

INTERNATIONAL HYDROGRAPHIC
ORGANIZATION



ORGANISATION HYDROGRAPHIQUE
INTERNATIONALE

CHART STANDARDIZATION & PAPER CHART WORKING GROUP (CSPCWG)

[A Working Group of the Hydrographic Services and Standards Committee (HSSC)]

Chairman: Peter JONES
Secretary: Andrew HEATH-COLEMAN

UK Hydrographic Office
Admiralty Way, Taunton, Somerset
TA1 2DN, United Kingdom

CSPCWG Letter: 02/2013

UKHO ref: HA317/010/031-10

Telephone:
(Chairman) +44 (0) 1823 337900 ext 3311
(Secretary) +44 (0) 1823 337900 ext 3656
Facsimile: +44 (0) 1823 325823
E-mail: peter.jones@ukho.gov.uk
andrew.coleman@ukho.gov.uk

To CSPCWG Members

Date 2 January 2013

Dear Colleagues,

Subject: Feedback from 9th CSPCWG meeting.

Although there has been some evolution in the format of CSPCWG meetings over the 9 times we have met, we have never attempted to consider all aspects of the meetings to see if there are any improvements we can make. I therefore asked the participants at WG9 to provide some feedback, using a form Andrew and I made for the purpose.

For your information, the consolidated results of this feedback are attached at Annex, including useful free text comments (unattributed).

We are grateful to the 10 participants who responded. In general, they confirm that the meetings are well managed and little specific change to our practices is required. Andrew and I aim to meet the requirements of the WG and our remit as effectively and efficiently as we can. It seems the respondents consider we generally achieve that aim; however, we promise not to become complacent and all comments will be kept in mind for the future.

Yours sincerely,

Peter G.B. Jones,
Chairman

9TH CSPCWG MEETING - PARTICIPANTS FEEDBACK FORM

Introduction. Although there has been some evolution in the format of CSPCWG meetings over the 9 times we have met, we have never attempted to consider all aspects of the meetings to see if there are any improvements we can make. This form is an attempt to get a better understanding of **your actual experience**, as a participant, and whether you have any suggestions for improvements.

Please indicate your experiences below. You are invited to also add free text 'comments', including constructive criticism as appropriate, to enable us to have a clear understanding of your views. We cannot undertake to meet everyone's preferences, but will try to take account of any emerging consensus for change in any aspect. We will let you know outcomes, without attributing comments. **Please return directly to Chairman and Secretary, without using 'Reply to all'.**

1. Location. Meetings 1-4 and 6 were held in Monaco, and it always remains an option. For meetings 5 and 7-9 we accepted members' invitations (from Australia, South Africa, Finland, South Korea) and we have now accepted invitations from New Zealand and Germany (for meetings 10 and 11).

Would you prefer:

- To always meet in Monaco?
- To continue accepting invitations from members? **10**
- To alternate between Europe and non-European venues? **6**

Note: those who said 'yes' to the third option, also said 'yes' to the second option.

Comments or other options:

1. If possible (noted against option 2).
2. It's great to see other countries and I think this allows more member states to participate when it is moved around the world. I know it is not easy for a HO to always host, since there are costs associated, and I always appreciate the hospitality of the host nation, and I always welcome the chance to return to Monaco.
3. We could perhaps meet in Monaco every second year.
4. It is not necessary to alternate between EU and non EU venues.

2. Duration. The early meetings were planned for 3 days, but in more recent years a 4th day has been added (for longer agenda, travel etc). These meetings have been planned Tuesday to Friday (allowing hosts & officers to set up on Monday).

- Is 4 days the best time allowance for the meeting's duration?

Yes: 9 Yes/No: 1 (see comment 3)

Comments:

1. Perhaps 3 and a half days works good depending on the length of the agenda.
2. Not really a valid reason for having a longer meeting, but I always find it easier to justify attendance at a 4 day meeting rather than a 3 day meeting, given the distance that we are normally required to travel.
3. May be in the future, when the review of the S-4 is achieved, 3 days will be enough. I suggest being flexible between 3 and 4 days.

3. Room facilities. We have always met around a table in 'boardroom style'.

- Do you consider this is the best layout for our group? **Yes: 10**
- Do you find projecting papers & other material on screen helpful? **Yes: 10**
- Do you consider internet access to be essential? **Yes: 8 Yes/No: 2**

Comments:

1. Often I like to reference other documents that I can find online, particularly docs from the IHO website.
2. In regard to the 3rd question, it depends on the agenda and papers submitted for the meeting. Sometimes it may be required to access the IHO web site, or other sites, depending on the requirements of the presenter or the nature of discussions at the

meeting.

3. For non English natives, projecting papers are essential to follow the work, even if we have a personal copy. It is also useful to show pictures, schemes, charts ... The use of internet is essential when new questions appear and require more information to our staff. It is also essential to keep in touch with our daily work at the office.
4. Helpful.

4. Formality. Do you find the level of formality at the meeting about right (having regard to the cosmopolitan nature of the group)? **Yes: 8** **No: 1** (no explanatory comment)

Comments:

1. I think how the meeting is managed is just perfect for our group.
2. Should we be more relaxed (no tie or costume)?
3. No opinion: I don't mind the business attire, but casual doesn't bother me, either.

5. Meeting sessions. Are the timings (start, end), breaks and length of working day about right? **Yes: 10**

Comments:

1. With the time difference we all face when traveling, having the meetings as scheduled work well to help adjust.
2. It is perfect!

6. Breakout sessions. Splitting the WG for separate discussions has only been used exceptionally, on the assumption that most topics will be of interest to the entire group. But are opportunities for special interest meetings being lost? (subWG sessions may be an example).

