

Paper for Consideration by SCUFN

Report of the work made during the inter-sessional period

Wish-List of Improvements to the On-line Interface of the GEBCO Gazetteer

Submitted by:	IHB (as SCUFN Secretary)
Executive Summary:	This document reports on the monitoring, since SCUFN28, of the Wish-List of Improvements to the On-line Interface of the GEBCO Gazetteer.
Related Documents:	SCUFN28-07.1A
Related Projects:	N/A

Introduction / Background

1. In 2015, following the SCUFN28 meeting and considering the limited resources available within its Sub-Committee, the Secretariat of the GEBCO Sub Committee on Undersea Feature Names (SCUFN) decided to contract several tasks in order to improve the content of the IHO-IOC online GEBCO Gazetteer of Undersea Feature Names (the Gazetteer) and support SCUFN activities managed by the IHB. The following tasks were contracted to the former SCUFN Secretary.

Tasks	Objectives	Outcome reported in
1	<i>Update the Gazetteer from all undersea feature naming decisions and actions taken at SCUFN-28, ensuring quality control and standardization of the documentation provided as part of the relevant proposals.</i>	Doc. SCUFN29-07.2A
2	<i>Monitor the list of PENDING names (including analysis of information provided by K. Dobrolyubova during SCUFN-28 and proposal for a way forward, regarding Naletov Ridge vs Brass Ridge).</i>	Doc. SCUFN29-xx2
3	<i>Prepare a draft new edition of Publication B-6 (“red line” version), taking into account progress made at and after SCUFN-28¹, with a view to submitting it for comments at SCUFN-29. In accordance with IHO Resolution 2/2007, conduct an impact study and prepare a submission to the 2017 IHO appropriate committees’ meetings.</i>	Doc. SCUFN29-xx3
4	<i>Monitor, upgrade the wish-list of improvements to the Gazetteer interface and test the new developments if any.</i>	Doc. SCUFN29-xx4

2. The objective of this submission paper is to report on Task 4.

¹ This requires that Action SCUFN28/05 be completed.

Analysis/Discussion

3. Document SCUFN28-07.1A presented a wish-list of 28 improvements to the interface of the on-line Gazetteer that had been submitted to NOAA's NCEI² Gazetteer Project Team for assessment.

Regretfully, the NCEI team was not able to consider this document and provide appropriate estimates in terms of time and costs to achieve the work. However, the first three "improvements" of the list could be made, in fact corrected as these were actually shortcomings.

4. SCUFN28 report further noted that NCEI had informed the SCUFN Secretary that they might not be able to continue ensuring the maintenance of the interface of the Gazetteer. Fortunately, the IHB was subsequently informed that NCEI would continue to assume responsibility for the Gazetteer project, including the maintenance of the interface. More recently (May 2016), information has been received from NCEI that work on upgrading the Gazetteer interface will be undertaken in fall 2016.

5. Based on his experience in using the interface, the contractor has reorganized, completed and clarified the wish-list of improvements, as in [Annex A](#). There remain 26 improvements relating to either the Gazetteer Interface or the Gazetteer Administration, and which have been listed in decreasing order of priority. In fact, improvements with suggested priority ASAP concern shortcomings. As in SCUFN28-07.1A, a column is left for NCEI to assess each improvement.

6. New improvement no. 12 deserves particular attention. It is proposed to complement the edit function of the interface with a hyperlink to the SCUFN Review website (www.scufnreview.org), which provides details on the proposals submitted as well as their status following examination by SCUFN (Accepted, Not Accepted, Pending, ...). Thus, an editor will be able to populate the Gazetteer in advance of a SCUFN meeting from the proposals' details found on the SCUFN Review website. Following the meeting, he will also find there the resulting status of the proposal and complete the Gazetteer as appropriate. The idea behind this is to have one unique place where proposals' details and status will be provided, that is, the SCUFN Review website. Ideally, the SCUFN meeting page on the IHO website should also refer to the SCUFN Review website for the new proposals.

Recommendations

It is recommended that:

7. SCUFN Members review the wish-list of improvements in [Annex A](#), including the suggested priorities, and propose any changes as deemed necessary.

8. The NCEI Gazetteer Project Team makes an initial assessment of the work to be done in terms of time and costs, and provide provisional deadlines to achieve the work.

