

Work Item A

B-12 Maintenance

Report to CSBWG Meeting 16

NIWA, Wellington, New Zealand

26 March 2025

Brian Calder

CCOM/JHC, University of New Hampshire



IHO

International
Hydrographic
Organization



IHO

International
Hydrographic
Organization

Why We Need a Change in B-12 Maintenance Mechanism

**Technical
Concerns**

**Administrative
Concerns**



IHO

International
Hydrographic
Organization

Why We Need a Change in B-12 Maintenance Mechanisms

Report Working Draft				
Folder shared with File Sharing				
Name	Date Modified	Size	Kind	
> Alternative Formats	Nov 16, 2022 at 4:46 pm	--	Folder	
CSB-Guidance_Document-Edtion_2.0.2-Clean.docx	Jul 24, 2019 at 2:59 am	5.9 MB	Micros...(docx)	
CSB-Guidance_Document-Edtion_3.0.pdf	Mar 29, 2023 at 10:13 am	3.5 MB	PDF Document	
> Document Chapters	Nov 16, 2022 at 4:46 pm	--	Folder	
> SourceObjects_Uncertainty	Nov 16, 2022 at 4:46 pm	--	Folder	
> UsedAndDone	Nov 16, 2022 at 4:46 pm	--	Folder	
2017-12-12_CSB_uncertainty_comment.xls	Dec 22, 2017 at 7:09 pm	45 KB	Micros...ok (.xls)	
2017-12-12_CSB-Guidance_Document-v3.12_with_comments.docx	Dec 22, 2017 at 7:09 pm	6.7 MB	Micros...(docx)	
accuracy_vs_precision_556.jpg	Nov 10, 2016 at 4:37 pm	61 KB	JPEG image	
accuracy-precision-resolution.gif	Nov 10, 2016 at 4:37 pm	18 KB	GIF image	
CSB-Guidance_Document-v4_FINAL.docx	Feb 26, 2018 at 8:11 am	5 MB	Micros...(docx)	
CSB-guidance-document-v3.1_brc.docx	Nov 15, 2016 at 7:05 pm	5.1 MB	Micros...(docx)	
CSB-guidance-document-v3.5.docx	Feb 10, 2017 at 8:35 pm	4.2 MB	Micros...(docx)	
CSB-guidance-document-v3.6_with_comments_Uncertainty.docx	Feb 14, 2017 at 12:50 pm	4.5 MB	Micros...(docx)	
CSB-guidance-document-v3.10_BRC.docx	Mar 27, 2017 at 11:36 am	4.4 MB	Micros...(docx)	
CSB-guidance-document-v3.docx	Nov 10, 2016 at 4:37 pm	420 KB	Micros...(docx)	
EnvironmentInformation_Copy.docx	Nov 10, 2016 at 4:37 pm	17 KB	Micros...(docx)	
illustration_uncertainties_CSBWG.docx	Nov 10, 2016 at 4:37 pm	1.9 MB	Micros...(docx)	
Serge Comments CSB-guidance-document - SG - uncertainty.docx	Nov 10, 2016 at 4:37 pm	413 KB	Micros...(docx)	
Table of uncertainty_draft_squat_settlement.docx	Nov 10, 2016 at 4:37 pm	165 KB	Micros...(docx)	
Thomas Comments Uncertainty Draft V3.1.docx	Nov 10, 2016 at 4:37 pm	27 KB	Micros...(docx)	
uncertainty_definition.docx	Nov 10, 2016 at 4:37 pm	4 KB	Micros...(docx)	
UncertaintyAppendixSubjects.docx	Nov 10, 2016 at 4:37 pm	84 KB	Micros...(docx)	
UncertaintyExecSummary.docx	Nov 10, 2016 at 4:37 pm	68 KB	Micros...(docx)	

CSBWG Uncertainty Section Draft

File Edit View Insert Format Tools Extensions Help

100% Heading 1 Arial 20 B I U A

develop the data from the database into a product. More details on particular uncertainties, and suggestions for best practice, are provided in the sections below focussing on these use cases.

