|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 1 | 2 | (3) | 4 | 5 | (6) | (7) |
| **Id[[1]](#footnote-1)** | **Name** | **Chapter, section or clause no./ Subclause No./ Annex[[2]](#footnote-2)** | **Paragraph/ Figure/Table/Note[[3]](#footnote-3)** | **Type of com-ment[[4]](#footnote-4)** | **Comment (justification for change)** | **Proposed change[[5]](#footnote-5)** | **WG A observations** on each comment submitted |
| **1** | **NGIB** | **1 Executive Summary** | **§6** | **T** | ***simple GIS format with properties attached to ,* we need to be more explicit by refering to INSPIRE** | **"simpler data schema than the one adopted by the INSPIRE data specifications by avoiding the property types. Semantic information should be structured as attribute of the geometrical feature".** | **NA**  **Better to keep simple text in executive summary.**  **Proposed sentence has been added in chapter 5 about data delivery.** |
| **2** | **NGIB** | **2.3.3** | **Core recommendation X** | **Q** | **I try to understand the message. Is that related to an update cycle? or does that means that short term actions should be decided in order to improve in a way the core datasets knowing that all the core recommendations might not be fullfilled within a couple of years, which sounds to me a bit unrealistic. As written-up, the recommendation looks like a roadmap. Is that the purpose?** |  | **This is a generic explanation about the expected impact of core recommendations, i.e. need for short term actions (if recommendation is not yet achieved).**  **Depending on themes and countries, it may be difficult to fulfil all core recommendations within a couple of years but at least short-term actions should be launched as soon as possible.** |
| **3** | **Norway** |  |  |  | **My concern and suggestion is that there TN specification has references in the document to other European Union initiatives, particularly on Transport networks, nodes and routing;**  [**http://www.transmodel-cen.eu/**](http://www.transmodel-cen.eu/)  [**http://netex-cen.eu/**](http://netex-cen.eu/)  [**http://www.transmodel-cen.eu/video**](http://www.transmodel-cen.eu/video)  **Norwegian Implementation:** [**https://developer.entur.org/pages-intro-files**](https://developer.entur.org/pages-intro-files)  **It is important that the api’s and xml-files can be translated or the Inspire/ISO 19000-series of standards, and that joint UML-models can be developed. This would help integrate both data and web services (wfs 2.0, wfs 3.0, wms) into the Inspire/spatial data infrastructures.** |  | **Transmodel and netex are standards respectively about public transport and public transport schedules.**  **This kind of data is not considered as core data but it is topic of interest. Will be mentioned in chapter 6 Considerations about future.** |
| **4** | **Spain** | **2.6** |  |  | **The INSPIRE DS on TN should be v3.2 instead of v3.1 as it is the most update version** | **INSPIRE Data Specification on Transport Networks – Technical Guidelines 3.2** | **A** |
| **5** | **Spain** | **3.1** | **General Scope/** | **G** | **Answer to the comment about “network”:**  **I think so. Firstly because for the 2 first modes (road an railway) their lineal networks are being considered; Secondly because one of most important requirement of INSPIRE TN is that data must be modelled according to a network structure where the multimodal relationships should be defined by means of nodes (including ports and airport nodes). Therefore, even if only the infrastructures (the ports and airports) are considered, they must be defined as nodes as well, so that the multimodal relationships can be created by means of the relationships between nodes (i.e. road-port nodes, road-airport nodes, etc.) From this point of view these two modes can also been defined as part of the TN** |  | **A**  **The term “network” has been kept in the definition.** |
| **6** | **NGIB** | **4.1** | **geographical names** | **T** | **Geographical name is a generic attribute and needs to be better defined specifically for each feature For example: what means geographical names for the roads is that a streetname? .** | **Add a note after each table clarifying the specific meaning of the geographical name** | **A**  **Note or examples have been added directly to the attribute in the table** |
| **7** | **Spain** | **4.1.1** | **Table 1: Common attributes** | **T** | **The data time información is really important to allow following the feature traceability and thus to be able to implement authomatic data maintenance processes. Therefore the priority of beginLifespanVersion and endLifespanVersion should be 1** |  | **NA**  **Though very useful, the life-cycle information has not been considered as core for TN and other core themes.**  **General understanding is that in some countries it is already quite challenging to capture and provide current valid information.**  **If not yet the case, including life-cycle attributes is expected to occur when there is an opportunity to do so, e.g. upgrade in data base management system** |
