|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1 | FH | Dev0001 |  | te | This check may be to general. For example, it would be reported as non-conformance to an XML schema or to ISO 8211 as defined by S-100 Part 10a. As it stands, the check as written is too abstract to be implemented in validation software. Checks for specific encoding schemes will cater for this. | Delete Dev0001. | Now in Collection B, TBD if it is OK there (as a checklist item for the PS)  (VTC 15 Jan.) |
| 1 | FH | Dev0002 |  | te | This check is one of many that tries to validate IHO standards, and as such does not belong in S-158, which should be for dataset validation. | Delete Dev0002 or move to another document that documents QC procedures for creating IHO standards based on S-100. | Now in Collection B, TBD if it is OK there  (VTC 15 Jan.) |
| 1 | FH | Dev0003 |  | te | This check may be to general. For example, it would be reported as non-conformance to an S-10x feature catalogue. | Delete Dev0003. | Now in Collection B, TBD if it is OK there  (VTC 15 Jan.) |
| 2 | IC-ENC | Dev0007 |  | ge | This is only checking if the producer code exists not the products against that producer code which 153 is checking for | however suggest that this is at the PS level. | Dev007 is in Collection B, however it is redundant with Dev0153. Delete Dev0007 |
| 2 | IC-ENC | Dev0008 |  | ed | consistent logic for [description] column, either in the negative or the positive | Amend description - 'is not registered'? | Agreed |
| 2 | IC-ENC | Dev0009 |  | ed | consistent logic for [description] column, either in the negative or the positive | Amend description - 'does not conform…'? | Agreed |
| 2 | FH | Dev0010 |  | te | This is too general. There are numerous specific checks in part 5 and 5a related to this, e.g., S100\_Dev0161 – S100\_Dev0171. | Delete Dev0010. | Check for redundancy with other checks  (10 Feb.) Delete |
| 2 | IC-ENC | Dev0010 |  | ed | consistent logic for [description] column, either in the negative or the positive | Amend description - 'does not conform…'? | Agreed |
| 5 | IC-ENC | Dev0077 |  | te | 77 & 161 do seem duplicated, both checking dataset for prohibited objects which are not in the FC. |  | Reword and move to Collection A.  Dataset contains an element (feature, information type, attribute, or association) not defined in the feature catalogue. |
| 5 | IC-ENC | Dev0468 |  | ed | consistent logic for [description] column, either in the negative or the positive | Amend description - 'is not consistent with…'? | Agreed |
| 5 | IC-ENC | Dev0468 |  | te | Duplicate of 166. | Prefer wording of 166. | Delete Dev0468 and retain Dev0166 |
| 5 | IC-ENC | Dev0161 |  | te | 77 is worded more completely, so retain this check. | ? | Delete Dev0161 and retain Dev0077 |
| 5a | IC-ENC | Dev0165 |  | te | Partly duplicates 164? |  | Delete 0165 |
| 5, 5a | IC-ENC | Dev0166 |  | te | Agree, duplicate of 468. | Prefer wording of this check. | Retain Dev0166 |
| 5, 5a | IC-ENC | Dev0167 |  | ed | Amend solution? | 'Amend format of attribute value to conform to feature catalogue' to distinguish between 166 and 167 | Agreed |
| 5a | FH | Dev0168 |  | te | These are two different and unrelated checks defined here. | It is better to split them:  For each feature association which has a feature binding referencing itself.  For each feature association which has more than one feature binding to another feature. | Agreed  (10 Feb. Now Dev0577 & Dev0578; Dev0168 will be deleted. Proposed wording modified, see updated list.) |
| 5a | rmm | Dev0169 |  | ed | Reword in terms of composition and aggregation relationships, which are the only hierarchical relationships known at the S-100 level. | Insert “(aggregation or composition)” to clarify “hierarchical”. | New 10 Feb. |
| 5a | FH | Dev0170 |  | te | Can this check be removed in favour of check S100\_Dev0366? | Delete Dev0170, retain Dev0366. | Other way around? Dev0366 is specific to 10a, the ISO 8211 encoding, Dev0170 is for Part 5 and would also cover GML.  Remove 0366  **Description and message rewritten to generalize to all types of associations.** |
| 5a | IC-ENC | Dev0170 |  | te | Not sure how this would happen? |  | Could happen through wrong value of reference.  No action |
| 5a | rmm | Dev0171 |  | ed | Reword Check Description to be consistent with similar check for feature associations. | For each information association in an information type which references the instance which owns the binding. | New 10 Feb. |
| 6 | IC-ENC | Dev0012 |  | ed | Amend description | Amend description - 'S-100\_IO\_IdentifiedObject is either not present and/or in valid' | Check will be deleted |
| 6 | IC-ENC | Dev0013 |  | ed | Amend description | Amend description - 'A single CRS is not one of the supported single CRSs listed' | Check will be deleted |
| 6 | IC-ENC | Dev0016 |  | ed | Amend description | Amend description - 'The Coordinate System Class is not one of the defined coordinate systems' | Check will be deleted |
| 6 | IC-ENC | Dev0017 |  | ed | Amend description | Amend description - 'The Datum is not one of the described datums' | Check will be deleted |
| 6 | IC-ENC | Dev0018 |  | ed | Amend description | Amend description - 'The Coordinate Operation does not have a source CRS and a target CRS' | Check will be deleted |
| 6 | IC-ENC | Dev0019 |  | ed | Amend description | Amend description - 'The Coordinate Operations is not one of the defined operation types' | Check will be deleted |
| 6 | IC-ENC | Dev0172 |  | te | We turned our check off because the datum info was removed from the CATALOG.XML. | ? | Delete Dev0172, |
| 7 | IC-ENC | ~~Dev0176~~  Dev0177 |  | te | RCNM is referenced within part 10a |  | Should be product-specific check. Delete and refer to S-101 PT for addition to S-101 product-specific list. |
| 7 | FH | Dev0180 |  | te | Duplicates checks S100\_Dev0086 and S100\_Dev0095. | Delete Dev0180. | Merge?  Deleted Dev0086, retained Dev0180 as per other comments |
| 7 | FH | Dev0185 |  | te | This is already covered by check S100\_Dev0184. | Delete Dev0185. | Merge/  Retain both |
| 7 | FH | Dev0186 |  | te | Where in S-100 is this constraint specified? This also contradicts S-101 PS 4.4: "Where a real-world feature has multiple parts within a single ENC dataset due to ENC dataset limit truncations, the feature will reference each spatial part of the feature within the dataset. This is accomplished in the ISO/IEC 8211 encoding by including a Spatial Association for each disjoint component." | Delete Dev0186. | Agreed |
| 7 | FH | Dev0188 |  | te | The *Check Description* is incorrect and is unrelated to the *Check Message*. | Check Description:  For each feature with geometric primitive point or multi point where the spatial association field (SPAS) has ORNT != 255  Check Message:  SPAS references a point or multi point primitive where ORNT != 255. | Delete content in parentheses in description:  “(For each record of type Multi Point (10a-5.6.2-MRID), Surface (10a-5.9.2-SRID)or composite curve (10a-5.8.2-CCID)”  Description: Orientation is not defined for points  Look into separate checks for curves and surfaces. |
| 7 | FH | Dev0190 |  | te | Duplicates checks S100\_Dev0095 and S100\_Dev0180. | Delete Dev0190. | Merge?  Review 190, 95, and 180 and see if they can be merged  Delete Dev0095 and Dev0190, retain Dev0180 |
| 7 | IC-ENC | Dev0190 |  | te | Seems duplicated with Dev0180 |  | Merge |
| 7 | FH | Dev0193 |  | te | Duplicates check S100\_Dev0361. | Delete Dev0193. | Merge?  Delete 193, ensure there is an equivalent check for the GML encoding  Uniqueness of gml:id is enforced by ordinary schema validation, distinct check not needed. |
| 7 | IC-ENC | Dev0193 |  | te | 10a-7.2.2.1 states that with RCNM and RCID subfields, every point must be uniquely identifiable within a dataset. |  | Move to 10a section |
| 8 | FH | Dev0220 |  | te | The Check Description here is a general statement. We need something specific that the validation software can check | Change description  "The CATALOG.XML conforms to the S-100 exchange catalogue schema" | Delete, covered by Part 17 check Dev0154 (& other more specific checks in Part 17). Also duplicates Dev0224.  Also rewrite 154 for S-100 XC schema conformance,  Add new check for conformance to PS restrictions  Check 0154 rewritten |
| 8 | IC-ENC | Dev0220 |  | te | Can't see a direct duplicate check in part 17? |  | Part 8 is specifically about coverages; this checks applies to all types of data and should be deleted or merged into Part 17.  Check 0154 rewritten |
| 8 | IC-ENC | Dev0220 |  | ed | Amend description | Amend description - 'The S100\_DatasetDiscoveryMetadata module does not conform to S-100 Part 17 | S100\_DatasetDiscoveryMetadata is a part of the CATALOG.XML and will be covered by check that CATALOG.XML is valid. Dev0154 |
| 8 | FH | Dev0222 |  | te | This check is far to general. This is handled by feature catalogue and specific encoding profile checks. | Delete Dev0222. | Now in Collection B. Concur with deletion even from Collection B.  Delete |
| 8 | FH | Dev0224 |  | te | The Check Description here is a general statement. We need something specific that the validation software can check | Change description  "The CATALOG.XML conforms to the S-100 exchange catalogue schema"  This also seems to duplicate the intent of Dev0220. | Delete, covered by Part 17 check Dev0154 (& other more specific checks in Part 17)  Delete |
| 8 | IC-ENC | Dev0224 |  | te | Duplicated with Dev0220 |  | Covered by Part 17 check Dev0154, delete Dev0224 |
| 8 | IC-ENC | Dev0235 |  | ed | Spelling errors only with interpolation | Check Message: "Invalid interpolation method",  Check Description: "For S100\_IF\_GridCoverage the only allowable interpolationType are Bilinear interpolation, Bicubic interpolation, Nearest-neighbour and Biquadratic interpolation." | Agreed |
| 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  S-101PT (31 Jan.): S-101 PT agreed to remove Dev0344 |
| 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?  S-101PT (31 Jan.): Agree this check can be removed – related check S-101\_Dev2021 |
| 10a | IC-ENC | Dev0345 |  | ed | Spelling error, missing "I" in filename for the Check Description |  | Agreed |
| 10a | FH | Dev0346 |  | te | Duplicates check S100\_Dev0364. | Delete Dev0346. | Dev0346 should be product-specific. Refer to S-101 PT  **S-101 PT (31 Jan): 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.  S-101 PT (31 Jan): 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.  S-101 PT (31 Jan.): Agree this check can be removed – Although S100\_Dev0364 may be too generic |
