

Baltic Sea International Charting Coordination Working Group (BSICCWG)

BSI CCWG Report to the BSHC 18th Conference

[29 August 2013]

The BSICCWG TORs and ROPs were agreed at the BSHC 15th Conference 2010. The paragraphs 2.6 and 3.10 of these request the BSICCWG to report annually to the BSHC at least the following issues:

- An updated Regional INT Chart Catalogue;
- An update of the ENC Catalogue relevant to the Region (if not undertaken by RENCs);
- Changes made to the scheme of INT Charts for the Region, approved by the BSICCWG since the last report, together with a summary of reasons;
- Changes made to the small / medium scale ENC scheme for the Region, approved by the BSICCWG since the last report, together with a summary of reasons;
- An updated Work Plan (if used).
- Status of BSEHWG Harmonisation recommendations.

1. Status of Work of BSI CCWG

Mr Jarmo Mäkinen has been acted as the Chair of the BSICCWG. *Mr Juha Korhonen* has acted as the secretary of BSICCWG. There have been no changes to the BSICCWG membership. The members are: *Ms. Berit Holse*, *Mr. Peter Ladegaard Sørensen* (Denmark), *Ms. Senta Selli* (Estonia), *Mr. Jarmo Mäkinen*, *Mr. Juha Korhonen* (Finland), *Ms. Sylvia Spohn* (Germany), *Mr. Mikus Ranka* (Latvia), *Mr. Viktoras Liylus*, *Ms. Ausra Milinskaite* (Lithuania), *Mr. Jacek Kijakowski* (Poland), *Mr. Victor Kovalenok* (Russia), *Mr. Magnus Wallhagen* (Sweden).

There has been no meeting since BSHC 17th Conference. The communication within the BSICCWG has been performed by BSICCWG Letters and e-mails. There have been delays of getting replies to BSICCHG letters and e-mails from some BSHCCWG Members. The Chair has communicated with the IHB, the Chair of CSPCWG and the Region D Coordinator.

The BSICCWG meeting in June 2011 endorsed the plans to develop the S-11 as a database based solution and gave some new proposals to the database structure and the interface be included in further developments. It also proposed that Baltic Sea may be used as one test area for the new system. This issue is linked to wider scope of IHO Metadata service. *Mr. Juha Korhonen* has had some discussions with the staff at IHB. However, a database for S-11 Part B Region E (Baltic Sea) is not yet available. BSICCWG reiterates its strong support to develop S-11 as a database based solution.

2. Updates to Baltic Sea INT Chart Catalogue S-11 Part B Region E

In February 2013 combined updates to the Edition e2.005 of S-11 Part B Region E (November 2011) has been forwarded to the IHB and asked these to be included in the updated version. Summary of these updates is in [Annex 1](#).

The BSICCWG has now 28 available free INT numbers. The BSICCWG Chair has asked within the BSICCWG Letter 1/2013 (28 June 2013) information of member states' needs for new INT numbers. Denmark and Finland have informed on their needs for new INT numbers, at least 17 new numbers. Details are shown in [Annex 2](#).

The Chair will point out that all available INT numbers for Region E are close to be allocated. Also the available numbers are scattered and does not form any logical blocks for new numbers. This issue was discussed earlier at BSHC 13 (2008 in Rostock) and as a temporary solution a block of numbers were moved from Region D to Region E. There are several possibilities to solve this issue: e.g. to allow 5 digit numbers where needed, or to add an area prefix in to the numbers (e.g. E-1025). (S-4 Section A-200 refers). The BSHC 18th Conference is invited to discuss on this issue and to take appropriate actions to solve it.

The Chair has communicated with the IHB and the Chair of CSPCWG on the issue of Lithuania to use INT numbers even if they are not yet a member of the IHO. After studying the relevant specifications the conclusion was that Lithuania should not use INT numbers until it enters to the IHO as a full member. However the S-11 Part B Region E has already a long time included some INT numbers also Lithuanian charts. This should be clarified in S-11, e.g. by a footnote.

3. Status of the implementation of BSHC ENC Harmonisation recommendations.

The BSICCWG Chair has sent the BSICCWG Letter 1/2013 (28 June 2013) and asked updates to the implementation of the BSHC ENC harmonisation recommendations. Most of the BSICCWG members have provided updates. The BSHC 17th Conference recommended developing a shorter summary report of the status of the BSHC ENC harmonisation recommendations. The BSICCWG Chairs has tried to interpret various replies into a summary table where different colours indicate the status. This first draft table is attached in [Annex 3](#). All are invited to study our evaluation and forward comments, corrections and additional information to this. The Conference may also consider if this kind of reporting is useful and if the recommendations need to be reviewed or focused.

The WEND-WG has identified some overlappings on the Baltic Sea ENC cells. The list of these overlappings has been distributed to the BSHC members. Many of these overlappings are already clarified or planned to be removed in future editions. The BSHC members were also asked to verify that their ENC harmonisation procedures are duly implemented to avoid this kind of inconsistencies in the future.

ENC catalogues are maintained by RENCs (IC-ENC and Primar).

4. Harmonising the limits and names of the subareas of the Baltic Sea

The BSHC 17th Conference in September 2012 discussed on the BSICCWG Chair's proposal of subdivision and names of the Baltic Sea. The Conference agreed that the main scope is safety of navigation and chart production. The proposed subdivision and names were quite widely endorsed by the Conference. After the BSHC 17th Conference we have received some further comments, e.g. Russian comments referring to their Chart Index. We have also noticed that there are quite many variations on practices to show sea areas and subareas on the titles of Baltic Sea INT charts published by BSHC members. The subareas and names are not consistent between the chart titles and S-

11 Part B region E (Baltic Sea) and there are variations in the subareas and names previous versions of S-23.

Based on considerations of the above issues and the feedback from BSHC and BSICCWG members the Chair has made an enhanced proposal (June 2013). This proposal includes three levels and minimum changes to S-23 Draft Edition 2002 taking into account current practises. This has forwarded within the BSICCWG Letter 1/2013 (28 June 2013) to BSHC and BSICCWG Members and asked their comments to this proposal. Replies received so far are collected in Annex 4.

As a conclusion of the replies it can be noted that most of the BSHC members are in favour to the proposal but some details need to be developed further.

The BSHC is asked to endorse in principle the proposed limits and names of the subareas of the Baltic Sea. It is also asked to give guidance to BSICCWG for further processing of the details and for preparing guidance for showing the names on the titles of nautical charts.

If needed, a Workshop or a BSICCWG meeting could be arranged (perhaps in early 2014).

5. Actions for the BSHC 18th Conference:

The BSHC 18th Conference is requested to

- note this Report
- take appropriate actions to solve the problem with limited amount of available INT numbers
- endorse in principle the proposed limits and names of the subareas of the Baltic Sea
- give guidance to BSICCWG for further processing the some details and for preparing guidance for presenting the names on the titles of nautical charts

Annexes:

1. Summary of updates to S-11
 2. Proposal for new INT numbers
 3. Status of BSHC ENC harmonisation recommendations
 4. Comments to the Proposal for Baltic Sea sub-areas and their names
-

Annex 1. Summary of updates to S-11 by BSICCWG 2013

Current version of S-11 Part B on IHO web site is E_e2.005, November 2011.

In February 2013 the BSICCWG Chair has forwarded updates to this version of S-11 Part B_Region to the IHB, but not yet included in a new version.

Summary of the forwarded updates is below.

<u>Denmark:</u>	[Updated printing schedules]
<u>Estonia:</u>	[No updates]
<u>Finland:</u>	[Updated printing schedules]
<u>Germany:</u>	[Updated printing schedules and printer nations]
<u>Latvia:</u>	[No updates]
<u>Lithuania</u>	[No updates]
<u>Poland:</u>	[Updated printing schedule]
<u>Russia:</u>	[Updated printing schedules]
<u>Sweden:</u>	[Updated printing schedules, some detail changes]
<u>Region D.</u>	[Updated printing schedules for printer nations]

A new query of further updates is planned to be initiated when the above mentioned updates have been included into the S-11.

Annex 2. Proposals for new INT numbers

The following numbers or amount of requested numbers are forwarded by the BSICCWG members by August 2013.

Denmark: Expect to apply for a change in the chart coverage and scale for Danish Chart 134 INT 1334 as well as a new INT chart covering the harbour of Copenhagen

Estonia: No new INT numbers needed.

