to full name.	
101	NO	11.3.1	3rd bullet	ed	"A new edition can also be ENC data has previously been produced..."	Word missing, add **that**? "...data **that** has been"	
101	US	11.3.1	Datasets	GE	Like comment #1 should dataset cross 180° and if not can the **boudingBox** feature cross 180°	Change to: Data Sets must not cross the 180° meridian, this includes both the **DataCoverage** and **boundingBox** features**.**	
S-101 Draft	CAR IS	11.3.1	Para 3	te	"Features with the geometric properties of point or line coincident with the border of two data sets with the same maximum display scale must be part of only one data set" This should be allowed if same FOID is used so system knows it is the same object.	Features with the geometric properties of point or line coincident with the border of two data sets with the same maximum display scale must be part of only one data set unless the same FOID is used for all occurrences.	
S-101	CAR IS	11.3.1	Para 3	te	"When a feature extends across data sets at the same maximum display scale its geometry must be split at the data set boundaries and its complete	When a feature from a specific origin extends across data sets at the same maximum display scale its geometry must be split at the data set	

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: 01. March 2012	Document: **S-101 Product Specification Phase 3**

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
Draft					attribute description must be repeated in each data set" surely this only applies to data from same producer and when same FOID is used.	boundaries and its complete attribute description must be repeated in each data set. Ideally the same FOID is used to indicate each piece is part of a larger entity.	
S-101 Draft	CAR IS	11.3.1	Para 7	te	If we allow datasets crossing 180 we have to be thorough about definition of bounding rectangles etc to make sure they are lower left, upper right instead of min/max.	review	
4	DE	11.3.1 + C.4.5.3	Package rules no.3	ge	Wouldn't it be of an advantage, if there was a common rule for naming scale independent datasets? In this case they could easily be identified by everyone. Even though it is not technically necessary.		
6	US	11.3.1.1	Dataset size	GE	10MB may be too big. Not so much for download and transfer but a GIS and an inspector at this current time will choke on an ENC 10MB ENC.	Change to: = not exceed 7.5 MB	
PS Draft	UK	11.3.1.1		te	Updates 50kb limit? Suggest this is limiting for some updates. Currently a recommendation	Propose "updates should not normally be larger than 50kb and must not be larger than 200kb".	
S-101 Draft	CAR IS	11.3.1.1	Para 1 and 2	ed	"Shall" is used but is not defined in 1.3.1. Actually "Shall is used all over the doc.	Use "Should"	
	JP	11.3.1.1		ge	The word of 'shall' is used in these sentences, however the 'shall' is not defined in '1.3.1 Use of Language'. Therefore the 'shall' should not be used in S-101.		
101	NO	11.3.1.1	Dataset size	ge	Datasets/updates **shall** not exceed... the word shall is not in line with the Use of Language described in 1.3.1. Is shall to be treated the same way as a must?	Clarification needed? Is the limit strict or just recommended?	
S-	2J	11.3.1.1		TE	The update limit set to 50kb means that in most	Suggest changing the mandatory update size limit	

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.

TSMAD/DIPWG comments and editorial observations (Please send all comments to Julia.Powell@noaa.gov)	Date: 01. March 2012	Document: **S-101 Product Specification Phase 3**

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
101					cases a change to a pictorial representation will require a new edition.	to a recommended update size limit.	
	JP	11.3.1.1		te	Why is capacity of updates 50kb ? The capacity of updates was defined for some legacy ECDIS that cannot load the big ER in S-57. However, S-101 is a new ENC standard, therefore there is no Legacy ECDIS in the world. If the capacity of updates will be described, it should be described that the capacity of updates should be considered for user convenience. In addition, it is needed to describe whether it is encrypted or not to refer the size. We prefer the unencrypted.		
	FR	11.3.1.2		te	What about gap where it is difficult to achieve a perfect join ? Propose to add a statement:	There must be no overlapping data of the same scale, except at the agreed adjoining national data limits, where, if it is difficult to achieve a perfect join, a 5 metre overlapping buffer zone may be used**; and for this situation, there must be no gaps in data.**	
S-101 Draft	CAR IS	11.3.1.3	Para 1	te	Re overlap of SI datasets: This could be difficult. Perhaps if base datasets have explicit references to overlays it won't be a problem if overlays are not drawn except where they overlap the associated base.	Need more thought/rules about SI and SD datasets and related operations and constraints	
101	US	11.3.1.4	Scale Dependent Datasets	GE	Is the 5 metre overlapping buffer zone a real world distance?	Change: a 5 metre overlapping buffer zone (ground units) may be used.	

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: 01. March 2012	Document: **S-101 Product Specification Phase 3**