| 10a | IC-ENC | Dev0364 |  | ed | Spelling error in Check Message and Check Description, | should read "permissible" | Agreed |
| 10a | IC-ENC | Dev0367 |  | ed | Spelling error in Check Message, | should read "omitted" | Agreed |
| 10a | IC-ENC | Dev0379 |  | ed | Spelling error in Check Message, | should read "Numeric" | Agreed |
| 10a | IC-ENC | Dev0410 |  | ed | Spelling error in Check Solution, | should read "ARCS" | Agreed |
| 10a | FH | Dev0474 |  | te | Duplicates check S100\_Dev0364. | Delete Dev0474. | Clarify. One is about ORNT, the other about MASK.MIND.  S-101PT (31 Jan.): 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. |
| 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.  VTC – delete and create Github issue. Done – see issue #83 |
| 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.  S-101 PT (31 Jan.): 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  S-101PT (31 Jan.): 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  S-101PT (31 Jan.): 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  S-101PT (31 Jan.): 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  S-101PT (31 Jan.): 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.  S-101PT (31 Jan.): Agree this check can be removed |
| 10a | FH | Dev0386 |  | te | This check could be removed in favour of check S100\_Dev0166. | Delete ~~Dev0166~~. Dev0386 | Retain Dev0166 instead, which as a Part 5/5a check applies to other data formats too. Refer to S-101 PT for input.  S-101PT (31 Jan.): 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.  S-101PT (31 Jan.): 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 | Agreed |
| 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. | Agreed  S-101PT (31 Jan.): 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 | Agreed  S-101PT (31 Jan.): 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. | Agreed  S-101PT (31 Jan.): 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. | Agreed  S-101PT (31 jan.): It should compare the start/end vertices to all the intermediate. Agree that terminology should be updated.  19 Feb. Redundant with Dev0187, delete Dev0353. |
| 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 | Agreed  S-101PT (31 Jan.); 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 | Agreed  S-101PT (31 Jan.): 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. | Agreed  S-101 PT (31 Jan.): This should check the ordering of the records according to 10a-4.7 – these are different to S-57 and should be tested.  Applied |
| 10a | IC-ENC | Dev0441 |  | ed | Spelling error in Check Description, | should read "Beginning" | Agreed |
| 10a | IC-ENC | Dev0465 |  | ed | Duplicate error in Check Message, | remove one of the "contains" | Agreed |
| 10b | rmm | All Part 10b checks |  | ed | Introduced column blank for Part 10b checks | Set to 5.2.0 for all Part 10b checks too | Agreed |
| 10b | rmm | Dev0509 |  | te | Dev0509 compares the tag name to the code for the element. | Should be Collection B check comparing the FC to the GML schema. Conformance to the schema is checked separately by Dev0513 | Applied |
| 17 | ntou | Dev0556 | Check description | te | “must use SRS EPSG:4326” could be confusing, even misleading. (EPSG:4326 is not an URI and using such short form would lead to axis order problem)  It would be better to clearly describe the check, so that it is consistent with S100\_Dev0550 for Part10b.  Ref.: https://epsg.org/ogc\_uri.html | Change to  “Each data coverage polygon in discovery metadata must use EPSG code 4326 for its SRS, which shall be identified using the http URI specified by OGC as follows:  http://www.opengis.net/def/crs/EPSG/0/4326” | Agreed |
| 10b | ntou | Related to  Dev0508 | (New ?) | te | Clause reference 10b-8.4.1  How associations with attributes between FeatureType and InformationType are to be defined in the FC and implemented should be clearly specified and checked.  Associations with attributes are realized via intermediate Information Types. Information Type cannot have featureBinding. Therefore, association class for the relationship with a FeatureType must not be included in the InformationType side of the relationship.  Errors have been found in FCs of several Ed. 1 PSs. | Check Description:  For associations containing attributes, if the association is between a FeatureType and an InformationType, such association class is defined in the FC as an Information Association and included, as an informationBinding, only in the referencing FeatureType, not in the InformationType. | Agreed as a **Collection B** check, since it prescribes how the Product Specification package must structure the GML schema. |
