



Final Minutes
of the
BSICCWG5 Meeting on 21- 22 November 2017

at Hotel Hanza
Tokarska 6, Gdansk

Participants:

Ilze Driksne	Latvia
Nele Savi	Estonia
Peter Ladegaard Sørensen	Denmark
Susanne Carlsen	Denmark
Sylvia Spohn	Germany
Stanislaw Pietrzak	Poland
Jacek Kijakowski	Poland
Adam Klosinski	Poland
Dariusz Grabiec (day 2)	Poland
Anita Bodin	Sweden
Hans Engberg	Sweden
Jukka Helminen	Finland (Secretary)
Jarmo Mäkinen	Finland (Chair)

1. Welcome and formalities

The meeting convened on 22nd of November 2017 at 9:30.

The chair thanked the hosts for organizing the meeting. The Polish National Hydrographer Andrzej Kowalski welcomed all participants to the meeting. Mr. Adam Klosinski presented the schedule and information about Gdansk.

The chair, Jarmo Mäkinen (FI), opened the meeting and welcomed everyone to the meeting. The chair apologized for the late arrival of some of the documents. The chair briefly reviewed the agenda. [[BSICCWG5_1.2 Draft Agenda](#)]

There was a brief introduction of the participants [[BSICCWG5_List of participants](#)].

2. Status of BSICCWG and its work

2.1 Minutes of BSICCWG4

The Minutes of the previous BSICCWG4 meeting were accepted. [[BSICCWG5_2.1_Minutes of BSICCWG4](#)]

2.2 Status of BSICCWG4 Actions

Status of the list of actions was reviewed. [[BSICCWG5_2.2_Status of BSICCWG4 Actions](#)]

Actions 1,2,4,5,6,7,8, 10,11,12,13,17,18,19 were completed. Actions 3 and 20 are permanent.

Action 3 is a permanent action. The information about the new general cells should be sent to Germany hydrodata@bsh.de. It was agreed that the cells only need to be sent when they have been changed in a way that may actually affect the overview cell.

Action 1: All to send Germany the new editions of their general cells, when appropriate.

Denmark suggested that this action should be added to the bilateral agreements when they are updated.

Action 2: When updating bilateral arrangements action 1 should be added to arrangement.

There was a brief discussion about action 5 and how the members are making T&P corrections on POD charts. Latvia informed that they make them manually. Sweden does not put P&T's in charts. Denmark suggested asking Norway how they handle P&Ts on PODs in Norway.

Action 3 Denmark to ask Norway how they handle P&Ts in POD.



On action 8 there was a discussion about how often updating should be done since once a month was agreed to be too often. Four times a year was viewed as the best solution. The chair emphasized that updating is the most important part of the process.

Action 4 All member states to adopt S11 updating as a part of chart publishing process. Updating on quarterly basis.

On action 10 Andy Hinton had informed the chair that in the North Sea area, the practice is that the producer nation updates the status of the printer nation. There was a discussion that it could be easier for a printer nation to do this, because it is sometimes hard to know the schedules of the printer nation and when they are making new editions. Germany had experience, that they were more aware of NEs as a printer than the producer. On the other hand, locking issues of the database could be a challenge, when the printer nation is going to update INT database.

Action 7: When there is no automatic email, it is the job of the coordinator to send an e-mail when rejecting charts.

Action 14 has been discussed between Finland and Estonia. But a solution has not been found yet.

Action 5 Estonia and Finland will continue discussion of the limits/areas between Gulf of Finland/Väinameri/ Northern Baltic.

Action 15- > new action for Denmark. See agenda point 7.2.

On action 16 (metadata of IHO ENC Catalogue) There was no clear answer for this yet. Data is coming from RENCs (IC-ENC RENC). Stanislaw Pietrzak (PL) noted that their data in the catalogue has not been up-to-date.

Action 6: Chair will clarify source and updating procedure in IHO ENC Catalogue.

Action 17 will be handled on agenda point 4.4.

