## INTERNATIONAL HYDROGRAPHIC ORGANIZATION



## ORGANISATION HYDROGRAPHIQUE INTERNATIONALE

## CHART STANDARDIZATION & PAPER CHART WORKING GROUP (CSPCWG)

[A Working Group of the Committee on Hydrographic Requirements for Information Systems - CHRIS]

Chairman: Peter JONES

Secretary: Andrew HEATH-COLEMAN

UK Hydrographic Office

Admiralty Way, Taunton, Somerset

TA1 2DN, United Kingdom

CSPCWG Circular Letter: 02/2003

UKHO ref: HA317/010/031-01

Telephone:

(Chairman) +44 (0)1823 723343 (Secretary) +44 (0)1823 337900 x3656 Facsimile: +44 (0)1823 325823

peter.jones@ukho.gov.uk

andrew.coleman@ukho.gov.uk

**To CSPCWG Members** 

Date 29 October 2003

Dear Colleagues,

Subject: Responses to Questionnaire (Annex H to CL 01/2003)

Twenty-two (out of a possible twenty-five) CSPCWG members responded to the questionnaire and I would like to express my gratitude to you for this helpful action. The officers of the working group (Vice-chairman Jarmo Makinen, Secretary Andrew Heath-Coleman and myself) met in Helsinki on 16 October to consider the responses and make decisions on how to progress our work plan.

A summary of the responses and our resultant proposals are attached at the Annex. We will commence our work on this basis and hope to initiate substantive consultation shortly.

Thank you again for your contributions.

Yours sincerely,

Peter G.B. Jones, Chairman

## SUMMARY OF THE RESPONSES TO CL 01/2003 (ANNEX H) AND RESULTANT PROPOSALS

- 1. **Correspondence** will normally be by email (except where fax is necessary for sending non-digital graphics). Those Working Group (WG) members who have requested a hard copy, and those who have not responded to the questionnaire, will be sent follow-up hard copies by post. It was suggested that we should consider using a section of the OpenEcdis Forum (OEF) for discussion, and also have a bulletin board for posting Circular Letters (CLs) and changes to M-4, etc. The Secretary will explore these possibilities further.
- 2. **Timescales:** Although a majority of WG members indicated that they were happy with 6 weeks for new proposals and 3 weeks for follow-up, there was a significant minority who indicated that they needed 8 weeks and 4 weeks for consultation. Therefore, except where there is good reason for shortening the timescales, 8 and 4 weeks will be allowed (and could be extended for complex issues). The Secretary will ensure that the response date is clearly shown on all such correspondence.
- Other WGs: WG members were unanimous that other relevant CHRIS WGs should receive CSPCWG
  CLs to allow them to add their comments at an early stage. CLs will therefore be supplied to other WG
  chairmen or secretaries as appropriate.
- 4. **Meetings:** All WG members agreed that meetings are useful (assuming that there are issues to be discussed). Most favoured meeting at two year intervals (in accordance with our Terms of Reference). Although it is important to have issues which would benefit from a face-to-face discussion on the agenda, which may not be known until near the meeting time, in practice most members need to plan and budget for travel well in advance of the meeting. Members generally considered that a meeting should last two days (although this could be increased if necessary). Less than two days is unlikely to be worthwhile. For this reason we consider it best to plan for a 2 day meeting every two years, beginning in the period September to November 2004. (In the unlikely event that there is nothing to discuss, we can cancel the meeting).
- 5. Venue: The most favoured venue was IHB Monaco. However, some non-European WG members would find it difficult to budget for travel to Europe for one meeting. For this reason it would be helpful if such members could let us know whether there are any other meetings they might attend in Europe in the time period suggested, if possible by 31 December 2003. We could then try and arrange our meeting just before or just after that meeting.
- 6. **Publications:** All WG members favoured the idea of updating an "edit" version of M-4 held on the IHB web-site, with members-only access. Some constructive comments were made on how this might be managed and the issue is currently with IHB staff to advise on the technical details. In the short term, it will be necessary to continue in the old "CSC" way until the "edit" version is available.
- 7. **Work plan:** This generally met with the approval of WG members, although it is clear that the suggested end dates are very challenging (and perhaps unachievable with the limited resources available). We can reconsider these at our first meeting, by which time it will be clearer how fast we can progress items. Suggestions were made for raising the priority of some items, but that could only be done at the expense of lowering priorities for other items. Priorities will be kept under review and are subject to endorsement by CHRIS at its annual meeting.

- 8. **Specific work items:** Specific work items will be the subject of further CLs, usually one for each work item. Where possible the work will be progressed from the point at which the former Chart Standardization Committee had left off. Environmentally Sensitive Sea Areas (ESSA/PSSAs) and Archipelagic Sea Lanes (ASL) will be the first items to be progressed.
- 9. In addition to those items listed in the published work plan, there is a back-log of numerous symbols and other issues that had been addressed to the former CSC. It is not planned to reopen all these (some would be "time-expired") but the Secretary will examine them on an opportunity basis, and where possible include proposals with the revision of the relevant section of M-4. However, if any members are aware of old topics that have not been progressed, which they consider to be important, they are recommended to resubmit the issue to CHRIS in accordance with the "Instructions for Submission of Proposals to CHRIS and CHRIS Subsidiary Bodies" (Annex E to CSPCWG CL 01/2003). The same submission process should also be used for the suggestions for new topics which were included on some of the questionnaire responses.