



4, Quai Antoine 1er
B.P.445 - MC 98011 MONACO Cedex
PRINCIPAUTE DE MONACO

IHB File No. S3/8151/CHRIS

6 September 2002

CHRIS Letter No. 8/2002

To: Chairman of the IHO Strategic Planning Working Group (SPWG)
(Mr Frode Klepsvik, Norway)

Subject: Input to SPWG from CHRIS

Dear Sir,

I am writing to you in your capacity as Chairman of the IHO Strategic Planning Working Group. CHRIS at its 14th meeting in Shanghai, 15-17 August 2002, had on its agenda a discussion on the future work programme of CHRIS. The discussion took place in the light of the work of the SPWG, based on the discussions at the XVIth IHC.

The discussion focused on how the work of CHRIS and CHRIS WGs could be improved. All participants in the 14th CHRIS meeting supported the following conclusions from the discussions:

1. The meeting supports the draft vision/objective from SPWG i.e. *“create the global environment in which all States gather and exchange high quality hydrographic and oceanographic data and information and so ensure the widest possible use particularly for marine navigation and marine environment protection.”*
2. The meeting agreed that:
 - a. In order to support the vision/objective above, *all IHO Technical* issues should come under *a single Committee*;
 - b. In order to increase the efficiency of the decision processes in the IHO, the new Committee should be empowered to make appropriate decisions.
3. The meeting discussed the cooperation with industry and believes that:
 - a. co-operation with industry at the technical level should be better; and
 - b. formal recognition of industry organisations, in some way, would be of assistance.
4. Finally the meeting discussed the current communication practices from CHRIS and its working groups to Member States, other IHO bodies and Industry. The meeting agreed:
 - a. that the communication practices need to be improved, primarily by means of the IHO website;

- b. to establish a small task group to provide assistance to the IHB in improving the IHO website as the primary means of communication from CHRIS and CHRIS WG.

Pleased find enclosed for your information three small reports, which are the basis for the conclusions referred to in 1 to 4 above.

Yours sincerely

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Ole Berg', with a stylized, cursive script.

Ole Berg
Chairman of CHRIS

Enclosures: 3 annexes

Copy to CHRIS Members

SUB-WG 1: REVIEW TERMS OF REFERENCE OF CHRIS AND TSMAD

Participants: Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Indonesia, Korea (Rep. of), Norway, Singapore, Sweden and USA (NIMA). (*Underlined = Chair*)

Basic issues

The WG agreed that the review of the TOR should be carried out in relation to the basic objective of the Organization, as stated in the SPWG IHO vision/objective ie. *“create the global environment in which all States gather and exchange high quality hydrographic and oceanographic data and information and so ensure the widest possible use particularly for marine navigation and marine environment protection.”*

The WG noted that the vision should be aligned to the new amendment to Regulation 9 of the SOLAS Convention. The WG agreed that any changes to the CHRIS TOR should support the draft vision of hydrography proposed by the SPWG.

It was noted that the name of the Committee may have to be changed accordingly.

The WG then discussed whether CHRIS was the right Committee to take on the proposed widened scope. The WG noted that presently 3 Committees covered technical issues. Taking into consideration the mechanism and need for coordination, the WG agreed that *all technical issues* should come under *a single Committee*, similar to finance, etc.

The WG agreed that the new Committee should be *empowered* to make appropriate *decisions* in order to increase the efficiency of the decision processes in IHO.

ADDRESSING THE TERMS OF REFERENCE (TOR)

The WG agreed that the **objectives** of the Technical Committee should take on a holistic approach to promote and coordinate the technical issues in relation to the implementation of the vision / objective of the IHO SPWG.

Principles of the TOR:

The WG agreed that the TOR should adopt the following principle:

- a. *To guide and coordinate the work of the technical working groups;*

Following paragraph 1.1, the WG agreed that a new paragraph should be added to address the need of new users other than mariners such as fishery, marine environment protection, etc.

“1.2 new. To monitor the requirements of the marine geospatial information community (coastal zone management, environmental protection, ocean research, marine engineering, marine habitats, renewable resources, etc.) that may require data provided by national hydrographic offices, and identify the matters that may affect the activities and products of these offices.”

