

**Joint TSMAD-26 & DIPWG-5 Meeting
Silver Spring, Maryland, USA (10-14 June 2013)**

S-101 Initial Draft Punch List

| Section | Issue | Who | Resolution |
|----------------|--|------------|--|
| 3 | <p>Spatial Resolution: TSMAD 25 accepted the concept that several larger scales needed to be added. A paper will be presented at TSMAD26 with a recommendation regarding which scale values should be added. This paper will use an analysis of the current scales supported by the World ENC collection</p> | JLP | Paper for TSMAD26 |
| 4.3.2.3 | <p>Aggregated Feature Type: Need a UML for the EXAMPLE Propose reference Bridge example at 4.3.3.2 rather than repeat content.</p> | TR | Deleted Example. Added clause reference |
| 4.3.4 | <p>Information Type: Need a real use case for this and not an invented use case + UML</p> | TR | Removed the example. Will wait until the DCEG has an actual information type to use. |
| 4.4 | <p>Feature Object Identifier: It is noted that information types need to have a FOID – however in the S-100 8211 the IRID table does not contain a FOID. It might be because an information type is associated to a feature type – but that means the statement is misleading</p> <p>From Holger:</p> <p>4.4 Feature Object Identifier The FOID is for feature records only. Information types do not have them and must not be mentioned in this section.</p> <p>Amended Text from:</p> | JLP/HB/TR | Amended Text. |

| | | | |
|-------|---|--------|--|
| | <p>Each real world feature and instances of information type within an ENC must have a unique universal Feature Object Identifier. This identifier, called the feature object identifier, is formed by the binary concatenation of the contents of the subfields of the “Feature Object Identifier” [FOID] field.</p> <p>To:</p> <p>Each real world feature within an ENC must have a unique universal Feature Object Identifier. This identifier, called the feature object identifier, is formed by the binary concatenation of the contents of the subfields of the “Feature Object Identifier” [FOID] field. Information types must not have a FOID.</p> | | |
| 4.5.1 | <p>Data Coverage: Possible TSMAD paper on why having multiple dataCoverages in a single dataset is not a good idea</p> | JLP | |
| 4.6 | <p>Display Scale Range – second paragraph</p> <p>The DataCoverage area features carry the scale attribution within the data set. The discovery metadata must list all the DataCoverage area features contained within that dataset and their assigned mimimumDisplayScale and maximumDisplayScale</p> <p>Note from TSMAD25: This needs to be reworded to comply to what the discovery metadata says. It should not say features. Need to decide how the data should be structured and then figure out how to do the metadata.</p> | JLP/TR | |
| 4.8.2 | <p>Masking The S-101 8211 also has a MIND field for the Mask Indicator – there are two values</p> <p>{1} Truncated by the dataset limit {2} Suppress portrayal</p> <p>In the example given I assume that the MIND would be set to {2}.</p> <p>Question: The default values in the 8211 table for MIND would be {1} or {2}?</p> <p>Would assume we should put some language in</p> | HB | Added that MIND is also required and clarified the example that MIND = 2 |

| | | | |
|---------|--|--------|-------------------------|
| | regarding the use of MIND? | | |
| 12.1 | <p>Figure 14 – Realization of Exchange Set Classes –</p> <p>This figure needs to be modified to reflect S-101 and not S-100 – dependent upon the S-101 metadata schemas</p> | EK, TR | |
| 12.1 | <p>Figure 15 S-101 Exchange Set</p> <p>Graphic needs to be updated for S-101. We use a generalized graphic in clause 11:</p> <pre> classDiagram class SupportFile class ExchangeSet class S101_ENC_DataSet SupportFile "0..1" --> "1..1" ExchangeSet : +aggregateFile ExchangeSet "0..1" --> "1..1" S101_ENC_DataSet : +partOf S101_ENC_DataSet "1..1" --> "1..1" ExchangeSet : +composedOf </pre> | EK, TR | |
| 12.1 | <p>Figure 16 S-101 Exchange Set – class details</p> <p>Graphic needs to be updated to reflect what has been agreed to in the tables.</p> <p>I would also recommend renaming the figure to discovery metadata – class details.</p> | EK, TR | |
| 12.1.1 | <p>Copyright –</p> <p>Needs to be included in S-100 metadata – currently derived from ISO 19115 and located in Part 8 Imagery and Gridded Data</p> | JLP | |
| 12.1.2 | DigitalSignatureReference and Value - Still seeking clarification as to what the purpose of this is. It came from S-63???? | TR | Paper to joint meeting. |
| B1.6.20 | <p>Curve Component field in S-101</p> <p>Does not make sense as the NCCO states that it is the Number of Curve Components and the Comment says it can be either Forward or Reverse.</p> | HB | Fixed to S-100 |

| | | | |
|--------------------------------------|--|-------|---------|
| | S-100 states the following: for NCCO -Number of Curve record pointer in the CUCO field(s) of the update record. I'm assuming that S-100 is correct and should eliminate the Forward/Reverse notations... | | |
| B1.7 | Data Cancellation would the DSID be set to (13*1) like all the others? | HB | Correct |
| General | Need to outline an approach for ingesting and updating feature and portrayal catalogues into the ECDIS. Is the catalogue cumulative and ties it back to the version that the data was created on or does the ECDIS handle multiple versions of the catalog | JLP | |
| C.9 | This still needs revision and review by DIPWG as this is the S-52 that has been incorporated. It may need to be moved to the main body of the Product Specification | DIPWG | |
| | | | |
| Data Loading and Unloading Scenarios | <p>From KI- need to check if this accounted for.</p> <p>Please do not forget that ECDIS is supposed to provide a data coverage display at any display scale. What if at certain scale the display is not covered by the cells with appropriate min/max display scales? There are a lot of overview cells of scale 1:1,500,000 that covers maybe 90 % of the oceans that will never loaded at display scale larger than 350,000. I can see at least two scenarios that can cause problems for the mariner.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. User is in the middle of the ocean and he sees several AIS targets (looks at his route, radar overlay, etc.). He zooms in his display and overview cell (the only available) disappears from his screen. 2. User approaching the coast and there are overview cell 1:1,500,000 and approach cell 1:75,000. Their min/max display scales do not overlap that means only one cell in time will be loaded. <p>I'm probably missing something, but I think we need more comprehensive explanation of the display mechanism. HO should define M_CSCL in their charts in such a way so some chart coverage is always displayed at any display scale.</p> | | |

| | | | |
|--|---|--|--|
| | <p>...It became too much complicated and I cannot generate more ideas at the end of the business day.</p> | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |