

Paper for Consideration by HSSC

Proposed Management Arrangements for the GII (HSSC1-06.1G)

Submitted by:	Inland ENC Harmonization Group (IEHG)
Executive Summary:	This paper invites the HSSC to consider the concerns of the Inland ENC Harmonization Group (IEHG) regarding the new management procedures for the GII which have been proposed by TSMAD.
Related Documents:	HSSC1-06.1G
Related Projects:	None

Introduction / Background

1. TSMAD proposed new management arrangements for the geospatial information infrastructure (GII) in HSSC1-06.1G. The Inland ENC Harmonization Group (IEHG) discussed this proposal at its 7th meeting on 9-11 September 2009. While IEHG is aware of the benefits of having only two “general” registers (Hydro and Supplementary), the descriptions and explanations contained in the paper are not clear enough and require further clarification.

Analysis/Discussion

2. At present, on the “interim” IHO Registry, there is a register for Inland ENCs, however, the paper makes no mention of the Inland ENC register that was agreed to at CHRIS 19. We understand that there would be a domain for Inland ENCs in the supplementary register in accordance with the new proposal.

3. For the proposed **Register** structure, it is not clear how the Supplementary Register will actually operate, or who will perform the management duties.

4. IEHG assumes the following procedure for an amendment in a register:

- the submitting organization (e.g. IEHG) discusses a proposal for a new feature/attribute/enumeration and agrees on a proposal
- the submitting organization enters the proposal in its domain in the GII and the proposal is marked as not valid
- the register manager checks the proposal for formal completeness and provides feedback to the submitting organization if necessary
- the register manager informs the members of the control body about the new proposal
- the members of the control body (who are representatives of working groups like TSMAD or other submitting organizations like IEHG) distribute the proposal for comments within their respective organization
- the members of the control body and their organizations should check, whether the proposal is already covered by an existing feature/attribute/enumeration in

- their domain, they might propose to move the proposed object to another domain (e.g. HYDRO instead of IENC) or might propose improvements to the proposal; it should not be possible to reject a proposal completely
- each member of the control body compiles the comments of his/her organization and provides the comment of the organization to the register manager
 - the register manager(s) compile the comments of the control body
 - if the proposal is already covered by an existing feature/attribute/enumeration in an other domain, the register manager informs the submitting organization, which would have to withdraw the proposal
 - if the control body proposes to move the feature/attribute/enumeration to an other domain, the register manager copies the proposal to the other domain
 - if there are recommendations for improvements of the original proposal, the register manager forwards these recommendations to the submitting organization which can decide to include the recommended improvements in the proposal or to reject them because of incompatibility with the area of the submitting organization
 - if the proposal is accepted, the register manager(s) change the status of the feature/attribute/enumeration to valid.

5. The detailed procedures and the Terms of Reference for the decision process within the control body (including time limits) have to be fixed before a final decision on the proposed management arrangement.

For instance:

- What will be the tasks of the register manager(s)? (Will he/they have to enter proposals in the registry or will the submitting organizations be able to do this?, Will he/they have only the administrative task of organizing the adoption process or will he/they be able to make decisions on the content?)
- The organization of the control body has to be specified (IEHG proposes to work by correspondence via internet. Meetings should only take place, when absolutely necessary and not more than one per year). If there will be meetings: would every member be obliged to participate in all the meetings or only in those where proposals of his/her domain are discussed?
- Who will be in charge (organize internet discussions, organize meetings, document the decision processes, etc.)?
- How will the coordination between IHO and non-IHO members be achieved?
- Will decisions of the control body be made by simple majority? Will there be a right of a veto? Will the members have to express their consent or will proposals also be adopted if there is no dissent?
- The rights of the control body have to be defined
- Depending on the decision process, decisions on the HYDRO register/domain might only be possible with the support of non-IHO organizations. Would that be acceptable for IHO?

- The relation between the register control body and the submitting organizations should be clarified.
- What are the criteria for a submitting organization?
- What will be the application process to become a submitting organization?
- What can an organization do if the application is rejected by the register control body?
- IEHG proposes that recognized NGIOs should be entitled to become submitting organizations.

6. If the roles and responsibilities of the submitting organizations would be reduced and the register manager and/or the control body would not only have administrative functions but also the authority to change the content of the registers directly and to overrule decisions of the submitting organizations, IEHG would be very concerned about the feasibility of the management arrangement.

For instance:

Register Manager

7. According to the proposal there will be only one register manager for both registers or one register manager for each of the two registers (including all the domains in this register) instead of one manager for each domain ("register" according to the old model). Therefore one register manager would have to cover at least AML, IENC, ICE and all future domains in the supplementary register. The IEHG is concerned that it will be very difficult to find a person with detailed knowledge of all these areas.

- How would these person(s) be chosen (by IHO or by the Register domain participants?)
- What would happen, if none of the submitting organizations for the supplementary register is able to provide a manager, who is able to cover all the domains?
- Would the register manager(s) be obliged to do the amendments in all the domains or would it be intended to have additional persons for the individual domains?-

8. In case of more than administrative functions IEHG would prefer to have one manager for each domain, unless an organization that is responsible for a particular domain is unable to provide one. In this situation, a "general" manager of the Supplementary Register might cover all the other domains (i.e. those domains that are unable to provide its individual register manager).

Register Control Body

9. There will be only one register control body for both registers (including all the domains in these registers) instead of one control body for each domain ("register"

according to the old model). Therefore one register control body would have to cover all domains (HYDRO, AML, IENC, ICE, MIO, NPub, etc.).

- Due to lack of technical expertise, a representative of IEHG would likely not be able to contribute to a decision process on the content or the necessity of amendments of AML or ICE or other domains. The same might hold true to representatives of other domains.
- Each of the members of the control body would have to spend more than 80 % of his/her time for problems of other domains.

10. IEHG would prefer a clear regulation which ensures that the role of the proposed register control body would be to control the compatibility of proposed amendments for one domain with the other domains and to provide proposals for improvements to the submitting organizations. The decision on the content of amendments should stay at the submitting organizations.

Conclusions

11. The 4th EIHC confirmed that IHO should take into account standardized electronic charts for inland waterways, and the need to cooperate with the Inland ENC Harmonization Group (IEHG).

12. Previously, the management arrangements for the GII listed a register for Inland ENCs, with its own register manager and the IEHG as the control body. However, under the new proposal, Inland ENCs are not shown. If we understand the new proposal correctly, Inland ENCs would become a domain in the Supplementary Register under the responsibility of one register manager and one register control body that would be responsible for all domains.

13. The new concept would be beneficial for an effective management of the GII, if the submitting organizations keep their competencies and the procedures for the control body and the register manager(s) are defined.

14. Under the new concept, it appears that the roles and responsibilities of the submitting organizations is reduced, and that the register manager and/or the control body is given the authority to overrule decisions of the submitting organizations. IEHG has strong concerns about the feasibility of the management arrangement. If this is to be the case, the IEHG would prefer the old concept which allows submitting organizations to provide their own manager and their own control body.

15. The organizational structures, the decision processes, and the relationship to existing organizations must be better defined. IEHG requests that HSSC clarifies these questions before a final decision is made on the proposed GII structure and management.