

Minutes
of the
BSICCWG Meeting on 9-10 June 2011

on Swedish Maritime Administration
Norrköping, Sweden

[30 June 2011]

Participants¹: *Mikus Ranka (Latvia)*
Berit Holse, Peter Ladegaard Sørensen (KMS)
Sylvia Spohn (BSH)
Tony Pharaoh (IHB)
Magnus Wallhagen, Anita Bodin, Svante Håkansson (partly) (SMA),
Jarmo Mäkinen (Chair), Juha Korhonen (FTA),

1. Opening of the meeting

The meeting convened 9 June 2011 at 09.00. The BSICCWG *Chair, Jarmo*, opened the meeting and welcomed all participants, especially *Tony from the IHB* and *Magnus* for arrangements.

Magnus welcomed all to the meeting and informed on practical arrangements. He apologized the Hydrographer *Patrik Wiberg* was not able to address the meeting. He gave some overview information of the Swedish HO and its activities.

The program was reviewed [*Program*]. There was a short introduction of participants, [*List of Participants*]. The draft Agenda [*Agenda*] was approved with some additional items. The meeting documents were introduced, [*List of Documents*]. Sylvia will check if this is the first BSICCWG meeting ever. (*Action #1*).²

2. Review the BSICCWG TORs and ROPs

The new BSICCWG TORS and ROPs [*BSICCWG TORs and ROPs, approved at the BSHC/15 in September 2010*] were reviewed. The tasks were clarified. For BSICCWG the ENC harmonisation means mainly to report to BSHC the status of the implementation of the ENC harmonisation recommendations (2008). It was noted that these TORs are new and this is the first time on working with them. The exact wording of them may not be possible the bests for the BSICCWG; however no changes are proposed at this point.

It was noted that there is no need for a formal Work Plan, an Action list is sufficient. There is no need to have a Vice-coordinator. It was noted that the time for replying to BSICCWG Letters has been fine. Jarmo noted with pleasure that most Members have been very active nowadays.

It was noted that the Annexes A and B of S-11 Part A need updating. The status of Printer nations' information should also be updated. There were some doubts if

¹ Estonia, Poland, Russia and Region E Coordinator time Wellington have informed not being able to attend the meeting.

² Post meeting note: It has been found that this really was the first meeting.

Annex B is still relevant at all. It was agreed that Jarmo will ask the Chair of the CSPCWG to invite Member States to update these. (Action #2).

Sylvia informed on their ECDIS training courses approval and promised to send their ECDIS training courses approval documents, if available. (Action #3).³

It was agreed that the BSICCWG members will act as Point of Contacts for ENC coordination issues.

The status of Baltic Sea ENC harmonisation actions [Draft status of ENC harmonisation actions, agreed in 2008] were reviewed. It was agreed that Juha will send the draft status report to all BSICCWG members for review and updating. All should send their updates by 12 August 2011. (Actions #4, #5).

There was some discussion of the future role of the Baltic Sea Depth information Working Group (BSDIHWG). The WG was found to be important; however it should focus more on presentation of depth information. The meeting proposes to re-activate the WG. Perhaps Sweden may volunteer to chair the WG, but needs to have internal discussions regarding resources before a final decision. Perhaps Latvia may be as a pilot area for S-101 transition.

3. Updating the S-11 Region E (Baltic Sea)

The status of updates to S-11 Region E (Baltic Sea) [S-11 Region E, Edition 2.004, Oct. 2010] was briefly reviewed. Some updates were already received and all are invited to forward their updates to Juha as soon as feasible, but at the latest by 12 August 2011 (Action #6). Juha will send consolidated updates to the IHB prior the BSHC/16.

There was discussion of the status of Baltic Sea INT numbers. Juha will send the list of numbers for all to review their status of numbers. Especially the status "Reserved" should be checked. Replies by 12 August 2011. (Actions #7, #8).

Regarding proposals for new INT numbers it was noted that Finland will request new numbers for 5 to 7 new INT charts replacing current panels on back sides of charts. Jarmo noted that the BSICCWG should keep some numbers in reserve, because it is difficult to get new numbers. Last major set of numbers was received from Region D, thanks to Tim Wellington.

It was found the definitions of "insets", "continuations" and "plans" need to be clarified and their definitions should be included in the Hydrographic Dictionary and S-4. (Action #9).⁴

Sylvia informed on her proposal to change the coverage and format of INT charts 1303 and 1304 to be more comparable to the respective ENC area before producing the General usage band ENC. This causes no changes to overlapping INT 1201 before this ENC can be produced from two charts. Berit informed that they may have difficulties of using three charts instead of two. There is no adoption planned of INT 1304 by DK. Also their production system is not ready for that. This information was noted now only for consideration.

