
 Status of Baltic Sea ENC harmonisation recommendations

Explanation of the status classes

Status	Meaning	Example
<i>Completed</i>	Recommendation completed. No actions to BSHC members. No need to follow up any more. <i>[Previously noted as "Completed", "Done", "Adopted"?)</i>	Recommendation #14 has been completely done. Recommendation may be deleted in the Summary Table.
<i>Adopted</i>	Recommendation included in the ENC production process. <i>[Previously noted as "Done", "Adopted"?)</i>	Rec. #9: before releasing new cells or editions to check that there are no gaps or overlaps (over 5 m buffer)
<i>Partially Adopted</i>	Recommendation included partially in the ENC production process (e.g. for some scale ranges or some products). <i>[Previously noted as "On-going"?)</i>	Rec #3 implemented only for some scale ranges.
<i>Not applicable</i>	Recommendation not relevant to a MS or for the time being.	Rec #10 may be valid e.g. when S-101 is introduced into use
<i>Unclear</i>	No information available or information not clear.	No or unclear status information received from a MS.

Revised Draft Summary Table (based on the classification above)

Rec. #	Recommendation	Denmark	Estonia	Finland	Germany	Latvia	Lithuania	Poland	Russia	Sweden
#1	1a) Overview navigational purpose should be in harmony with other navigational purposes within the producers' portfolios. 1b) The Overview cell should be harmonised with adjacent cells in the North Sea.									
#2	The Harbour and Berthing navigational purposes should be in harmony with other navigational purposes within the producers' portfolios									
#3	On the Baltic Sea, the following values for the compilation scales should be used: General - 180,000; Coastal - 90,000; Approach - 22,000.									
#4	If a Hydrographic Office (HO) wants to use a compilation scale other than those recommended above, it may do so if all the following conditions are met: i) the value used is in line with the intention of the IHO CL 47/2004 ii) use of it is agreed bilaterally with neighbouring HO(s) concerned, in order to avoid inconsistencies at the border, and iii) every effort is made to minimise possible inconsistencies due to deviations from the recommended compilation scale.									
#5	BSHC should adopt the guidelines as stated in the Annex J.									
#6	6a) The BSEHWG proposes that the BSHC establishes a Working Group to study possibilities for Harmonisation of the Conveying and Presentation of Depth Information for both ENCs and paper charts. 6b) Meanwhile, if the IHO recommended contour intervals are not applicable, or if additional intervals									

Rec. #	Recommendation	Denmark	Estonia	Finland	Germany	Latvia	Lithuania	Poland	Russia	Sweden
	are needed, implementation should be agreed bilaterally/multilaterally so that possible inconsistencies to the mariners could be avoided.									
#7	All BSHC countries should ensure that bilateral agreements are in place with their neighbouring countries concerning harmonisation of features continuing/extending over national borders.									
#8	All BSHC countries should check and carry out harmonisation before launching updates or new editions of ENC.									
#9	All BSHC countries should check that there are no gaps between cells at national borders by establishing a buffer zone of up to 5 metres, if necessary.									
#10	The BSHC should agree on joint plans and time schedules for the adoption of new versions of ENC related standards (e.g. S-57 Ed. 3.1.1 or S-101).									
#11	The BSHC should agree on joint plans and a time schedule for the adoption of new object classes on their products.									
#12	12a) BSHC should encourage all countries to make further studies of the use of objects in the Baltic Sea ENCs and report to the following BSHC meeting. 12b) BSHC should decide on proper actions to ensure ENC consistency as far as possible.									
#13	If found necessary it is possible to deviate from the recommendations. When doing so, the relevant HO should make every effort to minimise the effect of any inconsistencies that may occur. This should be done through bilateral/multilateral agreements and through harmonisation of data in order to ensure that no serious disharmony is introduced to the ENCs.									
#14	BSHC should ask the IHO Committee on									

Rec. #	Recommendation	Denmark	Estonia	Finland	Germany	Latvia	Lithuania	Poland	Russia	Sweden
	Hydrographic Requirements for Information Systems (CHRIS) to consider appropriate actions to recommend other Regional Hydrographic Commissions (RHCs) to adopt regional implementations to IHO consistency recommendations within their sea areas.									
#15	All relevant bodies are encouraged to continue the education of mariners regarding 'ECDIS', 'ECS', 'ENC' and 'Electronic chart'.									
#16	All BSHC countries should follow the time schedule for the implementation of all relevant recommendations as stated in Annex L.									
#17	Reporting of the implementation of the recommendations									