

D2.8.I INSPIRE Annex I Data Specifications – Comments Sheets

This questionnaire shall be used to gather your comments on the consultation on the INSPIRE Annex I Data Specifications. The questionnaire reflects the questions and numbering used in the document '*Draft Structure and Content of the Implementing Rules on Interoperability of Spatial Data Sets and Services*'. The structure of this questionnaire also reflects the structure of the document: You can use the sheet navigator below to switch between the different themes.

Recitals	
Articles	
Appendix I: General Provisions	Sheet navigator Generic questions Geographical names Administrative units Addresses Cadastral parcels Transport networks Hydrography Protected sites
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Part A: Terms and definitions • Part B: Identifier Management • Part C: Life-cycle of Spatial Objects • Part D: Consistency Between Data • Part E: Encoding 	
Appendix II: Common Types	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Part A: Types defined in ISO Standards • Part B: Base Types defined in the GCM • Part C: Gazetteer Model • Part D: Generic Network Model 	
Appendix III: Coordinate Reference Systems	
Appendix IV: Geographical Grid Systems	
Appendix V: Geographical names	
Appendix VI: Administrative units	
Appendix VII: Addresses	
Appendix VIII: Cadastral parcels	
Appendix IX: Transport networks	
Appendix X: Hydrography	
Appendix XI: Protected sites	

How-To

You do not need to answer to all questions, or comment on all Appendices. Just select the question you want to answer from the list and provide your comment and proposed solution.

If for a single question you have more issues that you want to see addressed, you can describe each of these issues in a different response: simply choose the same question more than once.

1	2	3	4
Comment ID		Structural ID	Question
1	General comment	Question 1: Do you agree with the contents of the Network Model?	E
2	General comment	Question 1: Do you agree with the contents of the Network Model?	T
*			

The questionnaire is formatted as a list. To add a new row, move the cursor into an existing cell in the list. If you press on the * that occurs at the bottom of the list, you can enter a new row, just by typing. If the * does not occur (Office 2000 and earlier) you can enter a new row by using the "Insert - Rows" tool for inserting new lines for comments.

25	Comment ID	Structural ID	Question
	1	General comment	Question 1: If several data t specified above
26			
27	*		
28			

Generic Questions for Appendix I to IV

(1): All the comments should be entered in the table below. Each row should be numbered with the progressive comment number, starting with 1.
 (2): Drop-down list to select the question that you intend to answer (in column B). All questions appear when you click on the cell in this column. G
 (3): Use only short marks for the chapter, subchapter, section or clause, as they are stated in the data specification.
 While entering longer text, please, don't use additional line-breaks inside the cell, if possible.
 To add a new row, move the cursor into an existing cell in the list. If you press on the * that occurs at the bottom of the list, you can enter a new
 If the * does not occur (Office 2000 and earlier) you can enter a new row by using the "Insert - Rows" tool for inserting new lines for comments.
 Please, don't insert additional columns into the table.

Questions (each question might be addressed with more than one answer)

Question 1: Do you agree with the contents of the Section 9.9.3 of the GCM [INSPIRE DS-D2.5].

Question 2: Do you agree with the contents on INS Section 2 of the Guideline document on Coordinate Reference Systems [TWG RS-CRS].

Question 3: Do you agree with the contents on Map Section 3 of the Guideline document on Coordinate Reference Systems [TWG RS-CRS]

Question 4: Do you agree with the contents on Ten Section 10.1 of the GCM [INSPIRE DS-D2.5]

Question 5: Do you agree with the contents on Gec Guideline document on Geographical Grid Systems [TWG RS-GGS].

Generic question: Do you have any additional comments or suggestions related to the parts ? Please specify

DS D2.8.I INSPIRE Data Specification - First Draft

1	2	3	4	5	6
		Select from list >	Note [1]	Note[2]	Note[3]
Comment ID	Structural ID	Question	Type of comment	Comment	Proposed change
1	General comment	Question 3: Do you agree with the contents on Map Projections ?	G	In some federal states of Germany we do not support Lambert Azimuthal Equal Area for spatial analysis and display but we use the UTM-System.	We recommend UTM
2	General comment	Question 2: Do you agree with the contents on INSPIRE Coordinate Reference Systems	T	The current requirements are not specific enough and do not specify the CRSs unambiguously. For example, information on the axis order and the units are missing.	Provide all parameters to clearly specify the CRSs.
3	General comment	Question 3: Do you agree with the contents on Map Projections ?	T	The current requirements are not specific enough and do not specify the projected CRSs unambiguously. For example, information on axis order or false easting are missing.	Provide all parameters to clearly specify the CRSs.
4	General comment	Generic question: Do you have any additional comments or suggestions related to the parts ? Please specify	G	Regarding the large amount of Text and UML menus to read and to comment and the short amount of time given for the Review, it is almost impossible to scrutinize the thoroughly composed Data Specifications appropriately	Please calculate for the next Review of Data specifications more time for the SDICs and LMOs
5	General comment	Question 2: Do you agree with the contents on INSPIRE Coordinate Reference Systems	Q	How is the scope of ETRS89 spatially defined (longitude, latitude)?	
6	General comment	Question 2: Do you agree with the contents on INSPIRE Coordinate Reference Systems	Q	How is the scope of EVRS spatially defined (longitude, latitude)?	
7	General comment	Question 2: Do you agree with the contents on INSPIRE Coordinate Reference Systems	Q	ArcGIS uses EVRS2000, is EVRS and EVRS2000 the same? (You cannot see the differences without a detailed description of EVRS, ETRS89 and GRS80)	
8	General comment	Question 2: Do you agree with the contents on INSPIRE Coordinate Reference Systems	G	ArcGIS does not offer ITRS	
9	General comment	Question 2: Do you agree with the contents on INSPIRE Coordinate Reference Systems	T	The x-coordinates of ETRS-TMzn can be defined with 0, 1 or 2 digits to reference to the stripe. Example: 32.793367, 5.828.450 (2 digits), 2.793367, 5.828.450 (1 digit), 793367, 5.828.450 (0 digit). With 0 or 1 digits in the x-coordinate, danger of confusion is possible. If 2 digits are recommended, the x-coordinates are always unique.	

10	General comment	Question 3: Do you agree with the contents on Map Projections ?	G	"Map Projections" are also covered in "Geographical Grid Systems". In "Map Projections" there are three projections recommended (ETRS-LAEA, ETRS-LCC and ETRS-TMzn), while "Geographical Grid Systems" mainly refers to ETRS89-LAEA. It is confusing to find different names and references (ETRS-LAEA and ETRS89-LAEA). Why are the mandated projections ETRS-LCC and ETRS-TMzn not mentioned in GGS ?	
11	General comment	Question 3: Do you agree with the contents on Map Projections ?	Q	What is the difference between "Map Projections" and GGS? Why is this theme covered two times with different content?	
12	General comment	Question 3: Do you agree with the contents on Map Projections ?	T	The map projection parameters of ETRS89-LAEA (EPSG-Code:3035) are defined in the document D2.8.1.2. The map projection parameters of ETRS89-LCC (EPSG-Code:3034) are missing in the document D2.8.1.2. Here they are: Projection: Lambert_Conformal_Conic False_Easting: 4000000,000000 False_Northing: 2800000,000000 Central_Meridian: 10,000000 Standard_Parallel_1: 35,000000 Standard_Parallel_2: 65,000000 Latitude_Of_Origin: 52,000000 Linear Unit: Meter Spheroid: GRS80 Datum: ETRS_1989 The declaration of EPSG-Codes, additional to the name of the map projection, would be very helpful. ETRS89-LAEA = EPSG-Code:3035 ETRS89-LCC = EPSG-Code:3034	
13	General comment	Generic question: Do you have any additional comments or suggestions related to the parts ? Please specify	G	The scope of the IR includes spatial data services. The relevant requirements are currently described in the Technical Architecture Overview document, but not in the draft IR.	Add Appendix I, Part F, "Spatial Data Services" with a single requirement: "All spatial data services shall be described by service metadata according to COMMISSION REGULATION (EC) 1205/2008 and published via discovery services." A note should be added: "Additional requirements may be specified in the Implementing Rule on Network Services, in particular the 'Invoke spatial services service'."
14	General comment	Generic question: Do you have any additional comments or suggestions related to the parts ? Please specify	E	The description of the enumeration in the Draft Guidelines only is not sufficient. It must also take place in the schemes.	The scheme should contain the description of the enumeration elements with respect to the XSD specifications.
15	General comment	Generic question: Do you have any additional comments or suggestions related to the parts ? Please specify	T	The definitions of the elements of enumeration without a relationship to the individual member states is not sufficient.	The content of the different enumerations should connect to the MS (means: translation tables; the main roads in DE are "Bundesautobahn"; the main roads in France are...). The descriptions should be consistent. The relationship should be part of the description of the enumerations in the schemes.
16	General comment	Question 5: Do you agree with the contents on Geographical Grid systems?	G	We do not have such a Grid System in Northrhine-Westphalia (I don't think, someone else in Germany will have). We all use the Grid of UTM with the zone-Numbers as identification for geobasisdata. This is the official way given by the Arbeitsgemeinschaft der Vermessungsverwaltungen der Länder der Bundesrepublik Deutschland in 1995.	
17	General comment	Question 1: Do you agree with the contents of the Network Model?	T	The linear referencing (figure 15 and 9.9.3.12f) permits only references on a single linear network element (one segment or link). NetworkProperties that affect more than one link must be divided into two or more objects.	It should be possible to reference properties on AggregatedLinks using linear referencing.
18	General comment	Question 1: Do you agree with the contents of the Network Model?	T	The definition of a pseudo-node (9.9.3.10 in Generic Conceptual Model) is contradictory to Requirement 7 and 8 for Transport networks defining where to set nodes in a network. The notion of "attribute change" used in the explanation for pseudo-node is not well defined in the context of a linear referencing property model.	Remove inconsistency
19	General comment	Question 1: Do you agree with the contents of the Network Model?	E	CrossReference in Fig. 14 is obviously a featureType, because it is so in the GML schema. A description is lacking in 9.9.3.	Correct UML and add description
20	General comment	Question 2: Do you agree with the contents on INSPIRE Coordinate Reference Systems	E/G	In Requirement 17 the sense of the sentence is not quite clear. We think that you will demand the use of ETRS89 as TRS for areas within the scope of ETRS89. Maybe you should add an overview with a map of the positions of the permanent network stations.	

21	General comment	Question 2: Do you agree with the contents on INSPIRE Coordinate Reference Systems	T	In Requirement 19 you define the use of the ellipsoidal parameters of the GRS80, which is the reference object for ETRS89. I don't understand this Requirement? You don't need it. The geodetic transformations between different CRS are not only based on the usage of this parameters. It depends on many others! The organisations which will provide the needed information for INSPIRE are quit capable to work with different CRS.	Delete Requirement 19
22	General comment	Question 3: Do you agree with the contents on Map Projections ?	G	In Requirement 22 there is only defined that a special CRS should be used for 'purposes' where true area representation is required. This statement is too general. Please adopt it by define the special purposes!	The named purposes should be specified.
23	General comment	Question 5: Do you agree with the contents on Geographical Grid systems?	T	In this Part a special Grid is demanded. I believe, that in the different european countries, there are many different Grids in usage. Resampling statistical data can lead to errors in the resampled data. Maybe there should be an explicite definition howto resample gridded data when use different CRS and different grid sizes or the resampling should be done by INSPIRE/EUROSTAT itself. This would be the best way. The resampling can be very costly for some institutions.	The named purposes should be specified.
24	General comment	Generic question: Do you have any additional comments or suggestions related to the parts ? Please specify	G	In Requirement 34 is stated, that not only the metadata elements which are required by the Commission Reg. (EC) No. 120/2008 of 3 December should be provided, but also further theme specific metadata should be provided which give more information about the datasets respectively the featuretypes. These featuretypes are served by WebFeatureServices which describe the served data by the content section in their OGC capabilities document. Here more information can automaticaly generated (maybe out of the database) and linked as a web-accessable xml document. It is suggestive to generate this metadata automaticaly and not by hand. Some of this metadata elements is used for searching and will be give away through a catalogue service interface. These elements are the elements which are described by the IR regards metadata. The elements which are defined in the dataspecs have another intention. They are used by specialists for support descisions and don't need to be served through catalogue interfaces. The catalogue interface was designed to find the relevant data. In our opinion it is important to notice this kind of interpretation because many people ask why there are now more metadata elements as defined in the IR regards from 3.12.08. If this problem will not be	Clarification needed.
25	General comment	Question 3: Do you agree with the contents on Map Projections ?	E	INSPIRE should mandate the Universal Transverse Mercator Projection (UTM) for conformal pan-European mapping at scales larger than 1:500,000. Just Transverse Mercator is not detailed enough and Gauss-Krüger would fit in, too. This is the official way given by the Arbeitsgemeinschaft der Vermessungsverwaltungen der Länder der Bundesrepublik Deutschland in 1995.	Change Transverse Mercator with Universal Transverse Mercator Projection (UTM)
26	General comment	Generic question: Do you have any additional comments or suggestions related to the parts ? Please specify	G	It is regarded as critical, to insert enumerations in the current definition of the objects in the various schemes. In contrast to the general definition of the objects themselves, the enumerations influence the content of the objects.	Enumerations related on theme-specific stuff shall be implemented and described as codelist. This ensures that the maintance and update is feasible.
27	General comment	Generic question: Do you have any additional comments or suggestions related to the parts ? Please specify	E	It is a bit difficult to read the INSPIRE data specification. For each feature type listed in the specification, the reader has to decide if it is instantiable (that means if it may occur in the data) or if it is not (in this case, it is only used to generalize a concept within the inheritance hierarchy). For an instantiable feature, it is necessary to trace its entire inheritance hierarchy to find out all of its attributes and relationships. If an additional specification was provided which only contained the instantiable features with ALL of their attributes and relationships (also the inherited ones), this specification would be more easy to understand and would be a valuable help for data providers.	Publish an additional representation only containing the instantiable features with all of their attributes and relationships as a help for data providers

NOTES (must **not** be deleted)

[1] [Type of comment can be G \(general\), E \(editorial\), T \(technical\), Q \(question\)](#)

[2] [Specify your answer to the given question. If you want to address different issues related to a single question, please use separate rows. You n](#)

[3] [Please specify any changes that you might propose](#)

Questions for Geographic names (Appendix V)

Please, use one file and this worksheet to provide the comments on all data specifications. Data specifications in column B can be selected from

(1): All the comments should be entered in the table below. Each row should be numbered with the progressive comment number, starting with 1.

(2): Drop-down list to select the question that you intend to answer (in column B). All questions appear when you click on the cell in this column. Grey back

(3): Use only short marks for the chapter, subchapter, section or clause, as they are stated in the data specification.

While entering longer text, please, don't use additional line-breaks inside the cell, if possible.

To add a new row, move the cursor into an existing cell in the list. If you press on the * that occurs at the bottom of the list, you can enter a new row, just if the * does not occur (Office 2000 and earlier) you can enter a new row by using the "Insert - Rows" tool for inserting new lines for comments.

Please, don't insert additional columns into the table.

Question must not be deleted

Questions (each question might be addressed with more than one answer)

Question 6: Do you agree with the spatial object types to be included in the Thematic Appendix?

Question 7: Do you agree to the definitions of the spatial object types?

Question 8: Do you agree to the data types to be included in the Thematic Appendix?

Question 9: Do you agree to the definitions of the data types?

Question 10: Do you agree to the enumerations to be included in the Thematic Appendix?

Question 11: Do you agree to the definitions of the enumerations?

Question 12: Do you agree to the codelists to be included in the Thematic Appendix?

Question 13: Do you agree to the definitions of the codelists?

Question 14: Do you agree to the attributes and relationships to be included in the Thematic Appendix?

Question 15: Do you agree to the definitions of the attributes and relationships?

Question 16: Do you agree to the allowed values to be included for the enumerations listed in the Thematic Appendix?

Question 17: Do you agree to the definitions of the allowed values to be included for the enumerations?

Question 18: Do you agree with the terms and definitions to be included in the Thematic Appendix?

Question 19: Do you agree with the life-cycle rules to be included in the Thematic Appendix?

Question 20: Do you agree with the rules on identifier management to be included in the Thematic Appendix?

Question 21: Do you agree with the consistency rules to be included in the Thematic Appendix?

Question 22: Do you agree with the requirements on coordinate reference systems to be included in the Thematic Appendix?

Question 23: Do you agree with the requirements on temporal reference systems to be included in the Thematic Appendix?

Question 24: Do you agree with the constraints to be included in the Thematic Appendix?

Question 25: Should minimum data quality requirements be included in the Thematic Appendix? If yes please specify data quality elements and measure

Question 26: Do you agree to the mandatory or conditional metadata elements to be included in the Thematic Appendix?

Question 27: Do you agree to the definitions of the mandatory or conditional metadata elements?

Question 28: Do you agree to the layers to be included in the Thematic Appendix?

Question 29: Do you agree to the definitions of the default styles to be included in the Thematic Appendix?

Question 30: Do you agree to the well-defined styles to be included in the Thematic Appendix?

Question 31: Do you agree to the definitions of the well-defined styles?

Generic question: Do you have any other comments or change requests for this Thematic Appendix?

