

Paper for Consideration by HSSC6**UK Response to HSSC6-04.2A Report on the Correspondance Group on HSSC Working Groups' Restructure (CGHR)**

Submitted by:	The United Kingdom
Executive Summary:	Further consideration of the restructure proposals is requested.
Related Documents:	HSSC6-04.2A Report on the Correspondence Group on HSSC Working Groups' Restructure (CGHR).
Related Projects:	

Introduction / Background

The following is provided in response to paper HSSC6-04.2A - Report on the Correspondence Group on HSSC Working Groups' Restructure (CGHR).

Analysis/Discussion

The United Kingdom supports the continued existence of CSPCWG.

The United Kingdom cannot support a merger between CSPCWG with SNPWG until the following items have been fully addressed:

- Benefits of the merger have been defined and measures identified to monitor delivery of the benefits;
- Clarification on what the 'integrated approach for the provision of chart and other geo-referenced nautical information, especially in the context of e-navigation implementation' (HSSC6-04.2A Annex C) means in practice, and what work this will require NIPWG to deliver.
- More formal definition of the relationship between NIPWG as the voice of the user, and S-100 WG in developing product specification to support e-navigation services.
- A full transition plan is drawn up to ensure that all present and future responsibilities are appropriately addressed.

To achieve the ideal of NIPWG, The United Kingdom suggests the formation of an e-navigation MSP WG, independent of CSPCWG or SNPWG. This would monitor e-navigation developments and advise other WGs on how to respond. As S-10x standards and MSPs become more mature, the relative position and need for CSPCWG and SNPWG could be reviewed again.

S-101 should be the responsibility of ENCWG now.

S-100 WG should be responsible for the maintenance of S-64 and the development of symbol specifications when required for use in ECDIS related products. It would be counter productive if these are not the responsibility of the subject matter experts (SMEs) which will mainly form the membership of the S-100WG. No efficiency will be gained by the restructure if such SMEs have to attend other meetings just to address a small portion of the agenda.

As DQWG has a limited life, it should remain as is until it ceases to exist.

Conclusions

The United Kingdom does not support all of the restructure proposals in paper HSSC6-04.2A.

Recommendations

Further consideration of the restructure proposals is requested.

Justification and Impacts

The United Kingdom does not consider that the current proposal will deliver the expected benefits.

Action Required of HSSC6

HSSC6 is requested to consider the above remarks when considering the proposed restructure of WGs.