**NICE TO HAVE**

* Link to S-99 goes to the IHO Publications download page (OK). However, this is done in the same tab as the Registry cover page tab. Suggest that this would be better if it was opened in a new tab (convenience).
* Product Specification Register and Test Bed: Watching users unfamiliar with the interface, it is apparent that the absence of a “hyperlink” or similar type cursor graphic is causing some confusion. Suggest that such capability is implemented.

**TO DO**

* Registry cover page (and all other pages): IHO logo to be replaced with the “new” IHO logo once implemented.
* Registry cover page: Status bar (top of page) – there appears to be a hyperlink when logged in (as SO) under the “Rank” text. This hyperlink does not go anywhere. Suggest that this hyperlink be removed.
* Registry cover page: Status bar (top of page) – there appears to be a hyperlink when logged in (as SO) under the “Domain” text. This hyperlink does not go anywhere. Suggest that this open a “pop up” box listing the domains accessible for the logged in SO; or the hyperlink removed.
* Registry cover page: The link to the SO application form goes to the form for the “old” Registry. This link will need to be amended to whatever application form will be relevant for the “new” Registry, noting that some fields in the existing form will not be relevant for some Registers in the “new” Registry (e.g. Domains for the Concept Register).
* Registry cover page: The “Registry Manager” hyperlink at the end of the introductory paragraphs requests a login. This needs to be amended to a blank email addressed to the Registry manager ([jeff.wootton@iho.int](mailto:jeff.wootton@iho.int)(?)), similar to the link for Producer Code Register requests opening a blank email to ADCS.
* Registry cover page (and overall Registry structure): Under the “GI REGISTERS” tab, there is no link to an Enumeration/Codelist Register. Assume that this Register has not yet been implemented (see also For Discussion section below).
* Auto forwarded email to DCB: Email currently specifies [info@iho.int](mailto:info@iho.int) and [pok@iho.int](mailto:pok@iho.int) as contacts for further information. Pok email needs to be amended to [jeff.wootton@iho.int](mailto:jeff.wootton@iho.int).
* GI Registers/Product Specification Register: Suggest that the introductory text at the top of the page should be amended as follows: “The Product Specification Register is a repository of published S-100 based Product Specifications. Each Product Specification includes metadata and downloadable components including Product Specification documentation (including Annexes as required for Data Classification and Encoding Guide (DCEG), Application Schema, Validation Checks and Encoding Format); Feature Catalogue; and Portrayal Catalogue. Sample or test datasets may also be included.”.
* GI Registers/Product Specification Register: The “Related links/Go to details” link goes to the IHO Home page, which is not very helpful. Suggest that this goes to a page such as the S-100 web site page (perhaps even to a bookmark for the relevant Product Specification?). The link also opens in the same tab, which is inconvenient; suggest that this opens in a new tab.
* Codelist Register: Has not yet been implemented.

**FOR DISCUSSION**

* Registry cover page: Second sentence of introductory paragraph on the cover page states “The site contains many registers of hydrographic information together with registers of supplementary information owned by specialist domain experts”. What are the registers of supplementary registers owned by specialist domain experts?
* Registry cover page: Suggest that the introductory paragraphs be amended as follows:

## **This Registry is owned by the International Hydrographic Organization (IHO) and is managed by the Secretariat of the IHO. The site contains ~~many~~ several registers of hydrographic related information together with ~~registers of~~ supplementary information owned by specialist domain experts. ~~Each~~ A Register ~~type is~~ may be further sub-divided into domains, ~~e.g.~~ for example hydrographic, nautical publications, ice, inland ENC etc. The administration of this Registry conforms to IHO Publication S-99 (Operational Procedures for the Organization and Management of the S-100 Geospatial Information Registry); a copy of which can be downloaded**[**here**](http://www.iho.int/iho_pubs/IHO_Download.htm#s99)**.**

## **The information contained in the Registry can be freely accessed, however items can only be added or changed by the ~~managers~~ representatives of approved Submitting Organizations. Application to become a Submitting Organization representative can be made by fulfilling the requirements of the prerequisite form available**[**here**](http://registry.iho.int/member/join.do)**. Once accepted as a Submitting Organization you are free to submit proposals to the approved registers.**

