

1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)	
Component	CO <sup>1</sup>	Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex (e.g. 3.1)	Paragraph/ Figure/Table/ Note (e.g. Table 1)	Type of comment <sup>2</sup>	Comment (justification for change) by the CO <sup>3</sup>	Proposed change by the CO	Secretariat observations on each comment submitted
	GB		Title Page	ge	Content not appropriate for an introduction. Part 1 of the product specification could be considered to negate the need for an introduction.	Reword introduction to introduce the document to a first time reader and not to extol the benefits of S-101 over S-57 as this can be done elsewhere.	<b>TSMAD ACTION: Does TSMAD agree with the comment, if so, who will re-write this section.</b>
	US	1.1	1	ED	The following sentence has a typo: This document describes an S-100 compliant product specification for Electronic Navigational Charts, which will form the base navigation layer for <b>and</b> S-100 based ECDIS	Change <b>and</b> to <b>an</b>	Accepted
	GB	1.1	Para 1 Sentence 1	ed	To improve readability.	Amend 'navigation layer for and S-100 based ECDIS' to 'navigation layer within an S-100 based ECDIS'	Accepted see US comment
	US	1.4	Content	ED	As S-101 also includes a portrayal component the Content for the General Data Product Description should be amended to reflect the inclusion of a portrayal catalogue	Change:  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 Data Classification and Encoding Guide (DCEG) provides guidance on how data product content must be captured.  To:  <b>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 display of features is defined by the symbols and rule sets contained in the portrayal catalogue. The Data Classification and Encoding Guide (DCEG) provides guidance on how data product content must be captured.</b>	<b>TSMAD ACTION: Does TSMAD accept this revised wording.</b>

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 <sup>1</sup>	Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex (e.g. 3.1)	Paragraph/ Figure/Table/ Note (e.g. Table 1)	Type of comment <sup>2</sup>	Comment (justification for change) by the CO <sup>3</sup>	Proposed change by the CO	Secretariat observations on each comment submitted
	GB	1.4	Abstract	ed	To use the correct name.	Amend 'International Maritime Organisation' to 'International Maritime Organization'.	Accepted
	GB	1.4	Abstract	ed	To use the correct name.	Amend 'Safety Of Life At Sea' to 'Safety of Life At Sea'.	Accepted
	GB	1.4	content	ed	To improve navigation of the Product Specification	Reference DCEG Annexe ?	Accepted
	US	1.5	Date	ED	Product Specification Date should be updated to reflect the latest draft	Update Date	Accepted
	GB	1.5.1.3	3 <sup>rd</sup> para	ed	To make it clear that the meaning is feature catalogue and not a new feature.	Amend 'In most cases a new feature or portrayal catalogue will result in a revision of S-101' to 'In most cases a new feature catalogue or portrayal catalogue will result in a revision of S-101'	Accepted
101	NO	1.5.1.4	1 <sup>st</sup> paragraph	Ed	Part of sentence reads: " <b>insert improved graphics in spelling, punctuation and grammar</b> ". Are some words missing?		TSMAD ACTION: Originating clause is from TR 2/2007. Does TSMAD want to stick with the clause wording or amend for Grammer
	US	3	Abstract	ED	Grammer – ENC should be plural and the phrase "S-101 details specification" does not make sense	Change: S-101 ENC must be produced in accordance with the rules defined in the S-101 Product Specification. S-101 details specifications intended to enable Hydrographic Offices to produce a consistent ENC, and manufacturers to use that data efficiently in an ECDIS to satisfy IMO Performance Standards for ECDIS.  To: S-101 ENCs must be produced in accordance	Accepted

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 <sup>1</sup>	Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex (e.g. 3.1)	Paragraph/ Figure/Table/ Note (e.g. Table 1)	Type of comment <sup>2</sup>	Comment (justification for change) by the CO <sup>3</sup>	Proposed change by the CO	Secretariat observations on each comment submitted
						with the rules defined in the S-101 Product Specification. The S-101 <del>details Product</del> Specification <b>contains all the information necessary</b> intended to enable Hydrographic Offices to produce a consistent ENC, and manufacturers to use that data efficiently in an ECDIS to satisfy IMO Performance Standards for ECDIS.	
	GB	3		te	Dataset type used without introduction/definition.	Explain dataset type, not mentioned in S-100	<p><b>PROPOSAL TO TSMAD:</b> While not mentioned in S-100, S-101 can be extended. Knowing that this still needs to be tested prior to keeping this concept in S-101 we have two options:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Acknowledge that we are extending S-101 and add a definition for dataset type, SI and SD</li> <li>2. Eliminate this extension and add this to the Abstract of this clause.</li> </ol>
	FR	3		te	The title "Spatial Resolution" is not appropriated. Spatial Resolution is given by CMFX and CMFY (see	Propose to change the title to: Display Scale range.	<b>PROPOSAL TO TSMAD:</b> SHOM is correct.

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 <sup>1</sup>	Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex (e.g. 3.1)	Paragraph/ Figure/Table/ Note (e.g. Table 1)	Type of comment <sup>2</sup>	Comment (justification for change) by the CO <sup>3</sup>	Proposed change by the CO	Secretariat observations on each comment submitted
					clause 10.1.1).	Or move the content of this clause to §4.6 (Display Scale range).	Recommend moving this to clause 4.6 and adding in the CMFX and CMFY to this clause – we may be able to delete 10.1.1
	FR	3	Table 1	ed	Title : ENC Minimum and Maximum Scales	Replace with : ENC Minimum <b>Display Scales</b> and Maximum <b>Display Scales</b>	Accepted
	US	3	Spatial resolutions	TE	Would remove the reference to standard RADAR ranges. While that has always been the intent, there could be a possibility that they may change and now longer be standard.	Remove the radar range side of the table	TSMAD
	US	3	Spatial Resolutions	TE	Since S-101 is intended to be more specific and less open ended than S-101, TSMAD should look to add some additional scales to eliminate the < and > operators.  In researching how google maps sets it's scales it utilizes 19 specific values. S-101 should also endeavour to use that type of specificity and proposed to add in 3 new values.	Add in a 10,000,000 as the minimum display scale value. Add in 1:3,000 Add in 1:1,500 For the lower end values	TSMAD
S101	FR	4.1		ed	The second sentence also exists in clause 4.3.1. Change it for a more general statement (taken from S100, clause 11-7.1)	Change the wording to : "An S-101 ENC is a feature-based product. <b>The content information is described in terms of a general feature model and a feature catalogue.</b> "	Accepted
101	NO	4.3.1	2 <sup>nd</sup> paragraph	Ge	Is a general reference to the IHO website sufficient? Should there be some guidance on where to look at the website, ie in what section you will find it.		ED NOTE: We can insert the link once everything is finalized
	GB	4.3.1	Last	ed	Upon publication this will be available ensure text	Amend 'It will also' to 'It is also'	Accepted

