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Revision of AtoN Information Product Specification, S-201

# Summary

This paper introduces a new revision of the AtoN Information Product Specification, S-201 - version 0.0.7.

## Purpose of the document

The Committee is invited to consider the new revision of S-201 and approve its posting on the IALA website for comment.

## Related documents

Revision 0.0.7 of S-201.

# Background

Revision 0.0.6 of S-201 was considered at ENAV 20, together with inputs received on version 0.0.4. Comments have been considered by Task Group 1 inter-sessionally.

# Discussion

The comments shown in green have been incorporated in version 0.0.7, those in yellow have been partially dealt with, but require further work. Those in red have still to be considered. The uncompleted revisions are to be dealt with under a planned cooperation agreement with ROK, for inclusion in a new version 0.1.0 during 2018.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Source** | **Document** | **Section** | **Comment type** | **Action proposed** | **Response** |
| ARM | PS | Various | TE | Include AIS AtoN | Incorporate S-101 approach |
| ARM | PS | Various | TE | Racon box missing from Fig 3 | Already included |
| ARM | PS | Various | TE | Change fog signal to audible signal | Changed text |
| ARM | Annex A | 4.1 | TE | Add pictograms as a feature | ARM to advise |
| ARM | Annex A | 5.6 | TE | Add pictograms as a feature | ARM to advise |
| ARM | PS | Various | TE | Indicate the serviceability status of an AtoN | Implement (phase 2) |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| NIPWG | PS | Various | TE | Use MRN | Pending approval |
| NIPWG | PS | Various | TE | Coordination with S-125 | For consideration at ENAV 21 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ROK | PS | Various | TE | AtoN Management | To be scoped |
| ROK | Annex A | Various | TE | Update DECG | Invite specific suggestions |
| ROK | PS | Various | TE | Restrict enumerations | Invite specific suggestions |
| ROK | Annex E | Various | TE | Add portrayal catalogue | Invite proposals |
| ROK | Annex G | Various | TE | S-57 conversion rules | Invite proposals |
| ROK | PS | Various | TE | Validation checks | Invite proposals |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| IHO | PS | Metadata | TE | Align with S-100 v 3.0.0 | Align by reference |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| RM | PS | Various | TE | See attached notes | Implement |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

1. The classes Aggregation and Association should have object name attributes added, to allow for naming collections. It will also allow more intuitive display and data entry for the 'peer' associations in the UI.

2. The allowed values of attributes status and colour within specific classes should be reviewed to ensure they make sense in context. E.g., no black, pink, or brown lights.

3. Lighthouse.function attribute: presumably the only allowed value here should be 'light support'?

4. Allowed values of attribute "status" for Landmark and Lighthouse should be reviewed - e.g., 'extinguished'?

5. LightVessel and LightFloat: allowed values of 'nature of construction'.

6. Allowed values of 'status' and 'condition' attribute for beacon types.

7. The "condition" attribute of Pile is missing in the feature catalogue.

8. "IALA\_" prefixes in the UML model, feature catalogue, and GML schema (which were used for new items proposed by IALA) should be removed - I think the IALA-proposed items have now all(?) been accepted into the GI registry.

9. There were a few items in the version 0.0.6 feature catalogue where definitions were still required at the time it was prepared (the reviewing print of the FC has 'Definition required' in those places).

10. Product specification (11.2.3, 11-3.1): Dataset file and support file naming rules should be clarified to say that file names can have fewer than 10 characters in the base name.

11. Product specification 11.3 - JPEG is not a text file format. Also XML and HTML files can reference graphics, so they may not be suitable for text support files.