

# S-101PT comments and editorial observations

Date: 14 May 2018

Document: **S-101 Ed 1.0.0 DCEG**

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
	IHO Sec	Cover Page		ed	Amend document to be in line with decisions made at HSSC10 (refer to Decisions and Actions <b>XX</b> ).	Remove reference to “(Beta 1)”	Document amended accordingly.
	IHO Sec	Cover Page		ed	Suggest more appropriate wording for red boxed note.	Amend to “IMPLEMENTATION VERSION FOR EVALUATION AND TESTING PURPOSES ONLY”.	Document amended (also included in clause 1.2 (Version)). <b>For consideration of S-101PT.</b>
	JP	Entire		ge	Description of the first letter of feature and attribute name is not harmonized between Paragraph, table, and Remarks, etc.  (for Capital letter or small letter )  e.g. “M”aximum display scale in 3.4 attribute list and “m”aximum display scale in 2nd paragraph of 3.4.1.	Harmonize description.	<b>For discussion of S-101PT.</b>
	JP	Entire		ge	Description about direction of “role” for FeatureBinding is the reverse between FC and DCEG.  e.g. Attribute “Deep Water Route” has a role of “consists of “ Deep Water Route Part in DCEG, but “component of” in FC.	Amend description in DCEG	<b>For discussion of S-101PT.</b>
	PRIMAR	Whole document		ed	Change information class to information type, as described in 2.3 and 24.4	Replace class with type, search document for all instances.	Changes made. <b>For consideration of S-101PT.</b>
	IHO Sec	Entire		ed	To be consistent with changes made at clause 25.	Amend cardinality of all feature/information relationships throughout the document.	Changes made. <b>For consideration of S-101PT.</b>
	IHO Sec	1.2		ge	Refer to 7Cs comment for S-101 Main document clause 1.5 (Identifier)).	May need to amend the Identifier metadata value.	Depends on outcome of clause 1.5 of Main document discussion. <b>For discussion of S-101PT.</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
	IHO Sec	1.3.1		ge	Terms and Definitions are incomplete.	Complete the list of terms and definitions.	Expanded. Used as reference S-100, draft S-101 Main, draft S-111 and draft S-129. <b>For consideration of S-101PT.</b>
	PRIMAR	1.3.1	composition	ed	The definition of composition differs from the definition in S-100 – Annex A Terms and Definitions.	Consider adjust definition.	Definition amended to agree with S-100. <b>For consideration of S-101PT.</b>
	DK	1.3.1	Curve	Ed	Wrong word?	NOTE: The <b>boundary</b> of a <b>curve</b> is the <b>set</b> of <b>points</b> at either end of the <b>curve</b> . If the <b>curve</b> is a <b>cycle</b> (circle?), the two ends are identical, and the <b>curve</b> (if topologically closed) is considered to not have a boundary.	The word “cycle” is also included in the definition in S-100 (Annex A). Suggest no change required. <b>For consideration of S-101PT.</b>
	PRIMAR	1.3.1	curve	ed	When comparing with S-100 – Annex A Terms and Definitions, the word "clause" is missing at the end.	Add "clause" to the end of last sentence.	“clause” added to agree with S-100. <b>For consideration of S-101PT.</b>
	IHO Sec	1.3.2		ge	Abbreviations are incomplete.	Complete the list of abbreviations.	List of abbreviations has been expanded. <b>For consideration of S-101PT.</b>
	IHO Sec	2.1	Aggregated feature type (example)	te	Refer to JP comment for clause 6.5.1.	Replace <b>Bridge Association</b> with <b>Structure/Equipment</b> .	Change made. <b>For consideration of S-101PT.</b>
	IHO Sec	2.1	Meta feature type	ed	Refer to PRIMAR comment for clause 4.3.2 of S-101 Main document.	Expand description of metadata feature type to agree with S-101 Main document.	Change made. <b>For consideration of S-101PT.</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
DCE G	IC	2.2.1	Para 3	te	To ensure that guidance is provided when the ENC producer may need to insert additional coordinates.	The third paragraph refers to long lines needing additional coordinates. If this must be done by the encoder additional guidance should be added, if S-100 systems will do it then this should be explained.	Assume this is for long ("loxodromically"? ) straight lines? <b>For discussion of S-101PT.</b>
	PRIMAR	2.4	Last sentence	ed	Simple attributes are assigned to <b>9</b> types, ref 2.4.2	Change number of types from 8 to 9.	Change made. <b>For consideration of S-101PT.</b>
	DK	2.4	2.4 and 2.4.2	Ed	Wrong number?	On 2.4 it says "Simple attributes are assigned to one of <b>8</b> types" and on 2.4.2 "Each simple attribute is assigned to one of <b>9</b> types: "Nine seems to be the correct answer.	Refer to comment above from PRIMAR.
	IHO Sec	2.4.2	DT	te	The Date and Time attribute type has not been used anywhere in S-101 (so far). Is there a justification therefore for keeping this in the document?	Remove this entry from the DCEG.	Rather than remove from S-101, have provided an indication that this attribute type is not currently used in S-101. <b>For consideration of S-101PT.</b>
	IHO Sec	2.4.3	Par 1 and bullets	ed	Refer to PRIMAR comment for clause 10.1.5 of S-101 Product Specification main document.	Amend paragraph and bullets to be consistent with S-101 PS main document.	Supported. Change made. <b>For consideration of S-101PT.</b>
DCE G	IC	2.4.3	Table 2.2 TSSLPT	te	To avoid conditional mandatory attributes as these make encoding and validation more difficult. This may also support improved portrayal.	It might be possible to remove the conditional mandatory on TSSLPT? This only applies in instances which are not roundabouts or crossings. One option would be a Boolean attribute on lane part to indicate a junction. This attribute might also support different portrayal rules.	Don't see how a Boolean (e.g. isJunction) would remove the conditional mandatory. The <b>orientation</b> attribute would still be conditional dependant on whether the Boolean is populated. <b>For discussion of S-101PT.</b>