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 <sup>1</sup>	Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex (e.g. 3.1)	Paragraph/ Figure/Table/ Note (e.g. Table 1)	Type of comment <sup>2</sup>	Comment (justification for change) by the CO <sup>3</sup>	Proposed change by the CO	Secretariat observations on each comment submitted
			sentence.		reflects this.		
	FR	4.3.2.1.1		ed	The two paragraphs in this clause say the same things in different ways.	I propose to replace the first sentence with the text of the second paragraph which is a more precise explanation to read: <i>Each area covered by a meta feature <b>DataCoverage</b> must be totally covered by a set of geo features of geometric primitive type that do not overlap each other (the Skin of the Earth). Skin of the Earth Feature Types are listed below: <b>DepthArea</b> <b>DredgedArea</b> <b>LandArea</b> <b>UnsurveyedArea</b> The geometry of coincident boundaries between Skin of the Earth features must not be duplicated.</i>	Accepted
	US	4.3.2.2	P2	Ed	This paragraph appears to be more of an encoding guidance and would be better suited in the DCEG. Meta features must be used to their maximum extent to reduce meta attribution on individual features. Also do we want to indicate how meta-features are flagged in the Feature Catalogue?	Remove paragraph	TSMAD
	US	4.3.2.3	P2	TE	Remove Reference to clause 4.3.3.2 as that is for a feature relationship type aggregation and is a bit misleading.	It would be better to put in the example that a Bridge is a aggregated feature type that is composed of multiple spans or a single span.	TSMAD
	US	4.3.3.2	P1, L2	ED	The following line is a repeat from meta features:  Meta attribution on individual features overrides attribution on meta features.	Remove line	See SHOM Below

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 <sup>1</sup>	Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex (e.g. 3.1)	Paragraph/ Figure/Table/ Note (e.g. Table 1)	Type of comment <sup>2</sup>	Comment (justification for change) by the CO <sup>3</sup>	Proposed change by the CO	Secretariat observations on each comment submitted
	FR	4.3.3.2	First paragraph	ed	I don't understand why the statement: "Meta attribution on individual features overrides attribution on meta features.", which is a general rule, would only concern Aggregation.	I propose to move it to clause 4.3.2.2 to read: Meta features contain information about other features within a data set. Information defined by meta features override the default metadata values defined by the data set descriptive records. <b>Meta attribution on individual features overrides attribution on meta features.</b>	TSMAD
S101	2J	4.3.4	Figure 4	ed	Should be an actual use case and not an invented case.	Use the actual information type for chart notes as an example. Alternatively another "real" case of information type.	TSMAD: Action for a new use case
	US	4.3.5	Attributes	ED	There should be an introduction to this section	Add: S-101 defines attributes as either simple or complex.	TSMAD
	US	4.3.5.1	Table: Real Integer	ED	Need to add that Non-significant 0's must not be used	Add non-significant zero's must not be used.	TSMAD
	GB	4.3.5.1		te	Revise table to align with S-100 1.0.0 currently the table contents do not conform to S-100 GFM or FC model.	Revise table to be consistent with S-100 1.0.0.	ED NOTE: It is close but not quite the same. TSMAD
	US( SPA WA R)	4.3.5.2		ge	Historical Perspective from Vector Product Format (VPF)– I am not a fan of "complex attributes", section 4.3.5.2. This was tried in VPF and was a real mess and a performance hit. I would rather see a simple feature with proper attribution defined that encapsulates all characteristics vs creating something "complex" from sub pieces. Since we have to pre-process data, this might not be as vital but it does add production complexity as "things" won't be as easily verified until they are fully		TSMAD FOOD FOR THOUGHT

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 <sup>1</sup>	Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex (e.g. 3.1)	Paragraph/ Figure/Table/ Note (e.g. Table 1)	Type of comment <sup>2</sup>	Comment (justification for change) by the CO <sup>3</sup>	Proposed change by the CO	Secretariat observations on each comment submitted
					constructed from more abstract "pieces". Simple features just define NULL for unused attributes, and we move on to the next feature. We don't need every relational concept ever invented to be part of these specifications.		
	US	4.4	P2 L1	ED	The following line seems ambiguous: The FOID may be used to identify that the same feature has instances in separate datasets.  It would seem we want to specify within the same maximum scale.	Change: The FOID may be used to identify that the same feature has instances in separate datasets.  To: The FOID may be used to identify that the same feature has instances in separate datasets at the same <b>maximumDisplayScale</b> .	TSMAD
	US	4.4		te	Feature Object Identifier (FOID) is a hold-over from S-57 and does not fit well with the new terminology used in this document.	The term Feature Instance Identifier (FIID) is more appropriate.	TSMAD
	FR	4.4	Third paragraph	ed	The sentence " <i>When a surface is split up each component must be represented by a separate surface spatial that the feature refers to.</i> " is difficult to understand for me.	Is a word somewhere missing, may be "instance" after surface spatial ?	TSMAD
S101	2J	4.4	Para 3	ed	Why is surface mentioned specifically? Does not the same apply to curves?	Either mention both curve and surface or remove specific mention. Alternatively make it into an example.	TSMAD
	US	4.5.2		ed	The references to bounding boxes is superfluous and makes it hard to grasp the meaning.	Remove references	TSMAD
	GB	4.5.2	2 <sup>nd</sup> para	ed	Minimum bounding box? Replace with geographic bounding box as in S-100 Metadata.	Data Sets (limits defined by the <b>geographic</b> bounding box) with the same maximum display	TSMAD: Contingent on US(SPAWAR) comment