Reference

Section 5.1.2.1 (Spatial object types) of the

Section 5.1.2.1 (Spatial object types) of the

Definitions of the data types in section 5.1

Definitions of the data types in section 5.1

Definitions of the enumerations in section

Definitions of the enumerations in section

Definitions of the code lists in section 5.1

Definitions of the code lists in section 5.1

Sections 5.1.2.1 (spatial object types) and

Sections 5.1.2.1 (spatial object types) and

Section 5.1.2.3 (Enumerations and code

Section 5.1.2.3 (Enumerations and code

Section 2.5 (Terms and definitions) in the

Sections 5.1.1.7 (Temporality representa

Section 5.1.1.4 (Identifier management) in

Section 5.1.1.3 (Consistency between sp

Section 6.1 (Spatial reference system) in

Section 6.2 (Temporal reference system)

Constraints defined for the types listed in

Section 8 (Data set -level Metadata) of the

Section 8 (Data set -level Metadata) of the

Section 11.1 (Layers) of the Guideline do

Section 11.1 (Layers) of the Guideline do

Section 11.1 (Layers) of the Guideline do

Section 11.1 (Layers) of the Guideline do

DS D2.8.I INSPIRE Data Specification - First Draft

1	2	3	4	5	6
		Select from list >	Note [1]	Note[2]	Note[3]
Com ment ID	Structural ID (autofill)	Question	Type of comm ent	Comment	Proposed change
1	Geographical names	Question 10: Do you agree to the enumerations to be included in the Thematic Appendix?	E	UML-model shows "PhysicalWaters::IndicativeLoD" while the feature catalogue has "BaseTypes::IndicativeLoD"	Change UML-Model accordingly
2	Geographical names	Question 13: Do you agree to the definitions of the codelists?	Q	Who will specify and decide upon the possible values for the CodeList NamedPlaceType?	Please clarify
3	Geographical names	Question 14: Do you agree to the attributes and relationships to be included in the Thematic Appendix?	T	FeatureType NamedPlace: Every feature in the INSPIRE context should have a stable, unique Identifier	Change attribute "identifier" in feature type NamedPlace to mandatory.
4	Geographical names	Question 14: Do you agree to the attributes and relationships to be included in the Thematic Appendix?	T	NamedPlace objects can have a reference point and a footprint at the same time	Multiplicity of the geometry attribute of NamedPlace should be 1..*
5	Geographical names	Question 14: Do you agree to the attributes and relationships to be included in the Thematic Appendix?	T	The 4 possible values for "levelOfDetail" do not seem sufficient. It would be better to handle this similar to the WMS-specification which allows to define a scale-range, e.g. 1:50000 to 1:200000, for mapping purposes.	Change attribute value to contain minimum and maximum scale.
6	Geographical names	Question 26: Do you agree to the mandatory or conditional metadata elements to be included in the Thematic Appendix?	G	The defined elements should be harmonized between the different data specifications.	The element DQ_CompletenessOmission should be changed to DQ_CompletenessCommission
7	Geographical names	Question 6: Do you agree with the spatial object types to be included in the Thematic Appendix?	E	"NamedPlace" is not an appropriate name for this feature class, because according to the scope it can be any geographical feature like rivers, mountain ranges, mountains, landscapes etc.	Change name of feature type into "NamedEntity", "NamedObject", or "NamedPhenomenon"

8	Geographical names	Generic question: Do you have any additional comments or suggestions related to the parts ? Please specify	G	If data-providers can not populate non-voidable properties, it would prevent them to delivery the complete featurtype. On the other hand, too much voidable properties would increase the number of provides data that do not fullfill the requirements for the defined use cases. Find a well balanced way for the usage of voidable and use it in a consitent way though all data specifications.	
9	Geographical names	Generic question: Do you have any additional comments or suggestions related to the parts ? Please specify	G	Clarify the use of the Level of detail mechanism. Please, explicitly explain the relation to the "spatial resolution" metadata elements and use the Level-of-detail-mechanism in a consitent way and only where the "spatial resolution" meta data elements are not applicable (e.g. different LoD for same feature for presentation)	
10	Geographical names	Generic question: Do you have any additional comments or suggestions related to the parts ? Please specify	T	Generate as mutch documentation a possible into the XML-Schemas. Use the xml-schema-annotation/documentation elements.	
11	Geographical names	Generic question: Do you have any other comments or change requests for this Thematic Appendix?	T	Sometimes informations of the models (e.g. geometries) can be derived from other model elements. To include them always in addition to the implicit spatial relationship will require additional effort and cost in the provision of datasets for INSPIRE, but the benefits are unclear - in particular as redudant information is prone to inconsistencies and errors.	Delete all associations that can be derived by intersecting geometries, unless there is a good reason not to do so.
12	Geographical names	Generic question: Do you have any other comments or change requests for this Thematic Appendix?	G	Due to the short time, only key comments could be documented. There are a number of additional editorial and minor technical errors in most theme specifications (e.g., broken references, use of informative/normative language, inconsistencies between feature catalogue and UML, duplicate text in clause 8, etc) in the document that should be resolved in a review of the document by the editors. In addition, some specification aspects do require some further cross-theme harmonisation.	Review document and correct editorial and minor technical issues.
13	Geographical names	Generic question: Do you have any other comments or change requests for this Thematic Appendix?	G	The consequences of a specification which is so detailed and extensive can not be conceived. Probably it causes enourmous efforts to capture spatial data and corresponding metadata according to the specifications and to update them. This effort cannot be financed by the affected public authorities especially on the lowest level of government (towns).	Reduce the amount of mandatory elements. Only the objects and attributes which are really necessary for the use cases/GIS-related tasks should be mandatory. We suggest to define a basic set of the mandatory elements that can be extended by voidable mandatory elements and optional elements.
14	Geographical names	Question 26: Do you agree to the mandatory or conditional metadata elements to be included in the Thematic Appendix?	G	Strictly there should be no mandatory elements beyond the ISO standard or the additional mandatory elements defined by the INSPIRE implementing rules for metadata. For existing metadata systems with existing metadatasets additional mandatory elements are infeasible. Additional (compared to the already defined metadata elements in the IR Metadata) dataset level metadata elements will cause in high costs for adapting existing metadata and metadata systems in germany. (e.g. would mean to adapt ~ 15.000 existing metadata elements in the german UDK)	define all mandatory elements in section 8 as optional
15	Geographical names	Generic question: Do you have any additional comments or suggestions related to the parts ? Please specify	G	The usage of optional and voidable seems not consitent through all inspire themes. Check that optional is strictly used for cardinality-aspects and check that voidable is strictly used for fields where it should be possible to omit population without braking the conformity. Clarify, that optional and voidable are separte concepts, that can occur in any combination. Clarify also, that the obligation to provide information can not be derived from the optional or voidable state in the model (Obligation of providing information is not regulated in the data specification, but in the inspire directive itself, e.g. information does exist in digital form ..., The dataspecification gives just obligation how to provide the information in a interoperable way).	
16	Geographical names	Generic question: Do you have any additional comments or suggestions related to the parts ? Please specify	Q	If a member state provides one reference data set for an inspire annex theme, is there any obligation to provide additional existing data sets for that inspire annex theme?	

NOTES (must **not** be deleted)

[1] Type of comment can be G (general), E (editorial), T (technical), Q (question)

[2] Specify your answer to the given question. If you want to address different issues related to a single question, please use separate rows. You might th

[3] Please specify any changes that you might propose

Questions for Administrative Units (Appendix VI)

Please, use one file and this worksheet to provide the comments on all data specifications. Data specifications in column B can be:

- (1): All the comments should be entered in the table below. Each row should be numbered with the progressive comment number, starting with 1.
- (2): Drop-down list to select the question that you intend to answer (in column B). All questions appear when you click on the cell in this column.
- (3): Use only short marks for the chapter, subchapter, section or clause, as they are stated in the data specification.

While entering longer text, please, don't use additional line-breaks inside the cell, if possible.

To add a new row, move the cursor into an existing cell in the list. If you press on the * that occurs at the bottom of the list, you can enter a new row. If the * does not occur (Office 2000 and earlier) you can enter a new row by using the "Insert - Rows" tool for inserting new lines for comments. Please, don't insert additional columns into the table.

Question must not be deleted

Questions (each question might be addressed with more than one answer)

Question 6: Do you agree with the spatial object types to be included in the Thematic Appendix?

Question 7: Do you agree to the definitions of the spatial object types?

Question 8: Do you agree to the data types to be included in the Thematic Appendix?

Question 9: Do you agree to the definitions of the data types?

Question 10: Do you agree to the enumerations to be included in the Thematic Appendix?

Question 11: Do you agree to the definitions of the enumerations?

Question 12: Do you agree to the codelists to be included in the Thematic Appendix?

Question 13: Do you agree to the definitions of the codelists?

Question 14: Do you agree to the attributes and relationships to be included in the Thematic Appendix?

Question 15: Do you agree to the definitions of the attributes and relationships?

Question 16: Do you agree to the allowed values to be included for the enumerations listed in the Thematic Appendix?

Question 17: Do you agree to the definitions of the allowed values to be included for the enumerations?

Question 18: Do you agree with the terms and definitions to be included in the Thematic Appendix?

Question 19: Do you agree with the life-cycle rules to be included in the Thematic Appendix?

Question 20: Do you agree with the rules on identifier management to be included in the Thematic Appendix?

Question 21: Do you agree with the consistency rules to be included in the Thematic Appendix?

Question 22: Do you agree with the requirements on coordinate reference systems to be included in the Thematic Appendix?

Question 23: Do you agree with the requirements on temporal reference systems to be included in the Thematic Appendix?

Question 24: Do you agree with the constraints to be included in the Thematic Appendix?

Question 25: Should minimum data quality requirements be included in the Thematic Appendix? If yes please specify data quality elements.

Question 26: Do you agree to the mandatory or conditional metadata elements to be included in the Thematic Appendix?

Question 27: Do you agree to the definitions of the mandatory or conditional metadata elements?

Question 28: Do you agree to the layers to be included in the Thematic Appendix?

Question 29: Do you agree to the definitions of the default styles to be included in the Thematic Appendix?

Question 30: Do you agree to the well-defined styles to be included in the Thematic Appendix?

Question 31: Do you agree to the definitions of the well-defined styles?

Generic question: Do you have any other comments or change requests for this Thematic Appendix?

Reference

Section 5.1.2.1 (Spatial object types)

Section 5.1.2.1 (Spatial object types)

Definitions of the data types in the Thematic Appendix

Definitions of the data types in the Thematic Appendix

Definitions of the enumerations in the Thematic Appendix

Definitions of the enumerations in the Thematic Appendix

Definitions of the code lists in the Thematic Appendix

Definitions of the code lists in the Thematic Appendix

Sections 5.1.2.1 (spatial object types)

Sections 5.1.2.1 (spatial object types)

Section 5.1.2.3 (Enumeration values)

Section 5.1.2.3 (Enumeration values)

Section 2.5 (Terms and definitions)

Sections 5.1.1.7 (Temporality)

Section 5.1.1.4 (Identifier management)

Section 5.1.1.3 (Consistency)

Section 6.1 (Spatial reference systems)

Section 6.2 (Temporal reference systems)

Constraints defined for the thematic relationships

Section 8 (Data set -level Metadata)

Section 8 (Data set -level Metadata)

Section 11.1 (Layers) of the Thematic Appendix

Section 11.1 (Layers) of the Thematic Appendix

Section 11.1 (Layers) of the Thematic Appendix

Section 11.1 (Layers) of the Thematic Appendix

Section 11.1 (Layers) of the Thematic Appendix

DS D2.8.I INSPIRE Data Specification - First Draft

1	2	3	4	5	6
		Select from list >	Note [1]	Note[2]	Note[3]
Comment ID	Structural ID (autofill)	Question	Type of comment	Comment	Proposed change
1	Administrative units	Question 14: Do you agree to the attributes and relationships to be included in the Thematic Appendix?	T	The AFIS-ALKIS-ATKIS application schema of the German mapping agencies does not explicitly represent spatial relationships as thematic relationships. It is unclear why this is required or beneficial in INSPIRE. The information can be derived when needed. To include them always in addition to the implicit spatial relationship will require additional effort and cost in the provision of datasets for INSPIRE, but the benefits are unclear - in particular as redundant information is prone to inconsistencies and errors.	Delete all associations of Boundary
2	Administrative units	Question 14: Do you agree to the attributes and relationships to be included in the Thematic Appendix?	T	AdministrativeBoundary.boundaryStatus: What is the meaning of a default value for a voidable property?	Remove default value

3	Administrative units	Question 14: Do you agree to the attributes and relationships to be included in the Thematic Appendix?	T	AdministrativeBoundary.meaningOfLine: This information is not represented in ALKIS or ATKIS datasets in Germany. The value would have to be determined by intersecting the geometry with the relevant hydrographic objects. An issue exists with boundary objects where meaningOfLine would change its value somewhere along the curve. It is unclear, why this information is unconditionally mandatory for INSPIRE - in particular as the information can in principle be derived by intersecting the boundaries with other spatial objects representing water objects.	Change property to voidable
4	Administrative units	Question 11: Do you agree to the definitions of the enumerations?	T	AdministrativeBoundary.meaningOfLine: It is unclear, if "9" applies to boundaries along river/lake centerlines.	Clarify definitions of the listed values
5	Administrative units	Question 6: Do you agree with the spatial object types to be included in the Thematic Appendix?	T	This type is incompatible with the administrative units model in the AFIS-ALKIS-ATKIS application schema of the German mapping agencies where no individual objects are created per surface primitive and the individual surfaces are not distinguished by administrative area and land cover type (both properties are not voidable). Therefore, this object cannot be provided - which is an issue as the type is mandatory.	Change AdministrativeUnitLowestLevel.geometry to a non-derived property. Either drop the type or change the AdministrativeUnitLowestLevel.administrativeArea property to voidable.
6	Administrative units	Question 14: Do you agree to the attributes and relationships to be included in the Thematic Appendix?	T	AdministrativeUnitArea.administrativeAreaType: Information not included in ALKIS or ATKIS data sets in Germany	Change property to voidable
7	Administrative units	Question 14: Do you agree to the attributes and relationships to be included in the Thematic Appendix?	T	AdministrativeUnitArea.landCoverType: Information not included in ALKIS or ATKIS data sets. In addition, this information can be derived from land cover data (also included in INSPIRE)	Delete property or at least change property to voidable
8	Administrative units	Question 14: Do you agree to the attributes and relationships to be included in the Thematic Appendix?	T	AdministrativeUnit.validFrom: Information not available in data according to the AFIS-ALKIS-ATKIS application schema of the German mapping agencies.	Change property to voidable
9	Administrative units	Question 14: Do you agree to the attributes and relationships to be included in the Thematic Appendix?	T	NUTS.validFrom: Information not available.	Change property to voidable
10	Administrative units	Question 6: Do you agree with the spatial object types to be included in the Thematic Appendix?	T	NUTSRegion: This type is mandatory (non-voidable relationship), but is not available in data according to the AFIS-ALKIS-ATKIS application schema of the German mapping agencies.	Change property to voidable. This change is also supported by the text which only *recommends* to provide NUTS codes.
11	Administrative units	Question 6: Do you agree with the spatial object types to be included in the Thematic Appendix?	T	Use of Coastline is unclear. This seems to be in conflict with meaningOfLine in AdministrativeBoundary. See general comments with regard to AdministrativeBoundary.meaningOfLine. These apply here, too.	Delete spatial object type. Alternatively, improve definition and resolve inconsistencies.
12	Administrative units	Question 6: Do you agree with the spatial object types to be included in the Thematic Appendix?	T	It is unclear how condominiums could be represented. In German ATKIS data, these are always a separate unit while in INSPIRE they are always part of a unit.	Reconsider model for condominiums
13	Administrative units	Question 10: Do you agree to the enumerations to be included in the Thematic Appendix?	T	AdministrativeHierarchyLevel is not necessarily stable and may change due to changes in administrative hierarchies in MS.	Change to code list. Reconsider also which of the other enumerations are stable and for which values might be added in the future. The latter ones should be code lists.
14	Administrative units	Question 14: Do you agree to the attributes and relationships to be included in the Thematic Appendix?	T	AdministrativeUnitLowest/UpperLevel.geometry: What does it mean that the minimum multiplicity is "0"? Since every unit has a location the minimum should be "1"	Change multiplicity to "1". Change to voidable, if there is no requirement to explicitly provide the derived geometry.

15	Administrative units	Question 15: Do you agree to the definitions of the attributes and relationships?	T	AdministrativeUnitUpperLevel.lowerLevelUnit: Definition does not make sense.	"The lower level administrative units that belong to this unit."
16	Administrative units	Question 7: Do you agree to the definitions of the spatial object types?	T	Boundary: This is not a definition.	Provide a semantically meaningful definition. If there is none, the type should be deleted as it represents some irrelevant concept.
17	Administrative units	Question 10: Do you agree to the enumerations to be included in the Thematic Appendix?	T	It is not clear why BoundaryLevelType is specified in addition to AdministrativeHierarchyLevel. Why couldn't that data type be used for the levels of boundaries?	Delete BoundaryLevelType
18	Administrative units	Question 16: Do you agree to the allowed values to be included for the enumerations listed in the Thematic Appendix?	T	BoundaryStatusType: Isn't a value "boundary has not yet been edge-matched with neighbouring region" missing?	Clarify
19	Administrative units	Question 17: Do you agree to the definitions of the allowed values to be included for the enumerations?	T	BoundaryStatusType: So these values are only for international boundaries?	Either change definition of the enumeration and its values or change multiplicity of attribute to 0..1 as it would only apply to a tiny fraction of all boundaries
20	Administrative units	Generic question: Do you have any other comments or change requests for this Thematic Appendix?	T	The DQ elements specified in clause 7 are not used/referenced anywhere - neither from clause 5 nor from clause 8.	Delete DQ element definitions.
21	Administrative units	Question 27: Do you agree to the definitions of the mandatory or conditional metadata elements?	T	The metadata elements in 8.1 to 8.3 are inconsistent and incomplete: E.g. the 19115 reference does not seem to fit to the element, the 19139 path is missing, examples are missing, etc	Drop elements (as they are optional anyhow) or provide complete information
22	Administrative units	Question 29: Do you agree to the definitions of the default styles to be included in the Thematic Appendix?	T	SLDs need improvement. For example, AU:geographicalName is referenced, but this is a complex data type	Improve and test layer and style definitions
23	Administrative units	Question 28: Do you agree to the layers to be included in the Thematic Appendix?	T	There are two layers with the same title. This is confusing and also not consistent with the SLD.	Improve and test layer and style definitions
24	Administrative units	Question 6: Do you agree with the spatial object types to be included in the Thematic Appendix?	G	The NUTS classification is included. Consequently, the change information of the NUTS - called CONC/MODA - has also to be included. This information is needed to recalculate associated values regarding the change of the territorial division.	Add a new feature-type describing the changed territory geometrically and attributed with source-unit; destination-unit; date of change; area etc.
25	Administrative units	Generic question: Do you have any other comments or change requests for this Thematic Appendix?	G	An important requirement of the NUTS classification is missed.	include Requirement n: The spatial classification on all levels has to cover the whole territory of the MS. If one level is incomplete, this gap has to be filled out with the unit of the level above.
26	Administrative units	Generic question: Do you have any other comments or change requests for this Thematic Appendix?	G	A useful recommendation should be included to avoid gaps between similar borderlines on different hierarchical levels.	Include Recommendation m: The geometry should be updated only on the lowest hierarchical level. The borderlines of a level should be derived (dissolved) aggregating the borderlines of the next lower level.
27	Administrative units	Question 6: Do you agree with the spatial object types to be included in the Thematic Appendix?	T	FeatureType "boundary": It is unclear why this information is needed, as it is -except for the boundaryStatus- completely derivable from the Administrative Units features.	Delete FeatureType "boundary" or, if it is absolutely necessary to have a boundary status, change the requirements in that sense, that boundary features are only necessary for "national" borders that are indefinite or in dispute.
28	Administrative units	Question 14: Do you agree to the attributes and relationships to be included in the Thematic Appendix?	T	Many "special areas" (like lakes or national forests) and condominiums in different countries are not associated to an Administrative Unit on lowest level, but to a unit on a higher level. How can this be mapped to this model? Is it necessary to build "virtual" AdministrativeUnitsLowestLevel objects?	Please clarify
29	Administrative units	Question 27: Do you agree to the definitions of the mandatory or conditional metadata elements?	T	multiplicity of updateScope is not ISO-compliant	multiplicity should be changed to 1 .. 0

