3RD MEETING OF THE HYDROGRAPHIC SERVICES AND STANDARDS COMMITTEE
IHB, Monaco, 8-10 November 2011

Paper for Consideration by HSSC

Comments by Finland to proposed Review of S-58 *(HSSC3-05.1B)*

Submitted by:	*Finland*
Executive Summary:	*The document includes comments and concerns to the proposed review of S-58*
Related Documents:	*1. HSSC3-05.1B*
Related Projects:	*None*

Introduction / Background

1.   Finland has reviewed the proposal to review the IHO S-58 (*HSSC3-05.1B*) and has the following observations, comments and concerns to this proposal:

2.   The proposal states that the scope of this standard is unclear and proposes that it should be clarified (para 4.4 recommendation 9c). It also proposes that the HOs will be obliged to apply this standard in their own work (paragraphs 4.4, 6, and recommendation 10c). However, the current S-58 is a derived standard (from S-57). If the S-58 will be changed as mandatory then how the relations between these will be defined? For example, which one is authorative if there are conflicts?

3.   The current S-58 Version 4.2.0 states *"[S-58] specifies the checks that, at a minimum, producers of ENC validation tools should include in their validation software*". In our opinion the scope of this standard is very clear. This is a standard which guides the developing the validation softwares.   The validation softwares based on this standard may be used as an additional tool to help HOs to ensure that their ENCs are according to the S-57 standard. Also ECDIS manufacturers may use that as an aid when developing their systems.

4.   In our opinion **this proposal aims to a substantial change to the scope of the S-58 standard**. If that will be approved, it should be based on a thorough analysis of its consequences. We are not convinced on the need for that.

5.   It is proposed in para 4.1 that "*ECDIS specific tests should be moved out of S-58 into a separate IHO "S" standard for reference by manufacturers*". It is unclear for us to which tests this refers.

6.   There is a proposal in para 4.2 to divide errors into 2 classes: "*Major errors*" and *Minor errors*".   The S-58 includes already a classification to "*Errors*" and "*Warnings*".   In our opinion it may cause confusion if there are different kind of errors and if some of them area acceptable as proposed.   We would like keep the existing classification.

7.   The review of the content of S-58 may be feasible, as proposed in para 4.3.

Action required of HSSC

8.   The HSSC is invited to

   • take **note** on this information

31 October 2011
Juha Korhonen