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 <sup>1</sup>	Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex (e.g. 3.1)	Paragraph/ Figure/Table/ Note (e.g. Table 1)	Type of comment <sup>2</sup>	Comment (justification for change) by the CO <sup>3</sup>	Proposed change by the CO	Secretariat observations on each comment submitted
						scale may overlap, however <b>DataCoverage</b>	
	FR	4.5.2	Second paragraph		Delete the brackets : « Data Sets (limits... »	Propose to change to « Data Sets which limits... »	TSMAD: Contingent on US(SPAWAR) comment
	JP	4.5.2	4 <sup>th</sup> para	GE	When we want to change the 'boundingBox', How do we do?	The description for changing the boundingBox is needed.	TSMAD: Contingent on US(SPAWAR) comment
	GB	4.5.2	1 <sup>st</sup> para	te	Definition of dataset includes metadata is this consistent with the ISO definition?	Amend definition to be consistent with ISO definition.	ED NOTE: ISO definition: identifiable collection of data PROPOSAL TO TSMAD: Recommend no change
	JP	4.5.2	2 <sup>nd</sup> para	GE	"There must be no overlapping data of the <b>same scale</b> ,"	What mean is the 'same scale'? Is it maximum display scale or compilation scale?	TSMAD
	JP	4.5.2	4 <sup>th</sup> para	GE		Amend to , this <b>must</b> be done by issuing a new edition of the dataset.	Accepted
	FR	4.5.2	Last paragraph	te	Is the rule " <i>Datasets must not cross the 180° meridian, this includes both the <b>DataCoverage</b> features and the <b>boundingBox</b>.</i> " still valid ?  DCEG - Clause 2.5.9 states the opposite: " <i>Datasets may cross the 180° meridian of longitude.</i> "		This was decided at TSMAD24. The DCEG needs to change.
	GB	4.5.3	Last para	ed	Remove unnecessary word 'of.	The business rules for <b>of</b> scale independent and scale dependent datasets are located in Annex C.	Accepted
	US	4.5.3	Paragraph 2	te	The usage of feature class and feature instances is	Introduce the concepts of feature class and	TSMAD: Do we want 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.

1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)	
Component	CO <sup>1</sup>	Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex (e.g. 3.1)	Paragraph/ Figure/Table/ Note (e.g. Table 1)	Type of comment <sup>2</sup>	Comment (justification for change) by the CO <sup>3</sup>	Proposed change by the CO	Secretariat observations on each comment submitted
					confusing.	feature instances earlier in the text and use them consistently throughout.	remove (instances). It might clarify some things. Already added feature to the Terms and Definition list.
	US	4.5.3.1		ED	While I understand this is a placeholder, this header is already used in the feature section.	Would suggest that the header be expanded to: Feature Relationships between SI and SD datasets	TSMAD: Does TSMAD agree – also need a volunteer to write this section.
	FR	4.6	Second paragraph	te	<p><i>"The discovery metadata must list all the <b>DataCoverage</b> areas features contained within that dataset and its assigned <b>mimumDisplayScale</b> and <b>maximumDisplayScale</b>."</i></p> <p>When extending the portofolio of ENC's, an Hydrographic office may have to insert a new ENC in the existing series of ENC's covering the area. For this operation, it will be necessary to modify the maximum and minimum display scales of existing ENC's. Changing the attribute values of geo features Data coverage is possible by update (ER) but not changing the value populated in the dataset discovery metadata. I think this should be possible to avoid the re-edition of existing ENC's for this purpose.</p>	<p>Find a way to make possible the updating by revision (ER) of the value for the maximum display scale populated for a dataset.</p> <p>In addition, I think the wording should be corrected to read:</p> <p><i>"The discovery metadata must list all the <b>DataCoverage</b> area features contained within that dataset and <b>their</b> assigned <b>mimumDisplayScale</b> and <b>maximumDisplayScale</b>."</i></p>	TSMAD: Could we say that it must be updated either by a new edition or an update????
	US	4.7		GE	I think we should add the algorithm and worked examples back into the Main PS. I think they are buried in the implementation guidance	Add in the worked examples and algorithm back.	TSMAD
	2J	4.8	Entire Section	GE	<p>We've had a discussion internally following one point I omitted from the comments I sent yesterday, it pertains to 4.8 Geometry and I hope you can clarify the discrepancies between S-100 and S-101.</p> <p>My understanding was that the geometry section of S-101 would be a copy of what's in S-100. If this is</p>	In the darker corners of my memory, I seem to remember there was some discussion about this a few meetings back, and that S-100 might have some of this stuff wrong. If that memory is correct, then I suggest a note of comment is added to S-101 explaining why this section is different from S-100, and stating that S-100 will be corrected in	TSMAD

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 <sup>1</sup>	Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex (e.g. 3.1)	Paragraph/ Figure/Table/ Note (e.g. Table 1)	Type of comment <sup>2</sup>	Comment (justification for change) by the CO <sup>3</sup>	Proposed change by the CO	Secretariat observations on each comment submitted
					correct, then bullet 3 is wrong as this constraint is not found in S-100 (see 7-5.3.2 and 7-5.3.4). Also the reference to figure 8 from bullet 2 is wrong since S-100 has this reference from that is bullet 5 in S-101.	the next version.	
	JP	4.8.1	.	ED	'See Figure 9' is wrong.	Amend to See Figure 6, 7.	I think I fixed this
	JP	4.8.1		ED	'See Figure 10' is wrong.	Amend to See Figure 8.	I think I fixed this
	FR	4.8.1	Fourth and fifth bullets	ed		Amend "areas" for "surfaces"	Accepted
	FR	4.8.1	Ninth bullet	ed	<p><i>"Linear features not be encoded at a point density greater than 0.3mm at optimum display scale."</i></p> <p><b>1)</b> The notion of optimum display scale no longer exists in S101.</p> <p><b>2)</b> The wording "a point density greater than 0.3mm" is ambiguous, as 0.3mm is a distance and not a density.</p> <p><b>3)</b> A S-58 check would be useful to indicate to the encoder when a filtering operation is necessary to reduce an excessive point density. I think that the test should be written in such a way that would accept a reasonable number of defects and avoid massive validation logs. It seems necessary to agree on a tolerance threshold above which the S-58 test would trigger.</p>	Change to read: <i>"Linear features <b>should not be encoded with a distance between two consecutive vertices which is smaller than 0.3mm at maximum display scale.</b>"</i>	TSMAD
101	NO	4.8.1	3 <sup>rd</sup> paragraph	Ge	Point density refers to optimum display scale, should it be referring to max display scale instead?		See SHOM