| **8** | **Spain** | **4.1.2** | **Table 2: expected content of Road Transport Network/ Type RoadLink** | **T** | **TransEuropean Transport Network should provide more information distinguishing between core and comprenhension network, as it is its natural classification. Then their values can’t be boolean but an enumeration:**  **TransEuropeaTransport Network Values:**  **- Core**  **- Comprenhensive**  **- No TenT Network** | **To extend the values that the TransEuropeaTransport Network attribute in order to allow providing more specific information of this network** | **A**  **The enumeration will be provided in the table but with a NOTE allowing Boolean as alternative solution (e.g. it is still the case in ERM).** |
| **9** | **Spain** | **4.1.2** | **Table 2: expected content of Road Transport Network/ Type MarkerPost** | **T** | **About the attribute link to Road: The way to link a markerPost (usually kilometer point) to a road should be done using the Road ID as a FK in this table, and, additionally, it should be done spatially as well stablishing a relationship between the roadlink and the marker post (e.g. by means of the orthogonal projecting of the point on the roadlink)** | **To fill:**  **Values / enumeration**  **(FK) Road Identifier** | **A**  **Road identifier will be mentioned as the most usual way to link Marker to Road.** |
| **10** | **Kadaster** | **4.1.2** | **Table 2** | **G** | **As road lay-outs differ from country to country, some additional advice on how to interpret the various form of way types could be helpful in mapping the national data format to the proposed UNGGIM data format. E.g. what is the difference between freeways and motorways and what is the definition of an enclosed traffic area?** | **Include mapping instructions for form of way types as a note to table 2, or as a paragraph in the methodology annex (B). This is also helpful for other values in this table and for the values in tables 2 to 5.** | **AwM**  **The code list is coming from INSPIRE => WG A doesn’t have the necessary background to provide required background.**  **What can be done is that each data provider documents the meaning and/or criteria used in road links classification (form of way & functional road class)** |
| **11** | **Kadaster** | **4.1.2** | **Table 2** | **Q** | **The priorities for “Markerpost” in the Type column do not match the priority in the priority column. Logically it seems incorrect that the priority of the type is lower than the priority of the attributes.** |  | **This is explained in NOTE 1 of chapter 4.1**  **“There may be first priority attributes on features considered as second priorities; if the feature is captured (good practice), it should be captured with its core attributes ; if not, the feature might be meaningless or useless.”** |
| **12** | **Spain** | **4.1.3** | **Table 3: expected content of Railway Transport Network/Type RailwayLink** | **T** | **TransEuropean Transport Network should provide more information distinguishing between core and comprenhension network, as it is its natural classification. Then their values can’t be boolean but an enumeration:**  **TransEuropeaTransport Network Values:**  **- Core**  **- Comprenhensive**  **- No TenT Network** | **To extend the values that the TransEuropeaTransport Network attribute in order to allow providing more specific information of this network** | **A**  **The enumeration will be provided in the table but with a NOTE allowing Boolean as alternative solution.** |
| **13** | **Spain** | **4.1.3** | **Table 3: expected content of Railway Transport Network/Type RailwayLink** | **T** | **Maybe the attribute type should be on railway line better than on the railway link so that a link it is not generally shared by different kinds of rail transport** | **To move the attribute type from railway link to railway line** | **NA**  **Keeping this information at road link level makes the model more flexible, enabling it to deal with possible exceptions.**  **In addition, it is also the modelling choice of INSPIRE (better to keep close to it if no significant benefits expected from a change).** |
