



**Minutes
of the
BSICCWG6 Meeting on 3-4 April 2019**

at Maritime Administration of Latvia, Riga, Trijādības Street 5, (room 205).

Participants:

Kell Torp Jensen	Denmark
Peter Ladegaard Sørensen	Denmark
Maris Akkerman	Estonia
Gabriela Kotsulim	Estonia
Sylvia Spohn	Germany
Ilze Driksne	Latvia
Linda Purina	Latvia
Liene Saulite	Latvia
Ilona Markusa	Latvia
Liva Goba	Latvia
Normunds Duksis	Latvia
Jacek Kijakowski	Poland
Adam Klosinski	Poland
Anita Bodin	Sweden
Hans Engberg	Sweden
Jukka Helminen	Finland (Secretary)
Jarmo Mäkinen	Finland (Chair)

DAY 1

1. Welcome and formalities

Docs:

- *BSICCWG6_1.1 Draft Program_v2*
- *BSICCWG6_1.2 Draft Agenda_v2*
- *BSICCWG6_1.3_List of Participants*

The meeting convened on 3rd of April 2019 at 9:29.

1.1 Welcome and Practical Arrangements

The chair, Jarmo Mäkinen (FI), opened the meeting and welcomed everyone to the meeting. Chair thanked Latvia for hosting the meeting. Normunds Duksis, the head of head of cartographic department in Latvian Maritime Administration, welcomed everyone to the meeting.

1.2 Adoption of the Agenda

The agenda was accepted without changes.

1.3 Introduction of the participants

There was a brief introduction of the participants.

1.4 List of Documents

The meeting documents have been sent before by email. Chair hoped everybody had received the documents before the meeting (because of the big size of some files). There was a discussion about possibility to have meeting documents online before the meeting at the BSHC website. Chair said that the documents from the previous BSICCWG meetings are there but the documents for this meeting are not yet there.

There was a discussion that the webpage is public and that it might be problematic to have draft documents there. Chair said that he could investigate what can be done with this issue.

Action 1: Chair to discuss with Sweden, how the BSICCWG could update the documents online to the BSHC website.

2. Status of BSICCWG and its work

Docs:

- *BSICCWG6_2.1_Final minutes of BSICCWG5*
- *BSICCWG6_2.2_Status of BSICCWG5 Actions*
- *BSICCWG6_2.3_BSICCWG TORs and ROPs*
- *BSICCWG6_2.4_BSICCWG Members*

2.1 Minutes of BSICCWG5

Minutes of the last meeting was reviewed.

2.2 Status of BSICCWG5 Actions

Status of the actions from the last meeting was reviewed. Permanent actions will be separated from the new actions.

- #1 Permanent action. New action number (Permanent action #1)
- #2 Permanent action. New action number (Permanent action #2).
- #3 Denmark and Germany will ask Norway about the POD-> to continue action
- #4 Permanent action. New action number (Permanent action #3).
- #5 Done
- #6 Done
- #7 Done
- #8 Done
- #9 Permanent action. New action number (Permanent action #4).
- #10 Done
- #11 Done
- #12 Done
- #13 Done
- #14 Done
- #15 Done
- #16 Done
- #17 Done
- #18 Done
- #19 Done

Action 2: Denmark and Germany to ask Norway how they handle P&Ts in POD. Send the answer to BSICCWG.

2.3 Review BSICCWG TORs

Since the last meeting, the TOR document was updated according to the comments and feedback. It should now be in line with the IHO TOR recommendations for the ICCWGs.

2.4 Review of BSICCWG Membership

Susanne Carlsen is no longer working for Danish hydrographic office. Kell Torp Jensen was added as a new member of the group from Denmark.

Maris Akkerman and Gabriela Kotsulim from Estonia will be members of the group for at least the next two years.

Adam Klosinski will replace Stanislaw Pietrzak as a Polish member.

3. BSHC23

Doc:

- [BSICCWG6_3.1_BSICCWG report to BSHC23](#)

3.1 Outcome of BSHC 23rd Commission

Chair presented the issue. Last BSHC meeting was held in Denmark September 2018. Minutes and actions are not yet available.