	IHO Sec	2.4.3	Table	ed	Refer to IC-ENC comment for clause 15.1.	Replace <b>orientation</b> with <b>orientation value</b> for remodelled attribution.	Change made. <b>For consideration of S-101PT.</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
	JP	2.4.3	Table 2.2	ed	In 3.7, attribute "Survey date range" has multiplicity "1,1" (= Mandate Attribute), but there is no description in 2.4.3 Table 2.2 Mandatory Attributes.	Harmonize description between 3.7 and 2.4.3.	<b>survey date range</b> added to list of mandatory attributes for <b>Quality of Bathymetric Data. For consideration of S-101PT.</b>
DCEG	IC	2.4.3	Table 2.2	te	To make the conditional mandatory cases more clear and less subjective.	Consider defining navigable water in terms of features e.g. areas covered by DEPART and DRGARE.	Have added some words on NOTE 1 at the end of the table. Note that <b>Unsurveyed Area</b> has not been included in the list of Group 1 features that define "navigable water". <b>For consideration of S-101PT.</b>
	PRIMAR	2.4.3	Note 1	ed	The paragraph before table 2.2, 1 <sup>st</sup> sentence states: Within this document, mandatory attributes (multiplicity 1,1; 1,n (n>1); or 1,*) are identified in the description of each feature type.  Note 1 first sentence states: In the tables below describing each feature and its attributes, mandatory attributes are described with a multiplicity of "1,1" "1,n" (n>1); or "1,*".  These sentences give the same information	Remove 1 <sup>st</sup> sentence from Note 1.	Change made. <b>For consideration of S-101PT.</b>
DCEG	IC	2.4.9	N/A	ed	Based on discussions at S-100WG3 with regard to S-100 guidance should be included here.	Add guidance regarding time zones.	Have added guidance regarding use of attribute <b>time reference</b> . However note that the description of the time attribute type at clause 2.4.2 does not conform to this modelling. <b>For discussion of S-101PT.</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/Tab le/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
	NIPW G	2.4.9		te	Based on recent discussions, and based on the coming M-3 resolution amendment on time description, we deleted the simple attribute “time reference” from the NPUB application schema and consequently, the relevant registry entries (one attribute and two enumerate values) could be deleted as well.	Remove attribute <b>time reference</b> from S-101 and amend guidance for encoding of time to be the full ISO 8601 format (refer to clause 2.4.2).	Refer also to above comment. This would necessitate changes in several areas of the DCEG, however agree that this is the best course of action in respect to recent discussions. <b>For discussion of S-101PT.</b>
DCE G	IC	2.4.12.1	Para 1	ed	To avoid the use of XML files without explicit guidance on how they should be included and how systems should deal with them.	Remove reference to XML which is not specifically used in S-101 at this time. It can be retained in the DPS but omitted from the DCEG at this version.	Suggest retain for now, with experience gained in implementing Edition 1.0.0 used to develop the required guidance. <b>For consideration of S-101PT.</b>
DCE G	IC	2.4.12.2	Para 1	ed	To specify the format to be used. The table at bullet 2 is only a guideline. Also to be consistent with the guidance for text files.	Specify TIF format explicitly as has been done for text files.	Have added some text specifying TIFF 6.0 or PDF. <b>For consideration of S-101PT.</b>
	IHO Sec	2.5.2	Figure	ed	The figure is not aligned to the dataset discovery metadata table at clause 12.1.2 of the S-101 main document (figure includes a field dataTypeVersion that is not in the table).	Update and replace the figure.	Not sure who has the master of this Figure. Note also that in S-100 dataTypeVersion is included – need to confirm that this a deliberate omission in S-101. <b>For consideration of S-101PT.</b>
DCE G	IC	2.5.2	Para 2	ed	The term main document could be confusing. This change makes the language more explicit.	Suggest amend Main Document to “S-101 ENC Product Specification (main document)”.	Supported. Change made. <b>For consideration of S-101PT.</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
DCE G	IC	2.5.4	N/A	ed	The section is incomplete and does not provide guidance regarding dataset attributes.	Section needs to be completed and a table of dataset attributes inserted.	Have inserted table derived from S-101 Main document clause 12.1.1, but am not sure if this is the right information. Will need to be confirmed. <b>For consideration of S-101PT.</b>
DCE G	IC	2.5.6	N/A	ed	To ensure that the guidance is complete and to avoid the need for encoders to refer to the DPS for this information (10.1.2 is the DPS reference)	Within this section COMF is explained in terms of the X and Y but not CMFZ. Propose add text for CMFZ within 2.5.6, and amend its title to Multiplication Factors. Add text for depths as follows –  The coordinate multiplication factor stored in the CMFZ subfield values in the Dataset Structure Information field must be set to 100 for all datasets. EXAMPLE: A depth = 4.2 is converted in Z = depth*CMFZ = 4.2*100 = 420	Supported. Changes made. <b>For consideration of S-101PT.</b>
	IHO Sec	2.5.7	Table	ed	To be consistent with S-101 main document (refer clause 3, Table 1).	Add row at top of table for NULL value.	Change made. <b>For consideration of S-101PT.</b>
	JP	2.5.7.	“NOTE”	GE	In this section, technical terms of “Navigational Purpose” and “compilation scale” are used. These terms are not used in S-101. ( In this section, should not use “compilation scale” but “maximum display scale”	Amend terms and description	Complete review of this clause has been done and changes made as appropriate. NOTE: Paragraph (NOTE) relating to overlapping data of different Navigational Purposes but same maximum display scale has been removed, as Navigational Purpose is not a part of data load/unload strategy in S-101. <b>For consideration of S-101PT.</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.

