5TH MEETING OF THE HYDROGRAPHIC SERVICES AND STANDARDS COMMITTEE
Shanghai, China, 5-8 November 2013

Paper for Consideration by HSSC5

CSPCWG Comments on Proposals for the Structure and Optimizing of HSSC Working Groups

Submitted by:	Chairman CSPCWG
Executive Summary:	Summary comments on proposals for the re-structuring and optimizing of HSSC Working Groups contained in the respective meeting papers: • HSSC5-04.2A - Review of the Structure of HSSC Working Groups • HSSC5-04.2C rev1 - Optimizing HSSC Working Groups. These comments are limited to the perspective of the Chart Standardization and Paper Chart Working Group (CSPCWG) but may also assist early consideration and facilitation of discussions on the structure of the WGs.
Related Documents:	HSSC5-04.2A - Review of the Structure of HSSC Working Groups HSSC5-04.2C rev1 - Optimizing HSSC Working Groups. HSSC5-05.5B - CSPCWG Proposed Change of Name
Related Projects:	-

Introduction / Background

1. HSSC5-04.2A *Review of the Structure of HSSC Working Groups*. The executive summary states:

   This paper reviews the current structure and operation of HSSC Working Groups in the light of the take up of S-100 in particular. It recommends considering a new structure to accompany the transition to S-100 based interoperable product and services.

2. HSSC5-04.2C rev1 *Optimizing HSSC Working Groups*. The executive summary states:

   A proposal to reorganize several HSSC working groups by aligning product specifications and tasks into functionally related working groups. This help make the HSSC more efficient and ensure that the appropriate subject matter experts are most effectively positioned to support ongoing efforts. A recommendation is made to establish an ad hoc committee to evaluate the proposed changes and to make recommendations to HSSC6 for implementing a reorganization of HSSC working groups.

3. **Comments within this paper are provided from the perspective solely of CSPCWG**. It is noted that several other HSSC WG are impacted by the proposals in the referenced papers, but their perspectives are not the subject of the comments below.

Analysis/Discussion

4. Discussions in CSPCWG have included the on-going relevance of, and principles behind, the INT chart concept, and the future of the paper chart more generally. Further, the WG recognises that the conventions and principles in the continuing development of nautical cartography will increasingly be challenged to meet the needs of standard nautical (paper) and electronic (ENC) charts, the relationships between them and their respective roles in serving the mariner. Also, that these issues are only likely to increase in the future.

5. The future role of CSPCWG and its interfaces with sister HSSC WG is outlined in reference HSSC5-05.5B which proposes a change of WG name (to the Nautical Cartography Working Group - NCWG).

6. **CSPCWG Comments on reference HSSC5-04.2A:**

6.1 Table 3 shows, and paragraph 13 comments on the cross-participation between WG, including CSPCWG. For CSPCWG:

- This active cross-participation by members is viewed as a key strength and value in consolidating collaboration, rather than 'a problem to fix'. The question is rather one of balancing resources committed by MS to a number of WG whilst maintaining the expertise of specialists in the discipline. For CSPCWG, this balance is achieved, particularly with the active participation of DIPWG and TSMAD members.

- Whilst UKHO continues to provide the level of participation represented in HSSC WG, collaboration also occurs between HO colleagues as participants of different WG.

6.2 Table 3 shows, and paragraph 14 comments on concerns regarding WG membership. For CSPCWG:

- Its status as containing the 'highest participation' of MS of any WG also includes a very high level of <u>active</u> participation both in meetings and in inter-session correspondence. This provides an indicator of the WG's perceived relevance and value to each participating MS in its current form.

- The level of industry participation is influenced by the nature of the work and/or the degree of technological development in a WG's Work Plan items.

6.3 Paragraphs 29 and 31 propose principles for the development of IHO S-100 based product specifications, including being run as <u>time-limited</u> projects by a specific working group established and disbanded, with sustainable maintenance arrangements, by HSSC. From CSPCWG's experience:

- There should be caution in creating product specifications that, once developed, become effectively 'orphaned' without a responsible body to oversee their application and maintenance. This has occurred to a limited degree with S-12, but could this be more problematic with new S-100 based product specifications?

- Time-limited groups may encourage greater participation (MS, industry, other stakeholders) but does not support continuity and specification maintenance.

6.4 Paragraph 33 references the current revision cycle of S-4 Part B undertaken by CSPCWG and its completion in 2014. From CSPCWG's experience:

- This milestone is significant but is not a 'closure' of activity. One reason why this revision has taken so long is the continuing stream of emerging and changing specification requirements that demand review and maintenance of the standard (as evidenced by CSPCWG-sponsored Circular Letters, reports to HSSC and its work plans). Whilst it may have been expected that such matters would subside, experience has shown this not to be the case as real-world issues emerge and MS continue to raise new items requiring attention (including issues of compatibility between paper and digital charts).

- S-4 Part C (which addresses small-scale ocean charting) has never been reviewed in modern times. Whilst not anticipated to be a major task, it could act as a proto-type, relatively constrained model task to fully explore the integration of standard (INT) paper and ENC charting content and

specifications, including the application of ENC scheming guidelines currently being developed (CSPCWG work item B.3). If so agreed, this could start to address the aspiration in the reference paper: *to consider shifting the underlying framework of chart specifications from paper to digital products*.

