

**8th CSPCWG Meeting
Turku, Finland, 29 November – 2 December 2011**

Paper for Consideration by CSPCWG

CSPCWG’s technical ‘standards’: should their application be monitored?

Submitted by:	Chairman
Executive Summary:	S-4 (and other documents) are listed as IHO technical ‘standards’. Should adherence and compliance with these standards be monitored? If so, who should undertake the task and by what procedures?
Related Documents:	IHO TR2/2007
Related Projects:	Developments in ENC community to improve consistency

Introduction / Background.

1. IHO TR2/2007 was approved by Circular Letter CL50/2011 (following CLs 24/2011 and 37/2011). Extract from M-3:

<p>PRINCIPLES AND PROCEDURES FOR MAKING CHANGES TO IHO TECHNICAL STANDARDS AND SPECIFICATIONS</p>	2/2007	CL50/2011	A1.21
--	---------------	------------------	--------------

1. Scope

1.1 These principles and procedures are intended to be applied to all proposals for changes to IHO technical standards and for new work items that will require significant resources to resolve or will potentially impact on those who need to apply the standards. They are not intended for IHO publications, catalogues or supporting documentation of a guidance, general or non-technical nature.

1.2 Any reference to “standards” in these principles and procedures follows the ISO/IEC definitions for *standard* and *guide* and may therefore also include some IHO “specifications” and “guidelines” as appropriate*. IHO Product Specifications are considered to be standards.

* ISO/IEC Directives, Part 2 - Rules for the Structure and Drafting of International Standards defines a standard as... *a document, established by consensus and approved by a recognized body, that provides for common and repeated use, rules, guidelines or characteristics for activities or their results, aimed at the achievement of the optimum degree of order in a given context.*

2. CL87/2010 Annex C lists S-4, S-11 Part A and S-49 as ‘standards’ and CSPCWG as the responsible IHO custodian body.
3. CSPCWG develops and agrees the specifications, which are then approved by IHO MS before implementation. MS apply and interpret them for their own use, as required.

4. CSPCWG's Terms of Reference (paragraph 3.a) provide for the Chairman to:
 - iv. Advise the IHB and Regional Hydrographic Commissions, as appropriate, on the work of International Charting Coordination Working Groups (ICCWG) or Regional Charting Groups (RCG) in order to promote the production of international (INT) charts. The role of the WG is purely consultative.
 - v. Offer advice based on its experience to ICCWG/RCG and individual Member States, on chart schemes and cartographic work, in order to strongly encourage adherence to IHO charting specifications. The role of the WG is purely consultative.
5. At one time, IHB reviewed newly published INT charts. It is understood that this is no longer done.
6. In the ENC producer community, there is increasing concern over variability in respect of presentation to the mariner. Are there any parallels applicable to paper charts?

Analysis / Discussion.

7. In accordance with its Terms of Reference (see above), advice is supplied on request, to both individual MS and ICCWG/RCG coordinators. However, there is no review of how CSPCWG's standards have been applied, the degree of conformance to those standards or, indeed, the opportunity for feedback to chart producers – including where modifications may be appropriate in the standard. We do not usually receive any confirmation whether specific advice provided has been followed and implemented in the particular charts produced. These standards include:
 - S-4 in terms of the standardization of presentation and cartographic conventions
 - S-11 Part A in terms of the concepts and application of IHO INT Charts and schemes
 - S-49 in terms of the content and standardization of Mariners' Routeing Guides (of very limited application, to date).
8. In pursuing the concept of continuous improvement, and possibly capacity building, is this lack of feedback a potential flaw?
9. Is there a need to protect and 'guard' the community standard which, in the example of an INT Chart, carries the IHO crest (seal)?
10. Perhaps a useful analogy is to a code (eg UK's 'Highway Code' for driving standards, see Annex) which describes *good practice* and what *should* be done? In this case, might divergence from the standard increase the producer's risk of product liability in the event of an incident?
11. **If** there is a role for CSPCWG (& TSMAD) as owner in monitoring its standards:
 - what degree of 'quality control' may be applicable?
 - how might it operate?
 - what measures could be determined?
 - what degree of tolerance may be reasonable?

12. Alternatively, many HOs have a 'standards' function within their organization to oversee national standards in their chart products. Is there any merit in sharing this experience and collaborating more formally or does CSPCWG act sufficiently well to address this?

13. Or, should this matter be left entirely to the discretion of MS, as currently?

Conclusions. None

Recommendations. None

Justification and Impacts.

To open a CSPCWG discussion on the subject.

To seek views on whether there is a need for a new approach to improve standardization in charts provided to the mariner.

If adopted for further investigation, the task will need to be prioritized within the Work Plan and resources allocated to determine a way ahead. And subsequently, to implementing any agreed actions.

Action required of CSPCWG. CSPCWG is invited to advise the Chairman.

Extract from the Introduction to UK's Highway Code

Many of the rules in the Code are legal requirements, and if you disobey these rules you are committing a criminal offence. You may be fined, given penalty points on your licence or be disqualified from driving. In the most serious cases you may be sent to prison. Such rules are identified by the use of the words '**MUST/MUST NOT**'.

Although failure to comply with the other rules of the Code will not, in itself, cause a person to be prosecuted, The Highway Code may be used in evidence in any court proceedings under the Traffic Acts (see 'The road user and the law') to establish liability. This includes rules which use advisory wording such as 'should/should not' or 'do/do not'.