# S-101PT comments and editorial observations

Date: 14 May 2018

Document: **S-101 Ed 1.0.0 DCEG**

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
	PRIMAR	2.5.7	Note	ed	NOTE (after pictorial example of scale range overlap) mentions navigational purposes, a concept currently not existing in S-101.	Amend note, or reconsider navigational purposes for S-101.	Refer to JP comment above.
	Nippon Sogo Systems	2.5.8	Para. 1	ed	The sentence "Each feature and information instance within an ENC must have a unique universal Feature Object Identifier [FOID]" is inconsistent with the first paragraph of Product Specification 4.4 "Information types must not have a FOID".	Change the sentence as follows: "Each feature instance within an ENC must have a unique universal Feature Object Identifier [FOID]."	Change made to DCEG as proposed to be consistent with Main document. <b>For consideration of S-101PT.</b>
DCEG	IC	2.5.8	Para 3	te	Currently it's not clear and the DPS and DCEG seem to be inconsistent.	It should be made explicit whether the FOID must be unique across all ENC cells and be persistent or whether this just applies to a single dataset. The text is currently not consistent with the text in the DPS (4.4 in the DPS).	Needs to be considered in association with discussion on Main document clause 4.4 (refer to comments from IC-ENC and IHO Sec in Main document review comments. <b>For discussion of S-101PT.</b>
	PRIMAR	2.5.8		ed	Add information of reuse of FOID as stated in Main document 4.4.	Add one last sentence: The same feature can be deleted and then added again later using the same FOID.	Sentence added at end of clause. <b>For consideration of S-101PT.</b>
	JP	2.5.9.	1st paragraph	GE	Description in this paragraph is different from description of "4 <sup>th</sup> paragraph, 4.5.2., Main Document".	Add "This includes both the Data Coverage features and the bounding box for dataset." ( in Main Document) to the end of this paragraph.	Change made. <b>For consideration of S-101PT.</b>
DCEG	IC	2.5.13	N/A	ge	To improve display and reduce need for manual masking by the producer.	Some instances of masking could be addressed by changes in the S-101 Portrayal Catalogue, no specific change but note to consider when Portrayal Catalogue is being developed. E.g. VEGATN is a boundary linestyle needed?	Note for further discussion? <b>For consideration of S-101PT.</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/Tab le/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
	PRIMA R	2.5.13 8.6.2 11.7.2 13 18.2 18.2	2 Figure Figure 2 <sup>nd</sup> paragr. Figure Remarks	ed	Surface objects.... spatial object.... spatial objects point (object... Marked objects Equipment objects...	Change object to feature	Changes made. Not however that the 2 <sup>nd</sup> figure at clause 18.2 includes both reference to "object" and S-57 acronyms. Need to track down the original of this figure and amend as required. <b>For consideration of S-101PT.</b>
	IHO Sec	2.6	UML diagram	ed	To be consistent with changes made at clause 25.	Amend cardinality on right side of the diagram to [1..1].	Holger or Julia? <b>For consideration of S-101PT.</b>
	DK	3		Ed	In <b>Data Coverage</b> and <b>Navigational System of Marks</b> , what is the difference between: "part of the dataset covered by Skin of the Earth features" and "part of the dataset containing data"?	Should the same wording be used here?	This wording has been taken directly out of the S-57 ENC UOC. Assume this is written as it is because to say that <b>Data Coverage</b> must cover the area containing data is self-evident, so skin of the earth has been chosen here to provide a different reference. <b>For discussion of S-101PT.</b>
	IHO Sec	3.3	Horizontal Position Uncertainty	te	<b>horizontal position uncertainty</b> is currently modelled in S-101 (and defined in the Registry) as a simple attribute. DQWG have modelled this as a complex (as for <b>vertical uncertainty</b> ), principally due the variable component specified in the S-57 CATZOC table.	Remodel <b>horizontal position uncertainty</b> as a complex.	Not sure whether this is required for non-bathymetric data – would prefer to retain as simple attribute for <b>Quality of Non-bathymetric Data</b> . <b>For discussion of S-101PT.</b>
DCE G	IC	3.4	Definition	ed	To ensure that the definition matches the feature type name.	Amend Coverage to Data Coverage	Change made. <b>For consideration of S-101PT.</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.