30	Administrative units	Question 27: Do you agree to the definitions of the mandatory or conditional metadata elements?	E	The ISO/TS 19139 paths are missing for all elements	Add the ISO/TS 19139 paths for all elements
31	Administrative units	Question 27: Do you agree to the definitions of the mandatory or conditional metadata elements?	E	page 34: the correct name for ISO 19115 code number 143 is "maintenanceAndUpdateFrequency"	Use correct ISO names and numbers
32	Administrative units	Generic question: Do you have any additional comments or suggestions related to the parts ? Please specify	G	If data-providers can not populate non-voidable properties, it would prevent them to delivery the complete featurtype. On the other hand, too mutch voidable properties would increase the number of provides data that do not fulfill the requirements for the defined use cases. Find a well balanced way for the usage of voidable and use it in a consitent way though all data specifications.	
33	Administrative units	Generic question: Do you have any additional comments or suggestions related to the parts ? Please specify	G	Clarify the use of the Level of detail mechanism. Please, explicitly explain the relation to the "spatial resolution" metadata elements and use the Level-of-detail-mechanismn in a consitent way and only where the "spatial resolution" meta data elements are not applicable (e.g. different LoD for same feature for presentation)	
34	Administrative units	Generic question: Do you have any additional comments or suggestions related to the parts ? Please specify	T	Generate as mutch documentation a possible into the XML-Schemas. Use the xml-schema-annotation/documentation elements.	
35	Administrative units	Generic question: Do you have any other comments or change requests for this Thematic Appendix?	T	Sometimes informations of the models (e.g. geometries) can be derived from other model elements. To include them always in addition to the implicit spatial relationship will require additional effort and cost in the provision of datasets for INSPIRE, but the benefits are unclear - in particular as redudant information is prone to inconsistencies and errors.	Delete all associations that can be derived by intersecting geometries, unless there is a good reason not to do so.
36	Administrative units	Generic question: Do you have any other comments or change requests for this Thematic Appendix?	G	Due to the short time, only key comments could be documented. There are a number of additional editorial and minor technical errors in most theme specifications (e.g., broken references, use of informative/normative language, inconsistencies between feature catalogue and UML, duplicate text in clause 8, etc) in the document that should be resolved in a review of the document by the editors. In addition, some specification aspects do require some further cross-theme harmonisation.	Review document and correct editorial and minor technical issues.
37	Administrative units	Generic question: Do you have any other comments or change requests for this Thematic Appendix?	G	The consequences of a specification which is so detailed and extensive can not be conceived. Probably it causes enourmous efforts to capture spatial data and corresponding metadata according to the specifications and to update them. This effort cannot be financed by the affected public authorities especially on the lowest level of government (towns).	Reduce the amount of mandatory elements. Only the objects and attributes which are really necessary for the use cases/GIS-related tasks should be mandatory. We suggest to define a basic set of the mandatory elements that can be extended by voidable mandatory elements and optional elements.

38	Administrative units	Question 26: Do you agree to the mandatory or conditional metadata elements to be included in the Thematic Appendix?	G	<p>Strictly there should be no mandatory elements beyond the ISO standard or the additional mandatory elements defined by the INSPIRE implementing rules for metadata.</p> <p>For existing metadata systems with existing metadatasets additional mandatory elements are infeasible. Additional (compared to the already defined metadata elements in the IR Metadata) dataset level metadata elements will cause in high costs for adapting existing metadata and metadata systems in germany. (e.g. would mean to adapt ~ 15.000 existing metadata elements in the german UDK)</p>	define all mandatory elements in section 8 as optional
39	Administrative units	Generic question: Do you have any additional comments or suggestions related to the parts ? Please specify	G	<p>The usage of optional and voidable seems not consistent through all inspire themes.</p> <p>Check that optional is strictly used for cardinality-aspects and check that voidable is strictly used for fields where it should be possible to omit population without braking the conformity. Clarify, that optional and voidable are separate concepts, that can occur in any combination. Clarify also, that the obligation to provide information can not be derived from the optional or voidable state in the model (Obligation of providing information is not regulated in the data specification, but in the inspire directive itself, e.g. information does exist in digital form ..., The dataspecification gives just obligation how to provide the information in a interoperable way).</p>	
40	Administrative units	Generic question: Do you have any additional comments or suggestions related to the parts ? Please specify	Q	<p>If a member state provides one reference data set for an inspire annex theme, is there any obligation to provide additional existing data sets for that inspire annex theme?</p>	

NOTES (must **not** be deleted)

[1] [Type of comment can be G \(general\), E \(editorial\), T \(technical\), Q \(question\)](#)

[2] [Specify your answer to the given question. If you want to address different issues related to a single question, please use separate rows.](#)

[3] [Please specify any changes that you might propose](#)

Questions for Addresses (Appendix VII)

Please, use one file and this worksheet to provide the comments on all data specifications. Data specifications in column B can be selected from the drop-down list.

(1): All the comments should be entered in the table below. Each row should be numbered with the progressive comment number, starting with 1.

(2): Drop-down list to select the question that you intend to answer (in column B). All questions appear when you click on the cell in this column. Grey background color of the cell.

(3): Use only short marks for the chapter, subchapter, section or clause, as they are stated in the data specification.

While entering longer text, please, don't use additional line-breaks inside the cell, if possible.

To add a new row, move the cursor into an existing cell in the list. If you press on the * that occurs at the bottom of the list, you can enter a new row, just by typing.

If the * does not occur (Office 2000 and earlier) you can enter a new row by using the "Insert - Rows" tool for inserting new lines for comments.

Please, don't insert additional columns into the table.

Question must not be deleted

Questions (each question might be addressed with more than one answer)

Question 6: Do you agree with the spatial object types to be included in the Thematic Appendix?

Question 7: Do you agree to the definitions of the spatial object types?

Question 8: Do you agree to the data types to be included in the Thematic Appendix?

Question 9: Do you agree to the definitions of the data types?

Question 10: Do you agree to the enumerations to be included in the Thematic Appendix?

Question 11: Do you agree to the definitions of the enumerations?

Question 12: Do you agree to the codelists to be included in the Thematic Appendix?

Question 13: Do you agree to the definitions of the codelists?

Question 14: Do you agree to the attributes and relationships to be included in the Thematic Appendix?

Question 15: Do you agree to the definitions of the attributes and relationships?

Question 16: Do you agree to the allowed values to be included for the enumerations listed in the Thematic Appendix?

Question 17: Do you agree to the definitions of the allowed values to be included for the enumerations?

Question 18: Do you agree with the terms and definitions to be included in the Thematic Appendix?

Question 19: Do you agree with the life-cycle rules to be included in the Thematic Appendix?

Question 20: Do you agree with the rules on identifier management to be included in the Thematic Appendix?

Question 21: Do you agree with the consistency rules to be included in the Thematic Appendix?

Question 22: Do you agree with the requirements on coordinate reference systems to be included in the Thematic Appendix?

Question 23: Do you agree with the requirements on temporal reference systems to be included in the Thematic Appendix?

Question 24: Do you agree with the constraints to be included in the Thematic Appendix?

Question 25: Should minimum data quality requirements be included in the Thematic Appendix? If yes please specify data quality elements and measures.

Question 26: Do you agree to the mandatory or conditional metadata elements to be included in the Thematic Appendix?

Question 27: Do you agree to the definitions of the mandatory or conditional metadata elements?

Question 28: Do you agree to the layers to be included in the Thematic Appendix?

Question 29: Do you agree to the definitions of the default styles to be included in the Thematic Appendix?

Question 30: Do you agree to the well-defined styles to be included in the Thematic Appendix?

Question 31: Do you agree to the definitions of the well-defined styles?

Generic question: Do you have any other comments or change requests for this Thematic Appendix?

Reference

Section 5.1.2.1 (Spatial object t

Section 5.1.2.1 (Spatial object t

Definitions of the data types in :

Definitions of the data types in :

Definitions of the enumerations

Definitions of the enumerations

Definitions of the code lists in s

Definitions of the code lists in s

Sections 5.1.2.1 (spatial object

Sections 5.1.2.1 (spatial object

Section 5.1.2.3 (Enumerations

Section 5.1.2.3 (Enumerations

Section 2.5 (Terms and definitio

Sections 5.1.1.7 (Temporality r

Section 5.1.1.4 (Identifier mana

Section 5.1.1.3 (Consistency br

Section 6.1 (Spatial reference s

Section 6.2 (Temporal referenc

Constraints defined for the type

Section 8 (Data set -level Meta

Section 8 (Data set -level Meta

Section 11.1 (Layers) of the Gu

Section 11.1 (Layers) of the Gu

Section 11.1 (Layers) of the Gu

Section 11.1 (Layers) of the Gu

DS D2.8.I INSPIRE Data Specification - First Draft

1	2	3	4	5	6
Comment ID	Structural ID (autofill)	Select from list > Question	Note [1] Type of comment	Note[2] Comment	Note[3] Proposed change
1	Addresses	Question 26: Do you agree to the mandatory or conditional metadata elements to be included in the Thematic Appendix?	G and T	There is no theme-specific reason for the conditional metadata elements "Metadata character set" and "Data character set" (page 50, table 5). Why does especially the theme "addresses" need those elements, but all others not? As a consequence	Delete all or reduce the mandatory theme specific metadata elements or change them at least to "optional".
2	Addresses	Question 7: Do you agree to the definitions of the spatial object types?	T	Requirement 3 in Section 5.1.1.1 "If an address component has more than 1 parent these must be of different address component types" In Germany it is possible that a ThoroughfareName-Addresscomponent has a parent-child-relation to more than one PostalDiscriptors (Postcodearea) or/and of more than one AddressAreaNames (parts of a municipality).	The requirement 3 in section 5.1.1.1 should be canceled from the document. Otherwise the german situation of relations between PostalDiscriptors and ThoroughfareName can not
3	Addresses	Question 9: Do you agree to the definitions of the data types?	Q	I'm not sure wether a phonetical property for all geographical names should be part of the INSPIRE-Datamodel of Addresses. It would be easier to find a specific address in a dataset while having an incorrect spelling (writing). The german Gazetteerservice for housecoordinates has such an functionality to ensure to find addresses although an incorrect spelling(writing). The Problem on such an property is that the phonetical algorithm has a quite close connection/relation to languages. It would be difficult to find one algorithm for the hole European Union.	
4	Addresses	Generic question: Do you have any other comments or change requests for this Thematic Appendix?	E	In Figure 6 and following tables the imported classes Gazetteer:LocationInstance and Geographical name are not included.	
5	Addresses	Generic question: Do you have any other comments or change requests for this Thematic Appendix?	E	Names of classes defined in this document are not used homogeneously throughout the text. E.g. refer to the constraint description "Constraint AddressName": Here, it is said that "An address area name instance cannot ..." instead "An AdressAreaName instance cannot ...". Many more occurrences of this type!	

6	Addresses	Question 19: Do you agree with the life-cycle rules to be included in the Thematic Appendix?	T	It is expected that a major source of German address data delivery will not include validFrom, validTo and lastChange for all Address and AddressComponent instances. Further more the data set will not include any identifier, beginLifespanVersion, endLifespanVersion properties for all AddressComponent instances.	
7	Addresses	Question 27: Do you agree to the definitions of the mandatory or conditional metadata elements?	G	The defined Elements should be harmonized between the different data specifications.	The element DQ_CompletenessOmission should be dropped. The information can be derived by DQ_CompletenessCommission
8	Addresses	Question 27: Do you agree to the definitions of the mandatory or conditional metadata elements?	E	DQ_AbsoluteExternalPositionalAccuracy: wrong multiplicity	change multiplicity für DQ_AbsoluteExternalPositionalAccuracy to 0 .. 1
9	Addresses	Question 27: Do you agree to the definitions of the mandatory or conditional metadata elements?	E	DQ_ThematicClassificationCorrectness: wrong ISO-path	correct ISO-path for DQ_ThematicClassificationCorrectness
10	Addresses	Generic question: Do you have any additional comments or suggestions related to the parts ? Please specify	G	If data-providers can not populate non-voidable properties, it would prevent them to delivery the complete featurtype. On the other hand, too much voidable properties would increase the number of provides data that do not fulfill the requirements for the defined use cases. Find a well balanced way for the usage of voidable and use it in a consistent way though all data specifications.	
11	Addresses	Generic question: Do you have any additional comments or suggestions related to the parts ? Please specify	G	Clarify the use of the Level of detail mechanism. Please, explicitly explain the relation to the "spatial resolution" metadata elements and use the Level-of-detail-mechanism in a consistent way and only where the "spatial resolution" meta data elements are not applicable (e.g. different LoD for same feature for presentation)	
12	Addresses	Generic question: Do you have any additional comments or suggestions related to the parts ? Please specify	T	Generate as much documentation a possible into the XML-Schemas. Use the xml-schema-annotation/documentation elements.	
13	Addresses	Generic question: Do you have any other comments or change requests for this Thematic Appendix?	T	Sometimes informations of the models (e.g. geometries) can be derived from other model elements. To include them always in addition to the implicit spatial relationship will require additional effort and cost in the provision of datasets for INSPIRE, but the benefits are unclear - in particular as redundant information is prone to inconsistencies and errors.	Delete all associations that can be derived by intersecting geometries, unless there is a good reason not to do so.
14	Addresses	Generic question: Do you have any other comments or change requests for this Thematic Appendix?	G	Due to the short time, only key comments could be documented. There are a number of additional editorial and minor technical errors in most theme specifications (e.g., broken references, use of informative/normative language, inconsistencies between feature catalogue and UML, duplicate text in clause 8, etc) in the document that should be resolved in a review of the document by the editors. In addition, some specification aspects do require some further cross-theme harmonisation.	Review document and correct editorial and minor technical issues.
15	Addresses	Generic question: Do you have any other comments or change requests for this Thematic Appendix?	G	The consequences of a specification which is so detailed and extensive can not be conceived. Probably it causes enormous efforts to capture spatial data and corresponding metadata according to the specifications and to update them. This effort cannot be financed by the affected public authorities especially on the lowest level of government (towns).	Reduce the amount of mandatory elements. Only the objects and attributes which are really necessary for the use cases/GIS-related tasks should be mandatory. We suggest to define a basic set of the mandatory elements that can be extended by voidable mandatory elements and optional elements.
16	Addresses	Question 26: Do you agree to the mandatory or conditional metadata elements to be included in the Thematic Appendix?	G	Strictly there should be no mandatory elements beyond the ISO standard or the additional mandatory elements defined by the INSPIRE implementing rules for metadata. For existing metadata systems with existing metadatasets additional mandatory elements are infeasible. Additional (compared to the already defined metadata elements in the IR Metadata) dataset level metadata elements will cause in high costs for adapting existing metadata and metadata systems in germany. (e.g. would mean to adapt ~ 15.000 existing metadata elements in the german UDK)	define all mandatory elements in section 8 as optional

17	Addresses	Generic question: Do you have any additional comments or suggestions related to the parts ? Please specify	G	The usage of optional and voidable seems not consistent through all inspire themes. Check that optional is strictly used for cardinality-aspects and check that voidable is strictly used for fields where it should be possible to omit population without braking the conformity. Clarify, that optional and voidable are seperate concepts, that can occur in any combination. Clarify also, that the obligation to provide information can not be derived from the optional or voidable state in the model (Obligation of providing information is not regulated in the data specification, but in the inspire directive itself, e.g. information does exist in digital form ..., The dataspecification gives just obligation how to provide the information in a interoperable way).	
18	Addresses	Generic question: Do you have any additional comments or suggestions related to the parts ? Please specify	Q	If a member state provides one reference data set for an inspire annex theme, is there any obligation to provide additional existing data sets for that inspire annex theme?	

NOTES (must **not** be deleted)

[1] [Type of comment can be G \(general\), E \(editorial\), T \(technical\), Q \(question\)](#)

[2] [Specify your answer to the given question. If you want to address different issues related to a single question, please use separate rows. You might thus select the same que](#)

[3] [Please specify any changes that you might propose](#)

Questions for Cadastral parcels (Appendix VIII)

Please, use one file and this worksheet to provide the comments on all data specifications. Data specifications in column B can be selected from the list below.

(1): All the comments should be entered in the table below. Each row should be numbered with the progressive comment number, starting with 1.

(2): Drop-down list to select the question that you intend to answer (in column B). All questions appear when you click on the cell in this column. Grey background indicates the selected question.

(3): Use only short marks for the chapter, subchapter, section or clause, as they are stated in the data specification.

While entering longer text, please, don't use additional line-breaks inside the cell, if possible.

To add a new row, move the cursor into an existing cell in the list. If you press on the * that occurs at the bottom of the list, you can enter a new row, just like a new row in a list. If the * does not occur (Office 2000 and earlier) you can enter a new row by using the "Insert - Rows" tool for inserting new lines for comments.

Please, don't insert additional columns into the table.

Question must not be deleted

Questions (each question might be addressed with more than one answer)

Question 6: Do you agree with the spatial object types to be included in the Thematic Appendix?

Question 7: Do you agree to the definitions of the spatial object types?

Question 8: Do you agree to the data types to be included in the Thematic Appendix?

Question 9: Do you agree to the definitions of the data types?