On action 18 Estonia had received some feedback from other countries.

Action 19 has been discussed with Primar and it will be possible, in principle. But mostly the changes are very small and it will not be worthwhile to create automated e-mail. This was seen as more responsible for each member state to monitor ENC coverage and report for BSICCWG (BSHC).

2.3 Review BSICCWG TORs

The BSICCWG TOR's were reviewed. [[BSICCWG5_2.3.1_BSICCWG TORs and ROPs](#)]

Poland had sent a correction to chapter 3.7. On 3.9 "[Region]" should be changed to Baltic Sea Hydrographic Commission.

The Chair requested everyone to send possible comments about TORs and ROPs. Updated TORs and ROPs will be presented in the next BSHC meeting.

Action 7: All to send possible comments for new draft for BSICCWG TORs and ROPs.

2.4 Review of BSICCWG Membership

The BSICCWG membership was reviewed. [[BSICCWG5_2.4_BSICCWG Members](#)]

Susanne Carlsen from Denmark and Dana Kuznetsova from Estonia were confirmed as members of the group. Jukka Helminen (FI) was also added as a member.

3. BSHC22

3.1 Outcome of BSHC 22nd Commission

The chair reviewed the BSICCWG report and presentation to BSHC 22nd commission.

[[BSICCWG5_3.1_BSICCWG report to BSHC22 Commission](#)]

4. INT chart web catalogue; updating of S-11 Part B, Region E



4.1 Updating process in member states

The chair presented the updating process and asked if it is clear for all members. The Chair said that it is working quite well from the coordinator's view.

Poland made a remark that if you take out a PDF file from WebChart Tool, the Polish letters are not visible anymore. Same for a Latvian letters (ā, ī, ē), which are not visible anymore on a PDF file from the WebChart Tool.

Action 8: Chair to ask from IHO spelling of Polish and Latvian characters, which are not visible, when taking PDF outcome from S-11 WebChart tool.

There was discussion of the status of printed Mariners Routing Guide (INT 1200), where producer nation is Germany. Chair also informed of actions of BSCH to update web version of Mariners Routing Guide (maintained by Denmark). Routing guide includes also a lot of information where responsibility does not belong to Hydrographic Offices.

Action 9 : All to send updates for Baltic Sea Routing Guide (INT 1200) to Germany.
(hydrodata@bsh.de)

Post meeting document: See actions of Baltic Sea Hydrographic Commission

23rd BSHC Conference
BSHC22_Draft Actions



28-30 August 2018
Aalborg, Denmark

No.	Agenda item	Subject	Responsible	Time Frame	Status
14.	B.3.1	To put a link to "Mariners' Routeing Guide Baltic Sea" web version on BSHC webpage.	Sweden	BSHC 23	
15.	B.3.1	To check web version of the Mariners' Routeing Guide Baltic Sea and comment by the end of 2017.	All MS	End of 2017	

4.2 status of updates in Region E (all members)

[BSICCWG5_4.1_Updating Process+ BSICCWG5_4.2_Status of updates]

4.2.1 Denmark

Denmark has evaluated Web Tool and made some updates in area E. Although they were not sure if the changes they've made have been implemented. Chair responded that no information has come to the Coordinator. Denmark will clarify updating process.

4.2.2 Estonia.

Estonia had made some updates and for Estonia the tool is working ok.

4.2.3 Finland

Updating process continues.

4.2.4 Germany

Germany had difficulties with names of the plans, e.g. if you delete a plan it is not possible to change the name of the plan that remains; plan B cannot be changed to A or just a plan. Sweden had experienced similar difficulties with plan names. If difficulties will continue, members will inform coordinator.

4.2.5 Latvia

For Latvia tool has working well. Some help is needed, when adding plans to the main chart.

Post meeting comment: Latvia has succeeded to add plan to the main chart.

4.2.6 Lithuania

Lithuanian INT chart are unofficial, until Lithuania will be member of IHO. **4.2.7 Poland**



Poland is using the tool successfully, without any special problems.

4.2.8 Russia

Russia has got username and password from IHO. No updates received yet by coordinator.

4.2.9 Sweden

Sweden had just produced 2 new editions of paper charts, by new production system. They were wondering what the status is for these editions and if they are approved. Region E has been updated in September 2017 (Edition 3.0.7).

4.3 Web chart tool in use; possibilities, challenges, need for development?

The chair summarized that the tool is working quite well. It is useable but there are some small issues to be clarified.

4.4 Development phase 2

[BSICCWG5_4.4_INTToGIS_development phase II]

Chair presented the project. Development phase II (KHOA/IHO Sec.) has started. Region E (Baltic Sea will be one testing area (Spring 2018). Development phase II contains:

- ✓ ENC scheme management procedures (S-11)
- ✓ Base map for Polar regions (Arctic & Antarctic)
- ✓ Additional layers for 500 world ports and AIS traffic information
- ✓ Connection between IHO ENC catalogue and INTToGIS systems
- ✓ Improve the chart display functions
- ✓ User Feedbacks from HO, regional coordinator

Discussion of other user needs.

Sylvia Spohn (DE) suggested that route planning could be interesting. Chair answered that this kind of tool is included e.g. in Datema tool PAYS (pay as you sail).

Post meeting document: See actions of Baltic Sea Hydrographic Commission



Draft List of Actions of the 22nd BSHC Conference
 19-21 September 2017 – Rostock, Germany
 [updated 22 Nov 2017]

8.	B.2	Provide continuous updates to S-11 Part B for INT Region E through the INTToGIS tool and implement the procedure depicted in IHO CL 64/2015 for the review and monitoring of INT charts and define Approved ENC Schemes.	All MS, BSICCWG Chair	Permanent
----	-----	--	-----------------------	-----------

5. Baltic Sea INT-scheme

[BSICCWG5_5.1_Status of New INT charts+ 5.2_Review of INT Scheme]

5.1 Status of new INT charts /new INT numbers

There was a discussion about the needs and plans for new INT charts in the future.

5.2 Review of Baltic Sea INT Chart Scheme

5.2.1 Estonia.

Estonia needs maximum three new INT numbers.

5.2.2 Finland.

Estimation of two new numbers.



5.2.3 Germany

Sylvia Spohn (DE) had a presentation about the German needs for INT numbers. Germany needs 10 new numbers.

Germany is planning to change INT chart scheme in Baltic Sea and North Sea area ('Neuekonzeption'). Work was started from the North Sea this year. The renewal for the Baltic Sea is not expected to be ready before 2021. Cooperation with UKHO is a part of the project.

- BSH will give up producing charts DE40 (INT 1201, 1:250 000) and DE64 (INT 1304, 1:200 000) when the new INT chart in scale 1: 375 000 will cover the German waters.
 - DE40 (INT 1201, 1:250 000) -> to SE?
 - DE64 (INT 1304, 1:200 000) -> to DK?

There was a discussion about the national chart numbers and is Germany using old national numbers for new charts? Anita Bodin (SE) informed that in Sweden it had caused some misunderstanding when they had recycled some old numbers even after 5 years. These charts could be seen as the same chart by some end users. Chair urged to consider if the old national numbers could be changed to the new ones.

Sylvia Spohn (DE) responded, that they are not planning to recycle old national numbers for new charts as they had same experiences as SE. The proposal for the cooperation chart numbering came from GB and is to take old German numbers combined with the preposition DE (they already have done it with AUS, NZ, JP) If the chart area changes a lot than Germany will change the national number, too

5.2.4 Latvia

Latvia do not need any new INT numbers in the nearest future.

5.2.5 Poland

Poland had a presentation of their plans. Poland has a request for four new INT numbers for charts in Gdynia, Gdansk, Szczecin and Swinoujscie. The purpose is to divide old charts INT1290 and INT1299 into two parts each.

Poland requested having those numbers by 15 January 2018 so they could release the charts in February 2018.

Poland will send the information to chair in two weeks.

Action 10: Poland to send presentation/plan for 4 new INT charts.

Action 11: BSICCWG Chair to allocate new INT numbers for Poland.

Germany is a printer nation of INT 1299. Old INT number (INT1299) will stay in use, until Germany will adopt 2 new Polish INT charts.

5.2.6 Denmark

Denmark will need 3-5 INT numbers but probably not before 2019.

5.2.7 Sweden

Sweden needs one new INT number for a coastal chart SE92 (1:250 000) from the Sound. They requested to have it in a fast schedule because of the Kattegat separation scheme.

There was a brief discussion on how soon before needing should these numbers be requested. The chair said two weeks could be ok. He also wished that if there is a deadline for the numbers, it should be mentioned when requesting.

6. Revised Management, review and Monitoring of new INT charts

[BSICCCWG5_6.1_IHO CL64/2015, Basic check list]

Following the trial procedure since August 2015 and based on the feedback from regional coordinators, it is proposed to standardize the procedure (IRCC9-11B).



All **new** INT charts should be sent to the area coordinator for evaluating. This new basic check list is now a part of document S-11, Part A, Annex 2. This will be a permanent process in the future.

Post meeting document: See actions of Baltic Sea Hydrographic Commission

23rd BSHC Conference
BSHC22 Draft Actions



28-30 August 2018
Aalborg, Denmark

Draft List of Actions of the 22nd BSHC Conference

19-21 September 2017 – Rostock, Germany
[updated 22 Nov 2017]

2	D.2	To forward the first edition of new INT charts to chair of BSICCWG for evaluation.	All MS	Permanent	
---	-----	--	--------	-----------	--

7. Baltic Sea sub-areas

7.1 Defining exact limits for sub-areas

[BSICCWG5_7.1.1_limits for Baltic Sea sub areas]

[BSICCWG5_7.1.2_limits excel]

[BSICCWG5_7.2.1_comments from DE]

[BSICCWG5_7.2.2_comments from EE]

[BSICCWG5_7.2.3_comments from SE]

[BSICCWG5_7.2.4_comments from FI]

The chair presented the background for the issue. The naming of the sea-areas has been challenging. Chair had been in contact with Finnish Meteorological Institute and received some feedback about the areas.

There was a discussion about the name *Middle Baltic* on the level 3. The chair suggested changing the name *Middle Baltic* to *Central Baltic*. It was then pointed that the name *Central Baltic* is already in use in level 2. It was decided that the level 3 is more important level in charts and that the name should be *Central Baltic* in this level. Level 2 was viewed more of a theoretical level and that name could be changed in that level. Nobody in the group saw any problem in this name changing.

Proper Baltic and *Main Baltic* were suggested names for the level 2 but nothing was decided yet.

7.2 Comments from member states

Germany suggested moving one coordinate and adding two new coordinates in the limits.

Latvia suggests to move the Central Baltic limit southwards to 56°00'N.

Denmark will come back to this issue after the meeting.

Action 12: Denmark to send comments for Baltic Sea area limits.

Poland suggested one more accurate coordinate.

Estonia needs to add one extra point.

Latvia suggested moving the Central Baltic limit southward to 56:00. Right now it is cutting a main port in Latvia and it would also seem more logical to have the limit more south. Sweden and the chair reminded that the reason for the limit being in the current position is the MSI reporting areas. The Chair suggested we inspect the MSI limits and then decide what should be done.

Action 13 Chair to contact Svante Håkansson to get accurate coordinates for MSI limits.

Sweden had two coordinate adjustments and four name changes. Denmark will comment them later on.

Finland had some minor changes in the Archipelago Sea.

Chair emphasized that we should keep the deadlines so we can get these to the Baltic Sea Hydrographic Commission.

7.3 Comments from Baltico/Meteorological institutes



8.0 Transition to the harmonized vertical reference (BSCD 2000)

Docs:

- BSICCWG5_8.1_CDWG report to BSHC22
- BSICCWG5_8.2_SMA NtM_BSCD2000

8.1 Discussion of affects around Baltic States

The chair presented the issue. Every country will go to the new chart datum (Baltic Sea Chart Datum 2000) in a transition period, which will take couple of years. For some countries this is a bigger issue than for others.

Poland at this point doesn't have a date when this transition will be published in products.

Sweden has started the process with nine charts done. They have had to change the coastline also. Anita Bodin (SE) warned that it may cause confusion in the end users. Even though mariners have read about it they may have not really understood it. Informing the mariners is difficult and they have to be informed many times. The Chair is expecting similar problems in Finland because of the way Finland uses maximum authorized draught. Mariners will have difficulties to understand why the maximum authorized draught is suddenly smaller than before.

The Chair reminded about the challenges in the overlapping areas in the charts and how to handle with them in notices to mariners, during transition period.

The Chair also reminded that you have to be in contact with the meteorological institutions also because this concerns them too.

Latvia does not have accurate plans for publishing schedule yet. In approach, harbour and berthing charts Latvia use note and scheme, which shows how big are changes in Ports of Latvia

Estonia will start these changes in 2018. Estonia is planning to start from harbors. Nele Savi (EE) was concerned how to show the mariner that the ENC is in the new chart datum. Specially, if mariner is not looking VERDAT -value. There was no clear solution for this.

The new vertical datum is not an issue for Germany and Denmark, because the change is so small.

There was a brief discussion about 30 m depth contours and which countries are presenting them on charts. Denmark (Kattegat project) and Sweden are working with them. Finland is considering. No plans for Estonia and Latvia. Germany has already included the 30m contour line where we they have data for it, e.g. in INT1342 and INT1353. The work is continueing according new surveys.

Action 14: Sweden will send a screen shot of the new chart produced in the new vertical datum.

Day 2

9. Baltic Sea ENC harmonization recommendations

Docs:

- BSICCWG5_9.2.1_Status of Baltic Sea ENC harmonization recommendations (2017)
- BSICCWG5_9.2.2_Final BSEHWG report (2008)
- BSICCWG5_9.2.3_Annex L_ENC harmonisation recommendations
- BSICCWG5_9.2.3_Annex J_Proposals of the use of scamin
- BSICCWG5_9.3_Revision of ENC harmonisation_comments form BSICCWG4

9.1 Changing compilation scales in ENC approach cells, members experiences

Chair presented the issue. There was a brief discussion about harmonizing depth contours between different scale layers. The recommendations say that they should be harmonized but in practice it is not always so easy. Hans Engberg (SE) reminded that because they belong to different usage bands they are generalized differently and they will never match exactly.

Estonia had a presentation of their current ongoing project of changing compilation scales and the challenges they are experiencing.

There was a discussion about the density of soundings. Hans Engberg (SE) reminded that Sweden and every country has its own system on how to choose soundings. Because the sea bottom varies very much in Sweden they cannot have a fixed distance for soundings. So harmonizing for example with Finland proved to



be challenging. Every country has the best view on how to handle its own area and you should not for example clutter the chart just to make it harmonized with ENC. In future, we have to think more ENCs than paper charts.

The chair agreed and reminded that the most important thing is to harmonize the depth contours in border areas. But that that also be challenging when the depth contours are not in the same intervals.

Estonia asked if you needed approval for the change. It was viewed that for compilation scale it is not needed.

9.2 Status of ENC Harmonization recommendations

Status of the ENC harmonization recommendations was reviewed.

9.3 Review of the harmonization recommendations

Recommendation 1. is adopted by Poland. Sylvia Spohn (DE) pointed out that maybe all the countries should be green on this one except maybe Russia.

Denmark should be green on this recommendation 2. Estonia has also adopted recommendation 5.

There was a discussion about the meaning of recommendation 7. And it was concluded that the term agreement should be changed to arrangement to make it clearer.

Poland has adopted recommendation 9. The Chair will ask Lithuania about this issue.

Recommendation 10 is becoming relevant in the future and should be marked as adopted by everyone.

There was a brief discussion about future of ENC's with S-101. The Chair said it would be useful to share information inside Baltic area of what kind of plans each country has.

Recommendation 11 was also agreed that it should be labeled adopted for everyone.

Denmark will investigate its situation on recommendation 13.

It was agreed that recommendation 14 may be deleted from the list since it has been adopted by everyone.

It was agreed that classification *Not applicable* should be changed to *Not applicable now*.

There was a discussion about the classifications and the purpose of this list in general. Hans Engberg (SE) emphasized that this is a historical check list. We understand the meaning of it and we maybe should not be modifying this list in this group. Creating new list in the future would probably be more useful (when S-100 products are coming etc.).

Sylvia Spohn (DE) suggested that maybe we should not go these through as much in the future.

Action 15: The Chair to ask Lithuania status of ENC harmonization recommendation 9.

10. Baltic Sea ENC-scheme

Docs:

- BSICCWG5_10.3_gaps and overlaps analysis by WENDWG7

- BSICCWG5_10.4_IC_ENC overlapping policy

10.1 IHO ENC catalogue

There was a discussion about the IHO ENC catalog. Stanislaw Pietrzak (PL) said it has improved but there are some dysfunctions. There was a discussion about who is actually using this tool. Members of this group were mainly using other tools (Primar), not this tool. Sylvia Spohn (DE) said this tool is helpful when talking about the issues considering ENC coverage. Hans Engberg (SE) considered ENC scheme issues may be more useful topics in the future when we have new product types.

There was a brief discussion about AIS history and where you could find this history.

Action 16: To find a link to Baltic Sea area AIS history.



10.2 Status of ENC coverage in Baltic Sea. Review of Baltic Sea ENC-scheme

Denmark will produce 5 new coastal cells in Kattegat area to harmonize the data with Sweden. Denmark is also planning to release 200 new harbor cells within a couple of years.

Poland is planning to extend its approach coverage to cover the whole coastline

Latvia have 4 approach cell, 3 for the main Ports (1:22000) and 1 (1:45 000) for the Irbe Strait. Latvia will try to find a chance in the future to have all coastline areas covered with approach cells in scale 1:22 000 to achieve harmonization with the other Baltic Sea Member States. The project will not be started earlier than 2019.

Estonia has released new approach cells in the lake areas. But there are no plans to extend the coverage in the near future.

Russian coverage was briefly viewed. There is a hole in the coverage in the Kaliningrad area. In St. Petersburg area there are no general cells.

Finland has plans to extend coastal coverage sometime in the future.

Sweden has no plans changing the coverage.

CATZOC

There was a brief discussion about CATZOC. Poland is currently improving it to more precisely classified. Sweden uses CATZOC B for everything but they are improving it maybe in 2019. Latvia is using A and B. Estonia is using D for very old data. Denmark uses E, B and A. Finland uses A and C. Germany has issued two new approach cells for the offshore windfarms Baltic1 and Baltic2. They are using CATZOC B and A (for larger multibeam surveyed areas).

INLAND WATER ENCS

There was a brief discussion about Inland water ENCs. Why are they not included to the ENC Catalogue. In Sweden and Finland ENCs from inland waters (lakes) equals for ENCs for Sea areas. German Inland water ENCs (rivers) are different product.

The link to German Inland water ENCs: <https://www.elwis.de/DE/Service/Inland-ENC-der-WSV/Inland-ENC-der-WSV-node.html> It is a free download service for the Inland ECDIS data. There is also a WMS (<https://atlas.wsv.bund.de/clients/desktop/?parameter=visible&value=iencwms>).

10.3 Gaps and overlaps analysis in the Baltic Sea by WENDWG 7 (IC-ENC)

The Chair presented the issue and the background and hoped that everyone would report to the chair whether these overlaps are real and what are the plans to eliminate them. Chair has to report the status of this in the next WEND working group in March 2018.