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 <sup>1</sup>	Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex (e.g. 3.1)	Paragraph/ Figure/Table/ Note (e.g. Table 1)	Type of comment <sup>2</sup>	Comment (justification for change) by the CO <sup>3</sup>	Proposed change by the CO	Secretariat observations on each comment submitted
					(Clause 5.2 refers to a 0.3mm accuracy at max display scale)		
S101	2J	4.8.1	Para 3, bullet 3	ed	Text should be clarify if this is a requirement or a recommendation	Must or should? Would recommend it is a should, as it may be impossible for some producers to issue data if legislation determines coordinates of a navigationally significant feature, and those coordinates are closer than 0.3mm at optimum display scale.	See SHOM
	FR	4.8.2			[RRNM], [RRID] and [MUIN] are not defined before this paragraph. When subfield label are used, I suggest referring to annex B clauses.	Add "(see Annex B - clause B1.5.13)" at the end of the paragraph.	Accepted
	FR	4.8.2	Figure 10 (see Figure 12)	ed	Depth area instead of DEPRE.	Change to read: Figure 10 – Example of masked edge between Rivers and <b>Depth area</b> features	Accepted
	JP	4.8.2	Figure 10 (see Figure 12)	GE	It is confusion.	Which should we mask Rivers or DepthArea or both?	TSMAD
	GB	5.1		te	Propose remove statement 'due to the nature of hydrography' the separation of hor and vert CRS is common to all domains of GI and established within the ISO 19100 standards.	Amend <i>Due to the nature of hydrography it is to</i> <i>When describing geographic information</i>	TSMAD
	US	5.2 and 5.3		TE	This section needs more specification regarding where in the 8211 these values are stored and how they are coded for entire datasets	Holger and Tom Richardson had a discussion at the ECDIS forum and will be writing up a solution	TSMAD
	US		Figure 11	ed	Figure 11 is missing.		Accepted
	GB	6.1.1		te	Previous comment stands the specification should provide useful data quality indicators for ENC. ISO 19157 provides a useful basis.	Section should be revised to reflect ISO 19157.	Outstanding Action

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 <sup>1</sup>	Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex (e.g. 3.1)	Paragraph/ Figure/Table/ Note (e.g. Table 1)	Type of comment <sup>2</sup>	Comment (justification for change) by the CO <sup>3</sup>	Proposed change by the CO	Secretariat observations on each comment submitted
	US	6.1.1		ED	Add in some for language regarding what the intent of overall data quality is for	Add the following: Overall data quality for an S-101 ENC should cover the following: completeness, logical consistency, positional accuracy, temporal accuracy, thematic accuracy, and anything specifically required for the product being specified.	TSMAD
	FR	6.1.2		ed	Is it normal that this clause named Bathymetric Data Quality refers to the meta feature <b>QualityOfNonbathymetricData?</b>	Create a new clause for Non Bathymetric Data Quality.	TSMAD
	GB	7.1		ed	Suggest improve the following wording; <i>provides the information to map real world features into the dataset.</i>	Replace with ' <i>describes how data describing the real world should be captured using the types defined in the S-101 Feature Catalogue</i> ' taken from current DCEG draft.	Accepted
	GB	7.1		te	S-101 datasets must conform to the ENC DCEG. Conform to what?	Suggest amend to 'must conform to all mandatory elements of the ENC DCEG where the word 'must' is used.	TSMAD
	US	7.1	P2	GE	It states that S-101 datasets must conform to the ENC DCEG.	How does one know they conform? What does conform mean – does it have to meet the mandatory checks of S-58, what are those checks. Language should be added that conformance is based on validation to S-58 – although that is already stated in the data quality section.  Suggest adding language that conformance is indicated via clause 6.1.1	TSMAD
101	NO	8	2 <sup>nd</sup> paragraph	ge	Last sentence read: <b>The data source is stored internally in the producing agencies production system.</b> Should S-101 dictate/recommend any internal functionality within a production system		TSMAD: Should this sentence be removed?

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 <sup>1</sup>	Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex (e.g. 3.1)	Paragraph/ Figure/Table/ Note (e.g. Table 1)	Type of comment <sup>2</sup>	Comment (justification for change) by the CO <sup>3</sup>	Proposed change by the CO	Secretariat observations on each comment submitted
					beside the S-101 product coming out of it?		
	GB	9.2		te	Is this required it is simply a specific type of data and portrayal logic. ENC contains many and if we do not explain others why explain this one. Should not need to repeat here.	Remove clause 9.2.	TSMAD: Remove entirely or Remove from the main PS and move to the implementation guidance?
	US	9.2	P1	TE	It would be helpful if an example was provided that included the name of the Override Feature	As the US did not develop this and has not seen a proposal for the override feature – would suggest that the UK volunteer for this one.	See UKHO above
	US	10.1	Version	ED	What version do we mean. I think it is S-100	Add S-100 to version to make it clear that we are talking about the S-100 version of the encoding.	TSMAD
	FR	10.1.1 and 10.1.2		ed	1) Use the same convention that in clause 4.8.2 (The Mask Update Instruction [MUIN] must be set to {1} ...) in the whole document to quote subfield and subfield value. 2) When subfield label are used, I suggest referring to annex B clauses.	Change to: ...under [CMFX] and [CMFY] (see Annex B - clause B1.6.3). ... must be set to {10000000} (10 <sup>7</sup> ) for all datasets. ...by means of the [CMFZ] (see Annex B - clause B1.6.3). ... therefore the [CMFZ] must be set to {100}.	Accepted
	US	10.1.1		te	If CMFX and CMFY are always 10 <sup>7</sup> , why are they specified? If it may change in a future revision, then it should be made clear that ECDIS systems shall always use the encoded values when computing coordinates.		This is a legacy issue where it wasn't specified. No we specify – although it won't change.
	US	10.1.2		te	If CMFZ is always 100, why is it specified?		This is a legacy issue where it wasn't specified. No we specify – although it won't change.

