11th CHRIS MEETING IHB, Monaco, 16-18 November 1999

QUESTIONNAIRE TO CHRIS DELEGATES ON THE FINNISH PROPOSAL (CHRIS LETTER 2/1999) (by LCD. Jorge PEREIRA LIBOR, Vice-Chairman of CHRIS)

PROPOSAL	Y/N	COMMENTS
HO's should continue having direct involvement in:		
a) defining the minimum level of QA for ENC's.		
b) defining rules and guidance for use of SCAMIN to avoid ECDIS clutter.		
• Without considering all of S-57, one off changes are dangerous, and also difficult to monitor/control if done by external agencies.		
This would strip HO's of their own experts to join the TEG.		
• TSMAD, collectively, has expertise in areas such: Maritime boundaries, Sailing Directions, MIO's, etc.		
• It seems more appropriate to contract out certain specific activities to appropriate experts.		
Sub-groups of TSMAD should be created, with goals carefully defined.		
Sub-groups of TSMAD, if created, should be kept as small as possible.		
• Existing TSMAD structure should be retained, until having worldwide ENC coverage.		
CHRIS goals should focus on decision making and policy direction, rather than reviewing progress report of HO's.		
HO's progress report should be issued in advance.		

PROPOSAL	Y/N	COMMENTS
Whenever a clear majority prevails within CHRIS, this should be taken into account.		
Modern correspondence means should be used in a more extensive way.		
Relation between CHRIS WG's should be clarified.		
Meetings of TSMAD, C&SMWG and MIO, should be run consecutively, as far as possible.		
Funds should be made available to contract, under the CHRIS umbrella, certain development/feasibility.		
Persons who would compose the proposed TEG should be elected.		
• The Finnish Proposal should be discussed during the next Hydrographic Conference in March 2000.		
Each CHRIS meeting should concentrate on an area of application or a product specification.		
• Task groups, for specific purposes, should be formed with Professional Assistants of the IHB.		
Work of developing other S-57 based standards should be shared with other organizations (e.g. IOC for bathymetric data exchange).		
Remaining work on extending S-57 should be coordinated and organized (e.g. status of MIO's, interface with SNPWG and TSMAD, etc.).		
MS should enable the IHO to work on S-57 on a structured basis, e.g. by establishing a TEG, with funding and/or personnel provided.		
• IHO should take care of providing the means to use S-57 as vehicle for other applications.		

PROPOSAL	Y/N	COMMENTS
IHO should restrict itself to hydrographic charting applications.		
• Standardization work should be done in a close relation to production environments rather than in a close relation to policy/strategic body like the IHB.		
Arrangements should be made to allow employees from various HO's to participate in new developments for a given and limited time period.		
There should close relationship between the core TEG and an operational RENC.		
• Development and inclusion of additional issues (Nautical Publications, MIO, etc) will require the redefinition of CHRIS WG's.		
TEG should be a sub-group within TSMAD.		
ToR of CHRIS should be reviewed in order to pay more attention to tasks and relationships with its WG's.		
• TEG should be formed by the Technical Experts on ECDIS and computers, already existing at the IHB.		
• A sub-group within TSMAD, called TEG, should be established to specify and award the private companies contracts to S-57 development work.		
• A sub-group of S-57 experts (TEG) should be established to work continuously during a limited time period, e.g. one month, to promote a new section of S-57.		
Should a TEG be established, members of other groups or sub-groups should accept their results.		
• The number of CHRIS meetings should be increased (two or three times a year).		