Document tabs

CSBWG Uncertainty...

1. Uncertainty

Meaning, Sources, and ...

The Meaning of Unce...

Sources of Uncertainty

Estimation & Expressi...

Consequences of Indi...

Uncertainty for Indivi...

Uncertainty for Trust...

Uncertainty for Datab...

Estimation & Expression of Uncertainty

The most common method for estimating and expressing uncertainty is through some statement of the statistics associated with a measurement or system. Ideally, this is done by making the same observation multiple times, and then assessing the degree to which the measurement indicated changes between different observations. For example, imagine the case where an echosounder is mounted in a tank, and constantly measures the depth. Since we do not believe that the depth of the tank is varying significantly within the duration of the observations (e.g., due to atmospheric pressure, evaporation, or condensation), or we consider these variations to be insignificant with respect to the scale of the variations being examined, any change in the indicated depth must be due to uncontrolled variabilities in the echosounder. For example, there could be differences due to acoustic or electrical noise in the returned signal. Taking all of the measurements together, it would be possible to estimate the average depth returned, and therefore the degree of variability of the depths about this average value. If we depth of the tank was independently measured, for example by draining all of the water and measuring with a laser level, then it would also be possible to estimate any bias between the average acoustic depth and the physically measured depth². Going further, it might be possible, depending on the number of observations, to estimate whether the observations are all clustered symmetrically around the average value, or if there is an asymmetry in the observations, with most likely value being shallow or deeper than the average.

This ideal case rarely occurs in practice. In many physical systems it is very difficult to keep conditions sufficiently constant that multiple observations can be made of exactly the same system. For example, imagine that the echosounder is now attached to a dock and observes ostensibly the same patch of seafloor on each measurement cycle. Changes in the water

² Note that this is not the "true" depth, since the physical measurement also has uncertainties. It might be, however, significantly lower uncertainty than the acoustic measurement and therefore considered sufficiently "true" for current purposes.

properties on the scale of a few measurement cycles can cause sufficient difference to dominate the variability being observed—it is even possible for miniscule changes in the configuration of the seafloor to affect the observations.

In practice, therefore, many techniques have been developed to attempt to estimate uncertainties using non-ideal data, at least as an approximation. For example, if two different systems observe the same thing simultaneously, any difference in the pair of observations has to be caused by the systems, and not by the thing itself. This is sometimes used to make paired observations where the statistics of the difference between two devices are examined. Effective techniques can vary according to the measurement; more details for suggested methods with respect to crowd-sourced bathymetry are presented in the following sections, and in Appendix X.

Data sufficiently rich to be interesting are often the result of a number of different observations, or the combination of core data from multiple different systems. For example, with bathymetric observations, the resulting depth is a function of at least a positioning system and an



IHO

International
Hydrographic
Organization

Why We Need a Change in B-12 Maintenance Mechanisms

IHO Programme 2

3. Procedures

3.1 Standards
properly developed
remain simple

3.1.1 Changes
or clarification
process differs

³ See HSSC and

approval at the
to be "significant"

New Edition

New Editions of standards introduce significant changes. *New Editions* enable new concepts, such as the ability to support new functions or applications, or the introduction of new constructs or data types, to be introduced. *New Editions* are likely to have a significant impact on either existing users or future users of the revised standard. It follows that a full consultative process that provides an opportunity for input from as many stakeholders as possible is required for standards listed in Appendix 1, optional for those listed in Appendix 2. Proposed changes to a standard should be evaluated and tested wherever practicable. The approval of Member States is required before any *New Edition* of a standard can enter into force. All cumulative *clarifications* and *revisions* must be included with the release of an approved *New Edition* of a standard.

Revision

Revisions are defined as substantive changes to a standard. Typically, *revisions* change existing specifications to correct factual errors; introduce necessary changes that have become evident as a result of practical experience or changing circumstances; or add new specifications within an existing section. *Revisions* could have an impact on either existing users or future users of a revised standard. It follows that a full consultative process that provides an opportunity for input from as many stakeholders as possible is required for standards listed in Appendix 1, optional for those listed in Appendix 2. Proposed changes to a standard should be evaluated and tested wherever practicable. The approval of Member States is required before any *revisions* to a standard can enter into force. All cumulative *clarifications* must be included with the release of approved corrections revisions.