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 <sup>1</sup>	Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex (e.g. 3.1)	Paragraph/ Figure/Table/ Note (e.g. Table 1)	Type of comment <sup>2</sup>	Comment (justification for change) by the CO <sup>3</sup>	Proposed change by the CO	Secretariat observations on each comment submitted
	FR	10.1.6	First paragraph	te	As it is written, this rule is wrong as it means that the encoder may encode missing values for every attributes, even if they are not mandatory.	Change to read: " <i>In a base data set, when an attribute code is present but the attribute value is missing, it means that this attribute is mandatory and the value is unknown.</i> "	TSMAD
S101	2J	11.2			What is the associated XML metadata file for each dataset - is metadata part of dataset & copied into catalog, or is it separate?	clarify	TSMAD: Metadata is in clause 12. Can we add a pointer to this clause for clarification?
	US	11.2	Mandatory elements: Bullet 2	ED	Last sentence needs a modifier	Add: It also  So it reads: It also includes an additional file level CRC check per dataset	Accepted
	GB	11.2	Support files	te	Picture representation should be pictorial representation as used in S-57. May consider graphical more appropriate? As many images may be diagrams rather than pictures.	Amend <i>picture</i> to <i>pictorial</i>	TSMAD: Pictorial or Graphical
	GB	11.2		te	Must used when May seems more appropriate.	Amend Data conforming to S-101 must be transformed, but not changed. To Data conforming to S-101 <b>may</b> be transformed, but not changed.	TSMAD: I think we had discussed this at TSMAD24
	GB	11.2		ed	Improve wording	Insert 'be' as follows; This product specification defines the encoding which must <b>be</b> used as a default for transmission of data between parties.	Accepted
S101	2J	11.3, 11.4.1	various	te	Naming conventions in 11.3 refer to an eleventh character, presumably before the "." separator. Clause 11.4.1 describes a naming convention for support files based on 10 characters (plus separator character and extension). Metadata files can have even longer names (see 12.1.2).  File names longer than 10+3 characters are	Remove the implicit limit on file name length in clause 11,4 or increase the limit on file name length to at least 16 or 32 characters.  Allow extensions of greater than 3 characters (needed for XHTML – see comment on file types).  A consistent limitation on file names length (if	TSMAD

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 <sup>1</sup>	Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex (e.g. 3.1)	Paragraph/ Figure/Table/ Note (e.g. Table 1)	Type of comment <sup>2</sup>	Comment (justification for change) by the CO <sup>3</sup>	Proposed change by the CO	Secretariat observations on each comment submitted
					desirable. It is difficult to make reasonable names with only 10 characters. Case in point – metadata files. Also, other domains will require longer file names so S-101 should not impose a special restriction. Keep in mind that every special product imposed limitation adds complication in the implementation.  ISO 9660 (standard for CD file systems) has multiple levels. Only Level 1 restricts names to 11 characters (familiar 8+3) and modern CD applications started supporting longer names several years ago.	there must be a limitation) would be nice.	
	US	11.3.1	Bullet Points	ed	Rework		No proposal on the re-work
	US	11.3.2	Dataset Naming	TE	There are two options on the table for dataset naming. As currently proposed with an SI and SD convention or no differentiation	The US would prefer that there be a differentiation, that way you can use the dataset name to easily tell the difference between the two.	TSMAD
	GB	11.3.2		ed	Suggest go with option 2. Previous precedent to remove navigational purpose as it may be used by software applies. This information can be provided elsewhere.	Propose option 2.	TSMAD
S101	2J	11.3.2.1, 11.3.2.2	3 <sup>rd</sup> bullet	te	Says that 4 <sup>th</sup> -11 <sup>th</sup> characters are optional; does it mean they can be excluded? Or must they be there in any pattern the producer wishes?	Clarify	TSMAD
	JP	11.3.2.1 11.3.2.2		ED	Add re-issue	Amend to .EEE new editions and re-issue use 000.	Accepted
101	NO	11.3.3	Last bullet point (issue date)	te	Currently says that <b>The issue date must be greater than the previous issue date of the data set.</b> If this goes for updates as well I would like to allow for the issue date of an update to be the same as the	Issue date must be greater than <b>or the same as</b> the previous date of the dataset	TSMAD

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 <sup>1</sup>	Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex (e.g. 3.1)	Paragraph/ Figure/Table/ Note (e.g. Table 1)	Type of comment <sup>2</sup>	Comment (justification for change) by the CO <sup>3</sup>	Proposed change by the CO	Secretariat observations on each comment submitted
					previous update. We sometimes have to make more than one update to a dataset on the same day, this could be just for technical reasons or to fulfil the requirement in clause 4.5.2.1 regarding size on update files.		
	FR	11.3.3	paragraph update number	ed	« update number 0 is assigned to a new data set » and « the new edition must have update number 0 » are redundant	Propose to change the first sentence to read: update number 0 is assigned to a new data set <b>and a new edition.</b>  Remove the last sentence.	Accepted
	US	11.3.3		te	Clarification needed on re-issue data sets. It is not clear what the EEE portion of the filename is.		See Japan comment
	JP	11.3.3		ED		Amend to  Where a dataset is cancelled and its name is <b>reused</b> at a later date,	Accepted
S101	2J	11.4	table	te	Consider adding types for cascading style sheets (will make management of HTML files easier), and DTD files (for possible legacy HTML/XML text).  Would also like the group to consider XHTML (EXtensible HyperText Markup Language, which is HTML adapted to conform to XML conventions) if the 3-letter limitation on extensions can be removed.	Add the following types and extensions:  CSS: Cascading style sheet files.  XHTML: EXtensible HyperText Markup Language files  Allow local CSS files for HTML support files.  Example use case for CSS files: Multiple extracts from the US Code of Federal Regulations can be included in a dataset. All can use the same style file; for XHTML: Some editing tools create them with an XHTML extension, they have to be renamed, which adds another maintenance task for tools.	TSMAD
S101	2J	11.4	table	te	Consider whether local (on the ECDIS) validation of data and local transformation are necessary, if the	TSMAD is requested to discuss the issue described. If a decision is made to add more	TSMAD