Question 10: Do you agree to the enumerations to be included in the Thematic Appendix?

Question 11: Do you agree to the definitions of the enumerations?

Question 12: Do you agree to the codelists to be included in the Thematic Appendix?

Question 13: Do you agree to the definitions of the codelists?

Question 14: Do you agree to the attributes and relationships to be included in the Thematic Appendix?

Question 15: Do you agree to the definitions of the attributes and relationships?

Question 16: Do you agree to the allowed values to be included for the enumerations listed in the Thematic Appendix?

Question 17: Do you agree to the definitions of the allowed values to be included for the enumerations?

Question 18: Do you agree with the terms and definitions to be included in the Thematic Appendix?

Question 19: Do you agree with the life-cycle rules to be included in the Thematic Appendix?

Question 20: Do you agree with the rules on identifier management to be included in the Thematic Appendix?

Question 21: Do you agree with the consistency rules to be included in the Thematic Appendix?

Question 22: Do you agree with the requirements on coordinate reference systems to be included in the Thematic Appendix?

Question 23: Do you agree with the requirements on temporal reference systems to be included in the Thematic Appendix?

Question 24: Do you agree with the constraints to be included in the Thematic Appendix?

Question 25: Should minimum data quality requirements be included in the Thematic Appendix? If yes please specify data quality elements and measures.

Question 26: Do you agree to the mandatory or conditional metadata elements to be included in the Thematic Appendix?

Question 27: Do you agree to the definitions of the mandatory or conditional metadata elements?

Question 28: Do you agree to the layers to be included in the Thematic Appendix?

Question 29: Do you agree to the definitions of the default styles to be included in the Thematic Appendix?

Question 30: Do you agree to the well-defined styles to be included in the Thematic Appendix?

Question 31: Do you agree to the definitions of the well-defined styles?

Generic question: Do you have any other comments or change requests for this Thematic Appendix?

Reference

Section 5.1.2.1 (Spatial object types)

Section 5.1.2.1 (Spatial object types)

Definitions of the data types

Definitions of the data types

Definitions of the enumerations

Definitions of the enumerations

Definitions of the code lists

Definitions of the code lists

Sections 5.1.2.1 (spatial object types)

Sections 5.1.2.1 (spatial object types)

Section 5.1.2.3 (Enumerations)

Section 5.1.2.3 (Enumerations)

Section 2.5 (Terms and definitions)

Sections 5.1.1.7 (Temporal reference systems)

Section 5.1.1.4 (Identifier management)

Section 5.1.1.3 (Consistency rules)

Section 6.1 (Spatial reference systems)

Section 6.2 (Temporal reference systems)

Constraints defined for the data sets

Section 8 (Data set -level metadata)

Section 8 (Data set -level metadata)

Section 11.1 (Layers) of the Thematic Appendix

Section 11.1 (Layers) of the Thematic Appendix

Section 11.1 (Layers) of the Thematic Appendix

Section 11.1 (Layers) of the Thematic Appendix

DS D2.8.I INSPIRE Data Specification - First Draft

1	2	3	4	5	6
		Select from list >	Note [1]	Note[2]	Note[3]
Comment ID	Structural ID (autofill)	Question	Type of comment	Comment	Proposed change
1	Cadastral parcels	Question 6: Do you agree with the spatial object types to be included in the Thematic Appendix?	T	CadastralBoundary: These objects are not part of the German data sets. In Germany only special boundaries, e.g. those under dispute, are represented. The reason for adding them in INSPIRE is unclear as the boundaries are represented by the CadastralParcel features already. The only additional information seems to be the accuracy, which is not clear anyhow - see separate comment.	Delete spatial object type and 10.1.3
2	Cadastral parcels	Question 6: Do you agree with the spatial object types to be included in the Thematic Appendix?	T	CadastralIndexSet: The need for and the usefulness of these objects in INSPIRE is unclear. In Germany, these are purely internal features to organise the work in the cadastral agencies and are not used by applications. Therefore, these objects do not seem to offer ANY value to INSPIRE.	Delete spatial object type and 10.1.2
3	Cadastral parcels	Question 14: Do you agree to the attributes and relationships to be included in the Thematic Appendix?	T	CadastralBoundary.estimatedAccuracy: The accuracy should be associated with a point/coordinate, but not with some arbitrary part of the parcel boundary. The derivation of a boundary accuracy from a set of accuracy values at locations along a curve seems odd from a thematic/geodetic point of view. The derivation of such features is not simple, i.e. costly, and the benefits are unclear at best.	If accuracy information is really required in INSPIRE for parcel coordinates, consider associating it with individual points.
4	Cadastral parcels	Question 14: Do you agree to the attributes and relationships to be included in the Thematic Appendix?	T	*.topology: The use of topology is unclear. All topological information can be derived from the geometry as it is done for other themes.	Delete properties

5	Cadastral parcels	Question 14: Do you agree to the attributes and relationships to be included in the Thematic Appendix?	T	*.topology: The topology model is incomplete. For example, no requirements are stated that all topological primitives in the same dataset have to be part of the same theme ("theme" in the meaning used in 19107 not in INSPIRE) and which dimensionality the theme has (probably 2 to includes faces, edges and nodes)	Delete properties
6	Cadastral parcels	Question 14: Do you agree to the attributes and relationships to be included in the Thematic Appendix?	T	CadastralIndexSet.geometry: For such index sets, no geometry is maintained explicitly in the data. In INSPIRE, however, this property is not voidable.	Change to voidable
7	Cadastral parcels	Question 14: Do you agree to the attributes and relationships to be included in the Thematic Appendix?	T	In general, the schema contains significant redundancies. In the German model such redundancies are avoided. Providing data for all the redundant properties would be costly. For example, the parcel/boundary properties can be derived from the geometry properties, if needed.	Delete topology properties and all associations that are already represented by the geometry properties, i.e. both associations in the current schema.
8	Cadastral parcels	Question 24: Do you agree with the constraints to be included in the Thematic Appendix?	T	uomSymbol="meter" - "meter" is not the symbol of the unit metre	uomSymbol="m"
9	Cadastral parcels	Question 15: Do you agree to the definitions of the attributes and relationships?	T	*.referencePoint: "A point within ..." is not a clear definition. This just indicates that it is an arbitrary point with no special semantics. I.e, there is not benefit in this attribute	Delete attributes
10	Cadastral parcels	Question 14: Do you agree to the attributes and relationships to be included in the Thematic Appendix?	T	CadastralIndexSet.parcel: Why is this property navigable? An index set may contain a large amount of parcels. Since the set of parcels in an index set changes constantly this introduces a significant overhead. In addition, a change in the set of parcels would require the creation of a new object version with every change. This is clearly not desirable nor appropriate.	Make role non-navigable (if the association is not deleted)
11	Cadastral parcels	Question 14: Do you agree to the attributes and relationships to be included in the Thematic Appendix?	T	CadastralParcels and CadastralIndexSet; attribute "originalMapscaleDenominator": Object oriented cadastral systems in Germany do not have any scale information of the "original" paper map at the parcel feature type level. By the way: What does "original" mean? Usually you have several information (maps, cadastral sketches etc.) defining a parcel legally. If you mean the map that you potentially have used for digitization, this information should be stored in quality metadata (see ISO 19115).	Delete that attribute or shift it to metadata elements
12	Cadastral parcels	Question 14: Do you agree to the attributes and relationships to be included in the Thematic Appendix?	T	CadastralParcel.geometry: In Germany, parcels are not restricted to single areas. The current model does not reflect reality and must be changed.	Change type to GM_MultiSurface and drop 2nd sentence of the definition.
13	Cadastral parcels	Question 15: Do you agree to the definitions of the attributes and relationships?	T	CadastralParcel.nationalCalculatedArea: if it is the calculated area the information is redundant with the geometry. In Germany only the the legal area of th land regsiter is usually applied to a parcel.	Drop attribute or change definition to reference the area associated in the cadstral register with the parcel (which is typically different from the computed area)
14	Cadastral parcels	Question 14: Do you agree to the attributes and relationships to be included in the Thematic Appendix?	T	CadastralParcel.AU_adminUnit: This is redundant information and can be derived from intersecting the geometry with the administrative units.	Delete association or justify the costs for maintaining/deriving such redundant information
15	Cadastral parcels	Question 10: Do you agree to the enumerations to be included in the Thematic Appendix?	T	CadastralIndexSetLevel: Since the use of 3 levels is arbitrary, this should rather be a code list than an enumeration.	Change to code list
16	Cadastral parcels	Question 26: Do you agree to the mandatory or conditional metadata elements to be included in the Thematic Appendix?	T	7.1.1. Omission: This recommendation is valid fo all data sets in INSPIRE and nothing specific for cadastral parcels	Shift such quality requirements on a more general level
17	Cadastral parcels	Question 26: Do you agree to the mandatory or conditional metadata elements to be included in the Thematic Appendix?	T	The number of incorrect or missing cadastral references must be 0% in all cases. Parcels without cadastral references must not exist in Germany.	Delete thematic accuracy
18	Cadastral parcels	Question 26: Do you agree to the mandatory or conditional metadata elements to be included in the Thematic Appendix?	T	Req 8: The data specificaitons should not change the meaning of elements in the metadata regulation	Delete requirement
19	Cadastral parcels	Question 27: Do you agree to the definitions of the mandatory or conditional metadata elements?	T	8.7: A lineage statement is different from a description of the data set.	Remove or use appropriate metadata element.
20	Cadastral parcels	Question 31: Do you agree to the definitions of the well-defined styles?	T	The referenced SLDs are not available.	Provide SLDs with revised version
21	Cadastral parcels	Question 26: Do you agree to the mandatory or conditional metadata elements to be included in the Thematic Appendix?	G and T	There is no theme-specific reason for the mandatory metadata elements "Description of a data set", "Rate of missing items", "Rate of incorrect classification for national identifier" and "Frequency with witch changes are made" (page 25, table 7). Why does especially the theme "cadastral parcels" need those elements, but all others not? As a consequence metadata profiles become larger and therefore more and more confusing. Theme-specific changes on the metadata profile defined by the regulation (EC) nr. 1205/2008 cause inadequate expenses for the metadata catalogue systems operated in the member states.	Delete all or reduce the mandatory theme specific metadata elements or change them at least to "optional".

22	Cadastral parcels	Question 26: Do you agree to the mandatory or conditional metadata elements to be included in the Thematic Appendix?	G	Theme-specific reason for the mandatory metadata elements "Overlap between surfaces", "Gap between surfaces", "Mean value of positional uncertainties (1D, 2D)" (page 25, table 7) can be identified, but please note that all theme-specific changes on the metadata profile defined by the regulation (EC) nr. 1205/2008 cause inadequate expenses for the metadata catalogue systems operated in the member states. Those parameters are very dynamic and could rather be obtained by monitoring&reporting or by GIS analysis.	Delete the mandatory theme specific metadata elements, change them to "optional" or update the INSPIRE metadata regulation
23	Cadastral parcels	Question 27: Do you agree to the definitions of the mandatory or conditional metadata elements?	T	The element "Frequency with witch changes are made" use the ISO element "143. maintenanceAndUpdateFrequency". Why has the name been changed? Other thematic draft guidelines use the term "maintenanceAndUpdateFrequency" (e.g. hydrography).	Call this INSPIRE metadata element "maintenanceAndUpdateFrequency"
24	Cadastral parcels	Question 27: Do you agree to the definitions of the mandatory or conditional metadata elements?	E	pages 25, 26: What shall be the name of the metadata element nr. 8.1: "CompletenessOmission" or "Rate of missing items"?	Eliminate inconsistent denomination
25	Cadastral parcels	Generic question: Do you have any other comments or change requests for this Thematic Appendix?	E	pages 30-41, elements nr. 8.12-8.33: the identical content is written 3 times and the sense of this is unclear	Delete this pages and place the requirements and recommendations correctly.
26	Cadastral parcels	Generic question: Do you have any other comments or change requests for this Thematic Appendix?	G	The use cases and therefore the usefulness of the provided draft are not clear.	Identify the use cases/GIS-related tasks that the data specifications are based on.
27	Cadastral parcels	Question 26: Do you agree to the mandatory or conditional metadata elements to be included in the Thematic Appendix?	G	The defined Elements should be harmonized between the different data specifications.	The element DQ_CompletenessOmission should be changed to DQ_CompletenessCommission
28	Cadastral parcels	Generic question: Do you have any additional comments or suggestions related to the parts ? Please specify	G	If data-providers can not populate non-voidable properties, it would prevent them to delivery the complete featurtype. On the other hand, too mutch voidable properties would increase the number of provides data that do not fulfill the requirements for the defined use cases. Find a well balanced way for the usage of voidable and use it in a consitent way though all data specifications.	
29	Cadastral parcels	Generic question: Do you have any additional comments or suggestions related to the parts ? Please specify	G	Clarify the use of the Level of detail mechanism. Please, explicitly explain the relation to the "spatial resolution" metadata elements and use the Level-of-detail-mechanism in a consistent way and only where the "spatial resolution" meta data elements are not applicable (e.g. different LoD for same feature for presentation)	
30	Cadastral parcels	Generic question: Do you have any additional comments or suggestions related to the parts ? Please specify	T	Generate as much documentation a possible into the XML-Schemas. Use the xml-schema-annotation/documentation elements.	
31	Cadastral parcels	Generic question: Do you have any other comments or change requests for this Thematic Appendix?	T	Sometimes informations of the models (e.g. geometries) can be derived from other model elements. To include them always in addition to the implicit spatial relationship will require additional effort and cost in the provision of datasets for INSPIRE, but the benefits are unclear - in particular as redudant information is prone to inconsistencies and errors.	Delete all associations that can be derived by intersecting geometries, unless there is a good reason not to do so.
32	Cadastral parcels	Generic question: Do you have any other comments or change requests for this Thematic Appendix?	G	Due to the short time, only key comments could be documented. There are a number of additional editorial and minor technical errors in most theme specifications (e.g., broken references, use of informative/normative language, inconsistencies between feature catalogue and UML, duplicate text in clause 8, etc) in the document that should be resolved in a review of the document by the editors. In addition, some specification aspects do require some further cross-theme harmonisation.	Review document and correct editorial and minor technical issues.
33	Cadastral parcels	Generic question: Do you have any other comments or change requests for this Thematic Appendix?	G	The consequences of a specification which is so detailed and extensive can not be conceived. Probably it causes enourmous efforts to capture spatial data and corresponding metadata according to the specifications and to update them. This effort cannot be financed by the affected public authorities especially on the lowest level of government (towns).	Reduce the amount of mandatory elements. Only the objects and attributes which are really necessary for the use cases/GIS-related tasks should be mandatory. We suggest to define a basic set of the mandatory elements that can be extended by voidable mandatory elements and optional elements.
34	Cadastral parcels	Question 26: Do you agree to the mandatory or conditional metadata elements to be included in the Thematic Appendix?	G	Strictly there should be no mandatory elements beyond the ISO standard or the additional mandatory elements defined by the INSPIRE implementing rules for metadata. For existing metadata systems with existing metadatasets additional mandatory elements are infeasible. Additional (compared to the already defined metadata elements in the IR Metadata) dataset level metadata elements will cause in high costs for adapting existing metadata and metadata systems in germany. (e.g. would mean to adapt ~ 15.000 existing metadata elements in the german UDK)	define all mandatory elements in section 8 as optional

35	Cadastral parcels	Generic question: Do you have any additional comments or suggestions related to the parts ? Please specify	G	The usage of optional and voidable seems not consistent through all inspire themes. Check that optional is strictly used for cardinality-aspects and check that voidable is strictly used for fields where it should be possible to omit population without breaking the conformity. Clarify, that optional and voidable are separate concepts, that can occur in any combination. Clarify also, that the obligation to provide information can not be derived from the optional or voidable state in the model (Obligation of providing information is not regulated in the data specification, but in the inspire directive itself, e.g. information does exist in digital form ..., The dataspecification gives just obligation how to provide the information in a interoperable way).	
36	Cadastral parcels	Generic question: Do you have any additional comments or suggestions related to the parts ? Please specify	Q	If a member state provides one reference data set for an inspire annex theme, is there any obligation to provide additional existing data sets for that inspire annex theme?	

NOTES (must **not** be deleted)

[1] Type of comment can be G (general), E (editorial), T (technical), Q (question)

[2] Specify your answer to the given question. If you want to address different issues related to a single question, please use separate rows. You might thus s

[3] Please specify any changes that you might propose

Questions for Transport networks (Appendix IX)

Please, use one file and this worksheet to provide the comments on all data specifications. Data specifications in column B can be selected from the

(1): All the comments should be entered in the table below. Each row should be numbered with the progressive comment number, starting with 1.

(2): Drop-down list to select the question that you intend to answer (in column B). All questions appear when you click on the cell in this column. Grey background

(3): Use only short marks for the chapter, subchapter, section or clause, as they are stated in the data specification.

While entering longer text, please, don't use additional line-breaks inside the cell, if possible.

To add a new row, move the cursor into an existing cell in the list. If you press on the * that occurs at the bottom of the list, you can enter a new row, just by t

If the * does not occur (Office 2000 and earlier) you can enter a new row by using the "Insert - Rows" tool for inserting new lines for comments.

Please, don't insert additional columns into the table.

Question must not be deleted

Questions (each question might be addressed with more than one answer)

Question 6: Do you agree with the spatial object types to be included in the Thematic Appendix?

Question 7: Do you agree to the definitions of the spatial object types?

Question 8: Do you agree to the data types to be included in the Thematic Appendix?

Question 9: Do you agree to the definitions of the data types?

Question 10: Do you agree to the enumerations to be included in the Thematic Appendix?

Question 11: Do you agree to the definitions of the enumerations?

Question 12: Do you agree to the codelists to be included in the Thematic Appendix?

Question 13: Do you agree to the definitions of the codelists?

Question 14: Do you agree to the attributes and relationships to be included in the Thematic Appendix?

Question 15: Do you agree to the definitions of the attributes and relationships?

Question 16: Do you agree to the allowed values to be included for the enumerations listed in the Thematic Appendix?

Question 17: Do you agree to the definitions of the allowed values to be included for the enumerations?

Question 18: Do you agree with the terms and definitions to be included in the Thematic Appendix?

Question 19: Do you agree with the life-cycle rules to be included in the Thematic Appendix?

