|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 10a | FH | Dev0344 |  | te | By definition, a ring is an interior boundary if and only if USAG equal to 2. So this check is a tautology, i.e., there is nothing to check. Applicable checks for interior and exterior surface boundaries are S100\_Dev0181, S100\_Dev0182, S100\_Dev0183 and S100\_Dev0184. | Delete Dev0344. | TBD, clarify with with S-101 PT  **Agree this check can be removed** |
| 10a | FH | Dev0345 |  | te | The DSID does not directly specify the producing agency. The DSID specifies the agency via DSNM, but this leads to a different check altogether. Where is it specified that the agency within the FOID must match the dataset agency? | Delete Dev0345. | Product-specific check?  **Agree this check can be removed – related check S-101\_Dev2021** |
| 10a | FH | Dev0346 |  | te | Duplicates check S100\_Dev0364. | Delete Dev0346. | Dev0346 should be product-specific. Refer to S-101 PT  **Agree this check can be removed and if required added to S-158:101** |
| 10a | FH | Dev0347 |  | te | This check is too vague. In this case, it needs to be specified what fields are allowable for a particular update record. | Revise the check. Define “certain fields”. | Need to define fields.  **Check can be removed from S-158:100 and considered for S-158:101.** |
| 10a | FH | Dev0348 |  | te | Duplicates check S100\_Dev0364. | Delete Dev0348. | Agree, subject to S-101 PT concurrence, noting that Dev0364 is very general so this will have to revisited if we end up requiring more specific check descriptions than Dev0364.  **Agree this check can be removed – Although S100\_Dev0364 may be too generic** |
| **10a** | **JP** | **Dev0349** |  | **te** | **Uses S-57 terminology (e.g. SG2D and SG3D). Needs to be updated.** |  | **New comment from S-101PT review.** |
| 10a | FH | Dev0474 |  | te | Duplicates check S100\_Dev0364. | Delete Dev0474. | Clarify. One is about ORNT, the other about MASK.MIND.  **Agree this check can be removed – Although S100\_Dev0364 may be too generic** |
| 10a | FH | Dev0475 |  | te | Duplicates check S100\_Dev0364. "SPAS is notNull" does not make sense. SPAS cannot be null. | Delete Dev0475. | Agree, noting that Dev0364 is very general in form; delete subject to S-101 PT concurrence.  **Agree this check can be removed – Although S100\_Dev0364 may be too generic** |
| 10a | FH | Dev0352 |  | te | These checks use S-57 terminology, edge and node. The S-100 context is quite different with more geometry types and possible spatial associations. | The formulation of this checks needs to use S-100 terminology and data types. | In progress.  **Agree – use S-100 terminology ‘start point’; ‘end point’; ‘curve segment’ etc** |
| 10a | FH | Dev0353 |  | te | This is incorrect. The opposite is actually true of S-100. See S100\_Dev0437 and S100\_Dev0437. | Delete Dev0353. | SG2D in S-57 -> C2IT / C2FT in S-100  The cited S-58 check #31 was included in the Oct. 17 draft prepared by the S-101 validation sub-group (description just “SG2D”) and the added language is from S-58.  Clarification needed.  **Agree remove this check** |
| 10a | FH | Dev0354 |  | te | Duplicates check S100\_Dev0364. Also, spatial associations in S-100 differ significantly to S-57. | Delete Dev0354 or revise the check based on S-100 terminology and data types. | Agreed to deletion, subject to confirmation by S-101 PT  **Agree this check can be removed – Although S100\_Dev0364 may be too generic** |
| 10a | FH | Dev0355 |  | te | There are no isolated or connected nodes in S-100. There are no nodes in S-100, only points. This check needs to be reformulated. | Rewrite as:  For each point primitive which EQUALS another point primitive. | Agreed pending S-101 PT concurrence  **Agree with proposed wording** |
| 10a | FH | Dev0367 |  | te | An ISO 8211 subfield cannot be omitted, however, a subfield of type A() could be empty (a character string with zero characters). This check can be removed, and check S100\_Dev0364 covers the intended scenarios intended by this check. | Delete Dev0367. | Refer to S-101 PT for input  **Agree this check can be removed – Although S100\_Dev0364 may be too generic** |
| 10a | FH | Dev0370 |  | te | This is already catered for by check S100\_Dev0365. This check can be removed. | Delete Dev0370. | Both are from the S-101 PT list, refer to S-101 PT for input  **Agree this check can be removed** |
| 10a | FH | Dev0376 |  | te | This check could be removed in favour of check S100\_Dev0166. | Delete Dev0376. | Agreed to delete Dev0376 in favor of Dev0166 subject to S-101 PT assent.  **Agree this check can be removed** |
| 10a | FH | Dev0386 |  | te | This check could be removed in favour of check S100\_Dev0166. | Delete Dev~~0166~~**0386**. | Retain Dev0166 instead, which as a Part 5/5a check applies to other data formats too. Refer to S-101 PT for input.  **Agree this check can be removed** |
| 10a | FH | Dev0461 |  | te | This check could be removed in favour of check S100\_Dev0166. | Delete Dev0461. | Agree subject to S-101 PT assent.  **Agree this check can be removed** |
| 10a | rmm | Dev0465 |  | ed | Content of “Introduced” is just “10a” instead of “Part 10a” like the other Part 10a checks | 10a -> Part 10a | **Agree** |
| 10a | rmm | Dev0345, Dev0346, Dev0475 |  | te | Depend of product-specific information, not on requirements stated in S-100. See the Working Remarks on each for details | Remove from S-100 list and refer to the S-101 PT for inclusion in S-158:101 as product-specific checks. | **Move to S-158:101** |
| 10a | rmm | Dev0354 |  | te | As the remark in the spreadsheet says, S-100 10c-7.2.6.2.2 does not include code 3.  Also this check is subsumed in Dev0364 (generic check that subfield values conform to S-100 or PS). | Consider whether S-100 revision is needed. Does S-101 use code 3?  Delete Dev0354 as redundant with Dev0364 | **S-101 does not use USAG = 3**  **Agree this check can be removed – Although S100\_Dev0364 may be too generic** |
| 10a | rmm | Dev0349, Dev0350, Dev0351, Dev0352 |  | ed | See remark in spreadsheet | Split into individual checks, resolve redundancies, update to use S-100 terminology. | **Need to remove the parts already covered by Dev0364 and create individual checks for the remainder.** |
| 10a | rmm | Dev0353 |  | ed | S-100 equivalent of SG2D is apparently C2IT / C2FT. If this check compares the first and last points of a curve it is inaccurate and should be deleted. If it compares the start or end to an intermediate point it is valid. | Refer to S-101 PT for affirmation or deletion. | **It should compare the start/end vertices to all the intermediate. Agree that terminology should be updated.** |
| 10a | rmm | Dev0356 |  | te | Requirement applies only to level 2a or higher geometry | Add condition for level 2a or higher geometry or move to S-158:101 | **Agree with specifying ‘level 2a or higher geometry’** |
| 10a | rmm | Dev0357 |  | te | Sweeping requirement about conformance to ISO 8211. Too high-level for implementation, not clear eactly what should be checked. | Delete Dev0357 | **Agree check is too generic and can be removed** |
| 10a | rmm | Dev0358 |  | te | High-level requirement, what exactly is supposed to be checked? | Delete Dev0358 or re-formulate to add more detail. Refer to S-101 PT for reformulation. | **This should check the ordering of the records according to 10a-4.7 – these are different to S-57 and should be tested.** |