However, there may be instances where more urgent action is required, especially where there are serious implications to safety of navigation. In such cases, a "fast-track" approval by correspondence and rapid implementation process may be needed. This should only occur in exceptional circumstances, but any such fast-tracked *revisions* will still require the approval of Member States before they can enter into force.

A *revision* shall not be classified as a *clarification* in order to bypass the appropriate consultation processes.

Clarification

Clarifications are non-substantive changes to a standard. Typically, *clarifications*: remove ambiguity; correct grammatical and spelling errors; amend or update cross references; insert improved graphics in spelling, punctuation and grammar. A clarification must not cause any substantive semantic change

⁴"n" is not limited to 9.

IHO Programme 2 "Hydrographic Services and Standards"
2.1 – General

to a standard. *Clarifications* are the responsibility of the relevant subordinate body and may be delegated to the responsible editor.

2 "Hydrographic Services and Standards"
2.1 - General

to IHO standards are
these procedures should

is: new edition, revision,
al and implementation
ne for new editions, to

ds"

revisions are considered
entation.



IHO

Context & History for the Proposal

International
Hydrographic
Organization

github.com

CCOMJHC / CSBWG-B12

Type to search

<> Code Issues 1 Pull requests 1 Discussions Actions Projects Security Insights Settings

Markup language for B.12

Ideas · brian-r-calder

Is open

Sort by: Latest activity Label Filter: Open New discussion

Categories

- View all discussions
- Announcements
- General
- Ideas
- Polis
- Q&A
- Show and tell

Most helpful

Be sure to mark someone's comment as an answer if it helps you resolve your question — they deserve the credit!

Community guidelines

Community insights

Discussions

- Thoughts re. suggested edit to Ch 3 of B-12
jencks started 3 weeks ago in General
- Thoughts re. updated IRCC proposal
jencks started 3 weeks ago in General
- New sections proposed
jencks started on Dec 23, 2024 in Ideas
- Voting protocols for finalised modifications
brian-r-calder started on Nov 12, 2024 in Ideas
- Is CC0 1.0 Universal license compatible with current B-12 disclaimer?
gumas started on Nov 19, 2024 in General
- Markup language for B.12
brian-r-calder started on Nov 5, 2024 in Ideas
- Working protocol for modifications to B.12
brian-r-calder started on Nov 12, 2024 in Ideas
- Starting a new discussion
brian-r-calder announced on Nov 12, 2024 in Announcements
- Composition of the Maintenance Group
brian-r-calder started on Nov 5, 2024 in Ideas

© 2025 GitHub, Inc. Terms Privacy Security Status Docs Contact Manage cookies Do not share my personal information

Discussions & Idea Formation

github.com

CCOMJHC / CSBWG-B12

Type to search

<> Code Issues 1 Pull requests 1 Discussions Actions Projects Security Insights Settings

Edits to IRCC proposal (Jencks) #9

Open brian-r-calder wants to merge 15 commits into main from dev-ircc-7

Conversation 28 Commits 15 Checks 0 Files changed 2 +242 -176

brian-r-calder commented on Jan 8

This PR implements issue #8, supporting discussion #7. This adds significant edits to the IRCC proposal document to clarify background and intent, particularly governance and versioning.

brian-r-calder added 2 commits 2 months ago

- Edited in proposed modifications to the IRCC proposal document from J...
- Synchronizing update to IRCC proposal document.

