

S-58 SUB-GROUP MEETING – 03 FEBRUARY 2021

Attendees: Richard, Tony, Christian, Friedhelm, Herman, Inga, Odd, Frank, Svein, Mikko, Su, Hugh, Liz, Alvaro, Jeff.

Issue	Check No.	Action	Comments	Status
1	19	Check solution amended	Alvaro (AHO) to propose new check for area features with boundary portrayal Approved. Close issue.	Open
2	44	Dependant on changes to UOC	Frank (NauticalDimensions) to submit paper for ENCWG to change UOC Issue to remain open. Ongoing.	Open
3	54a, b & c + check 1775	Approved	MORFAC (CATMOR 1, 2,& 5) added to checks 54a,, b & c and 54b downgraded to 'W' - DAYMAR excluded from check 1775 Approved, however revised text to be expanded out to include attribute values. Close issue. Post-meeting note: Amendments made for approval.	Open
4	61b	Check wording & message amended	Approved. Close issue.	Open
5	94	Review proposed new wording	Agreed to amend as per Frank wording in the GitHub. Navico agreed to this change in response to question on their comment in the GitHub. Close issue.	Open
6	502	No change	Leave Check 502 as is it for now. Further input (perhaps a stakeholder survey of the OEMs) required from the ENCWG. Richard to submit paper to ENCWG. Close issue.	Open
7	505	Rejected	It was agreed that the amendment required for Check 505 is already covered by Check 1726 Close issue.	Open
8	507, 508a, b & c	Partially Approved	No change to check 507, check 508a amended to avoid the need for proposed check 508c NLHO (Tony) still had some concern with Check 507. Approved. Close issue.	Open

9	519	Approved	check message and solution amended Approved. Close issue.	Open
10	548a	Approved	New critical check 548a added Approved. Close issue.	Open
11	551a	Approved	Existing check 551a upgraded to critical Approved. Close issue.	Open
12	555	Approved	Existing check split into 555a and 555b Approved. Close issue.	Open
13	1512a	Approved during meeting	Post meeting comments propose further needs further discussion Proposed new Check 1512c as proposed by Frank approved. Amendment to 1512a proposed to amend "is not DISJOINT" to "INTERSECTS". Changes made and approved during meeting. Close issue.	Open
14	1637	No action required	proposed change included in edition 6.1.0 Close issue.	Open
15	1657, 1663, 1669	General agreement	Frank (NauticalDimensions) revised proposal for discussion Issue to remain open. Sub-Group to comment on the amended proposal from Frank as included in the GitHub.	Open
16	1670	Approved	feature objects specified Agreed to add MARCUL. Approved. Close issue.	Open
17	1687	Rejected	Close issue.	Open
18	1722a	Rejected	Check solution updated Approved. Close issue.	Open
19	1768	Approved	Check split into 2, a) for DEPARE, b) for DRGARE Approved. Close issue.	Open
20	1772b	Approved	Editorial correction Approved. Close issue.	Open

21	1795c, d, e & f	Approved	1795a & b amended & new checks 1795c, 1795d, 1795e and 1795f added Approved. Close issue.	Open
22	2000 STATUS	Rejected	Review allowable values of STATUS for buoys & beacons - DK to raise DK to submit paper to ENCWG. Close issue.	Open
22	2000 VERDAT	Approved	Values of VERDAT to be constrained in line with S101 Approved. Close issue.	Open
23	1504b	Approved	existing check 1504 renamed 1504a and new check 1504b added. As the new check excludes Null as a valid value, the original check 1504 is redundant and therefore proposed just replacing with new wording. Post-SubGroup 1 meeting amendment as proposed by IHO Sec approved. Minor amendment made to Check solution during meeting. Approved. Close issue.	Open
23	1510b	Approved	existing check 1510 renamed 1510a and new check 1510b added. As the new check excludes Null as a valid value, the original check 1510 is redundant and therefore proposed just replacing with new wording. Post-SubGroup 1 meeting amendment as proposed by IHO Sec approved. Minor amendment made to Check solution during meeting. Approved. Close issue.	Open
24	1810	Approved	New check for missing centre point for omnidirectional 10+NM lights Amendments made to Check description to standardise wording during meeting. Approved. Close issue.	Open

25	1809a & 1809b	Approved	New checks for illogical intertidal areas - 1809b solution should allow for correct datums and therefore may require data re-compilation Post-SubGroup 1 meeting amendment as proposed by IHO Sec approved. Approved. Close issue.	Open
26	New check	Rejected	Existing check 1507 already covers the proposed new check Close issue.	Open
27	1024c	General Agreement	Requires further work on the wording Issue to remain open.	Open
28	New Check 72b	Approved	Existing check 72 renumbered 72a and new check 72b created Approved. Close issue.	Open
29	New check 1024?	Rejected	Close issue.	Open
30	1778	Approved	Downgrade check 1778 to 'W' Approved. Close issue.	Open
31	507	Not discussed	No proposal just a comment from Alvaro & Christian Close issue.	Open
32	2000	Not Discussed	Add RESTRN = 7 as allowable attribute value for MARCUL Issue to remain open.	Open

Those issues highlighted in yellow can be closed after the changes have been agreed at next weeks meeting

Check 19 (GitHub #1):

- Proposal to upgrade from 'Warning' to 'Error'

No	Check description	Check message	Check solution	Conformity to:	Cat
19	For each edge which is COINCIDENT with the data limit borders (i.e. limits of M_COVR with CATCOV is Equal to 1 (coverage available))	Edge coincides with the data limit and USAG does not equal 3 (exterior boundary truncated by the data limit).	Amend edge to USAG = 3 (exterior boundary truncated by the data limit).	Part 3 (4.7.3.3)	W E

	where USAG is Not equal to 3 (exterior boundary truncated by the data limit).				
--	---	--	--	--	--

Decisions:

- Leave as a Warning. Amend Check solution as per Christian's suggestion (GitHub).
- Alvaro to propose new Check to cover area features with boundary portrayal.

