**DQWG subWG on CATZOC**

**VTC meeting 21 September 2021**

**FINAL MINUTES**

**Participants:**

|  |
| --- |
| Edward Hands (NO) |
| Anderson Peçanha (BR) |
| Antonio Di Lieto (CSMART) |
| Thijs Ligteringen (NL)  Arnon Meurink (NL) |
| Yves GUILLAM (IHO Secretariat) |
| Christos Kastrisios (University of New Hampshire) |
| Nicolas David (FR) |
| Friedhelm Moggert-Kägeler (7c’s) |
| Nigel Robinson (DK) |
| Andrew Talbot (UK) |
| Samantha Lerigo (UK) |
| Sean Legeer (US NOAA) |

**DISCUSSIONS**

The DQWG Chair began with a review of the actions from the last subWG meeting. Members considered the topic of the update rate of S-101 versus S-102 and associated CATZOC values. *Moggert-Kägeler* (7Cs) commented that the update frequency of S-102 is probably much faster than that of S-101. The previous assumption was that the data would come from exactly the same source and noted that this would not really be the case if the S-102 had a much higher update frequency. The suggestion was made that the group could come to a common understanding of the situation and formulate a recommendation. Eventually both S-101 and S-102 will be used and there will be a degree of interoperability between the two. The issue of priorities in the interoperability rules between products was queried and the issue of whether there should be a recommendation that S-102 takes priority over the S-101 in situations where both exist based on the fact that the S-102 will be based on newer survey data than the S-101. *Legeer*(US NOAA) noted the existence of legal issues particularly related to situations where an S-102 data set is released that has a value of a sounding that is different from the S-101 in the same position although no clear guidance exists for this eventuality at this time. It was also noted that it is very likely that they will be producing S-102 data sets in the near future well in advance of any S-101 datasets. The concept of having S-102 datasets in circulation as independent data sets, perhaps having access to S-57 data sets may prevent us from having to make this decision for a while but any guidance from the group and IHO endorsed examples of best practice would strongly welcomed. *Talbot* (UK) noted that the data you might put into an S-102 might not be quite the same as what you put in an S-101. In addition the distinction between how data quality will be displayed in different products (CATZOC, QoBD, and uncertainty) and how this could complicate the situation and cause confusion was highlighted. It was agreed that although an important issue it was perhaps not directly relevant to the drafting of the guidance document this subWG has been tasked with and instead should remain an issue for further discussion possibly for the wider DQWG.

*Legeer* provided a recap of ongoing discussion regarding the role that chart scale has with regards the current CATZOC symbolization. When cartographers create M\_QUAL polygons and do not give adequate regard for the compilation scale of the chart the results are areas that do not display correctly. Particularly smaller CATZOC areas might disappear with CATZOC appearing to downgrade to the lower values of larger surrounding areas. The potential for such effects should be taken into account by HO’s when creating CATZOC polygons and attempting to assure they are of a suitable size*. Di Lieto* (CSMART) commented that as a user he was most interested in the other direction of this relationship, how compilation scales are assigned based on CATZOC as a starting point. The need to consider the existence of CATZOC when determining compilation scales to optimise the effectiveness of products. The issue of compilation scale is tied into a consideration of a minimum size for CATZOC polygons and it was agreed that although these issues should remain as items of interest for group it does not directly relate to the drafting of the guidance document and does not have to be resolved now.

The relation between S-44 and S-101 was discussed. *Kastrisios* (UNH) provided a presentation of a developing work with Gaumet (SHOM) to create matrices to automatically convert S-44 values to CATZOC/QoDB values. The goal is to combine all the different parameters to calculate a final value. *Talbot* enquired if the conversion matrix could be shared with the group. *Kastrisios* confirmed that the work could be shared with the group and welcomed feedback and input from other members regarding possible improvements. It wasagreed to make the work available to all members following the meeting.

*Guillam* (IHO Secr.) took the opportunity to emphasize that the main objective of this subgroup is to provide guidance to the hydrographic offices to populate CATZOC values from survey data and recommended a pragmatic approach focusing on this main task to ensure that this target is met.

*Hands* (Chair) noted his agreement with the need for a pragmatic approach and suggested that the group begin work to produce a first draft of the guidance document which could them from the basis for further discussion and refinement and support for this approach was received. *Kastrisios* reminded the group of the Survey to ZOC document compiled prior to the previous meeting of the group and it was suggested that this could form a good basis for further work. An updated version of this document has been prepared and it was agreed that this would be shared with all members. *Hands* agreed to investigate the best method of organise the collaborative drafting of the shared document and share details with the members so that work could begin.

**ANNEX B – List of Decision and Actions**

| Action item | Actions (in bold, action by) | Target Date/Event | Status (21 September 2021) | Comments |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1/1 | Update rate of S-101 versus S-102 and associated CATZOC values. | DQWG17 | Open | Issue not directly related to initial drafting of guidance document – to remain item of interest for the group |
| 1/2 | Inclusion of compilation scale. | DQWG17 | Open | Issue not directly related to initial drafting of guidance document – to remain item of interest for the group |
| 1/3 | Minimum size of a CATZOC polygon. | DQWG17 | Open | Issue not directly related to initial drafting of guidance document – to remain item of interest for the group |
| 1/4 | Order 1a, Special Order and Exclusive order all translate into CATZOC A1. | DQWG17 | Open | Conversion matrices – will assist in the mapping of different survey orders to CATZOC values |
| 1/5 | Impact analysis on changing CATZOC parameters into a direct alignment with S-44 parameters (what to do with existing CATZOC values). | DQWG17 | Open |  |
| 1/6 | DQWG to report on the progress of task HSSC13/50. Liaise with other WGs/PTs as considered appropriate. | HSSC14 | Open |  |
| 2/1 | Survey-to-ZOC document and matrices to be shared with the group | 1 October 2021 | Open |  |
| 2/2 | Chair to Investigate the best method of organize the collaborative drafting of the shared document and share details with group | 1 October 2021 | Open |  |
| 3/2 | Create a first draft of the guidance document – to enable further discussion and editing | Dec 2021 |  |  |