# S-101PT comments and editorial observations

Date: 14 May 2018

Document: **S-101 Ed 1.0.0 DCEG**

1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)	
Component	CO <sup>1</sup>	Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex (e.g. 3.1)	Paragraph / Figure/Tab le/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
	IHO Sec	3.7	Horizontal Position Uncertainty	te	As for 3.3 above.	Remodel <b>horizontal position uncertainty</b> as a complex.	Note in particular impacts of the current modelling on S-57 to S-101 conversion (CATZOC A1 to C). <b>For discussion of S-101PT.</b>
	DK	3.7.1	Figure	Ed	The size and styles of font make this figure difficult to read.	Slightly larger?	Have done what I can to enlarge the figure. <b>For discussion of S-101PT.</b>
DCE G	IC	5.6.1	Remarks	ed	Add remark that control points are no longer included in ENC as a dedicated feature but may be captured as point LandElevation.	As this feature has been removed in S-101 it is useful to indicate how they should be encoded if the producer wishes to.	Supported, however some of the S-57 CATCTR values have been moved to <b>Landmark</b> . Have therefore added such encoding to the proposed guidance. <b>For consideration of S-101PT.</b>
DCE G	IC	5.7.1	N/A	te	Currently status contains a large number of mixed concepts and this modelling should be improved.	Consider separating periodic/intermittent as a separate boolean attribute on specific features. River, Lake, Sea Ice	Supported, however suggest a full proposal be developed for Edition 2.0.0 (there may be other values of <b>status</b> that can be remodelled?). <b>For consideration of S-101PT.</b>
DCE G	IC	5.11	N/A	te	The last remark for River refers to the use of Land Region therefore using Category of land region seems appropriate.	Add Wadi to Category of land region.	Supported. Have added to clause 27.31 in addition to clause 5.11. New enumerated value ( <b>category of land region 21</b> ) added to Registry (NOTE: Will impact on Feature Catalogue and possibly portrayal(?)). <b>For consideration of S-101PT.</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
	JP	6.5.1	Para 1	te	There is no description about definition of “Bridge Association”, but in 6.5.1, there is wording of “Bridge Association”.  ( In FC, “Bridge Association” is defined as “Feature Association”.)	Harmonize description about “Bridge Association”.	Do not think there is a requirement for a “Bridge Association” as aids to navigation associated with a bridge are associated using a <b>Structure/Equipment</b> composition. Have deleted the reference to <b>Bridge Association</b> . For consideration of S-101PT.
	IHO Sec	6.5.2	Diagram	ed	Sub-attribute incorrectly named <b>clearance value vertical</b> .	Amend to <b>vertical clearance value</b> (x2).	Change made. For consideration of S-101PT.
DCEG	IC	6.9	N/A	Te	To distinguish it better from the fixed version not currently explicit that it's safe other than by the complex.	Consider making safe clearance value safe clearance value.	Do not support this change, as this is considered to be an advantage of modelling as complex attributes. However, it is noted that here (and several other places in the DCEG) the attribute is incorrectly named <b>clearance value vertical</b> , which does not exist. Have therefor amended throughout as required to <b>vertical clearance value</b> . For consideration of S-101PT.
	JP	6.9		te	In DCEG 29.38, complex attribute “Vertical clearance safe” has sub-attributes “Vertical clearance value”.  However, in 6.9, “Vertical clearance safe” has “Clearance value vertical”.	Harmonize description between 6.9 and 29.38.	See IHO Sec comment above.