## **Please note: It is not necessary to be a Submitting Organization in order to request new (S-62) Data Producer codes. Requests for new Data Producer codes, or changes to existing codes should be sent to the following email address (**[**adcs@iho.int**](mailto:adcs@iho.int)**).**

## **~~Once accepted as a submitting organization you are free to submit proposals to any register.~~ The Registry interface undergoes periodic improvements and any difficulties using this site should be reported to the**[**Registry Manager**](http://registry.iho.int/member/list.do?Search_Ranked=Registry%20Manager)**.**

* Registry cover page: Enumeration/Codelist Register is yet to be implemented. Previous discussion suggests that only a single Register is required (there may have been a Register for each of enumerations and codelists), principally as if there were a Register for each type there would likely need to be duplication where a concept is used both as an enumeration and a codelist. Given that the structure of these types is very similar (where the codelist is of type open enumeration) it makes sense to have just a single Register. Provision will need to be discussed and agreed for how to handle closed/open dictionary codelists within this Register (i.e. registering the uri?). For example, could a closed dictionary type codelist also be registered as an enumeration so as to include as such in a Product Specification?
* Proposal/Data Dictionary/Feature Type: There is a field here “Distinguishing Features”. As has been raised previously, consider that this has been incorrectly labelled, and should be renamed “Distinctions”. Distinguishing features implies that the field should contain “things” that distinguish this concept from others, whereas distinctions implies a list of concepts that are “similar but different” (distinct) from the concept being defined. Further, it is suggested that this field should be included at the concept level, and not the data dictionary level, therefore suggest removing this field from the Data Dictionary proposal form and adding to the Concept Register proposal form.
* GI Registers tab: There should be a search capability to search all the Registers (in particular the Concept, Codelist (Enumerate) and Data Dictionary Registers) for any instance of a search entry and return all instances in a single window. Such a search return should include the Register; Type and Domain (if in the Data Dictionary Register); and assigned Code and binding attribute (if in the Codelist (Enumerate) Register). This search may be made more interactive by allowing the user to select the Register(s) to search (however include an option of “All”). Search results would then link to the individual registered item within the Registers.
* Concept Register: There needs to be a mechanism in the Register to flag whether an item is also defined in the IHO Hydrographic Dictionary. This could be as simple as a Boolean metadata attribute. This would facilitate export of items and their definitions from the IHO GI Registry to the Hydrographic Dictionary database; and hopefully provide a mechanism for checking synchronization.
* Data Dictionary Register: There is a category at the top of the form “Listed Value Type”. Consider that this should not be here, as this is actually the list of codelist (enumerate) values that should be in the separate Codelist (Enumerate) Register?
* Data Dictionary Register (Complex Attributes): Suggested improvement from the “current” Registry: For sub-attribute cardinalities within complex attributes, the “current” Registry only allows integers to be included as the upper/lower bounding limit for cardinality. Suggest there needs to be a “value” implemented to indicate an unbound upper limit for cardinality (for instance “\*” or Null?).
* Register Content (Concept and Codelist Registers): “Generic” concepts used in different Product Specifications in different ways. Refer to email trail below (distance) – read from bottom up. This appears to me to be an example to support the implementation of namespaces in the Registry. **Need to know how this would work and the implication of PSs in development/published.** Alternative is something similar to Briana’s suggested implementation.
* Codelist Register: Suggest that there needs to be a field to distinguish between a list that is a list of “characteristics” of a concept (for instance colour, condition, status) and a list that is a “classification” (for instance Beaufort Scale, IUCN Code, Dangerous or Hazardous Goods Code). The intention of this is that for “characteristics” a definition is not likely to be required (for instance, there is no requirement for a definition of “red”, “ruined”, “not in use” to be included in the Register(?) or the Feature Catalogue), but for classification codes the definition (“meaning” for the classification value) will be required as the code may not be easily interpreted by the end user (for instance Saffir Simpson category 1 = 64-82 knots, 2 = 83-95 knots ….). Suggest that this can be done easily in the Codelist Register with a Boolean field (radio button). Not sure if there are any implications of this in production software and end-user systems. [NOTE: Source for this thinking is the INSPIRE Codelist Register, which has a “Parent” class of “Classification Type” implemented.]
* Codelist Register: Refer to the INSPIRE Registry – Codelist Register. Within the entries in their “Classification Type” Parent class(?), they have implemented an external dictionary codelist attribute that is referenced via a URL. Need to discuss whether this is something that could (or needs to be?) implemented in the Codelist Register. [Note: The implemented list is simply a list of code values and their meanings (<http://ec.europa.eu/competition/mergers/cases/index/nace_all.html>). Not sure how this would be implemented in a production system (or end-user systems)?]
* Product Specification Register: Suggest that access to PS pages for PSs under development and the capability to download draft PSs should not be login and password protected.
* Product Specification Register: Need to agree on a standard structure for the content of each Product Specification as included in the Register. Suggest that this should be:
  + Product Specification documentation (including Main document and associated Annexes as required; such as DCEG, Application Schema, Encoding format and Validation Checks) – zip file;
  + Feature Catalogue – xml file;
  + Portrayal Catalogue – zip file;
  + Sample or test dataset(s) – zip file.

