

Baltic Sea Hydrographic Commission

Strategic Correspondence Group

1st meeting

15 March 2023 13-15 CET

virtual remote meeting

MEETING MINUTES V1.1

1. Introduction

List of participants

Member states: Magnus Wallhagen (chair; SE), Jens Schröder-Fürstenberg (DE), Elizabeth Hagemann (DK), Hendrik Justus Stang (DK), Olavi Heinlo (EE; BSHC vice chair), Rainer Mustaniemi (FI; BSHC chair), Jurijus Gleikinas (LT), Jānis Krastiņš (LV), Aigars Gailis (LV), Witold Stasiak (PL)

Secretary: Benjamin Hell (SE)

Invited working group chairs: Jarmo Mäkinen (BSICCWG chair), Thomas Hammarklint (CDWG chair)

Not present: Johan von Bültzingslöwen (BSMSIWG chair)

Opening of the meeting

Magnus Wallhagen, chair (SE), opened the meeting and reminded the participants about the background of the BSHC Strategic Correspondence Group (SCG). Even though the decision to form this group already had been taken at BSHC26 1,5 years ago, due to the geopolitical situation the work has not commenced before now.

The meeting reviewed the agenda, which is based on the SCG ToR:

Document:

- *BSHC-SCG Terms of reference / rules of procedure*

Finland commented that due to the delay in the group's work, some details in the SCG's Rules of Procedure are now outdated. The meeting recognized that the group now should report to BSHC28 instead of BSHC27.

The SCG adopted the agenda.

2. RHC allocated Strategic Performance Indicators (SPI)

2.1. Agree upon SPI measurements as discussed at BSHC27

The SCG realised that the measurement of the SPIs has been implemented by the IHO Secretariat and also by means of the IGIF matrix, coordinated by IRCC and WENDWG.

Thereby further action from BSHC to contribute to the SPI measurements has been overtaken by events, and the chair suggested that there is no need to agree upon further measures for delivering SPIs directly from BSHC.

FI commented that there might be new needs coming with S-100 implementation, but for the time being the current measurements work well enough.

The SCG agreed that currently there is no need for action regarding the SPIs.

3. Gap analysis against IHO Strategic Plan

See Annex 1 of the agenda for compiled gap analysis performed early 2022

The chair considered that the gap analysis has been overtaken by events in the Council and that BSHC has a system in place to track the implementation of the IHO's strategic plan on a RHC level.

DE appreciated the questionnaire results and commented that they do not see any need for further action.

DK suggested to archive the document for the time being.

The SCG agreed to archiving the document until any future need for updates may arise.

4. Strategic guidance for regional S-100 implementation

See Annex 2 of the agenda for BSHC26 Actions

The chair briefly reminded the SCG about the decisions taken at BSHC26 and BSHC27. In principle this should imply updating the WGs ToR.

The chair suggested that endorsement by SCG correspondence of any changes to ToR and RoP should be enough for the WGs to commence their work according to the updated ToR, before final and formal approval by BSHC28 in autumn 2023.

The SCG agreed about the suggested procedure to implement WG's ToR and RoP changes.

DK raised the question whether there may be a need for changing names of any of the WGs, and whether S-102 responsibility alternatively could fall under the scope of the Monitoring Working Group. The chair explained that the BSHC decision was to task BSICCWG with S-102 implementation, but recognised that the situation may be different in the North Sea Hydrographic Commission.

4.1. BSICCWG ToR updates

In accordance with the decisions taken at BSHC26, Actions 18, 21 and 22, the SCG should suggest updates to the BSICCWG ToR.

The BSICCWG chair presented some considerations about the role of the WG with regard to S-100 implementation, partly also based on the outcome from the most recent WENDWG meeting. It is important to remember that the work of the International Charting Coordination Working Groups is based on IHO publication S-11 and its annexes. WENDWG will propose a new S-11 part A section, specific to S-100, to IRCC and HSSC/NCWG. For this, the WG chair suggested that BSHC might propose some input for WENDWG. The WG chair considered the WENDWG IGIF matrix as a good tool for following the S-100 implementation in the region. INT2GIS version 3 with S-100 support could become a valuable tool for the scheming of S-100 based products. The WG chair raised the question if there is a need for additional harmonisation guidelines for S-100 based products, in the same way as S-57 has been harmonized regionally. In general, the WG would appreciate more guidance on what S-100 implementation coordination means in practice.

The Chair asked DE (in the capacity of WENDWG “chair-elect”) whether this S-11 update is already due for the up-coming IRCC15 meeting. DE confirmed that the WENDWG action regards IRCC15.

DK asked whether overall S-100 coordination, alongside with S-101 and S-102 implementation coordination, could be too large a task for the ICC WGs in general and BSICCWG in particular. The chair answered that the existing structure with ICCWGs existing in each RHC certainly is a strength, but that the ICC WGs also need to be strengthened with additional S-100 competence by the hydrographic offices, e.g. the hydrographic offices’ internal S-100 coordinators.

EE commented that they also see a concern for overloading the BSICCWG. A solution could be to add additional S-100 competence, but that could make the WG potentially quite large.

FI seconded the concerns expressed by DK and EE and suggested as a solution to establish product specific Project Teams, particularly for S-102 implementation, under the BSICCWG.

DE pointed out that there are strict S-100 implementation deadlines towards IMO and that selected products need to be in place rather soon. Therefore, the prioritized first task should be to coordinate S-101 and S-102, not the full portfolio of other S-100 based products. Regional prioritization of what to produce is very important in this phase, e.g. based on traffic patterns or geographic areas. Then product coverage and product variety should be expanded one step at a time.

The BSHC chair agreed that a one-step-at-a-time approach would be wise. Not all products are equally complex to coordinate and S-101 should be the primary focus at the moment.

The BSICCWG chair commented that the current plan is to monitor the progress of S-101 implementation, to monitor production readiness in the MS, and to look into the question of S-101 ENC scheming. Project teams could be part of a solution. Another solution could be to appoint a dedicated person as S-100 coordinator for BSHC.

DE asked whether BSICCWG plans to collect input from the MS about their current status, or rather to guide MS in how to proceed and prioritize. The BSICCWG chair answered that in the beginning the WG would need an overview of the implementation status in the individual MS.

The chair suggested that the BSICCWG should submit a yearly S-100 regional implementation report to the BSHC Conference, in order to enable BSHC make informed prioritization decisions. For the next Conference, it would be enough with a S-101 and S-102 overview.

The BSHC chair (FI) reminded the SCG about the overall goal with regional harmonization, which is

primarily a seamless user experience and a seamless transition to S-100.

The SCG decided that:

- The SCG chair shall draft suggested updates to the BSICCWG ToR, to include overarching regional S-100 coordination, specific regional coordination of S-101 and S-102, and to present an annual report to BSHC.
- The draft shall be circulated with the BSICCWG and the BSHC chairs, before circulating them with the rest of the SCG for comments and, finally, endorsement.

Action 1: Chair to draft suggested updates to the BSICCWG ToR and to circulate them for comments and endorsement.

4.2. BSMSIWG ToR updates

The BSMSIWG chair was not able to participate in the SCG meeting, but the chair informed the meeting about a dialog with the BSMSIWG chair prior to the meeting. Based on these discussions, and in accordance with decisions taken at BSHC26 (Action 19), the chair suggested that the BSMSIWG ToR should be amended with a task to govern, coordinate and harmonize S-124 services in the Baltic Sea. The chair also mentioned that in the future, the WG could play a role in coordination of S-41x ice- and weather related products, as they are another part of MSI.

FI commented that for the weather related products, additional technical competence from other organisations would need to be involved in the WG, and highlighted that at present, S-124 should be the main priority of the WG.

EE commented that the MSIWG is the only WG which already has participation the meteorological community, and that competence should be readily available.

DK commented that there could be a need to change their national representatives in the group.

The chair answered that the current priority is S-124, which is part of phase 1 in the IHO S-100 Implementation Plan. Looking into weather related services would be a future step, as these products and services not even are included in phase 2 of the implementation plan and are under the WMO domain.

The SCG decided that:

- The SCG chair shall draft suggested updates to the BSMSIWG ToR, to include S-124 governance, coordination, and harmonisation.
- The draft shall be circulated with the BSMSIWG and the BSHC chairs, before circulating them with the rest of the SCG for comments and, finally, endorsement.

Action 2: Chair to draft suggested updates to the BSMSIWG ToR and to circulate them for comments and endorsement.

4.3. CDWG ToR updates

The CDWG chair informed the SCG that the CDWG has already drafted suggested changes to the group's ToR, which are based on the decisions taken at BSHC26 (Action 20) and will be discussed at their upcoming meeting in spring 2023. The WG has also discussed the potential overlap of regional

coordination in the BSHC CDWG and global coordination within the IHO TWCWG and wonders if this is efficient. The WG chair agreed that an annual report to BSHC is important, and that the WG will be happy to contribute to the S-100 coordination report.