Justification and Impacts

9. Benefits: incremental improvements of the Gazetteer, and correction of anomalies when they exist. Better monitoring and management of the actions to be done. Better visibility on resources needed and better efficiency.

10. Resource implications: impact on NCEI resources to be budgeted. Solutions through GEBCO funding to possibly be considered.

² National Centers for Environmental Information

Action required of SCUFN

11. SCUFN is invited to:

a. note this report.

b. consider / agree on the recommendations made in sections 7 and 8.

Wish-List of Improvements to the On-line Interface of the GEBCO Gazetteer
(September 2016)

No.	Improvement	Suggested Priority	NCEI Assessment (yes/no, deadline, estimated costs)
GAZETTEER INTERFACE			
1	<p><i>Polygon or line crossing the date line.</i> A name with geometry crossing the date line (180°) has its geometry - line or polygon - cut into two new geometries of type MULTILINESTRING, one of each side of the date line. Further, MULTILINESTRING geometries are not visible on the basemap (in yellow), e.g. Havre Trough, Hawaiian Ridge, Kermadec Ridge, Lomonosov Ridge or Pacific-Antarctic Ridge. The only way to have the geometry shown in such cases is to transform the two MULTILINESTRING geometries into two adjacent polygons, with their respective segments along the date line (almost) coinciding, e.g. Pennell Bank. However, this is not satisfactory. A polygon delimiting an undersea feature should remain one single polygon, even if it crosses the date line. Such situation should not result in creating artefacts. This constitutes a major shortcoming of the current interface. It should be noted that there seems to be no problem with geometries – line or polygon – crossing the equator.</p>	ASAP	
2	<p><i>Display of Information – Minimum Depth, Maximum Depth and Total Relief.</i> Any value which has been entered under “Minimum Depth”, “Maximum Depth” or “Total Relief” cannot be removed. It can only be changed. This should be corrected.</p>	ASAP	
3	<p><i>Display of Information – Year of Proposal and Year of Discovery.</i> Any value which has been entered under “Year of proposal” and “Year of discovery” cannot be removed. It can only be changed. The only way to have the year not shown in the “saved” version is to set it to 0 (zero), which is not satisfactory. This should be corrected.</p>	ASAP	
3a	<p><i>Display of Information – Search results.</i> The “Search result” box, on the lower left corner of the Gazetteer front page, should be active when using any popular browser. While this box is active with Mozilla Firefox, it is not with Google Chrome, thus making the Gazetteer unusable with the latter browser. This should be remedied.</p>	ASAP	
4	<p><i>Display of information – Minimum Depth.</i> In some rare cases, the Minimum Depth is a height, that is, above sea surface, e.g. Kikai Caldera or Oki-Daito Plateau. In order to cope with such cases, it should be possible to enter a negative value under Minimum Depth.</p>	Short Term	
5	<p><i>Input and Display of Information – Diacritical Characters.</i> It should be possible to enter and display the following characters: ā, ē, ī, ō and ū, as part of a specific name, e.g. Pūkākī Rise, or as part of the</p>	Short Term	