At the BSHC meeting, Baltic Sea sub areas were not yet approved. Issue was left for BSICCWG to discuss because Sweden made a late proposal about limit between Baltic Sea and Skagerrak (North Sea chart coordination area) limit.

4. INT Chart Web Catalogue; Updating of S-11 Part B, Region E

Docs:

- [BSICCWG6_4.4_INTtoGIS_Project2](#)

4.1 Updating process in member states

Chair presented the issue. Database has been updated and almost all updates should be in the system. The updating process is working quite well although the process is quite long because the changes has to be approved in three levels.

There was a discussion whether there is still a need to send e-mail to the chair when there are changes made on the web tool. Chair informed that this is no longer needed because the system sends automatic e-mail.

4.2 Status of Updates in Region E

4.2.1 Denmark

The tool has been working well for Denmark. Denmark suggested that it would be useful if the member countries could also get an e-mail when the changes are updated to the catalog database. Chair will investigate the possibility for this.

Action 3: Chair to investigate possibility for an automatic answer from INTOGIS system to member state after approval of updates.

There was a brief discussion about how in the future the tool will probably be more like an online system. Maybe it is not the clearest tool at the moment but it is working well for this purpose. Chair said that he could, if needed, ask the database to be updated in fast schedule.

4.2.2 Estonia

Estonia had a presentation about their INT chart plans. They have had no problems with the tool.

4.2.3 Finland

Tool is working well for Finland and they have had not big challenges with it. All the Finnish INT charts are in the system.

4.2.4 Germany

All German INT charts are in the system. Germany is hoping that when the new version comes the planned improvements are in there.

4.2.5 Latvia

Tool is working for Latvia also. When they release chart they update the catalog.

4.2.6 Lithuania

Chair explained that Lithuania does not release official INT charts until they are a full IHO member.

4.2.7 Poland

Poland is using the tool without any problems. When there is a new edition, they update the catalog.

Poland hopes that the problem with the polish characters will be fixed in the next version of the catalog.

4.2.8 Russia

Not attending. Russia is not updating charts in web catalog.

4.2.9 Sweden

Sweden was interested why the web catalog requires Chrome browser since it is not standard in Sweden. Chair answered that Chrome is a recommendation because it seems to work better with it. Sweden had also had some challenges with plans that are not rectangle and have lot of corner points. The system only allows four coordinate points. Chair said that Sweden could send some example case to him and he could send it forward to IHO for development.

4.3 Web chart tool in use; possibilities, challenges?

There was a discussion about who should update the printer nation status and how does the producing nation know when the printer nation prints the new chart. Some members have not updated the printer nation status since they have not had the information.

Chair informed how the process is going in the case of adopted Finnish charts, Finland follows the list of charts adopted by UK. If Finland sees in the UKHO website that UK has released new edition on some of the charts UK have adopted from Finland, Finland will then update the printer nation status. However, this list of UK adopted charts is not easy to find. Finland follows this information because they want to make sure that UK releases new editions whenever Finland releases new editions. UK has adopted 30-35 Finnish INT charts.

Chair said that it is not a very easy task to get UK as a printing nation to update the status of all of their adopted charts. Answer from Andy Hinton (UK) had been that it is the responsibility of the producer nation to update it. It could also cause some locking issues if the printer nation will have responsibility to update it. Chair proposes that producer nation updates the printer nation status too.

Action 4: Chair to send a link for an updated list of UKHO new editions.

4.4 Development phase II-status- new features

Chair had a presentation about INTOGIS Project Phase 2. There was a general discussion about the planned improvements and what are their schedules. The Project is slightly late from the original schedule but will maybe be use in next August.



There was a discussion about where the CATZOC information comes from. Chair explained that it is not clear yet how it has been done now and IHO and RENCs are searching for solutions. The development of CATZOC information is under discussion in IHO DQWG.

Action 5: Chair to ask IHO what are the remaining items in INTOGIS -project phase II and what is the time schedule for them.

5. Baltic Sea INT-Scheme

Docs: BSICCWG6_5.1.4_New DE INT numbers

Docs: BSICCWG6_5.1.4b_New DE INT numbers_coordinates

Docs: BSICCWG6_5.1.7_New INT numbers_PL, SE

5.1 Status of New INT Charts/ need for new INT Numbers

5.1.1 Denmark

New INT numbers will be needed in the future. At least three new charts will be released in 2019-2020.

INT1301 (DK 101) will be published with new coordinates in 2019.

5.1.2 Estonia

Estonia does not need new INT numbers at the moment.

5.1.3 Finland

Finland does not need new INT numbers at the moment.

5.1.4 Germany

Germany had a presentation about the plans to reduce the data in their INT charts focusing only on the deeper areas with international traffic. They will reduce the data outside the main international traffic routes and will not depict information on shallower, less than 5 m waters. Charts in A1 format will cover all the German waters and German ENC's and national charts will include all necessary depth information even if the INT chart information is reduced.

Meeting discussed the benefits of giving up or reducing the information on INT charts and still producing national charts. Germany's view is also that this is the benefit of the mariners also since they do not have to do corrections to areas that are not relevant for international traffic.

There was a discussion about the need of a note where to find more information about the shallower waters. In Netherlands, they have already done this kind of data reducing on INT charts. In there, they have used a note in the charts instructing to use national charts on the areas with no data on the INT chart. The decision in Germany was not to include a note but to describe the use of the chart system at BSH web page.

There was some discussion about the different data content of INT charts and ENC's. Germany's view is that they only differ in areas not relevant for international traffic. BSH started to use the new given 16 INT numbers for charts where the scales and coverage have changed a lot.

5.1.5 Latvia



Latvia does not need new INT numbers in the near future.

5.1.6 Lithuania

Not attending.

5.1.7 Poland

Poland had a short presentation about their chart plans. At the moment there is no need for new INT numbers.

5.1.8 Russia

Not attending.

5.1.9 Sweden

No need for new INT numbers at the moment

There was a brief discussion when Germany could give up the production of charts 1303 and 1201 to Denmark and Sweden. There is no timetable for that yet.

5.2 Review of Baltic Sea INT Chart Scheme

Covered in 5.1

6. Baltic Sea sub-areas

Docs:

- [BSICCWG6_6.1_Baltic Sea areas](#)
- [BSICCWG6_6.1b_limits excel](#)
- [BSICCWG6_6.3 Names of the Baltic Sea Subareas](#)
- [BSICCWG6_6.4_Subareas_LV2](#)
- [BSICCWG6_6.5_SMA comments; limit between Region D-E](#)

6.1 Status of Sub-areas

Chair presented the issue. At the last BSICCWG5-meeting, the limits and names were mostly agreed. There were two limits that were still under discussion. The limit between South-Eastern Baltic and Central Baltic and the limit between charting regions D and E in Kattegat. Every member was satisfied with the coordinates apart from those to places.

6.2 Feedback from BSHC23

Chair explained that BSICCWG should first agree on these two limits and after that, the BSHC could approve the whole baggage.

6.3 Names of Baltic Sea subareas

Based on the feedback BSHC23 had decided that on the level 3 Middle Baltic will be changed to Central Baltic and on level 2 the name Central Baltic will be changed to Baltic proper.

6.4 Central Baltic and South-Eastern Baltic limit in LV side

Latvia presented the issue. The current suggested limit is splitting the Latvian Liepaja port and is therefore not very suitable. Latvia also informed about military practice areas that the limit should preferably avoid splitting. Latvia had three proposals for the limit. Latvia preferred the limit in the south, at the Lithuanian border, so that Latvian waters would be completely in the same subarea.

There was a discussion about how angled lines maybe bit too complicated for cartographical purposes. Straight lines with two coordinates were seen more preferable. Sweden preferred a straight line option at 56°35' N. Latvia will discuss this suggestion internally and will come back to this issue after the meeting.

Action 6: Latvia will discuss about straight line option at 56°35' N for the limit of the Central Baltic and South-Eastern Baltic and inform WG.

6.5 Proposal to move limit between charting Region E (Baltic Sea) and Region D (North Sea)

Chair presented the issue. Right before the last BSHC meeting Sweden had suggested moving the limit between Region E (Baltic Sea) and Region D (North Sea). BSHC had not had enough time to cover the issue so there was a need to clarify the issue in BSICCWG.

There was a general discussion about the limits of this area in different systems and how they differ. The purpose of the limit and the benefits of moving the limit was also discussed. There was an agreement that the limits should be as simple as possible.

Sweden presented the reasons why Swedish wishes to move the boundary. Denmark has no strong opinion about the issue. It was decided that Sweden will ask some more information from the Swedish office about the proposed limit and the discussion would continue the second day.

After receiving the extra information and arguments from Sweden (also post meeting arguments), the view was there is no reason not to have limit as Sweden proposes. Since Denmark or any other members had no objections or strong opinions about the limits.

After meeting Sweden has sent a paper with arguments to fix a limit between region E and D.

Action 7: Sweden to send the new proposal (with benefits) for the limit between charting Region E (Baltic Sea) and Region D (North Sea)

7. Status of IHO INT1

7.1 Future of IHO INT1

Chair presented the issue.

Germany presented the issue about giving up producing official English-version of INT1. Latest version of INT1 was produced 2018. Germany has informed that it will update it until the Assembly 2.

Instead of INT1 and paper chart-issues, Germany wants to focus on the S-100 and S-101 related issues because of limited resources. Germany is now searching for volunteering countries to take the challenge of producing the official INT1 besides France and Spain.

Chair emphasized that INT1 is not just about symbology but also about the data content of the charts. INT1 has been very important for HO's and we should have to find options how to continue this work.

There were no immediate volunteering members in the group to take the responsibility of producing INT1 but it was proposed, that all members should consider the issue at their offices.

Action 8: Member states to consider taking the responsibility of INT1 after Germany.

There was a discussion about US INT1 which also includes symbols for ECDIS
<https://nauticalcharts.noaa.gov/publications/docs/us-chart-1/ChartNo1.pdf>

DAY 2

8. Baltic Sea ENC-scheme

Docs:

- [BSICCW6_8.2_WENDWG9_Status report_ BSHC](#)

8.1 IHO ENC Catalogue [link to IHO ENC catalogue](#)

Chair had a presentation of the development version of the ENC catalogue from WEND.

8.2 WENDWG9_Status report BSHC

Chair presented the operation of the RENCs and the ENC data flow diagram.

https://www.iho.int/mtg_docs/com_wg/WEND/WENDWG_Repository/ENC%20FOLIO%20and%20DATA%20FLOW_v4.1-February2019.pdf

Chair presented the status of the ENC coverage in the Baltic Sea area. Chair explained the issue about overlaps and how it was agreed that something should be done with the overlaps.

8.3 Status of ENC Coverage in Baltic Sea. Review of Baltic Sea ENC –scheme

Chair presented the issue. Member states plans with the ENC scheme were reviewed. Chair explained that IHO wants that these schemes and plans are accepted in the BSHC commission like paper charts.

Latvia: Latvia will first finish the implementation of Caris HPD first and after that come back to this issue.

Estonia: No planned coverage changes

Sweden: No plans to extend to coverage. Sweden improves their ENCs by adding maritime boundaries to all new ENC editions and they are also improving the description of CATZOC.

Poland: Poland is still planning to extend approach and berthing coverage. On coastal scale, they are waiting fresh data from surveys.

Denmark: Denmark is planning new coastal cells as part of the Kattegat project. These cells are planned to come out within a year. Denmark has also produced many new harbor cells and more are coming this year.

Finland: Finland has plans to extend their coastal coverage but the schedule is not yet clear. No other coverage plans at the moment.

Germany: No changes in the Baltic Sea area.

8.4 List of Ports

Chair presented the issue. The List of Ports in the IHO ENC Coverage Catalogue and INTtoGIS will be upgraded in 2020. Meanwhile, its maintenance through the provision of new data or corrections by Member States is expected. The list of ports in Baltic Sea were shortly reviewed. It seems the list only contains major ports and not the smaller ones. Chair will clarify what is the criteria for the ports in the list. Then all members will update the list of catalog. The Chair will collect the updates from Baltic and forward to US, who is maintaining this information.

Chair reviewed the list of ports not covered by ENC and noted how this information is not accurate for example in the case of Pori Finland and Norrköping Sweden. In both of these cases, the port exists, but not in the city center. The ENC coverage covers the port but not the city center. This issue is under clarification.

Action 9: Chair to ask criteria on how the ports in the IHO ENC catalogue have been selected.

Action 10: After action #9 all members to update this list of ports and send updates to chair.

9. Gaps and overlaps in the Baltic Sea

Docs:

- BSICCW6_9.1_BSHC overlap report 2019_ WENDWG9
- BSICCW6_9.1b_IC ENC letter to BSHC
- BSICCW6_9.1c_BSHC overlap report_IC ENC 2019
- BSICCWG_9.2.3_Overlap FIEIJV2- RU400KM9 (example)

9.1 Gaps and overlaps analysis in Baltic Sea, by WENDWG9

Chair presented the issue and the background of IHO resolution 1/2018 and IHO CL 19/2018, which deal with the elimination of overlaps in ENC data.

Chair explained the issue with overlaps and why they are seen as a risk. There is no clear view on when an overlap is a navigational risk. But in Baltic Sea area the overlaps have not been generally seen as critical for navigation. Still the aim is to get rid of the overlaps all together.

After the overlap has been reported to member state, there is one-year time to react to the issue after which the issue will be reported from IHO to IMO. But in which cases this happens and when the overlap is seen as a navigational risk is not clear. Chair said regional commissions have pressure to report these overlaps even if they are not seen as risks.

Meeting discussed differences between two different lists; IC-ENC list and UKHO list. Chair informed that the list made by IC ENC contains overlaps only from states, that are members of IC- ENC.

9.2 Status of overlaps in Region E

There was a general agreement that those reported overlaps can be looked into and fixed whenever a new edition is released. Many of them were seen as technical issues and not navigationally significant. Overlaps should be solved bilaterally. There was a discussion on finding the right contact in Russia about this issue and how to correct these in co-operation.

It was agreed that every member-state will report the chair about the overlap cells reported in this list and what they will do with those overlaps (overlap by overlap), and consider if they are a risk or not.

Action 11: All members to report chair how they will manage with the reported overlaps.

- 9.2.1 Denmark
- 9.2.2 Estonia
- 9.2.3 Finland
- 9.2.4 Germany
- 9.2.5 Latvia
- 9.2.6 Lithuania
- 9.2.7 Poland

- 9.2.8 Russia
- 9.2.9 Sweden

[Link](#) to the WENDWG9 ENC coverage report.

10. Baltic Sea ENC Harmonisation Recommendations

Docs:

- BSICCWG6_10.1_Status of Baltic Sea ENC harmonization recommendations (2018)

In the last BSICCWG5 meeting in Gdansk 2017 it was agreed that there is no need to update these recommendation anymore. They have fulfilled their original purpose. In the future, new recommendations can be created and discussed related to the S-101 issues.

10.1 Status of ENC Harmonization Recommendations

Two updates; the recommendation number nine was marked green for Poland and recommendation number 13 was marked green from Denmark.

10.2 S-100 products- publication plans, review

There was a discussion about the plans of the member states with the S-100 products in the future. A common view was that a lot depends on the technology available at the time.

Sweden is in a strategic phase with S-100/S-101 products with not much concrete yet. Sweden is hoping for a regional concept with timeline and focus. Swedish view is that this is a larger change and not just an issue about conversion from S-57 to S-101. Converting and producing are different things.

Denmark is waiting what the future will bring. It will take few years until they will be able to create S-100/S-101 products.

Estonia has converted some S-57 products to S-101 products for Primar to test. They wish some guidance for the S-101 issues.

Germany is waiting for new version of CARIS and their solutions in S-101. There is a lot of work to fill all the data with new additional attributes in the new data model.

Latvia is waiting new updates from Caris and then see what are the possibilities of the software and after that think about the future plans and research the possibilities.

Poland is staying in touch with Caris and Primar and are waiting what happens.

Hans Engberg (SE) briefed some S-100 working group issues and S-100 concept.

There was a discussion on how BSICCWG as a working group can prepare for these new products. Is there a need for new harmonization recommendations or something else?

Swedish view was that there should be a strategic vision on what should be done and in what schedule. This should come from the commission and after that, these kind of working groups could be used for harmonization and coordination. It is however difficult for working groups to take tasks until they know what and when. Chair said a special kind of competence is needed for this work and in the next commission meeting, this should be considered.

