| ISPRA TESTING Commenting Spreadsheet                             |                                      |   |   |  |  |  |  |
|--|--------------------------------------|---|---|--|--|--|--|
| Document   | Number of<br>chapter, section        | Paragraph, figure,                      | Short title   | Comment  | Proposed change  | Severity                               |  |
| For data specifications (D2.8 x)                                 | or (sub)clause                       | diagram, table                          | A short summary of the  | The comment. This should include a   | The proposed change should be as precise   | Select level of                        |  |
| use a comma-separated list of                                    | chapter, section or                  | paragraph"                              | comment (maximum 1  | justification for the proposed change (if any).  | and specific as possible.  | severity from drop                     |  |
| (e.g."AC,MF,OF,SR") or "all" (to                                 | "3.1" instead of                     |   | the summary of the issue in the                                       |  |  | down list (minor,<br>normal, critical) |  |
| refer to all data specifications)<br>For the proposed changes to | "Clause 3.1" or<br>"Chapter 6.1" For |   | issue tracking system used by<br>the TWGs                             |  |  |  |  |
| D2.5 & D2.7, use "D2.5/2.7"                                      | comments                             |   | ale TWO3.   |  |  |  |  |
| For the O&M guidelines (D2.9),<br>use "D2.9"                     | referring to the<br>whole document,  |   |   |  |  |  |  |
|  | use "all".                           |   |   |  |  |  |  |
| [This field is validated using a                                 |                                      |   | [This field is limited to max. 255                                    |  |  |  |  |
| macro]<br>LC   | All                                  | All                                     | characters]<br>Comments as part of other                              | Most of own comments and suggestion are  |  | Normal                                 |  |
|  |                                      |   | documents.  | just incorporate by the INSPIRE DT and TWG   |  |  |  |
|  |                                      |   |   | incorporated in other SDIc community   |  |  |  |
| GE   | 5.2.1                                | page 11, 3rd row                        | samplingFrame association   | documents due to face to face meeting that<br>In this part of the document is required as                      | A referenced list of term could be included.   | Normal                                 |  |
|  |                                      |   | need codelist   | mandatory the SamplingFeature identification,  |  |  |  |
|  |                                      |   |   | possible term. In most case this can generate  |  |  |  |
| GE   | 5.2.1                                | page 12, second-<br>last paragraph      | geologic structure  | it is important to consider the inclusion of<br>buried fault in the fault type. In many case it's              | introduce buried fault in fault type   | Critical                               |  |
|  |                                      |   |   | possible to have buried structure below  |  |  |  |
| GE   | 5.2.1                                | page 12, last                           | Error in a  | From our point of view   | New sentence: A GeomorphologicalFeature  | Critical                               |  |
|  |                                      | paragraph,<br>GeomorphologicalE         | GeomorphologicalFeature<br>definition                                 | GeomorphologicalFeature can be also a point<br>of interest that at certain scale can be                        | (Figure 3) is a landform represented as point,<br>linear or areal form                       |  |  |
|  |                                      | eature                                  | deminion  | represented just as point, while the sentence  |  |  |  |
| GE   | 5.2.1                                | page 11, Body<br>Morphology             | Body Morphology conflict  | The description of morphology of a geologic<br>body: it isn't clear which type of relation have                | Clarify the relation between body morphology<br>of a Geologic Unit with the                  | Minor                                  |  |