No.	Improvement	Suggested Priority	NCEI Assessment (yes/no, deadline, estimated costs)
	information in the fields "Origin of Name" and/or "Additional Information".		
6	<i>Cancel Option under Edit Function.</i> Under the "Edit" function, two options are available, that is, "Cancel" and "Save". To end up under the "Edit" function, one has to select "Edit" under either the "Approved" or "Ready" or "Pending" or "Edit" status. Selecting the option "Cancel" always results in a new "Edit" status, which is fine only if the previous status was "Edit". Rather, one should revert to the actual previous status, whether "Approved", "Ready", "Pending" or "Edit".	Short Term	
7	<i>Display of information - Geometry.</i> Only the primary geometry is shown. There should be an additional line showing the secondary geometry.	Medium Term	
8	<i>Display of geometry on the chart background.</i> The geometry of any name selected is shown in yellow on the basemap. When clicking on the geometry, it sometimes disappears, e.g. Acapulco Seamounts, Guling Seamounts.	Medium Term	
9	<i>Display of Position on the Chart Background.</i> At present, the coordinates associated with the cursor's position on the basemap are expressed as <i>Long, Lat</i> with format \pm LLL.DDD, \pm lll.ddd, e.g. – 119.833, 13.475. There should be an option to express them as <i>Long, Lat</i> with format LLL°MM.M'E/W, ll°mm.m'N/S, e.g. 119°50.5'W, 13°27.1'N. The latter format for geographical coordinates is more familiar to the average user of the Gazetteer.	Medium Term	
10	<i>Edit and Pending Status – New option Withdraw/Reject.</i> Only "Approved" names can be "Deleted" and marked as such in the database, which is logical and therefore correct. However, the "Edit", "Pending" and even "Ready" status also propose the function "Delete" as an option, which is illogical and, in fact, does not work: an error message is generated. The function "Delete" should therefore be removed from the options available under the "Edit", "Pending" and "Ready" status. On the other hand, it is recommended that an option " Withdraw/Reject " be available instead under the "Edit" and "Pending" status, which would result in the concerned names being flagged as " Withdrawn/Rejected " in the database. In effect, all names proposed in advance of a SCUFN meeting are entered into the Gazetteer database with status "Edit", for convenience. Following their examination at the meeting, these names are considered "Accepted", "Adopted", "Pending", "Not Accepted" or "Withdrawn". At present, the only way to deal with "Not Accepted" and "Withdrawn" names is to first "Approve" these names, then to "Delete" them. This is not satisfactory. Similarly, some names which have been kept "Pending" for years in the database, may eventually be "Withdrawn" by decision of SCUFN or at the request of the proposer, for whatever reason. Again, those "Pending" names must first be "Approved" then "Deleted", which is	Medium Term	

No.	Improvement	Suggested Priority	NCEI Assessment (yes/no, deadline, estimated costs)
	not satisfactory. By definition, "Not Accepted", "Withdrawn" and "Pending" names have never been "Approved".		
11	<i>Display of Information - Geometry – Coordinates.</i> Importing geometry from shape files results in coordinates with an unnecessary great number of decimals, e.g. -35.79992945866667 - 21.76742849571431. It is recommended to limit to five the number of decimals (the fifth decimal being rounded), which corresponds to an accuracy of the order of 1 metre on the ground (the sea in fact). In the above case, the coordinates would become -35.79993 - 21.76743. The other additional decimals are meaningless.	Medium Term	
12	<i>Edit Function – Link to SCUFN Review website.</i> The SCUFN Review website (www.scufnreview.org) provides details on the proposals submitted as well as their status following examination by SCUFN (Accepted, Adopted, Not Accepted, Pending, Withdrawn or Deferred). It is suggested to include a new key "Review Proposal" on the "state" line of the Edit Function (but separate from the other state keys, for example in the middle of that line), with a hyperlink to the SCUFN Review website, so as to read: " <input type="button" value="Review Proposal"/> <input type="button" value="Cancel"/> <input type="button" value="Save"/> Thus, an editor will be able to populate this page in advance of a SCUFN meeting from the proposal details found on the SCUFN Review website. Following the meeting, he will also find there the resulting status of the proposal so as to select the appropriate state key ("Hold", "Summit" or "Withdraw/Reject") for the next step.		
13	<i>Display of Information – Associated Meeting.</i> At present, one Associated Meeting only is allowed. In a number of cases, a name has been the subject of successive changes, relating to the generic term, the position(s) or even the specific term. These are reported in the relevant meetings. It would therefore be useful to be able to enter up to three associated meetings, shown on same line, in order to trace back the history of a name if needed.	Long Term	
14	<i>Display of Depth on the Chart Background.</i> In addition to the coordinates <i>Long, Lat</i> associated with the cursor's position on the basemap, it would be useful to have the possibility of displaying the depth in meters, that is, <i>Long, Lat, Depth</i> , using the GEBCO gridded bathymetry database	Long term	
15	<i>Display of Information - Editor.</i> The e-mail shown should be that of the latest editor having made changes to the database. At present, this is the e-mail of the first intervening editor.	Long Term	
GAZETTEER ADMINISTRATION			
16	<i>Meetings List.</i> When updating the details for a given meeting, the field "Year" is reset to "1975". It should stay as it was.	ASAP	