**EMAIL DISCUSSION 14-15 DECEMBER 2017:**

Hi All.  
  
Julia is correct - I have almost completed my review of the Registry (FCD Register) content, and in conjunction a draft document of Guidelines and Conventions for Registry proposals and content.  This draft at the moment contains more documented questions/issues than actual guidelines and conventions; one of the principle issues is along the lines of the argument in Briana's email.  I will be emailing all this stuff to the Sub-WGs established at S-100WG2 for evaluation and comment before the Christmas break.  I think this will be the start of a significant discussion that is required within the S-100WG.  
  
For now, in the interest of advancing S-100 based Product Specifications and acknowledging that there are significant issues with the current content of the FCD Register, I have been approving all submitted proposals unless it is an absolute duplicate (including bindings) of an already existing item in the Register.  The intention is to rationalize this content into the new "Concept Register" in accordance with the final agreed Conventions and Guidelines.  In the meantime, as Julia has suggested, I will be including the content of Briana's email (and Raphael's response) with all the other issues so far identified with the FCD Register.  
  
Best Regards,  
  
Jeff.

***Jeff Wootton***

***Technical Standards Support Officer***

***Organization hydrographique internationale / International Hydrographic Organization******4b Quai Antoine Ier - BP 445 - MC98011 Monaco Cedex - Principauté de Monaco***

***em:*** [***tsso@iho.int***](mailto:tsso@iho.int)

***ph:  +377 93 10 81 09***[***https://www.iho.int/***](https://www.iho.int/)

On 15/12/2017 00:25, Julia Powell - NOAA Federal wrote:

Hi All -

I agree with Briana in principle - but I also am wary of this potentially holding up a bunch of product specifications.  Jeff is doing a holistic review of the content, and this should be added to his list as a better way of modeling the real world.  the results of that exercise will have a knock on effect to the registry, its content and different product specifications.

Julia

On Thu, Dec 14, 2017 at 4:06 PM, Raphael Malyankar <[raphaelm@portolansciences.com](mailto:raphaelm@portolansciences.com)> wrote:

Hi,

I believe NIPWG did formulate a more generic definition, though it was different from the one in Briana's e-mail.

It is on the NIPWG Wiki:  "A numeric measure of the spatial separation between two locations." dating from 30 May this year. (The S-122/S-123 feature catalogues use an older definition 'A linear extent of space'  and should be updated.)

The matter of a generic distance attribute + a distanceType is more complex, and something that needs more consideration and discussion. For one, it adds another attribute (another two, if you define a complex attribute as a 'container' for distance and distanceType).

Regards,

Raphael

*This message, including any attachments, may contain confidential information intended for a specific purpose, and is intended only for the person or entity to which it is addressed. Unauthorized disclosure, use, dissemination, copying, or distribution of this message, its attachments, or the information contained in this e-mail are prohibited. If you received this message in error, please contact the sender and delete the material.*

On Thu, Dec 14, 2017 at 8:26 AM, briana sullivan <[briana@ccom.unh.edu](mailto:briana@ccom.unh.edu)> wrote:

Jens/Jeff,

*(NOTE: in the interest of time you can skim this email reading only the highlighted yellow text and probably get the jist of what I am proposing)*

The 'distance' definition that we submitted is:

* distance: ***distance from the user to the marker (real - IHO Hydro)***

Jeff's note in the register states:

Definition could possibly be more generic (and authorized). Accepted in the interim.(by. Jeff Wootton, 2016-10-25, Assign DCB )

And Julia noticed the measuredDistance attribute:

 I believe that there is already a measured distance attribute.(by. Julia Powell, 2016-11-02, Reject )   
 (by. Jeff Wootton, 2016-11-14, Finalize ) ->  what does "Finalize" mean in this situation?

