**LIST of DECISIONS & Actions arising from S-102PT6**

27-28th October via VTC meeting

| **AGENDA**  **ITEM** | **SUBJECT** | **ACTION**  **No.** | **ACTIONS**  **(in bold, action by)** | **TARGET**  **DATE/EVENT** | **STATUS**  **(at 28 Oct. 2020)** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **1. Opening and Administrative Arrangements** | | | | | |
| |  | | --- | | **2. Approval of Agenda** | | | | | | |
|  | Agenda and Timetable for S-102PT-6 |  | **S-102PT6 approved** the agenda and associated timetable. |  | Decision |
| **3. S-102PT Administration** | | | | | |
|  | Membership | S-102PT6/01 | **IHO Member States and Expert Contributors** provide their contact details to Chair, Vice-chair ,and IHO Sec. with the membership form (refer to S-102PT6-3c) | **End of November 2020** | DONE |
|  |  |  | **S-102PT6 agreed** to set the priority to meet S-100 RL4 for the edition 3.0.0, S-102 by 2023 |  | Decision |
|  |  | S-102PT6/02 | **S-102PT chair circulate** the draft priority to the PT members and propose to the next S-102PT meeting for approval. | **S-102PT7** |  |
| **4. Test Bed** | | | | | |
| 4.1 | CHS-CARIS-PRIMAR | S-102PT6/03 | **S-102PT6 noted** the pilot project presented by the CHS and **invited** them to propose any amendment to the next edition of the S-102 PS.  JM: Chair notes: NOAA mentions that they have available a Python code conversion BAG to S102. Available from their Github with others functionalities | **S-102PT7** | UNGOING |
| **5. Proposals to the Product Specification** | | | | | |
| 5.1 | MinMax |  | **S**-**102PT6** **agreed** to remove the extents group as proposed by CARIS.  For details, See: <https://iho.int/uploads/user/Services%20and%20Standards/S-100WG/S-102PT/S-102PT6/S-102PT6_2020_05.1a_S-102%20Proposal%20-%20Propose%20Change%20to%20MinMax%20Definition.pdf> |  | Decision |
|  | HDF5 encoding instructions |  | **S-102PT agreed** to update in general the encoding instructions in section 10 as proposed by Teledyne CARIS with refinement of further inputs within two weeks.  For details, See: <https://iho.int/uploads/user/Services%20and%20Standards/S-100WG/S-102PT/S-102PT6/S-102PT6_2020_05.1b_S-102%20Proposal%20-%20New%20content%20to%20clarify%20HDF5%20encoding%20instructions.pdf> |  | Decision |
|  | Data Product Format |  | **S-102PT agreed** the proposal, agenda 05.1c in general, but make adjustment with S-100 part 10.c.  For details, See:  <https://iho.int/uploads/user/Services%20and%20Standards/S-100WG/S-102PT/S-102PT6/S-102PT6_2020_05.c_Data%20Product%20Format_Prepared%20by%20CARIS-v3.pdf> |  | Decision |
|  | Data Product Format | S-102PT6/04 | **CHS, SHOM, SevenCS** make refinement on the proposed paper of agenda 05.1c and submit to the next 102PT meeting.  JM: Chair notes: On January 8th 2021, we got this:    Is there anything else I could have missed ? | **S-102PT7** | ONGOING |
| 5.2 | Discussion about CHS beta S-102 V2.1 | S-102PT6/17 | **All** send any comment to all members.  JM: Chair notes: The latest version of this dataset (Jan2021) has been sent on Dec22 2020 on CHS FTP site (CHS\_golden\_s102\_v2\_1**b**.zip) and will be available soon on http://s100.iho.int/S100/interoperability%20and%20testing/ecdis-testbed-projects  The layer Depth is used instead of elevation in the latest version |  | ONGOING |
| 5.3 | Data structure |  | **S-102PT6 noted proposal by the BSH** adding one layer called “Quality of Survey Coverage” in the data set. |  |  |
|  | Data structure | S-102PT6/05 | **BSH submit** the proposal regarding “Quality of Survey Coverage” at the next S-102PT meeting for approval.  JM: Chair notes: Personally, I have really appreciated this Paper. This reflects a real need from S-102 end users. I suggest to have this extension added to PS as optional. Need the PT to vote on this for next meeting. For details, see: <https://iho.int/uploads/user/Services%20and%20Standards/S-100WG/S-102PT/S-102PT6/S-102PT6_2020_05.3_S-102PT-online_2020_BSH.pdf> | **S-102PT7** |  |
|  | Data structure |  | **BSH submit** the proposal “Clarify and enhance HDF5 encoding  instructions for S-102”. All the following points (Dataset files naming, etc.) for Agenda item 5.3 are related to this document.  For details see:  <https://iho.int/uploads/user/Services%20and%20Standards/S-100WG/S-102PT/S-102PT6/S-102PT6-05.3_New%20Proposals%20to%20get%20Readliness%20Level%204%20from%20Germany_rev1.pdf> |  |  |
|  | Dataset file naming |  | **S-102PT agreed** to keep unchanged 11.2.3 of PS. **The proposal** was **rejected** |  | Decision |
|  | commonPointRule |  | JM: Chair notes: My note are not clear on the decision to accept or not ☹ |  |  |
|  | Vertical Datum |  | **S-102PT6 agreed** to keepthe vertical datum as a mandatory in the PS having consideration of harmonized interoperability with other S-100 based PSs, especially S-101.  JM: Chair notes: Mikan has raised the ambiguity about “depth vs elevation” attributes and provide this document to help clarifying this for the future. CHS has modified since the use of elevation attribute to use depth attribute in the latest S102 dataset v2.1 sent on Dec22. |  | Decision |
|  | Sounding datum |  | **S-102PT6 agreed** with this proposal  JM: Chair notes: This is what I understood, please validate |  | Decision |
|  | Project CRS for the dataset | S-102PT6/06 | **S-102PT chair submit** a proposal regarding a projected CRS for the dataset to S-100WG in cooperate with S-100 edition 5.0.0.  JM: Chair notes: To help to achieve this, See: <https://iho.int/mtg_docs/com_wg/S-100WG/TSG5/TSM5-7.1_S-102%20Update.pdf> |  |  |