Question 20: Do you agree with the rules on identifier management to be included in the Thematic Appendix?

Question 21: Do you agree with the consistency rules to be included in the Thematic Appendix?

Question 22: Do you agree with the requirements on coordinate reference systems to be included in the Thematic Appendix?

Question 23: Do you agree with the requirements on temporal reference systems to be included in the Thematic Appendix?

Question 24: Do you agree with the constraints to be included in the Thematic Appendix?

Question 25: Should minimum data quality requirements be included in the Thematic Appendix? If yes please specify data quality elements and measures.

Question 26: Do you agree to the mandatory or conditional metadata elements to be included in the Thematic Appendix?

Question 27: Do you agree to the definitions of the mandatory or conditional metadata elements?

Question 28: Do you agree to the layers to be included in the Thematic Appendix?

Question 29: Do you agree to the definitions of the default styles to be included in the Thematic Appendix?

Question 30: Do you agree to the well-defined styles to be included in the Thematic Appendix?

Question 31: Do you agree to the definitions of the well-defined styles?

Generic question: Do you have any other comments or change requests for this Thematic Appendix?

Reference

Section 5.1.2.1 (Spatial object types) (

Section 5.1.2.1 (Spatial object types) (

Definitions of the data types in section

Definitions of the data types in section

Definitions of the enumerations in sec

Definitions of the enumerations in sec

Definitions of the code lists in section

Definitions of the code lists in section

Sections 5.1.2.1 (spatial object types)

Sections 5.1.2.1 (spatial object types)

Section 5.1.2.3 (Enumerations and co

Section 5.1.2.3 (Enumerations and co

Section 2.5 (Terms and definitions) in

Sections 5.1.1.7 (Temporality represe

Section 5.1.1.4 (Identifier managemer

Section 5.1.1.3 (Consistency between

Section 6.1 (Spatial reference system)

Section 6.2 (Temporal reference syste

Constraints defined for the types liste

Constraints defined for the types liste

Section 8 (Data set -level Metadata) o

Section 8 (Data set -level Metadata) o

Section 11.1 (Layers) of the Guideline

Section 11.1 (Layers) of the Guideline

Section 11.1 (Layers) of the Guideline

Section 11.1 (Layers) of the Guideline

DS D2.8.I INSPIRE Data Specification - First Draft

1	2	3	4	5	6
		Select from list >	Note [1]	Note[2]	Note[3]
Comment ID	Structural ID (autofill)	Question	Type of comment	Comment	Proposed change
1	Transport networks	Generic question: Do you have any other comments or change requests for this Thematic Appendix?	G	It should be checked, if the INSPIRE Transport network model should be used in the future as basis for the incoming data for European Environmental Noise Mapping (EU Environmental Noise Directive). If yes, all the noise concerning data information have to be added to the model (e.g. noise barriers, attributes on road properties like road surface, road gradient, speed limit, traffic flow and so on). Noise Mapping is also mentioned in part "Executive Summary" and "Identification Information" of the Document D2.8.1.7.	
2	Transport networks	Question 21: Do you agree with the consistency rules to be included in the Thematic Appendix?	T	Req 8 requires that for all transport links the bounding nodes are provided, too. The GNM does not require this - for good reasons. If the current requirements remain, the networks in the German ATKIS data could not be provided as transport networks in INSPIRE.	Delete requirement 8
3	Transport networks	Question 14: Do you agree to the attributes and relationships to be included in the Thematic Appendix?	Q	AerodromeNode - attributes aerodromeCategory and conditionOfFacility: In German ATKIS data this information is associated with the AerodromeArea - not the node (the nodes are not part of the data). Is there any method, which properties are associated with the area objects and which ones with the node objects?	
4	Transport networks	Generic question: Do you have any other comments or change requests for this Thematic Appendix?	Q	Is there a good reason not to use AIXM5 as-is for the basis for the air network model?	
5	Transport networks	Question 6: Do you agree with the spatial object types to be included in the Thematic Appendix?	Q	RailwayLine: Are these always unambiguous sequences of links?	

6	Transport networks	Question 6: Do you agree with the spatial object types to be included in the Thematic Appendix?	T	Road: Roads are in general not unambiguous sequences of links.	Change model or definition of Road
7	Transport networks	Question 6: Do you agree with the spatial object types to be included in the Thematic Appendix?	Q	Road: The way Roads are specified seems to disregard the fact that separate carriageways might be represented by different objects. How could this be an aggregated link?	
8	Transport networks	Question 6: Do you agree with the spatial object types to be included in the Thematic Appendix?	T	RoadArea: The definition is not sufficiently clear. The definition of Road/TransportArea seems to imply that these describe the surface of the network while Area in the GNM seems to represent surface areas "in" the network.	Reconsider definitions and make them consistent with the GNM.
9	Transport networks	Question 10: Do you agree to the enumerations to be included in the Thematic Appendix?	T	Most of the enumerations should probably be code lists. For example, ConditionOfFacilityValues lists four values. The DFDD has more than 10 values.	Re-evaluate enumerations and change to code lists in case of doubt
10	Transport networks	Question 7: Do you agree to the definitions of the spatial object types?	T	The distinction between a road area and a vehicle traffic area is not clear.	Clarify definitions.
11	Transport networks	Generic question: Do you have any other comments or change requests for this Thematic Appendix?	Q	This document specifies a significant number of optional DQ elements in clause 7. and 8. Are there any signals that this information will be provided (and trusted/used by users)?	
12	Transport networks	Generic question: Do you have any other comments or change requests for this Thematic Appendix?	T	Req 20 states that linear referencing shall not be used at this time, however, the model depends on the use of LRS in the simple form specified in the current GNM (as the text above the requirements states, too).	delete requirement to remove the inconsistency
13	Transport networks	Generic question: Do you have any other comments or change requests for this Thematic Appendix?	G+Q	Did you consider the development of upcoming EC directives for Single European Sky which are already in preparation and based on Regulation (EC) No 549/2004 in general and No 552/2004 particularly?	Consider requirements for the development of the Single European Sky and contact responsible EC bodies to avoid duplication or ambiguity of data specifications.
14	Transport networks	Generic question: Do you have any other comments or change requests for this Thematic Appendix?	G	Did you consider the development of the upcoming directive Intelligent Transport Systems in the field of road transport and for interfaces with other transport modes	Consider requirements of the existing proposal from the commission
15	Transport networks	Generic question: Do you have any other comments or change requests for this Thematic Appendix?	G	Cableways are quite different from railways.	A separate Application schema Cable transport networks
16	Transport networks	Question 14: Do you agree to the attributes and relationships to be included in the Thematic Appendix?	T	It would be very useful to encode whether or not a TransportLine belongs to the Trans European Network (TEN).	Table 5.1.2.1.9: Common Transport Elements.TransportLink (feature Type) Add the Attribute "relatedTEN", Value type Boolean
17	Transport networks	Question 16: Do you agree to the allowed values to be included for the enumerations listed in the Thematic Appendix?	T	In Germany there are some ship lifts in addition to locks. Therefore we proposed to add these property to the application schema Water Transport Networks.	Table 5.4.2.3.3 Water Transport Network.FormOfWaterwayNodeValues (codeList) Add Value "ShipLift"
18	Transport networks	Generic question: Do you have any other comments or change requests for this Thematic Appendix?	E	Definition of NDB not correct included. (Section 2.6 Symbols and abbreviations)	NDB = Non-direction radio beacon
19	Transport networks	Question 10: Do you agree to the enumerations to be included in the Thematic Appendix?	T	Access restriction of aviation elements can also be caused by military operations or by temporal events.	Include: + reserved for military + temporal restrictions apply
20	Transport networks	Question 10: Do you agree to the enumerations to be included in the Thematic Appendix?	T	Condition of Facility can also be "closed", e.g. for airports or airfields which still exist but are not in operating mode.	Include: Closed = 5
21	Transport networks	Question 14: Do you agree to the attributes and relationships to be included in the Thematic Appendix?	Q	5.5.2.1.2 Attribute: conditionOfFacility What is the intended use? Usage of airport (MIL/CIV) or type of airport (IFR/VFR ...)?	Please explain the attribute better to avoid ambiguity.
22	Transport networks	Question 19: Do you agree with the life-cycle rules to be included in the Thematic Appendix?	G	The proposed temporality model is not in accordance with the temporality model used in AIXM. Not critical since "voidable". If the intended use of the data is just information, this is ok. If the intended use of the data is to be a basis for flight operations, e.g. in case of emergencies, then this model is not acceptable because safety guidelines are not met.	Define the temporality in accordance with AIXM or include a disclaimer that the data is not intended for navigation purposes.
23	Transport networks	Question 22: Do you agree with the requirements on coordinate reference systems to be included in the Thematic Appendix?	T + Q	According to ICAO the World Geodetic System - 1984 (WGS-84) shall be used as the horizontal reference system for international air navigation. Consequently, published aeronautical geographical coordinates (indicating latitude and longitude) are expressed in terms of the WGS-84 geodetic reference datum. The differences between ETRS89 and WGS84 are neglectable. Are coordinates in WGS84 accepted for INSPIRE?	Include WGS 84 as additional spatial reference system to choose.
24	Transport networks	Question 22: Do you agree with the requirements on coordinate reference systems to be included in the Thematic Appendix?	T	According to ICAO mean sea level (MSL) datum, which gives the relationship of gravity-related height (elevation) to a surface known as the geoid, shall be used as the vertical reference system for international air navigation. And the Earth Gravitational Model - 1996 (EGM-96) shall be used by international air navigation as the global gravity model.	Include MSL as additional vertical reference system for air transport network data.
25	Transport networks	Generic question: Do you have any other comments or change requests for this Thematic Appendix?	T	An Airspace is always 3-dimensional. On page 28 (section 5.1.2.4.2) NetworkArea is defined as a 2-dimensional element in a network. And in the Application schema Air transport networks in section 5.5.1.1. on page 85 the UML class diagram introduces the feature type AirSpaceArea with attributes lowerAltitudeLimit and upperAltitudeLimit. This is ambiguous.	Adapt definition on page 28 with reference to the possibility of an area having lower and upper limits which implicates such areas being a 3-dimensional element.

26	Transport networks	Generic question: Do you have any other comments or change requests for this Thematic Appendix?	T + Q	While Airspace is always 3-dimensional, there can be several different airspaces defined on top of each other. It is possible that there are two or more airspaces with exact the same coordinates but different altitudes and different classification. It is not completely clear if this is in line with the quality issues defined in section 7.1.1.2 in this data specification, where duplicate features are considered to be an error. Is it conform with the quality issues to have several airspaces on top of each other?	Please explain quality issues in terms of 3-dimensional elements.
27	Transport networks	Generic question: Do you have any other comments or change requests for this Thematic Appendix?	G	5.5.2.1.3 Air Transport Network.AirConnector 5.5.2.1.10 Air Transport Network.PublishedInstrumentApproachProcedure 5.5.2.1.13 Air Transport Network.StandardArrivalRoute 5.5.2.1.14 Air Transport Network.StandardInstrumentDeparture These data are not electronically available in the state organisation DFS.	Remove Air Transport Network.AirConnector, Published Instrument Approach Procedure, StandardArrivalRoute and StandardInstrumentDeparture from feature catalogue or make the data voidable.
28	Transport networks	Generic question: Do you have any other comments or change requests for this Thematic Appendix?	G	5.5.2.1.15 Air Transport Network.ControlTower Not available in the state organisation DFS (air traffic control) - neither on paper nor electronically.	Remove Air Transport Network.Control Tower from feature catalogue or make the data voidable.
29	Transport networks	Generic question: Do you have any other comments or change requests for this Thematic Appendix?	G	There is already a central database for aeronautical information established in Europe. This database is called EAD - European AIS Database. It belongs to Eurocontrol. All Eurocontrol member states are expected to upload their aeronautical data into the EAD. We recommend to check with Eurocontrol if the EAD can be used to feed INSPIRE databases as for us it does not seem practical to upload the same data into several different databases.	Consult Eurocontrol and check if the EAD can be used to make the air transport network data available for INSPIRE purposes.
30	Transport networks	Question 12: Do you agree to the codelists to be included in the Thematic Appendix?	G	codelist RailwayUseValues (5.3.2.3.5): The use of 3 values (Cargo [exclusively], CarShuttle [exclusively], Passengers [not exclusively]) on railway use is not sufficient for german requirements	change codelist to: Cargo [exclusively], CarShuttle [exclusively], Passengers [exclusively], mixed use
31	Transport networks	Generic question: Do you have any other comments or change requests for this Thematic Appendix?	G	Statement: In railway-data-structures a "transport link" references to "Streckenabschnitt". That means a link could contain one or two tracks (bidirectional) and there could be two or more parallel links.	
32	Transport networks	Generic question: Do you have any other comments or change requests for this Thematic Appendix?	E	The metadata element Nr. 8.7 "DQ_TopologicalConsistency" has to be mapped to ISO 19115 number 115.	Use correct ISO names and numbers
33	Transport networks	Generic question: Do you have any other comments or change requests for this Thematic Appendix?	E	The metadata element Nr. 8.9 "DQ_ThematicClassificationCorrectness" has to be mapped to ISO 19115 number 125.	Use correct ISO names and numbers
34	Transport networks	Generic question: Do you have any other comments or change requests for this Thematic Appendix?	G	The use cases and therefore the usefulness of the provided draft are not clear.	Identify the use cases/GIS-related tasks that the data specifications are based on.
35	Transport networks	Generic question: Do you have any other comments or change requests for this Thematic Appendix?	T	Requirement "network change protocol": The data specifications TN need an own information structure indicating the network changes. Without this requirement subject specific data couldn't implement automatically in the changed network structure.	recomandation: providing a description for a standardized network protocol to list amendments in the network independent from the used application.
36	Transport networks	Question 26: Do you agree to the mandatory or conditional metadata elements to be included in the Thematic Appendix?	G and T	There is no obvious theme-specific reason for the conditional metadata elements "spatialResolution" and "maintenanceAndUpdateFrequency" (page 115, table 14). Why does especially the theme "transport networks" need those elements, but all others not? As a consequence metadata profiles become larger and therefore more and more confusing. Theme-specific changes on the metadata profile defined by the regulation (EC) nr. 1205/2008 cause inadequate expenses for the metadata catalogue systems operated in the member states.	Delete all or reduce the mandatory theme specific metadata elements or change them at least to "optional".
37	Transport networks	Generic question: Do you have any other comments or change requests for this Thematic Appendix?	G	IDMVU is a nationwide initiative by the VDV, several considerable transportation companies and project executing organizations, and is the Infrastructure-Data-Management for transportation companies with standardized data- and interface structures (VDV recommendation 456). Purpose and mission of the research project has been the specification of consistent data and interface structures, for the exchange of traffic infrastructure relating information, internal as well as external (e.g. contractors). Concerning passenger as well as cargo transportation in Germany. IDMVU is essential foundation and requirement for efficient business processes and sustainable improvement of the cost effectiveness, as well as for the development / further development of information and communication systems. Our future aim is to further develop this standard, based on the particular demand. IDMVU is essential for all national transportation companies and needs to be integrated fundamentally.	
38	Transport networks	Generic question: Do you have any other comments or change requests for this Thematic Appendix?	G	It is important that the INSPIRE data specifications should focus on other directives, but also vice versa. That means that other directives should notice the existence of the INSPIRE directive and integrate the contents like data specs in their considerations.	
39	Transport networks	Question 6: Do you agree with the spatial object types to be included in the Thematic Appendix?	G	Common Transport Network and Road Transport Network: The following types of TransportProperties will not be available in most of the existing local road databases: AccessRestriction, RestrictionForVehicles, LocationCategory, SpeedLimit	

