



INTERNATIONAL HYDROGRAPHIC ORGANIZATION MESO AMERICAN  
& CARIBBEAN SEA HYDROGRAPHIC COMMISSION



Minutes of the 9<sup>th</sup> Meeting – Niterói, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil, Oct 9<sup>th</sup> 10<sup>th</sup>

Summary

1	Opening	3
2	Approval of the Agenda	5
3	Review Action Items from the VIII <sup>th</sup> MACHC Conference	5
4	IHO Matters	7
5	Report of the VI <sup>th</sup> IHO Capacity Building Committee Meeting and 20082009 Work Plan S55 publication update Report on WEND Committee Report of IHO TSMAD Marine Environmental Protection Task Group Report of IHO HCIWWG	12
6	National Reports Barbados, Brazil, Colombia, Cuba, France, Guatemala, Honduras, The Netherlands, Suriname, United Kingdom, United States of America, Report on ISPWG Activities and Status	25
7	Report by Electronic Chart Committee ECC Task Group 1 ECC Task Group 2 Report by the International Chart Committee	34
8	Report on MACHC Forum	44
9	Report on MACHC Statutes revision, including Region Limits change	44
10	Report on MACHC Council Representation, including Hydrographic Interest..	48
11	MACHC Relationships with others organizations	49
12	Date and Venue for the X <sup>th</sup> MACHC Meeting	52
13	Election of Chairman and ViceChairman	53
14	List of Actions with deadlines and assigned lead	53
15	Any Other Business	54
16	Outgoing Chairman Words	54
17	Official Closing of the IX <sup>th</sup> MACHC Meeting	54
18	Annex: Amendments to the Statutes	56

## 1. Opening

Captain Wesley Cavalleiro (Brazil) welcomed the participants and explained that a simultaneous translation ~~took~~ would take place throughout the meeting from Spanish to English and viceversa.

He introduced Captain Antonio Garcez and explained to the participants that Captain Garcez was representing Admiral Palmer, the Brazilian Director of Hydrography and Navigation, who could not be present at the meeting. He let them know that Captain Garcez would justify Admiral Palmer's absence at the appropriate time.

He then informed the Chairman that they were ready to begin the meeting.

Words of the Chairman – Rear Admiral José J. Ocaña García (Mexico) greeted all the participants attending the meeting and expressed his gratitude to the Brazilian Directorate of Hydrography and Navigation for the beautiful facilities, the great logistic support, the structure and the organization they have been provided with in order for them to successfully hold that 9th MACHC Conference. He then highlighted the following points:

- At these times of global change, both economically and climatically, the current scientific achievements offer us an opportunity to learn more about what is going on around us.

- Within this context, the cooperation between countries shall perform a crucial role for the fluent exchange of knowledge.

- "As Hydrographic Authorities in our respective countries, we are responsible for the safe navigation of the ships that sail the national waters of our countries."

- During the current MACHC conference, the participation of the member states is expected so that agreements can be reached and the necessary decisions can be made in order to make for the best conditions for the safe navigation within the region.

- Technological development and globalization have prompted us to struggle to keep on improving our hydrographic capacity, promoting the standardization of our procedures and techniques in order for us to be able to produce NAVAIDS and cartographic items which will help the mariners who sail the waters of the region to feel safe.

- The creation of new routes which are safe and always respectful of the marine environment has been contributing for the achievement of this purpose.

- At the present meeting, we will be discussing several issues which should be thoroughly analyzed by all the participants in order for us to reach agreements and make decisions which will benefit the whole region.

- "I am grateful for the presence of all the member states of this commission and I hope that this conference proves to be a great way to strengthen cooperation and friendship ties among our nations. Thank you!"

He then invited the participants to listen to a word of welcome from Captain Antonio Fernando Garcez Faria on behalf of ViceAdmiral Luiz Fernando Palmer Fonseca, Director of Hydrography and Navigation of what he described as "this beautiful country, Brazil".

Captain Antonio Fernando Garcez Faria (Brazil) greeted the participants and justified Admiral Palmer's absence. He informed the participants that unfortunately Admiral Palmer could not attend the opening ceremony due to the fact that his mother had passed away. He remarked that Admiral Palmer would hopefully be able to join them the following day for the official photo of the event. He then started reading the following speech on behalf of ViceAdmiral Luiz Fernando Palmer Fonseca from Brazil:

*"Honorable Chairman, Delegates, Representatives of the International Hydrographic Bureau and Observers,*

*Welcome to the 9th Meeting of the Meso-American and Caribbean Sea Hydrographic Commission, MACHC.*

*The Directorate of Hydrography and Navigation welcomes you all to Brazil and wishes that your stay here can be pleasant and productive.*

*The Hydrographic Service is delighted to host another meeting of this highly respected organ which is in charge of coordinating the issuing of International Electronic Navigation Charts and mutual capacity building support.*

*We feel greatly honored to hold the 9th Meeting of the MACHC. We are aware of the challenge faced by the member states of the International Hydrographic Organization to render*

*excellent service to the International Maritime Community in order to contribute to the safety and security of human life at sea as well as the preservation of the environment.*

*I believe we have a great challenge ahead of us these two days. Nevertheless, we are aware of the fact that the IHO needs some power planning, some mutual support for the development, as well as a great cooperative spirit associated with the formulation of resolutions so that the work developed by this commission can be relevant and useful to the maritime community. We would like to highlight one more time our delight in hosting this meeting and we want to assure you that DHM shall be doing whatever is possible in order to make you feel at home.*

*We have the necessary infrastructure for a successful development of the task we intend to accomplish and we wish that this short stay in the Brazilian land can prove to be pleasantly memorable. Thank you very much!"*

Words of the Director of the International Hydrographic Bureau, Captain (Chile) Hugo Gorziglia Antolín – He pronounced the following speech:

*“Thank you Mr. Chairman! Rear-Admiral José Jesus Ocaña Garcia, Chairman of MACHC, members of MACHC, Observers, Ladies and Gentlemen.*

*th*

*It is a great pleasure for me to represent the IHB at this 9<sup>th</sup> Meeting of MACHC. From the IHB, I have been following with great interest the developments of this regional hydrographic commission as well as the development of other four commissions.*

*It is very interesting to learn that there are several matters of common interest to welcome issues but, at the same time, each regional hydrographic commission has its own and very particular characteristics.*

*MACHC has on board some very well developed hydrographic offices, some developed hydrographic offices, some developing hydrographic offices and also, belonging to the MACHC area of coordination, there are countries with no hydrographic infrastructure at all. This particular situation constitutes a real challenge for MACHC and, on the other hand, a justification for its existence.*

*The geographic area that MACHC shall coordinate constitutes, together with the South West Pacific Small Island States, the East, South and West Africa Coast and some areas in the East Asia, the least developed areas according to S-55 Status of Hydrographic Surveys and Nautical Charting. This situation, if recognized and accepted, shall constitute the rationality of an increased level of cooperation and collaboration among its members. The route is not easy, but from the IHB side, we believe it worth that you all do your best to identify viable actions aiming at achieving progress in hydrography, nautical cartography and marine safety information.*

*I would like to recall a couple of aims that MACHC has:*

*-To promote technical cooperation and training in the domain of hydrographic survey,*

*marine cartography and nautical information. Are you doing so? And, if so, are you getting results? If no, what is going wrong? Let us analyze another aim: -To stimulate all countries of the region. I repeat, to stimulate **all** countries of the region to expand their hydrographic activities and to encourage them to seek advice and technical assistance from IHB and other organizations in order to strengthen their hydrographic capabilities.*

*Same questions as before: Are you doing so? And, if so, are you getting results? If no, what is going wrong? And the third one, in order not to go through all the aims and objectives of MACHC: -To implement the INT Chart Scheme for the region and to monitor its suitability.*

*I prefer not to ask any questions at this time. I would like to stress the importance of your deliberations and the agreements you might reach. Do not be too ambitious, but be realistic! Do not consider more than what is viable! And whatever activity you commit to, consider it with great responsibility and seek support from the IHB, if necessary, to achieve those*

*agreements.*

*As you might be aware, starting first of January, 2009, the IHO will start working with a new structure. And I will report on some details at a later stage during this meeting. But, at this time, I want to stress that the new scenario will be much more dependent on the work of the Regional Hydrographic Commissions. Chairmen of all Regional Hydrographic Commissions collectively will have a say at the Interregional Coordination Committee and therefore, the position of Chairman and the guidance of the Regional Hydrographic Commission to its Chairman are of crucial importance for the achievement of IHO missions and objectives.*

*MACHC has a heavy agenda and I do not want to take more of your valuable time. But before finalizing, let me reiterate that the IHB is always ready and willing to help Regional Hydrographic Commissions to develop their work programs. Mr. Chairman, Members of MACHC, please, do not hesitate to contact us at anytime you feel it necessary. I wish you a productive meeting! Thank you very much!"*

The Chairman opened the floor to Captain Wesley Cavalheiro to provide some administrative directions.

## 2. Approval of the Agenda

Following the Program, the Chairman remarked that all the participants had received the Agenda of the conference and asked participants to, either bring up comments or observations of issues that they wanted to rectify or add to the contents of the program, or just raise their hands in approval of the contents of the Agenda.

Ms. Kathryn Ries (USA) suggested a small change for the agenda of the morning of the following day and highlighted the following points:

-We are scheduled to have reports from the Electronic Chart Committee as well as the International Chart Committee at nine o' clock a.m. the following day.

-We have an hour and a half for those reports.

-It is a pleasure that we have the director of the Gulf of Honduras Project with us at that meeting, Mr. Edas Muñoz Galleano.

-It would be very important if he could present to the group a status report of that project.

-The MACHC has been very engaged in supporting that regional project which is supported by the countries of Guatemala, Belize and Honduras and Hydrographic Capacity Building is a part of that project.

-It would likely be of great interest to all there to receive the latest update of what is happening overall with that project and as it relates to the MACHC participation in it.

She then proposed that they allowed that presentation during that time frame the following day.

The Chairman remarked that Ms. Kathryn Ries' proposal was reasonable and relevant and suggested that it be approved unless somebody should come up with a better proposal.

Once none of the participants came up with a different proposal, the Chairman pointed out that they would work on the changes and that they would communicate the adjustments to the agenda early in the morning the following day.

Ms. Kathryn Ries remarked that she could work on the adjustments to the agenda with Captain Wesley Cavalheiro and the Chairman agreed with it.

The Chairman asked the participants whether they had any other questions or wanted to make any other comments about the Agenda.

Colonel Eloy Luís Alum Ortíz (Cuba) asked whether it would be possible to postpone Cuba's national report to the following day and his requested was granted by the assembly.

### 3. Review Action Items from the VIII<sup>th</sup> MACHC Conference

The Chairman highlighted that the following point of the agenda was to review action items from the 8<sup>th</sup> MACHC. He then urged the assembly to be very specific and restricted to the agenda items discussed during the 8<sup>th</sup> MACHC Conference.

He informed the assembly that Captain Wesley was going to present the review of those actions.

Captain Wesley Cavalheiro pointed out to the participants that they had a paper version of the list of actions (MACHC.904) from the 8<sup>th</sup> MACHC Conference and they would be projected on the screen as well. He then advised that he would go over them one at a time. He started reading the document and making the following comments:

- Action 1): it will be discussed in an agenda item the following day.
- Action 2): it has been carried out and it will be reported as an agenda item the following day.
- Action 3): it has been carried out and it will be reported as an agenda item the following day.
- Action 4): it has been carried out and it will be reported as an agenda item the following day.

He also remarked that all the items which had been mentioned could be found in the CD they had received that morning.

– Action 5): initially, Venezuela was in charge of those activities and, for some internal matters, Mexico temporarily took over the task. He also proposed to discuss it in a specific agenda item that afternoon.

- Action 6): it has been carried out and that it will be reported as an agenda item during the meeting.
- Action 7): it has been carried out.
- Action 8): the status of that action was not known (INT Charts at 1/1 million will be displayed in PDF format in

the MACHC Web site.). Ms. Kathryn Ries commented:

Very few countries have sent the PDFs of their charts so there are not many posted.

*“Just as a reminder, the reason this has been suggested was not as a way to distribute the charts but only for countries who are interested to have an idea of what the chart looks like and then they could contact the producer country”.*

We would like to encourage the countries to supply the PDF format of their relevant charts and we will make sure they get posted.