Stanislaw Pietrzak (PL) said that the Polish overlaps are not a risk in a navigational point of view. Sylvia Spohn (DE) said that their overlaps are something they cannot do anything to.

Sweden and Denmark have overlaps up to 50 m. When Denmark will make new coastal cells they will adjust the coverage to match the Swedish cells. Same might also be done in the German border.

Estonia has up to 7 km overlap with Russian cells but they have not been able to get contact to Russia about the issue.

Hans Engberg (SE) said that Sweden does not have very much use for this kind of overlap analysis. Sweden has kept its coverage unchanged for years and lets neighboring countries cut or extend their coverage to match the border.

This group agreed that overlaps are not a very big issue in the Baltic Sea area.

ACTION 17: all send comments for a list of overlaps in Baltic Sea

10.4 IC-ENC overlapping policy



Chair presented report and analysis made by IC-ENC. The benefits of this kind of reporting were discussed. Hans Engberg (SE) reminded that Primar already have these kinds of tools and the member countries can themselves check these issues. Countries themselves are responsible for the data and decide if it is a risk or not.

11. Future work of BSICCWG

The chair presented issues that are monitored in the future.

- ✓ To test INTOGIS tools, report possible needs to develop the tools
- ✓ To put updating of INT charts (by INTOGIS tools) as permanent and continuous process
- ✓ To review and monitor new INT Charts/ Testing of Check list provided by IHB/NCWG
- ✓ To review of ENC harmonization recommendations
- ✓ To reporting how to solve overlaps reported in WENDWG
- ✓ To study INT chart scheming issues
- ✓ New ENC related tasks for ICCWGs (e.g. WENDWG6&7 actions) -> need to increase ENC related skills in the WG.
- ✓ Temporary and Preliminary Notices in in the POD service

There was a discussion on how to handle these issues, especially ENC issues in these meetings. Sylvia Spohn (DE) pointed out that many working groups are handling the same issues. The Chair reminded that focus of this group should be based on BSICCWG TORs and ROPs.

12. Any other business

12.1 charting of borders limits if no bilaterally agreed

Sylvia Spohn (DE) presented the issue. There was a discussion about how to chart the borders that are not bilaterally agreed. It was agreed that the normal way to chart them would be using a note.

12.2 information about new S-4 and planned NEs of INT1

Sylvia Spohn (DE) informed about the new symbol changes in S-4 and INT1. There was discussion about adding ENC symbols into INT1. The American INT1 includes ENC symbols. Sylvia will send the US INT1 to all. **Action 18: Germany to send link to US INT1.**

12.3 Progress made with inclusion of 15 m depth contour

Sylvia Spohn (DE) informed about the progress, what Germany has made in the inclusion of 15 m depth contours in charts.

Finland will add 15m contours whenever they have new surveys and add them into charts when new editions of those areas are issued.

Poland charts 15m contours for harbor and approach charts.

Sweden has 15 m contours in berthing, harbor and approach in the fairly new charts.

Latvia has 15 m contours in approach and coastal and harbors.

Estonia has started adding them into berthing and harbor and will have them in approach in the future.

Denmark finds 15 m contours a good idea and they will investigate the issue.

13. Review of actions

Actions were reviewed by chair.

14. Next meeting

There was a discussion about the place and time for the next meeting. The Chair suggested 3rd-4th of April 2019 which no one had objections. Germany and Latvia will ask the possibility to arrange next meeting.

Action 19: DE and LV to ask about possibility to arrange next BSICCWG meeting in April 2019.



Post meeting comment: Latvia and Germany have kindly provided a possibility to arrange a meeting. Next meeting will be in Riga in 3-4 April 2019. The meeting after that will be arranged in Rostock.

15. Closing the meeting

The Chair thanked all the participants and thanked the Polish hosts for the arranging the meeting. Poland also thanked the participants. The meeting was closed at 15:37.