

Title: Technical corrections to Edition 5.0 Parts 10b and 17**S-100 Maintenance - Change Proposal Form**

Organisation	Portolan Sciences LLC	Date	31-Oct-2022
Contact	Raphael Malyankar	Email	raphaelm@portolansciences.com

Change Proposal Type (Select only one option)

1. Clarification	2. Correction	3. Extension
X		

Location (Identify all change proposal locations)

No.	S-100 Version No.	Part No.	Section No.	Proposal Summary
1	5.0	10b	8.4.1	<p>The examples below Figure 10b-3 do not match the figure. The role name for the <i>PermissionType</i> association should be <i>permission</i>, not <i>theApplicableRxN</i> and the target should be an <i>Applicability</i> instance.</p> <p>Replace <i>theApplicableRxN</i> by <i>permission</i> (lines 3 and 7 in the red/blue example and line 7 in the other example on the same page of Part 10b).</p> <p>Replace the last element (S127:Restrictions ...) with:</p> <pre><S127:Applicability gml:id="R1"> <categoryOfCargo code="7">dangerous or hazardous</categoryOfCargo> </ S127:Applicability></pre>
2	5.0	10b	8.4.1	<p>Noting (a) the discrepancy between the coding in the examples and elsewhere (i.e., omission of a numeric code), and (b) questioning whether a <i>gml:id</i> attribute is needed for the association class, and (c) that taking these examples literally may result in duplicate encoding of information:-</p> <p>The examples in Clause 10b-8.4.1 should be designated "informative" pending a resolution of the above issues.</p> <p>Add the following sentence at the end of clause "10b-8.4.1 Association Classes":</p> <p>The examples above are informative, not mandatory.</p>
3	5.0	17	4.5	<p><i>productIdentifier</i> is misspelled in table S100_ProductSpecification. The schemas and UML spell it correctly so no change is needed to them.</p> <p>Correct spelling from <i>productIdentifier</i> to <i>productIdentifier</i>.</p>

Change Proposal

This proposal corrects certain discrepancies in S-100 Edition 5.0.

Addressing the matter of how association classes should be encoded in the GML format is left for more action at a future date because there are different alternatives and the best solution is undetermined at this point of time, but it should be addressed before the next revision of S-100 is finalized.

Change Proposal Justification

Discrepancies have been found in S-100 Edition 5.0 and technical corrections are needed. The proposed corrections are non-substantive changes to S-100 Edition 5.0.

What parts of the S-100 Infrastructure will this proposal affect?

- S-100 Feature Concept Dictionary Interface or Database
- S-100 Portrayal Register
- S-100 Feature Catalogue Builder
- S-100 Portrayal Catalogue Builder
- S-100 UML Models
- S-100 GitHub Schemas

Please send completed forms and supporting documentation to the secretary S-100WG.