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 <sup>1</sup>	Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex (e.g. 3.1)	Paragraph/ Figure/Table/ Note (e.g. Table 1)	Type of comment <sup>2</sup>	Comment (justification for change) by the CO <sup>3</sup>	Proposed change by the CO	Secretariat observations on each comment submitted
					decision is yes several file types come into play: XSD, XSL, DTD (Document Type Definition –for legacy XML files), SCH (Schematron) and RNG (RELAX NG another XML schema format) files – for validation of XML come into play so consideration should be given to allowing wider latitude with file types, thus:	types, 2 solutions are suggested: 1) The narrow solution: Decide exactly which file types and extensions are permitted. 2) The broad solution: Allow supplementary data and model files only (sic) in any format. “Data and model only” implies no executable files, for security. Applications (including ECDIS) shall be free to ignore formats they do not understand. Required information must be provided in one of the “core” formats (TXT, HTM, XML) but more complex deliveries are possible with supplementary formats.	
	US	11.4.1	P1	Ed	Will is a bit ambiguous and the S-101 terminology is must.	Replace instances of will with must	TSMAD
	US	11.4.1	Bullet 3	ed		.EEE – support file extension (TXT, HTM, XML or TIF).	Accepted
S101	2J	11.4.2	1 <sup>st</sup> para	ed	Makes reference to 12.3.1, but there is no part 12.3.1	Should it be 12.1.3? Other references should be validated too.	Accepted
	GB	12.1.1		ed	These items define the relationships not actual metadata values this should be made clear or the section removed. It could be argued Figure 13 conveys this more clearly.	To rename 12.1.1 to exchange set structure and/or refer to figure 13.	TSMAD
S101	2J	12.1.1	table	te	Not clear what this clause “Exchange set Metadata” does or how it is supposed to be implemented. Its name suggests metadata about the exchange set, but in its present form it appears to be more of a catalogue giving the structure of an exchange set rather than <u>metadata</u> . Taking the current definition literally, implementation would be as a collection of	Clarify or delete clause; lack of type and values makes it difficult to understand how it is to be implemented	See UKHO and TSMAD

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 <sup>1</sup>	Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex (e.g. 3.1)	Paragraph/ Figure/Table/ Note (e.g. Table 1)	Type of comment <sup>2</sup>	Comment (justification for change) by the CO <sup>3</sup>	Proposed change by the CO	Secretariat observations on each comment submitted
					pointers to datasets, support files, and exchange sets of which this exchange set is a part, or which are part of it.		
S101	2J	12.1, 12.1.1, 12.1.4	none	te	<p>There is apparently no mention of metadata about the exchange set itself, rather than the individual elements itself such as catalogue, datasets, and support files.</p> <p>Clause 12.1.1 is titled Exchange Set Metadata but the table has class S100_ExchangeSet which lacks metadata elements like date, identification, etc.</p> <p>The language in 12.1.4 is ambiguous, it refers to the catalogue (e.g., “date” is “the creation date of the exchange catalogue”).</p>	<p>Alternatives:</p> <p>(1) Define a new element for exchange set metadata (S100_ExchangeSetMetadata), or,</p> <p>(2) add exchange set metadata elements to an existing metadata element, or,</p> <p>(3) clarify the language in section 12.1.1 and 12.1.4.</p> <p>The exchange set metadata should have the date of issue, date of application, information about the producer (compiler of the exchange set, who might be different from the producer of the datasets and support files)</p>	TSMAD
	US	12.1.2		ed	CRC should be expressed in hex notation.		TSMAD: Is it ok to put in remarks.
101	NO	12.1.2	Last row in table (layered)	ge	Should the layer complete still be listed? In clause 4.5.4 and 4.5.5 only the SI and SD layers are mentioned. If it is to be kept it should it also be described in the document? Also clause C4.5.3 only mentions the SI and SD layers.	Remove layerid=3 ?	TSMAD
	FR	12.1.2		te	The only way to encode a Copyright is using the Comment field.	<p>Create a new metadata to encode a copyright.</p> <p>The number of copyright references for one ENC may be multiple.</p>	TSMAD
S101	2J	12.1.2, 12.1.3	tables	te	Support file metadata has both checksum and (optional) digital signature but dataset metadata has only checksum.	Add optional digital signature to dataset metadata	TSMAD

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 <sup>1</sup>	Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex (e.g. 3.1)	Paragraph/ Figure/Table/ Note (e.g. Table 1)	Type of comment <sup>2</sup>	Comment (justification for change) by the CO <sup>3</sup>	Proposed change by the CO	Secretariat observations on each comment submitted
S101	2J	12.1.2	filePath	te	Meaning of “full path” should be clarified. Should it start with a “/”? Does it include the file name too? If it includes the file name too, that is redundant because it is already given in the fileName metadata attribute	Change remarks to: Path to the dataset file, relative to the root directory of the exchange set. The location of the dataset file after the exchange set is unpacked into directory <EXCH_ROOT> will be: <EXCH_ROOT>/<filePath>/<fileName>	TSMAD
	GB	12.1.2.1		te	Is this consistent with S-100/ ISO 19115? Which uses geographic extent?	Amend to be consistent with S-100	TSMAD
S101	2J	12.1.3	dataType	te	Values are different from S-100 4a.D.2-11 and TSMAD23-4.3.6. The labels in S-100 are slightly different e.g., HTML instead of HTM. TSMAD23-4.3.6 conforms to S-100 (and TIFF is missing from those lists). Other product specifications will take S-100 as the norm for labels. It would be nice to avoid confusion like one product specification using Text and another using TXT (this row specified the metadata and not the file extensions).	make consistent with S-100. (edit either S-101 or S-100 or both to use the same labels for the same type).	TSMAD
S101	2J	12.1.4	para 1, sentence 1	ed	Redundant language “..and the data set files are encoded as ISO/IEC 8211 data records, fields, and subfields.” The encoding of dataset files is specified elsewhere in S-101 and need not be specified again here.	Delete the phrase quoted.	Accepted
S101	2J	12.1.4	para 1, sentence 2	ed	Unclear language “The Exchange catalogue inherits the dataset discovery metadata and support file discovery metadata.” taken literally this is multiple inheritance. Should it be “The Exchange catalogue metadata is inherited by the dataset discovery metadata and support file metadata?”  Also, given the current attribute multiplicities, it is hard to see what inheritance achieves. For example, if the productSpecification is inherited it need not be mandatory (i.e., multiplicity=1) in the child element	Clarify language, is it inheritance, aggregation, or composition that is really desired?  If “inheritance”, review multiplicities of attributes supposed to be inherited and make then conditional in the child. (Conditional on them not being present in the parent?)	TSMAD