- Should we include specific time for breakout sessions?

Yes: 4 **No: 5** **Yes/No: 1** (see comment 3)

Comments: (if you think they are required, please indicate purpose).

1. I think if there is a need for a sub group to meet separately from the joint meeting, then that should be scheduled around the sessions, not as a breakout within the sessions. So sub groups could meet the day prior or following the general session that everyone attends.
2. Have answered "Yes" to this question, but this can be handled in conjunction with the 4 (or 3.5) day meeting timeframe. As has been done successfully at many TSMAD meetings, if there is a requirement to have a "break-out" meeting, this can be done informally at the end of the day (often we have done this in the bar) if it is considered that the issue can be resolved quickly. Alternatively, the Chair may choose to close the day half an hour or an hour early to give the break-out group the opportunity to meet at the end of the day, and the lost time can, if required, be made up at the end of the meeting.
3. It depends of the subjects; at the last meeting, we decided to create a sub-WG on the future of cartography and we have also the sub-WG on INT1. It could have been valuable to have a specific time for the two sub-WGs expanded, with more than the 3 or 4 "designated" people, in order to collect the opinion of some others on the subjects: future of the cartography, improvement of INT1.
4. Yes, but only if beneficial to a subset of the WG.

7. Open discussions. Did you find the opportunity for some 'free' discussion not aimed at a final decision on a subject useful (at WG9, the discussion on 'INT' charting)? **Yes: 10**

Comments: (if you think they are useful, please indicate topics to Secretary, as they arise).

1. I think we should always have a visioning session, where a discussion of latest developments are concerned, about new technologies or directions HO's are going. We can learn a lot from each other's experiences. Just like when we review accidents, I think we can learn lots from a session on new developments.

8. Language. We are aware that English is not first language for most participants.

- Is the speed and clarity of spoken English in the discussions generally acceptable?

Yes: 8 **No: 1** **Yes/No: 1** (see comment 2)

Comments: (including options for improvement, if not generally acceptable)

1. Everybody is good at helping and guiding if you cannot find the right word. The

- Chairman is good at repeating questions and to follow up on conclusions.
2. Could be improved; I know I probably speak too fast and others do not understand, and I need to be reminded to slow down a little when discussing a topic.
 3. The use of microphones has proved very useful in that it makes you stop and think cautious. Also any intervention via a microphone is better understood by all. In any case, speakers should be asked to speak loud and articulate, in particular those whose English is the mother tongue.
 4. From time to time, I have some difficulties when people speak too fast. A short reminder could be a simple solution at the beginning of the meeting.
 5. I did have some problems hearing a speaker when the microphone was squarely in front of a speaker, but the speaker's head was turned toward the Chairman. I don't have a solution. Peter is, however, good about summarizing the speaker's input.

9. Your involvement. Do you find you have adequate opportunity to enter discussions and that your views are given due attention? **Yes: 10**

Comments:

1. I think it's great to hear the opinions of the members, but I know with language issues those with a strong command of English probably dominate the meeting.

10. Documents and Report. The preparatory documents (eg calling letter, advisory correspondence, agenda, EN) are long-established and attempt to follow good practice in meeting participants' needs in their preparation. Also, the Report attempts to capture only the major points and conclusions, from sometimes lengthy discussions.

- Is the preparatory documentation adequate and appropriate? **Yes: 10**
- Is the layout and level of detail in the Meeting Report about right? **Yes: 10**

Comments:

11. How would you rate the performance of the Chairman in conducting the meetings? (select 1 & be honest!)

Very Poor	Poor	Adequate	Good	Excellent
				10

Comments:

1. Peter has done an excellent job in chairing this group, and I appreciate how he is inclusive of all members, and how he manages the meeting in general. His approach could not be better in my opinion.
2. At the end of each item in the agenda, it would useful if the Chair would summarize the discussion and provide the conclusion/decision/action on that item.
3. Many thanks to Peter to take time to summarise subjects and discussion in order to make sure that every body can understand.

12. How would you rate the performance of the Secretary in managing the display of documents and advising the meeting when necessary? (select 1 & be honest!)

Very Poor	Poor	Adequate	Good	Excellent
			½	9½

Comments:

1. I attend a lot of meetings, and for a multi day meeting this one is extremely well organized and managed. I truly appreciate the hard work that goes into preparing material, as well as the work during the meeting and after hours, in terms of organizing for the next day and producing summaries. This meeting is done in a very professional manner, and I like the structure. Well done!
2. All the work and advises from Andrew are always perfect, and his knowledge of the S-4 is incomparable. But from my point of view, I think Andrew is too concentrated on its comment and forget that there are [some] people attending the meeting which are not so fluent in English!

13. Please comment on any other aspects of the meetings that could be changed to make the experience more enjoyable and/or worthwhile:

1. Many thanks for this initiative. I personally think such assessment should be made

following every IHO meeting.

2. The Chairman spoke in the last meeting about the possibility of change the Working Group name. In this case it would be good to incorporate people associated with the world of ENC and so to coordinate the standards of both types of cartographies.
3. Just a question: Should we perhaps put a limit to the number of participants from industry?
4. I personally don't think that there is something to change except for some of our colleagues to speak slowly! What could be change for some of us is the time to prepare the meeting and, in general, to work on standardisation more deeply along the year. But we need an equilibrium between experts of high level like you or Jeff, and people more involved in production, with different experiences.
5. The only thing I can think of is that sometimes, long-time members (such as myself) tended to congregate and I feared that new members (such as ...) might have felt left out of conversations....