| 10b | ntou | Related to  Dev0548 | (New ?) | te | Clause reference 10b-11.7  To ensure SRS is specified and the same SRS is uses for all geometries contained in the dataset. | Check Description:  SRS must be specified using the srsName attribute of the gml:Envelope element in the dataset, or the srsName attribute of the first geometry element in the dataset.  SRS specified using srsName attribute in any geometry element or the gml:Envelope element should be the same in the dataset. | Contradicts S-100 5.2.0 10b-11.7, which says the SRS can be specified either in the gml:Envelope or using srsName and srsDimension attributes for individual geometry elements.  (Note also this sentence in clause 7-4.1.2.1 “In this profile, the associated SC\_CRS must be linked at the GM\_Aggregate level and not directly to a DirectPosition.”)  Dev0548 description rewritten and new check Dev0587 added. Dev0549 becomes redundant and will be deleted.  At this point, if it is necessary to restrict to only the second method, it will need to be done by means of product-specific checks in the S-158:1xx for GML-based Product Specifications. |
| 10b | IC-ENC | Dev0521 |  | ed | Spelling error in Check Message, | should read "Prohibited" | Agreed |
| 10b | IC-ENC | Dev0525 |  | ed | Note: use of both Center and centre in S-100 |  | S-100 issue; note that names of classes, etc., from external standards must use original spellings. |
| 10b | IC-ENC | Dev0544 |  | ed | Spelling error in Check Description, | should read "attributes" | Agreed |
| 10b | rmm | Dev0552 |  | te | This should be a Collection B check, it constrains the product-specific GML schema (if it does – the language in 10b-13 is descriptive, not prescriptive). | Move to Collection B | Applied |
| 10b | rmm vice NIWC | New |  | te | Association links in GML formats should have association type information encoded in the link, not just the role name. | Mandate title attribute in feature and information associations.  Mandate arcrole attribute in links from spatial object to information type since they may use just a generic tag. | Agreed. New checks Dev0575, Dev0576, Dev0585 |
| 10c | IC-ENC | Dev0282 |  | ed | Duplicate error in Check Description, | remove one of the "the" | Agreed |
| 10c | IC-ENC | Dev0288 |  | ed | Spelling error in Check Message, | should read "Positioning" | Agreed |
| 10c | IC-ENC | Dev0294 |  | ed | Check Description: add "." after etc | add "." after etc | Agreed |
| 10c | IC-ENC | Dev0297 |  | ed | Spelling error in Check Description, | should read "identification" | Agreed |
| 15 | IC-ENC | Dev0479 |  | ed | Spelling error in Check Description, | should read "certificate" | Agreed |
| 15 | rmm | Dev0480 |  | te | Redundant with Dev0310 “The Exchange Set Catalogue XML (CATALOG.XML) must be located in the S100\_ROOT folder with its digital signature (CATALOG.SIGN) file” | Delete Dev0480 | Agreed |
| 15 | IC-ENC | Dev0480 |  | ed | Spelling error in Check Description, | should read "separate" | Agreed |
| 15 | rmm | Dev0487 |  | te | Retain as validation check | retain as validation check | Agreed |
| 15 | rmm | Dev0481 |  | ed | The requirement is in clause 17-4.2 (p. 7) | Move check to Part 17 section of list | Agreed |
| 17 | IC-ENC | Dev0299 |  | te | Suggest that this check is not redundant to 301 as this overs missing CATALOG.XML. However it is redundant to 154 which is checking the validity against the S-100 Metadata Profile Schemas. |  | Agreed, redundant with Dev0154 |
| 17 | IC-ENC | Dev0300 |  | te | Redundant with Dev0301, suggest remove check | remove check | Agreed |
| 17 | IC-ENC | Dev0159 |  | te | Redundant with Dev0301, suggest remove check | remove check | Agreed |
| 17 | IC-ENC | Dev0302 |  | ed | SM: Suggest reword Check Description | S-100 Exchange set (CATALOG.XML and CATALOG.SIGN) must be placed in the S100\_ROOT folder | Agreed with modification:  CATALOG.XML or CATALOG.SIGN is not present in the S100\_ROOT folder |
| 17 | IC-ENC | Dev0302 |  | ge | LT: Will be covered when DevOpsID 707 is actioned (reg check to validate S-1XX exchange set structure) | ? | Side comment? No actionable proposal, so no action. |
| 17 | rmm | Dev0306 |  | te | Where does 17-4.2 requires a unique name for ISO metadata files. Is this about distinguishing names for metadat files for base and update datasets, which might have the same base name in certain product specifications (when the extension is used to indicate update files)? | Apparent gap in S-100, S-100 clarification needed. Fortunately the Phase 1 specifications for ECDIS are not using ISO metadata files, so this could wait for Edition 6. | Delete Dev0306, see ICENC comment |
| 17 | IC-ENC | Dev0306 |  | te | Suggest this check is redundant with 308 | remove check | Delete Dev0306 |
| 17 | rmm | Dev0307 |  | te | Redundant since Dev0308 specifies the name of the ISO metadata file. | Delete | Delete Dev0307, se IC-ENC comment |
| 17 | IC-ENC | Dev0307 |  | te | Suggest this check is redundant with 308 | remove check | Delete Dev0307 |
| 17 | IC-ENC | Dev0309 |  | ed | Suggest reword Check Solution | Amend name of exchange set catalogue file to CATALOG.XML | Agreed |
| 17 | IC-ENC | Dev0310 |  | te | Suggest this check is redundant with 302 (reword), | remove check | Agreed, pending agreement on Dev0302 rewording |
| 17 | IC-ENC | Dev0311 |  | ed | Suggest reword Check Description | All digital signatures (except CATALOG.SIGN) must be included within their corresponding resource metadata records in the CATALOG.XML | Agreed, but reword for consistency with other rewording:  Resource metadata block in CATALOG.XML does not contain a digital signature |