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 <sup>1</sup>	Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex (e.g. 3.1)	Paragraph/ Figure/Table/ Note (e.g. Table 1)	Type of comment <sup>2</sup>	Comment (justification for change) by the CO <sup>3</sup>	Proposed change by the CO	Secretariat observations on each comment submitted
S101	2J	12.1.4	editionNumber, date	te	attribute "identifier" already has edition number and date sub-fields from type S100_CatalogueIdentifier	delete these attributes, use attributes of "identifier" instead	TSMAD
	2J	12.1.4	algorithmMethod	te	This is mandatory, but what if the exchange set is not compressed?	multiplicity = 0..1, make conditional on compressionField=Yes	TSMAD
S101	2J	12.1.4	identifier, contact	ed	why 2 types?	clarify type specification	TSMAD
S101	2J	12.1.4	identifier, contact (see column "Type")	ed	typographic error	S-100 -> S100	Accepted
S101	2J	12.1.2	productSpecification, dataType	ed	typographic error	S-100 -> S100	Accepted
S101	2J	12.1.3	purpose, productSpecification	ed	typographic error	S-100 -> S100 Purpose -> purpose	Accepted
S101	2J	12.1.2.1, 12.1.2	S101_Data Coverage	ed	Important enough to be defined in the body of the document	should receive more explanation in main body of document	TSMAD
	US	B1.5		ed	The meaning of the number in the parenthesis following the field name (e.g. DSID (11) ) is not explained.	Explain that the number indicates the number of subfields contained in the field.	TSMAD
	JP	B1.5 B1.5.2  B1.6 B1.6.2	Tree diagram of DSID	TE	Number of sub-fields in the DSID described in tree diagram is not equal to the number of sub-fields described in table B1.5.2 and B1.6.2.  Array type of DSTC is concatenated to the vector type of data which is consist of 13 sub-fields (from RCID to DSED).  For the reasons above, we propose to amend the	Amend to   <1>-DSID(13\*1)	Accepted – confirmed with HOLGER

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 <sup>1</sup>	Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex (e.g. 3.1)	Paragraph/ Figure/Table/ Note (e.g. Table 1)	Type of comment <sup>2</sup>	Comment (justification for change) by the CO <sup>3</sup>	Proposed change by the CO	Secretariat observations on each comment submitted
					description of DSID in tree structure diagram. In ISO8211 standard, “\” is used for delimiter to delimit the array descriptors of concatenated structure.		
	JP	B1.5 B1.5.4.1  B1.6 B1.6.5	Tree diagram of INAS	TE	Number of sub-fields in the INAS described in tree diagram is not equal to the number of sub-fields described in table B1.5.4.1 and B1.6.5.  Vector type of ATTR is concatenated to the vector type of data which is consist of 5 sub-fields (from RRNM to IUIN).  For the reasons above, we propose to amend the description of INAS in tree structure diagram.	Amend to   --<0..*-> INAS (*5\*5)	<b>Not-Accepted</b> it must read:  --<0..*-> INAS (5\*5)  The first 5 subfields does not repeat. For each association a separate field must be used.
	JP	B1.5.4.1 B.1.6.5	table	ED	This is the repeat field, need “*”.	Amend to *RRNM	<b>Not – Accepted (confirmed with HOLGER)</b>  The first 5 subfields does not repeat. For each association a separate field must be used.
	JP	B.1.5.4.3	table	ED	Format of the CRIX is missing.	Append b11 to the format field of the table.	<b>Accepted – HOLGER Confirmed</b>
	JP	B.1.5.4.2		ED	Tag of the Coordinate reference system record is still duplicated with the tag of curved record.	Amend to CSID.	<b>Accepted – HOLGER confirmed</b>
	US	B1.5.1		ed	Section is empty	Explanatory text should be included and/or the following subfield descriptions need subordinate numbering.	<b>TSMAD</b>
	JP	B.1.5.11		ED	The word `field` is missing after sentence “Feature	Amend to :	<b>Accepted – However, other</b>

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 <sup>1</sup>	Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex (e.g. 3.1)	Paragraph/ Figure/Table/ Note (e.g. Table 1)	Type of comment <sup>2</sup>	Comment (justification for change) by the CO <sup>3</sup>	Proposed change by the CO	Secretariat observations on each comment submitted
		B.1.6.12			Association”.	“Feature Association field”	<p>issue:</p> <p>But the table and the tree diagram are not correct. It must reflect the new encoding with attributes for associations. Tree diagram must read:</p> <pre> -&lt;0..*&gt;-FEAS (5\\*5)</pre> <p>and the table must be ammended according to the new S100 encoding part.</p> <p><b>NEED TO GET AMENDED TABLE</b></p>
	JP	B1.5 B1.5.13  B1.6 B1.6.14	Tree diagram of MASK	TE	<p>Number of sub-fields in the MASK described in tree structure diagram is not equal to the number of sub-fields described in table B1.5.4.13 and B1.6.14.</p> <p>Which is correct?</p> <p>Information: The result of our investigation.</p> <p>Although IHO test data contains 3 sub-field (RRNM,RRID,MUIN), S-101 data converted from “ESRI S-101 converter” has 4 sub-field (RRNM,RRID,MIND,MUIN).</p>		<p><b>TSMAD –</b></p> <p><b>FROM HOLGER</b></p> <p>The field must have 4 subfields. The MIND subfield is missing in the table.</p> <p>Need to fill table out.</p>
	JP	B1.5	Tree	TE	The vector type of data (*YCOO!XCOO!ZCOO) is		<b>TSMAD – FROM HOLGER</b>