The information is to be sent to the website address of Percy Pacheco who is the web administrator. Captain Wesley thanked Ms. Kathryn Ries for the information and asked the assembly for comments or suggestions on the issue. Having no comments, he then proposed to go back to that subject the following day. He remarked that they would discuss that issue during the INT Chart Committee discussion that day and reinforce it. – Action 9): Ms. Kathryn Ries commented that the US and the UK had had a discussion about that issue (INT Charts 4017 and 4021 production) during the morning meetings and the item would be addressed in their reports the following day. – Action 10): it has been carried out. He remarked that it had been discussed that morning and that it would be brought up for the final approval of the assembly the following day. – Action 11): Ms. Kathryn Ries mentioned that those changes had been made and added that they had not been sent out by email, they had been posted to the MACHC website. Capt. Wesley remarked that it had been thoroughly accomplished. Ms. Kathryn Ries agreed with Captain Wesley Cavalheiro, that they had been thoroughly accomplished and that, as it indicated, they had been merely expanded to include greater detail about the responsibilities of the Chair, the ViceChair, the Technical Coordinator and so forth. – Action 12): it does not have any information on the status of that action (Mexican pilot project to include the

private sector in the production of ENC's) and asks for information about it. Ms. Kathryn Ries commented:

This was a pilot project that Mexico had undertaken to coproduce a chart with the private sector to see if that might be a viable option for increasing the production of electronic navigation charts.

She does not know the status of that, whether that chart has been completed yet.

*“I would defer to Mexico. I just do not know the status. Possibly it is still underway”.* Rear-

Admiral José Jesus Ocaña García (Mexico) stated the following:

As far as that chart is concerned, they really do not know about the outcome of it; however, they have commitments with the UK for the production of ENC's".

They have had problems with their data and their validation by the UK so that they can commercialize them.

He believes, in the case of the first chart, it must be in the same situation.

"I hope that tomorrow we will have a clear and concrete report of the status of this chart". –

Action 13): it was remarked that they had not been talking about the very last WEND meeting but the 2008 WEND meeting. He stated that it had been carried out by the USA and Brazil. He said that they were there and the correspondent report would be presented during the Conference. – Action 14): the

ENC Committee was invited to comment about the situation of that action (ENC scheme information is up to date on the IHO Web). Ms. Kathryn Ries reported that they had addressed it in their meeting that morning quite extensively and they would discuss that in their summary report the following day. –

Action 15): it has been carried out. – Action 16): The status of that action was not known (circulate by e-mail the proposal to establish a stakeholder advisory group to member states). It was Mexico's responsibility. It was asked about it and it was found out that it had

not been accomplished yet. It was suggested that they should decide whether they keep or withdraw that decision. Ms. Kathryn Ries asked Mr. Rafael Ponce whether he still had an electronic version of the proposal for that stakeholder advisory group to the MACHC for the private sector to post to the website and he told her that he did. She then highlighted the following points:

If that proposal is still available electronically, they could post it for comments.

Perhaps, it could be printed and circulated here.

They could decide either to resolve it or establish a time to make a decision.

She asked whether it would be possible to get a copy of the file and then get some copies made to circulate.

She suggested that they could talk about it later on the agenda. Captain Wesley Cavalheiro remarked that they might be able to have the copies made during lunch time and then, discuss it after lunch.

Ms. Kathryn Ries supported Captain Wesley Cavalheiro's suggestion and highlighted the following points about action number 15:

They did update the website to try to better distinguish the electronic charts scheme from the International Chart Scheme but they had not received any comments until that moment.

She would again just ask the member states to take a look at the website to make sure that it looks accurate and, in case of inconsistencies, to kindly let her know or Percy Pacheco, their website administrator.

They want to make sure that it is as up to date as possible.

Probably, with the discussion they just had in the two committees for international charts and electronic charts there are already going to need to be some updates.

They could ask the countries to look at it later. The Decisions agreed during the discussions on this Agenda item were: – Mexico will report on the results of the Mexican pilot project to include the private sector in the production of ENC's (MACHC 8, Action 12). – MS to evaluate and to comment on the Proposal to Establish a Stakeholder Advisory Group to Member States (MACHC 8, Action 16). If no comments are received, then the proposal shall be accepted and the Advisory Group of the Commission is established. (Alternative: to include at one of the Committees ToR). – It was decided that the documents of the Commission would be posted only at the Commission website managed by NOAA. MACHC Forum must be used only for the discussion of specific topics.

The web site manager and the IHB must work to ensure that the documents posted at the IHO site do not include current documents in progress.

After that Captain Wesley Cavalheiro remarked that they had finished up with the review of

## MACHC 8 List of Actions.

### 4. IHO Matters

The Chairman passed to the next Agenda item which was “IHO Matters”, which would be presented by the IHB Director Captain Hugo Gorziglia.

Captain Hugo Gorziglia highlighted the following points:

- He would like to make a comment on the MACHC webpage.
- They have a new layout of IHO webpage in which for each regional hydrographic commission, they have a standardized way to keep member states informed.
- They have experienced a little problem with the MACHC website, the address outside their domain.
- The MACHC website under the control of a specialist is kept very well updated but if they are not informed, then they cannot keep the same information in their layout format in the IHO website.
- *“The only solution for that is just to erase everything of MACHC in the IHO website and just put a connection to the MACHC website that lies in somewhere else’s places”.*
- Today there is duplication, so outsiders can go to the IHO website and search for MACHC and they get one piece of information and they will go and click the MACHC website and they will get another piece of information.

He inquires the participants about the solution to this problem and he points out the following:

- It is probably something that you would like to decide and inform the IHB.
- *“One action could be to just leave, whenever you want to refer to MACHC, please click here and full stop. And then, it would be something very easy for us because we will not have to worry about any concern from the users and we will not have to do any work extra because everything is being done by your site”.*
- *“We are not criticizing the work that has been done. On the contrary, it would be great that each regional cartographic commission could keep their website updated in that way”.*
- *“We have to avoid duplication since this duplication is providing different information to the audience”.*

Ms. Kathryn Ries remarked that she thought that was an excellent solution if the IHB was comfortable to just have a link to their website directly and to not have to have the Bureau worry about keeping a separate site updated. She proposed that if they were agreeable they could just resolve it that way.

Mr. Christopher Smith (UK) sympathized with the IHB Director and highlighted the following points: – In fact, they themselves got very confused in looking at some of the papers for that meeting because there was a difference between the MACHC website and the IHO website.

– Equally, the new forum which they are setting out, they have to be very careful that they do not introduce duplication and understand where the correct information should be; whether it should be on the form or whether it should be on the standard website or on the IHO website.

– *“Otherwise I can see that more confusion will come about in future time”.*

Captain Antonio Fernando Garcez Faria (Brazil) highlighted the following:

– *“We do agree that the best would be just to have a link and this way, we can all be sure that all the information”.* – *“It does not matter where you get in. It can be through the web IHO, webpage or the MACHC, you are going to go to the same place and you are going to get the same documents, the same information”.*

– That would be the easiest way.

The Chairman, RearAdmiral José Jesus Ocaña García, asked the assembly to consider Captain Gorziglia’s proposal as well as Captain Antonio’s proposal. He closed the meeting session stating that they could proceed to lunch while they waited for the confirmation of the time the official photograph would be taken.

The 2<sup>nd</sup> Session begun with IHB representative, Capt (Chile) Hugo Gorziglia continuing his

presentation. He thanked the Chairman for the opportunity and said the following:

*“There are several issues from IHB that I would like to share with the members of MACHC. One of them is the ratification process of the protocol of amendment to the IHO Convention.*

*You are aware that in 2005, the IHO Conference agreed on changes to the Convention but the procedure includes the ratification process by Member States. So far, there are twenty Member States that have ratified this protocol and they are Denmark, Germany, Morocco, Cyprus, Norway, Pakistan, Republic of Korea, Japan, Sweden, Mexico, the UK, Cuba, Estonia, Australia, Tunisia, the Netherlands, France, Finland, Latvia and Spain, being Spain the number twenty in the order, just ratified this protocol in June 2008. Since 2008, no other member state has submitted its ratification to the government of Monaco.*

*Member States are eighty. So, fifty-four ratifications are needed to have this protocol put in place. So, the new structure, the big new structure to establish a council today is a little bit far in the horizon, but that does not mean that the regional hydrographic commission should take that issue on board because the time will come when regions should have a representative to the council.*

*Now, I would like to pass to other items, mainly those related to the IMO, the International Maritime Organization, the development of carriage requirements for ECDIS and the IHO Online Catalogues are two subjects that I would like to refer to.*

*At the last NAV Meeting, NAV-54, it was noted with interest that the update of the information provided by the IHO on the availability of ENC's and on the development of the IHO Online Catalogue of available official charts. With regard to the availability of them, we need to keep in mind that the IHO adopted decision 2 at the last International Hydrographic Conference. This decision refers to this subject and I quote:*

*“Member States should adhere and comply with the WEND principles in order for the IHO to reach Member States and the regional and worldwide bodies in which they come together to achieve adequate coverage, availability, consistency and quality of ENC's by 2010”.*

*That looks to be a very ambitious plan, a very ambitious aim, but, of course, this refers to a list of main ports and main routes and an assessment was made by the IHB with all IHO Member States to see how they were in relation to this matter. And, with that information (IMO has been informed), and therefore, that helped to establish within the IMO the carriage requirements that would enter in force by the time that, hopefully, these ENC's would be available.*

*The online catalogue is aimed at providing a clear picture of the availability of ENC's. It stresses the importance to progress in the production of ENC's. But production is not sufficient; making consistent and reliable ENC's available to the user is the key, as well as keeping these charts updated. There are several ENC's that have been produced; but, unfortunately, they have not been made available yet due to different concerns by IHO Member States. But, we are progressing in that line and the catalogue contains mainly those ENC's that are made available through the RENC's and that information is almost automatically loaded into the catalogue. Producers of ENC's that do not distribute ENC's through the RENC's are encouraged to provide the relevant information to the IHB in order to load the coverage of their charts in this catalogue. IHB attempts to show information on the ENC coverage as updated as possible. Therefore, IHOs are invited from time to time to review the information provided and update or provide advice to amend in case there is any mistake or error in our catalogue.*

*Another issue that I would like to say a few words is with regard to the IHO structure: As you might be aware, IHO will put in place a new structure starting first of January, 2009. This is the first step and this is the structure that can be achieved without requiring the convention to be ratified, the protocol to be ratified. So, there is structuring that can be made with the existing regulation. Two main committees' structures will concentrate, on one side, almost all technical matters in the so-called Hydrographic Services and Standards committee and, almost all matters requiring a regional approach, in the so-called Interregional Coordination Committee. The Hydrographic Services and Standards Committee is coordinating its internal structure, work and its first meeting and, as soon as this coordination is finalized, it will be made known to the IHO Member States. It is expected that this information will be made available after the CHRIS meeting that will take place in November 2008. With regard to the Interregional Coordination Committee, this will integrate the Regional Hydrographic Commission's Chairman, the Chairman of ACA, which is the Antarctic Commission on Antarctica, the CPRNW, which*

is the Commission on the Promulgation of Radio Navigational Warnings. The GEBCO guiding committee, the International Advisory Board on Standards and some matters that today are being dealt by the WEND group. The first meeting of this committee will take place immediately after the 4<sup>th</sup> Extraordinary Hydrographic Conference that will take place in Monaco in June 2009. It is

th  
expected that this meeting will take place on Friday, the 5<sup>th</sup> of June. The draft agenda for this first meeting has been circulated to all Chairmen of the Regional Hydrographic Commissions and the other mentioned groups. I would like to emphasize that the chairman of MACHC is a member of this International Interregional Coordination Committee. So, it is expected that the chairman of MACHC will attend this meeting.

Another piece of information that I would like to share with you is: Some changes to the GEBCO structure. GEBCO stands for the General Bathymetric Charts of the Ocean. This is a joint project between IHO and IOC. We work with IOC in order to put the Terms of Reference and the Rules of Procedures of the GEBCO Guiding Committee and its two Sub-Committees, the undersea Feature Names and the Technical Sub-Committee on Ocean Mapping in line with the same layout of the Terms of Reference and Rules of Procedures of the other IHO groups. That was finally accepted after four years. This was agreed by IHO Member States. After having achieved that agreement by Member States, this was submitted to the IOC, the Intergovernmental Oceanographic Commission that approved this new structure and Terms of Reference and Rules of Procedures in their last executive council that took place in June 2008. So, our aim is that as the new committees will start on the first of January, the GEBCO group will start as well with this new structure in 2009. It will probably start as soon as they meet and they will meet in September, these three groups, the committees and the sub-committees in Brest, France as a normal meeting but that will be the starting point with this new structure. We expect that with this new structure, GEBCO will be much more in line with the objectives of IOC and IHO and, of course, GEBCO will be as good as IHO and IOC instruct them to be and provide them a good interrelation.

