

S-101 Data Quality

with depthRangeValue1, depthRangeValue2, soundingUncertainty, techniqueOfSoundingMeasurement and fullSeafloorCoverageAchieved within the QualityOfData feature there is no doubt this is a bathymetry quality of data feature. Seems we must then develop a topology quality of data feature to support bullet point 6 under agenda item 4 in the DQWG4 minutes. Or could this be done in another way? Also, would it be prudent to rename QualityOfData to make it clear this is for bathymetry data only?

should soundingUncertainty and verticalUncertainty be merged into one, as suggested by DQWG4 minutes, in Agenda item 4a?

Antti: Depth ie. sounding vs. vertical measurement is a discussion that has to be continued at Monaco.

How to deal with this item from the DQWG4 minutes: DQWG request that any attribute capturing a measurement also contain a sub-attribute to capture uncertainty of said value, should this value be of a different uncertainty than specified in a meta feature containing it. Any S-101 uncertainty attribute must be captured at the 95% confidence level.

Antti: The issue of different uncertainty than meta object's could be handled with optional field, I guess. It needs rules or guides like the S-57 UOC..?

since the limits of a polygon is defined by curves that already have spatial quality, is it also necessary to have spatial quality on the polygon?

Antti: I would think polygon as a very different spatial entity compared to a collection of curves. Therefore I don't find it very good idea to define polygon as a set of curves with quality attributes.

Eivind: I forgot to mention this; S-101 makes use of S-100 Level 3a Geometry (7-5.3.4). It states there that "Areas are represented by a closed loop of curves beginning and ending at a common point". This is why the question on the necessity of polygon spatial quality arose.

DQWG5-03A