6.5 Paragraph 33 seeks to *promote an integrated approach;* and paragraph 34 (and 39 bullet #2) proposes *to merge CSPCWG and SNPWG and to focus their activities on the standardization of digital products.* From CSPCWG's perspective:

- This proposal significantly extends the discussion from the priority issue regarding TSMAD / S-100. Is there a MS requirement for this reorganisation, noting that CSPCWG continually solicits participating MS for items requiring development to refresh its work plan? In simplistic terms, it seems odd that the WG with the highest MS representation and participation is so fundamentally altered.

- Enhancing the consistency and inter-relationships in charting (paper and ENC) would appear to be a more valid approach than bringing nautical charts and publications together. (A current example is the development of a revised edition of S-11A to incorporate 'ENC scheming guidance' (work item B.3)). S-4 continues to form a foundation resource in establishing the community 'standard' of nautical cartography, its reasoning, value and implementation. This does not solely apply to paper charts as both TSMADWG and DIPWG are dependent on the work of CSPCWG to guide chart specifications in whatever format the chart is delivered. This work needs to continue.

- Recognising the consultative spirit of this proposal, there is little analysis or justification presented for this merger.

- The merger would create a WG (Chart and Nautical Information WG) with a large and wide-ranging remit. There is a risk such a group would be too unwieldy and with too wide a scope (a situation that has been experienced by TSMAD, prompting review of the WG structure due to an unbalanced workload). Also, that it would dilute the expertise of representation in the respective disciplines, noting the current expertise of the two separate WG as currently resourced by MS. In the case of CSPCWG, an expertise that is centred on <u>nautical cartography</u>. Both CSPCWG and SNPWG should re-emphasise their focus on *both* paper and S-100 products; for each, this is a significant task which will not be helped by merging.

- This merger and synergy has not been identified in the similar review of HSSC WG undertaken by US (HSSC5-04.2C rev1 refers).

- In previous CHRIS discussions, a synergy between CSPCWG and CSMWG (now DIPWG) had been proposed – but was not pursued.

- If the focus of activities is to be on the standardization of digital products, what becomes of the existing ongoing maintenance work (e.g. of S-4 mentioned above)? There is a risk that this standard becomes 'orphaned'.

6.6 Paragraph 37 proposes *to maintain…HDWG under [its] current terms of reference.* This is mentioned here only to note the contrary view in HSSC5-04.2C rev1.

7. **CSPCWG Comments on reference HSSC5-04.2C rev1**:

7.1 Throughout, CSPCWG has been renamed Chart Content & Cartography Working Group (CCCWG or '3Cs' WG). After extensive review by CSPCWG, it is proposed to rename it the Nautical Cartography WG (NCWG) (HSSC5-05.5B refers). 'Chart Content' was considered but deemed to be encompassed by the term 'Cartography'. NCWG is also a name that is format-neutral.

7.2 The proposal for SNPWG (renamed Nautical Information Working Group) to adopt responsibility for S-49 (Standardization of Mariners' Routeing Guides - MRG) from CSPCWG is considered feasible, if required. For information:

- The April 2010 edition of S-49 was developed by a sub-WG of CSPCWG led by SNPWG VC (now its Chairman).

- MRG complement nautical charts as do other Nautical Publications but in a fused graphical / textual form. In their current format, they are designed and printed as paper 'chart' products.

- Existing MRG are all numbered and catalogued as charts. Also, they may now be assigned INT Chart numbers (and some do carry INT numbers), thus linking them to paper charts more strongly than previously.

7.3 In the analysis of the role of CSPCWG, regarding the content and symbolization of chart features, there is recognition of its strong liaison with TSMAD and DIPWG.

- This is most evident through cross-participation by its members (6.1 above refers). CSPCWG officers additionally consult other WGs' officers within UK.

- Whilst consultation can always be improved, as described, the assertion that *there is often a degree of waiting for CSPCWG to specify the cartographic approach for a feature (such as virtual aids to navigation) in S-4* is disputed. There are many examples of CSPCWG leading, going back to the introduction of ASL. Virtual AtoN (using AIS) is a particularly inappropriate example as CSPCWG anticipated this technological application and developed symbology, in liaison with other WG, well before its implementation.

- Implementing a cartographic representation that can be applied easily to all chart types regardless of format is the goal, although a 'one-size' solution may not always be appropriate or feasible.

7.4 There is a proposal that responsibility for S-32 (Hydrographic Dictionary) is moved to this WG *to bring together both the definition and specification of chart content to a single working group.* And that, consequently, HDWG is eliminated.

- S-32 is 'hydrography' and much wider than 'charts' and their content. HDWG do consult CSPCWG but they also consult many other 'specialist' WG, depending on the subject matter, and this independent role should continue.

- HDWG is now re-invigorated acting under a new Chairman who has been apprised of this proposal. It is for HDWG to comment but I understand the proposal that HDWG is disbanded is not supported; rather, that it should receive more attention.

- Eliminating the existing HDWG will not help distribute the workload. Also, it is contrary to the proposal in HSSC5-04.2A (paragraph 6.6 above refers).

Conclusions
8. The above comments put on record the initial response from CSPCWG to the proposals made in the referenced papers.

Recommendations and Action Required of HSSC5
9. These perspectives are to be taken onto account in any subsequent discussion.