Comments submitted by Raphael Malyankar (date: 7 Nov 2023)

S100WG8-5	4.1	[Clarification for Part 9 Linestyle](#)	
S100WG8-10	4.2 4.2a	Part 8 Imagery and Gridded Redline ([.doc](#)) [Part 8 Clarifications](#)	
S100WG8-3	4.3	Correction for AugmentedRay /[Change Proposal](#)	
S100WG8-4	4.4	Part 10 (Table 10c-6) / [Change Proposal](#)	This change should be applied to in Table 10c-12 (Attributes of feature instance groups) instead (with appropriate changes). Table 10c-6 describes a different level, the <u>root</u> level. The bounding box at the root level should be the same as the bounding box in exchange catalogue discovery metadata. NB: ISO 19115-1 specifies decimal degrees for EX_GeographicBoundingBox and says no more than two decimal places need be encoded.
S100WG8-18	4.5	[S-100 Part15 Key Lengths](#)	
S100WG8-19	4.6	[Interoperability Identifier](#)	Using MRN (or just URN) instead of "text" avoids the need for extra language constraining the content. It doesn't matter if the rules for MRNs are not yet decided – every dataset referencing the original will have to use whatever the original dataset has populated it with, anyway. Recommend using the URN type.
S100WG8-20	4.7	[S-100 Part 15 HW_ID and Definitions](#)	

S100WG8-22	4.8	[Representation of DataCoverage Geometries in S-100 Part17](#)	What is the proposed amendment to Part 17? Is an amendment to S-98 necessary if Part 17 is amended?
S100WG8-24	4.9	[Catalogue and Dataset versioning](#) / [Change proposal](#)	(1) New attributes not necessary, and likely counter-productive. Other solution(s) have been discussed in GitHub discussions. (2) Apart from (1) - proposed change (adding attributes to metadata) will require revision of the S-100 UML model and S-100 schemas, and also implementations. (3) This will affect all data products and other working groups should be consulted.
S100WG8-26	4.10	[Metadata extensions clarifications in S-100 Part 4 and part 17](#) / [Change proposal](#)	Understand the reasoning behind not extending metadata in Product Specifications, but the proposed revisions look a little ad hoc.
S100WG8-27	4.11	Name change to S100_DatasetDiscoveryMetadata attribute notForNavigation ([Change proposal](#))	Apart from anything else, this will require changes to the UML model and S-100 schemas. This proposal is more "extension" than "correction".
S100WG8-28	4.12	Clarifications for S-100 Part 9 Appendix 9-B (SVG Profile) / [Change proposal](#)	(1) Does this require new S-100 SVG schemas? (2) Can this be extended to plotting time series information?
S100WG8-29	4.13	Language Attributes in Exchange Catalogues / [Change proposal](#)	

S100WG8-36	4.14	Support files concept and clarification / Change proposal	(1) Recommend postponing this to a comprehensive review of the management of support files in relation to the exchange catalogue rather than an ad hoc change based on one product. I do not think all cases for "support files" have been considered, either here or in Part 17 as it is in Edition 5.1.0. (2) Apart from (1), this proposal will require revision of the S-100 UML model and schemas. This proposal is an "extension".
S100WG8-40	4.15	WLA-compatibility – Clarification to Discovery Metadata	Prefer 8-40 for the immediate future if no other change is being made to the Part 17 model and schemas, because it does not require a change to the model or schemas; otherwise prefer the proposal in 8-41.
S100WG8-41	4.16	WLA-compatibility – Extension to Discovery Metadata	See comment for 8-40. Take 8-41 up for the next edition of S-100 if it is postponed now.
S100WG8-48	4.17	S-100 Part 10c Array Indexing, TIN Data Points / Change proposal	