brian-r-calder added documentation enhancement labels on Jan 8

brian-r-calder requested a review from jencks 2 months ago

brian-r-calder self-assigned this on Jan 8

brian-r-calder commented on Jan 8

AuxiliaryDocuments/IRCC-Proposal/CSBWG-B12-Maintenance-Proposal.md Outdated Show resolved

brian-r-calder commented on Jan 8

AuxiliaryDocuments/IRCC-Proposal/CSBWG-B12-Maintenance-Proposal.md Outdated Show resolved

brian-r-calder commented on Jan 8

AuxiliaryDocuments/IRCC-Proposal/CSBWG-B12-Maintenance-Proposal.md Outdated Show resolved

brian-r-calder commented on Jan 8

AuxiliaryDocuments/IRCC-Proposal/CSBWG-B12-Maintenance-Proposal.md Outdated Show resolved

Reviewers

- gumas
- selimnair
- glabmoris
- matt-the-bass
- jencks

Still in progress? Learn about draft PRs

Assignees

- brian-r-calder

Labels

- documentation
- enhancement

Projects

- None yet

Milestone

- No milestone

Development

Successfully merging this pull request may close these issues.

None yet

Notifications

Unsubscribe

You're receiving notifications because you were assigned.

5 participants

Lock conversation

Formal Review of Updates



IHO

Context & History for the Proposal

International
Hydrographic
Organization

Files

1b285bd

Go to file

AuxiliaryDocuments/IRCC-Prop...

CSBWG-B12-Maintenance-Pr...

B12-Main

LICENSE

README.md

CSBWG-B12 / AuxiliaryDocuments

Preview Code Blame

- Initial version: 2024-11-0
- This version: 2025-01-08
- Reviewed and Approved

Background and Purpose

In 2014, the Fifth Extraordinary Regional Coordination Committee prepare and maintain a new IHO document would state the IHO bathymetry. This document would provide guidelines for gathering and assessing data and would supersede national or international standards.

Initial development of B.12, which was primarily using general desktop approval process, CSB data collection was provided to the CSBWG. Immediately after its initial publication.

By the time v 3.0.0 was approved, IHO approval timeline, were by then meant to provide ever-evolving meeting reports, it could be difficult to make changes were or were not agreed upon.

These issues, and an annual review consistent with the speed at which bathymetry community. This led to actual practice in the field, with data submitted to the IHO Data Collection formats within the database value of these potentially very different.

During CSBWG14 and CSBWG15, to address the maintenance issues, it was decided that an approach to maintenance allow a more flexible and timely decisions, enable transparency.

It is worth noting that the CSB groups, particularly the S-102, switching to these new tools and therefore, highlights the proposal and how these tools and protocols

Edits to IRCC proposal (Jencks) #9

0 / 2 files viewed

Review in codespace Review changes

AuxiliaryDocuments/IRCC-Proposal

CSBWG-B12-Maintenance-Proposal.md

B12-Main

B12-main.adoc

The primary benefit of the proposed maintenance protocol is that B-12 will meet its original intent of providing best practices for collecting, contributing, assessing and using crowdsourced bathymetry by recognizing that these practices are ever-evolving. Having a more timely and flexible development process for the data/metadata format recommended will break an annual (and often longer) update cycle, allowing for more rapid adaptation as requests are made and ensuring that the guidance stays relevant within not only IHO Member States, but the global community.

A more subtle benefit is that this process will build community and trust. That is, at present it is well known that changes to B.12 the data/metadata recommendations for CSB data accession to DCDB will take at least a year to be approved, and many developers either cannot or will not wait that long. This encourages them to just make (non-standard) modifications to data or metadata since they need to move on; the potential for database damage is therefore high. If, however, developers know that they can make suggestions for changes to B.12, and particularly the data and metadata, using mechanisms that they already understand and use themselves (i.e., issue trackers and GitHub repositories) and, critically, have these requests actioned in a timely manner (e.g., within a couple of weeks), then there is an impetus to use this mechanism for change. This will more likely keep changes within the standard B.12 model, and reduce the probability of incompatible (or unusable) data appearing in the IHO databases.

Potential Risks and Mitigations

The proposal for use of new tools to maintain the B-12 guidance document changes only the method of implementation for modifications, but not the process for approval or oversight. The tools being proposed for use are commonly recognized and used for many massive open and closed source projects world-wide. This is therefore considered very low risk.