| 17 | IC-ENC | Dev0312 |  | te | unsure as to the logic for this check be good to understand how the digital signature is validated, as the Check Description could be clearer, e.g. "The digital signature is valid as defined by S-100 Part 15" |  | TBD, not an S-158:100 issue per se? |
| 17 | IC-ENC | Dev0314 |  | te | Further discussion required - how will standalone entities be validated? | Further discussion required | TBD. Support file management in S-100 is unsatisfactory, in my opinion. For now, reword description and reduce severity level to W?  If a resource named by S100\_SupportFileDiscoveryMetadata with resourcePurpose=supportFile is not referenced in a dataset  This will still cause spurious warnings for standalone replacements of text files but may be the best compromise possible at this time  [10 Feb. Modified wording to allow for common resources.] |
| 17  17  15 | rmm | Dev0315, Dev0317, Dev0490 |  | te | Rewrite description of Dev0317 in terms of   1. all support files referenced by a dataset must be present in the exchange set; 2. all support files referenced by a support file metadata block in CATALOG.XML must be present in the exchange set.   Nate for both: The file reference may be a digital signature MRN (Table 15-11) or cryptographic hash MRN (Table 15-12). | Rewrite Dev0315 and Dev0317 as the two checks described in Col. 6;  Delete Dev0490 as being redundant with the rewritten checks and the Note. | (a) “dataset” should be base dataset.  (b) add that they must be in the SUPPORT\_FILES/ hierarchy in the exchange set  [10 Feb. Delete 0317 as duplicative of 0315] |
| 17 | IC-ENC | Dev0315 |  | te | Support but be good to understand the logic for this check, e.g checking references in datasets |  | Request clarification |
| 17 | rmm | Dev0316 |  | te | There is a statement in S-100 17-4.3  “All content relating to such external resources should be validated and must be consistent with the dataset content to form a valid S-100 Exchange Set.”  It is not clear what validation software should should do to implement this check. | Clarify the intent of this requirement in S-100 and update check description, and verify that is checking requirements not covered by other checks. | Agreed |
| 17 | IC-ENC | Dev0316 |  | te | Support but be good to understand the logic for this check |  | S-100: “All content relating to such external resources should be validated and must be consistent with the dataset content to form a valid S-100 Exchange Set.”  Not clear what the S-100 requirement actually is. Refer to S-100 WG for clarification or deletion from S-100.  Meanwhile, delete Dev0316 |
| 17 | IC-ENC | Dev0317 |  | te | "Suggest this check is redundant with 315 | remove check | Agreed, see actions above |
| 17 | IC-ENC | Dev0317 |  | ed | (""."" missing after e.g)" |  | Agreed |
| 17 | IC-ENC | Dev0318 |  | te | Support but only checking S-100 URI form not that it is uniquely resolvable by the implementing system |  | Agreed |
| 17 | rmm | Dev0320, Dev0158, Dev0159 |  | te | File naming conventions are defined in S-100 Part 17 and elaborated in individual Product Specifications. | Merge Dev320 and Dev0158 | Agreed |
| 17 | IC-ENC | Dev0320 |  | te | "Support check - no changes required  New check suggested: Supporting resource name does not conform to naming convention." | New check suggested: Supporting resource name does not conform to naming convention." | Agreed |
| 17 | FH | Dev0320, Dev0157 |  | te | Both checks set out to validate dataset file names. S100\_Dev0157 is more concise, and the level of detail provided by S100\_Dev0320 check description is not required, since this is defined by the standard.  New Issue #81 | 1. Remove check S100\_Dev0320.  2. The S-100 reference for S100\_Dev0157 should be changed to 17-4.3. | New issue Feb. 5  TBD |
| 17 | IC-ENC | Dev0321 |  | ed | Suggest reword Check Description | The variable component of the dataset name shall be unique for the data producer and not be reused | Agreed |
| 17 | IC-ENC | Dev0322 |  | te | Is this not a Data Producer Check as this is looking at the content of the supporting resource? |  | Delete Dev0322  Can be S-164 test? |
| 17 | rmm | Dev0323 |  | te | (See remark in worksheet) | Move to S-98 list. | Agreed  Description rewritten to check location, but this should be in S-98 or S-164. |
| 17 | IC-ENC | Dev0323 |  | te | Agree suggest this is moved to S-158:98; discussion required on how to implement this. | Move to S-158:98  discussion required on how to implement this. | Agreed |
| 17 | rmm | Dev0324, Dev0325, Dev0326, Dev0328, Dev0330 |  | te | Implementing these checks requires access to other datasets, exchange sets, or exchange catalogues (previous updates, previous exchange catalogue, etc.) | No action unless this is a problem for implementers of validation software | Agreed |
| 17 | IC-ENC | Dev0324 |  | ed | Support check with minor reword to check Description to include "each" | reword check Description to include "each" | Agreed |
| 17 | IC-ENC | Dev0326 |  | ed | Suggest reword Check Message | Dataset issue date precedes previous issue date of the dataset | Agreed |