GitHub issue #1 to be closed. Amendment to Check solution approved and agreed to leave as Warning. Alvaro to propose any new Check as a new GitHub issue.

Check 94 (GitHub #5):

- Proposed clarification and downgrade to 'warning'.

No	Check description	Check message	Check solution	Conformity to:	Cat
94	For each ER file feature object record that which contains instructions for the FSPC field to modify an FSPT field whose field values are all equal to the field values of the original FSPT field. of a feature object to a value it already contains.	ER file contains instructions to modify an FSPT field to a value it already contains. Feature object update record contains a redundant FSPT field.	Remove irrelevant FSPC field from ER file.	Logical consistency	E W

Decisions:

- Leave this issue open in GitHub to allow Sub-Group members to review and comment on the revised wording by Frank.

Agreed to amend as per Frank wording in the GitHub. Navico agreed to this change in response to question on their comment in the GitHub. Close issue.

Check 1512a (GitHub #13):

- Proposal to revise the check wording.

No	Check description	Check message	Check solution	Conformity to:	Cat
1512a	For each SOUNDG feature object which CROSSES OR TOUCHES a M_SDAT meta object	SOUNDG object intersects boundary of a M_SDAT object.	Split SOUNDG object at boundary of M_SDAT object.	2.1.3	E

Proposed alternate wording:

No	Check description	Check message	Check solution	Conformity to:	Cat
1512a	For each SOUNDG feature object which does not lie WITHIN an M_SDAT feature object AND is not DISJOINT from an M_SDAT feature object.	SOUNDG object intersects boundary of a M_SDAT object.	Split SOUNDG object at boundary of M_SDAT object.	2.1.3	E

Decisions:

- Change accepted as suggested by Frank.

Post-Meeting comment from Frank (taken from the GitHub):

I think that SOUNDG should not be treated a discrete list of points, since the attributes and metadata apply to the whole set of points.

Looking more closely at the OGC/ISO 19125 definitions of MultiPoint and the WITHIN operator, Hugh's concern is correct. Therefore, the proposal needs to consider the case where one or more sounding points touch the M_SDAT. Rather than having one check that deals with all scenarios, I believe that the following two should suffice.

For each SOUNDG feature object which does not lie WITHIN an M_SDAT feature object AND is not DISJOINT from an M_SDAT feature object.

and

For each point of a SOUNDG feature object that TOUCHES an M_SDAT feature object.

Proposed new Check 1512c as proposed by Frank approved. Amendment to 1512a proposed to amend "is not DISJOINT" to "INTERSECTS". Changes made and approved during meeting. Close issue.

Checks 1657, 1663, 1669 (GitHub #15):

- Proposal to improve consistency of table contents.

Inconsistent use of terminology:

Checks 1663 uses the term 'Undefined'. 'Not Present' should be used instead.

Checks 1663 and 1669 use the term 'Any value'. S-58 doesn't provide a definition for 'Any value' and it is used inconsistently. Based on the UOC 6.1.2 and 6.2.2, Any value for TECSOU and SOUACC implies that they may be encoded at the discretion of the encoder.

"A blank indicates that the encoder may choose a relevant value for the attribute."

In other uses of 'Any value', e.g. WRECKS with VALSOU not Present, Any value for CATWRK implies Present, since CATWRK is mandatory when VALSOU is not Present.

Propose that 'Any value' be replaced with a blank cell or 'Present', as appropriate.

Proposal to amend to section 1.4.3:

1.4.3 Values

The following terms are used for types of values:

- Present – An attribute ~~is present and~~ has been populated either with a value or null (255).
- notPresent – An attribute has not populated, neither with a value nor with a null (255).
- Null – An attribute ~~is present and~~ has been populated with a value of null (255).
- notNull – The attribute is present and has been populated with a value.
- Any value - The attribute can be Present (populated) or notPresent (not populated).
- Unknown – Present and Null

Alternative definitions:-

- Null – an empty value for S-57 attributes or 255 for ISO 8211 integer subfields
- notNull – Present and not Null

Decisions:

- Frank to revise the original proposal based on the accumulated GitHub comments and the proposal as presented at the meeting, and post for discussion at the next meeting.

Issue to remain open. Sub-Group to comment on the amended proposal from Frank as included in the GitHub.

Check 2000 (GitHub #22):

- Proposal to address an inconsistency between the allowable values for the attributes STATUS for Buoys and Beacons and that for TOPMAR feature objects.

Attribute		Code	Allowable attribute values
STATUS		185	
	TOPMAR	144	1-2-5-7-8-12-14-18

Decisions:

- Proposal rejected.

- A review of the allowable values of STATUS for buoy and beacon objects is required. New issue to be raised by DK.

DK to submit paper to ENCWG. Close issue.

New Check (GitHub #27):

- Proposed new check to identify when M_COVR is modified by an ER file.

No	Check description	Check message	Check solution	Conformity to:	Cat
1024c	For an update cell file where the extent M_COVR where CATCOV is Equal to 1 (coverage available) is not EQUAL to the extent M_COVR where CATCOV is Equal to 1 (coverage available) on base cell to which they apply.	ER file changes the extent of data coverage.	Issue as NE	Appendix B.1 Annex A 2.6)	E

Decisions:

- Further work required. General agreement that this Check should be included in S-58 and it should be a Critical Check, however there needs to be a very clear idea of the intent of the Check to only report on a “deliberate” change of the extent of the data coverage.
- Once included, this Check to be numbered 1024c.
- Investigation of possible new test data for the S-58 Test Data Set.

Issue to remain open.