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
DCE G	IC	8.11.1	Bullet 1	te	The current S-58 check 1617 implies that linear DAMCONs also require LNDARE review bullet one and consider inclusion of curve if required.	Currently in S-57 Critical errors are being reported for linear DAMCON objects. Make S-101 more explicit in this regard.	Have made this change, as the guidance for <b>River</b> states that a non-navigable river must be encoded on <b>Land Area</b> . However for S-57 this can also be encoded on <b>UNSARE</b> . Is this a problem for S-58? <b>For consideration of S-101PT.</b>
DCE G	IC	8.14	N/A	te	To simplify the attribution and make encoding/the user experience more intuitive.	Mooring/Warping Facility mixes fined and floating objects. As proposed in paper S-100WG2 11.8 consider separating this feature into Mooring Buoy and (fixed) Mooring Facility.	This is an outstanding action from S-100WG2/S-101PT2. Will need to develop a full proposal for implementation in Edition 2.0.0. <b>For consideration of S-101PT.</b>
DCE G	IC	Gen	Various features	te	To reduce the number of attributes to a minimum and ensure that only logical attributes are permitted. Clearly for dangers such as rocks and wrecks reported may be appropriate but for certain features it seems illogical.	Reported date is present on the following objects, it seems unlikely that these objects would be reported. Suggest consider removal of this attribute from these features to simplify the data modelling; <b>FLODOC, PONTON, DOCARE, GATCON, DAMCON, CRANES, DRYDOC.</b>	Tend to agree. This attribute appeared on these features in the very first draft of the DCEG (2013), however the proposals that I could find related to this do not include these features. <b>For consideration of S-101PT.</b>
DCE G	IC	9.1	N/A	te	To reflect outcome of ENC display sub WG work.	Consider adding scale maximum to allow improved display of sea area names, potentially add on 23.1 instead.	Suggest this needs a full proposal, as there may be other features that <b>scale maximum</b> can be applied to. Implement in Edition 2.0.0. <b>For consideration of S-101PT.</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
DCE G	IC	10.2	N/A	te	This will allow automatic validation using the feature catalogue, IC-ENC has seen examples of 80 knots!	On speed propose add an allowable range applies to 10.3 and 10.5 also.	Supported. Will need to determine which values to use. Have added placeholders at these clauses for now. <b>For discussion of S-101PT.</b>
DCE G	IC	11	N/A	ed	Based on ENCWG 3 discussions possibly next time. Add placeholder for now.	Expand description regarding high density bathy ENC.	Agree this needs to be done for Edition 2.0.0. Suggest also the NCWG be consulted on this (possible guidance in S-4?). <b>For discussion of S-101PT.</b>
DCE G	IC	11.3	N/A	te	Potential simplification.	What is the distinction between QUASOU doubtful sounding and Status existence doubtful?	A doubtful sounding, by definition, is a depth that may be less than indicated. Existence doubtful is defined as a feature that may not exist. Note that this is an ongoing action (ENCWG, DQWG, NCWG).
	DK	11.5.1	Figure	Ed	The size and styles of font make this figure difficult to read.	Slightly larger?	Refer to comment for clause 3.7.1.
DCE G	IC	11.6.1	N/A	ed	As for comment at 11.	Update thinking around depth contours.	Refer to comment for clause 11.

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
DCE G	IC	11.9	N/A	te	To reflect discussions of ENC display sub WG.	Reconsider an inadequately surveyed feature.	Consider that the inadequacy (or adequacy) of surveys to an extent is subjective. The principle indicator (or mechanism) for determining adequacy is the <b>Quality of Bathymetric Data</b> feature (and the optional <b>Quality of Survey</b> feature). Not sure what this comment is suggesting. <b>For discussion of S-101PT.</b>
DCE G	IC	13.4	N/A	te	To simplify this attribute.	EXPSOU consider remove 2 make boolean? Wrecks also	Suggest leave as is to keep the modelling (and therefore data encoding) consistent. Cannot do this for <b>Wrecks</b> as there are still 3 values required. <b>For discussion of S-101PT.</b>
DCE G	IC	13.8	N/A	te	ENCWG 3 discussions attributes type of activity and frequency could be used.	Consider adding feature seismic activity area to cater for submarine volcanoes and other phenomenon.	Not sure what the discussion at ENCWG3 was. Suggest for now such areas can be encoded as <b>Caution Area</b> , and a full proposal be developed, if required, for Edition 2.0.0. <b>For discussion of S-101PT.</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.