No.	Improvement	Suggested Priority	NCEI Assessment (yes/no, deadline, estimated costs)
17	<p><i>Feature Types List.</i> The Feature Types “Arrugado”, “Mountains” and “Unknown” appear in the list with description “not a recognized Feature Type”. These 3 feature types are not used anywhere in the Gazetteer, they are not listed in B-6 and should therefore be removed from the list. However, the function “Delete” which is available when selecting a Feature Type does not work. An error message is generated when attempting to delete it (Administrator). This should be corrected. Further, a particular case is that of the Feature Type “Zone”. Although, it does not appear in B-6, it has been used in the past for names which are now flagged “Deleted” in the database. For that reason, it is assumed that “Zone” should be kept in the list, for historical purpose, with its current definition “not a recognized Feature Type”. In any case, the Feature Types “Arrugado”, “Mountains”, “Unknown” and “Zone” should not appear in the list which is proposed when selecting “Type” from the “Undersea Feature Search” box of the Gazetteer Interface.</p>	Short Term	
18	<p><i>Contacts List.</i> The following contacts “German R/V Meteor”, “German R/V Meteor (Dr. R. Werner, GEOMAR)”, “NMOC, USA”, “Soviet Northern Fleet Hydrographic Expedition” and “R/V Melville, SIO, USA” are not linked to any name in the database (Search results under “Proposer” or “Discoverer”: “0 features found”). They should therefore be removed from the list. However, the function “Delete” which is available when selecting a Contact does not work. An error message is generated when attempting to delete it (Administrator). This should be corrected. In any case, these 5 Contacts should not appear in the list which is proposed when selecting “Proposer” or “Discoverer” from the “Undersea Feature Search” box of the Gazetteer Interface.</p>	Short Term	
19	<p><i>Privileged Users.</i> A privileged user with status “Administrator” should have the possibility to remove from the User List an editor (that is, with status “Enabled”) who has lost his/her privilege for whatever reason, for example after leaving the IHB or stepping down from SCUFN. This is not the case at present and this shortcoming should therefore be remedied.</p>	Short Term	
20	<p><i>Feature Types List.</i> If, during the editing of a feature type, you click on the “return” key to start a new line, this change is not reflected in the updated text, although it is shown if that feature type is edited again. This should be corrected.</p>	Medium Term	
21	<p><i>Feature Types List.</i> It should be possible to reach a given feature type, for example “Seamount”, directly by entering some initial letters (e.g. “sea”) in an additional small window “Filter by name” somewhere at the top of the page, similarly to what has been done to search through the Contacts List.</p>	Medium Term	
22	<p><i>Feature Types List.</i> For consistency purpose, it is recommended that the expression “Feature Type” be replaced with “Generic Term”,</p>	Medium Term	

No.	Improvement	Suggested Priority	NCEI Assessment (yes/no, deadline, estimated costs)
	which is the accepted wording as reflected in B-6. Similarly, the words "Name" and "Description" at the top of each page should be replaced with "Term" and "Definition", respectively.		
23	<i>Feature Types List.</i> Wherever the description of a Feature Type is not provided because reference is made to another Feature Type, e.g. "Cap: see BANK", there should be a hyperlink from the relevant word – here, "BANK" – to the actual description for that Feature Type, in this case under "Bank".	Medium Term	
24	<i>Feature Types List.</i> The following "Note" should be included at the top of each page, preferably in the line "Feature Type List" (to become "Generic Term List"): "NOTE: Terms written in CAPITALS in the definitions are themselves defined elsewhere in the list."	Medium Term	
25	<i>Contacts List.</i> Following harmonization of the contact names (proposers and discoverers) in 2015, a number of "Deleted" undersea feature names continue to point to obsolete expressions of contacts. In order to maintain the harmonization thus obtained, it should not be possible to use any of the obsolete contacts anymore. To achieve that, it is recommended to create a separate section "Historical Contacts List" and move to that new section all obsolete contacts, as listed in the middle column of the table shown at Annex B to Doc. SCUFN28-07.2A . As a result, only those contacts in the Active Contacts List should be shown in the list which is proposed when selecting "Proposer" or "Discoverer" from the "Undersea Feature Search" box of the Gazetteer Interface. Additionally, a new functionality should be developed to allow an Administrator to transfer an obsolete contact from the Active Contacts List to the Historical Contacts List, as needed in the future.	Medium Term	
26	<i>Contacts List.</i> It should be possible to enter more than one e-mail address in the "Email" field. At present one address only can be included.	Long Term	