It was also discussed that S-101 is still in test phase and things will be re-written in product specifications. Therefore, plans are not fixed.

10.3 S-100 need for harmonization recommendations in Baltic Sea?

There was discussion about the need of common strategy and recommendations from the BSHC commission. S-100 issues should be discussed at the BSHC and they could consider common strategy and recommendations. Also workshops or subgroups were suggested where specialist could meet and find a common ground about the issue.

Sweden was willing to make a paper for BSHC about the issue after discussions at the Swedish office.

11. Future work of BSICCWG

Chair reviewed some plans for the future tasks for the working group.

The future work of BSICCWG will consist:

- To test INTOGIS development phase II tools, and report back.
- To finalize all the limits, names and coordinates for Baltic Sea subareas.
- To put updating of INT charts (by INTOGIS tools) as permanent and continuous process in every member state.
- To review and monitor new INT Charts (IHO CL 64/2015).
- To develop and maintain INT charts for the Baltic Sea.
- To follow and coordinate all the planned new INT charts and the freezing numbers.
- To monitor and maintain ENC coverage in the Baltic Sea.
- To update a list of ports in Baltic.
- To analyze gaps and overlaps and report to BSHC and WENDWG.
- To review ENC harmonization recommendations connected to S-100 products.

12. Any Other Business

12.1 Status of BSCD2000 chart publication in member states

Estonia had a presentation about their BSCD2000 project. They started the project in 2018 with berthing and harbour ENCs and paper charts. Approach scales are planned to be released in 2020-2023.

Sweden started the project in 2015 from the north, where the land rise is high and their charts were quite old. They have tried to inform mariners and all the people who this issue might concern beforehand. However, when the charts have been released there have been confusion among users and some of the users have not understood the change. Spreading the information about the issue has been a huge challenge. Sweden has released 36 charts in the new chart datum and they have 81 left to do. Sweden has no exact time schedule when the project will be ready. They are now working on areas that require more work and time.

There was a discussion on how it is not easy to present on an ENC-cell, which areas are in what vertical reference system. Estonia is using M_NPUB object on ENC to depict the datum. Finland is planning the same.

In Germany, the change is so minimal that they are not changing the data just changing the datum. They do not know yet when they will start to use it.

In Denmark, the issue is the same as in Germany. It will not affect the charts.

In Poland, the difference is about 8 cm. They will inform all the necessary stakeholders about the issue and start to use the new datum maybe in 2020.

In Finland first new charts in BSCD2000 will be released 2020 according to plans. Finland will start the project from the north like Sweden did and advance to the south.

Latvia has no time schedule for this yet. They are in the middle of migration process with production system. They will first start the normal process with the new system and after that they will have time to focus on the new chart datum issues.

12.2 15 m and 30 m contours

Estonia was interested in other member's plans to include 15 m and 30 m contours in charts. Estonia has added 15 m contours to their charts since last year.

Latvia is using 15 m contour but not 30 m contour. They have not seen any need for 30 m contour though it is technically possible.

Germany is inserting 15 m and 30 m contours on to their new editions. They have them now in half of their charts.

Sweden in the past and present have had 15 and 40 m contour. In the future, they will have 15 m, 30 m, 50 m contours. Sweden have changed their contours in the same process as they are changing their chart datum. They are progressing from north to the south.

Denmark does not use 15 m contours and have no plans on inserting them in to their charts. Denmark does have 12 m and 17 m contours. At the moment they don't have 30 m contours but they see the benefits of the 30 m contour and will add them to their charts in Kattegat area at the same time they are harmonizing the data with Sweden.

In Poland 15 m contours have been in use to a long time. Poland is not using 30 m contours.

Finland has started to use 15 m contours. 30 m contours have also been considered, but there are no immediate plans on implementing those. Some old 30 m contours might exist in the old data.

Harmonization in general was seen as a good direction.

13. Review of actions

The new actions were reviewed.

14. Next meeting

BSICCWG welcomed the offer made by Germany to host the BSICCWG7 (11-12.11.2020) meeting in Rostock.

15. Closing of the meeting

Chair thanked the participants for the good and active meeting. Chair express special thanks for the hosts for the great hospitality and support provided to the meeting.

Meeting was closed at 15:30.