Another matter that I would like to share with you refers to the Capacity Building Officer. At the last conference it was agreed, (after a proposal submitted by one of the Member States, the UK) to request the capacity building committee that, in consultation with the Regional Hydrographic Commissions, to consider the allocation of a person that could take over the responsibilities and the continuity of the regions' capacity building efforts. It was felt that it was needed, absolutely needed to have someone in charge of keeping an eye and having the follow-up responsibilities of what is going on at a regional level with regard to the capacity building matters. The Capacity Building Committee examined this situation. Clearly, it was not very appropriate, not very realistic, that each Regional Hydrographic Commission will hire or will pay somebody to tackle this activity but on a voluntary basis and those Regional Hydrographic Commissions that would feel that it was important for them to have this position, of course they should be able to do it. So, it was a proposal to modify one of the administrative resolutions of the IHO and the worry for it was, where capacity building is required in a region, the Regional Hydrographic Commissions are recommended to establish an internal body to deal with capacity building matters and to designate a focal point to ensure continuity in the capacity building process.

I will not read all the text, but that is the general concept. So there is a clear indication of the IHO, a clear recommendation for the regions to identify a person to have this responsibility, focal point and to have an internal body to discuss capacity building matters. That was approved by the Member States and that administrative resolution entered in force.

Another subject that I would like to share with you refers to the "World Hydrography Day". This year the World Hydrography Day was dedicated to capacity building issues and we have identified that for 2009 the topic for that would be protecting the marine environment, so the relationship between Hydrography and protecting the marine environment. That is the main subject and, of course, each Hydrographic Office or each region might wish to take on board this idea, do something collectively, independently, etc.

Considering that the World Hydrography Day is on the 21<sup>st</sup> of June and considering that in

th  
June 2009 the 4<sup>th</sup> Extraordinary Hydrographic Conference will take place, the IHB Directing Committee has suggested to its Member States that it could be an opportunity that the 4<sup>th</sup> Extraordinary Hydrographic Conference could be used as a gathering to celebrate. Of course, it will not be on the 21<sup>st</sup>

*of June, but it will be in June. Why not to take advantage of the presence of all Hydrographers in Monaco to celebrate the World Hydrography Day a little bit anticipated but to place emphasis on the importance of Hydrography and the protection of the marine environment. The idea is to allocate one afternoon on this topic and to have three speakers; probably somebody from the Atomic Energy Laboratory of Marine Environment, that is in Monaco, downstairs of the IHO; probably, somebody from the government of Monaco and, probably, somebody from one of our Hydrographic Offices. So, we are trying to build up this because we think that it is very important and it is in line with the change of the structure of the organization that has placed emphasis not just on Hydrography associated to safety to navigation but the importance of having hydrography in the protection of the marine environment issue.*

*Some other very important news that is particularly very important to this Regional Hydrographic Commission is that the government of Haiti has approached the Directing Committee, high officials of the government have paid visit to the Monaco government and have paid visit to IHB. This initiative has been progressing the conversations that we have started and Haiti has submitted to the government of Monaco a request to join the IHO and has requested the IHB to organize a very first technical visit to Haiti. That technical visit will be made by me in two weeks' time and it will be great that if this issue of Haiti and the whole support that Haiti might need to establish, if you could provide me some information. So as not just to arrive to Haiti and say, "Really, you will have to start doing almost from zero", but it would be good if I can manage some intentions from MACHC and some intentions from particular Member States of MACHC on the willingness to support further technical and specific visits to Haiti aiming at developing the basic for hydrographic infrastructure.*

*I have two more points. I have tried to highlight just those which you are not aware of in detail. One of them is about the International Hydrographic Review. The International Hydrographic Review has been a publication ever since the organization exists. At one point, the International Hydrographic Review was given to editor to manage that and the financial situation for the review was no longer sustainable. You can imagine that, the International Hydrographic Review, the copies printed were about six hundred. So, it was not a good business for anybody at all compared with the nine thousand of the Hydro International. So, really, it was absolutely difficult for the publisher to continue this responsibility. It was not in the spirit of the Directing Committee to suggest IHO Member States to put more money in order to continue making this review in the private sector. So, we proposed IHO Member States that we will move into the International Hydrographic Review to a digital publication that will be issued twice a year through the IHO Website; that we will have, for the first two years, the former editor of the International Hydrographic Review, that is Mr. Adam Care, he will continue working with IHB for these purposes. After those two years, we will make a selection of volunteers that would like to take the position of editor but we thought that it was good to take advantage of the experience of Adam Care at the very initial step of this transitional period from the paper work into the digital work and we are aiming at (and the resources are still available) producing a printed collection of all the articles that will have the first and the second edition a year but only for Member States' use. We are not thinking of taking advertisements and this and that because it is not the objective of IHB and we do not have the human resources to have a company aside or within the IHB to manage this. The point that I would like to make concerning the International Hydrographic Review is that, if we want to keep this publication alive, no matter whether it is in a digital form, we need the contribution of the Member States. We need contribution from the hydrographic industry not present here, we need information and we will establish procedures on how we are going to work. So, Thursday and Friday next week, I will have a meeting with Adam Care and we will review what the existing procedures are today for submitting papers and we will make the proper amendments in order to make it updated and that will be circulated to Member States to facilitate the process of bringing documents to the editor and for posting them in the International Hydrographic Review in its new format.*

*And the last topic, there is no circular letter yet on this, it is that the International Maritime Academy that existed in Trieste no longer exists. Nevertheless, big efforts have been made by the Italian government with the Italian Hydrographic Office and with the Italian Merchant Marine and they have established a Maritime Academy in Genoa. That Italian Maritime Academy will have a section that will be the International Maritime Academy and the first Coordination Meeting between the IHB, the Hydrographic Institute of Italy and the Academy will take place on*

*th*

*the 28of October. There, we are going to be able to assess what the situation is; what the*

*options we have are; and how we can use these facilities and how this could help us in trying to achieve what the former IMO used to provide. This constitutes some very good news but we have not been able yet at the IHB to produce something about it. Before that meeting takes place, it will be really too premature to think what will happen. No, we want to be absolutely clear in order to avoid interpretations. So, this is some very good news because many Central American States and Small Islands States used to benefit from IMO and if this academy really will do the same, I think we will have some very good help and training in our Capacity Building Process”.*

He finished his speech offering to answer the participants’ questions and remarked that he would be there that entire day as well as the following day in case they wanted to talk to him about what he had just finished saying.

The Chairman asked the assembly whether they were interested in asking Captain Hugo Gorziglia questions about what he had just said.

Captain Steve Barnum (USA) said he just would like to pass on the information that the United States Senate had ratified the articles and it had been sent to the State Department. He then remarked that it was under review and it should be cleared the White House soon. He said they expected it would be taking place within a month.

Captain Wesley Cavaleiro (Brazil) presented a doubt regarding the ratification process: when it was decided in 2005, IHO did not have at that time eighty Member States; but seventytwo Member States at that time. The question ~~is was~~ what ~~is the~~ necessary number of voting Member States was to approve the amendments the percentage of at that time of the 3<sup>rd</sup> EIHC or the current updated number of Member States?

Captain Hugo Gorziglia responded this issue was put to the Legal Expert Committee. “This Committee had two views but in general, after discussing themselves, it seems that it will prevail that according to other practices in the international arena that should affect all the members that exist at any time. So, in that case, if tomorrow we have ten more members, that ratification will affect the newcomers so the newcomers should have a saying in their protocolar ratification”.

Mrs. Meg Danley (USA) asked the following question: “When the new structure goes into effect next year, will that just be the committees or will it also include like the Industry Advisory Group and some of the other ancillary groups that were established in the ISPWG process?”

Capt. Hugo Gorziglia responded the following: “On the 1<sup>st</sup> of January, 2009, IHO will have these two groups that he had referred to and the internal actual existing bodies will have to be accommodated. For example, really, the Standards and Services, what today is CHRIS. CHRIS is already dealing with all of these industry things but as far as how they are going to organize that, those details will be considered at the first meeting of the HSSC. The same thing happens, for example, with the IRCC. The first meeting will play a key role in identifying how the working procedures will be. There are many things that require the consent of the participants of the committees on how the committees will work. So, whatever exists today, will have room in the new structure”.

The Decision reached during the discussions on this Agenda item was: –  
MACHC Member States are invited to provide IHB information regarding a possible support to Haiti to develop a hydrographic infrastructure.

The Chairman closed the discussion on this Item and invited participants to a coffeebreak.

## 5. Report of the VI<sup>th</sup> IHO Capacity Building Committee Meeting and 20082009 Work Plan

The Chairman opened the floor to Captain Wesley Cavaleiro (Brazil) in order to present the Report on the VI<sup>th</sup> IHO Capacity Building Committee Meeting. He read MACHC.905CBC.pdf document and opened the discussion on the status and the future of MACHC CBC. 7<sup>th</sup> MACHC elected a Chairman –

Venezuela – which, for internal reasons, couldn't continue the work. By letter, the Chairman announced this matter should be discussed at this meeting and there should be need to review Terms of Reference and to decide about MACHC CB Work Plan.

After the presentation, the Chairman opened to participants' comments and suggestions.

Colonel Eloy Ortiz (Cuba) make some comments about what Captain Wesley Cavaleiro report, expressing he believe it was good. Even though it looked complete, an impasse had been reached due to time restrictions to the validity of the decisions made concerning the training courses to be held in 2010 and 2011. Once it had already been previously decided, he proposed MACHC should take advantage of the fact that it was written in the document and vote for the confirmation of these dates. *"I am talking about 2009, about the countries which are applying to sent representatives to those events. I would like to inform the presidency that we are interested in submitting the application of a candidate to attend one of those events in 2009 or 2010 because those who will be attending these events in 2008, have already been defined. I think there should be an annex sent to the countries informing them of the procedures and requirements for participation in the events so that we could plan and send representatives to attend them. Cuba would like to receive further information on the support that would be given to the people attending these events as well as how many could attend them. I realize that these courses are important and we are very interested in learning a little more about them, if it is possible."*

Captain Wesley replied he thought MACHC couldn't change the order of priorities. *"First of all, we must set up a Capacity Building Committee here. This Committee must discuss a Work Plan; appoint a Chairman and this Chairman shall help the Chairman of the Commission on the procedures for selecting potential applicants for each of these events. If we start discussing details here such as who will attend them or who will not attend them, then a Committee will be unnecessary; we can discuss all the details here. I understand that the Commission is to play a managerial role in this process, and the Chairman of the Committee should be in charge of the logistical and operational details."*

Captain Hugo Gorziglia took the floor explaining:

*"I would like to help in this process. How does the Capacity Building Committee work?"*

*As you know, it is one of the latest (oldest) committees formed by the IHO. So, it started developing while we were walking and now we are running and we still need to develop procedures. So, one of the main activities turned at the last meeting of the CBC was the identification and development of five procedures:*

*Procedures on what the CBC expects from the Regional Hydrographic Commissions in terms of initiative, projects or whatever you want to call it.*

*What should be the criteria or elements that the Chairman or the Commission should take on board to select among all the initiatives, sort the priorities and pass on that information to the CBC.*

*How the CBC will take all the information provided by Region 1, 2, 3, 4, 5. How to merge this and have a clear and transparent procedure for selection? Well, all those 5 procedures are ready except for one that is the assessment because we do not want just to provide Capacity Building but we want to know a feedback from the regions on if really what the IHO is providing to the regions and to the countries is producing results. All of this is in the process of being developed and I think that before the end of the year, all of these five procedures will be circulated or posted in our Webpage. Now, that is one thing!*

*For the time being, of course we cannot stop because I imagine that we started walking and now we are running and the lion is behind us; so, we have to run quickly because there is a lot of pressure and there are a lot of needs and there is a lot of money not being used. An example of this is what Wesley has indicated, "there was allocation of resources to be spent this year and the resources are there and the commissions are not reacting". I am not accusing this commission of not taking action. It is just a general thing of all the commissions that are in need. They are not taking action; they are not taking advantage of the allocation of resources made by the Capacity Building Committee. In the framework of the Capacity Building Committee, it is analyzed without this procedure already in place because we do not have them; it is analyzed with the best of our knowledge and we choose the priorities, for example, we identify that if we are going to have a top multibeam workshop in Brazil as an initiative of one country, one region, why not use that opportunity for the neighboring regions? Especially if they all speak nearly the same language. Probably, it is an advantage and we are trying to do that in other regions as well. That is one point!*

*The other thing is that when we finalize this process and we identify and we assess what has been done in the year. Let's say in the meeting in June or May of 2008, we assess what was the progress of the achievement of the program of 2008. Of course, we have run just half of the year at that time. Were we successful? We did something? We need to take some action? We need to include other activities? We need to delete some other activities? So, in the middle of the year we are able to adjust according to the circumstances but also we look for the following year program and that is why in the Capacity Building Committee we assess the achievement of the actual plan and we come up with a work program for the following year. And we communicate with the Chairmen of all the regions what the situation is and what the view is of the Capacity Building Committee with regard to their initiatives and they say, "well, according to us, activity number one for 2008 was done, fantastic! Please, let us know your report; activity two, we do not know, we have no news at all; activity three, we know it will take place in November and we are quite happy that has been scheduled that way, full stop. For 2009, this is what the Capacity Building Committee has anticipated and I will quote what it is for this region; that was the information passed to the region. 30,000 Euros to fund the attendance of ten students, course free, lodging, meals, except travel and pocket money from the following Regional Hydrographic Commissions: Southeast Atlantic, MACHC and Southeast Pacific. The IHB will coordinate this activity with the course provider and the host country, Brazil. So, the goal that was in the middle of the field has been already kicked. Now, it is up to Brazil and the IHB to start moving things, but the parameters, the general parameters for how many people we are thinking about is ...*

*The second initiative was Chart Production and ENC training course. Day to be determined, 2009 in Brazil. 20,000 Euros to fund the attendance of twelve students from the following Regional Hydrographic Commissions: the three of the Americas. Per diem, lodging and partial travel and for experts, we have reserved 5,000 of those 20,000 Euros in order to ensure that we are going to be able to count on some experts.*

*If in the fighting for organizing all of this, experts come because they are provided by one of the Hydrographic Offices for free, that is fantastic! If those experts are provided by the Hydrographic Industry for free, it is fantastic! Then, those 5,000 will be used to have, instead of 12 students, probably to have, 14, or 15, or 16 students. So, we have to be a little flexible as well. The host country, Brazil, will coordinate this activity with the support of the IHB. Selection of participants will be made by IHB in conjunction with the Regional Hydrographic Commissions' Chairmen. So, in the absence of these procedures that I have indicated, we have so far provided, we think, some basic information that can be used in order to consider and take advantage of this possibility. Thank you, Mr. Chairman!"*

*Captain Wesley commented: "Just to add some comments, we have the total here of 120,000 Euros approved to be used next year and we are not able to use it. It was a challenge to approve it! I was there and the USA representative also. It was a challenge because we have a great dispute there. Just for your knowledge, in order for us to be able to have it approved, it was necessary to quit some programs for the East Asia Hydrographic Commission which is the major sponsor of the CBC and they are not very comfortable with this situation. Now, if we do not use these resources, it will be damaging to our reputation. We have to take this subject very seriously. Then, we have to elect our Chairman; we have to elect a committee; Terms of Reference; we have to define a Work Plan stating what our needs are; we have to decide about the Hydrography and Cartography Basic Training Course, if we will keep up with it or not. In case we decide to keep up with it, we have to plan on how we are going to handle it. We have to send a letter to CBC explaining what is happening. Then, please, let us do something! Haiti has required some help. They are in Phase 1. Haiti is one of the members of MACHC, what shall we do? Thank you, Mr. Chairman!"*

*Mrs Kathryn Ries (USA) asked for a clarification: "In the earlier action list, there was action number five which is relevant to this discussion. It reads that there was a letter sent by the MACHC Chairman updating MACHC members on the status of the Capacity Building Committee in requesting nominations for a new Chair. Were there any responses to that letter? The reason I am asking is that we had established the Capacity Building Chair and a Committee in the past that for a variety of reasons, just has not functioned and it seems to me that this is always the case. If we could even identify one focal point for our commission as a beginning, there is someone who could begin to develop that plan with some support but I think we have to take small steps but that is why I am asking. Were there any nominations in response to that letter? To see if there is anyone who is even would be willing to consider becoming that focal point to the commission."*

Mr. Chris Smith (UK): *“Mr. Chairman, I understand there is also an organizational question still on the floor: How do we maintain proper communication within MACHC for Capacity Building matters? I think we can fully agree about the importance to be successful on Capacity Building and, as Captain Gorziglia already introduced, the magnitude of Capacity Building programs necessary in this region. I would like to propose to mandate the Chairman of MACHC in the future with all the duties as described in the Terms of Reference for our Internal Capacity Building Committee to mandate the Chair of MACHC with this duty because all the primary we have discussed about Capacity Building is so much the focal point of this audience and I would like to see the MACHC Chair very much involved with these important matters. One of the positive side effects is that it is also easy for internal communications to write circular letters on behalf of MACHC, just to make sure that this type of communication is a proper one. So, I only contribute to our organizational question to mandate the Chair of MACHC in the future with all the duties as described in the Terms of Reference for Capacity Building, especially in this phase where we now start building our capacity in this region. Thank you!”*

MACHC Chairman, in response to this concern, acknowledged this administrative failure *“Without considering the causes which have made for them to take place. However, I commit myself from now on, to be more careful concerning the control of the External Issues Department of the Directorate of Hydrography of the Marine Secretariat which represent the Mexican government. We consider that within a week’s time after the end of this meeting, we are going to communicate with all Member States in order to express the knowledge and intent of the Capacity Building Committee to accomplish the necessary corrections and actions so that it can effectively work. I do not know if it resolves the issue.”* Any comments? Any other questions?

LtCmdr Ángel Reyes (Cuba): *“I believe that the intervention you have made is of great importance to all of us because it will enable us to put two things together: Act within the MACHC Capacity Building policy and at the same time make for the employment of available resources within the region. In order to carry out these projects, some technical experience within the area is required. Developing projects, such as those planned for the area of Ibero-America from the United Nations Development Programme and the like, require a clear vision. The toughest obstacle faced by most countries when planning Capacity Building Training is lack of resources. I believe that, currently, our greatest advantage is that we possess those resources. I would propose to the assembly that Cuba would be willing to cooperate with you in the presidency of this Committee. Thank you very much!”*

MACHC Chairman: *“It seems like a consideration and a proposal that we who also represent a government from one of the Americas for this type of activity should carefully consider. I believe that the idea of teaming up in order to solve this issue of lack of coordination, lack of management so that we can reach our targets is very positive. However, I would like to say that again, that we must issue an official notice to all Member States of our intentions, of our response to this proposal, within the first or the second week after we have arrived back home.”*

Captain Antonio Garcez Faria (Brazil): *“I would just like to raise one more point that was as a recommended action to encourage one of the Member States to run for the election for the CBC Chairmanship. This was one of the suggestions. Most of the courses which have been approved during the last meeting in June, we presented as members of the Southwest Atlantic Commission between Brazil, Uruguay and Argentina. And the idea for all of these courses being held in Brazil has come about specifically so that it can help the Southwest and the MACHC Region. So, for this upcoming workshop on Multibeam which shall be taking place at the end of November, we have been putting it up and we are paying part of the expenses of the experts in order to maximize the money invested by the IHO. So, for 2008, of course, it is closed but for 2009 I think we should not miss the opportunity of coordinating efforts and sending and putting as many people as we can here. So, in that regard, I think it is really important to be very active not only among us all but also at the IHO and trying to get funds for our region. Thank you, Mr. Chairman!”*

Having no more comments, The Chairman interrupted the session for a coffee time.

The Decisions reached during the discussions on this Agenda item were: –  
MACHC Chairman will take the responsibility of the Commission Capacity

Building matters, which includes a five (5) years work plan and to represent the Commission at the IHO CBC. – MACHC Chairman shall reply Venezuela asking conformation of the interest to promote the Hydro Cart course in March 2009 and to request IHO CBC to make the resources available for this event.

#### S55 publication update

After the coffee break the Chairman reconvened the meeting and informed the assembly that Captain Wesley Cavalheiro was going to speak about the status of the Charts of the S55 publication.

Captain Wesley Cavalheiro (Brazil) informed the participants that the importance of the S55 publication had been steadily growing within the IHO Community. He then highlighted the following points:

- The IHO Strategic Plan has established some performance indicators, some of which will be based on S55;
- Most of the criteria regarding IHO decisionmaking processes and the accomplishment of tasks shall be based on S55; and
- Regarding IHO CBC, Captain Gorziglia talked about procedures, some of the procedures are evaluating procedures of the projects and one of the components is S55.

Also, he gave the participants an overview of the S55 publication. He highlighted the following points:

- It is a publication which contains basic information about Maritime Security, Hydrography and Cartography developed by each Hydrographic Service;
- Whatever is accomplished, whatever is not accomplished, whatever updates are required and so on. All of it comprises the S55 publication; and
- It is a real challenge to keep the S55 publication uptodate.

He urged each of the Hydrographic Services comprising the Commission to help keep the S55 publication uptodate.

He then warned the participants that, in case they did not fulfill their duties concerning the updating of the S55 publication, they might jeopardize their participation in the IHO Community as well as within the IHO Work Programs.

He closed his words making himself available to answer any questions or clear up any doubts the participants might have.

The Chairman asked the participants whether they had any questions or comments to make about what had been said by Captain Wesley Cavalheiro

Mr. Erwin Wormgoor (The Netherlands) highlighted the following point concerning the S55 publication: as far as the S55 publication is concerned, there have been Member States of the MACHC which have not provided any figures about their performance in the last three or five years. He then requested the Chairman to urge MACHC Members to, at least, fill in the figures they are supposed to.

He justified his request stating that, if MACHC Members did not provide the figures about their performance, it would be extremely hard to maintain focus on capacity building issues without being able to prove them based on the S55 status.

He also questioned whether the IMO had been auditing the IHO community to find out if they had been achieving the paper chart equivalent with their ENC production.

He concluded, remarking that, another reason why the S55 publication performed such a key role was due to the fact that, according to MACHC statutes, the S55 publication was the document supposed to present a rough overview of the current status of ENC production.

The Chairman urged the assembly to consider the comments made as well as the request for the provision of consistent statistical data for the update of the status of the S55 publication.

Captain Hugo Gorziglia (IHB) made the following comments regarding the S55 publication:

- Participants are to be aware of the existence of a voluntary IMO Member States Audit Scheme;
- There are some very easy questions in the referred Audit Scheme such as: Are you a member of IHO?
- The questions put by IMO to the Coastal States in the SOLAS Regulations 4 and 9 are the same

questions as those included in the S55 publication; and

– At the end of the day, each Maritime Country that would like to follow that voluntary IMO Audit Scheme, shall be forced to fill in a sort of data form, as it is today in the S55 publication.

He then warned the countries which had not provided or had not made the effort to assess their own status that, whenever a system is initially placed on a voluntary basis, it ultimately becomes a procedure.

He declared that the IMO Members, who were not willing to join that voluntary Audit Scheme, would be placed in a different group, the group of nonaudited countries.

He remarked that, eventually, there were going to be two distinct groups of Member States within the IMO, the audited and the nonaudited members.

He pointed out that being counted within the group of nonaudited members could prove to be a very complex scenario for some maritime states which are unwilling to would submit to the IMO Audit Scheme which, presently, is voluntary.

He finally remarked that he wondered what would happen concerning that subject in the years to come.

Mr. Chris Smith (UK) remarked that, even though he was not quite sure, he believed the subject had been recently brought up during the WEND Committee Meeting that the voluntary IMO Audit Scheme was going to start being mandatory as of 2010.

Captain Antonio Fernando Garcez Faria (Brazil) suggested that an item should be included in the national report for MACHC, indicating the date of the last review of the S55 Publication Status. He defended that it would be an easy way to get Member States to comply with the procedures.

He remarked that when Member States had to fill out their national reports, they would come across the following item there: “Date of the last update of the S55 Publication”. They would have to fill it out at least once a year.

He informed the assembly that Brazil was going to go through “the IMO special” the second semester of 2009 and pointed out that he was not aware of the fact that the voluntary IMO Audit Scheme was going to become mandatory as of 2012.

He proposed that including an extra item in the national reports to be submitted prior to the MACHC Meetings would be easy to accomplish.

The Chairman remarked that he was in favor of the proposal made by the Brazilian delegate if the assembly agreed with it and said that the presidency would be in charge of officially communicating the proposal prior to the MACHC Meeting. He then asked for the input of the assembly on the issue.

Captain Hugo Gorziglia (IHB) reminded the participants that the IHO had already agreed on a standard format for the reporting from each member to their proper Regional Hydrographic Commission and highlighted the following:

- There is a special item referring to the S55 Publication;
- The issue seems to have already been properly regulated; and
- There should be no other action to be taken except urging the Member States to comply with the regulations which they have already agreed upon.