|  | depthTypeIndex |  | **S-102PT agreed** to keep unchanged. **The proposal** was **rejected** |  | Decision |
|  | gridOriginLatitude and gridOriginLongitude |  | **The proposal** was **rejected**  JM: Chair notes: This attribute must be aligned to system coordinate and to be aligned to S-100 edition5 specifications. |  | Decision |
|  | Origin attribute: |  | **S-102PT confirmed** the origin attribute necessary in the PS. **The proposal** was **rejected** |  | Decision |
|  | Scan Direction |  | **S-102PT agreed** adding information on using a projected CRS for the attribute in the PS**.** |  | Decision |
|  | Scan Direction | S-102PT6/07 | **BSH, CHS, SevenCS and NICWG prepare** a draft amendment and submit the next S-102PT for approval. | **March 2021** |  |
|  | Scan Direction | S-102PT6/08 | **S-102PT Chair submit a proposal** on the scan direction to the S-100WG for the edition 5.0.0. of S-100. | **March 2021 (deadline for S100 PS proposal)** |  |
|  | Chunking attribute | S-102PT6/09 | **S-102PT agreed** to remove the chunking attribute in the PS **and S-102PT chair submit** its proposal to the S-100WG. | **March 2021 (deadline for S100 PS proposal)** | Decision |
|  | Group.001 |  | **S-102PT agreed** to change the group name in the PS as proposed. |  | Decision |
|  | Annex B | S-102PT6/10 | **S-102PT6 visit** a necessity of the annex B at the next S-102PT meeting considering the CHS paper “Chapter 10”. We need a final agreement on this proposal. | **S-102PT7** | Decision |
|  | Data Size |  | **S-102PT6 agreed or reject(?)** the proposal that the PS to store the depth and the uncertainty in two separate coverage of the type HDF5 scalar dataset and making uncertainty optional for navigational purpose. However, for non-navigational purpose it could be an optional.  JM: Chair notes: My note are not clear on the decision to accept or not ☹ to put uncertainties in a separate coverage type. My note mentions that uncertainties values are easy to compress. |  | Decision |
|  | Data Size |  | **S-102PT agreed** to add a note in the PS recommending HOs to consider putting the uncertainty in the data set in terms of possibility of the value in the data set.  JM: Chair notes: It will be very hard short term to define uncertainties values in the S102 files. Not sure it is good to say it will be mandatory for navigational purpose. We can aim this for Edition #3 for sure. But the challenge is important to succeed this. I got an email from Sweden and this is very challenging for them too. I also personally believe that BSH proposal about “Quality of Survey Coverage” layer would also be helpful for end users. The age of the data is often even more important for the user that the uncertainty value itself. Recall: Papers have described in the past that the uncertainty value could automatically change with time. Very complex all this it will required other discussions. I have noted too that CATZOC vs uncertainty approach is confusing for users. |  | Decision |
|  | Data Size | S-102PT6/11 | **S-102PT chair drafts** the note and submit the next S-102PT meeting for approval. | **S-102PT7** |  |
| **6. Work Plan** | | | | | |
|  | Work Plan | S-102PT6/13 | **S-102PT6 chair makes** a draft work plan of the PT and circulate to members for their comments. | **December 2020** |  |
|  | Test Data Set |  | **S-102PT6 agreed** to collaborate with S-100WG developing S-102 Test Data Sets for S-164 entire suit |  | Decision |
|  | Test Data Set | S-102PT6/14 | **S-102PT chair**  is a contact point of S-164 project to support the development in line with S-102PT work plan. |  |  |
| **7. General Topics** | | | | | |
| 7.1 | S-102 for “Navigation” only |  | **S-102PT6 agreed** to revise the PS for navigational purpose only at this moment. However, the scope of the PS will visit later when S-102 operation version completed.  JM: Chair notes: Some good comments have been made about:  -Difficulties for OEM to manage/maintain two different standards (navigation vs non-navigational). Suggestion to send them a letter to look to this and come back with comments.  -Naming convention to adapt for two different standards  -Metadata different for two data scope  -PRIMAR, BSH did not agree completely with the proposal to split the scope.  -7Cs, CARIS, Rogier were in favour.  -Comment from Yong that the S-98 development in base only on navigational purpose. |  | Decision |
|  |  | S-102PT6/15 | **CHS Canada draft (using a contract)** the redline version of the S-102 edition 2.1.0.  JM: Chair notes: A first draft have been written and commented.    The redline must taking into account:  -the navigational purpose  -impact on PS to remove the tracking list  -identify and resolve all inconsistencies (ex.: depth vs elevation convention)  -Need to double check with other PS as S-104. |  |  |
|  | S-102 for “Navigation” only | S-102PT6/16 | **S-102PT chair proposes** to S-100WG its concept and scope of the S-102 PS ‘Navigation only’ taking into consideration of S-100 implementation road map. | **S-100WG6 meeting** |  |
| **8. Reference documents** | | | | | |
| **9.**  **Any Other Business** | | | | | |
| **10. Date & Location of the next meetings** | | | | | |
|  | Date/location |  | **S-102PT agreed** to have the meeting at beginning of December 2020 via the remote meeting. |  | Decision |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |