

6th IHO HSSC Meeting
Viña del Mar, Chile, 11-14 November 2014

Proposal to include a documented peer review process for publishing procedures

Submitted by: Convenor of IEC TC80/MT7 ECDIS

Executive Summary: 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 14th Sep 2014 during which it was noted that the related publishing rule is actually a part of IHO M-3 resolutions. It is proposed that the publishing process should include a mandatory documented peer review process. In practice this does not change a lot in current practice for new editions or revisions, but this improves a lot the publishing process of clarifications.

Related Documents: 1. IHO M-3 2nd edition, updated 2014
 2. Draft IHO S-100 ed 2.0.0 published for review 11th Jul 2014

Related Projects: None

Introduction / Background

1. 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 14th 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.

2. 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.

3. 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

4. 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.

5. Quality improvement is achieved by thorough review by the affected stakeholders, which also have motivation to perform such review.

6. 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.

7. The IHO resolution 2/2007 just requires a consultative process that includes stakeholders for new editions and revisions.

8. The IHO resolution 2/2007 does not provide any details of this consultative process.

9 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.

10. 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.

11. This document also proposes how decision is made for publishing of a clarification.

Conclusions

12. Documented and clear procedures improve IHO work within publishing of the international standards.

Justification and Impacts

13. 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.

14. 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 from HSSC

14. The HSSC is invited to

- a) To consider the proposed amendment to the IHO resolution 2/2007

5. Procedures - Specific

5.1 New Editions, Revisions and Clarifications

New Edition

New Editions of standards introduce significant changes. *New Editions* enable new concepts, such as the ability to support new functions or applications, or the introduction of new constructs or data types, to be introduced. *New Editions* are likely to have a significant impact on either existing users or future users of the revised standard. It follows that a full consultative process that provides an opportunity for input from as many stakeholders as possible is required. Proposed changes to a standard should be evaluated and tested wherever practicable. The approval of Member States is required before any *New Edition* of a standard can enter into force. All cumulative *clarifications* and *revisions* must be included with the release of an approved *New Edition* of a standard.

The consultative process is based on a documented peer review process before publication. The relevant body shall perform a documented peer review preferably among stakeholders but at least among members of the relevant body. The relevant body shall address issues from the peer review. After completion of the peer review process the relevant body shall make a review result document to be submitted together with draft new edition for approval by the parent of the relevant body. After approval of the parent of the relevant body the new edition shall be made available in the IHO website.

Revision

Revisions are defined as substantive semantic changes to a standard. Typically, *revisions* change existing specifications to correct factual errors; introduce necessary changes that have become evident as a result of practical experience or changing circumstances; or add new specifications within an existing section. *Revisions* could have an impact on either existing users or future users of a revised standard. It follows that a full consultative process that provides an opportunity for input from as many stakeholders as possible is required. Proposed changes to a standard should be evaluated and tested wherever practicable. The approval of Member States is required before any *revisions* to a standard can enter into force. All cumulative *clarifications* must be included with the release of approved corrections revisions.

A *revision* shall not be classified as a *clarification* in order to bypass the appropriate consultation processes.

The consultative process is based on a documented peer review process before publication. The relevant body shall perform a documented peer review preferably among stakeholders but at least among members of the relevant body. The relevant body shall address issues from the peer review. After completion of the peer review process the relevant body shall make a review result document to be submitted together with draft revision for approval by the parent of the relevant body. After approval of the parent of the relevant body the revision shall be made available in the IHO website.

Clarification

Clarifications are non-substantive changes to a standard. Typically, clarifications: remove ambiguity; correct grammatical and spelling errors; amend or update cross references; insert improved graphics in spelling, punctuation and grammar. A clarification must not cause any substantive semantic change to a standard. Clarifications are the responsibility of the relevant subordinate body and may be delegated to the responsible editor.

The relevant body shall perform a documented peer review preferably among stakeholders but at least among members of the relevant body. The relevant body shall address issues from the peer review. After completion of the peer review process the relevant body shall make a documented decision for the publishing of the *clarification*. The *clarification* shall be made available in the IHO website.