

**3RD MEETING OF THE HYDROGRAPHIC SERVICES AND STANDARDS COMMITTEE  
IHB, Monaco, 8-10 November 2011**

**Paper for Consideration by HSSC**

**Comments by Finland to the Restructure of HSSC WGs (HSSC3-04A)**

**Submitted by:** Finland

**Executive Summary:** *The document includes observations, comments and concerns to the proposed re-structuring plans of HSSC Working Groups.*

**Related Documents:** 1. HSSC3-04A

**Related Projects:** None

### **Introduction / Background**

1. Finland has reviewed the proposed plans to re-structure the HSSC Working Groups (HSSC3-04A). Finland agrees that there may be needs to enhance the coordination and to clarify the relations between the HSSC Working Groups. Finland has the following observations, comments, questions and concerns to this proposal:

#### Proposed Digital Chart Data Working Group (DCDWG)

2. The role of the proposed DCDWG is not clear. In our opinion we should try to follow the principle that first to define the data content and format specifications based on the user's needs. Based on these specifications the appropriate WG may develop suitable portrayal or display specifications. This principle was also the case in the SPWG Proposal in 2007, when two sub committees were proposed under HSSC, namely "*Data Acquisition & Transfer Standards Sub-Committee*" and "*Symbology & Presentation Standards Sub-Committee*" (CONF.17.Doc.1 Annex H). However this was not implemented.

3. So the roles should be that the TSMAD will define the data content specifications and based on these the DIPWG will develop appropriate display specifications. When actively developing S-57 and S-52 the TSMAD and DIPWG (C&SWG at that time) worked quite well as separate WGs and applying the above principle. Currently (when actively developing the S-100 standards) the TSMAD and DIPWG have worked closely together and have had joint meetings, and their roles seem to be somewhat ad-hoc mixed. But in the future in a more stable maintenance situation can they be more separated again?

4. There are also connections between TSMAD, DIPWG, CSPCWG, EUWG. The roles between these should be clarified. For instance, why EUWG is a separate WG?

5. We have also noted that within the process of developing standards within these WGs there seems to be a division to two groups which need different kind of expertise: "data content" by experts from HOs, and "hard core" by technical experts (mostly by expert contributors).

#### Proposed Digital Data Technical Support Working Group (DDTSWG)

6. The proposed DDTSWG is supported. The application of S-100 will expand widely outside the IHO community (to IALA, IMO, IEHG, ...) and the IHO needs a clear Point of Contact to these other bodies and a capable body to address the issues raised by them. The DDTSWG is proposed to maintain the S-100 registry and thus may well serve this purpose. It is proposed to

be kept quite small and to be composed from few experts really with deep knowledge and experience of S-100 related issues.

7. The tasks of the DPSWG are proposed to be included into the DDTSWG. Thus establishing the DDTSWG will not increase the number of HSSC WGs.

#### Proposed Digital Data Coordination Sub-Committee (DDCSC)

8. The DDCSC is proposed to meet only during the proposed Technical Working week. It is proposed to be composed from the representatives of IHO MSs, Expert contributors and NGOs who are attending to the Working Week. Is it really intended that almost all participants of the Working Week will be participate also to the DDCSC?

9. Is the establishment of this kind of DDCSC sub-committee really needed, is it too heavy body for these coordination tasks? Would it be efficient enough if the Chair Group composed of the Chairs of the WGs and perhaps some experts will take care of these tasks?

#### Proposed Technical Working Week:

10. The proposed Working week seems to be a good idea. The most of the relevant experts would then be in same place and communication with them should be easier. Even today some of the WG:s work closely together. However, this proposal raises some technical and resource questions, e.g. if MSs have representatives to many WGs there may be quite many participants to the Working week, does the IHB have big enough meeting facilities, etc.

11. We believe that carefully reviewing the timing of the HSSC and its Working Group meetings will increase the progress of the work of the WGs quite much with the current WG structure. For example, the postponing the dates of this HSSC3 meeting caused that the DSMAD has no time to have its meeting in 2011. Are there any good reasons to have the HSSC meetings to be held in October/November?

12. The scheduling of the proposed Working week should be harmonized with the HSSC meetings. Also the schedules of IMO NAV meetings should be considered when scheduling the Working Week.

#### Conclusions:

13. This is a new proposal, during the preparations there has not been discussions within the WGs concerned. The DIPWG Chair not included in the proposal.

14. As a conclusion, the paper contains in principle many relevant good proposals which may enhance the work of the HSSC WGs, but further analysis and discussions are needed before final decisions.

#### **Action Required of HSSC**

15. The HSSC3 meeting is invited to

- take **note** on this information