| 17 | rmm | Dev0327 |  | te | The method of cancellation is defined in each Product Specification. | Rewrite as separate checks for file-based and fileless cancellation (see new checks below) | Agreed |
| 17 | rmm | Dev0327a (new) |  | te | New check for file-based cancellation (see Dev0327 comment). | IF the exchange catalogue cancels a dataset using the file-based method, its exchange set must contain an update dataset file for which the Edition number must be set to 0 in its discovery metadata block in the exchange catalogue. | Agreed  Rewritten as Dev0327, Dev0579 |
| 17 | rmm | Dev0327b (new) |  | te | New check for file-less cancellation (see Dev0327 comment). | IF the exchange catalogue cancels a resource using the file-less method, its exchange catalogue must use a dataset metadata entry with the filename and original digital signature specifying the resource to be cancelled, and with all other mandatory metadata fields also set to the same values as the original, with the exception of the issueDate, which must be set to the issue date of the fileless cancellation itself. | Agreed  Rewritten as Dev0327, Dev0579 |
| 17 | IC-ENC | Dev0327 |  | te | Support check for file based cancellation, reword.  Agree new check required for fileless cancellation. | suggest reword Check Description to: "To cancel a Base dataset file the Edition number of the cancellation update must be set to 0".  new check needed for fileless cancellation | Compare to proposed Dev0327a and Dev0327b above  Rewritten as Dev0327, Dev0579 |
| 17 | IC-ENC | Dev0328 |  | ed | Suggest reword Check Message | Dataset issue date precedes previous issue date of the cancelled dataset | Agreed |
| 17 | IC-ENC | Dev0330 |  | te | Suggest this check is redundant with Critical check 324 | remove check | TBD, wording is different, Dev0330 is about the content of the exchange set, Dev0324 is about production |
| 17 | FH | Dev0156 |  | te | S100\_Dev0156 states: "Digital signature values are missing or do not match."  1. Individual checks for missing values within an exchange set catalogue are not required, since this is covered by S100\_Dev0154, which will check against the catalogue schema and additional constraints that are imposed by the product specification.  2. The "do not match" part is covered by check S100\_Dev0312.  New Issue #80 | Recommend that check S100\_Dev0156 be removed. | New issue Feb. 5  TBD |
| 17 | rmm | Dev0334 |  | te | Dev0334 is covered by Dev0154, since “duration” is an XML built-in type. | Delete Dev0334 as being redundant with Dev0154 | Agreed |
| 17 | rmm | Dev0342 |  | te | See remark in worksheet: “Cannot be automatically validated without production-specific knowledge.” The granularity of updates is specified (if it is) in the Product Specification. | Delete from S-100 list and refer to S-1xx PTs for consideration as a product-specific check. | Agreed |
| 17 | IC-ENC | Dev0471 |  | te | Check Solution is incorrect for this check; is this check necessary, could it be combined with 470 (similar to 469)? |  | Merge |
| 17 | IC-ENC | Dev0472 |  | ed | Check Solution is incorrect for this check; reword | Populate phone, address, onlineResource or contactInstructions | Agreed |
| 17 | IC-ENC | Dev0153 |  | te | This is checking if the producer code exists for the product, rather than if the producer code exists at all (007). | Suggest remove check 153 as this is at the PS level. | Not agreed, validates content of discovery metadata in CATALOG.XML |
| 17 | IC-ENC | Dev0153 |  | ed | Suggest the term register of IHO Data Producer Codes in the IHO GI Registry is used as described in the introduction to S-100, and S-62 is removed | Suggest the term register of IHO Data Producer Codes in the IHO GI Registry is used as described in the introduction to S-100, and S-62 is removed (only one reference in S-100, which needs to be updated (as a clarification in S100\_DatasetDiscoveryMetadata (Part 17) | S-62 is currently listed as an IHO standard (including a link to the online register + PDF), and the online register calls itself S-62: |
| 17 | IC-ENC | Dev0154 |  | ed | Suggest reword Check Description and Check Solution | Check Description: "The structure and content of the CATALOG.XML must conform to 10c-12  Check Solution: "Amend CATALOG.XML to conform with S-100 Metadata Profile Schemas" | Agreed, but the clause is in Part 17, Part 10c is about HDF5  “The structure or content of CATALOG.XML does not conform to the S-100 exchange catalogue XML schema.” |
| 17 | IC-ENC | Dev0155 |  | te | SM: Does this check impact 315/316? | ? | Redundant with 0315, disposition depends on decision w.r.t. 0315 comment |
| 17 | IC-ENC | Dev0155 |  | ed | Suggest reword Check Description | For each support file referenced in S100\_SupportFileDiscoveryMetadata where supportFileRevisionStatus is Equal to (new) or (replacement) that is not Present in the location specified by fileName | Possibly redundant, dpepending on decision w.r.t. 0315 |
| 17 | IC-ENC | Dev0156 |  | te | Further discussion required to define valid (see also 312). Check Description may need to be reworded |  | TBD |
| 17 | IC-ENC | Dev0157 |  | te | Suggest that this check sits within the PS level Validation Checks, already have 320 - Error |  | Dev0320 is about S-100 requirement, Dev0157 for additional PS requirements |
| 17 | IC-ENC | Dev0158 |  | te | SM: Suggest that this check sits within the PS level Validation Checks, already have 320 - Error |  | Dev0320 is about dataset files, Dev0158 about support files |
| 17 | IC-ENC | Dev0158 |  | ed | Spelling error in Check Description, should read "Specification" |  | Agreed |
|  | IC-ENC | Dev0333 |  | te | To note PT\_Locale shows only the following three attributes: language, country and characterEncoding. Not id.  Suggest, if correct, reword this to clarify as S-100 states: Of note is the id attribute of PT\_Locale. When used in otherLocale definition, it needs to be unique… |  | PT\_Localeis defined in the ISO schemas and inherits the id attribute from ISO type gco:AbstractObject\_Type  As an xs:ID type it must be unique within the whole of any single exchange catalogue XML file (XML requirement). |
| 17 | IC-ENC | Dev0334 |  | te | Agree that this would be validated against the schema. |  | Delete 0334 |
| 17 | IC-ENC | Dev0334 |  | ed | If this check is required, suggest reword Check Message and Check Solution.  For Check Description - add comma after populated | Check Message: Non-conformant maintenance frequency format  Check Solution: Amend format of duration in maintenance frequency.  For Check Description - add comma after populated | Delete 0334 |
| 17 | IC-ENC | Dev0335 |  | ed | Suggest minor reword for Check Message and Check Description | Check Message: add hyphen for Non-conformant  Check Description - add comma after populated | Agreed |
| 17 | IC-ENC | Dev0336 |  | ed | Suggest minor reword for Check Message | Check Message: add hyphen for Non-conformant | Agreed |
| 17 | IC-ENC | Dev0337 |  | ed | Suggest minor reword for Check Message abd Check Description | Check Message to add hyphen for Non-conformant  Check Description add as after long. | Agreed |
| 17 | IC-ENC | Dev0338 |  | ed | Suggest minor reword for Check Message | add hyphen for Non-conformant | Agreed |
| 17 | IC-ENC | Dev0339 |  | ed | Suggest minor reword for Check Message | add hyphen for Non-conformant | Agreed |
| 17 | IC-ENC | Dev0341 |  | ed | Reword Check Message and Check Description | Check Message: "Maintenance frequency date/time not comparable to issue date/time"  Check Description: "Smaller date time components of start and end instants must not be encoded unless the availability of the successor dataset is known to the corresponding level of precision" | Producer-specific? Not clear how this can be checked without specific knowledge of production requirements.  Delete Dev0341 |
| 17 | IC-ENC | Dev0342 |  | ed | Suggest that this is a Data Producer check | consider removing | Delete Dev0342 |
| 17 | IC-ENC | Dev0484 |  | ed | Suggest reword for Check Message and Check Description | Check Message: protectionScheme value is not S100p15 where encryption is applied  Check Description to: Amend discovery metadata | Agreed, but Check Description & Check Solution seem more appropriate to the proposed changes |
| 17 | IC-ENC | Dev0553 |  | ed | Suggest reword for Check Message | Dataset bounding boxes in discovery metadata and dataset do not match | Agreed |
| 17 | IC-ENC | Dev0554 |  | ed | Suggest reword for Check Message | Dataset temporal extents in discovery metadata and dataset do not match | Agreed |
| 17 | IC-ENC | Dev0572 |  | ed | Suggest reword for Check Message and Check Description | Check Message: Temporal extent begin does not precede end  Check Description: Where both temporal extent attributes are populated, timeInstantBegin must precede timeInstantEnd | Agreed |
| 17 | IC-ENC | Dev0574 |  | ed | Suggest reword for Check Message and Check Description | Check Message to: Issue date and time in discovery metadata does not match issue date and time in dataset  Check Description: Issue date and time in discovery metadata must match issue date and time in dataset", and Check Solution to: "Amend discovery metadata | Agreed |
| 17 | IC-ENC | Dev0555, Dev0556, Dev0557, Dev0558, Dev0559 |  | ed | Suggest reword for Check Message | Data coverage polygon in discovery metadata does not conform to S-100 Part 17 restrictions | Agreed |
| 17 | IC-ENC | Dev0570 |  | te | Further discussion required - may be a Data Producer check where approximateGrid Resolution is populated? |  | TBD  Emailed 12 Feb |
| 17 | DK | All |  | ed | The document contains instances of the words ‘Prohibited’ and ‘unallowed’ and conversely ‘permitted’ and ‘allowed’. It would be more consistent to use the same words in all cases, my preference would be for ‘prohibited’ and ‘permitted’ | Replace ‘unallowed’ with ‘prohibited’ and  Replace ‘allowed’ with ‘permitted’ | Agreed |
| All | rmm | All |  | ge | “S-100 Part” column (column O) is redundant since column “Standards Document Reference” column specified the Part. | Delete “S-100 Part” column (column O) | Agreed |
| All | rmm | All |  | ge | Determine whether spreadsheet should be published as 3 sheets (All, Collection A, Collection B) or 2 sheets (Collection A, Collection B). | Fair publication should have only (Collection A, Collection B) to avoid the need for extra explanations in the cover document. | TBD, GitHub issue #76  Fair copy will have only two sheets |
