

**20<sup>TH</sup> CHRIS MEETING**  
**Niteroi, RJ, Brazil, 3-7 November 2008**

**Paper for Consideration by CHRIS**

**Role and Future of HGMIO**

<b>Submitted by:</b>	USA (NOAA)
<b>Executive Summary:</b>	Proposal that some activities of HGMIO be transferred to TSMAD and that HGMIO be disbanded.
<b>Related Documents:</b>	CHRIS20-07.1B
<b>Related Projects:</b>	

### **Introduction / Background**

CHRIS paper CHRIS20-07.1B persuasively argues that the HGMIO has fulfilled its original purposes and should be disbanded as an IHO/CHRIS body. That paper states:

1. The need for harmonizing with IEC on S-57/S-52/S-100/101 matters has been successfully concluded with the completion of IEC Standards 62288, 61174, and 62376.
2. IEC agrees with this position and sees no further need for a harmonization group at this time.
3. HO's have ceased to participate in HGMIO, apparently in recognition that MIO's are successfully being dealt with through IHO's stakeholders' forums, NGIO status within IHO for recognized bodies, and the ability of MIOs to be accommodated by the IHO's S-100 geospatial standard and its register/registry structure.

CHRIS paper CHRIS20-07.1B also argues for the establishment of a Technical Outreach Panel (TOP) with a large membership including most WG, sub-WG, HGMIOs, expert contributors, and others. The proposed functions of that Panel are listed in Annex A to the CHRIS paper.

### **Analysis/Discussion**

USA (NOAA) agrees with the conclusion of CHRIS paper CHRIS20-07.1B that HGMIO has completed its work and should be disbanded.

USA (NOAA) would like to consider alternatives to the establishment of a TOP as proposed in CHRIS paper CHRIS20-07.1B for the reasons that:

1. The proposed membership is too broad and is staffed with people from whom we already request a lot of work.
2. Means already exist for proposing changes to IHO standards, e.g. through member states, NGIOs, or through participation in WGs.
3. The proposed activities should be closely monitored by the body responsible for the standard being represented, promoted, or changed rather than be monitored by CHRIS as a whole.
4. Such an effort to promote, solicit changes, and make application demonstration models may be premature for standards not yet adopted (S-100) and not yet implemented (registers/registries).

USA (NOAA) recognizes that there is a need to liaise with other organizations for which adoption of the IHO geospatial standards would be appropriate. It is important that such organizations be aware of IHO standards, their strengths and weaknesses, and of how to adopt and operate within the IHO standards. To a limited extent, this liaison responsibility should include promotion of the IHO standards in order to minimize the creation of other standards where IHO's would be suitable.

USA (NOAA) also recognizes that the HGMIO contributed to identifying, promoting, and organizing the use of S-57 with other types of navigation-related information through its MIO work. It is our opinion that successes in this direction are beneficial and could continue as opportunities become available. However, they must not interfere or compete with specific tasks of CHRIS/HSSC or its WG's.

Therefore, as an alternative to establishing a TOP, CHRIS is asked to consider assigning a work item to TSMAD that would accomplish a subset of the TOP purposes. The work item would be:

- to liaise with other organizations so as to educate and encourage the application of IHO standards to the work of those organizations<sup>1</sup>, and
- to identify and promote the availability of other navigation-related data in ECDIS and in IHO geospatial standard-compliant format.

This work is consistent with the “applications development” responsibility of the TSMAD (Transfer Standard Maintenance and Application Development Working Group). Through liaison it develops the application of the IHO Standards to other organization's needs. Through promoting of other navigation-related data for use in ECDIS (such as MIOs) it helps develop specific applications of the standards.

This approach would have the advantages of:

- not establishing another CHRIS body,
- not impacting already heavily tasked individuals,
- providing technically knowledgeable supervision,
- keep the effort modest until S-100 is fully implemented, supported, and ready for further exploitation.

## **Conclusions**

The dis-establishment of HGMIO is appropriate.

The assignment of work item to TSMAD instead of establishing a TOP should be discussed at CHRIS-20.

## **Recommendations**

Discuss.

## **Justification and Impacts**

The proposed alternative should be discussed as a less resource intensive, better focused alternative than establishing a TOP.

## **Action Required of CHRIS**

The CHRIS is invited to discuss the assignment of a work item to TSMAD to perform “application development” of the IHO geospatial standards instead of establishing a Technical Outreach Panel. The work item would be:

- to liaise with other organizations so as to encourage the application of IHO standards to the work of those organizations, and
- identify and promote the availability of other navigation-related data in IHO geospatial standard-compliant format.

---

<sup>1</sup> Note: TSMAD already has a dormant sub-WG called “Liaison with non IHO constituents.” Its duties would be included within the proposed work item and the sub-WG disbanded.