The Chairman asked the assembly to consider the proposal made by the Hydrography Director, Captain Hugo Gorziglia and highlighted the following points:

- The issue that was being discussed expressed a general concern of the assembly; and
- Despite the fact that further measures to regulate the issue were not necessary, the presidency was going to urge MACHC Member States to provide their respective data in order for the S55 Publication to be updated.

He then announced the following item in the agenda which was a report on the 11<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the Wend Committee.

The Decision agreed during the discussions on this Agenda item was:

- MACHC Members should provide update information to IHO S55 publication and update it at least once a year, reporting this action at the National Report.

Report on WEND Committee

Mrs. Meg Danley (USA) presented the subject and highlighted the following points:

- The 11<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the WEND Committee was held in Tokyo, Japan, from the 1<sup>st</sup> to the 5<sup>th</sup> of September, 2008;
- Two days of the meeting were also the ECDIS Stakeholders' Forum; and
- There was also one day dedicated to the IHO Strategic Planning Work Group.

She pointed out that the report she was presenting was going to be focused on two main topics of discussion from the WEND Committee:

- 1 – Revision to the WEND Principles; and
- 2 – The Transition of WEND to the New Structure and to the Interregional Coordination Committee.

She then highlighted the following points:

- In June 2008, IMO NAV Subcommittee decided to recommend mandatory carriage requirement of ECDIS by SOLAS vessels by 2012;
- Over the past several years the IHO has repeatedly assured the IMO that there will be adequate ENC coverage in time to meet this deadline;
- There has been a lot of concern not only about the gaps in coverage for ENCs but also about the quality of the ENCs that have been produced and are being produced;
- The WEND Committee's role is to recommend ways to address this issue and to ensure coverage and consistency on the ENCs; and
- At the meeting, the requirements for compliance with WEND were discussed in some detail.

She then highlighted the following points:

- Coastal States are responsible to meet the obligations of SOLAS V Regulation 9 which mandates that all contracting governments of the IMO are responsible for producing ENCs in their waters;
- ENCs must conform to IHO and IMO Standards in order to be considered part of the WEND;
- Capacity building is strongly encouraged to assist developing countries with producing charts and also making sure that the production of these charts is carried out in a quality manner;
- To ensure the countries have cartographic capability that can meet IHO standards before they start producing ENCs;
- To ensure that ENCs are available through the wide strand of end user services which is intended as through a RENC;
- The WEND Committee is composed of national Hydrographers of the IHO Member States and the Committee meets annually. However, in 2004 it was decided that there was a need to continue the work of the Committee in between these annual sessions and to provide preparations for the annual meeting to make it more useful. To this end, a WEND Task Group was formed. The membership has been very limited. It has been an IHO Director, the UK which represented the ICENC, France representing PRIMAR and then Germany has been the Chair of it;
- This task group was set up to speed up the work between the sessions and to look at the specific issues and develop an agenda where the specific issues could be addressed;
- In June of 2008, the WEND Task Group held a meeting looking at some significant issues related to ENC development. This included:
  - a) ENC consistency;
  - b) Consistency between ENCs;
  - c) Consistency between the ENCs and the paper charts; and
  - d) Overlapping data – which, of course, occurs on paper charts and paper charts have often been used, are usually used, as the basis for ENCs, but overlapping is not allowed in ENCs – It is becoming a major problem and then, of course, the gaps in coverage worldwide.
- In response to this, the Task Group decided to review the WEND Principles and to provide some clarification on the principles and some additional guidance to the Member States to assist in the resolution of the issues that have been identified;
- The members of the WEND Committee reviewed these Revised Principles and there were some concerns expressed about the principles and some of the language in them;
- As a result, it was decided that the original WEND principles would be retained; including the Guidance, Appendix A of the old principles and that a new document, that are guidelines for the WEND Principles was composed and adopted by the WEND Committee. This document provides more information on the way to address the WEND principles when producing ENCs and also suggestions on alternatives for producing ENCs when a Member State is not able to accomplish it by itself;
- The guidelines in the WEND Principles address the four elements:

- a) Responsibilities of Coastal States;
- b) Reference Standards and Implementation toward the harmonization and uniform implementation of the IHO Standards and insuring that the ENC's and the WEND requirements for consistency and quality are widely distributed;
- c) Capacity Building and Cooperation; and
- d) The Integrated Services (The RENCs).

– In the end, the Committee decided not to change the principles but to retain these guidelines and also publish this guidance for the WEND principles to hopefully help Member States to better understand the intent of the WEND principles and the goals;

– The conclusions of the meeting included the recommendation that these guidelines will be placed in the record of the meeting and distributed it to all IHO Member States as a specific WEND document with a circular letter inviting Member States to take action by applying these guidelines for implementation of the WEND principles;

– There was also the discussion that these guidelines and these proposals should be addressed at each of the Regional Hydrographic Commission to give them the greatest distribution among the Member States and to address any questions related to them;

– The other issue that was discussed at the WEND Meeting was also the transition to the Interregional Coordination Committee which, of course, will happen in January 2009;

– Many of the WEND policy-related functions will be subsumed into the IRCC until the council is established which cannot happen until the ratification of the protocol of amendment;

– The WEND and the IHB will prepare a transition report and circulate it to the WEND participants and then submit a final report to the IRCC;

– The first IRCC Meeting will be immediately following the Extraordinary International Hydrographic Conference in June 2009;

– The Chair of the WEND will recommend to the IRCC to consider establishing a WEND Task Group with the terms and rules of procedure that were agreed to by the WEND community;

– It was also discussed at some length about the composition of this task group and the obvious concerns, the understandable concern about having this Task Group too large to accomplish anything or to be able to meet in a short period of time. On the other hand, if there are going to be the decisions made and the actions taken such as revising the WEND Principles, then there is also concern that the Task Group should be more open and more geographically diverse to give better representation to the full membership;

– Since there was no real decision on how to make the decision on how many members to have, it was left to the IRCC to recommend how many and what the distribution would be;

– The MACHC is invited to send a report to the IHB on ENC coverage and quality. This will be presented to the Conference and also to support the establishment of a WEND Task Group unto the IRCC; and

– The MACHC Members are encouraged to promote the inclusion of a MACHC representative on this Task Group.

She then asked Captain Wesley Cavalheiro to go on with the report on the 11<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the WEND Committee.

Captain Wesley Cavalheiro (Brazil) called attention to MACHC.907WEND.pdf document, mentioning it contained details about the meeting and described everything that had taken place there, highlighting the following points:

– The International Hydrographic Organization (IHO) is encouraging the transition from paper charts to electronic navigation through its support of a carriage requirement for ECDIS. *“Here, we are not talking about ENC production; we are talking about a transition of navigation. So, the understanding is that “ENC” is not a product but it is a service provided to mariners and this fact makes all the difference for us”.*

– The relevant aspects regarding Regional Hydrographic Commissions;

– Distribution;

– Prices;

– WEND Principles;

– Resolutions and recommendations made by the WEND; and

– And the ECDIS Stakeholders Forum.

He highlighted the importance of the use of SCAMIN to produce ENC's and remarked that it was the main point for the quality assurance of ENC's.

He also highlighted that the GUIDELINES FOR THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE WEND PRINCIPLES were attached to the information paper number 7 and encouraged the participants to read that document which had already been distributed to them.

Mrs. Kathryn Ries (USA) highlighted that when the Electronic Chart Committee had been talking about the Electronic Chart overlaps that they had just in their region, they realized that some of the criteria for addressing the overlap issue had been put into those guidelines and that sort of information was important so that countries within their region could consider it as they had been having bilateral discussions to talk about how to resolve the overlap and the boundary issues for the ENC's.

Mrs. Meg Danley (USA) encouraged the participants to take the time to carefully read that document which referred to more production of ENC's, better quality of ENC's. She warned them to also be careful so as not to impose any kind of unwanted action onto a Member State in order not to infringe on anybody's sovereign rights or their intellectual property rights. She then highlighted the following:

- There is definitely a need to speed up the production of ENC's;
- There are a number of places where there is some discussion about, if the Member State cannot do something; then, they should find out other ways of producing ENC's, perhaps working with other Member States in order to make sure that they have the capability to adequately produce charts before they take it on themselves, to consider alternatives in case they do not have the expertise to produce charts in compliance with the standards of the IHO;
- What Ms. Kathryn Ries had been talking about was the scale of the data, the currency of the data and avoiding dividing of nationally significant features between producers; and
- The issue came up due to a concern of areas where there was overlap between ENC's and also areas where there might be some territorial disputes.

She wondered how those disputes could be addressed and whether just making a decision within a particular area in which one countries' data would be chosen over another. She reminded the participants that it was of general knowledge that that was not the best approach. She then remarked that it was for that reason that those cartographic principles had been recommended in order not just to choose either a country or another and showing some obvious bias, the best data from both places would be collected for the production of an ENC.

She again encouraged the participants to read the document and make comments about it before it was finalized.

Capt. Wesley highlighted the following points

- IHO Member States should consider ENC related projects as high priority capacity building initiatives; and
- Again, we are talking about Capacity Building; Joint Projects, Bilateral Arrangements; and the like.

He concluded the presentation of the report, asked the participants to make comments on it if they wanted to and volunteered to answer any questions that they might have about it.

Mrs. Kathryn Ries (USA) highlighted the following:

- There is a very ambitious deadline ahead of us for providing adequate coverage of Electronic Navigation Charts in order to meet an IMO mandated carriage requirement for large vessels to use in their electronic charting and display systems. It is only a couple of years away;
- The IHO is the organization that is supposed to deliver those Electronic Navigation Charts;
- Just in our own region, there are gaps, there are overlaps, there are different capabilities and there are different arrangements for producing and distributing ENC's;
- The purpose of the guidelines is to help Member States of the IHO but also all the members of this commission, who are not Member States but who have a vested interest in helping to participate in producing and taking advantage of these products, it is in all of our interest to look at these guidelines and to make sure that they are something that is workable for all of us and that it is something that all of us can work towards;
- Captain Wesley Cavalheiro's words were very wise when he said that "that should be a driver for the focus of our capacity building efforts" because there is so much work that needs to be done to help move us toward this deadline because we collectively are the IHO and we collectively are the ones who

are to be providing the products that the mariner is going to need in order to implement these mandates that are now coming from the IHO; and

– That is the bigger picture context and because it was developed within the WEND Committee, it does not have all the breadth of participation that is included in this Commission. That is why it is very important for the Commission Members to look at it, to respond, to give comments and also to use this as a focus for our capacity building efforts to help meet these mandates.

Mr. Christopher Smith (UK) highlighted the following points:

– “*We, as a commission, have a huge job to do here and it is quite clear that unless we work together and cooperate and pull our resources, then we have a very hard deadline to try to meet*”;

– The UK is willing to try and assist nations in the production task;

– We strongly support the capacity building initiatives;

– Nevertheless, we do have to recognize that the IHO Capacity Building Phases really cause a problem because the Stage 1 Capacity Building is related to MSI and much of the region; many areas of the region have not been covered yet and we still have a lot of work to do in order to accomplish Stage 1;

– ENC Production is Stage 3. So there is a big jump between the capabilities;

– It is very important in the guidelines that we have seen a change of emphasis from nations being required to produce ENCs themselves, more to considering their capabilities and looking at different ways of achieving what is required under IMO SOLAS Regulations, which will be when the mandatory carriage requirement comes into force to have ENCs available for their waters; and

– It is incumbent that it will be necessary for nations to ensure that ENCs are provided for their waters and that is very different from necessarily nations producing those ENCs themselves and this is where I think, as Members of the Commission here, we need to work very closely together to achieve the coverage of this requirement in the time scheduled.

The Chairman went on to the next point on the agenda for the meeting and asked Ms. Kathryn Ries to go over the report on Environment Protection with the participants.

The Decision reached during the discussions on this Agenda item was: –

MACHC strongly advise all Members of the Commission to review and apply the Guidelines on WEND Principles.

#### Report of IHO TSMAD Marine Environmental Protection Task Group

Mrs. Kathryn Ries (USA) remarked that she was just going to provide an update about their relatively new initiative under the auspices of the IHO which she had introduced at the previous year’s meeting and pointed out that there is a new effort to bring both, new environmental information to the mariner to make more informed decisions, not only for safety of navigation but also for protection of the marine environment.