|  |                                      |   |   | with the GeomorphologyFeature that describe  | GeomophologyFeature Type.  |  |  |
| GE   | 5.2.1                                | page 13, second-                        | CGI_TermRange and   | Concerning the opportunity to encode the   | Just to make a remark.   | Minor                                  |  |
|  |                                      | last paragraph                          | CGI_NumericRange could be   | geologic feature as OGC WFS service the  |  |  |  |
|  |                                      |   | sobstituted by Swe model?   | category and quantity to encode the numeric  |  |  |  |
| GE   | 5.2.1                                | Page 15, 1st<br>paragraph               | CGI_planar_orientation<br>properties                                  | how is described a horizontal orientation of a<br>plane?   | Add "horizontal "  | Minor                                  |  |
|  |                                      | F = 3 - F                               | F F   |  |  |  |  |
| GE   | 5.2.2.1.2                            | page 15,                                | GeomorphologicFeature   | cfr. comment before about  | New sentence: A GeomorphologicalFeature  | Critical                               |  |
|  |                                      | GeomorphologicFe                        | definition  | GeomorphologyFeature definition; the   | (Figure 3) is a landform represented as point,   |  |  |
|  |                                      | ature                                   |   | deminition should be changed   |  |  |  |
| GE   | 5.2.2.1.3                            | page 16,<br>NaturalGeomorphol           | NaturalGeomorphologicFeature<br>definition                            | NaturalGeomorphologicFeature definition isn't<br>exhaustive of the processes that produce                      | New sentence: The type of geomorphologic<br>feature produced by Natural process              | Normal                                 |  |
|  |                                      | ogicFeature                             |   | them.  | ·······  |  |  |
| GE   | 5.2.2.2.1                            | page 16,                                | Governance should be not  | The possibility of the extension of the  | We suggest the introduction of a vocabulary  | Normal                                 |  |
|  |                                      | AnthropogenicGeo                        | extended as term  | Governance (by the member States) will   | or a fixed codelist.   |  |  |
|  |                                      | eTypeTerm                               |   |  |  |  |  |
| GE   | 5.2.2.2.1                            | page 16,<br>NaturalGeomorphol           | NaturalGeomorphologicFeature<br>Type require a vocabulary.            | In the GeomorphologyFeature model is<br>missing the possibility to explain the state of a                      | From the model isn't clear the role played by<br>geomorphology (e.g. in the NRZ model); we   | Critical                               |  |
|  |                                      | ogicFeatureTypeTe                       | ,   | landform that in most case is essential to   | think that it should be better explained.  |  |  |
| GE   | 5.2.2.2.2                            | page 16,                                | NaturalGeomorphologicFeature  | A very long list of term like  | We suggest the introduction of a hierarchy   | Critical                               |  |
|  |                                      | NaturalGeomorphol                       | Type require a vocabulary.  | NaturalGeomorphologicFeatureTypeTerm   | vocabulary based on morphodynamic factors.   |  |  |
|  |                                      | rm                                      |   | can generate confusion into the user, because  |  |  |  |
| GE   | 5.2.2.2.2                            | page 16,<br>NaturalGeomorphol           | Governance should be not<br>extended as term                          | The possibility of the extension of the<br>Governance (by the member States) will                              | We suggest the introduction of a vocabulary<br>or a fixed codelist.                          | Critical                               |  |
|  |                                      | ogicFeatureTypeTe                       |   | decrease the harmonization.  |  |  |  |
| GE   | 5.2.3                                | page 17, 1st                            | Geological Age is described in  |  | Geologic Age should be included into the core  | Critical                               |  |
