On Oct 25, 2023 at 8:45 AM Darren Wright - NOAA Federal <darren.wright@noaa.gov> wrote:

Good morning Mark,

Were you able to utilize the attribute table for the files sent? How is development coming?

Darren

On Oct 26, 2023, at 8:11 AM, Mark Hayden <mark@seaiq.com> wrote:

Hi Darren,

Thanks for the note. We'll try to add the attribute information for our next release. The other changes to support the new S-102 files (including switching between them) have been in our software since shortly after you sent the files. I've confirmed the NY Hudson dataset works with SEAiq. I've not done the Savannah since those require a little more work renaming all the files.

best, Mark

On Oct 26, 2023 at 9:21 AM Mark Hayden Wrote:

Hi Darren,

Actually, I went through some of the files and could not find the Root Quality Survey attributes. Are you sure they are there?

—Mark

On Oct 26, 2023 at 11:18 AM Darren Write wrote:

Barry,

Can you assist Mark?

Darren

On Oct 26, 2023 at 12:02 PM, Barry Gallagher wrote:

Hi Mark,

Attached is one of the sample files and below is a picture using HDFView, if you are not seeing the QualityOfSurvey information under Group_F or the root, then either I have a bad file posted or you are looking at the 2.1 files. Let me know which file(s) you were looking at that may be broken or if you disagree with my interpretation of the spec and you think I have things in the wrong place or missing.

<image.png>

Cheers,

Barry Gallagher

On Oct 27, 2023 at 9:15 AM Mark Hayden wrote:

Hi Barry,

Thanks for the detailed information. We've added the ability to see the list of surveys.

best, Mark

On Oct 27, 2023 at 9:22 AM, Barry Gallagher wrote:

Hi Mark,

Glad it helped. I wanted to make sure you understood the purpose of the quality of survey, the list of surveys relates to the additional grid so you can change the depths used for sounding selection, for example to exclude interpolated data, or to overlay the survey areas to tell where the newer data is. You may have already done this or understood it from the spec, but I figured I'd say something since the spec document itself is not the easiest read (unless you need a cure for insomnia).

Cheers,

Barry Gallagher

On Oct 27, 2023 at 9:38 AM Mark Hayden wrote:

Hi Barry,

Thanks for the note.

I think I understand the purpose. I had considered we might provide the ability to show an overlay of the location for the surveys. Or to allow the user to see which survey using a graphical "probe".

Regarding excluding interpolated soundings. I had thought the surveys IDs would cover contiguous areas and not "checkerboard" the grid. Is this correct? Unfortunately, HDFView gives an error when I try to view the grid, and I've not yet added ability to access the quality grid in our software. Is it possible that an given area might have grid points from muliple surveys mixed in? How would we know that there are enough non-interpolated soundings so that excluding interpolated soundings still provided enough detail?

Do you have other use cases for how the new survey data might be used in our product?

best, Mark

On Oct 27, 2023 at 2:17 PM Barry Gallagher wrote:

Below are two images of the survey coverage. If you plot the QualityOfSurvey by source survey you get the stuff below. Some things are interleaved due to the equipment or style used. There are also single points for where existing chart data or old chart data was used (see the dots in the second image). One of the colors should relate to the interpolated data (not real measurements but estimates) but I stole this picture during a meeting. You can download the data in TIFF files from BlueTopo and look at the layer in QGIS for this. You could also color by survey dates or "quality" as well.

<image.png>

<image.png>

Barry Gallagher

On Oct 28, 2023 at 9:17 AM Mark Hayden wrote:

Hi Barry,

Thanks for the information. Do you know if there is there any presentation standard/suggestions around coloring for dates/quality? Eg, algorithm for mapping from FAT entries to color.

best, Mark

On Nov 1, 2023 at 9:14 AM Darren Write wrote:

Does S-98 have any standards on coloring? See Mark's question below.

On Nov 1, 2023 at 8:35 AM Julia Powell wrote:

Hi JP and Lawrence –

Does S-98 have any guidance for the issue below. We have a PPU that is looking at implementing S-102 and I'm not sure if this is part of S-102 portrayal or an interoperability portrayal issue.

Julia

On Nov 2, 2023 at 3:01 AM Lawrence Haselmaier wrote:

Hi Julia!

BLUF: I think it's going to be an issue of S-102 Portrayal.

Discussion:

1.   If I understand the question correctly, I believe the answer can be found in S-98 (Main text, Ed. 1.0.0), Clause 10.7.1, Para 3 (in relevant part):

"Means of distinguishing data quality portrayals for individual products is left to the Product Specification authors (in particular, Portrayal Catalogue authors) and OEMs, and can be handled by distinguishing portrayal rules or symbology for different products' data quality meta-features, such as colour coding or special line symbol."

2.   S-98 (Main text, Ed. 1.0.0), Clause 10.3:

This clause references S-4, B-141 to B-145 and emphasizes the fact that special consideration must be given when creating portrayal rules regarding colour choices. Those S-4 Clauses, however, don't prescribe anything pertaining to data quality.

3.   S-98 (Parts A to D) do not appear to prescribe a colour scheme regarding data quality.

4.   That leads me to the conclusion that it must be intended to be handled at the PS portrayal level.

@JP, for my own edification, I'd very much like to hear your take on the question.

I hope this response is helpful—please feel free to let me know if I can clarify anything or provide further info to assist.

Cheers!

Best regards,

Lawrence Haynes Haselmaier, Jr.

On Nov 5, 2023 at 7:27 PM Jonathan Pritchard wrote:

As far as the WCDIS portrayal goes it's up to S102 to come up with portrayal for its product specification, including data quality. Anything relating to it interacting with the S101 would be dealt with by the interoperability catalogue (and there's no working group with that formally assigned right now). As 102 replaces the 101 depth areas the user would see just the portrayal of the 102 and believe although true interoperability systems are very thin on the ground right now so it's hard to actually get a user view jn this…

Portrayal of data quality is a hot topic though as it's now an IMO requirement to take into account quality when evaluating dangers and alerts. I believe IEC were of the opinion this only relates to S101 though, mainly for simplicity, so I'm not sure there's a bigger S98 impact here.

It's certainly one to go through next week - I'd welcome an explanation and more of the background. I hope this helps.

Thanks

Jonathan.

On Nov 6, 2023 at 8:54 PM, Julia Powell wrote:

Thanks JP. Something to talk about next week and for Lawrence to consider as part of his PT meeting.

Julia