S-102 PT PS draft v.2.2.0 Change Guide

Change #	Broad Location	Specific Location	Nature	Description
0	10.2	Para 1	Review	Changed "10C" to "10c" to maintain consistency with the other mentions in the document
1	1.3.2	Uncertainty	Review	Added comment about 2-sigma to apply to whole document
2	1.4	Content	Chair action	Chair needs to upload FC and provide link here
3	3	Classification	Chair action	Chair still needs to draft suggestion to S-100WG about adding an "Other" option here
4	4.3.1	Para 2	Chair action	Chair needs to upload FC and provide link elsewhere in doc
5	10.1	Specification Datatype	Review	May require mod if BSH enum position not adopted
6	T10-2	Row 10	Review	May require mod if BSH enum position not adopted
7	T10-4	Row 3	Review	May require mod if BSH enum position not adopted
8	T10-4	Row 4	PT Discussion	What is the appropriate use of these uncertainty values? Average? Max?
9	T10-4	Row 5	PT Discussion	What is the appropriate use of these uncertainty values? Average? Max?
10	T10-4	Row 7a	Review	May require mod if BSH enum position not adopted
10	T10-4	Row 8	Review	May require mod if BSH enum position not adopted
11	11.2.1	Cancellation	PT Discussion	"No guidance provided. For S-57: The Edition Number@ [EDTN] subfield must be set to 0. This message is only used to cancel a base cell file."
12	F12.1	(absent)	PT Discussion	S102_DSMetadataBlock is not shown in diagram below
13	T12-6	Row 11 (Level)	Review	Ensure PT is happy with removal of "or tile" here
14	T12-7	Row 11 (replacedD	PT Discussion	Add "Not used in S-102" as logically sits here. To note, for service management, RENCs and service providers will need to use this attribute to manage coverage changes.
15	T12-7	Row 12 (dataRepla	PT Discussion	Add "Not used in S-102" as logically sits here. To note, for service management, RENCs and service providers will need to use this attribute to manage coverage changes.
16	Annex C	(potential removal)	Chair action	Chair needs to upload FC and provide link elsewhere in doc

				Items below added by Raphael for later redline with quality attribute mods. The entries under "Nature" are tentative.
17	General	Various	PT Discussion	Since the feature attribute table is introduced in S-100 Ed. 5, and since it is needed for the quality grid, the implication is that the whole PS should be updated to align with S-100 5.0.
18	10	Various	Action (Chair, RMM)	Updated references to S-100 from Ed. 4 to Ed. 5. This will have to be done throughout the document.
19	T10.1	Group_F	Review	QualityOfSurveyCoverage dataset, analogous to featureCode dataset
20	T10.1	QualityOfSurveyCoverage and succeeding rows	Review	Additional rows for the survey quality group and its contents.
21	T10.1	QualityOfSurveyCoverage, column 2, Metadata	Review	BSH example datasets have metadata apparently the same as the BathymetryCoverage feature itself. (If this is the same as the metadata for BathymetryCoverage group why is it duplicated here? The same question applies to the instance groups.)
22	Fig. 10.2		Review	Updated with new groups and datasets for quality of survey coverage
23	T10.2	4, 5	PT Discussion	Aligned with Ed. 5. TBD whether "user defined CRS" (cf. S-100 10c) should be allowed in S-102.
24	T10.2	10 to 13	PT Discussion	Aligned with Ed. 5. PT to confirm whether S-102 should allow only a subset of the datums listed in S-100 or any vertical datum in the EPSG registry; tentatively assuming only the datums listed in S-100.
25	12.7.4		PT Discussion	This table is referenced in embedded metadata but is no longer referenced in S-100 discovery metadata. Consider removal or relocation (if relocated, add BSCD 2000 and IGLD 2020).
26	10.2.1	4th paragraph	? Action	The paragraph describing BathymetryCoverage needs clarification. featureCode only lists the names (camel-case codes). Also, this is an HDF5 dataset, not a feature. (Similarly for QofS Coverage, added as the next paragraph.)
27	10.2.2	New clause	Review	Material added describing the Quality of Survey Coverage dataset in Group_F
28	10.2.7	T10.6	PT Discussion	Have provisionally used GI registry definitions where available; that being so, I recommend using the same names as the GI registry (included in the 1st column as S-101 names). Horizontal uncertainty fixed/variable may need to be exceptions.

29	10.2.7	T10.6	PT Discussion	dataAssessed should be type enumeration, not Integer, this is an enum in the GI registry.
30	10.2.7	T10.6	PT Discussion	Review and confirm the fields in featureAttributeTable, including whether producers are allowed to add other fields than those mentioned. For example, surveyType is not listed in the August 2022 paper.
31	7	New section 7.1	PT Discussion	New section describing the quality and source metadata, taken from the S-102 PT9 paper.
32	7, 10.2.7		PT Discussion	Clarify how featureSize and featureSizeVar are to be compared.