| **14** | **Spain** | **4.1.3** | **Table 3: expected content of Railway Transport Network/Type RailwayLink** | **T** | **We miss the type MakerPost as the type for the kilometers point in railway. This type should have the same attributes as it has been modelled in road TN** | **To evaluate if including MarkerPost type in a similar way as it has been modelled in Road TN** | **NA**  **Though Marker posts also exist along railway lines, they have more limited use and therefore haven’t been considered as core data.** |
| **15** | **Kadaster** | **4.1.4** | **Table 4** | **Q** | **The priorities for “Runway” in the Type column do not match the priority in the priority column. Logically it seems incorrect that the priority of the Type is lower than the priority of the attributes.** |  | **This is explained in NOTE 1 of chapter 4.1**  **“There may be first priority attributes on features considered as second priorities; if the feature is captured (good practice), it should be captured with its core attributes ; if not, the feature might be meaningless or useless.”** |
| **16** | **Spain** | **4.1.5** | **Table 5: expected content of Water Transport/Type ferrycrossing** | **T** | **TransEuropean Transport Network should provide more information distinguishing between core and comprenhension network, as it is its natural classification. Then their values can’t be boolean but an enumeration:**  **TransEuropeaTransport Network Values:**  **- Core**  **- Comprenhensive**  **- No TenT Network** | **To extend the values that the TransEuropeaTransport Network attribute in order to allow providing more specific information of this network** | **A**  **The enumeration will be provided in the table but with a NOTE allowing Boolean as alternative solution.** |
| **17** | **NGIB** | **4.4.4** | **Core recommendation 11** | **T** | ***or in another core theme ( adress or )*.  If so , we should define the linkage methodology.  How to link ponctual adress feature to a road network? Not to be confused with a geographical name** | **To define the link data system ( by key identifiers?) Avoid to refer to the adresses as defined in INSPIRE in order to populate the geographical names of the road network which needs to be clarified. Do we mean a streetname?** | **The INSPIRE data model for theme Address includes a link between the (punctual) address feature and the Thoroughfare Name (generally a name street).**  **NOTE 2 states as condition “there is an easy way to join the name stored in address or toponymal database to the related transport feature.”**  **Proposal is to keep this generic recommendation as the WG A deliverable is focusing on expected data content rather than on detailed explanations about data management.** |
| **18** | **NGIB** | **4.4.4** | **NOTE 3:** | **T** | ***stated in document “Spatial Core Data theme Geographical Names – Recommendations for content”.*  complicated and risky to properly maintain and use. It is a similar case as for the property types of the transport network. To avoid.** | **to refer to the flattening rules on geographical names adopted by INSPIRE.see https://github.com/INSPIRE-MIF/2017.2/blob/master/model-transformations/SimpleGeographicName.md** | **NA**  **The flattening rules of INSPIRE reduce too much the information about the geographical name.**  **From the agreement found by WG A about theme GN, at least language, status and source (if relevant) should be captured for each name.** |
| **19** | **NGIB** | **4.5.4** | **Core recommendation 15** | **G** | ***update frequency should be one year of better.* What is the real implication? 1) A full coverage update, 2)partial update. 3) Online update meaning that any update should be published asap ( one year or better)** | **We prefer option 3** | **Expected target is first option that corresponds to reasonable balance between user requirements and feasibility.**  **Note that WG A is only providing recommendations (reasonable common target) and not legal obligations.** |
| **20** | **NGIB** | **5.3** | **Good practice 14** | **T** | **most current GIS** | **let say the most currently used or the most popular. Replace GIS format by encoding systems** | **A** |
| **21** | **Kadaster** | **6.4** |  | **G** | **The transition in the automotive sector from combustion engines towards electric propulsion is an important issues in Europa at the moment, and also effects SDG goals related to climate change. This transition should be widely supported in the TN data model, e.g. in the form of electric car stations. Furthermore, this data should be relatively easy to capture/acquire.** | **Include electric car (loading) stations as priority 1 data in the RoadService types.** | **A** |
| **22** | **NGIB** | **7.1.1.2** | **Fig 4** | **E** | **Form of RoadNode Value not in green** | **should be filled at generalised LoD** | **A** |
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