					Date: 12th August 2019		Document: **Various Proposals**

1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)	
Component	**CO[1]**	**Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex** (e.g. 3.1)	**Paragraph/ Figure/Table/ Note** (e.g. Table 1)	**Type of comment[2]**	**Comment (justification for change) by the CO[3]**	**Proposed change by the CO**	**Secretariat observations** on each comment submitted
	DE	1.1.and 4.1		ge	It is to be questioned whether the specific purpose of the product specification is to respond to requests to produce a data product that can be used in a NWIO within an ECDIS.		**Action for Elena:** Rewrite the specific purpose of the product specification in such a way that it is a statement of what the product specification is (i.e. eliminate the history part). Timeline: to be done for this week.
	FR	1.1		ge	The scope of the S-124 should clarify the product. It applies to NW of the WWNWS. It may be used for official local NWs.	The first sentence could be: *This document describes an S-100 compliant product specification for navigational warnings issued under the auspice of the IMO/IHO WWNWS. It may also be used for local navigational warnings issued on the authority of a government authorized institution.*	In agreement with the comment from France. **Action for Elena**: Work in the comment from France. Par. 3: Make the text clear that it is possible from S-124 to feed other systems, it is not that S-124 will go over these other systems. Par. 3: Should also account for the functionalities being different in a NW in native S-124 format vs S-124 transliterated into NW sent over

1 **CO** = Contributing Organisation (HOs should use 2 character codes e.g. FR AU etc.)
2 **Type of comment:** **ge** = general **te** = technical **ed** = editorial
3 Whilst not compulsory, comments are more likely to be accepted if accompanied by a proposed change.
NOTE Columns 1, 2, 4, 5 are compulsory.

S-124 Draft 20190711 comments and editorial observations (Please send all comments to Eivind Mong (eivind.mong[at]dfo-mpo.gc.ca)

Date: 12th August 2019 | Document: **Various Proposals**

1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)	
Component	**CO[1]**	**Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex** (e.g. 3.1)	**Paragraph/ Figure/Table/ Note** (e.g. Table 1)	**Type of com-ment[2]**	**Comment (justification for change) by the CO[3]**	**Proposed change by the CO**	**Secretariat observations** on each comment submitted
							NAVTEX/recognized mobile satellite service.
	NZ	2.1		ed	Should "formates" be "formats"?		All agree to change to "formats."
	FR	3.1	In-force bulletin	ge	This definition comes from S-53 (§ 2.2.1). The term "and broadcast" is questioning. There is a discrepancy with S-53 chapter 7 (Miscellaneous/In-force bulletin) where the in-force bulletin lists all warnings in-force even if no longer being broadcast. The definition of in-force bulletin in S-53 should be clarified by WWNWS-SC (it could be "a list of serial numbers of those NAVAREA, Sub-area or coastal warnings in force issued by the NAVAREA Coordinator, Sub-area Coordinator or National Coordinator"). This proposed definition is aligned with Explanation given for In-force bulletin in paragraph 10.1.2 of the draft S-124.		**Action for everyone:** Look at the dissemination principles and participate in the brainstorming of what is the dissemination principles. The issue of in-force list will be discussed during the data dissemination discussions.
	DE	5		ed	The title should be the same like on the cover page	IHO Geospatial Standard for Navigational Warnings	Disagree with comment because "Navigational Warning" is the name of the data product information, while "IHO Geospatial Standard for Navigational Warnings" is the name of the standard.
	DE	5		ed	The first characters should be capitalized	Title; Abstract; Acronym, Content, SpatialExtent, TemporalExtent, SpecificPurpose	Disagree with comment as attributes, and not a

1 **CO** = Contributing Organisation (HOs should use 2 character codes e.g. FR AU etc.)
2 **Type of comment: ge** = general   **te** = technical   **ed** = editorial
3   Whilst not compulsory, comments are more likely to be accepted if accompanied by a proposed change.
NOTE   Columns 1, 2, 4, 5 are compulsory.