I completely agree DISTANCE should be more generic...

There are already in the register the following items related to **"a numerical description of how far apart two objects are." *(distance)***

***(pay attention to their definitions in bold)***

1. measuredDistance: ***An accurately defined distance along a course at sea. (integer - IHO Hydro - S101DEC)***
2. waterwayDistance: ***The distance measured from an origin of a river or canal. The length of the space between two points along a waterway. (real - inland ENC)***
3. distanceOfImpactUpstream: ***Upstream distance of the impact of an area, which is signed by notice marks. The distance is normally given on an additional mark left and/or right of the notice mark (real - inland ENC)***
4. distanceOfImpactDownstream: ***Downstream distance of the impact of an area, which is signed by notice marks. The distance is normally given on an additional mark left and/or right of the notice mark (real - inland ENC)***
5. distanceFromNoticeMarkSecond: ***Maximum distance of the impact of an area, which is signed by notice marks. The distance is measured from the notice mark rectangular to the bank (real - inland ENC)***
6. distanceFromNoticeMarkFirst:***Minimum distance of the impact of an area, which is signed by notice marks. The distance is measured from the notice mark rectangular to the bank (real - inland ENC)***
7. soundingDistanceMinimum: ***The minimum spacing of the principal sounding lines of a survey. (integer - IHO Hydro)***
8. soundingDistanceMaximum:***The maximum spacing of the principal sounding lines of a survey. (integer - IHO Hydro)***
9. horizontalClearanceLength - ***The length of a feature, such as a lock or basin, which is available for safe navigation. This may, or may not, be the same as the total physical length of the feature. (real - IHO Hydro)***
10. sectorLineLength - ***A sector is the part of a circle between two straight lines drawn from the centre to the circumference. Sector line length specifies the displayed length of the line, in ground units, defining the limit of the sector. (integer - IHO Hydro)***
11. waveLengthValue - ***The distance between two successive peaks (or other points of identical phase) on an electromagnetic wave.(real, IHO Hydro)***
12. verticalLength - ***The total vertical length of an object. (real, IHO Hydro)***
13. horizontalLength - ***A measurement of the longer of two linear axis. (real, IHO Hydro)***
14. maximalPermittedLength - ***The maximal permitted length of a vessel or convoy according to the particular article/clause of the applicable law/regulation (real, inland ENC)***
15. lengthRangeValue1\* - ***The minimum value of the length range the particular article/clause of the applicable law/regulation is dealing with (real, inland ENC*** - \**i would rename this to be more descriptive: lengthRangeValueMin*)
16. lengthRangeValue2\* - ***The maximum value of the length range the particular article/clause of the applicable law/regulation is dealing with (real, inland ENC*** - \**i would rename this to be more descriptive: lengthRangeValueMax*)
17. height - ***The value of the vertical distance to the highest point of the object, measured from a specified vertical datum. (real, IHO Hydro)***
18. leadMinWidth***- IA\_DMW defines the mimimum width of the lead or fracture or crack in metres (integer, WMO ICE)***
19. leadMaxWidth***- IA\_DXW defines the maximum width of the lead or fracture or crack in metres (integer, WMO ICE)***
20. iceLeadWidth - ***ICELWD indicates the width of a lead or fracture or crack in metres (integer, WMO ICE)***
21. horizontalWidth -***A measurement of the shorter of two linear axis. (real, IHO Hydro)***
22. horizontalClearanceWidth***- The width of an object, such as a lock or basin, which is available for safe navigation. This may, or may not, be the same as the total physical width (HORWID) of the object (real, inland ENC)***

Because in essence, at the core, all of these are really just a measurement between two points.