## S-101PT comments and editorial observations

Date: 14 May 2018

Document: **S-101 Ed 1.0.0 DCEG**

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
DCEG	IC	14.4	N/A	ed	<p>Cables and Pipelines should be consistent as the issues around damage to them are similar. Real world examples exist:</p> <p><a href="https://www.gov.uk/maib-reports/dragging-anchor-and-snagging-gas-pipeline-by-product-carrier-young-lady-in-tees-bay-england-resulting-in-material-damage-to-the-pipe">https://www.gov.uk/maib-reports/dragging-anchor-and-snagging-gas-pipeline-by-product-carrier-young-lady-in-tees-bay-england-resulting-in-material-damage-to-the-pipe</a></p>	Consider adding guidance re contact details for pipelines as has been included for cables.	Supported. Additional Remarks bullet included. Also applied at clause 14.5.1. <b>For consideration of S-101PT.</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/Tab le/Note (e.g. Table 1)	Type of com- ment <sup>2</sup>	Comment (justification for change) by the CO <sup>3</sup>	Proposed change by the CO	Secretariat observations on each comment submitted
DCE G	IC	15.1			See S-100WG2 Paper 11.8 proposal B was agreed according to the minutes. <a href="https://www.iho.int/mtg_docs/com_wg/S-100WG/S-100WG2/S-100WG2_Minutes_Final.pdf">https://www.iho.int/mtg_docs/com_wg/S-100WG/S-100WG2/S-100WG2_Minutes_Final.pdf</a>	Remove orientation uncertainty.	<b>Quality of Non-bathymetric Data: orientation uncertainty</b> exists as a simple attribute – need to discuss with DQWG. <b>Local Direction of Buoyage:</b> Change made. <b>Recommended Track:</b> Change made. <b>Fairway:</b> Change made. <b>Recommended Route Centreline:</b> Change made. <b>Two-Way Route Part:</b> Change made. <b>Recommended Traffic Lane Part:</b> Change made. <b>Deep Water Route Centreline:</b> Change made. <b>Deep Water Route Part:</b> Change made. <b>Traffic Separation Scheme Lane Part:</b> Change made. <b>Radio Calling-in Point:</b> Change made. <b>Radar Line:</b> Change made. NOTE: Will impact on Feature Catalogue.

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

<sup>2</sup> **Type of comment:** **ge** = general **te** = technical **ed** = editorial

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

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

# S-101PT comments and editorial observations

Date: 14 May 2018

Document: **S-101 Ed 1.0.0 DCEG**

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
DCE G	IC	15.3	N/A	ed	To avoid the need to update this document for such changes. 2015 is the latest version.	Propose removing the date of IMO ships routing, these definitions are so fundamental that they are unlikely to change frequently.	Changes made. <b>For consideration of S-101PT.</b>
DCE G	IC	15.4	N/A	te	See S-100WG2 Paper 11.8 proposal B was agreed according to the minutes. <a href="https://www.iho.int/mtg_docs/com_wg/S-100WG/S-100WG2/S-100WG2_Minutes_Final.pdf">https://www.iho.int/mtg_docs/com_wg/S-100WG/S-100WG2/S-100WG2_Minutes_Final.pdf</a>	Remove orientation uncertainty.	Refer to comment for 15.1 above.
	DK	15.13	S-101 Geo Feature	Ed	Both centreline and centreline are used	Amend to centreline?	Change made. <b>For consideration of S-101PT.</b>
DCE G	IC	15.19	N/A	ed	Currently get erroneous errors for example when a TWRTPT joins a TSS.	TSS objects, some e.g. zones and lines are often used between TSS objects and other route parts suggest add clarification.	Such a clarification will contradict the introductory paragraph at clause 15.19.1. <b>For discussion of S-101PT.</b>
DCE G	IC	15.28	N/A	te	See S-100WG2 Paper 11.8 proposal B was agreed according to the minutes. <a href="https://www.iho.int/mtg_docs/com_wg/S-100WG/S-100WG2/S-100WG2_Minutes_Final.pdf">https://www.iho.int/mtg_docs/com_wg/S-100WG/S-100WG2/S-100WG2_Minutes_Final.pdf</a>	Remove orientation uncertainty.	Refer to comment for 15.1 above.
DCE G	IC	16.2	N/A	te	To avoid a workaround encoding.	Can we not avoid very narrow surfaces in S-101! Consider adding curve to the required features with a caveat.	This has been discussed numerous times in the past, however happy for this to be discussed again. <b>For discussion of S-101PT.</b>
DCE G	IC	16.4	N/A	te	To make the table as clear as possible, avoids the encoder needing to look up the attribute section for more details.	Suggest indicate the units of radius (m) in the table and the remark. Applies to 8.12 also.	Change made (also at 8.12). This may be setting a precedent - should this be applied to all attributes where units of measure are defined? <b>For consideration of S-101PT.</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.