40	Transport networks	Generic question: Do you have any other comments or change requests for this Thematic Appendix?	G	Road Transport Network: It should be possible to generate most of the objects defined in the Road Transport Network based on OKSTRA-kommunal data from local road data bases.	
41	Transport networks	Question 11: Do you agree to the definitions of the enumerations?	T	Road Transport Network: The definition of a grade separated crossing by a RoadNode with FormOfRoadNode no. 2 "GradeSeparatedCrossing" is contradictory to Requirements 7 and 8 because at this location there is no connection between the two roads.	Grade separated crossings should only be defined using the GCM feature GradeSeparatedCrossing (see 9.9.3.4 in DCM). Value no. 2 "GradeSeparatedCrossing" should be removed from code list FormOfRoadNodeValues.
42	Transport networks	Generic question: Do you have any other comments or change requests for this Thematic Appendix?	G	Road Transport Network: The road network model is not routable because there are no traffic relations defined like "Manoeuvre" in GDF.	Since the field of application of the schema "Road transport networks" covers topics like "Flow modelling", "Navigation" and "Routing", features representing the ways vehicles may choose (or may not choose) in a road network should be added.
43	Transport networks	Question 7: Do you agree to the definitions of the spatial object types?	G	Road Transport Network: The definition of the RoadWidth feature is not sufficiently precise. For example: Is the width of the pavements along a road to be included or not?	The definition of the RoadWidth should be more precise.
44	Transport networks	Question 14: Do you agree to the attributes and relationships to be included in the Thematic Appendix?	T	Road Transport Network: In German urban networks Roads often do not have a national or european road code but always a municipal road code.	Road should have an additional attribute "municipalRoadCode" (CharacterString [0..1])
45	Transport networks	Generic question: Do you have any other comments or change requests for this Thematic Appendix?	E	Many incorrect, misleading or duplicated definitions, e.g. 5.2.2.1.6, addressComponent and road, 5.2.2.1.12, direction, 5.2.2.2.1, addressComponent and road	Correct
46	Transport networks	Question 10: Do you agree to the enumerations to be included in the Thematic Appendix?	T	Most of the enumerations should probably be code lists, e.g. VehicleTypeValues	Change enumerations into code lists
47	Transport networks	Question 14: Do you agree to the attributes and relationships to be included in the Thematic Appendix?	G	Road Transport Network: The definition of "FunctionalRoadClass" is very different in different countries. There is no internationally consistent definition.	
48	Transport networks	Question 6: Do you agree with the spatial object types to be included in the Thematic Appendix?	G	Road Transport Network: If there are TransportAreas existing in local road databases they will in most cases be areas generated from cadastre data. Data about areas assigned to specific traffic modes are only rarely available. Often only averaged width values for single lanes are kept and no geometric area objects.	
49	Transport networks	Question 21: Do you agree with the consistency rules to be included in the Thematic Appendix?	T	Req 19 requires that for all link and network geometry automated topology build within the Transport Network theme tolerance shall be supported. If this current requirement remains, the contents of many German federal state road databases could not be provided as transport networks in INSPIRE.	Change requirement to recommendation. Modify model to ensure compatibility with German OKSTRA road network standard.
50	Transport networks	Question 7: Do you agree to the definitions of the spatial object types?	T	Road Transport Network: The distinction between RoadArea and VehicleTrafficArea is not clear. If both are given, are there any geometric constraints to be observed? Are pedestrians considered "road going vehicles" (see VehicleTypeValues)? What is considered a vehicle? Why does the VehicleTrafficArea not indicate the types of vehicle that may use the area?	Clarify definitions of RoadArea and VehicleTrafficArea
51	Transport networks	Question 13: Do you agree to the definitions of the codelists?	T	The following values of the code list FormOfRoadNodeValues cannot be provided by the German federal state road databases: EnclosedTrafficArea, LevelCrossing, RoadEnd, TrafficSquare.	
52	Transport networks	Question 7: Do you agree to the definitions of the spatial object types?	T	RoadLinkThoroughfares and ThoroughfareNames cannot be provided by the German federal state road databases.	
53	Transport networks	Question 7: Do you agree to the definitions of the spatial object types?	T	RoadAreas, VehicleTrafficAreas and RoadServiceAreas cannot be provided by the German federal state road databases.	
54	Transport networks	Question 7: Do you agree to the definitions of the spatial object types?	G	The only sources evaluated for the construction of the Road Transport Network seem to be "GDF", "EuroRoadS", "TWG TN" and "NVDB". The model is not compatible with the German national OKSTRA standard.	The INSPIRE road transport network should be compatible with the German national OKSTRA standard.
55	Transport networks	Generic question: Do you have any other comments or change requests for this Thematic Appendix?	E	Bibliography: The bibliography should only contain publications that are cited within the specification. There should be clear references from the specification to the entries of the bibliography so that the reader can get the information which publication was used as a basis for the creation of a certain class or attribute.	Improve bibliography and add clear references to its entries.
56	Transport networks	Question 7: Do you agree to the definitions of the spatial object types?	T	There is no relationship between Road and RoadArea	Clarify definition of RoadArea and add a relationship between Road and RoadArea, if necessary
57	Transport networks	Question 10: Do you agree to the enumerations to be included in the Thematic Appendix?	G		yes, in general
58	Transport networks	Question 11: Do you agree to the definitions of the enumerations?	G		yes, in general
59	Transport networks	Question 12: Do you agree to the codelists to be included in the Thematic Appendix?	G		yes, in general
60	Transport networks	Question 13: Do you agree to the definitions of the codelists?	G		yes, in general
61	Transport networks	Question 14: Do you agree to the attributes and relationships to be included in the Thematic Appendix?	G		yes, in general
62	Transport networks	Question 15: Do you agree to the definitions of the attributes and relationships?	G		yes, in general

63	Transport networks	Question 16: Do you agree to the allowed values to be included for the enumerations listed in the Thematic Appendix?	G	yes, in general	
64	Transport networks	Question 17: Do you agree to the definitions of the allowed values to be included for the enumerations?	G	yes, in general	
65	Transport networks	Question 18: Do you agree with the terms and definitions to be included in the Thematic Appendix?	G	yes	
66	Transport networks	Question 19: Do you agree with the life-cycle rules to be included in the Thematic Appendix?	G	yes, but it is section 5.1.1.6	
67	Transport networks	Question 20: Do you agree with the rules on identifier management to be included in the Thematic Appendix?	G	yes, but it is section 5.1.1.3	
68	Transport networks	Question 21: Do you agree with the consistency rules to be included in the Thematic Appendix?	G	yes, but it is section 5.1.1.2	
69	Transport networks	Question 22: Do you agree with the requirements on coordinate reference systems to be included in the Thematic Appendix?	G	yes	
70	Transport networks	Question 23: Do you agree with the requirements on temporal reference systems to be included in the Thematic Appendix?	G	yes	
71	Transport networks	Question 24: Do you agree with the constraints to be included in the Thematic Appendix?	G	yes	
72	Transport networks	Question 25: Should minimum data quality requirements be included in the Thematic Appendix? If yes please specify data quality elements and measures.	G	yes, quality data are described in section 7	
73	Transport networks	Question 26: Do you agree to the mandatory or conditional metadata elements to be included in the Thematic Appendix?	G	yes	
74	Transport networks	Question 27: Do you agree to the definitions of the mandatory or conditional metadata elements?	G	yes	
75	Transport networks	Question 28: Do you agree to the layers to be included in the Thematic Appendix?	G	there are no layers specified	
76	Transport networks	Question 29: Do you agree to the definitions of the default styles to be included in the Thematic Appendix?	G	there are no styles specified	
77	Transport networks	Question 30: Do you agree to the well-defined styles to be included in the Thematic Appendix?	G	there are no styles specified	
78	Transport networks	Question 31: Do you agree to the definitions of the well-defined styles?	G	there are no styles specified	
79	Transport networks	Question 6: Do you agree with the spatial object types to be included in the Thematic Appendix?	G	yes, in general	
80	Transport networks	Question 7: Do you agree to the definitions of the spatial object types?	G	yes, in general	
81	Transport networks	Question 8: Do you agree to the data types to be included in the Thematic Appendix?	G	contains no data types	
82	Transport networks	Question 9: Do you agree to the definitions of the data types?	G	contains no data types	
83	Transport networks	Question 26: Do you agree to the mandatory or conditional metadata elements to be included in the Thematic Appendix?	G	Strictly there should be no mandatory elements beyond the ISO standard or the additional mandatory elements defined by the INSPIRE implementing rules for metadata. For existing metadata systems with existing metadatasets additional mandatory elements are infeasible.	define all mandatory elements in section 8 as optional
84	Transport networks	Question 26: Do you agree to the mandatory or conditional metadata elements to be included in the Thematic Appendix?	G	The defined Elements should be harmonized between the different data specifications. There are very much elements regarding the quality of the dataset. This could be a problem in collection and maintenance of metadata.	Reduce the number of quality elements (DQ_...) to the essential elements. Harmonize the elements with other data specification. For example: Reduce this elements to DQ_CompletenessCommission.
85	Transport networks	Question 27: Do you agree to the definitions of the mandatory or conditional metadata elements?	E	The ISO 19115 number ist wrong: spatialResolution DQ_TopologicalConsistency DQ_ThematicClassificationCorrectness	add the right ISO 19115 number
86	Transport networks	Generic question: Do you have any other comments or change requests for this Thematic Appendix?	G	We would like to draw the attention to VDV recommendation 456, available as pdf (in German) on http://www.vdv.de/wir_ueber_uns/vdv_projekte/idm.html?pe_id=123 . This specification for an interface between systems administrating information about infrastructure associated with railway tracks has been published by VDV as a standard for Germany. Thus it is a strong recommendation for all members of VDV, nearly all companies active in public transport or rail cargo transport in Germany (about 600). It is meant to be used in public transport (mainly railways but also busses) and also for the infrastructure of the long distance railways (used for passenger or cargo transport). The specification has been supported financially and also politically by the German Ministry of Transport.	

87	Transport networks	Question 1: Do you agree with the contents of the Network Model?	T	In urban networks roads have often dead-end roads or access roads (having the same road name) so there is no continuous path representing the whole road. In this case the road can not be represented by a single AggregatedLink .	Change Road definition
88	Transport networks	Generic question: Do you have any additional comments or suggestions related to the parts ? Please specify	G	If data-providers can not populate non-voidable properties, it would prevent them to delivery the complete featurtype. On the other hand, too mutch voidable properties would increase the number of provides data that do not fulfill the requirements for the defined use cases. Find a well balanced way for the usage of voidable and use it in a consistnt way though all data specifications.	
89	Transport networks	Generic question: Do you have any additional comments or suggestions related to the parts ? Please specify	G	Clarify the use of the Level of detail mechanism. Please, explicitly explain the relation to the "spatial resolution" metadata elements and use the Level-of-detail-mechanism in a consistnt way and only where the "spatial resolution" meta data elements are not applicable (e.g. different LoD for same feature for presentation)	
90	Transport networks	Generic question: Do you have any additional comments or suggestions related to the parts ? Please specify	T	Generate as mutch documentation a possible into the XML-Schemas. Use the xml-schema-annotation/documentation elements.	
91	Transport networks	Generic question: Do you have any other comments or change requests for this Thematic Appendix?	T	Sometimes informations of the models (e.g. geometries) can be derived from other model elements. To include them always in addition to the implicit spatial relationship will require additional effort and cost in the provision of datasets for INSPIRE, but the benefits are unclear - in particular as redudant information is prone to inconsistencies and errors.	Delete all associations that can be derived by intersecting geometries, unless there is a good reason not to do so.
92	Transport networks	Generic question: Do you have any other comments or change requests for this Thematic Appendix?	G	Due to the short time, only key comments could be documented. There are a number of additional editorial and minor technical errors in most theme specifications (e.g., broken references, use of informative/normative language, inconsistencies between feature catalogue and UML, duplicate text in clause 8, etc) in the document that should be resolved in a review of the document by the editors. In addition, some specification aspects do require some further cross-theme harmonisation.	Review document and correct editorial and minor technical issues.
93	Transport networks	Generic question: Do you have any other comments or change requests for this Thematic Appendix?	G	The consequences of a specification which is so detailed and extensive can not be conceived. Probably it causes enourmous efforts to capture spatial data and corresponding metadata according to the specifications and to update them. This effort cannot be financed by the affected public authorities especially on the lowest level of government (towns).	Reduce the amount of mandatory elements. Only the objects and attributes which are really necessary for the use cases/GIS-related tasks should be mandatory. We suggest to define a basic set of the mandatory elements that can be extended by voidable mandatory elements and optional elements.
94	Transport networks	Question 26: Do you agree to the mandatory or conditional metadata elements to be included in the Thematic Appendix?	G	Strictly there should be no mandatory elements beyond the ISO standard or the additional mandatory elements defined by the INSPIRE implementing rules for metadata. For existing metadata systems with existing metadatasets additional mandatory elements are infeasible. Additional (compared to the already defined metadata elemenets in the IR Metadata) dataset level metadata elements will cause in high costs for adapting existing metadata and metadata systems in germany. (e.g. would mean to adapt ~ 15.000 existing metadata elements in the german UDK)	define all mandatory elements in section 8 as optional
95	Transport networks	Generic question: Do you have any additional comments or suggestions related to the parts ? Please specify	G	The usage of optional and voidable seems not consistnt through all inspire themes. Check that optional is strictly used for cardinality-aspects and check that voidable is strikly used for fields where it should be possible to omit population without braking the conformity. Clarify, that optional and voidable are separete concepts, that can occur in any combination. Clarify also, that the obligation to provide information can not be derived from the optional or voidable state in the model (Obligation of providing information is not regulated in the data specification, but in the inspire directive itself, e.g. information does exist in digital form ..., The dataspecification gives just obligation how to provide the information in a interoperable way).	
96	Transport networks	Generic question: Do you have any additional comments or suggestions related to the parts ? Please specify	Q	If a member state provides one reference data set for an inspire annex theme, is there any obligation to provide additional existing data sets for that inspire annex theme?	

NOTES (must **not** be deleted)

[1] Type of comment can be G (general), E (editorial), T (technical), Q (question)

[2] Specify your answer to the given question. If you want to address different issues related to a single question, please use separate rows. You might thus sele

[3] Please specify any changes that you might propose

Questions for Hydrography (Appendix X)

Please, use one file and this worksheet to provide the comments on all data specifications. Data specifications in column B can be selected from

(1): All the comments should be entered in the table below. Each row should be numbered with the progressive comment number, starting with 1.

(2): Drop-down list to select the question that you intend to answer (in column B). All questions appear when you click on the cell in this column. Grey backg

(3): Use only short marks for the chapter, subchapter, section or clause, as they are stated in the data specification.

While entering longer text, please, don't use additional line-breaks inside the cell, if possible.

To add a new row, move the cursor into an existing cell in the list. If you press on the * that occurs at the bottom of the list, you can enter a new row, just if the * does not occur (Office 2000 and earlier) you can enter a new row by using the "Insert - Rows" tool for inserting new lines for comments.

Please, don't insert additional columns into the table.

Question must not be deleted

Questions (each question might be addressed with more than one answer)

Question 6: Do you agree with the spatial object types to be included in the Thematic Appendix?

Question 7: Do you agree to the definitions of the spatial object types?

Question 8: Do you agree to the data types to be included in the Thematic Appendix?

Question 9: Do you agree to the definitions of the data types?

Question 10: Do you agree to the enumerations to be included in the Thematic Appendix?

Question 11: Do you agree to the definitions of the enumerations?

Question 12: Do you agree to the codelists to be included in the Thematic Appendix?

Question 13: Do you agree to the definitions of the codelists?

Question 14: Do you agree to the attributes and relationships to be included in the Thematic Appendix?

Question 15: Do you agree to the definitions of the attributes and relationships?

Question 16: Do you agree to the allowed values to be included for the enumerations listed in the Thematic Appendix?

Question 17: Do you agree to the definitions of the allowed values to be included for the enumerations?

Question 18: Do you agree with the terms and definitions to be included in the Thematic Appendix?

Question 19: Do you agree with the life-cycle rules to be included in the Thematic Appendix?

Question 20: Do you agree with the rules on identifier management to be included in the Thematic Appendix?

Question 21: Do you agree with the consistency rules to be included in the Thematic Appendix?

Question 22: Do you agree with the requirements on coordinate reference systems to be included in the Thematic Appendix?

Question 23: Do you agree with the requirements on temporal reference systems to be included in the Thematic Appendix?

Question 24: Do you agree with the constraints to be included in the Thematic Appendix?

Question 25: Should minimum data quality requirements be included in the Thematic Appendix? If yes please specify data quality elements and measures.

Question 26: Do you agree to the mandatory or conditional metadata elements to be included in the Thematic Appendix?

Question 27: Do you agree to the definitions of the mandatory or conditional metadata elements?

Question 28: Do you agree to the layers to be included in the Thematic Appendix?

Question 29: Do you agree to the definitions of the default styles to be included in the Thematic Appendix?

Question 30: Do you agree to the well-defined styles to be included in the Thematic Appendix?

Question 31: Do you agree to the definitions of the well-defined styles?

Generic question: Do you have any other comments or change requests for this Thematic Appendix?

Reference

Section 5.1.2.1 (Spatial objec

Section 5.1.2.1 (Spatial objec

Definitions of the data types in

Definitions of the data types in

Definitions of the enumeration

Definitions of the enumeration

Definitions of the code lists in

Definitions of the code lists in

Sections 5.1.2.1 (spatial objec

Sections 5.1.2.1 (spatial objec

Section 5.1.2.3 (Enumeration:

Section 5.1.2.3 (Enumeration:

Section 2.5 (Terms and defini

Sections 5.1.1.7 (Temporality

Section 5.1.1.4 (Identifier mar

Section 5.1.1.3 (Consistency

Section 6.1 (Spatial reference

Section 6.2 (Temporal referer

Constraints defined for the typ

Section 8 (Data set -level Met

Section 8 (Data set -level Met

Section 11.1 (Layers) of the C

Section 11.1 (Layers) of the C

Section 11.1 (Layers) of the C

Section 11.1 (Layers) of the C

DS D2.8.I INSPIRE Data Specification - First Draft

1	2	3	4	5	6
		Select from list >	Note [1]	Note[2]	Note[3]
Comment ID	Structural ID (autofill)	Question	Type of comment	Comment	Proposed change
1	Hydrography	Question 6: Do you agree with the spatial object types to be included in the Thematic Appendix?	T	LandWaterBoundary: Why is this type necessary? The boundary can be determined by informations already defined in the datamodel.	
2	Hydrography	Question 6: Do you agree with the spatial object types to be included in the Thematic Appendix?	G	The HY schema contains a large amount of spatial object types much more than what has been specified for other themes. In trying to map German topographic ATKIS data to the schema, only a small and patchy subset of the complete schema could be provided. It should be verified before adopting the schema that data is actually available in Europe (and needed in INSPIRE. For example, would hydro data be considered useful that contains the following spatial objects? - some but not all physical water objects - none of the reporting information - watercourse links, but no other network elements - no hydro facilities - some POIs - some man-made objects - no relationships between physical water objects, watercourse links, man made objects and POIs	Verify that data provision according to the schema is feasible and all information is needed.
3	Hydrography	Question 7: Do you agree to the definitions of the spatial object types?	Q	Foreshore: definition unclear, should Wadden Sea areas (http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Waddenzee) be reported as foreshores? From the definition the answer would be yes, but it is unclear whether this is intended.	Clarify