So, why not **simplify the registry** and the list of simple attributes with only one generic attribute in the registry to encompass *all* types of distance?

registry entry => DISTAN distance -  "a numerical description of how far apart two objects are"

Then include a supporting attribute ***distanceType***that would then be ***an enumeration of possible definitions/uses for distance*.**

For example:

* measured                       - an accurately defined distance along a course at sea.
* waterway                        - the distance measured from an origin of a river or canal along a waterway.
* ofImpactUpstream          - Upstream distance of the impact of an area, which is signed by notice marks. The distance is normally given on an additional mark left and/or right of the notice mark
* ofImpactDownstream     - Downstream distance of the impact of an area, which is signed by notice marks. The distance is normally given on an additional mark left and/or right of the notice mark
* fromNoticeMarkFirst       - Minimum distance of the impact of an area, which is signed by notice marks. The distance is measured from the notice mark rectangular to the bank
* fromNoticeMarkSecond  - Maximum distance of the impact of an area, which is signed by notice marks. The distance is measured from the notice mark rectangular to the bank
* soundingMinimum          - The minimum spacing of the principal sounding lines of a survey.
* soundingMaximum         -The maximum spacing of the principal sounding lines of a survey.
* horizontalClearance       - The length of a feature, such as a lock or basin, which is available for safe navigation. This may, or may not, be the same as the total physical length of the feature.
* sectorLine                      - A sector is the part of a circle between two straight lines drawn from the centre to the circumference. Sector line length specifies the displayed length of the line, in ground units, defining the limit of the sector.
* waveLengthValue          - The distance between two successive peaks (or other points of identical phase) on an electromagnetic wave.
* vertical                           - The total vertical length of an object.
* horizontal                       - A measurement of the longer of two linear axis.
* maximalPermitted         - The maximal permitted length of a vessel or convoy according to the particular article/clause of the applicable law/regulation
* rangeValueMin              - The minimum value of the length range the particular article/clause of the applicable law/regulation is dealing with
* rangeValueMax             - The maximum value of the length range the particular article/clause of the applicable law/regulation is dealing with
* height                            - The value of the vertical distance to the highest point of the object, measured from a specified vertical datum.
* leadMin                         - IA\_DMW defines the mimimum width of the lead or fracture or crack in metres
* leadMax                        - IA\_DXW defines the maximum width of the lead or fracture or crack in metres
* iceLead                         - ICELWD indicates the width of a lead or fracture or crack in metres
* horizontal                      - A measurement of the shorter of two linear axis.
* horizontalClearance     - The width of an object, such as a lock or basin, which is available for safe navigation. This may, or may not, be the same as the total physical width (HORWID) of the object

The enumeration list could grow to cover all the specific uses of distance with their own definition of how that distance is measured. (Much cleaner than adding more attributes)

NOTE: Just doing the simple exercise of getting rid of the terms "distance, length, width, height" from the possible enumeration values it is evident that even this list could be reduced. (notice the "horizontal" items and their definitions)

* fromNoticeMarkFirst -                  Minimum distance of the impact of an area, which is signed by notice marks. The distance is measured from the notice mark rectangular to the bank
* fromNoticeMarkSecond -             Maximum distance of the impact of an area, which is signed by notice marks. The distance is measured from the notice mark rectangular to the bank
* height -                                         The value of the vertical distance to the highest point of the object, measured from a specified vertical datum.
* horizontal -                                   A measurement of the shorter of two linear axis.
* horizontal -                                   A measurement of the longer of two linear axis.
* horizontalClearance -                  The width of an object, such as a lock or basin, which is available for safe navigation. This may, or may not, be the same as the total physical width (HORWID) of the object
* horizontalClearance -                  The length of a feature, such as a lock or basin, which is available for safe navigation. This may, or may not, be the same as the total physical length of the feature.
* iceLead -                                      ICELWD indicates the width of a lead or fracture or crack in metres
* leadMax -                                     IA\_DXW defines the maximum width of the lead or fracture or crack in metres
* leadMin -                                      IA\_DMW defines the mimimum width of the lead or fracture or crack in metres
* maximalPermitted -                      The maximal permitted length of a vessel or convoy according to the particular article/clause of the applicable law/regulation
* measured -                                  An accurately defined distance along a course at sea.
* ofImpactUpstream -                     Upstream distance of the impact of an area, which is signed by notice marks. The distance is normally given on an additional mark left and/or right of the notice mark
* ofImpactDownstream -                Downstream distance of the impact of an area, which is signed by notice marks. The distance is normally given on an additional mark left and/or right of the notice mark
* rangeValueMin -                          The minimum value of the length range the particular article/clause of the applicable law/regulation is dealing with
* rangeValueMax -                         The maximum value of the length range the particular article/clause of the applicable law/regulation is dealing with
* sectorLine -                                 A sector is the part of a circle between two straight lines drawn from the centre to the circumference. Sector line length specifies the displayed length of the line, in ground units, defining the limit of the sector.
* soundingMinimum:The minimum spacing of the principal sounding lines of a survey.
* soundingMaximum:The maximum spacing of the principal sounding lines of a survey.
* vertical -                                      The total vertical length of an object.
* waterway -                                  The distance measured from an origin of a river or canal along a waterway.
* waveLengthValue -                     The distance between two successive peaks (or other points of identical phase) on an electromagnetic wave.