|  |                                      | paragraph,<br>geological age            | the extension schema  |  | model.   |  |  |
|  |                                      | 33                                      |   |  |  |  |  |
| GE   | 5.2.3                                | page 19, 3rd dotted<br>row, Start Point | Start point indicate the position<br>relative to ground surface where | In the BoreholeStartPointCode code list (page<br>175) doesn't appear "Rotary table", at which                  | add "Rotary table" in the<br>BoreholeStartPointCode code list                                | Normal                                 |  |
|  |                                      |   | the borehole commenced.   | most of the borehole "height a.s.l." is referred   |  |  |  |
| GE   | 5.2.7                                | pag.60                                  | profileType not unique  | other types of geophysical lines may be of   | extended profileTypeValue Codelist should at   | Normal                                 |  |
|  |                                      | GeophProfiles, last<br>paragraph, also  |   | importance also in the core schema: for<br>example multibeam and side scan sonar are                           | least include: multibeam, side scan sonar,<br>gravity, magnetic, em.                         |  |  |
| 05   |                                      | 5.2.8.4.6.                              |   | used for marine environmental studies also of  |  |  |  |
| GE   | 5.2.7                                | GeophProfiles, last                     | multimethod profiles  | acquired using different geophysical sensors   | Add attribute for multimethod profiles   | Normal                                 |  |
|  |                                      | paragraph                               |   | measuring different parameters at the same time  |  |  |  |
| GE   | 5.2.7                                | pag.62                                  | DataSetTypeValue to be  | other types of geophysical surveys may be of   | add new items to DataSetTypeValue:   | Normal                                 |  |
|  |                                      | GeophSurveys, last<br>paragraph, also   | extended  | importance also in the core schema: for<br>example multibeam and side scan sonar                               | multibeam, side scan sonar, em   |  |  |
| 05   | 5.0.7                                | 5.2.2.4.2.                              | station to a solution   | surveys for marine environmental studies also  |  | Mana                                   |  |
| GE   | 5.2.7                                | GeophStations first                     | station type restriction  | gravity, magnetic and seismological, why use   | keeping with the document version  | MINOF                                  |  |
|  |                                      | and last paragraph                      |   | examples or citation of vertical electrical<br>soundings, electrode spacing, etc?                              |  |  |  |
| GE   | 5.2.7                                | pag 60                                  | constraints   | we approve   |  | Minor                                  |  |
|  |                                      | GeophStations and<br>GeophProfiles      |   |  |  |  |  |
| 05   | 5.0.7                                |   | a change i O catila all a san a c                                     | No. to bla and used if the second | a mating of the Operlan of some  | Mara                                   |  |
| GE   | 5.2.7                                | defined in the                          | column "Section" wrong  | reference values (f.e. 5.2.2.1.1 should be   | correction of the Section references   | MINOF                                  |  |
|  |                                      | feature catalog"<br>Table               |   | 5.2.8.1.1)   |  |  |  |
| GE   | 5.2.7                                | pag 73, 5.2.8.1.12.                     | SeismicLine Type Value  | It could be important to distinguish 2D  | change the values in SeismicLine TypeValue   | Normal                                 |  |
|  |                                      | and 5.2.8.3.1.                          | extension   | multichannel and 2D one channel seismics<br>(lots of marine data was surveyed using one                        | (5.2.8.3.1) to: 2D onechannel seismic line; 2D<br>multichannel seismic line; 3D seismic line |  |  |