# S-101PT comments and editorial observations

Date: 14 May 2018

Document: **S-101 Ed 1.0.0 DCEG**

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
DCE G	IC	16.16	N/A	ed	Instances of joint fisheries zones exist e.g. the Torres Strait Fisheries Act 1984	How to deal with joint fishery zones? Suggest add guidance but retain 1,1 for nationality.	Needs a proposal. Is the suggestion that there be overlapping zones, or a single zone covering the "joint" area with more than one country indicated in <b>nationality</b> (refer to example in attributes section)? <b>For discussion of S-101PT.</b>
DCE G	IC	16.26	N/A		Improved modelling.	Regulation citation is present on this feature but could be applicable to many others, should an information type not be used and specific attributes such as this be avoided?	From memory, this was originally a proposal from US. Would like to have their input on this. <b>For discussion of S-101PT.</b>
DCE G	IC	16.26	N/A	te	Consideration of portrayal. In complex cases it is important to know which side of the line is which.	It may be necessary to add guidance about the direction of this line as the portrayal may need to reflect which side of the line is which.	Is dependent on whether a direction-oriented symbol is required. <b>For discussion of S-101PT.</b>
DCE G	IC	17.4	N/A	ed	Text does not correspond to attributes for speed limit added to RESARE.	Make text at 17.4 consistent with table 17.8 which includes specific attributes for speed limits and therefore avoids the use of an information type.	Changes made. <b>For consideration of S-101PT.</b>
	DK	17.6	Remarks	Ed	Inconsistent 'IMO designated Area to be Avoided' & 'IMO area to be avoided'	IMO Area to be Avoided?	Have amended to "IMO Area to be Avoided" throughout as required. <b>For consideration of S-101PT.</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.

# S-101PT comments and editorial observations

Date: 14 May 2018

Document: **S-101 Ed 1.0.0 DCEG**

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
DCE G	IC	17.9	N/A	te	To be consistent, alternatively add the attribute value on this feature. Suggest omit attributes as speed is fundamentally navigational.	As RESTRN 27 Speed restricted is not allowable on restricted area regulatory should the vessel speed limit complex be removed?	Option to add the attribute is not recommended, as this will allow the encoding of the same thing in two different ways. Suggest removing the complex to be consistent with other circumstances where both navigational and regulatory restrictions may apply (change made). <b>For consideration of S-101PT.</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
DCE G	IC	18.3	MARSYS	ed	To avoid erroneous validation errors. S-58 check 1729 refers.	Propose add guidance on the population of MARSYS other when a mark does not conform to IALA. E.g. populate no system	Requires discussion. When does a mark not comply with IALA? This is very open to interpretation – from the presence (and then things like shape and colour) or non-presence of topmarks; characteristics of lights, buoy shapes, ..... This has the potential to open a very large can of worms. Discussion at AHS determined that as long as the intent of the aid can be established (and this is done by feature class); and they know the IALA system in force (encoded in <b>Navigational System of Marks</b> ) this is all they need. Preference in encoding from a mariner perspective is to encode as in the real world – the fact that an aid may/may not conform to IALA is self-evident. From this perspective my preference would be to remove the attribute from all the aids features. The question to be asked is: What benefit is this information to the mariner? <b>For discussion of S-101PT.</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
DCE G	IC	19.2	CATLIT	tr	Not sure but seeking confirmation. Advice from an AtoN expert may be needed.	Should CATLIT bearing light be allowable for light all around?	Yes. The recommended bearing to follow may be defined, but the light is still all-around. <b>For consideration of S-101PT.</b>
DCE G	IC	19.3	Bullet 2	te	To enforce this rule via the feature catalogue.	Bullet 2 this could be addressed by adding an allowable range to the sector bearing attribute.	Not sure how to define a range when the sector is defined in a clockwise direction and the sector may straddle 0/360°. Have added some text in the table (also at 21.5). <b>For consideration of S-101PT.</b>
DCE G	IC	19.3	N/A	ed	Guidance needed. I think that sector extension is populated when sectors overlap. Should this be left to a portrayal rule?	Unsure how sector extension and sector line length work?	<b>Sector line length</b> is explained in the 5 <sup>th</sup> Remarks bullet in clause 19.3.1. <b>Sector extension</b> is an ECDIS system attribute – not sure if this therefore needs an explanation? <b>For discussion of S-101PT.</b>
DCE G	IC	20.12 and all BCNXXX	N/A	te	S-4 B-456.1 refers to minor impermanent marks. Perhaps a term like "minor beacon" would be more appropriate nowadays. IALA colleagues may be able to suggest a better term.	Suggest that stake, pole, perch, post and withy are not contemporary terms which are intuitive. Consider use of a more simple generic term. Possibly something to raise with the NCWG.	Not sure about "minor beacon", as this may be too broad a term. Agree that this should be referred to the NCWG. <b>For consideration of S-101PT.</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/Tab le/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
DCE G	IC	21.2	MMSI Code	te	The use of integer does not support codes which start with a 0.	MMSI code amend to text from integer see S-100WG2 Paper 11.8.	Changes made. Also applied at clauses 21.3 and 24.1. NOTE: Registry also amended – will impact on Feature Catalogue. be referred to the NCWG. <b>For consideration of S-101PT.</b>
DCE G	IC	21.4	CATROS	te	Systems are no longer operational. Symbols retired in S-4 (B151.2).	Review values of CATROS remove Decca, Syledis and Omega. Suggest retain LORAN for now	Change applied. Also applied to clause 27.50. Assume these values should also be retired from the Registry? <b>For consideration of S-101PT.</b>
	NIPW G	22.1	PILBOP attributes	te	As modelled by the NIPWG. There is some concern that the only way to provide this information currently is to associate an instance of <b>Additional Information</b> .	Suggest add attributes <b>pilot movement, preference of pilot boarding place and destination.</b>	The only question that I ask myself when looking at proposals such as this is whether the information is important in the navigational ENC in regard to safe navigation and protection of the marine environment, or is this just supplementary information that may divert the mariners attention from (or essentially "hide") the more important information. <b>For discussion of S-101PT.</b>
DCE G	IC	22.6	CATRSC	ge	S-4 B-493 makes no reference to rockets. More of a question than a comment.	Question whether rocket stations are still used. Consider removal of Category of rescue station value rescue station with rocket.	Question for NCWG? <b>For consideration of S-101PT.</b>
	IHO Sec	27	All entries	te	The attribute type (as listed in clause 2.4.2) is not included for the attribute entries in Section 27.	Include attribute type.	<b>For discussion of S-101PT.</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.

