

**11<sup>TH</sup> MEETING OF THE CSPCWG – 1<sup>ST</sup> MEETING OF THE NCWG  
Rostock, Germany, 27-30 April 2015**

**Paper for Consideration by CSPCWG-NCWG**

**The New S-4 Maintenance Regime and its Consequences on the Activities of the Nautical Cartography Working Group (NCWG)**

<b>Submitted by:</b>	IHB
<b>Executive Summary:</b>	This paper recalls the main principles of the S-4 maintenance regime since the entry into force of the Edition 4.5.0 of S-4. In order to make the work of the NCWG members as efficient as possible, it makes explicit the practical consequences of this new regime on the activities of the NCWG planned in its Programme of Work, under the supervision and monitoring of the Hydrographic Services and Standards Committee.
<b>Related Documents:</b>	M-3, IHO Resolutions 11/2002 and 2/2007, as amended. CSPCWG Letter No 8/2014 dated 2 October. IHO CL 69/2014 dated 20 October. S-4, Ed. 4.5.0, October 2014, § B-160.
<b>Related Projects:</b>	ENC (S-101, S-57).

### Introduction / Background

1. Since October 2014, date of the entry into force of its Edition 4.5.0 (IHO CL 69/2014 refers), the IHO technical standard S-4 is subject to the terms of Resolution 2/2007 as amended (Appendix 1 refers), for subsequent *Editions*, *Revisions* and *Clarifications*. This provision on the updating system of the S-4 standard is included in its Section B-160.
2. The consequences of this new regime were carefully considered by the CSPCWG as reported in the CSPCWG Letter No 8/2014. Some concerns were raised, the main of which being the duration of the full consultative process (including impact assessment by as many stakeholders as possible, when a revision is deemed necessary) through the HSSC, followed by the formal approval of IHO Member States.
3. It is recalled that this maintenance regime has been aligned with the procedure applied to the other IHO standards and approved by IHO Member States based on the assumption that the period for major changes to S-4 leading to a new Edition is over. This was proposed in 2010 (IHO CL 87/2010 refers) and endorsed at HSSC-3.
4. Following the approval and comments received from the CSPCWG Members on a couple of CSPCWG Letters issued by the CSPCWG Chair, on the 13<sup>th</sup> of November 2014, business as usual, the CSPCWG Secretary provided the IHB with a draft IHO CL requesting the approval of the IHO Member States for changing Section B-353.8 in S-4 in order to address the representation of glaciers. The IHB did not accept to issue this CL in application of the new S-4 maintenance regime.
5. On the 25<sup>th</sup> of November 2014, France (SHOM) informed the IHB that the responsibility for the maintenance of the French version of S-4 had now to be assumed by the IHB as no resource was available within SHOM for this task anymore. All files were transferred to the IHB accordingly.

### Analysis / Discussion

6. Two issues need to be considered:

- a. The first one is about the time spent between a change request to S-4 by an IHO MS, duly approved<sup>1</sup> for being studied and therefore included in the CSPCWG/NCWG Programme of Work by the HSSC, then analysed and approved by CSPCWG Members and finally submitted through for formal approbation to the IHO MS after endorsement of the change by HSSC. A year is the minimum for completing the full cycle.
- b. once this cycle is completed and the change approved, the second issue is about the implementation of this change into the standard as it leads to the question of the custodianship of S-4. Today, the English version is maintained by the UKHO, the Spanish version by the Instituto Hidrográfico de la Marina (IHM) of Spain, and the French version, let's say by the IHB following the transfer of data which occurred in November 2014 even if, in practice, no action has been undertaken since.

7. As far as the approbation cycle is concerned (request for a change → acceptance by HSSC-X of the proposed change task to be included in the annual programme of work → analysis and impact assessment by CSPCWG/NCWG Members<sup>2</sup> → submission to HSSC-X+1 → IHO CL), this process seems very acceptable, compared to other standards, unless there is an emergency/safety case that need to be considered immediately. It is also assumed that all changes to S-4 that are submitted to the approval of the IHO Member States by CL are those that are deemed “necessary” when those that are only “nice-to-do”, should be postponed. In that case, the IHO CL which is issued after one HSSC-X+1 meeting must encompass all the “necessary” changes. It is also agreed that *clarifications* (in accordance with Resolution 2/2007 as amended) remain under the sole NCWG's responsibility.

8. Two IHB staffs received a basic training on InDesign early 2014. A couple of tests made in January on the S-4 French version show that the maintenance by the IHB is manageable. In terms of workload, the conclusion after these tests is that changes can be incorporated into a new Edition for the three version (en, fr, sp) as long as the work can be distributed throughout the year. Considering that the period of major changes is over, it should be manageable as well.

## Conclusions

9. If the new S-4 maintenance regime looks less reactive and effective than before, it remains efficient and appropriate for minor changes. There is no need, from an IHB point of view, to come back to a regime of exceptions.

## Recommendations

10. In the future, it is recommended to stick with the life cycle regime of IHO standards defined in Resolution 2/2007 as amended, as long as the change proposals to S-4 remain “minor” and are not safety-at-sea critical.

11. Any change proposal in S-4, after approval of NCWG Members, should be provided to the S-101 Project Team and the ENCWG for their consideration and receive their endorsement before submission to HSSC.

12. The commitment of the UKHO and the IHM for the custodianship of the English and Spanish versions of S-4 is highly appreciated. If for some reasons, the UKHO and/or the IHM decide to transfer it to the IHB, it is kindly requested to provide the IHB with all the data files and ad hoc libraries of symbols and abbreviations in force. A 3-month notice would be appreciated for the effective transfer of responsibility.

---

<sup>1</sup> By HSSC.

<sup>2</sup> In the case of S-4, in principles subject in the future to minor changes only, it seems that the main stakeholders are the HOs themselves (including S-101 Project Team and ENCWG for portrayal issues) and therefore, there is no other need to launch an impact assessment study than the normal approval process in place within the CSPCWG/NCWG. It is assumed that this analysis by CSPCWG/NCWG Members, as subject matter experts, takes into account sailors' view, when and if the proposed changes, in fact, don't come directly from mariners themselves. From the IHB point of view, the comprehensive review by “stakeholders” in the approval cycle can therefore be considered as completed after the approval by CSPCWG/NCWG Members.

### **Justification and Impacts**

13. Many HOs are facing important resources issues and budget constraints. It is therefore important to prioritize the tasks of the HSSC Programme of Work in order to make sure that top priority issues are addressed in due course. The NCWG is one of the key stakeholders in this HSSC Programme of Work.

### **Action required of CSPCWG / NCWG**

14. The CSPCWG / NCWG is invited to:
- a. **Consider** this report,
  - b. **Consider** and adopt the proposals in sections 10, 11 and 12,
  - c. **Take any other actions** considered necessary.