| <u> </u>   | 11.0.0                               | nogo 105                                | atulaa far farit tur  | channel seismics) and the data processing,   | Introduce a suggle Hardwork of A. M.C.   | Normal                                 |  |
| GE   | 11.2.2                               | page 125                                | styles for fault types  | comment above), it is important to introduce a   | Introduce a symbol for buried fault (possibly<br>dotted line)                                | Normal                                 |  |
|  |                                      |   |   | symbol for buried fault  |  |  |  |
| GE   | 11.2.2                               | page 125                                | styles for fault types  | although it is indicated in the legend, avoid, if  | change the dotted line (ft 1, ft 1.1, ft 1.2) with   | Normal                                 |  |
|  |                                      |   |   | ft 1.2) which in many cases, for mapping   | anouner style type   |  |  |
| 1  |                                      |   | 1   | habit, can be interpreted as buried or   | 1  | 1                                      |  |

| GE | Anney F         | nage 169  | AlterationType Term  | which is the difference between "alteration   | eliminate "unknown alteration"   | Minor    |
|----|-----------------|---|--|---|--|----------|
|    | , JUIGA F       | Page 103  |  | type not specified" and "unknown alteration"?   |  |          |
| GE | Annex F         | page 175  | Start point indicate the position relative to ground surface where the borehole commenced. | most of the borehole quote is referred to<br>Rotary Table height a.s.l.   | add "Rotary table" in the<br>BoreholeStartPointCode code list  | Normal   |
| GE | Annex F         | page 212,<br>NaturalGeomorphol<br>ogicFeatureTypeTe<br>rm Code list | terminology doubt  | some doubt on the terms "Bajada" and<br>"Ballena"   | delete   | Minor    |
| GE | Annex F         | page 213,<br>NaturalGeomorphol<br>ogicFeatureTypeTe<br>rm Code list | terminology doubt  | some doubt on the term "Ballon"   | delete   | Minor    |
| GE | Annex F         | page 214,<br>NaturalGeomorphol<br>ogicFeatureTypeTe<br>rm Code list | terminology doubt  | some doubt on the term "Bayou"  | delete   | Minor    |
| GE | Annex F         | page 215,<br>NaturalGeomorphol<br>ogicFeatureTypeTe<br>rm Code list | terminology doubt  | some doubt on the term "Bolson"   | change with "Intermountain basin"  | Minor    |
| GE | Annex F         | page 215,<br>NaturalGeomorphol<br>ogicFeatureTypeTe<br>rm Code list | terminology doubt  | some doubt on the term "Coulee"   | delete   | Minor    |
| GE | Annex F         | page 225,<br>NaturalGeomorphol<br>ogicFeatureTypeTe<br>rm Code list | typing error   | Geiser instead of geyser  | change geiser with geyser  | Minor    |
| GE | Annex F         | page 227,<br>NaturalGeomorphol<br>ogicFeatureTypeTe<br>rm Code list | terminology doubt  | some doubt on the term "Gulch"  | change with "ravine"   | Minor    |
| GE | Annex F         | page 233,<br>NaturalGeomorphol<br>ogicFeatureTypeTe<br>rm Code list | terminology doubt  | some doubt on the term "Mogote"   | delete   | Minor    |
| GE | Annex F         | page 235,<br>NaturalGeomorphol<br>ogicFeatureTypeTe<br>rm Code list | terminology doubt  | some doubt on the term "Paha"   | delete   | Minor    |
| GE | Annex F         | page 236,<br>NaturalGeomorphol<br>ogicFeatureTypeTe<br>rm Code list | terminology doubt  | some doubt on the term "partial ballena"  | delete   | Minor    |
| GE | Annex F         | page 237,<br>NaturalGeomorphol<br>ogicFeatureTypeTe<br>rm Code list | terminology doubt  | some doubt on the term "pimple mound"   | delete   | Minor    |
| GE | Annex F         | page 238,<br>NaturalGeomorphol<br>ogicFeatureTypeTe<br>rm Code list | terminology doubt  | some doubt on the term "pocosin"  | delete   | Minor    |
| GE | Annex F         | page 238,<br>rankTerm Code list                                     | missing sinthemic unit (UBSU unit)   | we use the sinthemic unit (Synthem) for<br>quaternary continental deposits  | add "Synthem"  | Minor    |
| SO | 2.2             | page 1 paragraph<br>2.2 last sentence                               | add mitigation of desertification<br>process   | Desertification is considering in the<br>COM(2006)231final as final result of degration<br>processes.   | Add at the end of sentence also: the mitigation<br>of desertification porcesses in areas with arid<br>or semi-arid climatic condition.   | Normal   |