She said that she was going to provide the participants with some background and highlighted the following points:

– Marine environmental features in areas such as marine protected areas are increasingly being used around the world; particularly in this region, although not exclusively, to protect marine resources;

– Those resources are threatened by maritime accidents as well as routine shipping operations which can injure resources such as coral reefs, impact tourism and have negative economic impacts as a result and the cost of such damage can be millions and millions of dollars per accident, not only to ships but to the resources themselves;

– There are a number of emerging international requirements that are recognizing this;

– Individual countries are taking more steps for regulating and protecting their resources from shipping impacts;

– It is recognized in vehicles such as the IMO Intervention Convention, which affirms that countries have the right to take measures to mitigate or eliminate dangers to their coastlines from maritime casualties;

– They are all familiar with the International Maritime Organization which has a dual mission of balancing the protection of the marine environment with navigation rights;

– The IMO implements a variety of tools such as particularly sensitive sea areas, which are areas that

receive special international recognition and designation because of their ecological, socioeconomic or scientific characteristics which merit international recognition and the boundaries of those areas are reflected on charts. They are required to be represented on nautical charts;

- Within this hemisphere alone, there are three particularly sensitive sea areas. There is one in Cuba, one in Colombia and one in Ecuador, the Galapagos;

- Mr. Edas Muñoz Galleano will be sharing with you that the Gulf of Honduras Project together with the Partner Project from the MesoAmerican Barrier Reef System is considering submitting a proposal for a particular sensitive sea area that would encompass the Gulf of Honduras and that Reef System;

- Other international recognition activities that are engaging in these kinds of efforts, organizations such as the IMO, the World Bank, and the Global Environment Facility are donor organizations willing to provide funding for developing supplemental layers of information, environmental information for (as a regional project, I think most are familiar with here) the marine electronic highway in the Straits of Malacca;

- In the Hydrographic Plan for the Gulf of Honduras, it is also part of that vision that an environmental data layer for the MesoAmerican Barrier Reef, for example, could be overlaid information on electronic navigation charts in the future;

- The World Conservation Union, which is the international organization, which among other conservation issues, deals with marine protected areas, has expressed interest in international data exchange format to exchange information seamlessly about marine protection because no suitable one exists;

- National Hydrographic Offices are being asked by their environmental communities for expanded uses and applications of hydrographic data;

- *“I know that we are not alone in this. I just have by way of some examples; these are some of the requirements that we are now getting from other parts even of our own organization within NOAA, The US NOAA Coral Reef Program and the USA National Coral Reef Task Force have come to our office, the US Hydrographic Office to ask for help in bringing more environmental information to the mariner and to help provide an appropriate international exchange standard for coral reef and marine protected area information that could be used for many other purposes not necessarily related to navigation safety, but to have an exchange format that would allow those data to be exchanged and used for management and scientific purposes”;*

- We are in the process of conducting a pilot project in the Florida Keys which is the second largest coral reef ecosystem in our hemisphere, just behind the MesoAmerican Barrier Reef System, and forty percent of the world’s shipping commerce comes through the Florida Straits and since 1984; this is probably not quite an updated statistic, but there have been at least fifteen large ship groundings that have damaged the reef and, by anchoring alone, it has occurred at least seventeen times since 1977;

- *“I am aware that these events are not unique to the United States”;*

- What we are doing in our own piloting project in this area is to take ecological information like this benthic habitat, mapping information that comes from another part of our agency along with regulatory information;

- *“The fact that you cannot clearly read the slide I am showing you demonstrates the complexity of all different kinds of protected areas”;*

- Within the Florida Keys, it is designated as a particularly sensitive sea area, but even within that boundary there are numerous other boundaries, areas to be avoided, special scientific reserves, special no-anchoring areas and they are at the federal and state levels;

- What we are trying to do is to extract the information which is most relevant to the mariner, so that the mariner could make more informed decisions as they are making their route planning coming through this highly sensitive area and hopefully help avoid inadvertent damage from ships;

- Our national proof of concept demonstration is in process; we are now coming very close to having the layer completed. We are testing it in software for Electronic Charting Systems and we hope before the end of this year to do some demonstrations on ships to see how it works, make refinements and then share the results;

- We hope to replicate it not only in other parts of the country, but also that it could serve as information that could be utilized in other parts of the world;

- The outcomes and benefits of this kind of activity are numerous: It supplements the navigational safety related information which is not normally available in Electronic Navigation Charts; it helps the mariner to make more informed decisions and increases the mariners’ awareness also of marine

environmental protection;

- Ultimately, if it is carried to the international level which is what is happening right now through the IHO, it can be provided through an international data transfer standard for many multiple uses;

- In short, these are the objectives behind the efforts to both reduce damage to ships and reduce damage to the marine environment;

- What is happening at the IHO level, the other reason why the IHO is starting to look at this under the auspices of its highest technical committee, the CHRIS, is because ENC's are a powerful tool that could potentially bring this kind of information to the mariner without adding clutter to the chart, because these are layers that could be clicked on and off and it could potentially be displayed as a supplemental overlay to the Electronic Navigation Chart;

- We have heard about the restructuring of the IHO, and as part of the restructuring, the IHO has expanded its vision. Of course, at the core, it will continue to be the authoritative worldwide hydrographic body which advances maritime safety and efficiency but it is also now looking at more ways to support the protection and the sustainable use of the marine environment;

- The IHO and the IMO are also working together more closely and this is just an excerpt from the United Nations General Assembly resolution from a few years ago that speaks to the collaborative efforts of the IHO and the IMO to increase the coverage of hydrographic information globally and especially in areas that are vulnerable or protected maritime areas;

- That brings us to this Environmental Protection Product Specification Task Group that was established under the IHO's CHRIS Committee in November 2007 and it was tasked with developing what was referred to as a "Product Specification", basically looking at taking two features Marine Protected Areas and Coral Reefs and looking at how they could be incorporated into the future standard which is in development for Electronic Navigation Charts.

She showed the participants a diagram and remarked that it was just intended for showing the participants the Marine Environmental Protection Task Group which was part of the TSMAD, the Transfer Standard Maintenance and Application Development Group which was under the CHRIS and said that it was under the existing IHO structure and that it did not reflect the new structure which was going into effect at the beginning of 2009.

She then highlighted the following points:

- The participation of the Task Group has been relatively unusual for how IHO Committees and Task Groups have operated in the past, which have mainly had participation naturally, just from IHO Hydrographic Offices;

- To do this kind of work, the IHO has its own expertise but it has to reach out to the expertise from other international organizations in order to address issues like marine protected areas and coral reefs;

- The participation in this Task Group was very diverse. There were representatives from Hydrographic Offices, many of whom are here today, Marine Protected Area experts, and national experts as well as from international organizations such as the World Conservation Union and the United Nations Environment Programme. We also had representatives from the Maritime Industry as well as technical experts from the private sector;

- The participation of all is extremely important in an effort like this.

She explained to the participants the role of the World Commission of Protected areas. She remarked that it was part of the IUCN and that it was the world's largest network of protected areas expertise. She stated that it had generated a classification system for marine protected areas as well as land protected areas that had been recognized by the Convention on Biodiversity and added that they were really one of the focal points of the expertise in that arena of protected areas.

She mentioned the UNEP (United Nations Environment Programme), the Intergovernmental Environmental Organization and explained that, among other activities, it was in charge of promoting the protection, monitoring and scientific research of coral reef, among others, and said that they were in the middle of the International Year of the Reef.

She then went on to explain the goals of the Task Group, what they had been asked to do. She highlighted the following:

- To develop a Product Specification for the use and exchange of information on Marine Protected Areas and Coral Reefs;

- A Product Specification is basically a set of rules that establish how data is put together for a particular application or use. And, for example, the Electronic Navigation Chart is an example of Product Specification. It takes certain features and attributes, put some together in a certain way so that an Electronic Navigation Chart can be produced. That is very oversimplified, but, in a nutshell, that is

essentially what a Product Specification does;

- S100 is the new Geospatial Standard for Hydrographic Data that is under development within the CHRIS under TSMAD. It is a much more flexible standard. It is going to eventually replace the current S57 transfer standard which is more rigid and it has many benefits because it will allow the increased flexibility to not only produce the next generation of Electronic Navigation Charts but it will also allow the flexibility to create different kinds of data layer that could either be used in conjunction with ENC's or could potentially be used for nonnavigational purposes. But the idea of this transfer standard is that it would provide that global format to exchange any kind of information potentially in a standard seamless way so that collaborative work can be undertaken;

- What the IHO brings to this is that there is already a long history and experience in writing and adopting international standards such as the current S57 and it is a standard that could be used for multiple purposes.

She then showed the participants a diagram displaying the structure of the different registers which house the kind of information that can be used to develop different kinds of products. She then showed a hydrographic register on the screen as an example. She stated that it had the features and attributes that would be primarily used to create Electronic Navigation Charts. She pointed out that there were registers for Ice Information and for Nautical Publications. She then remarked that as the standard continued to evolve, more registers were likely to be created, depending on the demand and the need to use that information for different applications. She then highlighted the following:

- It is essentially the structure that is under development;
- There certainly will be a lot of discussion at the upcoming CHRIS Meeting about how to best manage that and how to engage other interested organizations in utilizing this management structure;
- The point being is for this Marine Environmental Protection Task Group that the group is trying to extract information from these registers that could be combined in a way that could create an overlay that might be most useful not just to the mariner but also potentially for other marine environmental protection purposes;
- The Task Group held a workshop with a very diverse participation in San Francisco, California in June;
- They developed a series of recommendations which were forwarded to the TSMAD;
- The TSMAD endorsed those recommendations and now those recommendations are being elevated to the CHRIS Meeting which is happening at the beginning of November, and we will hopefully receive final approval at that meeting;
- The recommendations were essentially that a Marine Protected Area Feature be created for inclusion in S100 Electronic Navigation Charts. This was because, particularly, the Hydrographic Representatives felt that Marine Protected Areas are significant enough now to the mariner, that the mariner needs to have that information incorporated in the Electronic Navigation Charts so that they know or they cannot go because there are fines and there can be other kinds of restrictions or consequences potentially if the mariner inadvertently crosses a Marine Protected Area boundary;
- There was a proposal that that feature should be included in the S100 Electronic Navigation Charts;
- There were other kinds of supplemental information about Marine Protected Areas that is not necessary to be included in an ENC, but there was consensus that that should be sent and housed in some of the other registers so that it could potentially be used if a country wanted to add additional information about Marine Protected Areas, depending on their own national interests and requirements;
- The Task Group was only able to go so far in addressing the Marine Protected Area Feature and it did not have time to even address Coral Reefs;
- Just due to restrictions of time and the nature of the discussion, part of the recommendations is for the group to continue its work; to develop the original task which was to produce a “Product Specification” for Marine Protected Areas and to also address the feasibility about whether this could also be done for Coral Reef Systems;
- That is essentially what the CHRIS will be considering at its upcoming meeting;
- For the interests of this region, the potential of this work is great because in the next generation of S100, this new geospatial standard, it offers the potential to offer information that is not only important for navigation purposes but also potentially for Marine Environmental Protection;
- The support from the Members of this Commission, indications of support would be very important and that can be done in a number of ways: 1) It could be through your CHRIS Representative (Some of the

countries do have representatives at the CHRIS Committee and will be at the meeting); 2) For the countries that do not have representation at the CHRIS (If you think this is important), it would be very welcome if you wanted to express that support to the Chair, who is Captain Vaughan Nail (UK);

3) If the MACHC itself as a commission wanted to consider sending an endorsement to the CHRIS that this kind of work is important and we would like to see it continued so that we could have further results, that also is something that I put forth as a point to be discussed and determined whether that might be a possible avenue as well.

She then pointed out to the participants that they could review the report from the Task Group which was provided to the TSMAD and also to the CHRIS. She provided the participants with a website address which would allow them to visualize the report and read it if they were interested in doing so.

She remarked that if the participants had any comments or questions to ask, they could also talk to the Chair of the Task Group, Mr. Craig Winn from the United States, who would be available to answer questions that anyone might have. She then offered to answer any questions the participants might have at that time.

She acknowledged that it was late but urged the participants to give her some feedback regarding her request for support to the work of the Marine Environmental Protection Task Group. She reminded the participants that she had brought up three options as possibilities for expressing interest or support to the work of the Task Group.

She asked the commission whether they would like to entertain the notion of having an endorsement come from the commission just in terms of an interest in seeing the work continue, or, if they would rather address the issue individually and urged them for some immediate response.

The Chairman asked the assembly whether they would be interested in coming up with some kind of response to the request made by Ms. Kathryn Ries from the United States.

Captain Antonio Fernando Garcez Faria (Brazil) remarked that Brazil would be hosting the CHRIS Meeting at the beginning of November and highlighted the following points:

- Brazil sent a representative to the last meeting in San Francisco;
- Brazil will be supporting the progress of the Work Group;
- We are going to be expressing our support as a country during the CHRIS Meeting but we can also join the commission if there is a collective decision to support it.