New proposed routing measures reviewed. It was noted that there are at least four related documents at IMO NAV Sub Committee: Russia: New TSS South West of

³ Post meeting note: ECDIS training courses are based on "Manila Amendments to the international Convention on Standards of Training, Certification and Watch keeping for Seafarers, 1978 (STCW)" dated 3rd August 2010 (STCW/CONF.2/34). Relevant IMO documents are available under ISBN 92-801-6112-1 (price not known).

⁴ Post meeting note: I have been informed that there already are some definitions for "plan" and "inset" in S-4 and in Hydrographic Dictionary.

Gogland (no time schedule, [NAV 56/INF.5](#)), Finland and Sweden: new TSS Norra Kvarken, (1 May 2013, [NAV 57/3/7](#)), Denmark: (text changes only, 1 Jan 2013, [NAV 57/3/10](#)), and Russia: New TSS Ust-Luga (no time schedule, [NAV 57/INF.2](#)). Magnus informed on the planned new TSS arrangements and associated routing measures on Kattegat, new INT chart planned, proposal planned to be forwarded to NAV in 2013 and enter in force 2014 – 2015.

There were discussions on the responsibility of the printer nations to deliver update information. There was some information on contacts to printer nations. IHB try to synchronize information for INT charts. Jarmo noted that this information should be updated. He proposed that in Bilateral arrangements should be agreed that printer nation should send e.g. once a year an updated list of latest versions of products. Otherwise it may be difficult to collect info from far away foreign countries, e.g. from UKHO charts. This updated information should be available via Internet and is already available on most chart dealers. The new S-11 database should solve this problem.

Mikus asked what is the status of S-11? What information the printer nation should provide to the producer nation? If the INT chart adoption exists, but printer nation has not officially submitted information to producer nation on it, should the information from the IHO INT Chart catalogue be removed about the printer? Jarmo asked if it is possible to put on flag state requirements not to allow navigating with charts, which are not updated.

4. Principles of naming charts and sea areas

There was discussion on the use of national language names in chart titles. It was noted that there are specifications in S-4 specification B-241. The CSPCWG has updated S-4 Section B 200 recently.

It was recommended that a national title should be used. Additionally an English title may be added. Also if there is a common English name, it could be added after the national name. Chart title in S-11 catalogue should be the same as in the chart. Germany uses English names on the back of chart concerning to the old BSICC Catalogue. Especially for smaller waters English names are not known. Denmark translates explanation texts into English, but chart title is not translated. In sailing directions they use also old traditional names.

There was discussion on the use of the names of sea areas. The Draft version of S-23 Chapter 2 (Baltic Sea) [[S-23_Chapter 2_Baltic Sea, Draft 2002](#)] was reviewed. It was noted that in navigational warnings and weather services there are non-defined or different names in use than those in Draft S-23, e.g. "*Northern Baltic*". Also some proposed names may cause confusion, e.g. the name "*Sound Sea*" on Estonian coast is close to the old name "*The Sound*" between Denmark and Sweden. Inconsistent use of different names may be safety critical issue. It was noted that a new edition of S-23 may be published soon if Japan and Korea can solve their disputes. Tony will check the estimated time schedule for publication of the next edition of S-23. **(Action #12).**⁵

It was agreed that the BSICCWG will make a proposal to BSHC/16 for amending some of the names in the Draft S-23 Chapter 2 Baltic Sea. Svante will prepare the first draft for this. Jarmo will distribute this to all BSICCWG Members and ask all for comments. Also all are kindly asked to contact the relevant meteorological etc. organisations in their country. Final proposal will be sent to BSHC/16. **(Actions #13, #14, #15, #16).**

⁵ **Post meeting note:** By the information from the IHB it seems likely the new edition of S-23 will not be approved prior the IHO XVIII Conference in April 2011.

5. Development of INT Chart Catalogue database

Tony explained the shortcomings of the current Word version of S-11 and the status of his S-11 database development. The new database will be based on GIS tools. The database structure was shown and discussed. The development plans were well received. The participants forwarded various comments and improvements to it. Tony will forward the next version within few days and expects feedback on the database structure. All are invited to comment the database structure by 17 June 2011 (*Actions #10, #11*). The database development will be shown and demonstrated at the next CSPCWG meeting on 29 November – 2 December 2011.

6. Experiences/information

There were discussions on the experiences of adoption of charts. Berit noted that UKHO will update only selected national NtM messages, mainly on fairway areas but e.g. 15m contours are not updated. Sylvia informed that UKHO itself decides which NtMs they apply, however for adopted charts all NtMs are applied. UKHO makes their own NtM messages which may not be exactly like the national ones. Jarmo noted that the Printer nation may modify the original NtM message. Magnus noted that UKHO does not remove dangerous things, only minor issues are excluded (no safety issues). Sweden would like UKHO to adopt Swedish charts, and plans to let UKHO to decide what updates they apply. If they request to apply all updates then UKHO NtMs may be too large. Jarmo questioned that if not all updates are applied is that then an adopted chart? It was noted that the Nordic Bilateral WG is dealing on these updating issues. Swedish plans are not exactly according to jointly agreed principles. HOs should avoid adding unnecessary details on national NtMs. It was noted that users may not be aware that all NtMs are not updated. It was noted that UKHO has visited some Nordic HOs discussing on updating issues. These issues should be specified in Bilaterals.

There was some discussion on classifying the corrections. Denmark uses four levels of corrections: small (internal) correction, chart correction, anomaly chart correction and block correction. It was noted that there is no guidance on this in S-4.

It was agreed that Jarmo will propose to the CSPCWG to clarify to the use of edition dates and edition number. (*Action #19*)

It was recommended that all should study the newly updated S-4 Section B-600 on the rules for NtMs. Jarmo will highlight at BSHC/16 the importance of the following the rules of publishing and using NtMs as in S-4 Section B-600. (*Action #20*).

There were discussions on the experiences of adoption and update of INT charts from Russia. Germany and Latvia have difficulties to get updated information or new editions from Russia. Finland has not adopted Russian charts, but uses Russian ENC's for updating the charts. Permission is asked from the HDNO and data received via *Transas*. Finland receives updated printed charts from Russia. These arrangements work normally quite well. Mikus reported on their difficulties with the adopted Russian charts on Latvian waters. The BSHC 13th Conference in 2008 agreed to move the responsibility of INT charts 1216 and 1217 from Russia to Latvia. However there still exist Russian charts with same INT numbers, these are also in *ChartPilot's* catalogue. These Russian charts are not updated (e.g. missing new routeing measures, showing some non-existent zones, omitting significant information). Latvia is not receiving Russian NtMs. These charts are outdated but some dealers are correcting these according to Russian NtMs.

It was noted that this is a safety critical issue and a navigational warning should perhaps be sent, if the Russian charts are not updated. Jarmo noted that IMO regulations request timely information on new routing measures. This should be agreed in Bilaterals. It was agreed that Jarmo will send a letter to Russia raising the difficulties to get updating information for adopted Russian charts (*Action #17*). He will also raise this issue at BSHC/16. Tony was not aware if this was discussed within IHO. He will forward this issue to the IHB (*Action #18*).

Magnus gave information about using ENCs for data exchange in Nordic countries for paper chart production. In 2009 the Nordic countries agreed on some recommendations to improve the change of updating information based on ENCs. The procedures were found feasible. They improve the quality of products and help adopting others' data. One benefit is that these procedures use existing RENC infrastructure. Bilateral Agreements could solve the problem of using different RENCs. Magnus will prepare a Presentation at BSHC/16 for fostering wider use of these arrangements (*Action #21*).

7. Cartographic issues

There was some discussion on cartographic issues, e.g. the use of colours in INT charts (light flares/ wind parks in small scale charts, depiction of local magnetic anomaly areas besides cables) and on principles of wreck depiction in smaller scales.

Magnus informed briefly on their search of all wrecks 2010 in all Swedish waters. There was some discussion on how wrecks are shown on nautical charts. It was noted that on small scale charts it is not needed to note that all wrecks are not included.

8. Reporting to BSHC16

Issues to be reported to BSHC/16 were discussed, and an early draft report to BSHC/16 was shown. Jarmo will forward to all BSICCWG members for review the draft Report including annexes and relevant documents by 12 August 2011, and the Final report to BSHC/16 by end of August 2011. (*Actions #25, #26*).

9. Further actions

The actions agreed at the meeting were reviewed. The List of Actions is in Annex 1.

There was a discussion on the need of the next meeting. General understanding was that BSICCWG meetings may perhaps be held every second year, next in 2013. There were no volunteers as the Coordinator.

Juha will distribute the draft minutes ASAP. All participants are asked to review and comment the Draft Minutes by 28 June 2011. Juha will distribute the Final Minutes and other related documents to all BSICCWG members by 1 July 2011. (*Actions #22, #23, #24*).

10. Any Other Business

None.

11. Closing of the meeting

The *Chair* thanked all on their active contribution, special thanks to Tony, and to Sweden for their good arrangements and hospitality. The meeting was closed on 10 June 2011 about at 14:00.