S-124 Draft 20190711 comments and editorial observations (Please send all comments to Eivind Mong (eivind.mong[at]dfo-mpo.gc.ca)

Date: 12th August 2019 | Document: **Various Proposals**

1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)	
Component	CO[1]	Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex (e.g. 3.1)	Paragraph/ Figure/Table/ Note (e.g. Table 1)	Type of com-ment[2]	Comment (justification for change) by the CO[3]	Proposed change by the CO	Secretariat observations on each comment submitted
							class. According to ISO, attributes always start with a ==lowercase==, and then they can be ==uppercase== (e.g. ==s==patialExtent).
	DE	6		ge	The clause should be rephrased due to the fact that the earlier versions are irrelevant as this is still a draft and not a released version	Remove all sentences with the term earlier versions	Agree with comment for the text to be rewritten. **Action for Eivind:** Clean up and change the text and to remove the prefixes, and to have the information to be within the S-124 standard and clear identification that this is clearly S-124 (no need for prefixes).
	DE	6	Figure 6.1	ed	Information in the naming of the figure should be written out	Figure 6.1 – S-124 Features and Information Types	Agree with comment.
	DE	6	Figures 6.1 and 6.2	ge	It would be beneficial for the reader if the composition of figures 6.1 and 6.2 content is similar.		Eivind will take this comment under advisement for the next version.
	DE	6		ge	The comprehensibility of the text would be supported by an example Navigational Warning with several instances of S-124_NavigationalWarningFeaturePart.		**Action for Eivind:** Rewrite the example to indicate a wreck and a buoy would require 2 separate

1 **CO** = Contributing Organisation (HOs should use 2 character codes e.g. FR AU etc.)
2 **Type of comment:** **ge** = general   **te** = technical   **ed** = editorial
3   Whilst not compulsory, comments are more likely to be accepted if accompanied by a proposed change.
NOTE   Columns 1, 2, 4, 5 are compulsory.

Date: 12th August 2019	Document: **Various Proposals**

1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)	
Component	**CO[1]**	**Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex** (e.g. 3.1)	**Paragraph/ Figure/Table/ Note** (e.g. Table 1)	**Type of comment[2]**	**Comment (justification for change) by the CO[3]**	**Proposed change by the CO**	**Secretariat observations** on each comment submitted
							instances. (Already amended in the document)
	DE	6	Figures 6.1 and 6.2	te	Does not every information belong to an area/spatial? The multiplicity of both spatial attributes should be 1..*	+ areaAffected: PointCurveOrSurface [1..*] + geometry: PointCurveOrSurface [1..*]	This discussion will be deferred until agenda item on 3 and 3.1 (Portrayal of S-124). FYI: Features can have no geometry (it is an option from S-100). For example, warnings about a global flare which cannot be positioned, and some warnings can have no location.
	DE	6	Figure 6.2	ge	S124_InformationType: which information should be inherited to the children?		A new version of the data model and description should address this.
	DE	6	Figure 6.2	te	In the S124_Preamble box – the simple attribute S124_publicationDate: dateTime needs to be explained. A definition is required.		Next version must contain a feature catalogue.

1   **CO** = Contributing Organisation (HOs should use 2 character codes e.g. FR AU etc.)
2   **Type of comment:**   **ge** = general   **te** = technical   **ed** = editorial
3   Whilst not compulsory, comments are more likely to be accepted if accompanied by a proposed change.
NOTE   Columns 1, 2, 4, 5 are compulsory.

Date: 12th August 2019	Document: **Various Proposals**

1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)	
Component	**CO[1]**	**Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex** (e.g. 3.1)	**Paragraph/ Figure/Table/ Note** (e.g. Table 1)	**Type of comment[2]**	**Comment (justification for change) by the CO[3]**	**Proposed change by the CO**	**Secretariat observations** on each comment submitted
	DE	6	Figure 6.2	te	The enumeration S_124warningType should be split into three different enumerations; consequently, the use of S124_Preamble is more convenient.	areaNW, areaNoNW, areaInForceBulletin	**Action for Yves:** Justify why we should keep the distinction between NAVAREA warning and sub-NAVAREA warning. FYI: It is important to distinguish between local and coastal.
	DE	6	Figure 6.2	te	Response on: remark to retain enumeration value ("repetition") in S124_referenceCategory. A repetition is not necessary. All valid NW are in-force.	Delete enumeration value "repetition"	**Action for Eivind:** Update data model to remove "repetition." Remove "update" (?) FYI: "Repetition" in this sense is for radio transmission, not data transmission.
	DE	6	Figure 6.2	te	ComplexAttributeType: S124_fixedDateRange the attributes timeofDayEnd and timeofDayStart could also be encoded by ComplexAttributeType: schedulebyDoW (see S-122). This simplifies the computing of information among various products		Comment rejected as this subject has been discussed in length before to arrive to this compromise.
	DE	6	Figure 6.2	te	The naming of the featureObjectIdentifier in S124_ENCFeatureReference and the featureIdentifier in S124_featureReference should be identical. Could it be solved by MRN?		Comment rejected: current structure is compatible with S-57 ENC and S-100 environment.
	DE	6	Figure 6.2	ed	Small character in the caption of the Figure 6.2	Figure 6.2 – The **f**ull S-124 Data Model 0.2.4	Agree with comment. (**Action for Eivind**)
	DE	6		ge	The reference for codelists for ISO 639-2 (language code), ISO 3166-1 (country code), S-62 (IHO data		Agree with comment. (**Action for Eivind:**