Mr. Christopher Smith (UK) highlighted the following points:

- We would agree that this is important work and we would want to see brought go to successful conclusion;
- Certainly we will be interested in the discussions which will take place during the CHRIS Meeting;
- *"I am not sure I have an opinion at the moment as to whether it should be individual countries*

*supplying support or whether that should be through this commission. I would be interested in listening to others about their opinion on that".*

The Chairman expressed his agreement with the comments made on the issue of Maritime Environmental Protection and said that, taking into consideration that the issue of Coral Reefs has been brought up, he would like to make some comments about this.

He referred to a meeting which had taken place in Cancun, Mexico, attended by representatives from NOAA, from Environmental Protection Agencies in Mexico, scientific organizations and universities and highlighted the following points:

- The concept of the MesoAmerican Barrier Reef System was discussed;
- Among the measures proposed by the countries which had cooperation agreements for the protection of that Reef System, there was the concern of turning it into a sensitive area which had been affected by the increase of the commercial routes particularly within that area;
- A document was being prepared to be sent to IMO with the intention of declaring it a sensitive area without affecting the commercial interests;
- On the other hand, it was also being requested in the same document that the maritime routes should be changed;
- Countries like Mexico, Honduras and Belize, are the custodians of the MesoAmerican Barrier Reef

System should also bring up a proposal to change those commercial routes;

– The tonnage, commercial routes and the contamination aspects should be considered in order to make for a firmer and more complete legislation which would allow, within the shortest possible time, the protection of that Barrier Reef System.

He then asked the participants whether it would not be a good idea to come up with a proposal within the same terms for that project.

Mrs. Kathryn Ries (USA) remarked that she believed what the connection would be between what the Chairman had just described, the proposal to designate the MesoAmerican Barrier Reef System and the Gulf of Honduras as a particularly sensitive sea area, could include internationally recognized shipping routes. She added that what she believed that effort could provide to a designation like that (as they, within the region, had been trying to establish RENCs, their Electronic Navigation Chart Scheme for the coverage of the region) was that it could help develop the additional layers of information to show the Reef System in such a way that as mariners came into the area, they would be able to turn on that layer which would show them where the reefs were and help them to plan their routes in order to help them avoid making any damage to the reefs. She then highlighted the following:

– Unless this effort is successful, which shows how those information layers are put together (that is the “Product Specification”), then it will be difficult to provide that in support of an effort to better protect the MesoAmerican Barrier Reef System;

– It is related but, at the same time, it is a parallel effort and for this reason I suggested that the commission as a whole may want to endorse the work of this task group to go forward because it will be essentially establishing the framework of how those supplemental layers would be put together and utilized both for Electronic Navigation Charts but also it could be used for other protection measures as well.

She then remarked that what she hoped her explanation had been clear.

The Chairman, then, asked the participants whether they wanted to make any comments about the words shared by Ms. Kathryn Ries from the United States. Since none of the participants volunteered to make any more comments, the Chairman then moved on to the next point of the agenda, the report of the Hydrography and Cartography in Inland Waters Work Group by Captain Wesley Cavalheiro.

The Decision reached during the discussions on this Agenda item was: –  
MACHC supports the MEP TSMAD Work Group Report and  
Recommendations to CHRIS20 and will send a letter to CHRIS Chairman  
expressing it.

#### Report of IHO HCIWWG

Captain Wesley Cavalheiro (Brazil) stated that he was going to present just a brief report on the work of that group. He highlighted the following points:

– It is a Work Group established by CHRIS;  
– The purpose of the last meeting was to analyze and recommend the level and nature of IHO involvement in the Hydrography and Cartography of Inland Waterways;  
– The study was to involve all relevant nonIHO international bodies in its deliberations, including the Inland ENC Harmonization Group (IEHG), and a Report submitted to the 4<sup>th</sup> Extraordinary International Hydrographic Conference (EIHC) in 2009;

- The CHRIS established the Working Group (WG) at its 19<sup>th</sup> meeting in November 2007;
- The Terms of Reference of the WG;
- The List of Participants of the WG;
- The expert contributor organization;
- The work program of the WG;
- Problems encountered;
- The research made by the WG;
- The WG conclusions, recommendations, and proposals to the 4<sup>th</sup> EIHC.

Captain Wesley stated that that proposed technical resolution had already been submitted to CHRIS and that it was available on the CHRIS Website. He encouraged the participants to download it and read

it. He finally, requested the participants support for the presentation to CHRIS at the 4<sup>th</sup> EIHC.

Captain Wesley Cavalheiro invited the participants to make comments on the report he had just presented and said he was willing to answer any questions the participants might have about it.

Since there were no questions or comments about the report presented by Captain Wesley Cavalheiro, the Chairman moved on to the next point of the agenda, the National Reports. He recommended that the representatives of the Member States should not spend more than five minutes on each report so that all of the Reports could be heard within the time allotted for them.

The Decision reached during the discussions on this Agenda item was: –  
MACHC supports the HCIW Work Group Report and Recommendations to  
CHRIS20 and will send a letter to CHRIS Chairman expressing it.

## 6. National Reports

(Emphasis on surveys, chart production – paper and ENC, S55; capacity building experience and offers)

The Chairman announced the representative of Barbados, the first in the order, to make his presentation.

Barbados

Captain George Fergusson from Barbados said that he was going to make some brief comments as to where they stood there in Barbados. He highlighted the following:

- We did establish a Hydrographic Committee which met on July 25<sup>th</sup> ;
- There were some reports on “inadequate lights” which they put on the table and they are currently being upgraded;
- The two main ones are two lighthouses, North Point and one at Ragged Point, which will undergo a full refurbishment; the port commission has taken that in hand to refurbish both lighthouses. The other one, South Point, is currently working properly;
- As far as the report on the S55 is concerned, we were waiting for some new hydrographic data which did not materialize. However, we have completed the S55 form without those data, with the hope of having that completed in the very near future;
- We are working along with the UK Hydrographic Office and they are helping us tremendously;
- Due to the fact that Barbados is a onelanguage country, we find it difficult to access the offers made by the Member States because we only speak English. However, at the moment, we have two Hydrographers, one in Australia and one in Plymouth, the University of Plymouth in England doing their masters’ and that one in Plymouth would be put in contact with the UK Hydrographic Office for any assistance they can pass on.
- In relation to the protection of the reefs, we have already established that and had that implemented on our new charts. We have Long Shore, which is no anchorage and also Sharks Bay which have been agreed upon by the IMO.
- We did have to make an alternative anchorage for ships, which was very difficult to do but we have that also in place;

He said that was all he had to report for the time being and thanked the participants for their attention.

Brazil

The next country to present its National Report was Brazil. Captain Antonio Fernando Garcez Faria highlighted the following points:

- Regarding the MACHC area, last year we had three or four ships surveying the mouth of the Amazon River in order to update the nautical cartography.
- At this time of the year, there are going to be three ships over there. One of them involved with bathymetry and the other two with oceanographic works.
- We have been putting in a lot of effort in order to keep our ENCs updated.
- We have already established conversations with the French Hydrographic Office, SHOM, so that we can arrange the nooverlapping rule between the French ENCs and the Brazilian ENCs.

- We are doing the same in the South it is not within the MACHC Region.
- Brazil has already been able to produce about fifty of the ENC's under its responsibility.
- There are another one hundred and fiftysix ENC's to be produced within our coastal area in all usage bands.
- Brazil has gone as far as fifty percent of the work to be done and hopes to reach between seventy-five to eighty percent of the planned ENC coverage by the end of 2009.
- All of our major ports currently have ENC's.
- We are aiming at having all of our waters covered by ENC's between the end of 2009 and the beginning of 2010.

He finished the report and thanked the participants for their attention.

## Colombia

The next country to present its National Report was Colombia, which, due there was no delegation at the meeting, was presented by Captain Wesley Cavaleiro (Brazil). He highlighted the following points from a Power Point presentation received from the Colombian Hydrographer:

- Hydrographic surveys:
  - 8 Hydrographic Surveys accomplished between 2006 and 2008 within the Caribbean Sea.
  - 10 Hydrographic Surveys planned to be accomplished between 2008 and 2010 within the Caribbean Sea.
  - 8 Hydrographic Surveys accomplished between 2006 and 2008 within the Pacific Ocean.
  - 8 Hydrographic Surveys planned to be accomplished between 2008 and 2010 within the Pacific Ocean.
- ENC production:
  - 6 Ports (3 within the Caribbean and the Pacific usage bands).
  - 27 Bay Charts.
  - 18 Coastal Approximation
  - 13 Coastal
  - 6 General Colombia currently holds seventyseven Electronic Navigation Charts and it is planning to produce another

twenty ENC's between 2009 and

2010. - Paper charts:

- 114 National Charts Printed
- 134 Publications (Including Paper Charts)
- 24 Publication planned for production between 2009 and 2010.
- Maritime safety:
  - 62 Lighthouses
  - 19 beacons
  - 168 buoys
  - 3 balises
  - 9 boyarines
- Capacity building:

- Multibeam Technology Surveys
- Single beam Technology Surveys
- Planning and Execution of Hydrographic Surveys
- Electronic Nautical Cartography
- Specialization in Hydrography
- Hydrography Technology Course
- Oceanography Technology Course
- Physical Oceanography Course
- Capacity building needs:
  - Multibeam Technology Training

- Electronic Charting Training
- Submarine Topography Training
- Advanced Cartography Training
- Navtext and Printing by Demand Training

Captain Wesley Cavalheiro concluded his presentation apologizing for not being able to answer any questions on behalf of Colombia.

#### France

The next country to present its National Report was France. Mrs. Gwladys Theuillon highlighted the following points:

- Two years ago SHOM became a public establishment.
  - We do not depend on the French Navy anymore.
  - The first chapter of the French report shall be on the new organization of SHOM and SHOM new activities.
  - No survey was accomplished in 2007 in the MACHC area. The planned surveys was postponed to 2009 due to a technical problem which happened to the multibeam echo sounder.
  - Concerning the new charts, France has produced the INT Chart number 4182.
  - France is also ready to print the chart corresponding to the French number 7625 but we have been waiting for the confirmation from the MACHC Commission of the INT Chart number 4070.
  - Before printing this chart, we are asking the MACHC Commission for the confirmation of this number.
  - There are two hydrographic agreements between SHOM and Venezuela and also between SHOM and Brazil to find agreement to fix the problem of overlap in the MACHC area.
- She concluded the presentation of her report and thanked the participants for their attention.

Captain Hugo Gorziglia (IHB) invited the participants to observe the new structure of SHOM and highlighted the following points:

- IHO found a couple of years ago that it was important to put the regulations that are in place in different countries regarding hydrographic matters on the IHO website in order for them to be used as examples or source information when trying to improve the existing structures or trying to put together a structure when there is no one at all in some of the countries.
- The new structure of SHOM has a very particular view as a body within France which has two missions: a civilian mission and a military mission.
- An absolutely different approach, from the one France has used, has been observed in other countries where hydrography has been erased from legislation.
- In fact, in the case of France, hydrography has been raised in priority and in level within the new structure.
- *“I would like to really encourage the participants to read and exam the new philosophy of this hydrographic establishment”*.
- *“In my opinion, it is really worth it to have a look at the new structure of SHOM as a good source of information”*.

He concluded his comments and thanked the participants for their attention.

At the end of this presentation it was agreed: – MACHC Members are invited to know the new SHOM structure, and take note of it as a reference to those Hydrographic Services which have two kinds of responsibility, both civil and military.

#### Guatemala

The next country to present its National Report was Guatemala. RearAdmiral José Jesus Ocaña García, the Chairman, invited Lieutenant Maynor J. Cordón Perdomo, the representative of Guatemala, to present their national report. Lt Perdonmo highlighted the following points:

- The last hydrographic surveys carried out by Guatemala took place a few years ago.
- Guatemala officially has five charts.
- Guatemala has practically just started the development of its hydrographic structure.