| SO | 2.2             | page 4 paragraph  | change Brownfields definition  | The definition of brownfields isn't correct and   | The definition of brownfields is: Brownfields  | Normal   |
| SO | 5.2.2.2.2       | page 39 paragraph   | Explain the definition of  | In the definition of contamination name is not  | If the terms are synonymous is important   | Normal   |
|    | Annex B         | page 121 Annex  | Explain or insert P factor in the  | The P factor that are present in the formula  | We suggest to explain because isn't in the   | Normal   |
| EF | Annex B/Annex C | page 52 Annex B<br>Uses case  | Add more explicative examples  | In the document should be more examples of<br>uses case, also examples how EF model<br>could be interlinked with the other model. In<br>own case, it isn't easy understand the<br>relation between EF as wave measurement | Add examples of uses case and also<br>examples of relation between EF model and<br>other models.   | Normal   |
| AM | Annex B         | page 74 Annex B<br>Uses case  | Add more examples  | In the document there should be more<br>practical examples, also XML schema<br>examples to better understand the data   | add practical example of compiled XML  | Normal   |
| NZ | 2.2             | page 13,<br>Table 1 (15th row)                                      | peak ground linear dislocation<br>change   | This definition is ambiguous and isn't<br>consistent with standard terminology, so we<br>suggest to change title.<br>In consideration of the list of hazard is better   | Coseismic surface tectonic dislocation   | Critical |
|    | 2.2             | page 13,<br>Table 1   | Geologic/Landslide change<br>name  | broader term than landslide that not take in<br>account all the phenomena   | Geologic\Ground deformation  | Normal   |
| NZ | 5.2.1.1         | page 22<br>After IR<br>Requirement 3                                | Insert the reliability of the<br>Hazard assessment   | The reliability of the Hazard assessment is<br>necessary to evaluate the quality of hazard<br>map   | Add the new attribute "Reliability".   | Normal   |
| NZ | 5.2.1.2         | page 25 in<br>paragraph: LINKS<br>WITH OTHER<br>THEMES              | Link the hazard to the inventory source  | *****   | Add a Reference attribute to the features<br>providing information about inventory or<br>catalogue supporting the hazard assessment.   | Critical |
| NZ | 50444           | page 35<br>ObservedHazard   | Add the reference attribute with   | To better link the Natural Hazard Assessment<br>to the source of phenomena information is<br>necessary to add a attribute in the<br>ObservedHazard Feature Catalogue.   | Association role: sourceInvetory<br>Value type: HazardArea<br>Definition: The association with the features<br>providing information about inventory or<br>catalogue supporting the hazard assessment<br>Multiplicity: 0.* | Nierzel  |
| NZ | 5.3.1.1.4.      | page 107 B.1 2nd  | the source<br>peak ground linear dislocation<br>change                                     | This definition is ambiguous and isn't<br>consistent with standard terminology, so we   | Stereotypes: «voidable»<br>Coseismic surface tectonic dislocation  | Critical |
| NZ | AILLEX D        | nade 107 P 1 2nd  | Ground dislocation definition  | "Ground dislocation harmful impact on solid   | Surface dislocation/deformation caused by the  | Untital  |
| NZ | Annex B         | row - 2nd column  | change   | with earthquake and tectonic events.<br>The ground motion of the tectonic plates  | fault  | Critical |
| NZ | Annex B         | row - 3rd column<br>page 109 B.1 table                              | tectonic explanation change  | with the new definition.  |  | Normal   |
|    | Annex B         | 3rd row - 1st<br>column   | Geologic/Landslide change<br>name  | In consideration of the list of hazard is better<br>broader term than landslide   | Geologic\Ground deformation  | Normal   |
| NZ | Annex B         | page 109 B.1 table,<br>3rd row - 2ndt<br>column                     | Landslide term ambiguity   | Landslide term includes several hazard<br>mentioned in the same group (i.e. Rockfall,<br>mudflow, slide, etc.); this could generate an<br>overlap.  | Delete Landslide term  | Minor    |

|     |           |  |  | the IT mapping on "Floods" is compliant with<br>the Inspired one because it was agreed in the<br>WG F (Working group on Flood Directive)  |  |          |
|-----|-----------|--|--|---|--|----------|
