

INCITS 1574-D Information Technology - Geographic Information Framework Data Content Standards  
Part 4, Geodetic Control

Adjudication of comments received with INCITS L1 ballot closed 2006-04-07

1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)	
MB <sup>1</sup>	Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex (e.g. 3.1)	Paragraph/ Figure/Table/ Note (e.g. Table 1)	Type of comment <sup>2</sup>	Comment (justification for change) by the MB	Proposed change by the MB	Secretariat observations on each comment submitted	Editing Comments 6/21/2006 (JM/JBC)
		Line 188					Added an introductory paragraph that was consistent with the rest of the parts.
		Lines 211-214					Deleted the second paragraph because this information is discussed more correctly and in more detail in the Forward.
FS	Part 4; 7.1	Figure 2	ge	The "geodetic control" schema re-invents the association of coordinates with CRS--twice.	Increase utilization of the existing standards when modelling coordinates, as suggested by following comments.		On 6/19, Doug Nebert submitted this comment: <i>The CRS association merely defines an identifier [meaning RS_Identifier] for a projection, ellipsoid, and or datum. It does not carry the coordinate value.</i>  Accordingly, we left this as is.
FS	Part 4; 7.2.2	Table 2; line 12 Figure 2	ed	the "heightType" attribute is derived, but this is not indicated in the UML or in the table.	Explicitly say heightType is derived in the table, retaining info about the source. Indicate that heightType is derived in the figure.		Done. Changed "heightType" to "/heightType". In Definition, added statement, "This attribute is derived".
		Table 2; line 12					Changed Domain to Unrestricted per cross-cutting instructions.

INCITS 1574-D Information Technology - Geographic Information Framework Data Content Standards  
Part 4, Geodetic Control

Adjudication of comments received with INCITS L1 ballot closed 2006-04-07

1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)	(8)
<b>MB<sup>1</sup></b>	<b>Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex</b> (e.g. 3.1)	<b>Paragraph/ Figure/Table/ Note</b> (e.g. Table 1)	<b>Type of com- ment<sup>2</sup></b>	<b>Comment (justification for change) by the MB</b>	<b>Proposed change by the MB</b>	<b>Secretariat observations on each comment submitted</b>	<b>Editing Comments</b> <b>6/21/2006</b> <b>(JM/JBC)</b>
FS	Part 4; 7.2.2	Table 2; line 11, 15 Figure 2	te	The combination of "height" as a Measure and "verticalReferenceSystem" as an MD_CRS ignores the established mechanism for expressing heights. MD_CRS is the wrong choice, as SC_CRS (or a subclass thereof) represents the combination of a datum and units.	"height" should be a DirectPosition, and "verticalReferenceSystem" should be a VerticalCRS. The crs associated with "height" is constrained to be "verticalReferenceSystem", (alternatively, verticalReferenceSystem should be derived from the CRS associated with "height".)		Replaced Figure 2 with the one Doug Nebert sent on 6/16.  Row 11, changed Data Type to <<Type>> DirectPosition  Row 11, changed Domain to "Defined in ISO 19107".  Row 15, changed Data Type to VerticalCRS.  Row 15, changed Domain to "Defined in ISO 19115".

INCITS 1574-D Information Technology - Geographic Information Framework Data Content Standards  
Part 4, Geodetic Control

Adjudication of comments received with INCITS L1 ballot closed 2006-04-07

1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)	(8)
MB <sup>1</sup>	Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex (e.g. 3.1)	Paragraph/ Figure/Table/ Note (e.g. Table 1)	Type of com- ment <sup>2</sup>	Comment (justification for change) by the MB	Proposed change by the MB	Secretariat observations on each comment submitted	Editing Comments  6/21/2006  (JM/JBC)
FS	Part 4; 7.2.1		te	Multiplicity of “vertical” role name is 1..2 without any explanation. Is this constrained to the same observation, expressed as different heightTypes? Is it two different observations at the same horizontal location?	Clarify purpose and impact of multiple vertical associations, or include reference to text.		<p>On 6/16, Doug Nebert responded with this comment:</p> <p><i>The text should reflect that each geodetic location may carry one orthometric and one ellipsoidal height value.</i></p> <p>As a result of this comment, we added the following sentence to section 7.2.1, “Each geodetic location shall carry at least one height value but may carry both orthometric and ellipsoidal height values.”</p>
		Table 1, lines 2 & 7					Added Unrestricted to the Domain per Base document.

