



Hydrographic Services and Standards Committee

Proposal by the

IEC TC80/MT7

Proposal to include documented peer review  
process for publishing of ECDIS related  
standards

Hannu Peiponen

Convenor of IEC TC80/MT7

# Introduction / Background

- ✦ This proposal begun as a review comment for publishing procedures of the draft IHO S-100 Ed 2.0.0. TSMAD had a comment resolution meeting on 14<sup>th</sup> Sep 2014 during which it was noted that the related publishing rule IHO resolution 2/2007 is actually a part of IHO M-3 resolutions.
- ✦ The review comment from IEC proposed a mandatory peer review process for clarifications which had a very weak decision making and publishing procedure drafted in IHO S-100 Ed. 2.0.0.
- ✦ The TSMAD meeting agreed that the issue of this proposal is more generic and that the related rule is in IHO resolution 2/2007. The meeting recommended that the IEC will propose this improvement of generic publishing procedure for the HSSC.



# Analysis / Discussion

- ✦ A peer review process is an important element for making international rules. It both improves the quality of the to be published standard and increase transparency of the process.
- ✦ Quality improvement is achieved by thorough review by the affected stakeholders, which also have motivation to perform such review.
- ✦ Transparency means in this case known and documented process of decision making for the publishing. Transparency is important for wide acceptance of any international standard.



## Analysis / Discussion – part 2

- ✦ The IHO resolution 2/2007 just requires a consultative process that includes stakeholders for new editions and revisions.
- ✦ The IHO resolution 2/2007 does not provide any details of this consultative process.
- ✦ The IHO resolution 2/2007 does not require any consultative process for clarifications. Further the IHO resolution 2/2007 does not specify any detail of the decision making for publishing of a clarification.
- ✦ This document proposes that the consultative process is based on peer review and that the peer review is applicable for all publishing including new editions, revisions and clarifications.
- ✦ This document also proposes how decision is made for publishing of a clarification.



# Conclusion, justification and impacts

- ✦ Documented and clear procedures improve IHO work within publishing of the international standards.
- ✦ IHO resolution 2/2007 required consultative process including stakeholders for new editions and revisions. This proposal documents the best practice which has been used by some workgroups within IHO. Therefore the impact for the best workgroups is no change for current practice. For the rest and newcomers this proposal gives good instructions how to proceed.
- ✦ For the clarifications the situation is different as the IHO resolution 2/2007 have neither required any consultative process nor required any formal method of decision making. This proposal causes that the clarifications will follow the best current practices.



# Action requested of HSSC

- ✦ The HSSC is invited to consider the proposed amendment to the IHO resolution 2/2007