4	Hydrography	Question 14: Do you agree to the attributes and relationships to be included in the Thematic Appendix?	T	The associations with Boundary objects do not seem to be complete. Isn't it possible that some LandWaterBoundaries are also along administrative boundaries? Why is the max. multiplicity 1 do they always have to be identical (seems unrealistic)?	Delete associations (see also other comment on redundant thematic associations)
5	Hydrography	Question 6: Do you agree with the spatial object types to be included in the Thematic Appendix?	T	Watercourse: The transformation from German ATKIS data is unclear. In principle, a watercourse seems to be equivalent to a AX_Wasserlauf/AX_Kanal feature (these are the features that carry thematic identifiers). However, these do not necessarily have a geometry that is a primitive. In addition, the different primitives in an aggregate may have different properties. I.e., the separation into spatial object types in the INSPIRE schema is inconsistent with the ATKIS schema. Currently, it is quite unclear how to map ATKIS data to the hydrography schema.	Change definition of hydrold to allow that multiple watercourse objects may have the same hydrold
6	Hydrography	Generic question: Do you have any other comments or change requests for this Thematic Appendix?	Q	This document specifies a significant number of optional DQ elements in clause 7. and 8. Are there any signals that this information will be provided (and trusted/used by users)?	
7	Hydrography	Question 29: Do you agree to the definitions of the default styles to be included in the Thematic Appendix?	T	The SLD is not consistent with the textual description (e.g. "Surface: no line" but SLD contains a line symbolizer)	Improve and test layer and style definitions
8	Hydrography	Generic question: Do you have any other comments or change requests for this Thematic Appendix?	G	References to Inspire or other documents are not uniform through the Draft Guidelines (page 10, Requirement 6) and incomplete	
9	Hydrography	Generic question: Do you have any other comments or change requests for this Thematic Appendix?	G	An introductory explanation of what is to be achieved; in clear words which can be understood by thematic experts would also be helpful	
10	Hydrography	Generic question: Do you have any other comments or change requests for this Thematic Appendix?	G	UML-models without legend	
11	Hydrography	Generic question: Do you have any other comments or change requests for this Thematic Appendix?	G	Listing of the attributes confusing	
12	Hydrography	Generic question: Do you have any other comments or change requests for this Thematic Appendix?	G	A brief example for some of the attributes behind feature types (e.g. table 4) would be helpful; the comment shows that a generic introduction into the terminology used is unclear; this is because ISO standards for theme-specific codification are often missing even though some reference materials (manuals, guidelines, nomenclature) do exist, but not in technical terms	
13	Hydrography	Generic question: Do you have any other comments or change requests for this Thematic Appendix?	G	The term "topologically sound" is often referred to (e.g. page 62, first paragraph). It would be necessary to give a clear definition.	
14	Hydrography	Generic question: Do you have any other comments or change requests for this Thematic Appendix?	G	Bibliography: the references provided are incomplete, and cannot be used by the reader.	
15	Hydrography	Generic question: Do you have any other comments or change requests for this Thematic Appendix?	G	WISE guidance: a proper reference is needed	
16	Hydrography	Generic question: Do you have any other comments or change requests for this Thematic Appendix?	E	The metadata element Nr. 8.6 "DQ_TopologicalConsistency" has to be mapped to ISO 19115 number 115.	Use correct ISO names and numbers
17	Hydrography	Generic question: Do you have any other comments or change requests for this Thematic Appendix?	E	The metadata element Nr. 8.13 "maintenanceAndUpdateFrequency" has to be mapped to ISO 19115 number 143 "maintenanceAndUpdateFrequency" .	Use correct ISO names and numbers
18	Hydrography	Question 20: Do you agree with the rules on identifier management to be included in the Thematic Appendix?	Q	The hydrography of Baden-Württemberg comprises some 17.600 water courses with internal system of mandatory identifiers (numerical, 13-digit) for every segment, and the centreline geometry representing the network model. It is used for all water resources purposes including WFD reporting. Changes of the complex system may be very costly. Therefore: Are there any rules intended concerning the segmentation of the water courses?	The rules for segmentation and for building nodes should not go beyond the network generation rules in Chapter 7 (especially 7.2.4 Topological consistency) and Chap. 10 of the guideline (see 5.1.2.1.15 Network.WatercourseNode: "NOTE: May represent a physical confluence, bifurcation/confluence/vanishing point etc, or it may be associated with a hydrographic point of interest or facility").

19	Hydrography	Question 19: Do you agree with the life-cycle rules to be included in the Thematic Appendix?	G	The purposes for which life-cycle information should be provided (if existent) should be described somewhat more concretely in order to capture useful information.	Please add an informative data capture and maintenance scenario, ranging from low level to high level requirements: 1. A data provider distributes DPS-conformant data at a specific date. 2. The data provider maintains the data, some spatial objects are deleted, changed and some inserted. 3. Should all the maintenance information should be part of the next distribution? Should all deleted objects be part of the distribution with a endLifespanVersion attribute? Examples may help furtheron: It may be useful to historize preliminar water courses and their lifespan (in a long run perspective).
20	Hydrography	Question 8: Do you agree to the data types to be included in the Thematic Appendix?	G	Besides the HydroID a class for the legally maintaining organisation may be provided, if available.	Addition of an Attribute MaintenanceResponsability (voidable) with possible values: State (federal), State (regional), communal, private. Example: Bundeswasserstraßen, Gewässer I./II. Ordnung according to Landeswassergesetz in DE.
21	Hydrography	Question 14: Do you agree to the attributes and relationships to be included in the Thematic Appendix?	Q	Should network Attributes be completed with stationing information of water courses (measure-values for the centerline)?	m-values, if available, could be added to any HydroFacility, HydroPointOfInterest or ManMadeObject with relation to water course and/or to any WaterCourseNode and WatercourseLink.
22	Hydrography	Question 24: Do you agree with the constraints to be included in the Thematic Appendix?	Q	The constraint widthOrHierarchySpecified is not really self-explanatory: What is the context of the width of a water course and its hydrological hierarchy? How are both interrelated?	Please, explain the meaning/reason of 5.1.2.2.2 PhysicalWaters.WidthRangeType.
23	Hydrography	Generic question: Do you have any other comments or change requests for this Thematic Appendix?	G	The use cases and therefore the usefulness of the provided draft are not clear.	Identify the use cases/GIS-related tasks that the data specifications are based on.
24	Hydrography	Question 7: Do you agree to the definitions of the spatial object types?	G	5.1.2.1.18 ManagementAndReporting.WFDGroundWaterBody: no attribute is specified for geometry. The abstract class WFDWaterBody doesn't provide such an attribute too.	Define an attribute
25	Hydrography	Question 6: Do you agree with the spatial object types to be included in the Thematic Appendix?	Q	Which object classes are really part of Annex I? The HydroFacility-Classes seem to be part of Annex III.	
26	Hydrography	Question 7: Do you agree to the definitions of the spatial object types?	G	In package ManagementandReporting the class WFDInlandWater does not correspond to the well known classes in the context of WFD. Up to now a RiverWaterBody was modelled as a group (collection) of RiverWaterSegments. The RiverWaterSegment class included the geometry.	
27	Hydrography	Question 26: Do you agree to the mandatory or conditional metadata elements to be included in the Thematic Appendix?	G	The defined Elements should be harmonized between the different data specifications. There are very much elements regarding the quality of the dataset. This could be a problem in collection and maintenance of metadata.	Reduce the number of quality elements (DQ_...) to the essential elements. Harmonize the elements with other data specification. For example: Reduce this elements to DQ_CompletenessCommission.
28	Hydrography	Question 27: Do you agree to the definitions of the mandatory or conditional metadata elements?	E	DQ_AbsoluteExternalPositionalAccuracy: wrong multiplicity	change multiplicity for DQ_AbsoluteExternalPositionalAccuracy to 0 .. 1
29	Hydrography	Question 27: Do you agree to the definitions of the mandatory or conditional metadata elements?	E	Some ISO/TS 19139 paths are missing or are wrong	Add the correct ISO/TS 19139 paths for DQ_ThematicClassificationCorrectness, maintenanceAndUpdateFrequency, updateScope, transferSize
30	Hydrography	Question 27: Do you agree to the definitions of the mandatory or conditional metadata elements?	E	The ISO 19115 number is wrong: DQ_TopologicalConsistency	add the right ISO 19115 number
31	Hydrography	Question 14: Do you agree to the attributes and relationships to be included in the Thematic Appendix?	T	The AFIS-ALKIS-ATKIS application schema of the German mapping agencies does not explicitly represent spatial relationships as thematic relationships. It is unclear why this is required or beneficial in INSPIRE. The information can be derived when needed. To include them always in addition to the implicit spatial relationship will require additional effort and cost in the provision of datasets for INSPIRE, but the benefits are unclear - in particular as redundant information is prone to inconsistencies and errors.	Delete all associations that can be derived by intersecting geometries

32	Hydrography	Generic question: Do you have any other comments or change requests for this Thematic Appendix?	G	Definition of the map projections and ETRS89: differences between CRS, Map Projections and Hydrography, reference to Eurasian tectonic plate and scope of ETRS89 is not mentioned in CRS	Please use the same definition of ETRS89 in CRS Map Projections in Hydrography
33	Hydrography	Generic question: Do you have any additional comments or suggestions related to the parts ? Please specify	G	If data-providers can not populate non-voidable properties, it would prevent them to delivery the complete featuretype. On the other hand, too much voidable properties would increase the number of provides data that do not fulfill the requirements for the defined use cases. Find a well balanced way for the usage of voidable and use it in a consistant way though all data specifications.	
34	Hydrography	Generic question: Do you have any additional comments or suggestions related to the parts ? Please specify	G	Clarify the use of the Level of detail mechanism. Please, explicitly explain the relation to the "spatial resolution" metadata elements and use the Level-of-detail-mechanism in a consistant way and only where the "spatial resolution" meta data elements are not applicable (e.g. different LoD for same feature for presentation)	
35	Hydrography	Generic question: Do you have any additional comments or suggestions related to the parts ? Please specify	T	Generate as much documentation a possible into the XML-Schemas. Use the xml-schema-annotation/documentation elements.	
36	Hydrography	Generic question: Do you have any other comments or change requests for this Thematic Appendix?	T	Sometimes informations of the models (e.g. geometries) can be derived from other model elements. To include them always in addition to the implicit spatial relationship will require additional effort and cost in the provision of datasets for INSPIRE, but the benefits are unclear - in particular as redudant information is prone to inconsistencies and errors.	Delete all associations that can be derived by intersecting geometries, unless there is a good reason not to do so.
37	Hydrography	Generic question: Do you have any other comments or change requests for this Thematic Appendix?	G	Due to the short time, only key comments could be documented. There are a number of additional editorial and minor technical errors in most theme specifications (e.g., broken references, use of informative/normative language, inconsistencies between feature catalogue and UML, duplicate text in clause 8, etc) in the document that should be resolved in a review of the document by the editors. In addition, some specification aspects do require some further cross-theme harmonisation.	Review document and correct editorial and minor technical issues.
38	Hydrography	Generic question: Do you have any other comments or change requests for this Thematic Appendix?	G	The consequences of a specification which is so detailed and extensive can not be conceived. Probably it causes enourmous efforts to capture spatial data and corresponding metadata according to the specifications and to update them. This effort cannot be financed by the affected public authorities especially on the lowest level of government (towns).	Reduce the amount of mandatory elements. Only the objects and attributes which are really necessary for the use cases/GIS-related tasks should be mandatory. We suggest to define a basic set of the mandatory elements that can be extended by voidable mandatory elements and optional elements.
39	Hydrography	Question 26: Do you agree to the mandatory or conditional metadata elements to be included in the Thematic Appendix?	G	Strictly there should be no mandatory elements beyond the ISO standard or the additional mandatory elements defined by the INSPIRE implementing rules for metadata. For existing metadata systems with existing metadatasets additional mandatory elements are infeasible. Additional (compared to the already defined metadata elements in the IR Metadata) dataset level metadata elements will cause in high costs for adapting existing metadata and metadata systems in germany. (e.g. would mean to adapt ~ 15.000 existing metadata elements in the german UDK)	define all mandatory elements in section 8 as optional
40	Hydrography	Generic question: Do you have any additional comments or suggestions related to the parts ? Please specify	G	The usage of optional and voidable seems not consistant through all inspire themes. Check that optional is strictly used for cardinality-aspects and check that voidable is strictly used for fields where it should be possible to omit population without braking the conformity. Clarify, that optional and voidable are separate concepts, that can occur in any combination. Clarify also, that the obligation to provide information can not be derived from the optional or voidable state in the model (Obligation of providing information is not regulated in the data specification, but in the inspire directive itself, e.g. information does exist in digital form ..., The dataspecification gives just obligation how to provide the information in a interoperable way).	
41	Hydrography	Generic question: Do you have any additional comments or suggestions related to the parts ? Please specify	Q	If a member state provides one reference data set for an inspire annex theme, is there any obligation to provide additional existing data sets for that inspire annex theme?	

NOTES (must not be deleted)

[1] Type of comment can be G (general), E (editorial), T (technical), Q (question)

[2] Specify your answer to the given question. If you want to address different issues related to a single question, please use separate rows. You might thus:

[3] Please specify any changes that you might propose

Questions for Protected sites (Appendix XI)

Please, use one file and this worksheet to provide the comments on all data specifications. Data specifications in column B can be selected from the drop-down

(1): All the comments should be entered in the table below. Each row should be numbered with the progressive comment number, starting with 1.

(2): Drop-down list to select the question that you intend to answer (in column B). All questions appear when you click on the cell in this column. Grey background color of

(3): Use only short marks for the chapter, subchapter, section or clause, as they are stated in the data specification.

While entering longer text, please, don't use additional line-breaks inside the cell, if possible.

To add a new row, move the cursor into an existing cell in the list. If you press on the * that occurs at the bottom of the list, you can enter a new row, just by typing.

If the * does not occur (Office 2000 and earlier) you can enter a new row by using the "Insert - Rows" tool for inserting new lines for comments.

Please, don't insert additional columns into the table.

Question must not be deleted

Questions (each question might be addressed with more than one answer)

Question 6: Do you agree with the spatial object types to be included in the Thematic Appendix?

Question 7: Do you agree to the definitions of the spatial object types?

Question 8: Do you agree to the data types to be included in the Thematic Appendix?

Question 9: Do you agree to the definitions of the data types?

Question 10: Do you agree to the enumerations to be included in the Thematic Appendix?

Question 11: Do you agree to the definitions of the enumerations?

Question 12: Do you agree to the codelists to be included in the Thematic Appendix?

Question 13: Do you agree to the definitions of the codelists?

Question 14: Do you agree to the attributes and relationships to be included in the Thematic Appendix?

Question 15: Do you agree to the definitions of the attributes and relationships?

Question 16: Do you agree to the allowed values to be included for the enumerations listed in the Thematic Appendix?

Question 17: Do you agree to the definitions of the allowed values to be included for the enumerations?

Question 18: Do you agree with the terms and definitions to be included in the Thematic Appendix?

Question 19: Do you agree with the life-cycle rules to be included in the Thematic Appendix?

Question 20: Do you agree with the rules on identifier management to be included in the Thematic Appendix?

Question 21: Do you agree with the consistency rules to be included in the Thematic Appendix?

Question 22: Do you agree with the requirements on coordinate reference systems to be included in the Thematic Appendix?

Question 23: Do you agree with the requirements on temporal reference systems to be included in the Thematic Appendix?

Question 24: Do you agree with the constraints to be included in the Thematic Appendix?

Question 25: Should minimum data quality requirements be included in the Thematic Appendix? If yes please specify data quality elements and measures.

Question 26: Do you agree to the mandatory or conditional metadata elements to be included in the Thematic Appendix?

Question 27: Do you agree to the definitions of the mandatory or conditional metadata elements?

Question 28: Do you agree to the layers to be included in the Thematic Appendix?

Question 29: Do you agree to the definitions of the default styles to be included in the Thematic Appendix?

Question 30: Do you agree to the well-defined styles to be included in the Thematic Appendix?

Question 31: Do you agree to the definitions of the well-defined styles?

Generic question: Do you have any other comments or change requests for this Thematic Appendix?

Reference

Section 5.1.2.1 (Sp

Section 5.1.2.1 (Sp

Definitions of the da

Definitions of the da

Definitions of the en

Definitions of the en

Definitions of the co

Definitions of the co

Sections 5.1.2.1 (sp

Sections 5.1.2.1 (sp

Section 5.1.2.3 (Ent

Section 5.1.2.3 (Ent

Section 2.5 (Terms

Sections 5.1.1.7 (Te

Section 5.1.1.4 (Ide

Section 5.1.1.3 (Cor

Section 6.1 (Spatial

Section 6.2 (Tempo

Constraints defined

Section 8 (Data set

Section 8 (Data set

Section 11.1 (Layer

Section 11.1 (Layer

Section 11.1 (Layer

Section 11.1 (Layer

Section 11.1 (Layer

DS D2.8.I INSPIRE Data Specification - First Draft

1	2	3	4	5	6
		Select from list >	Note [1]	Note[2]	Note[3]
Com ment ID	Structural ID (autofill)	Question	Type of comm ent	Comment	Proposed change
1	Protected sites	Question 6: Do you agree with the spatial object types to be included in the Thematic Appendix?	Q	ResponsibleAgency is defined as being a FeatureType, which by definition is a spatial object type. It is unclear what kind of spatial object a Responsible Agency is. Should this be a point indicating the location of the Agency? Should there be an address? Should it be linked to the addresses DS?	Please add a note, that spatial objects do not need a geometry or a geometrical description.
2	Protected sites	Generic question: Do you have any other comments or change requests for this Thematic Appendix?	G	General aspects to Natura 2000 - Current activities of WG on EU level under the HD and BD: In WP of Expert Group on Reporting under the Nature Directives the content of SDF is discussed and an updated format will be developed and decided by the MS soon. The data transmission is defined there. The cross references in the Data Spec. has to be flexible enough to allow changes by above mentioned decision. Content and technical structure of Natura 2000 reporting data are result of decisions of the Natura 2000 reporting working group on EU level. The data transmission is defined there.	
3	Protected sites	Generic question: Do you have any other comments or change requests for this Thematic Appendix?	G	General aspects to Natura 2000 - Alignment to Natura 2000 obligations: Rules for reporting and data administration are output of Natura 2000 Working Groups and Committees on EU Commission level. The content of the SDF is regulated by Decision 97/266/EU of European Commission; the Data specification must consider this decision; respective cross references are needed at several points in Data Specifications.	
4	Protected sites	Generic question: Do you have any other comments or change requests for this Thematic Appendix?	G	An important aspect before publication of data is the handling with sensitive information on protected areas. The Commission is working on a tool for filtering sensitive information on species from the Natura 2000 database, which will be implemented soon. A consideration on this aspect in the data spec. is missing.	