| 117 | 4         | page 118 C.1<br>refereed to Flood                | Election and the second  |   | Netword  | M        |
| NZ  | Annex C   | mapping  | Flood compliance   |   | Not need   | Minor    |
| NZ. | Annex C   | page 145 in all the<br>C 2.1 paragraph           | Ambiguity between Landslide<br>Hazard mapping scope and<br>Geologic/landslide cateoory |   | As just affirmed in the previous comment if<br>the Geologic/Landslide term, will be modified<br>than an example (uses case) of multi ground<br>motion hazard map will be deolov. | Normai   |
| OF  | 5.2.1.2   | page 11<br>Paragraph 5.2.1.2                     | Explain<br>PointObservationCollection part   | In the text isn't well explained the<br>PointObservationCollection part and   | add explaination of<br>PointObservationCollection  | Normal   |
| OF  | 5.2.2.1.7 | page 16<br>Paragraph<br>5.2.2.1.7 Definition     | Modify the<br>PointObservationCollection<br>definition                                 | In our case we have a collection of<br>PointSeriesObservation data therefore the<br>definition and description are incompatible   | Modify Definition as: Collection of<br>PointObservations and/or<br>PointSeriesObservation  | Critical |
| OF  | 5.2.2.1.7 | page 16<br>Paragraph<br>5.2.2.1.7                | Modify the<br>PointObservationCollection<br>description                                | In our case we have a collection of<br>PointSeriesObservation data therefore the<br>definition and description are incompatible   | Modify Description as: The<br>PointObservationCollection is simply a<br>collection of PointObservations and/or   | Critical |
| SR  | 5.2.2.1.1 | page 16<br>CoastLine                             | Datetime attribute to specify the<br>period of the detection                           | There may be more lines of shore, according<br>to the period in which it was detected. Date   | add an attribute date and time.  | Normal   |
| SR  | 5.2.2.1.6 | page 19 Shore<br>Segment                         | Datetime attribute to specify the<br>period of the detection                           | to the period in which it was detected. Date<br>and time at which this version of the spatial   | Add an attribute date and time.  | Critical |
| SR  | 5.2.2.1.6 | page 20<br>Shoreline/ShoreTyp<br>eClassification | Attribute shoreType more<br>general (natural, artificial,<br>virtual)                  | It would be appropriate to include at least an<br>attribute shoreType (natural, artificial, virtual)<br>more general, which precedes the attribute<br>shoreClassification   | Add an attribute shoreType more general.   | Normal   |
| SR  | 5.2.2.1.7 | page 20 Shoreline                                | Datetime attribute to specify the<br>period of the detection                           | to the period in which it was detected. Date<br>and time at which this version of the spatial<br>object was detected or changed in the spatial<br>data set.   | Add an attribute date and time.  | Normal   |
| SR  | 5.2.2.3.3 |  | the proposal codelist<br>shoreClassification is not<br>exhaustive                      | it would be appropriate to extend the<br>classification or use the classification defined<br>in the project EUROSION  | See the methodology of the project<br>EUROSION: D261 Methodology<br>CELEEA115511.pdf or D264 Coastal Erosion<br>LayerEEA115501.pdf   | Normal   |
| HΒ  | 5.2.2.2.3 | page 24 2nd<br>paragraph<br>"HabitatType"        | Add Palearctic Classification  | Because the Palearctic Classification scheme<br>(as a development of the CORINE-Biotopes)<br>provides the same information content as<br>EUNIS, it could be useful to allow an easier<br>intercoperability with existing data sets (spatial<br>or tables), based on CORINE. | Consider adding the Palearctic Classification<br>scheme to EUINS, as an alternative to the<br>HabitatsDirective Codelist.  | Normal   |
| SD  | all       |  | No comment   | Our database on the species distribution is<br>quite simple, therefore appear in great part<br>compliant with INSPIRE SD Data Model.  |  | Minor    |
|     |           |  |  |   |  |          |
|     |           |  |  |   |  |          |
|     |           |  |  |   |  |          |
|     |           |  |  |   |  |          |
|     |           |  |  |   |  |          |
|     |           |  |  |   |  |          |
|     |           |  |  |   |  |          |
|     |           |  |  |   |  |          |
|     |           |  |  | 1   |  |          |
| L   |           |  |  | 1   | 1  |          |