



Hydrographic Services and Standards Committee

Report of the S-101 Impact Survey to HSSC 5

November 2013



Introduction

- ✦ Survey is part of S-101 Impact Study
- ✦ Impact Study is an application of IHO resolution 2/2007
- ✦ Aims of the survey
 - Obtain feedback from the different parts of the S-101 stakeholder community
 - Identify critical issues
 - Make decisions for a as best as possible transition to S-101



Introduction

- ✦ A high level overview of S-101 and its potential impact on various stakeholder communities has been posted on the IHO website.
- ✦ An IHB letter S3/8151/TSMAD dated 13 July 2012, has been sent by e-mail to IHO list of stakeholders.
- ✦ The survey was available online from 13 July to 29 November 2012
- ✦ Analysis is based on scrubbed 161 responses
- ✦ One year later, many statements issued from the survey are still true



Results

- ✦ As S-101 doesn't address most of the actual frustrations of mariners, there is no enthusiasm from them
- ✦ As a consequence, ship owners are not encouraged to upgrade (at any price)
- ✦ Nobody knows precisely the economic cost of transition from S-57 to S-101
- ✦ Timeframe for transition varies considerably, from 1 month to 15 years, depending on HO' ENCs coverage and S-57 experience



Results

- ✦ Most of stakeholders have foreseen impact on legacy systems and the overhead due to a dual production.
- ✦ Every people would be keen of an overall roadmap, including their concerns and procedural delays from an IMO and IEC perspective.
- ✦ S-57 to S-101 transition should be as transparent as possible.



Analysis/Discussion

- ✦ Forwarding the survey, FR provides the following suggestions (1/2):
 - ✦ Cross match S-101 functionalities with IMO gap analysis and mariners' frustrations
 - ✦ Balance efforts between S-101 and highly expected e-nav S-100 based products
 - ✦ Consider IMO and IEC procedural delays in S-101 schedule
 - ✦ Consider HOs current and future capabilities



Analysis/Discussion

- ✦ Forwarding the survey, FR provides the following suggestions (2/2):
 - ✦ Simplify S-101 concepts to limit risks and stakeholders overhead
 - ✦ Implement S-57 to S-101 converters in legacy systems and preserve backward compatibility
 - ✦ Invest time for testbed and save money later



Conclusions

- ✦ S-101 is much more challenging than S-57
 - It doesn't introduce a big technological breakthrough from the end-users' perception
- ✦ Cost benefits are not crystal clear
 - A complete economic analysis should be considered
 - This goes quite beyond the capability and scope of TSMAD



Recommendations

- ✦ As a follow on, S-101 impact study should be enlarged and outsourced, on specifications that could be drafted by the TSMAD and approved by the MS
- ✦ As ENC is destined to become the core product of MSP, transition from S-57 to S-101 should be submitted for the consideration of the IMO, which could then refine S-101 timeline accordingly to the e-navigation strategy
- ✦ Final impact study, including recommendations to HOs, should be reported at next EIHC



Action requested of HSSC

- ✦ a. Endorse this report
- ✦ b. Agree these recommendations
- ✦ c. Take any other action as appropriate