1   **CO** = Contributing Organisation (HOs should use 2 character codes e.g. FR AU etc.)
2   **Type of comment:**   **ge** = general   **te** = technical   **ed** = editorial
3   Whilst not compulsory, comments are more likely to be accepted if accompanied by a proposed change.
NOTE   Columns 1, 2, 4, 5 are compulsory.

| Date: 12th August 2019 | Document: **Various Proposals** |

1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)	
Component	**CO**[1]	**Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex** (e.g. 3.1)	**Paragraph/ Figure/Table/ Note** (e.g. Table 1)	**Type of com-ment**[2]	**Comment (justification for change) by the CO**[3]	**Proposed change by the CO**	**Secretariat observations** on each comment submitted
					producer code) and EPSG (horizontal datum code) should be provided.		Add in to better maintain the lists.)
	DE	7		ed	The term "types" is missing	Simple attribute **types** used in this specification are listed in Table 7.1 – Simple feature attributes	Agree with comment. (**Action for Eivind**)
	DE	7	Table 7.1	ge	An example of a Truncated date would be beneficial to show that at least one of the components (YYYY or MM or DD) must be present with omitted elements replaced by the appropriate number of hyphens	EXAMPLE 2019----	Agree with comment. (**Action for Eivind to fix**)
	DE	7.3		ed	Replace the term "is" by "should be"	There **should be** no use of a specific unit of measure in the S-124 data model. However, the content of text attributes that describe the nature of navigational warnings may make use of the following units of measure	Comment rejected.
	NZ	7.3		te	*[response to comment]* Agreed. All examples in S-53 for short horizontal distances (E.g. length of tow) typically use metres as the unit of measurement.		**Action for Eivind:** Resolve this in the document to include additional units of measurements (as agreed by the WWNWS-SC). S-124 does not need to follow the same constraints as S-53.
	FR	8.5		te	Time/date information would be most often also included in the text attributes, at least at the beginning because the S-124 textual information would probably be the core textual information of the S-53 warning. Time-date coded in S-100 (S-124) attributes is for the machine. The display (HMI) is another thing. As S-100 ECDIS will display more time-date information from various dynamic products from different services (VTS, AIS, tide, current,		Referring to the discussion from yesterday with the NNWNWS-SC to align with the ECDIS standard in terms of display.

FYI: The WWNWS-SC agree that the |

1 **CO** = Contributing Organisation (HOs should use 2 character codes e.g. FR AU etc.)
2 **Type of comment:**   **ge** = general   **te** = technical   **ed** = editorial
3   Whilst not compulsory, comments are more likely to be accepted if accompanied by a proposed change.
NOTE   Columns 1, 2, 4, 5 are compulsory.

Date: 12th August 2019	Document: **Various Proposals**

1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)	
Component	**CO**[1]	**Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex** (e.g. 3.1)	**Paragraph/ Figure/Table/ Note** (e.g. Table 1)	**Type of com-ment**[2]	**Comment (justification for change) by the CO**[3]	**Proposed change by the CO**	**Secretariat observations** on each comment submitted
					etc…), it appears important to harmonize the display of dates and times in ECDIS HMI .		format of the data follows S-100, and that the display of the information in the ECDIS follows the ECDIS definition. Data can be displayed differently depending on the system.
	NZ	8.5		te	*[response to comment]* Drifting Objects require a date/time of sighting in the text – not sure if this is applicable to the text attributes?		**Action for Eivind:** Put a statement in the product specification that instances of time in the textbox must follow the ECDIS standard (dd mmm yyyy) and the time must be in UTC. FYI: Conversion software can translate this into the S-53 format.
	DE	9.1		ed	Is the header "9.1 Introduction needed" as it is the only one within the chapter Data Quality?		Agree with comment. (**Action for Eivind:** Document already amended.)
	DE	10		ed	Appendix A is missing	Appendix A (tbd)	Comment accepted. Next version should include Appendix A.
	DE	10		ge	Local warnings are outside of scope of S-53, and will be defined in national or local documentation. Should		Comment concerning this was added to the

1   **CO** = Contributing Organisation (HOs should use 2 character codes e.g. FR AU etc.)
2   **Type of comment:**   **ge** = general   **te** = technical   **ed** = editorial
3   Whilst not compulsory, comments are more likely to be accepted if accompanied by a proposed change.
NOTE   Columns 1, 2, 4, 5 are compulsory.

Date: 12th August 2019	Document: **Various Proposals**

1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)	
Component	**CO[1]**	**Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex** (e.g. 3.1)	**Paragraph/ Figure/Table/ Note** (e.g. Table 1)	**Type of com-ment[2]**	**Comment (justification for change) by the CO[3]**	**Proposed change by the CO**	**Secretariat observations** on each comment submitted
					this not rather belong to clause 4.1 "Specific Purpose"?		draft of the product specification to remove the entire text from "General principles…" to the end of the paragraph once Appendix A has been added to remove confusion.
	DE	10.1.2.1		ed	The font size must be adjusted to 11 pt		Comment accepted. (**Action for Eivind**)
	DE	10.1.2.1		ge	Could the content of Datasets be implemented into a table 10.2?		agree
	FR		10.1.2.1 In-force bulletin	ed	In the last sentence, remove "Dataset will contain one Preamble" because it is already stated in the first sentence of the paragraph.	Dataset may contain one or more References information type instances and must not contain any NavigationalWarningFeaturePart or TextPlacement instance.	agree
	FR		10.1.2.1	te	The Datasets and their type have a meaning within a same series. This should be stated in 10.1.2.1	A Navigational Warning within a series is communicated via a dataset. A dataset is a grouping of features, attributes, geometry and metadata which comprises a specific coverage. There are five types of S-124 datasets, and a dataset must contain only one Navigational Warning or In-force Bulletin of the series.	agree
	NZ	10.1.3		ed	*[response to comment]* What is meant by "self-reference"?		Self reference in this context means the in force bulletin include a reference to itself thereby saying it is in

1   **CO** = Contributing Organisation (HOs should use 2 character codes e.g. FR AU etc.)
2   **Type of comment: ge** = general   **te** = technical   **ed** = editorial
3   Whilst not compulsory, comments are more likely to be accepted if accompanied by a proposed change.
NOTE   Columns 1, 2, 4, 5 are compulsory.

Date: 12th August 2019	Document: **Various Proposals**

1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)	
Component	**CO[1]**	**Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex** (e.g. 3.1)	**Paragraph/ Figure/Table/ Note** (e.g. Table 1)	**Type of com- ment[2]**	**Comment (justification for change) by the CO[3]**	**Proposed change by the CO**	**Secretariat observations** on each comment submitted
							force. The alternative is to not include such self referencing and have a convention that the latest inforce bulletin is always 'in force'.
	DE	10.7.1		ed	Is the header 10.7.1 Sequence of objects needed as it is the only one in the sub chapter?		Agree, removed.
	FR		10.8	te	Use of MRN: the use of MRN should be optional because we can expect some difficulties when implementing the concept and because local warnings are out of IHO's domain. We only need to create one MRN for the dataset (the NW as a whole) and use URN inside the NW to refer occasionally to objects having an URN (an AtoN for example, a regulation,…).		<mark>Requires more discussion.</mark>
	DE	10.12		ed	"an electronic" is missing	S-124 datasets are intended to be used as an overlay over **an electronic** nautical chart.	agree
	DE	10.14		ed	change "+" into "and"	Filtering functions could include options like filtering on route **and** buffer, navigational warning topic, date range of the hazard, or valid time of the navigational warning.	Agree, but S124 workshop/WWNWS11 decided on very limited amount of filtering being permitted. So the section needs rewrite.
	DE	10.14		ge	A Navigational Warning with no display makes on charts no sense. The note is superfluous.	Delete the note: When a NavigationalWarningFeaturePart is not portrayed, any associated TextPlacement features must also not be portrayed.	Disagree, because these are two different features with portrayal and

