

S-102PT GitHub Repository Consideration

16 September 2022

Lawrence Haynes Haselmaier, Jr.

Chair

Purpose

This document is meant to showcase existing and proposed GitHub IHO repositories (repos) to facilitate a most informed decision regarding the best style of repo for our PT.

Considerations

While I am eager to help foster this discussion, GitHub is well outside the areas of my expertise. With that fact in mind, please take my summaries and commentary with an appropriately skeptical view. What's more, I encourage you to challenge my assumptions and correct me where I will have erred. It is only with your constructive criticism that we will reach our most mature and beneficial decision.

Method

The member state representatives and expert contributors are asked to:

1. Review the repos linked below, making note of desirable or unwanted characteristics
2. Answer the questions listed below
3. Email your responses and other relevant information to lawrence.h.haselmaier.civ@us.navy.mil by 30 September 2022.

Repos

Note: Repos that were empty or only containing one file were omitted from this listing.

Name:

Organisation:

Number	Name	Notes	URI
1	BSH Proposal	S-102PT9 2.1 GutHub.pdf	https://github.com/RohdeBSH/S-102
2	S-100WG	External server for schemas Comments form available Schemas not provided individually in this repo	https://github.com/IHO-S100WG
3	S-101_Portrayal-Catalogue	Readme: Changelog linked to issues Most activity in main branch	https://github.com/iho-ohi/S-101_Portrayal-Catalogue
4	S130PT	Two folders; Working doc for PS, Application schema info	https://github.com/iho-ohi/S130PT
5	S-101-Test-Datasets	Development folder (with cells and docs) Initial Data folder	https://github.com/iho-ohi/S-101-Test-Datasets
6	S-100UML	Files uploaded directly to main folder minimal info	https://github.com/iho-ohi/S-100UML
7	NCWG_Baseline-Symbol	Clearinghouse for notes, presentations, and project plans	https://github.com/iho-ohi/NCWG_Baseline-Symbol
8	S-57-to-S-101-conversion-sub-WG	Meeting reports, other info in folders Minimal info in readme	https://github.com/iho-ohi/S-57-to-S-101-conversion-sub-WG
9	S-101-Documentation-and-FC	Files uploaded directly to main folder minimal info	https://github.com/iho-ohi/S-101-Documentation-and-FC
10	S-101-Documentation-and-FC_Old	Used to store docs, create issues Folders per each subgroup	https://github.com/iho-ohi/S-101-Documentation-and-FC_Old
11	S-101-Portrayal-SubWG	Files uploaded directly to main folder minimal info	https://github.com/iho-ohi/S-101-Portrayal-SubWG

Questions

1. Are any of the repos good candidates for us to emulate? If so, what features or aspects make that repo such a fitting candidate?

2. Several repos make use of issue tracking via a changelog or similar means (e.g., #3, #10). Should our repo be built for issue tracking? Why or why not?

Yes

No

3. Should our repo include meeting information, working documents, final documents, and other content of a planning nature?

Yes

No

4. Should our repo include query-type documents? (For example, this document requesting responses from the team would fit into this category.)

Yes

No

5. Should our repo include the Feature Catalogue, Portrayal Catalogue (in future), and other product-type content?

Yes

No

6. Does BSH's proposal (#1) meet our needs as it has already been described?

Yes

No

7. If no to Question 6, what changes are needed to garner your endorsement?

8. Please include any other questions, comments, or relevant information that might be helpful to our decision process. Thank you!