The WG agreed to delete the word “digital” in paragraph 1.2 (old) and should also include some reference to ‘industry’. The WG also agreed that no amendment to paragraph 1.3 would be required and that paragraph 1.4 should be deleted as it would be inappropriate for TORs.

The WG agreed that it would not be appropriate to review the rules of procedures and the TOR for TSMAD at this time.

SUB-WG 2: CO-OPERATION WITH INDUSTRY

Participants: Canada, Italy, USA (NOAA), USA (USCG), CIRM, HGMIO, IHB and Primar-Stavanger. (*Underlined = Chair*)

Task: Provide input to SPWG on what is the best way to co-operate with industry.

Who is industry and the what is the current state of co-operation?

Industry means:

- Data gatherers, i.e. ENC makers, surveying companies,
- System manufacturers,
- Chart agents/distributors,
- Users.

Issues:

- Technical working groups co-operate with industry level more or less satisfactory.
- Industry complains that they are not involved in the strategic decision process of IHO.
- Industry cannot initiate work within IHO or committees.
- IHO cannot deal individually with all industry members. IHO needs a counterpart(s) who collects and coordinates the view of the individual industry members.
- IHO does not always follow through or honour its decisions.
- Industry did not get a response or reaction or a course of action based on their recommendations.
- Inclusion of Industry in IHO decision is in disfavour with some IHO members in spite of industry contributions.
- Industry cannot submit proposal to CHRIS.

IHB co-operation with Industry:

- IHB introduced “Industry Day” for co-operation with Industry.
- Industry Day was not a real interface between Industry and IHO: overwhelmingly industry attendees and only a few Member States sent representatives.
- It is not clear how much industry gained from the forums, but IHB did however obtain industry views on certain CHRIS issues.
- Individual industry members cannot attend at CHRIS.
- CIRM has got observer status at CHRIS but does represent only a part of the industry interests.

There are three options to co-operate at present:

- IHO Industry Days as a forum for the industry to present his views/complaints,
- Direct contribution to technical working groups,
- Attendance of industry organisations at CHRIS as observers.

New options (some options may require changes to IHO rules):

- Go to industry and ask them how they want to consult with us.
- Associate membership of industry in IHO without voting rights.
- Establish working groups under IHO committees chaired by industry gaining equal status with other working groups at CHRIS, e.g. a working group on the standards needs of industry.
- Industry to establish an independent group like CIRM with representative status at IHO committees.

- Use IMO model: Member States bring forward the view of the national industry as well as their official associations, i.e. HO's represent all their industries, not just mariners and the government.
- Expand on the use of industry forums, e.g. an industry day for shippers done jointly with ICS, provide specific topics to discuss, and make industry days more workable. Submit a formal paper to CHRIS.

Types of industry participation:

- Industry needs, e.g. specific standards,
- Industry guidance on technology,
- Industry guidance on direction.

SUB-WG 3: COMMUNICATION PRACTICES

Participants: China (Hong Kong), Estonia, New Zealand, Singapore, South Africa, IHB and OEF.
(*Underlined = Chair*)

1. Who should be informed:

- a. Member States
 - 1) participating,
 - 2) not currently participating [Highest Priority].
- b. Other IHO Committees / WGs
 - WEND,
 - SPWG,
 - etc.
- c. Chairmen of IHO Regional Hydrographic Commissions
- d. Stakeholders [2nd Highest Priority]
 - Non-Member States,
 - Maritime Safety Administrations,
 - Type-approval agencies,
 - Equipment and Software Manufacturers,
 - Data Producers,
 - Shipping Companies,
 - University/academia.

2. What to be communicated:

- a. Minutes of CHRIS meetings (official and approved).
- b. Official info – IHO Website.
 - Separate section on “new” items.
- c. Non-official – OEF, other.

3. How it should be done:

- a. Primarily to be done via IHO website.
 - website needs to be reviewed and re-designed,
 - it needs to be more user-friendly,
 - establish a small task group under CHRIS to provide concrete recommendations.
- b. Initially inform all MS by CL that CHRIS-related info exists on IHO website.
 - IHO Industry Days,
 - frequency:
 - push – CL, OEF link to IHO website,
 - pull – IHO website.
- c. MS need to further distribute within own country.