1   **CO** = Contributing Organisation (HOs should use 2 character codes e.g. FR AU etc.)
2   **Type of comment:**   **ge** = general   **te** = technical   **ed** = editorial
3   Whilst not compulsory, comments are more likely to be accepted if accompanied by a proposed change.
NOTE   Columns 1, 2, 4, 5 are compulsory.

S-124 Draft 20190711 comments and editorial observations (Please send all comments to Eivind Mong (eivind.mong[at]dfo-mpo.gc.ca)

| Date: 12th August 2019 | Document: **Various Proposals** |

1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)	
Component	**CO[1]**	**Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex** (e.g. 3.1)	**Paragraph/ Figure/Table/ Note** (e.g. Table 1)	**Type of comment[2]**	**Comment (justification for change) by the CO[3]**	**Proposed change by the CO**	**Secretariat observations** on each comment submitted
							associated with a feature association. Similar issues have occurred before in ENCs because it was not explicitly stated that sub objects should not be displayed when the main object isn't.
	DE	11	Table 11.1	ed	The value "English" is listed twice in the row Language	Delete one of the terms "English"	agree
	DE	11.2.1 and 11.2.2		ge	As any dataset not found in the latest in-force bulletin must be considered not valid, an in-force bulletin should always be created when a new NAVTEX message has been released.	The valid in-force bulletin dataset must be synchronized with valid NW datasets issued **at any time**.	Requires more discussion
	DE	11.2.2		ed	It should be considered whether the technical service description should be part of the Product Specification. Usually the data provision is not provided.		Requires more discussion
	DE	11.2.2		ed	See comment above. If technical service description should stay in this document, please consider the below. The producer technical service should deliver on request from client systems information about production process of a series for quality management purposes. Is this working by step-tracking or four-eye-principle?		Requires more discussion
	FR		11.2.2	te	Currently NW are broadcast separately in English via international SafetyNET and international NAVTEX,		Requires more discussion

1 **CO** = Contributing Organisation (HOs should use 2 character codes e.g. FR AU etc.)
2 **Type of comment:** **ge** = general   **te** = technical   **ed** = editorial
3   Whilst not compulsory, comments are more likely to be accepted if accompanied by a proposed change.
NOTE   Columns 1, 2, 4, 5 are compulsory.

S-124 Draft 20190711 comments and editorial observations (Please send all comments to Eivind Mong (eivind.mong[at]dfo-mpo.gc.ca)

| Date: 12th August 2019 | Document: **Various Proposals** |

1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)	
Component	CO[1]	Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex (e.g. 3.1)	Paragraph/ Figure/Table/ Note (e.g. Table 1)	Type of com-ment[2]	Comment (justification for change) by the CO[3]	Proposed change by the CO	Secretariat observations on each comment submitted
					and in national language via national safetyNET and national NAVTEX. Considering that broadcasts generally need limited among of data, this might imply that datasets will not be multilingual but will be replicated in both languages for separated broadcasts. This point should be examined.		
	FR		11.6	te	The problem with exchange sets is that exchange sets imply repetition of meta data, in particular dataset discovery metadata (cf 14.2.1) will be repeated with the same data for each dataset. As a result there is a risk that the size of this dataset metadata will be larger than the dataset itself in a lot of cases. Radio-broadcast at sea implies optimization of data volume. A lot of meta data inherits from the series (parent meta data) which could be described as a service. ME33 comment in 14.2 (S-124 as a service) should be investigated.		I think we found a solution to this issue with the new architecture developed at the workshop. It means retaining the exchange set option, but also requires the online service development. PS needs to be updated to reflect this development.
	DE	11.7		te	Dataset size of e.g. 50KB. Do we have any definitions on that in relevant IMO papers? Although we did an intensive cross check, we were not able to find any information.		The limit is taken 'out of the air' and is not based on anything. It was marked as best guess for a while, but with no objections it became the limit we go with now.
	FR		11.7	te	Limitations will come from radio-broadcast requirements, and thus, from radio-com systems at sea, in particular those used by the GMDSS for broadcasts.		I think this comment is somewhat overtaken by events (new architecture).

