Zimbra **christian.mouden@shom.fr**

Re: S-101 DCEG Sub-Group - Volunteers to review scale minimum policy

De : Grant, David M (52400) CIV USN NIWC ATLANTIC SC (USA) <david.grant1@navy.mil> lun., 25 janv. 2021 17:52

1 pièce jointe

Objet : Re: S-101 DCEG Sub-Group - Volunteers to review scale minimum policy

À : Christian Mouden <christian.mouden@shom.fr>, riafo <riafo@gst.dk>, Megan Bartlett, NOAA Federal <megan.bartlett@noaa.gov>, Jonathan Pritchard <jonathan.pritchard@iictechnologies.com>

Cc : Jeff Wootton <jeff.wootton@iho.int>, dops-psm-ca-xps101-all <dops-psm-ca-xps101-all@shom.fr>, Thomas Richardson <thomas.richardson@ic-enc.org>, alvaro sanchez <alvaro.sanchez@defence.gov.au>

Fundamentally, what is the advantage of allowing independent *maximumDisplayScale* on dataCoverages? It seems that those cases could be encoded using multiple datasets.

Requiring the *maximumDisplayScale* to be uniform within a dataset would simplify many of the issues presented. It would also simplify the S-101 loading / drawing algorithm and related guidance within the product specification.

Also, the latest S-101 PS (latest one I have received) documents 12.1.2 S100_DatasetDiscoveryMetadata *dataCoverage* as restricted to "1" in S-101, but I believe this is an error and should say "1..3" (the type should also be changed to S100_DataCoverage). If *dataCoverage* is restricted to 1 then the PS and DCEG should be updated accordingly.

Name	Multiplicity	Value	Type	Remarks
dataCoverage	1..*		S101_DataCoverage	Provides information about data coverages within the dataset 0..1 multiplicity in S-100 restricted to 1 in S-101

Otherwise, we agree with the considerations, except for perhaps applying scale minimum on base objects.

V/R,

David Grant
NIWC Atlantic 52400
(757) 541-5794 (w)
(312) 578-5794 (dsn)
(757) 708-4611 (m)

From: Christian Mouden <christian.mouden@shom.fr>
Sent: Monday, January 25, 2021 6:50 AM

To: riafo <riafo@gst.dk>; Megan Bartlett, NOAA Federal <megan.bartlett@noaa.gov>; Grant, David M (52400) CIV USN NIWC ATLANTIC SC (USA) <david.grant1@navy.mil>; Jonathan Pritchard <jonathan.pritchard@iictechnologies.com>
Cc: Jeff Wootton <jeff.wootton@iho.int>; dops-psm-ca-xps101-all <dops-psm-ca-xps101-all@shom.fr>; Thomas Richardson <thomas.richardson@ic-enc.org>; alvaro sanchez <alvaro.sanchez@defence.gov.au>
Subject: [Non-DoD Source] S-101 DCEG Sub-Group - Volunteers to review scale minimum policy

Dear all,

Following last week DCEG meeting, I'm launching the "scale minimum" topic.

First of all, if you do not wish to participate or being informed, please tell me. If you think I have forgotten someone, tell me too!

I suggest we work in a dynamic way so that we can present a formal proposal for next S-101PT6 (23-24 February). That could allow to have a new (or not, depending on the outcome) scale minimum policy in the DCEG 1.0.1 that could be tested. Does this sounds good to you?

I join the presentation Jeff sent on Friday. This is Shom's view and is to be taken as a base for discussion. The presentation also deals with Maximum and Minimum display scales as I think both subjects are linked (and although our task is indeed "scale minimum").

Hereafter some "personal" considerations (you may not agree):
- A mariner "normally" (i.e. in the vast majority of cases) has a range of ENCs on his ECDIS. When he has a usage band 5 (in S-57, being aware that there are no suche usage bands in S-101), he also has usage band 4, and 3 (at least). So, ENC display is not to be considered on "individual" cells, but as a continue series of cells at different scales.
- In case a mariner doesn't possess the next larger scale ENC on a certain area, the ENC he has subscribed for will remain displayed as he zooms in, even beyond the Maximum display scale (with overscale indication in this case).
- In case a mariner doesn't possess the next smaller scale ENC on a certain area, the ENC he has subscribed for will remain displayed as he zooms out, even beyond the Minimum display scale.
- Independently of the notions of "Compilation scale", "Optimum display scale", "Largest scale for safe navigation", etc., Maximum and Minimum display scales should set the range of scales between which the ENC is readable and usable.
- Scale minimum values should be between Maximum and Minimum display scale values.
- The above items go in favour of building a S-101 ENC portofolio with adjoining (versus overlapping) Maximum and Minimum display scale ranges.
- scale minimum values should not mandatory.
- More than 4 scale minimum steps could be useful in somes cases.
- All objects must be shown at Maximum display scale (scale minimum steps should be based on this value).
- Current policy is such that some objects (LNDELV, BUAARE, LNDRGN, etc.) "quickly" disappear from the display when zooming out, and reappears when the smaller scale ENC is displayed.
- Some attributes could be populated and used for a more gradual display of the ENC (CATROD, CATBUA, CONVIS).

- scale minimum is currently prohibited on objects of the Display Base. Could we allow it, as such objects still trigger alerts and indications even if not displayed (I join a screenshot of an ENC wil many Point LNDARE touching the coastline, so not dangerous at this display scale).

Please provide me on your views on the above and any other considerations on which we could base a new scale minimum policy.

Best regards,

Christian

Christian Mouden
Cellule d'expérimentation S-101
DOPS/PSM/CA/DIFF
13 rue du Chatellier - CS 92803 - 29228 Brest CEDEX 2
Tél. +33 (0) 2 56 31 25 31