After the meeting Magnus guided a short visit to the Hydrographic Office including some presentations, e.g. the depth database and navigational warning operations.

Annex 1: List of Actions agreed on 9 – 10 June 2011.

Annex 1: List of Actions of the BSICCWG meeting on 9-10 June 2011

Action #	Who	Action	Time schedule	Remarks/ Status by 30 June 2011
#1	Sylvia	To check if this is the first BSICCWG meeting.	By 12 August 2011	Done 29 June 2011.
#2	Jarmo	To propose to the Chair of the CSPCWG to ask for updating the S-11 Annex A and Annex B. To be checked if Annex B is relevant any more. Also to recommend to ask all MS to update of their Printer nation status in S-11 Part B.	By end of September 2011	
#3	Sylvia	To send ECDIS training course approval documents (if available) to all BSICCWG Members.	By end of August 2011	Done 29 June 2011.
#4	Juha	To distribute the status questionnaire on ENC harmonisation recommendations to all BSICCWG Members.	By end June 2011	Done 30 June 2011.
#5	All	To send back their updated status of their ENC harmonisation recommendations.	By 12 August 2011	
#6	All	To send their possible updates to S-11 Part B Region E (Baltic Sea) .	By 12 August 2011	
#7	Juha	To send updated List of Baltic Sea INT numbers to all BSICCWG Members for review.	By end June 2011	Done 30 June 2011.
#8	All	To review the status of their INT numbers as in list of #7 (especially status "Reserved") and forward comments and corrections to Juha.	By 12 August 2011	
#9	Jarmo	To propose CSPCWG to add the definitions of "inset" , "continuation" , "plan" to the Hydrographic Dictionary and to S-4.	By end of September 2011	
#10	Tony	To send next version of S-11 database structure within few days to all participants.	ASAP	
#11	All Participants	To send feedback to the database structure (#10).	By 17 June 2011	
#12	Tony	To check the estimated time schedule for publication of the next edition of S-23.	ASAP	Done.
#13	Svante	To prepare a draft proposal for amending the draft S-23 Part 2 and send to BSICCWG Chair.	By 17 June 2011	Done 20 June 2011.
#14	Jarmo	To distribute the draft proposal for amending sea area names in the	By end June 2011	Done 30 June 2011.

Action #	Who	Action	Time schedule	Remarks/ Status by 30 June 2011
		draft S-23 Part 2 (<i>#13</i>) to all BSICCWG Members for comments and to be forwarded to relevant organisations in their countries.		
<i>#15</i>	<i>All</i>	To forward their comments and possible further proposals to these sea name proposals (<i>#14</i>) to Jarmo.	<i>By 12 August 2011</i>	
<i>#16</i>	<i>Jarmo</i>	To forward the draft proposal to BSHC/16 to all BSICCWG Members for comments.	<i>By 12 August 2011</i>	
<i>#17</i>	<i>Jarmo</i>	To send a letter to Russia raising the difficulties to get updating information for adopted Russian charts.	<i>ASAP</i>	Ongoing.
<i>#18</i>	<i>Tony</i>	To raise the issue of communication difficulties with Russia for consideration and possible IHB actions.	<i>ASAP</i>	Done.
<i>#19</i>	<i>Jarmo</i>	Proposal to CSPCWG to clarify to the use of edition dates and edition number.	<i>By end of September 2011</i>	
<i>#20</i>	<i>Jarmo</i>	Highlight at BSHC/16 the importance of clarification of rules of publishing and using NtMs according to S-3 B-600.	<i>At BSHC/16</i>	
<i>#21</i>	<i>Magnus</i>	To prepare a Presentation of the Nordic arrangements for using ENCs for data exchange proposing fostering wider use of these arrangements.	<i>At BSHC/16</i>	
<i>#22</i>	<i>Juha</i>	To distribute Draft Minutes to the participants.	<i>ASAP</i>	Done 16 June 2011.
<i>#23</i>	<i>All Participants</i>	To review and comment the Draft Minutes (<i>#22</i>).	<i>By 28 June 2011</i>	Done.
<i>#24</i>	<i>Juha</i>	To distribute Final Minutes to all BSICCWG Members.	<i>By end June 2011</i>	Done 30 June 2011.
<i>#25</i>	<i>Jarmo</i>	To forward to all BSICCWG Members for review the draft BSICCWG Report to BSHC16 including annexes and relevant documents.	<i>By 12 August 2011</i>	
<i>#26</i>	<i>Jarmo</i>	To forward BSICCWG Report including annexes to BSHC/16.	<i>By end of August 2011</i>	