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Reducing attendance at e-NAV Committee meetings

# Summary

This paper proposes several options aimed at reducing the numbers attending e-Navigation Committee meetings with a view toward improving the quality of output papers and improving the efficiency of the Committee.

## Purpose of the document

To propose options for discussion by the Committee.

## Related documents

PAP21/8/1, PAP21/output/1, e-NAV9/output/1

# Background

It is common knowledge that the e-NAV Committee continues to break attendance records both in and outside of IALA HQ. At e-NAV9 hosted by Denmark, 108 members attended, 27 of which were new members (e-NAV9/output/1); 7 members registered but did not attend. That number already exceeds the fire code limit of the new IALA HQ plenary room. This broad participation is likely because of the broad scope of e-Navigation and that its development and implementation is still being defined. The current working group structure of the Committee is as follows:

WG1 – Operations. This WG is comprised of members representing general “users” of e-Navigation. The WG is the lead for input to the IMO Correspondence Group on user requirements.

WG2 – PNT. This WG is essentially the former RNAV Committee and focuses on radionavigation but also other sensors related to e-Navigation, e.g., radar.

WG3 – AIS. Another legacy group, this is the TWG of the former AIS Committee.

WG4 – Communications. This WG has been meeting sequentially with AIS as most of the members are the same. This WG focuses on general radiocommunications and spectrum management issues.

WG5 – Architecture. The Architecture Technical WG is developing an overarching e-Navigation architecture and the underlying data model.

WG6 – Portrayal. This WG was spun off from WG1 to focus solely on display/presentation issues.

At the same time, development of the e-Navigation concept is beginning to influence the work of other IALA Committees; e-Navigation will ultimately affect visual aids to navigation and VTS to a considerable degree.

# Discussion

With an eye toward reducing e-NAV meeting numbers to a manageable level (i.e., hopefully 80 or fewer) and aligning appropriate expertise within IALA Committees, three options may be appropriate.

## AIS WG to AIS Committee

The AIS Committee, along with RNAV, formed the nucleus of the new e-NAV Committee from its inception. The AIS WG has continued to carry forward its legacy work and in essence has not had to adapt its working arrangements at all. Although AIS stands to be a core element of e-Navigation implementation, a separate AIS Committee could ensure that role through liaison with the e-NAV Committee. Of all the e-NAV Committee working groups, it is believed that AIS would be least affected by separating from the e-NAV Committee. If the Association is able to accommodate two additional Committee meeting weeks during the year, this approach allows 1) a significant number to be reduced from e-NAV Committee attendance, 2) AIS to continue its efforts as a separate Committee and 3) maintains the synergy of IALA’s work on e-Navigation, i.e. it keeps the bulk of the current e-NAV Committee together.

This association could also be reinforced by setting up AIS and Communications (WGs 3 & 4) as a sub-committee, meeting separately, but reporting to the main e-NAV Committee.

## Transfer of WGs 1 & 6 to ANM & VTS

### WG1 to ANM

ANM has acknowledged being given the lead role for developing and verifying User Requirements for e-Navigation (e-NAV8/7/1). In order to consolidate the user expertise of IALA and facilitate interaction with the IMO correspondence group on user needs issues, moving WG1 to ANM may be a good fit. At e-NAV9, there were 15 participants in WG1.

### WG6 to VTS

The VTS Committee has a significant body of knowledge regarding the presentation of maritime information to VTS Operators. The VTS Manual addresses portrayal-related items such as display of AIS data, traffic situation and information displays, information management, and VTSO positions. The Portrayal WG in the e-NAV Committee could benefit from VTS expertise for shoreside displays. The presentation of *shipboard* information should be left to the expertise at IMO. Accordingly, WG6 could migrate to VTS. At e-NAV9, there were 18 participants in WG6.

### Unknown Impact on Attendance

The impact of WG migration on e-NAV Committee attendance cannot be predicted. Possibly because of the e-NAV “cachet,” some current e-NAV participants might continue to attend the e-NAV Committee. However, if nothing is done, the e-NAV Committee will continue to stress the capabilities of the Secretariat and the confines of IALA HQ.

## Sub-division of Committee

The Committee could be divided into operational (WG 1 & 6) and technical (WG 2, 3, 4 & 5). These sections could meet in consecutive weeks – operational requirements being set out in the first week for technical solution in the second. The effect on attendance would be more predictable than the previous option, but the resource implications would be similar to the formation of an additional committee.

# References

1. e-NAV9/output/1
2. PAP21/output/1
3. PAP21/8/1

# Action requested of the COMMITTEE

The Committee is requested to:

1. Consider the re-establishment of the AIS WG as a full Committee
2. Consider dividing the Committee in two, meeting in sequential weeks
3. Consider the migration of WG1 to ANM
4. Consider the migration of WG6 to VTS
5. Provide a recommendation to PAP22