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LIAISON NOTE

Maritime Resource Names (MRN)

# Introduction

The concept of Maritime Resource Names (MRN) was developed and introduced by the ENAV Committee and adopted by IALA and IHO as the core identity mechanism. The IHO and IALA are currently defining the appropriate structures for the MRN and usage structures.

# Discussion

The ENAV committee reviewed the actual documents discussed at the WG4 S100 of IHO for the usage of MRN.

ENAV committee identified that there is a need guidance for the identification of

* S100 artefacts:
  + Features Types (Feature Registry)
  + Terminology (Dictionary)
  + Data Objects (as generated by data providers)
* Maritime Services and G1128 artefacts:
  + Maritime Services
  + Service Specification
  + Service Design
  + Service Instance
* Publications:
  + Standards
  + Recommendations
  + Guidelines
  + Manuals
  + Model Courses
  + IALA Bulletin
  + e-Bulletin
  + others

The ENAV Committee proposes to have a country code in front of the organization element. For example urn:mrn:<…>:<country code>:<organization>:<…>.

Every S-100 artefact should follow the recommendations as discussed at IHO WG4 S-100 on MRN (s. Annex1). For example an AtoN will have an MRN in the form urn:mrn:iala:s201:<country code>:<organization>:<ID part>

The ENAV Committee wishes to point out that there could be overlaps of the product specifications, they are not disjunct.

Additionally, this Committee sees the issue, that existing data bases do not store the feature type but a transformation from existing IDs has to be made in an automatic way. This cannot be done automatically if we follow this proposal.

Additionally, an agency may have one data base for storing S201 related data about an AtoN with the same object being stored in other databases such as maintenance reports. Its recommended that the same ID can be used across databases.

The ENAV Committee concluded that ID of a data object should potentially not be linked to a Feature Type or Product Specification. One solution can be that s201 will be regarded a synonym for AtoN. But this can solve some but not all problems and will need further exploration and discussion.

The ENAV Committee discussed that all product specifications in the S-100 domain could have a common “domain owner” like e.g. “gsr” (geo-spatial registry). The idea behind this is that we already know who the responsible part for the product specification is and then all MRNs related to S100 product specifications would have the same first 3 elements. For example urn:mrn:gsr:s101:<xxx> and urn:mrn:gsr:s201:<xxx>. This will need further exploration and discussion.

# Related papers

ENAV23-12.1.5.1 - IHO Level Guidance on how to manage the IHO Maritime Resource Names (MRN) namespace

# Action requested

The ARM is requested to:

1. The ARM Committee is requested to consider the proposed comments for the MRN.
2. The ARM Committee is requested to liaise with the ENAV Committee for the development of an IALA Guideline on the usage of MRN and jointly coordinate this with IHO and other parties.