1   **CO** = Contributing Organisation (HOs should use 2 character codes e.g. FR AU etc.)
2   **Type of comment: ge** = general   **te** = technical   **ed** = editorial
3   Whilst not compulsory, comments are more likely to be accepted if accompanied by a proposed change.
NOTE   Columns 1, 2, 4, 5 are compulsory.

Date: 12th August 2019	Document: **Various Proposals**

1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)	
Component	**CO[1]**	**Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex** (e.g. 3.1)	**Paragraph/ Figure/Table/ Note** (e.g. Table 1)	**Type of com-ment[2]**	**Comment (justification for change) by the CO[3]**	**Proposed change by the CO**	**Secretariat observations** on each comment submitted
	DE	12.2		ge	As this version of the Product Specification contains the Appendix E the comment can be deleted.		agree
	DE	13		ed	One letter is missing	Appendix F contains the portray**a**l catalogue using the XSLT concept from S-100.	agree
	DE	13		ge	Once cancelled the dataset must not be displayed on the navigation system. From this point of time the information becomes superfluous and worthless.	Delete the part of the sentence "when it is used in route monitoring mode".	agree
	DE	14.2 and 14.2.1		ed	Font size is different	Change the font size from 12 pt to 11 pt	agree
	DE	14.2.1	Table 14.1	ge	For the purpose of providing information on different systems the dataset metadata copyright is not needed.	Delete the row copyright	agree
	NZ	14.2.1		ge	*[response to comment on copyright]* I can't envisage a situation where NAVAREA/National Coordinators could copyright a navigational warning. The subject/text is not originated by the NAVAREA Coordinator; rather it is reproduced in the warning typically from information provided by those whose operations are causing the hazard (tow/rig companies, etc).		This seems to be the consensus regarding copyright of NW.
	FR		14.4 / First sentence	ge	S124 product specification should specify only NWs and their delivery by their producers which are government authorized institutions. The delivery of NAVAREA, sub-area and coastal warnings from the producer to the ship should be defined by WWNWS-SC in the framework of the GMDSS. Composite exchange sets issued and sold by third party vendors should not be in the perimeter of S-124.	Remove all the text in 14.4 before 14.4.1	Requires more discussion. Consider a SAT provider collecting all NW issued in area of coverage and transmit that to ship in their special data saving protocol. At the receiving terminal

1   **CO** = Contributing Organisation (HOs should use 2 character codes e.g. FR AU etc.)
2   **Type of comment:**   **ge** = general   **te** = technical   **ed** = editorial
3   Whilst not compulsory, comments are more likely to be accepted if accompanied by a proposed change.
NOTE   Columns 1, 2, 4, 5 are compulsory.

Date: 12th August 2019	Document: **Various Proposals**

1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)	
Component	CO[1]	Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex (e.g. 3.1)	Paragraph/ Figure/Table/ Note (e.g. Table 1)	Type of com-ment[2]	Comment (justification for change) by the CO[3]	Proposed change by the CO	Secretariat observations on each comment submitted
							==all datasets regardless of producer is combined into a large exchange set and sent to ECDIS.==
	DE	14.4.1		ed	Error! Reference source not found.	Delete the bookmark or adjust the bookmark link	Seems to be resolved in my copy of the document. No action taken.
	DE	14.5		ed	Error! Reference source not found.	Delete the bookmark or adjust the bookmark link	Seems to be resolved in my copy of the document. No action taken.
	DE	Appendix E.	3.2 no.101	ge	The cell file size has to be conform with 11.7 data size		Check seems to match what 11.7 says. Unclear what comment tries to address.

1   **CO** = Contributing Organisation (HOs should use 2 character codes e.g. FR AU etc.)
2   **Type of comment: ge** = general   **te** = technical   **ed** = editorial
3   Whilst not compulsory, comments are more likely to be accepted if accompanied by a proposed change.
NOTE   Columns 1, 2, 4, 5 are compulsory.