5	Protected sites	Generic question: Do you have any other comments or change requests for this Thematic Appendix?	G	General aspects to Natura 2000 - Natura 2000 data exchange between Germany and EU Commission: Based on a national decision in Germany Natura 2000 databases and digital maps are annually updated and transmitted to EU with official letter of the federal government. Database structure and GIS data are conform with the requirements of the EU. For handling with sensitive information Germany provides two versions of databases in addition to the above mentioned filter of the EU.	
6	Protected sites	Generic question: Do you have any other comments or change requests for this Thematic Appendix?	G	General aspects to Natura 2000 - Source management in the EU: For presentation of data under INSPIRE a transformation in required formats is necessary. This will be a problem on local level in technical and financial reasons. For economic efficiency we suggest to use, at least for Natura 2000, the data which are already collected from the EU. The big effort is, that they are from the same defined standard and therefore comparable. Concerning reporting data there is only one national report no regional reports with data on regional or local level. The data are not connected with protected sites.	
7	Protected sites	Generic question: Do you have any other comments or change requests for this Thematic Appendix?	G	The Natura 2000 profile must strongly be adapted at the Decision 97/266/EU. According to this decision many of the attributes are no obligations.	
8	Protected sites	Generic question: Do you have any other comments or change requests for this Thematic Appendix?	G	chapter 4: spatial representation type: in Germany spatial data exist as polygon and point type.	
9	Protected sites	Generic question: Do you have any other comments or change requests for this Thematic Appendix?	G	chapter 5.1.5: geometry representation: inside designation types sites may overlap because of different geometry representation (points, polygons)	
10	Protected sites	Generic question: Do you have any other comments or change requests for this Thematic Appendix?	G	chapter 5.1.9: wrong connection to natura 2000 obligations. The reporting duties do not require site information.	
11	Protected sites	Generic question: Do you have any other comments or change requests for this Thematic Appendix?	G	Chapter 5.1.9: only for protected sites under the Habitats Directive data about habitat types are available. Other designation types use different biotope classifications.	
12	Protected sites	Question 8: Do you agree to the data types to be included in the Thematic Appendix?	G	5.2.4.1.2 the percentageOfNationalTerritoryUnderProtectedFeature: not in the SDF Natura 2000	
13	Protected sites	Question 6: Do you agree with the spatial object types to be included in the Thematic Appendix?	G	5.2.4.1.3 partly no obligation for Natura 2000; e.g.: IUCNCategory, legalFoundationDokument, legalExpiryDate, (Lifespan), fundingSource, isprotectedFor, hasHabitat	
14	Protected sites	Question 6: Do you agree with the spatial object types to be included in the Thematic Appendix?	G	5.2.4.1.4 partly no obligation for Natura 2000	
15	Protected sites	Question 8: Do you agree to the data types to be included in the Thematic Appendix?	G	5.2.4.2.1 not exactly like SDF Natura 2000	
16	Protected sites	Question 8: Do you agree to the data types to be included in the Thematic Appendix?	G	5.2.4.2.2 no obligation for Natura 2000	
17	Protected sites	Question 8: Do you agree to the data types to be included in the Thematic Appendix?	G	5.2.4.2.3 no obligation for Natura 2000	
18	Protected sites	Question 12: Do you agree to the codelists to be included in the Thematic Appendix?	G	5.2.4.3.2 currently Appendix E is under review	
19	Protected sites	Question 10: Do you agree to the enumerations to be included in the Thematic Appendix?	G	5.2.4.3.4 no obligation for Natura 2000	
20	Protected sites	Question 8: Do you agree to the data types to be included in the Thematic Appendix?	G	5.2.4.3.6 no obligation for Natura 2000	
21	Protected sites	Question 6: Do you agree with the spatial object types to be included in the Thematic Appendix?	G	5.2.5.1.1 generally the habitat type classification is not comparable with the system of habitat classes. The data information of both is not connectable	
22	Protected sites	Question 12: Do you agree to the codelists to be included in the Thematic Appendix?	G	5.2.5.2.1 wrong values listed	
23	Protected sites	Question 12: Do you agree to the codelists to be included in the Thematic Appendix?	G	5.2.5.2.2 purposes is different to habitat types. There is no need to review a possible duplication.	
24	Protected sites	Question 7: Do you agree to the definitions of the spatial object types?	G	5.2.6.1.2 attribute species: wrong definition	Definition: The species type from Annex II of the Habitat Directive and Annex I and reference list for Article 4(2) of the Birds Directive.
25	Protected sites	Question 8: Do you agree to the data types to be included in the Thematic Appendix?	G	5.2.6.2.1 Range information is part of the reporting obligation, is not not available for a single protected areas	
26	Protected sites	Question 19: Do you agree with the life-cycle rules to be included in the Thematic Appendix?	Q	5.2.4.1.3 In Germany as a Federal State there are different administrative levels providing data sets on Protected sites. The Federal Agency for Nature Conservation is harmonising the data sets provided by the Federal States (including small changes in geometry) in order to generate data sets covering the area of Germany. Do these changes in geometry have to be reflected in the attributes beginLifeSpan and endLifeSpan?	
27	Protected sites	Question 19: Do you agree with the life-cycle rules to be included in the Thematic Appendix?	Q	How to fill the attribute beginLifeSpan for data sets which already exist?	
28	Protected sites	Generic question: Do you have any other comments or change requests for this Thematic Appendix?	G	5.1.8 Sometimes the Name of the Protected Site (mandatory) is not included in the datasets provided by the Federal States.	change to optional
29	Protected sites	Question 16: Do you agree to the allowed values to be included for the enumerations listed in the Thematic Appendix?	G	5.2.4.3.3 The discussion when a Site of Community Interest (SCI) has changed to a Special Area of Conservation (SAC) is not finished in Germany. For that reason this information is often not included in the SDF.	
30	Protected sites	Generic question: Do you have any other comments or change requests for this Thematic Appendix?	G	chap. 8: It is important to harmonize the theme specific metadata for different themes (Protected sites, Hydrography, ...).	harmonization of the theme specific metadata for all data specifications
31	Protected sites	Question 16: Do you agree to the allowed values to be included for the enumerations listed in the Thematic Appendix?	G	5.2.4.3.11 The site code used by the WDPA is the site code of the CDDA.	add an information about CDDA to the Value UNEP WCMC (SiteCodeIdentifierScheme - 5.2.4.3.11)

32	Protected sites	Question 6: Do you agree with the spatial object types to be included in the Thematic Appendix?	G	In general, yes, however the spatial types are not explicitly defined for ProtectedFeatures. One can assume they are polygons/areas based on the "PercentageOfSiteCovered" attributes. However in some cases, for example man-made features such as archaeological sites, contributing organisations may not have polygons. This would require creating new data. That is unless multiple ProtectedSites feature classes should be created, each representing a different spatial type. The role of ResponsibleAgency as a (spatial) FeatureType is also not fully clear.	
33	Protected sites	Question 7: Do you agree to the definitions of the spatial object types?	G	Yes, the definition descriptions appear to be clear.	
34	Protected sites	Question 8: Do you agree to the data types to be included in the Thematic Appendix?	G	In general, yes. However the real test will be in translating real world data into the INSPIRE model.	
35	Protected sites	Question 9: Do you agree to the definitions of the data types?	G	Yes.	
36	Protected sites	Question 10: Do you agree to the enumerations to be included in the Thematic Appendix?	Q	If NationalDesignationType is supposed to be flexible, should it be a codelist rather than an enumeration?	
37	Protected sites	Question 18: Do you agree with the terms and definitions to be included in the Thematic Appendix?	G	Yes.	
38	Protected sites	Question 19: Do you agree with the life-cycle rules to be included in the Thematic Appendix?	G	Yes.	
39	Protected sites	Question 14: Do you agree to the attributes and relationships to be included in the Thematic Appendix?	Q	In general, yes, however in practical implementation terms some clarification may be needed regarding how to relate data held in a supporting dataType to a featureType. For example, in relating ActivitiesAndImpacts to a ProtectedSite, should this be through the objectIdentifier or at a higher level such as siteCode. The reason for this comment is that if a ProtectedSite changes, and the objectIdentifier changes accordingly (version for example) should the ActivitiesAndImpacts be maintained for the oldversion separately and a new set created for the new version of the ProtectedSite? Or, by using SiteCode, is it valid for the related Activities to be common to all versions of the ProtectedSite lifecycle? This applies to enforcing all relationships to DataTypes.	
40	Protected sites	Question 21: Do you agree with the consistency rules to be included in the Thematic Appendix?	G	Yes.	
41	Protected sites	Generic question: Do you have any other comments or change requests for this Thematic Appendix?	G	It is felt that for the vast majority of organisations who must eventually implement this data specification in its final form, the specification document relies too much on a multitude of supporting documentation, including ISO specifications. For physically realising this data spec, organisations must therefore have a very thorough understanding of the ISO specs, the INSPIRE drafting process, and all the technical implications of such. In reality, such complexity may act as a barrier to true and homogenous implementation of the data specification across the community. Rather than presenting the specs in such a complex manner, it might be worth considering the lowest common denominator and pitching the models at that larger audience to help promote adoption. For example, a single common guide, similar to the generic conceptual model, but with practical implementation in mind, and containing all the clear and unambiguous specifications for common data types, field types etc, with an enhanced (plainly written) layer of documentation for each individual specification that allows rapid deployment of the data model.	
42	Protected sites	Question 24: Do you agree with the constraints to be included in the Thematic Appendix?	G	While the constraints appear logical, there may be difficulties in practically implementing some of them within the database. For example, the SpeciesPopulationType under the Species Distribution Application Schema cannot be implemented without recourse to coded procedures or custom client applications, as such constraints are not supported by the core DBMS functionality. However, it is fair to say that once codified, it is the delivery of the data in a clean and consistent manner that is most important, and this could be realised in a transformation or publishing process. This is simply a pragmatic observation based on trying to physicalise the specification in an ESRI Geodatabase.	
43	Protected sites	Question 14: Do you agree to the attributes and relationships to be included in the Thematic Appendix?	Q	If, as the model seems to indicate, ProtectedFeature is a generalisation of Habitat, SpeciesDistribution and OtherProtectedFeature, is the relationship isProtectedFor also applied to Habitat as well as hasHabitat? Why is there no corresponding hasSpecies relationship for SpeciesDistribution?	
44	Protected sites	Question 26: Do you agree to the mandatory or conditional metadata elements to be included in the Thematic Appendix?	G and T	There is no obvious theme-specific reason for the mandatory metadata elements listed in this thematic appendix (page 47, table 11). Why does especially the theme "protected sites" need those elements, but most others not? As a consequence metadata profiles will become larger and therefore more and more confusing. Theme-specific changes on the metadata profile defined by the regulation (EC) nr. 1205/2008 cause partially inadequate expenses for the metadata catalogue systems operated in the member states.	Delete all or reduce the mandatory theme specific metadata elements or at least change them to "optional".
45	Protected sites	Question 27: Do you agree to the definitions of the mandatory or conditional metadata elements?	T	page 50: for the metadata element "profile", an ISO 19115 mapping is missing. This is not allowed if the INSPIRE metadata shall be ISO compliant. The table contains also a wrong metadata element name!	Correct the table, map adequate ISO name and number
46	Protected sites	Generic question: Do you have any other comments or change requests for this Thematic Appendix?	G	The use cases and therefore the usefulness of the provided draft are not clear.	Identify the use cases/GIS-related tasks that the data specifications are based on.
47	Protected sites	Generic question: Do you have any other comments or change requests for this Thematic Appendix?	G	According to feature definition „ProtectedSite“ (chapter 5.2.4.1.3) the attributes "objectIdentifier", "geometry", "designationType", "legalFoundationDocument", "legalFoundationDate", "beginLifespanVersion" (each with multiplicity: 1) and the attribute "geographicalName (multiplicity: 1..*)" are mandatory. In the UML class diagram: Protected sites Application Schema Simple Profile (chapter 5.2.3) the mandatory attribute "beginLifespanVersion" is missing.	Add the missing mandatory attribute "beginLifespanVersion" in the UML class diagram: Protected sites Application Schema Simple Profile (chapter 5.2.3).

48	Protected sites	Question 26: Do you agree to the mandatory or conditional metadata elements to be included in the Thematic Appendix?	Q	The meaning of geographicIdentifier is unclear. Is there a standard for a geographicIdentifier?	Drop the element if possible, else describe the standard by which the identifier is defined.
49	Protected sites	Question 6: Do you agree with the spatial object types to be included in the Thematic Appendix?	E	Reference is wrong, must be section 5.2.4.1 (if it refers to document INSPIRE_dataSpecification_PS_v2.0.pdf)	Section 5.2.4.1 (Spatial object types) of the Guideline documents
50	Protected sites	Question 6: Do you agree with the spatial object types to be included in the Thematic Appendix?	E	Please amend the requested WFD-Feature Types in detail, e. g. WFD Art.7	WFD-Feature Types: a) WFD-Art.7: Waters used for the abstraction of drinking water, b) Nitrates Directive: nitrate sensitive areas, ...
51	Protected sites	Question 7: Do you agree to the definitions of the spatial object types?	E	Please amend the definitions of requested WFD-Feature Types	see above, Definition of WFD-Art.7 Feature Types "Waters used for the abstraction of drinking water": all
52	Protected sites	Question 8: Do you agree to the data types to be included in the Thematic Appendix?	G/Q	not all WFD Art.7 protected sites protected sites have a polygon geometry, riverwaterbodies usually have line-geometry. Also Fish water Directive 78/659/EEC -protected sites have usually line-geometry. How are you going to deal with this?	
53	Protected sites	Question 11: Do you agree to the definitions of the enumerations?	E	Please amend definitions for impact types in accordance to WFD- and SoE-Reporting	
54	Protected sites	Question 12: Do you agree to the codelists to be included in the Thematic Appendix?	E	Please amend codes for impact types in accordance to WFD- and SoE-Reporting	
55	Protected sites	Question 13: Do you agree to the definitions of the codelists?	E	Please amend the codes for the requested WFD-Feature Types and impact types in accordance to WFD- and SoE-Reporting	
56	Protected sites	Question 15: Do you agree to the definitions of the attributes and relationships?	E	Attribute "vulnerability": Please consider that WFD-Reporting already includes definitions, attributes and codes for pressure types	
57	Protected sites	Question 16: Do you agree to the allowed values to be included for the enumerations listed in the Thematic Appendix?	E	Please amend WFD-Pressure Types codes	
58	Protected sites	Question 24: Do you agree with the constraints to be included in the Thematic Appendix?	E	Reference is wrong, must be section 5.2.1 (if it refers to document INSPIRE_dataSpecification_PS_v2.0.pdf)	Constraints defined for the types listed in section 5.2.1 (Feature catalogue) in the Guideline documents
59	Protected sites	Question 26: Do you agree to the mandatory or conditional metadata elements to be included in the Thematic Appendix?	G	profile is not an ISO element. The meaning is unclear.	drop the element profile
60	Protected sites	Question 27: Do you agree to the definitions of the mandatory or conditional metadata elements?	T	page 47, table 11: metadata element nr. 8.9 "geographicIdentifier" makes no sense on dataset level, it would be more adequate on feature level (chapter 7 ?)	Delete this metadata element
61	Protected sites	Generic question: Do you have any additional comments or suggestions related to the parts ? Please specify	G	If data-providers can not populate non-voidable properties, it would prevent them to delivery the complete featurtype. On the other hand, too much voidable properties would increase the number of provides data that do not fullfill the requirements for the defined use cases. Find a well balanced way for the usage of voidable and use it in a consitent way though all data specifications.	
62	Protected sites	Generic question: Do you have any additional comments or suggestions related to the parts ? Please specify	G	Clarify the use of the Level of detail mechanism. Please, explicitly explain the relation to the "spatial resolution" metadata elements and use the Level-of-detail-mechanismn in a consitent way and only where the "spatial resolution" meta data elements are not applicable (e.g. different LoD for same feature for presentation)	
63	Protected sites	Generic question: Do you have any additional comments or suggestions related to the parts ? Please specify	T	Generate as much documentation a possible into the XML-Schemas. Use the xml-schema-annotation/documentation elements.	
64	Protected sites	Generic question: Do you have any other comments or change requests for this Thematic Appendix?	T	Sometimes informations of the models (e.g. geometries) can be derived from other model elements. To include them always in addition to the implicit spatial relationship will require additional effort and cost in the provision of datasets for INSPIRE, but the benefits are unclear - in particular as redudant information is prone to inconsistencies and errors.	Delete all associations that can be derived by intersecting geometries, unless there is a good reason not to do so.
65	Protected sites	Generic question: Do you have any other comments or change requests for this Thematic Appendix?	G	Due to the short time, only key comments could be documented. There are a number of additional editorial and minor technical errors in most theme specifications (e.g., broken references, use of informative/normative language, inconsistencies between feature catalogue and UML, duplicate text in clause 8, etc) in the document that should be resolved in a review of the document by the editors. In addition, some specification aspects do require some further cross-theme harmonisation.	Review document and correct editorial and minor technical issues.
66	Protected sites	Generic question: Do you have any other comments or change requests for this Thematic Appendix?	G	The consequences of a specification which is so detailed and extensive can not be conceived. Probably it causes enourmous efforts to capture spatial data and corresponding metadata according to the specifications and to update them. This effort cannot be financed by the affected public authorities especially on the lowest level of government (towns).	Reduce the amount of mandatory elements. Only the objects and attributes which are really necessary for the use cases/GIS-related tasks should be mandatory. We suggest to define a basic set of the mandatory elements that can be extended by voidable mandatory elements and optional elements.

67	Protected sites	Question 26: Do you agree to the mandatory or conditional metadata elements to be included in the Thematic Appendix?	G	Strictly there should be no mandatory elements beyond the ISO standard or the additional mandatory elements defined by the INSPIRE implementing rules for metadata. For existing metadata systems with existing metadatasets additional mandatory elements are infeasible. Additional (compared to the already defined metadata elements in the IR Metadata) dataset level metadata elements will cause in high costs for adapting existing metadata and metadata systems in Germany. (e.g. would mean to adapt ~ 15.000 existing metadata elements in the German UDK)	define all mandatory elements in section 8 as optional
68	Protected sites	Generic question: Do you have any additional comments or suggestions related to the parts? Please specify	G	The usage of optional and voidable seems not consistent through all INSPIRE themes. Check that optional is strictly used for cardinality-aspects and check that voidable is strictly used for fields where it should be possible to omit population without breaking the conformity. Clarify, that optional and voidable are separate concepts, that can occur in any combination. Clarify also, that the obligation to provide information can not be derived from the optional or voidable state in the model (Obligation of providing information is not regulated in the data specification, but in the INSPIRE directive itself, e.g. information does exist in digital form The data specification gives just obligation how to provide the information in an interoperable way).	
69	Protected sites	Generic question: Do you have any additional comments or suggestions related to the parts? Please specify	Q	If a member state provides one reference data set for an INSPIRE annex theme, is there any obligation to provide additional existing data sets for that INSPIRE annex theme?	

NOTES (must **not** be deleted)

[1] Type of comment can be G (general), E (editorial), T (technical), Q (question)

[2] Specify your answer to the given question. If you want to address different issues related to a single question, please use separate rows. You might thus select the same

[3] Please specify any changes that you might propose