The WG chair expressed a concern that many IHO MS are uncertain about how to implement the oceanographic products. One obstacle is that the HOs in many countries are not primarily responsible for the required base data, and therefore need to collaborate nationally before being able to harmonise their work regionally.

The chair answered that the primary focus of the IHO TWCWG lies on the technical product specifications themselves (S-104 and S-111), not so much the implementation of S-104 and S-111 products or services. Therefore, implementation could very well be the focus of the BSHC CDWG.

DK suggested that the BSHC should consider a name change for the CDWG, due to the fact that the scope of the WG has shifted and expanded. The WG chair agreed that the current name could be too narrow with regard to the wider tasks of the group. The WG will discuss this at their up-coming meeting.

FI agreed that the scope of the WG has broadened but reminded the meeting that the implementation of the Baltic Sea Chart Datum 2000 has not yet been finalized in the Baltic Sea. FI asked if the WG could reach out to the oceanographic communities in other MS, on order to expand the group's competence in this field.

The chair suggested to wait for the input from the WG until after their 14th meeting later in March 2023, and base a draft for amended ToR on the outcome of the discussions there and in the SCG.

The SCG decided that:

- The SCG chair shall draft suggested updates to the CDWG ToR, to include S-104 and S-111 governance, coordination, and harmonisation, based on the CDWGs own suggestions to be discussed at the CDWG14 meeting.
- The draft shall be circulated with the CDWG and the BSHC chairs, before circulating them with the rest of the SCG for comments and, finally, endorsement.

Action 3: Awaiting CDWG14, chair to draft suggested updates to the CDWG ToR and to circulate them for comments and endorsement.

4.4. Other WG ToR updates

The SCG agreed with the chair that currently there is no need to amend any other WG's ToR with regard to S-100 implementation.

BS-NSMSDIWG status and future

As a side-track, the chair raised the question about the status of the BS-NSMSDIWG, whether the group is still needed, or whether resources alternatively should be focused on the IHO MSDIWG instead. The question was raised in order to start an open discussion before any decisions could be taken by NSHC and BSHC.

DK confirmed that this is an on-going discussion also within the WG. The original purpose of the group originates from an era where HO primarily focused on its charting related duties and data for navigation. This is not any longer the current mind set of neither IHO, in terms of its strategic plan, nor that of most hydrographic offices. DK has no ambitions to chair the group in the future, but reported that Norway

may step up for this.

FI seconds SE and DK that they do not see a well-defined future purpose of the BS-NSMSDIWG.

Also DE expressed the same opinion, wondering what the concrete output of the group should be at present, and therefore having limited interest in the WG. It was underlined that national MSDIs are in place and that the EU countries have structured their national MSDIs under the INSPIRE directive. The participation of BSHC member states in the IHO MSDIWG seems to be adequate.

EE agreed and added that often the HOs are not responsible for the national MSDI infrastructures. There are enough challenges with S-100 implementation that focusing resources is important.

LV confirmed that they have the same view.

The SCG realised that any formal BSHC decision to close the WG would need to be taken at BSHC Conference level.

The chair suggested to report the essence of this discussion at the up-coming NSHC Conference, for information, which the SCG agreed upon. Furthermore, the SCG Chair should report to BSHC28 that the SCG has concluded to propose closing the BS-NSMSDIWG, as a BSHC WG. Depending on decisions taken at NSHC the WG might stay as a NSHC WG.

Action 4: Chair to inform NSHC about the BSHC internal discussions about the BS-NSMSDIWG at NSHC36.

Action 5: Chair to propose to BSHC 28 that the SCG recommends to close the BS-NSMSDIWG as a BSHC WG.

4.5. Procedure forward

As discussed in the beginning of agenda item 4, the SCG agreed that endorsement by SCG of proposed changes to ToR and RoP should be sufficient for the WGs to commence their work accordingly, pending final and formal approval by BSHC28 in autumn 2023.

5. Strategic plan for BSHC

5.1. Scope

5.2. Format

Due to time constraints, agenda items 5.1, regarding the scope of a BSHC strategic plan, and 5.2, regarding its format, were only briefly discussed at the meeting.

The SCG decided that the SCG chair, the BSHC chair, and the BSHC vice chair should discuss this further and set up another SCG meeting for this if needed.

Action 6: SCG chair to continue discussions with BSHC chair and vice chair on the scope and format of a BSHC strategic plan, and involve the SCG appropriately.

6. Continued SCG work

See decision under agenda item 5.

7. Any other business

n/a