# S-101PT comments and editorial observations

Date: 14 May 2018

Document: **S-101 Ed 1.0.0 DCEG**

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
	IHO Sec	27		ge	Attributes included in S-101 that are specifically intended to provide a cartographic functionality (and therefore are not attributes of the physical feature) should have their own Section in the DCEG.	Perhaps something to think about for Edition 2.0.0 – create a new attribute Section to contain all cartographic attributes ( <b>sector line length, text justification</b> , etc).	Edition 2.0.0? <b>For consideration of S-101PT.</b>
	DK	27.53	definition	Ed	“game preserve” should read “game reserve”	Correct word	Change made. Note that have also removed the example of “anchoring prohibition area” as this is not an allowable value for <b>category of restriction</b> . <b>For consideration of S-101PT.</b>
	DK	27.61	definition	Ed	Classification based on the product <b>for which the silo is used</b> .	Add text?	Variation of proposed text added. <b>For consideration of S-101PT.</b>
	JP	27.111 Language		te	Description of “Indication” is not harmonized with that of “Format” or “Example”. ( The format of ISO 693-3 is “c3” (3 characters))	Harmonize between “Indication”, “Format” and “Example”.	Research indicates that this should be aligned with ISO 639-1:2002 – Codes for representation of names of languages – Part 1 – Alpha-2 codes. Have amended throughout the document, and changed example to conform. <b>For consideration of S-101PT.</b>
	IHO Sec	27.136		te	Not sure why this is considered to be a “feature” attribute while <b>quality of horizontal measurement</b> is considered to be a “Meta” attribute.	Move this table entry to Section 28.	<b>For consideration of S-101PT.</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
	DK	28.1		Ed	Ice bergs	Icebergs	Change made (x2) to be consistent with syntax used within <b>category of ice</b> table entry. <b>For consideration of S-101PT.</b>
	IHO Sec	28.23		te	As described in this table, cannot see how <b>uncertainty variable</b> can work as currently modelled. The cartographer cannot encode a value as the variable uncertainty as it is, as stated, variable. The only way that I can see that this will work is if this value is encoded as a factor to be used in calculating the variable uncertainty (i.e. a percentage, expressed as a fraction), that is applied to the underlying depths (i.e. to the value of <b>depth range maximum value</b> ) in the ECDIS to calculate the variable uncertainty when the mariner does an ECDIS Pick Report at a position. The ECDIS should then display in the Pick Report the total vertical uncertainty at that location as the sum of the encoded fixed component and the calculated variable component. [This sounds like very complicated operations need to be performed by the ECDIS??]. The alternative is that a different <b>Quality of Bathymetric Data</b> feature will need to be encoded in each depth area of the ENC where the horizontal and vertical accuracy conforms to CATZOC A1 to C (noting that there is a variable factor for horizontal accuracy for these ZOC values in S-57).	Remodel as a factor of vertical accuracy expressed as a fraction (%); and include guidance as to how this is intended to be utilized by the ECDIS. Suggest will need input on this from DQWG.	<b>For discussion of S-101PT and DQWG.</b>
	DK	Page 627	31.2.2 - 6	Ed	must not extend beyond the temporal attribute values encoded <b>for the structure component</b>	Add text?	Slight variation of proposed text added. <b>For consideration of S-101PT.</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.