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 <sup>1</sup>	Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex (e.g. 3.1)	Paragraph/ Figure/Table/ Note (e.g. Table 1)	Type of comment <sup>2</sup>	Comment (justification for change) by the CO <sup>3</sup>	Proposed change by the CO	Secretariat observations on each comment submitted
		B1.5.7  B1.6  B1.6.8	diagram of C3DI		concatenated to the VCID.  We think that the part of the vector type fields may repeat, however VCID never repeat.  We think that the description of the tree diagram is not correct.	Amend to  *-<0..*>-C3DI (1\3)	Correct for the multi point record.  There is a problem in the S-100 part for encoding. The point record uses the same field but the definition is different. This needs some discussion.
	JP		Spatial Data Structure in general	TE	Although Feature Data has a ATTR field, Spatial Data has no ATTR field(only has INAS field for attribute information).  Are there any special meaning?		<b>TSMAD</b> : Spatial attributes are not permitted by the ISO 19xxx data model. So we don't have them in S-100. Information and Feature associations INAS and FEAS now have attributes. This was a change to the S-100 data model after the version 1.0 was published.
	JP			TE	ISO8211 (para. 6.2.2) describe that ISO8211 record identifier is optional.  The result of our investigation of IHO s101 test data and S101 data converted from ESRI software.  IHO test data has a ISO8211 Record Identifier, however data which was converted from ESRI dose not have.  We think that ISO8211 record identifier dose not exist as long as we see the tree structure diagram and table.  To make clear whether ISO8211 Record Identifier is	We propose to remove the ISO8211 Record Identifier in IHO S101 test data.	<b>TSMAD</b>

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 <sup>1</sup>	Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex (e.g. 3.1)	Paragraph/ Figure/Table/ Note (e.g. Table 1)	Type of comment <sup>2</sup>	Comment (justification for change) by the CO <sup>3</sup>	Proposed change by the CO	Secretariat observations on each comment submitted
					needed or not, we propose to remove the ISO8211 record Identifier from IHO test data.		
	US	B1.6 / B1.6.8.9		te	Section B1.6 list the Curve Component Control Field as CCOC whereas section B1.6.8.9 lists it as CRPC.		TSMAD
	US	Annex C		GE	Currently there is not a lot of implementation guidance in this annex – with the exception of portrayal. I think things are getting ignored.	Propose to move the implementation guidance – with the exception of the portrayal back to the main product specification. Once S-101 is in test beds then TSMAD can make a better determination of what guidance is needed.	TSMAD
S101	2J	Annex C, C.4.5.3	para 1	ed	Anything that “must” be implemented should be in the main body of the specification.	Move the rules to the main body of the specification, perhaps in an “Additional Information” section.	TSMAD
S101	2J	Annex C C.4.6	clause 5.6.1.1	ed	This section should be reorganized, the information needed to understand the figures and algorithm should be presented before or in the figures and algorithms.  The algorithm as currently written is just a one-item list with 3 sub-items, followed by 2 paras which look like they should be other list items.	Change “defines the dataset loading and unloading algorithm” -> “illustrates the use of scales to load and unload datasets and decide their display order”  In general, re-organize this section so it flows more smoothly. E.g., move the algorithm to precede the figures and rewrite or restructure the text and layout of the algorithm to make it clear exactly what is happening. Move the definitions to the beginning (e.g., of MSVS).	TSMAD
	US	C.4.6.2	All	TE	Recommend deleting this clause as it is superceded by the new algorithm.	Remove the entire clause	TSMAD
101	NO	C4.6.2	1 <sup>st</sup> bullet point	ge	Display scale is referring to compilation scale, should this be changed to max display scale?		See US(NOAA) – this is legacy S-52 and still needs

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 <sup>1</sup>	Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex (e.g. 3.1)	Paragraph/ Figure/Table/ Note (e.g. Table 1)	Type of comment <sup>2</sup>	Comment (justification for change) by the CO <sup>3</sup>	Proposed change by the CO	Secretariat observations on each comment submitted
					Are we still using the term compilation scale?		some revision.
101	NO	C9.3	3 <sup>rd</sup> paragraph	Ge	Says that the display must be redrawn within 5 seconds. Assuming this requirement comes from IEC 61174, but is this really quick enough screen redraw to facilitate for ships moving at high speed? They travel quite a distance in 5 seconds.	No change proposed, just wondering...	TSMAD
	JP	C9.8.6		ED	A SCAMIN value of 50,000 is allowed. To avoid confusion, '50,000' should not be used even for an example.	Amend to C9.8.9 Scale-dependant features	TSMAD: Still needs some work
101	NO	C9.8.7.1	List	Ge	Text group 10 overlaps, both as 0-10 reserved for IHO and as 10 Important text	Change the first to 0-9 ?	Accepted
	JP	C9.10.3 1) C9.10.4.1		ED	'Shall' should not be used.		Accepted
	JP	C9.11.4.1 (ii)		ED		Amend to More details are given in <a href="#">Presentation Library</a> section 12 conditional symbology procedure DATCVR section 2.1.	TSMAD
	JP	C9.11.7.4		ED	'Might' should not be used.		Accepted
	JP	C9.11.10	2 <sup>nd</sup> para	TE	When we encode the breakwater of the line type, we use only the SLCONS as a line. (We don't use the LNDARE(L).  Therefore, we propose that the SLCONS should be included in this sentence.		
S-100	2J	4a D-2.10 D-2.11 D-2.12	table cells	ed	This typographic error appears in a few places in S-100 as well as S-101.	S-100 -> S100	Accepted

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 <sup>1</sup>	Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex (e.g. 3.1)	Paragraph/ Figure/Table/ Note (e.g. Table 1)	Type of comment <sup>2</sup>	Comment (justification for change) by the CO <sup>3</sup>	Proposed change by the CO	Secretariat observations on each comment submitted
		D-2.13					

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.