| All | rmm | various |  | ed | (See recommendations in Working Remarks column) | Apply recommendations except as noted in this form or decided otherwise after evaluating all comments. | Agreed |
| ? | 129 PT | ? |  | te | S129\_Dev0004  Wrong association used.  For each association between features instances, features instances and information instances, and between information instances that is not defined in the feature catalogue.  Use correct association type. | Generic test | Covered by Dev0077, also covered by schema validation of GML dataset |
| ? | 129 PT | ? |  | te | S129\_Dev0005  Wrong role used.  For each role name on associations that is not defined in the feature catalogue.  Use correct role name. | Generic test | Covered by Dev0545, Dev0509 and schema validation of GML dataset |
| ? | 129 PT | ? |  | te | S129\_Dev0006  Unknown association is used.  For each association that is not defined in the feature catalogue.  Use association that is defined in the feature catalogue. | Generic test | Covered by Dev0077, also covered by schema validation of GML dataset |
| ? | 129 PT | ? |  | te | S129\_Dev0007  Unknown role name is used.  For each role name that is not defined in the feature catalogue.  Use role name that is defined in the feature catalogue. | Generic test | Covered by Dev0545, Dev0509 and schema validation of GML dataset |
| ? | 129 PT | ? |  | te | S129\_Dev0008  Class is associated in an illegal association.  For each association ensure associated classes are only those permitted by the feature catalogue.  Ensure correct association is used between classes. | Generic test | Covered by Dev0077 (implementation must check source/target by schema validation and/or feature catalogue feature and information bindings) |
| ? | 129 PT | ? |  | te | S129\_Dev0009  Role name is used on an illegal association.  For each role name ensure it is only used with permitted associations.  Ensure correct role names are used on the association. | Generic test | Covered by Dev0077 (implementation must check source/target by schema validation and/or feature catalogue feature and information bindings) |
| ? | 129 PT | ? |  | te | S129\_Dev0012  Object has invalid feature class code.  For each feature instance, which does not have a valid feature class label/code as defined by the feature catalogue.  Amend object class code. | Generic test | Covered by Dev0509 and detectable by schema validation against GML schema (Dev0513)  In the GML format feature instances use only the (camel case) code to identify feature class. |
| ? | 129 PT | ? |  | te | S129\_Dev0013  Attribute has invalid attribute label/code.  For each attribute, which does not have a valid attribute label/code as defined by the feature catalogue.  Amend attribute label/code. | Generic test | Covered by Dev0509 and detectable by schema validation against GML schema (Dev0513)  In the GML format attributes use only the (camel case) code to identify the attribute class. Enumerations and codelist types use labels and codes of listef values but that is a Specification issue, not a data validation issue. |
| ? | 129 PT | ? |  | te | S129\_Dev0014  Attribute not permitted on feature class.  For each feature object, which contains attributes outside the list of permissible attributes for the feature class (as defined in the feature catalogue).  Remove attribute. | Generic test | Covered by Dev0077 and Dev0509 and detectable by schema validation (Dev0513) |
| ? | 129 PT | ? |  | te | S129\_Dev0015  Incorrect data order.  If the order of the data in a dataset is not correct.  Amend data order. | Generic test | Part 10b does not appear to require an order? The Product Specification might, in which case this ought to be a product-specific check. |
| ? | 129 PT | ? |  | te | S129\_Dev0016  Too many instances of attribute.  For each attribute instance where the total number of instances exceed the permitted number of instances  Ensure correct attribute encoding. | Generic test | Covered by Dev0165 |
| ? | 129 PT | ? |  | te | S129\_Dev0017  File referenced in the dataset is not present in the exchange set.  For each instance of a file referenced in the data, and if not present in the exchange set.  Add file to exchange set or remove reference to file. | Generic test | New Part 17 check?  Can’t be verified without format-specific code. New check Dev0586 |
| ? | 129 PT | ? |  | te | S129\_Dev0018  Dataset discovery metadata file that does not correspond to the dataset discovery metadata content table.  For each dataset discovery metadata file that does not correspond to the dataset discovery metadata content table.  Ensure correct encoding of the discovery metadata file. | Generic test | ~~New Part 17 check?~~  Covered by check Dev0299 |
| ? | 129 PT | ? |  | te | S129\_Dev0026  Attributes are not encoded according to attribute type format.  For the Date Time attributes generationTime, expectedPassingTime, Timestart and TimeEnd where encoding is not according to format.  Encode according to attribute type format. | Generic test | Could be added as a Collection B check, since datatypes of attributes are encoded in the GML schema. This could be a check on the GML schema.  No action in generic S-100 checks |