

**1<sup>ST</sup> MEETING OF THE S-100 WORKING GROUP  
Ottawa, Canada, 2 - 6 February 2015**

**Paper for Consideration by S-100WG  
Review of the draft S-100 Master Plan**

<b>Submitted by:</b>	IHB
<b>Executive Summary:</b>	This paper compiles inputs for consideration by the S-100WG when reviewing the draft S-100 Master Plan in accordance with its work item D.1.
<b>Related Documents:</b>	HSSC5-05.1C - <i>Master Plan for the development and implementation of S-100</i> IHO CL 8/2014 dated 20 January - <i>Outcome of the 5<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the Hydrographic Services and Standards Committee (HSSC)</i> NCSR 1/28 dated 16 July 2014 - <i>Annex 7 - Draft e-navigation Strategy Implementation Plan</i> HSSC6-07.1A - <i>IMO activities affecting HSSC (including e-navigation)</i> IHO CL 78/2014 dated 1 <sup>st</sup> December - <i>Report of the 94<sup>th</sup> session of the IMO Maritime Safety Committee</i>
<b>Related Projects:</b>	Development and maintenance of S-100 and related standards and product specifications.

**Background**

1. At its 4<sup>th</sup> meeting, HSSC tasked the Chairs of TSMAD and DIPWG “to produce, by the end of January 2013, a “master plan” document for the development of S-100 and S-101, in accordance with the life cycle diagram included in resolution 2/2007, incorporating sequencing with DQWG and DPSWG, and scheming the implications for stakeholders”.
2. A draft S-100 Master Plan was jointly developed by the Chairs of HSSC, TSMAD and DIPWG and the IHB and submitted to the 5<sup>th</sup> HSSC meeting (HSSC5-05.1C refers). The Committee endorsed the structure of the S-100 Master Plan and invited further comments and inputs from IHO Member States and other IHO Stakeholders. The draft was posted on the IHO web site (Home > Committees & WG > HSSC > Miscellaneous / Divers: Master Plan for the Development and Implementation of S-100 / S-101 Value Added Roadmap). The annual review of the Master Plan was included as a work item in the TSMAD work plan for 2014-2015. Following the restructuring of HSSC working groups, this work item is now item D.1 of the S-100WG work plan for 2015-2016.

**Input from IHO Member States and other IHO Stakeholders**

3. In accordance with the actions agreed at HSSC-5, IHO Circular Letter (CL) 8/2014 dated 20 January invited IHO Member States to consider the draft S-100 Master Plan and to provide comments to the IHB. A similar request was issued to other IHO Stakeholders by IHB letter dated 13 March 2014.
4. The inputs from IHO Member States are provided in Annex A for the consideration of the S-100WG. No input has been received to date from any other IHO stakeholder.

## **Impact of the IMO e-navigation Strategy Implementation Plan**

5. As reported in IHO CL 78/2014 dated 1<sup>st</sup> December 2014, the IMO Maritime Safety Committee approved at its 94<sup>th</sup> session the e-navigation Strategy Implementation Plan (SIP) endorsed by the 1<sup>st</sup> session of the IMO Sub-Committee on Navigation, Communications and Search and Rescue (NCSR 1).

6. The discussions on e-Navigation at MSC 94 highlighted the existing heavy workload of the NCSR and the requirement to prioritise the tasks identified in the SIP to help the IMO focus its efforts. A way forward was agreed with the following steps:

- Review the tasks listed in the SIP and reduce the number of outputs taking into consideration those tasks that have been completed or are near completion;
- Prepare each reviewed output in SMART terms (specific, measurable, achievable, realistic, time-bound) in accordance with the information required in Annex 3 of IMO Resolution A.1062(28);
- Prepare a comprehensive prioritized plan of work which includes the time required for the completion of each output; and
- Submit these results to MSC 95 (3-12 June 2015) for consideration and inclusion as outputs in the next biennial agenda (2016-2017) of the Committee.

7. The components of the draft IMO e-navigation SIP relevant to the IHO were reviewed in document HSSC6-07.1A. Now that the draft SIP is approved, these components need to be reflected in the S-100 Master Plan, subject to the prioritized plan of work to be considered by MSC 95.

### **Action required of the S-100WG**

8. The S-100WG is invited to:
- a. **Note** this report,
  - b. **Consider** its content when reviewing the S-100 Master Plan;
  - c. **Take any other actions** considered necessary.

**Annex A****Comments from IHO Member States on the draft S-100 Master Plan  
(Responses to IHO CL 8/2014 dated 20 January)****Canada**

Canada accepts the Master Plan and has no further comment, as Canada provided its input when the plan was being developed.

**Chile**

With regard to the draft Master Plan for the development and implementation of S-100, we consider a very useful document that helps to understand where we are going in this matter. A couple of minor comments are offered with the intention to avoid later misunderstandings:

- a) Point 2 Principles of S-100, page 4, says: All proposed changes shall be technically and commercially assessed before approval.

Comment: Who is responsible for conducting this assessment, the organization proposing a change or the IHO and which body of the IHO? We are particularly concern on the commercial component.

- b) Point 3 Tools and Maintenance of S-100 GI Registry, page 6, 3<sup>rd</sup> line says: Any recognized organization can propose a new domain.

Comment: We would recommend being more specific as “any recognized organization” seems to be too wide.

**Finland**

Due to limited human resources we have not been able to study in depth the *S-100 Master Plan* and thus have no comments to it.

**France**

France suggests that the IHO e-navigation strategy should be described in a master plan totally separate from the S-100 master plan. The IHO could develop better its contribution to the IMO programme in such a high level strategic document, thus displaying its determination to develop, implement and maintain the standards within its purview which are useful to e-navigation

**1/ IHO e-navigation Master Plan**

This document would refer to the IMO e-navigation strategy implementation plan by establishing a connection between the requirements of the maritime service portfolios and related IHO products and services, whether existing or future.

It would be supported by the new IHO governance associated with the restructuring of HSSC working groups.

In addition to IHO Resolution No 2/2007 and in accordance with the IMO methodological approach, this document would describe the different steps in a decision-making process including: the study of users' requirements, the economic analysis and the engineering design of different solutions, the analysis of any possible deviations between the solutions and the requirements, the implementation plan of the agreed solutions and feedback management.

It would propose implementation milestones set in accordance with the planned IMO e-navigation schedule and provide appropriate regulation mechanisms.

**2/ S-100 Master Plan**

The structure of this document should be reconsidered in line with a global roadmap which would set the implementation priorities of the different IHO products and services, in accordance with the interests of Member States and the level of their contribution.

It could also become a reference documents for the designers of new products and services. It would explain to IHO stakeholders what is expected and required to implement a new product or service based on the S-100 standard through describing the process which transforms requirements into standard specifications.

Through examples and typical cases related to domains of use, it could clarify the management of registers and point out the prerequisites.

Finally, considering that the current S-101 roadmap should refer to it, this document should not repeat elements which are already included in the S-101 roadmap.

### **United Kingdom**

Through our participation in TSMAD, DPSWG and DIPWG we have been actively involved in the drafting of the S-100 Master Plan. We therefore have no further comment at this stage but look forward to reviewing contributions from other MS.

### **United States**

The S-100 master plan seems to be more of an information paper. Are we trying to develop a “Strategic Plan” for S-100? There is a timeline in the plan, but it seems there is a need for clear goals, objectives and the actionable strategies associated with it.