INCITS 1574-D Information Technology - Geographic Information Framework Data Content Standards  
Part 4, Geodetic Control

Adjudication of comments received with INCITS L1 ballot closed 2006-04-07

1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)	
MB <sup>1</sup>	Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex (e.g. 3.1)	Paragraph/ Figure/Table/ Note (e.g. Table 1)	Type of comment <sup>2</sup>	Comment (justification for change) by the MB	Proposed change by the MB	Secretariat observations on each comment submitted	Editing Comments 6/21/2006 (JM/JBC)
FS	Part 4; 7.2.1	Table 1; line 6	ge	This is another instance of the mixture of content and encoding-in-a-string.	Define the expected content <<DataTypes>> or give the user an extension point so that they can define their own content.		On 6/20, Jane Messenger comment: <i>To answer this request we would have to put a reference to the Framework Base part (similar to a reference to an ISO standard in the Domain column. In the Data Type column, we would have to put just &lt;&lt;DataType&gt;&gt; ExternaResource.</i>  This would require a change to the figures in the Base Document and the Gedetic Control part and I think it would have a ripple effect in other parts. I wasn't sure if that was the intention, so I left this as is , in the hopes that we would have a more specific recommendation during the ANSI review.
		Table 1; line 6					Changed "ExtendedAttributes" to "ExtendedAttribute" per cross-cutting instructions.
		Lines 474-475					I moved these lines onto the next page because it was a widowed heading.

INCITS 1574-D Information Technology - Geographic Information Framework Data Content Standards  
Part 4, Geodetic Control

Adjudication of comments received with INCITS L1 ballot closed 2006-04-07

1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)	(8)
MB <sup>1</sup>	Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex (e.g. 3.1)	Paragraph/ Figure/Table/ Note (e.g. Table 1)	Type of com- ment <sup>2</sup>	Comment (justification for change) by the MB	Proposed change by the MB	Secretariat observations on each comment submitted	Editing Comments  6/21/2006  (JM/JBC)
FS	Part 4; 7.2.1	Figure 2; Table 1 line 3 & 7	te	<p>“horizontalPosition” and “horizontalReferenceSystem” should be types DirectPosition and SC_CRS (not MD_CRS) respectively. The horizontalReferenceSystem is identical to the crs associated with horizontalPosition, so the standard must define which is derived and which is the reference. This CRS is constrained to the datum specified in 6.5.1, but this constraint is not mentioned in the data dictionary.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Change types on horizontalPosition and horizontalReferenceSystem</li> <li>2. Clarify which CRS is derived and which is the reference.</li> <li>3. State the constraint on the Datum upon which the CRS is based.</li> </ol>		<p>On 6/19, Doug Nebert responded to items 1 &amp; 2: <i>No. GM_Point represents the elements of DirectPosition (coordinate and dimension). Also, MD_CRS is correct.</i></p> <p>Therefore, we left the Data Type as is for horizontalPosition and horizontalReference System. We added “Aggregated Class” above MD_CRS per ISO 19115.</p> <p>Regarding item 3, Doug wrote: <i>I have added a property to VerticalInformation. [to Figure 2]</i></p> <p>Therefore, we added “derived” to Table 2, “Indicator if the MD_CRS is derived (true) or referenced (false)”, M, 1, Boolean, True or False.</p>
		Table 1, row 6					Moved row below “link” to put in the same order as in the figure.

INCITS 1574-D Information Technology - Geographic Information Framework Data Content Standards  
Part 4, Geodetic Control

Adjudication of comments received with INCITS L1 ballot closed 2006-04-07

1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)	
<b>MB<sup>1</sup></b>	<b>Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex</b> (e.g. 3.1)	<b>Paragraph/ Figure/Table/ Note</b> (e.g. Table 1)	<b>Type of com- ment<sup>2</sup></b>	<b>Comment (justification for change) by the MB</b>	<b>Proposed change by the MB</b>	<b>Secretariat observations on each comment submitted</b>	<b>Editing Comments 6/21/2006 (JM/JBC)</b>
		Table 3; line 17					Deleted values from Obligation/Condition and Maximum Occurrence columns per cross-cutting instructions.
		Line 498					Deleted "non-exhaustive" per instructed correction to Base Document (redundant term).
		Lines 509- 510					Changed web address and updated accessed date.
		Line 602					Revisited site and changed accessed date.