And of course the distance attribute would also be associated with a generic attribute to give their units (the following could also be combined into one attribute....***distanceUnits***):

* heightLengthUnits - This attribute encodes the units of measurement for heights and lengths. (enumeration, IHO Hydro)
* distanceUnitOfMeasurement - A specified amount of a quantity, as of length, by comparison with which any other quantity of the same kind is measured or estimated (enumeration, IHO Hydro)

And if they can't all be of dataType = real, then to allow for some flexibility a ***distanceDataType*** enumeration could contain either real or integer.

--

Ok, so could it be too generic? Or is your answer to that question fueled by the "red tape", work and headache in getting everyone involved in the above terms to agree? Minus all of those things....if it was as *easy* as pushing the red "easy button"...would you want to do it?

I say we go bold and do this thing *RIGHT* not fall back on what is convenient. Doing the work upfront now will mean a more streamlined, easier to use and understand registry for the future.

My thoughts....knowing there are many ways to skin a dead cat....and this is just one.

Balls in your court now,

cheers,

briana

On Wed, Dec 13, 2017 at 3:21 PM, Jens Schröder-Fürstenberg <[Jens.Schroeder-Fuerstenberg@bsh.de](mailto:Jens.Schroeder-Fuerstenberg@bsh.de)> wrote:

Hi Briana,

Sorry that my email was not precise enough.

As far as I understand Jeff’s email correctly, we have a chain of dependencies which has to be settled starting with the ground level.

The first is to resubmit the attribute “distance” . Jeff was mentioning that this must be in your inbox (I afraid months ago)-

Once this has been approved that other complex attributes can be approved.

“bearingInformation” belongs on “distance” and “graphic”  belongs on “bearingInformation”

Having approved “bearingInformation” and “graphic” ,  I shall ask Yong for the next database/FC comparison. Based on that comparison, we can check what remains and how we will proceed. The interesting aspect is that each comparison comes up with new results (okay, we have some items which are coming up every time).  In particular, the sub-attributes of complex attributes  have been  sometimes not detected.

Doesn’t matter, one day it will be history.

Cheers

Jens

**From:** briana sullivan [mailto:[briana@ccom.unh.edu](mailto:briana@ccom.unh.edu" \t "_blank)]   
**Sent:** Tuesday, December 12, 2017 2:12 PM  
**To:** Jens Schröder-Fürstenberg  
**Subject:** Re: Registry Items

So Jens, my buddy,

I am a bit confused on what is "on me"? I thought (from the email with Raphael) that the spreadsheet (and further entries into the registry) would be put on hold until Raphael got another updated dump from Yong.

And then, I thought after that we would canvas the entire group for volunteers to split the work so they could gain practical experience.

Am I totally off base with this?

prost,

briana

On Sun, Dec 10, 2017 at 3:21 PM, Jens Schröder-Fürstenberg <[Jens.Schroeder-Fuerstenberg@bsh.de](mailto:Jens.Schroeder-Fuerstenberg@bsh.de" \t "_blank)> wrote:

All,

Let me know how the progress is. Briana, it’s on you now.

