**S-102 Revision to Ed. 2.1.0**

**Impact Study Questionnaire**

(to be returned to the IHO xxx by xx xx 2021)

*Upgrading the S-102 Product Specification (PS) by shifting its focus toward* ***navigational purposes*** *implies that the upcoming edition 2.1.0 will be adjusted to be mainly for navigational usage. What’s more, this adjustment will also similarly affect upcoming edition 3.0.0, which will be an operational S-102 edition intended for navigational usage. However, the proposed revisions do not preclude the use of S-102 for non-navigational purposes (e.g., data exchange).*

*Interoperability with other PS in future S-100 ECDIS will be handled within the Interoperability PS S-98. The original intent to use S-102 as a standard format for bathymetry data transfer among stakeholders will be addressed and optimized after the development of edition 3.0.0.*

**Part 1: Personal Information**

|  |
| --- |
| 1. What is the name and address of your organization?
2. Is there a technical POC that could answer follow-up questions if necessary?
3. What is the type of your organization?

[ ] IHO Member State, [ ] International Organization, [ ] Software developer, [ ] Equipment manufacturer, [ ] RENC, [ ]Product/Data producer, [ ] others \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ |

**Part 2: Questions pertaining to S-102 revision Ed.2.1.0 for navigational usage only**

|  |
| --- |
| 1. Have you implemented S-102 Ed 1.0.0 or Ed 2.0.0?

[ ] Yes, [ ] No1. If ‘yes’ to (1), which version of S-102 have you implemented?

[ ] S-102 Ed 1.0.0, [ ] S-102 Ed 2.0.01. If ‘yes’ to (1), would you implement an upgrade to S-102 Ed 2.1.0?

[ ] Yes, [ ] No1. If ‘no’ to (3), please explain your concerns.
2. If ‘yes’ to (1), what difficulties have you encountered in the implementation of S-102?
3. If ‘no’ to (1), would you implement any high-density bathymetric products (e.g., HD ENC for S-101)? Or have you already implemented any such high-density bathymetric products?
4. Would you approve of an upgrade to S-102 Ed 2.1.0?

[ ] Yes, [ ] No, [ ] comment\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_1. For which use cases and which user groups have you implemented (or would you implement) S-102 Ed 1.0.0 or Ed 2.0.0?

 1. For which sea areas is the use of S-102 planned or useful?

 [ ] Generally, [ ] Fairway areas, [ ] Specific Depth ranges, [ ] Specific scale ranges, [ ] others:\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_1. Do you use a regular tiling scheme to define boundaries of any product within the navigation scope?
2. Does your workflow (or notional workflow) require the capability to map multiple surveys and associated metadata to one product file? (e.g., multiple vessels from different times in one geographical area)
3. In your opinion, is additional information required within the navigation scope?
4. If ‘yes’ to (12), which would they be?
 |
|  |