Finland: At least 16 new INT numbers needed.

Germany: No new INT numbers needed.

Latvia:

Lithuania note regarding INT numbering that INT 1279 is not in use, but probably should be marked as reserved.

Poland: -

Russia:

Sweden: *We only have two amendments, which you also will find in the attached pdf.*
- INT 1025 (SE 4) is now IN USE. It is the new chart at scale 1:500 000 covering Bottenviken.
- INT 1227 (SE 719) should be changed to RESERVED. This chart is not produced yet.

Sweden does not estimate any new needs for INT numbers in the near future.

Regarding future needs for new INT numbers in the Baltic Sea I suggest that we propose to extend the numbers of digits from four to five digits. This will allow us to have similar numbers as we already have.

Annex 3.

Draft Summary status report of the implementation of the BSHC ENC harmonisation Recommendations 2008, by August 2013

This draft evaluation is based on the replies and information received to the BSICCWG Letter by 28 August 2013.

All are invited to review and check this evaluation and forward their comments, corrections or additional information on their status.

Legend:

	Implemented
	On-going
	Partially implemented
	Not implemented
	Not applicable for a country or for time being
	Status unclear
	No information received

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.									

Rec. #	Recommendation	Denmark	Estonia	Finland	Germany	Latvia	Lithuania	Poland	Russia	Sweden
#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.	Green	Yellow	Light Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Light Blue	Green
#5	BSHC should adopt the guidelines as stated in the Annex J.	Green	Green	Light Green	Light Blue	Green	Green	Green	Light Blue	Green
#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 ENC's and paper charts. 6b) Meanwhile, if the IHO recommended contour intervals are not applicable, or if additional intervals are needed, implementation should be agreed bilaterally/multilaterally so that possible inconsistencies to the mariners could be avoided.	Light Blue	Light Blue	Light Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Light Blue	Green
#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.	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green
#8	All BSHC countries should check and carry out harmonisation before launching updates or new editions of ENC's.	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green
#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.	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Yellow	Yellow	Green	Green
#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).	Grey	Grey	Grey	Grey	Grey	Grey	Grey	Grey	Grey

Rec. #	Recommendation	Denmark	Estonia	Finland	Germany	Latvia	Lithuania	Poland	Russia	Sweden
#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 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									

Annex 4: Replies to the proposal for Baltic Sea sub-areas and their names
(as in BSICCWG Letter 1/2013)

Denmark: Do you believe that this proposal is feasible and acceptable? YES
Especially are the proposed levels, subareas and names acceptable? YES

If the recommendations are approved then we support if there is a need for a workshop.

Estonia:

Finland:

Germany: For our responsible area we can accept the new naming solution and the 3 levels.

To comment further, it should be the case of Estonia to decide Väinämeri as part of the Gulf of Riga or not. Perhaps this can help: I have found in the old German publication "Die Grenzen der Ozeane und ihrer Nebenmeere" of May 1939 that the Gulf of Riga also includes Moon Sound (today northern part of Väinämeri).

You have already mentioned that a user could be confused by the use of the terms "Central Baltic" and "Baltic - Central" for different unities. My proposal is to use Central Baltic (Sea) only once, probably in level 3, and have no further term for the remaining area in level 2 (in the last proposal: Central Baltic Sea). According to S-23 Draft 2002 there are comparable examples for the North Atlantic Ocean, e.g. at page 1-1.

Latvia:

Lithuania

Poland: HOPN approves the current proposition (June 2013) of harmonization of Baltic Sea subareas and names connected with S-23 Draft Edition 2002.

Moreover, we agree, that the proposed names: Baltic – Central and Central Baltic Sea are too similar. Central Baltic Sea may be replaced with e.g. Middle Part of Baltic Sea or Main Part of Baltic Sea.

Russia:

Sweden: We do not have any specific comments at the moment. If accepted by the other BSHC counties we are most happy to accept this proposal even if it is, as you comment yourself, a bit unfortunate with the level 3 name Baltic Central and the level 2 name Central Baltic Sea. I do really hope that we are successful with this proposal at the BSHC18 meeting, and many thanks' to you for pushing this complicated issue forward.