Separately maintaining the most obvious and significant data/metadata recommendations has the potential risk of incompatibility with the proposed maintenance model. The current definition in B-12, or that B.12 the implementation will develop in a direction orthogonal to the IHO's intent without oversight by, or that of the CSBWG, IRCC, or the Member States. With the constraints of a Maintenance Group nominated by CSBWG with the Chair an ex officio member, this risk is relatively low. The Chair always has the ability to remit any development item to the CSBWG entire for review and vote, and has the choice of which type of vote is required.

In addition, the technical mechanisms used to make modifications to the B.12 document documents are intrinsically designed so that each modification is tracked and can be reversed if required: an entire history of the each document is maintained as a core feature of the tools used. Therefore any changes to B.12 that are subsequently considered damaging can always be reversed if required.

The overall risk of adopting the proposed methods is therefore considered very low.

Requested Actions

The CSBWG, having reviewed and approved these recommendations, request that IRCC:

- Acknowledge this request for a new maintenance method.
- Approve CSBWG to move ahead with maintenance of B.12 under these premises.
- Approve separation of the maintenance of the B-12 guidance document from the data/metadata

github.com

Type to search

actions Projects Security Insights Settings

ments / IRCC-Proposal / CSBWG-B12-Maintenance-Proposal.md

e353406 · last week History

284 lines (243 loc) · 16.3 KB

Raw

Crowdsourced Bathymetry Working Group

Introduction

jccom.unh.edu
jennifer.jencks@noaa.gov (CSBWG Chair)

gimas@gst.dk
es@com.unh.edu
Olas@sjofartsverket.se

11-04
3-06
revised for submission by IHO CSBWG: 2025-03-25 [update as appropriate]

Purpose

The International Hydrographic Conference (IHC-5), by Decision 8, tasked the Interim Committee (IRCC) with establishing a Crowdsourced Bathymetry Working Group (CSBWG) to develop IHO publication on policy for crowdsourced bathymetry (Terms of Reference). This document was envisioned to provide volunteer data collectors and interested parties with IHO's policy towards, and provide best practices for collecting and contributing data. This document was envisioned to provide volunteer data collectors and interested parties with IHO's policy towards, and provide best practices for collecting and contributing data. This document was envisioned to provide volunteer data collectors and interested parties with IHO's policy towards, and provide best practices for collecting and contributing data.

B-12, which began in 2016 and was approved by IHO Member States in 2019, was conducted using desktop and cloud word-processing tools. As the initial version was going through the IHO approval process, B-12 was put into practice, and real-world feedback was gathered. It quickly became apparent that B-12 would require significant updates almost immediately upon publication.

Approved by IHO Member States in 2022, it became clear that these tools, and the standard B-12, were becoming challenging for the type of incremental maintenance required on a document that is constantly evolving and improving technical guidelines. In addition, without searching into the CSBWG process, it would be difficult to determine the history of the modifications made, or the rationale by which they were agreed.

The annual meeting cycle of the CSBWG, mean that it is difficult to achieve an update cycle for B-12 (specifically within Chapter 3: Data and Metadata) consistent with the speed at which the practice are occurring within the crowdsourced bathymetry community. This leads to the

January 8, 2025



IHO

Context & History for the Proposal

International
Hydrographic
Organization

- The proposal has to address:
 - Tooling to use for discussion, work items, formal review, etc.
 - Governance model for contributions
 - Acceptable IHO process
- The initial proposal had an “all in” strategy for maintenance
 - Significant focus on process, not entirely in line with R-2/2007
 - Probably too detailed!
- Most responses were from technologists, and entirely **positive**
- **BUT not matching R-2/2007 was a big problem for IHO/MS**



IHO

Context & History for the Proposal

International
Hydrographic
Organization

The most significant difference in V1→V2:

B-12 shouldn't have detailed requirements on data/metadata formatting to satisfy DCDB needs.

With the obvious corollary:

DCDB should publish their specific requirements for accession to the archive and maintain these separately.