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
101	US	11.3.1.4	Dataset file naming	GE	The statement "the third to tenth characters are optional and may be used in any way by the producer to provide the unique file name." Seems to give the impression that 10 characters are not mandatory or more then the issuing agency characters are needed.	Remove the word optional.	
S-101 Draft	CAR IS	11.3.2	all	te	Naming convention of incomplete datasets?	Idea: Introduce concept of a virtual dataset that offers the equivalent of a full dataset for the purpose of cell loading etc but only references the component datasets needed to load it. The virtual dataset would refer to the base + nav info or overlay and when drawn the SI data would be clipped to the cover of the base data. Then give incomplete datasets a different naming convention so that they can be ignored for the purpose of cell loading etc. Virtual datasets would be prepared for each scale but could reuse a shared base or SI data.	
PS Draft	UK	11.3.3		te	Need to cover cancellation updates with a business rule.	Propose to add a business rule stating that upon cancellation of a dataset it must be deleted from the system.	
S-101 Draft	CAR IS	11.3.3	Re-issue – 2nd sentence	te	"In the case of an update dataset the file extension is the same as the update number". Is this really what we want? This is different than S-57 and could be confusing. Currently it is clear that a 000 file is self contained but may be a re-issue whearas a 00n file is only an update and must be applied to a base file.	Do it the same as in S-57. Re-issue has 000 extension.	
PS Draft	UK	11.4		te	Need to be specific about the flavour of HTM/L. Suggest XML files are only used for a specific purpose.	Propose prepare guidance on the use of each type in consultation with OEMs.	
S-101	CAR	11.4	Xml and	te	If we expect systems to do anything with an XML file then more info (schema etc will be needed) There	Ask system vendors for agreed specs	

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

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

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

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

1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)	
Component	CO[1]	Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex (e.g. 3.1)	Paragraph/ Figure/Table/ Note (e.g. Table 1)	Type of com-ment[2]	Comment (justification for change) by the CO[3]	Proposed change by the CO	Secretariat observations on each comment submitted
Draft	IS		html		are different flavours of html. Do we expect things like CSS to be supported?		
	FR	11.4		ed	Only 3 characters for extentions	In the table, the extention for picture file should be "TIF" (not "TIFF").	
101	NO	11.4	2nd bullet	ge	Picture files must be in TIFF 6.0. I assume the more detailed recommendation on resolution and size and so on will go into the DCEG?		
S-101	2J	11.4, 11.4.1	table in 11.4	ED	"TIFF" is 4 letters, 11.4.1 limits the extension to 3 letters	Reconcile by changing one or the other	
PS Draft	UK	11.6.2		ed	Is coding in C required?	Suggest that this is no longer required.	
PS Draft	UK	12.1		ed	National language support? Should we say may be repeated in a national language?		
PS Draft	UK	12.1.1		ed	Supersets? Etc ? requires clarification.		
S-101	2J	12.1.2, 12.1.3	tables	TE	One table has filePath, the other has fileLocation, defined in almost exactly the same way	change fileLocation -> filePath in 12.1.3	
PS Draft	UK	12.1.2		te	Should metadata file name be fixed to a common convention?		
PS Draft	UK	12.1.2		te	Should protection scheme be an enumeration?		
5	DE	12.1.2	Row 18	ed	This row mentions optimum scale. In Chapter 4.6.1.1 no optimum scale is mentioned, maximum scale and minimum scale, only. In my opinion there is no need for an optimum scale.		
PS Draft	UK	12.1.2		te	display scales are 1,1 does this need to allow for 1,* so does not support data coverages with different	Amend 1,1 to 1,*	

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: 01. March 2012	Document: **S-101 Product Specification Phase 3**

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
					scale ranges.		
	Tran sas	12.1.2	Dataset	te	What is the purpose to have character string instead of integer data types for the following meta data? Purpose, update number, HorizontalDatumReference, laierID		
101	US	12.1.2	Dataset Metadata maximumDis playScale	GE	What happens to display in the ECDIS when the maximumDisplayScale is set to (1). Does the system allow the user unlimited zoom in?		
PS Draft	UK	12.1		te	Do we need an XSD schema for a catalogue file?	Propose that this needs to be created and provided to simplify implementation.	
S-101	2J	12.1.3		TE	What is the purpose of digitalSignatureReference and digitalSignatureValue?	Suggest remove	
S-101	2J	12.2	para 1	ED	References to national textual attributes made obsolete by new model of text attributes	Delete text "In general...used in international attributes."	
	JP	B1.6		te	Although described as '--<1>-DSSI', as '--<0..1>-DSSI' is better. Because DSSI field is not used, when we issue the cancel ER.	Update dataset file |--<1>- Data Set General Information record |--<1>-DSID |--<0..1>-DSSI	
PS Draft	UK	C		ed	Annexe C should not repeat content from the product specification.		
S-101	2J	C.4.5	para 1	ED	structures -> structured		
7	DE	C.4.5.3		te	I'm not sure if SCAMIN shouldn't be made mandatory for scale independent datasets, because, there should be consistency between adjacent datasets of different		

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: 01. March 2012	Document: **S-101 Product Specification Phase 3**

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
					HOs.		
S-101	2J	C.9	Display of Names, EXAMPLE	ED	Don't specify the pick report here, just use it as an example	Change last sentence to "The long name may be displayed in the pick report and elsewhere".	
S-101	2J	C.9	model	TE	A new simplified model was developed in discussions with SNPWG.	Should be updated with model resulting from discussions with SNPWG.	
PS Draft	UK	C9		te	Suggest names will be covered in portrayal rules, no need to explain here.	Remove rules for display of names. This will be covered in the DCEG and Portrayal Catalogue.	
S-101	2J	C.11.3		ED	Realizing this part of the document is "under construction", suggest that a placeholder be put in for replacing and terminating existing files for both datasets and support files to ensure it is covered in due course.	Add placeholder for replacement of dataset and terminate dataset. Add placeholder for replacement of support file and terminate support file.	
PS Draft	UK	C11.4		te	Support file management, should not specify the folder structure so specifically.	Remove folder structure or make a recommendation.	
S-101	2J	C.11.4.2		TE	Folder structure should take into account the possibility of different languages.	Put text files (TXT, HTML, XML) and any other support files containing text into sub-folders named by ISO language codes.	

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.