

13th CHRIS MEETING
17-19 September 2001, Athens, Greece

SENC DELIVERY OPTION - VOTING PAPER RESULTS
(IHB)

IHB Circular Letter 15/2001 circulated the minutes of CHRIS/12 along with a questionnaire on the SENC delivery issue, according to CHRIS recommendation. Questions asked to Member States are reproduced below.

QUESTION 1 (Q. 1)

Do you agree with the recommendation of the CHRIS committee that SENC distribution be accepted as an option, in addition to direct ENC distribution, providing that the basic premises and safeguards for SENC delivery, as listed at Annex E to the Minutes of the 12th CHRIS Meeting, be adhered to?

QUESTION 2 (Q. 2)

If the answer to Question 1 is “YES” , do you agree that the paragraph 3.3 of IHO Publication S-52 be amended as emphasised in Annex F to the minutes of the 12th CHRIS Meeting?

After the CL had been issued, with a deadline for returning the questionnaire set to 1st May 2001, it was decided to suspend that deadline, pending further examination of the matter by WEND in May 2001 and also at the June 2001 Industry Workshop, and MS were informed accordingly. Despite of that, 17 responses have however been received at the IHB. They have been summarised in the table below.

<u>COUNTRY</u>	<u>Q. 1</u>	<u>Q.2</u>	<u>COMMENTS</u>
Argentina	-	-	At this stage, Argentina is focusing on ENC production and has not yet considered distribution and updating.
Australia	Y	Y	-
Canada	Y	Y	No comments
Colombia	Y	Y	IHO must ensure the SENC would be safe and sensible for Mariners.
Cuba	Y	Y	No comments
Estonia	Y	Y	No comments
Finland	N	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Even if accepted by CHRIS, the concept of SENC delivery option seems not clear and the consequences of allowing this have not been analyzed. The French paper (Attachment III to C15/2001) indicates this clearly. - At the last CHRIS meeting, there were some concern about the reliability of the SENC distribution, especially about updating (see the Premises for SENC distribution in CL 15/2001, Attachment 1, Annex E). There were also discussions on trials to verify this reliability. So far, Finland has received no new reports on this issue.

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Finland believes that the proposed SENC delivery option is more complex than the current one, i.e. ENC delivery, and may confuse those working with ECDIS systems or data delivery. - Finland proposes that IHO specifies the border line of HO's responsibility in delivering ENC data, in the context of SENC delivery. Currently this responsibility is clear, as regards releasing ENC data in a standard format (IHO- S-57 specifications) and having this data displayed correctly on an ECDIS (IHO S-52 specifications); But what about HO's responsibility on ENC data display on an ECDIS, following an external SENC generation? This also relates to the issues of encryption, data compression, data transfer in different data channels, etc.
Greece	Y	Y	No comments
Indonesia	Y	Y	The conversion from ENC to SENC should take place in the ECDIS.
Japan	N	-	A SENC is originally a database that is obtained from conversion of an ENC by the onboard ECDIS. A SENC externally generated would be valid for certain ECDIS and not for others. Therefore, a SENC is not a substitute or an equivalent to ENC. Also the expected emergence of different types of SENC and versions of ECDIS will cause difficulties for the authority.
Malaysia	N	-	SENC distribution is possible but at HO discretion, to allow for a better control of data
Maroc	Y	Y	No comments
New Zealand	Y	Y	No comments
Peru	Y	Y	In addition to the ENC distribution, the SENC distribution can be a voluntary option for each HO. All technical factors that affect SENC delivery have to be analysed.
South Africa	Y	Y	No Comments
Spain	N	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The ENC S-57 format which was adopted for the distribution of data should be the only officially recognized format. - The creation of SENC from the provided ENCs is only an adaptation of the ECDIS providing companies to meet the established requirements, and is not at all related to the production of data. - HOs should keep themselves out of possible commercial pressures to give preference to a particular SENC. - In our opinion, this is not the right time to address this issue, as there is neither enough experience nor enough request to implement the SENC distribution.

Turkey	N	-	<p>No doubt that technology is developing fast and that related standards should follow it, in order to maximize the benefits of new technologies. However modifications should be made with care, so as not to compromise navigation safety and consistency of the organisations. Therefore it is believed that the SENC distribution issue shall be further assessed and examined, taking into consideration all aspects of safety of navigation for ships using ECDIS on board. Potential disadvantages of SENC delivery are seen as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - This may cause liability problems, as HOs/RENC control of the data will not be as stringent as it is with ENC delivery. HOs will have no control over the conversion process of ENC to SENC ashore, unless this is done by means of a certified converter, with no way of external interference. - If this conversion is not going to take place in ECDIS, it will also blur the legal aspect of ENC usage and not help increasing the number of ENC users. - SENC delivery may also negatively affect competition among ECDIS manufacturers. There is a risk that the market be driven by some major companies, leaving the others out of it. This would then reduce the choice for alternative systems. Further, this would divert the hydrographic community from achieving the goal of one unique format for any ECDIS or ECS. - It is not clear whether SENC delivery, with provision of Electronic Charts in different formats, is the only way to increase their availability and to achieve a better coverage. Another option might be to encourage manufacturers to integrate their systems to allow ENC usage along with their proprietary format.
--------	---	---	--

In brief, out of the 17 "interim" respondents, 11 have said YES to both Questions 1 and 2. It is further noted that Malaysia's comment may be interpreted as a qualified YES (they voted NO) and that Indonesia's comment may be regarded as a qualified NO (they voted YES).

It is planned to set up a new deadline for replying to the questionnaire attached to CL 15/2001, after CHRIS/13.