Jens

**From:** TSSO [mailto:[tsso@iho.int](mailto:tsso@iho.int" \t "_blank)]   
**Sent:** Thursday, December 07, 2017 3:26 PM  
**To:** Jens Schröder-Fürstenberg; 'Julia Powell - NOAA Federal'; briana sullivan  
**Cc:** YONG BAEK  
**Subject:** Re: Registry Items

All:  
  
As you can see from the screenshot below, this proposal currently has a Disposition Status of "Not Accepted".  I assume that the proposal is therefore back in Briana's queue?  If so, could you please resubmit Briana, and I will finalize the proposal.  
  
Thanks and Best Regards,  
  
Jeff.

***Jeff Wootton***

***Technical Standards Support Officer***

***Organization hydrographique internationale / International Hydrographic Organization******4b Quai Antoine Ier - BP 445 - MC98011 Monaco Cedex - Principauté de Monaco***

***em: [tsso@iho.int](mailto:tsso@iho.int" \t "_blank)***

***ph:  [+377 93 10 81 09](tel:+377%2093%2010%2081%2009" \t "_blank)***[***https://www.iho.int/***](https://www.iho.int/)

On 07/12/2017 14:55, Jens Schröder-Fürstenberg wrote:

Okay,

It’s now either on Briana to resubmit or on Jeff to agree. Whoever takes the action, pls do so.

Thanks

Jens

**From:** Julia Powell - NOAA Federal [<mailto:julia.powell@noaa.gov>]   
**Sent:** Thursday, December 07, 2017 2:52 PM  
**To:** briana sullivan  
**Cc:** Jens Schröder-Fürstenberg; TSSO; YONG BAEK  
**Subject:** Re: Registry Items

Seeing as I cannot see what my original issue with distance was - I think it is back in Briana's workspace to resubmit and get it approved.

Julia

On Thu, Dec 7, 2017 at 7:11 AM, briana sullivan <[briana@ccom.unh.edu](mailto:briana@ccom.unh.edu" \t "_blank)> wrote:

yes agreed, as the "dispute" was just an oversight in all the terms I entered....I'm following the lead of Jens!

cheers all,

briana

On Thu, Dec 7, 2017 at 4:53 AM, Jens Schröder-Fürstenberg <[Jens.Schroeder-Fuerstenberg@bsh.de](mailto:Jens.Schroeder-Fuerstenberg@bsh.de" \t "_blank)> wrote:

Hi Jeff,

Thanks for bringing that up again.

Seems the progress is  sticking  in a dependency chain.

Considering that further progress depends on that, I agree with you proposal to accept this as an interim solution and sort out the issues afterwards.

Cheers

Jens

**From:** TSSO [mailto:[tsso@iho.int](mailto:tsso@iho.int)]   
**Sent:** Thursday, December 07, 2017 10:35 AM  
**To:** Jens Schröder-Fürstenberg  
**Cc:** briana sullivan; Julia Powell; YONG BAEK  
**Subject:** Registry Items

Hi Jens.  
  
All done, except:  
  
The complex attribute Graphic cannot be finalized, as one of the identified sub-attributes is the complex attribute "bearing information", which has not been completed:  
  
  
  
The reason that I cannot finalize this proposal is that there is a sub-attribute "distance", which as you can see from the screenshot above has itself not been finalized.  Now, the problem I have with the simple attribute "distance" is that it has been "in dispute" between Briana and Julia for almost 12 months - I cannot do anything from my end to resolve this.  
  
I have cc'd both Briana and Julia on this email, however I suggest that you get in touch with Briana yourself in order to try to expedite a solution.  My previous suggestion was that we just accept the "distance" proposal for now and sort it out when there are robust conventions and guidelines for Register content.  
  
Best Regards,  
  
Jeff.

--

***Jeff Wootton***

***Technical Standards Support Officer***

***Organization hydrographique internationale / International Hydrographic Organization******4b Quai Antoine Ier - BP 445 - MC98011 Monaco Cedex - Principauté de Monaco***

***em:*** [***tsso@iho.int***](mailto:tsso@iho.int)

***ph:*** [***+377 93 10 81 09***](tel:+377%2093%2010%2081%2009)[***https://www.iho.int/***](https://www.iho.int/)
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