IHO

Context & History for the Proposal

International
Hydrographic
Organization

Files

dev-ircc-7

Go to file

AuxiliaryDocuments/IRCC-Prop...
CSBWG-B12-Maintenance-Pr...
B12-Main
LICENSE
README.md

CSBWG-B12 / AuxiliaryDocuments / IRCC-Proposal / CSBWG-B12-Maintenance-Proposal.md

Preview Code Blame 284 lines (243 loc) · 16.3 KB

Raw

Proposed Revisions and Maintenance Protocols

Recommended Revision to B-12 Guidance Document, v 3.0.0

B-12 is intended to be a guidance document, but during the initial development it was agreed that some description of mandatory, recommended and optional data and metadata, was required. Over time, this information became more detailed (see section 3.3 of version 3.0.0 of B-12) and more specific to data accession to DCDB. The reality is that it is entirely possible to collect useful CSB data without fulfilling all of these requirements, and the CSBWG now feel that it is not entirely appropriate for a minimal guidance document to be so prescriptive and that any DCDB requirements or recommendations should be hosted and encouraged by the DCDB (albeit with collaboration and cooperation of CSBWG).

At the same time, the annual update cadence of B-12 mandated by IHO Resolution 2/2007 means that the recommended data and metadata, prescriptive or not, cannot be updated at a pace commensurate with that of technical innovation in the field. There is therefore real danger that *de facto* field practice could diverge from *de jure* recommendations, potentially resulting in a database at DCDB poisoned with variant and poorly controlled data formats. In addition, because B-12 is a guidance document, it contains no encoding recommendations for the data and metadata beyond a single worked example, and provides no method to validate any data before submission to DCDB for archiving. These are significant technical and practical limitations.

The CSBWG therefore recommend a Revision (within the meaning of IHO Resolution 2/2007) to B-12 v. 3.0.0 to add a statement to section 3.3 ("Metadata and Data Formats") indicating that the contents are *de minimis* guidance for data and metadata, but that updated recommendations specific to DCDB, including an encoding guide and validation software, are maintained separately (with appropriate URLs for the locations of the recommendations, and how to request modifications or updates). This would form edition 3.1.0; a draft is included as an appendix to this proposal.

The CSBWG recognises that it would be better to redraft section 3.3 to avoid many of the current details on data and metadata format recommendations in order to avoid overlap and to simplify the guidance of B-12. This would, however, amount to a new Edition (within the meaning of Resolution 2/2007), that would not be ready for IRCC17 (June 2025). The potential for database damage is, however, a real and present concern and the CSBWG feel that these changes cannot be delayed for another full development and review cycle. We therefore request that the proposed v 3.1.0 of B-12 be considered temporary and transitional, with a fully revised v 4.0.0 to be developed over the next year and submitted to IRCC for approval and Member State votes in 2026.

Recommended Technologies

The current B-12 guidance document, and the corresponding data and metadata guidelines, and encoding definitions will be maintained as simple text documents with appropriate mark-up indicators (e.g., [Markdown](#), [AsciiDoc](#), [MetaNorma](#)) to allow them to be converted into different formats for distribution and use (e.g., HTML, PDF). To ensure a history of modifications is maintained, the documents will be kept in a version control system (technically: [git](#)). A separate repository will be maintained for the current B-12 guidance document and the data/metadata/encoding definitions.

In both cases, to allow for tracking of requested modifications, technical discussion of the requests, and approvals; and to allow for remote collaboration, the appropriate repository will be hosted in a cloud service that supports version control (technically: [GitHub](#)).

Both the B-12 and data/metadata/encoding maintenance efforts will be owned by the

IRCC Proposal

Files

dev-ircc-7

Go to file

AuxiliaryDocuments/IRCC-Prop...
CSBWG-B12-Maintenance-Pr...
B12-Main
Assets
Chapters
B12-main.adoc
B12-main.md
LICENSE
README.md

CSBWG-B12 / B12-Main / B12-main.adoc

Preview Code Blame 729 lines (459 loc) · 67.3 KB

Raw

3.3. Metadata and Data Formats

The current active definition of the mandatory, recommended, and optional data and metadata described here are managed by the Working Group through a [GitHub repository](#) which is publicly available. The definitions here are now outdated by structural changes in the database at DCDB; the current definitions are provided in the repository above, and as [HTML pages](#).

