

Extract from HSSC 5 Report

4.2 Review of the Structure of HSSC Working Groups

Doc: HSSC5-04.2A [Review of the Structure of HSSC Working Groups \(IHB\)](#)

HSSC5-04.2B rev1 [Creation of an S-100 Working Group \(USA\)](#)

HSSC5-04.2C rev1 [Optimizing HSSC Working Groups \(USA\)](#)

HSSC5-04.2D [Review of the structure of HSSC Working Groups - Comments by FR \(France\)](#)

HSSC5-04.2E [Comments by Finland on re-structuring HSSC Working Groups \(Finland\)](#)

HSSC5-04.2F [CSPCWG Comments on Proposals for the Structure and Optimizing of HSSC Working Groups \(CSPCWG\)](#)

The Chair noted that this is one of the most important items on the agenda. He stressed that the objective was to ensure that the Committee is prepared for the challenges of the future. He noted that this item had been the focus of discussion at an earlier HSSC meeting and acknowledged that six papers have been submitted to the Committee. He indicated that a consolidated draft had been prepared by the Chair Group, taking into account the initial papers from the IHB and from the USA and the comments submitted by Finland, France and the Chair of CSPCWG. The Chair invited members to consider the proposals in the consolidated draft and suggested to have a general discussion aiming at agreeing on the principles. If necessary a breakout group could be formed and come back to the plenary with options for further discussion on Thursday. USA expressed its concern that MS which are not present will not get the opportunity to consider the Chair Group proposal. The Chair noted that the papers had been available on the IHO web site for a considerable time before the meeting, providing ample opportunity to all to submit comments.

The Chair outlined the papers that had been submitted and presented the Chair Groups views (see [Chair Group presentation](#)).

In response to Sweden's question about the availability of the presentation, the IHB confirmed that it had been posted on the IHO website.

China expressed support for the Chair Group proposal noting that the IHO should avoid establishing too many working groups as this will impact on the resources of MS to attend meetings.

Singapore referred to the comments that had been submitted by France and saw a need to consider what additional skills and resources will be required to implement the new structure.

Norway saw a need to take into consideration not only the move from paper to digital products and services, as reflected in the presentation, but also the growing use of hydrographic data for nonnavigational purposes.

France reiterated its view that the inventory of MS commitments was essential and should be addressed in the proposal, before the new structure can be developed.

Finland expressed its support in principle of the consolidated proposal subject to studying in more details. Finland shared the concerns of others about the issue of resources, noting that the situation was difficult at the national level.

Canada supported the formation of the S-100 WG and the joining of the TWLWG and SCWG but questioned why S-58 - *Recommended ENC Validation Checks* had been included with the ENC standards and not with the S-100 WG.

USA commended the goals described in the presentation and welcomed the establishment of the S100 WG. USA proposed to constitute an ad hoc group to review the issues and report back to

HSSC and suggested that the ad hoc group should be composed of Member States (MS) representatives.

Poland recommended that the new terms of reference (TOR) should cover the interaction with other organizations, notably the organizations involved in the development of e-navigation. The TOR should specify the link with other international organizations and industry partners.

Australia considered that the proposal did address the concerns expressed by USA and others. Its view was that the Chair Group was the best informed structure for further developments. USA clarified that their intention was not to exclude the chairs of the WG from the ad hoc group but to broaden the input to MS representatives.

The Chair confirmed that the Chair Group had addressed the concern to reduce the work load while taking into account the development of new domains such as S-100. He noted that the issue of resources mentioned by France could only be considered once the structure and the work plan of the working groups were agreed in principles.

Netherland agreed that the focus of discussion should be first to agree on a good structure and then look at the resources.

Following further discussion within the Chair Group and consideration by the members off session, the discussion was re-opened after the review of the reports of the WGs. The Chair introduced an animated presentation of the proposed new structure to explain in more details how the number of working groups would be reduced and why the new structure would allow for more efficient work and better allocation of resources. He outlined the new construct of time-limited projects. He presented the timeline for developing the new structure which would be implemented after HSSC-6. He proposed to set up a correspondence group comprising the chairs of the WGs and open to MS. A meeting should be convened before HSSC-6 to finalize the proposal, including TOR and Rules of Procedure (ROP), which would be presented to HSSC-6 for approval.

Sweden stressed that the process needs to be as open and as transparent as possible. The Chair confirmed that the restructuring exercise would be led by the HSSC Chair and the IHB, but MS will be welcome to follow the work and provide comments and inputs.

IALA offered to share its experience of using an on-line platform for this type of work, referring to the difficulty of managing large groups such as the IALA e-NAV Committee.

USA suggested that provisions should be made to facilitate on-line remote access at meetings. The IHO President stated that the IHB is attempting to improve the facilities at the IHB and would appreciate feedback from other organizations having implemented such facilities.

Outcome:

- The Committee approved in principle the new structure of WGs and project teams proposed by the Chair Group.
- The Committee approved the establishment of a correspondence group (CG) composed of the Chairs of HSSC, TSMAD, DIPWG, CSPCWG, SNPWG, TWLWG, SCWG and an IHB representative to develop draft terms of reference and rules of procedure, and consider the composition of the new bodies as well as the appropriate timely transition arrangements.
- The Committee agreed that the CG be open to representatives of Member States.
- The Committee requested Member States and stakeholders to define their contribution in terms of resources to the new bodies.

- **Action HSSC5/08:** HSSC Chair and Secretary to establish a correspondence group composed of the Chairs of HSSC, TSMAD, DIPWG, CSPCWG, SNPWG, TWLWG, SCWG and an IHB representative, to develop draft terms of reference and rules of procedure for the proposed new HSSC bodies, and consider their composition as well as the appropriate timely transition arrangements.
- **Action HSSC5/09:** HSSC Chair to invite MS to participate in the HSSC Correspondence Group on HSSC WG restructuring.
- **Action HSSC5/10:** IHB to request Member States and stakeholders to define their contribution in terms of resources to the proposed new HSSC bodies.
- **Action HSSC5/11:** USA to propose possible solutions for remote meeting facilities at the IHB and at other meeting venues.

5.10 Surface Current Working Group (SCWG)

Doc: HSSC5-05.10A rev1 Report and Recommendations of the SCWG (SCWG Chair)

The SCWG Chair presented the report and the recommendation of the working group via teleconference (see SCWG presentation).

Netherlands questioned the proposed inclusion of a reference to ENCs and ECDIS in the objectives of the working group as this would narrow the scope of the work.

Outcome:

- The Committee noted the report of the SCWG and endorsed the continuation of its work.
- The Committee approved the proposed amendments to the terms of reference and rules of procedure contained at Annex B of the report (excepting changes to 1. Objectives) and endorsed the draft work plan at Annex A of the report.
- **Action HSSC5/54:** IHB to amend the terms of reference of SCWG as agreed by the Committee.