This section provides guidance to data collectors and Trusted Nodes about the standard metadata that is required for submitting data to the DCDB. In addition, it provides information about additional metadata that would enhance the value of the data for end users. CSB data contributors should collect and forward this information whenever possible. Recognizing that translating metadata fields to files for submission to the DCDB can be complex, Trusted Nodes are encouraged to review the CSB Sample Data Contribution Formats Document which can be found on the [IHO DCDB website](#), and includes the latest conventions and examples of acceptable data formats. The International System of Units (SI) should be used, with the allowed addition of knots (nautical miles per hour, specified to be exactly 1.852 km/h, or approximately 0.514 m/s). As such, depth and offsets measurements should be in metres.

3.3.1. Mandatory Metadata from Trusted Nodes

Trusted Nodes should assign additional metadata to crowdsourced bathymetry before they deliver data to the DCDB. Table 1 lists metadata that Trusted Nodes should provide. Note that the Data Field, "Data License", shall list only the "Creative Commons Zero" universal public domain dedication (CC0 1.0). More information on data licensing can be found in Section 5.

Table 1. Trusted Node Metadata

Data Field	Description	Example
Provider Contact Point Organization Name	The Trusted Node's name, in free-text format	Example Cruises Inc.
Provider Email	A free-text field for the Trusted Node's email address, so that data users can contact the Trusted Node with questions about the data	support@example.com
Unique Vessel ID	Generated by the Trusted Node, this number identifies the Trusted Node and uniquely identifies the contributing vessel. The characters preceding the hyphen (-) identify the Trusted Node, followed by a hyphen (-), and then the vessel's unique identifier. The UUID assigned by the Trusted Node is consistent for each contributing vessel, throughout the life of service of the vessel. However, if the vessel chooses to remain anonymous to data users, the Trusted Node does not need to publish the vessel name in association with the UUID.	EXAMPLE-UUID
Convention	This field describes the format and version for the data and metadata, such as GeoJSON, CSV, or XYZT. Reference the version of BSB 2.0, CSB 3.0) where possible.	GeoJSON CSB 3.0
Data License	Universal public domain dedication under which the data is made available to the DCDB. Additional information on data licensing can be found in Section 5.	CC0 1.0

Proposed B-12/3.1.0



IHO

Implications of the Proposal

International
Hydrographic
Organization

- **IRCC:**
 - Accept proposal to use GitHub tooling for maintenance.
 - Accept proposed B-12/3.1.0 with adjusted Section 3.3.
 - [MS would also have to vote on IRCC decision]
- **CSBWG:**
 - Provide modified B-12/3.1.0. [done]
 - Formalize structure of GitHub repository for B-12. [copy demo repo]
 - Nominate a Maintenance Group for GitHub repository.
 - Redevelop B-12/3.1.0-3.3 → B-12/4.0.0 by 2026 IRCC.
- **DCDB (with CSBWG help):**
 - Establish GitHub repository for data/metadata definition. [CSBSchema?]
 - Publish documentation of current schema, ideally automatically. [done?]
 - Work with CSBWG for maintenance/development.



IHO

Request of Work Item A to the Working Group

International
Hydrographic
Organization

Debate the current IRCC Proposal document as circulated and presented.

Approve WG Chair to take the proposal to the next IRCC meeting as our request.



IHO

Points to Ponder in Discussion

International
Hydrographic
Organization

Big
Picture

- Do we agree Section 3.3 (as is) is correctly a DCDB thing?
- Does this proposal meet the requirements for oversight?

Smaller
Details

- Are we happy with tooling suggested?
- What formatting do we want (e.g., AsciiDoc or MetaNorma)?
- What should the Maintenance Group look like?
- How do we feel about electronic voting for approvals?
- Do we need documents (e.g., PDF) for review, or is online OK?