- One of Guatemala's capacity building priorities right now is developing a team because there are qualified professionals, Class A and Class B Hydrographers.
- There is an officer in Chile being qualified as a Class A Hydrographer.
- Nevertheless, I think that cannot count on a real team right now but a platform in the Atlantic, a smaller vessel designed for carrying out hydrographic surveys.
- In the Pacific, there is a larger ship to carry out this type of survey.
- *About the purchasing of equipment, I believe we can already see the fruit. It is an endeavor for the three countries which are working in cooperation on the Gulf of Honduras Project.*
- *Each one of these countries shall count on the necessary equipment to carry out the hydrographic surveys and make them available to all potential consumers within the maritime realms.*
- *This equipment meets the quality standard requirements of IHO.*
- *It would be important to establish a maritime sensitive area within the Gulf of Honduras Project in order to protect the existing environmental interests within this particular area, Meso-American Barrier Reef System.*
- *About the capacity to produce Electronic Navigation Charts as well a Paper Charts, we have been trying to make arrangements with other entities and we have already been able to make an agreement with the UK Hydrographic Office.*
- *Although, we do not possess updated hydrographic data, we are sure, we are committed and we are convinced that Guatemala, as part of MACHC and as part of the IMO, is responsible for the navigation safety within its national waters.*

He concluded his report and thanked the participants for their attention.

After that, the Chairman stated that, due the advanced time, he was going to declare the works of the day finished. He thanked all the attendants for their participation and finalized the session.

At the second day meeting (Oct 10<sup>th</sup> 2008), the Chairman, Rear Admiral José Jesus Ocaña García (Mexico) opened the day session greeting participants and moved forward giving continuity to the presentation of the National Reports of the Member States. He then announced the presentation of The Netherlands.

#### The Netherlands

Mr. Erwin Wormgoor, representative of The Netherlands, informed the participants that he was going to provide a brief overview of the Dutch National Report which would include information on their responsibilities, their recent surveys within the Caribbean area in 2006 and the typical S55 scoring tables as well as some future development plans if there were enough time. He then highlighted the following points:

- The primary objective of the Netherlands Hydrographic Service is to serve the mariners in the SOLAS domain.
  - We also have a military obligation with military hydrography.
  - Our major area is, of course, in the European waters, the North Sea.
- He showed them a PowerPoint slide displaying the following points:
- The high density of maritime traffic in the North Sea.
  - A graphic overview of their charting area, with both, the Windward Islands and the Leeward Islands.
  - The area where they are developing coproduction program with Suriname.

He then pointed out the following:

- For both the European and the Caribbean Waters, we have a systematic approach as to how we task our survey ships.
- That systematic approach is also available on the IHO Website where you can see how we can come to an efficient operation of our limited survey capacity.
- We have a schedule of ten years and we would like to cover both sea areas.
- We have two survey ships.
- We identified five cartography categories of operations of the survey ships and they are in agreement with the S44 Hydrographic Survey Recommendations.
- For further details for the ships, I would like to refer to the webpage of the Netherlands ([http://www.hydro.nl/pgs/en/hyd\\_vaart\\_en.htm](http://www.hydro.nl/pgs/en/hyd_vaart_en.htm)).

- Recent Surveys in 2006 (Especially in the Sabah Atoll Area):
  - This data is at the end of processing.
  - It took us almost two years to process the dense bathymetry data, mainly because it is difficult for us to add on some tidal corrections.
  - The positive news is that we have almost full coverage of the whole area with a lot of details.
  - The data will be available at the end of 2008 at the IHO digital database and it will be publicly available for

this audience. – S55

National Report:

- We are in charge of the production of lot of ENC's as the producer nation.
  - We have a very intensive coproduction program with the United Kingdom.
  - We have a limited national chart folio.
  - Presently, the North Sea has full ENC coverage.
  - The Windward Islands in the MACHC region is also complete.
  - We still have a major challenge for the completion of the ENC data in the Leeward Islands.
- As far as ENC production goes, the Dutch concern is mainly focused on the areas where we have put question marks.
- It is an important issue for us to find out how we deal with the lack of coverage in that area.
  - The Netherlands Hydrographic Office is ready to take the responsibility to compile the ENC's for the areas where there are question marks.
  - The only program for the oncoming year is the RET corners for Aruba and Borneo which will be completed before 2010.

He showed them what he described as a “typical unreadable S55 schedule” from December 2006 and assured the participants that it would be updated after the MACHC Meeting and, after that; they would be able to see ENC percentages almost up to one hundred percent.

He said that he would like to call the participants’ attention to the Netherlands’ interactive digital sailing directions highlighting that normally sailors are used to sailing with thick booklets to look for sailing directions.

He then showed the participants an official paper chart equivalent digital publication called, Digipilot of the Netherlands’ area and remarked that there was a DVD of that available for the participants to examine. He pointed out the following about the DVD:

- It is an interactive DVD, dealing with all sailing directions chapters.
- It is updated automatically via the Internet.
- It is not necessary to notes to mariners’ booklets anymore.
- Next to that we have, of course, as many of you, a similar enhancement of the production system based on CARIS HPD.
- It brings you more or less of the same.
- It has a database where you maintain accurate representative data and from which you can derive maritime products.

He thanked the participants for their attention and reminded them one more time of the Netherlands’ concern of the southern part of the Caribbean area, especially where the Netherlands and Venezuela were intended to have a coproduction program and said that they had had limited proceedings on that area.

He stated that he was going to finalize at the end of the day with some pragmatic steps to fill the gap for the sake of the mariner. He concluded his presentation, thanking the participants for their attention.

United Kingdom

The next country to present its National Report was the United Kingdom (UK). Mr. Christopher Smith stated that, one year before, they had decided to split the national report into two parts:

- a) A generic part giving general information on the operations of the UK Hydrographic Office which could be relevant to all of the Regional Hydrographic Commissions or people that may be interested in the operations. That generic report is on the IHO Website.
- b) A specific report to each Hydrographic Commission just with the information which is relevant to the MACHC Commission.

He then highlighted the following points:

- Most of the UK efforts in 2007 were focused on the ENC availability issue.
- This emphasis took place in support of the introduction of an ECDIS carriage requirement by IMO.
- Much of the work done with the Hydrographic Office Partners around the world has assisted in bringing that carriage requirement to being close to accepted.
- We worked with many Hydrographic Offices to produce all of these available ENCs.
- We also sought permission to produce ENCs on behalf of nations that are not yet able to provide that coverage.
- This is strictly as an interim measure.
- The activity over the year has culminated with the launching of a new ENC service, just before the IMO NAV54 Meeting.
- It was designed to demonstrate to the IMO that we as IHO nations and as a community are making very good progress with the ENC coverage.
- Coverage is not our only consideration.
- The continuous updating of ENCs, following their initial production is a very important issue.
- The UK is very pleased to be able to assist many Hydrographic Offices around the world with production assistance and capacity building in an effort to help the IHO to achieve the ENC coverage that is required to support the mandatory carriage requirement for ECDIS.
- The UK is privileged to operate the RENC ICENC on behalf of a number of Member States.
- Quite a few of the MACHC nations are members of the ICENC.
- Notably, Colombia and Ecuador joined the ICENC over the last year.
- ICENC is becoming more active in improving ENC standards across all the membership and gives feedback on consistency.
- The UK IHO often gets very critical reports from the ICENC regarding the contents of its ENCs which we have to act on.
- The ICENC does encourage its members to send feedback in order to help to get the general ENC data quality and consistency better.
- Those nations who are members of ICENC from this Commission are always welcome to send their input for the enhancement of the system.
- The UK has recently created a new post within the office, specifically to look at capacity building.
- A member of the staff shall be allocated to that post within the next few weeks.
- This person will be in charge of coordinating all the capacity building work within the UK HO and will act as the liaison person with all the Regional Hydrographic Commissions.
- The UK has considerable responsibility within the MACHC region for a number of overseas territories and is also the Primary Charting Authority for a number of Commonwealth nations and *“as such, I would expect to the group proportion of the time of this new member staff which will be spent on MACHC issues”*.
- *“I am sure that a proportion of that time will be available to support the Capacity Building Chair within this Commission”*.

He concluded his presentation and thanked the participants for their attention.

#### United States of America

The next country to present its National Report was the United States of America (USA). Captain Steve Barnun remarked that it was a pleasure for him to present the USA national report and highlighted the following points:

- The Hydrographic Organization in the United States is complex.
- It is composed of NOAA, under the U.S. Department of Commerce, the Army Corps of Engineers, NAVOCEANO, the US Navy, NGA and it also includes the US Department of Homeland Security Coast Guard and the US Department of Interior for Interior Coastline Baseline Maps.
- NOAA is responsible for charting US waters and territories.
- Our areas are vast.
- We also employ a similar protocol for trying to decide what to survey based on our limited resources and assets.

The United States representative showed the participants a PowerPoint slide displaying some of their current assets and added that they also had a significant number of private contractors, seven in all, that assist NOAA in collecting data. He remarked that two significant changes for their InHouse Resources

had been:

1) The replacement of the Bay Hydrographer which is a vessel used for test and evaluation of equipment; and

2) The replacement of the NOAA Ship RUDE with the HASSLER which is a SWAT vessel.

He then highlighted the following points:

– NOAA continues to work with their customers around the nation.

– We have navigation managers and small responsibilities that work to satisfy the needs of the mariner in the various ports within the Continental US.

– Certainly in the Alaska and Islands there are larger challenges that we are working to address.

– Hurricane Response

□ *“Certainly, we want to extend our sympathy to all of the nations that were affected by the hurricanes this year”.*

□ The United States have been affected.

□ We had several ports that were severely impacted. However, we provided a quick response to open shipping back up to allow relieve supplies to come and to get the ports and commerce moving again. – One thing that we used and had not used before, for the first time this year, was an autonomous underwater vehicle.

– That is an instrument that we are planning to use in the future to outfit all our vessels, in order to force multiply our ability to survey and also potentially the ability to survey and to service some of the smaller areas that are difficult to reach.

– NOAA has responsibility for roughly a thousand nautical charts covering our nation’s waters, 670 ENC’s are produced. The NOAA is on track to bringing them to completion by 2010 as well as the rest of the charts and other

products.

– One major effort within NOAA is our effort to the modernization of our nautical chart system.

– The NOAA is in the midst of transitioning to this new system.

– ESRI is a major partner in this effort.

– Our current work flow: We have two production lines one for ENC and one for RASTER.

– It is very resourcedemanding.

– Our future system is to have one database that supplies both the information for maintaining the RASTER or Paper Charts in addition to the ENC’s and lays the ground for future products so that when we update information, it gets updated in the database one time and then propagate it to the other products.

– There was another significant effort last year focused in the Arctic area, which is very poorly surveyed area. There was a significant effort in the Chukchi Sea in the Arctic Ocean and there are going to be additional efforts in the area in the future.

– NGA’s products comprise a variety of items including notices to mariners, digital nautical charts, bathymetric data, and nautical publications such as the Light List and Sailing Directions.

– Recent activities with the US Navy include several projects and involve several countries within the MACHC Region.

– There was significant Capacity Building Cooperative effort with Mexico in which representatives from the Navy and NOAA sailed aboard in the Tuxpan River to get the systems approved and working.

He showed them a PowerPoint slide displaying the areas where NOAA is planning to carry out several projects with the countries of the region and then he told the participants about US training opportunities. He highlighted the following:

– Category A Courses

□ There is one in the University of Southern Mississippi (Oneyear thesis option, oneyear non-thesis option and a twoyear thesis option).

□ In addition, there is the Degree Program Category A Course at the University of New Hampshire.

□ I also should mention the Shallow Water Survey Conference which will be happening the week of October 24<sup>th</sup>, 2009.

– In addition, Category B Course (A sixmonth program at the US Navy).

– There are additional training opportunities with the Naval Mobile Training Team in addition to

NOAA's Navigation Response Team – Those are the teams that respond to hurricanes, NOAA Hydrographic Ships in our Geodetic Positioning Parties.

– In addition, NGA offers opportunities for Worldwide Navigation Warning Service training.

He finally provided the participants with the website addresses of the three major components of the nautical

charting producers in the USA, the NOAA, the NGA and the

NAVOCEANO. He concluded the report and thanked the participants for their attention.

## Cuba

The next country to present its National Report was Cuba. The Chairman introduced Lieutenant Commander Angel Acanda Reyes, who highlighted the following points:

– The Republic of Cuba has been a Member State of the IHO since 1951.

– Due to the fact that Cuba is an exclusive economic zone, the 362,900 Km<sup>2</sup> (square kilometers) with a coastline of 2,500 Km were established through the enforcement of the Law of the Sea Convention of the United Nations Organization of 1981 which, in our particular situation, was determined based on the longitude of the straight line system, whose cut was made as far as the territorial sea goes and which has been officially acknowledged by our national legislation.

– The Hydrographic resources in Cuba are concentrated within the Hydrographic Service of the Republic of Cuba.

– This Hydrographic Service is a product of the development of the hydrographic and cartographic activities and was officially approved by the Decree Law no. 179 of 1978.

– This Hydrographic Service presently has thirtyseven Hydrographic Ships.

– 86% of these thirtyseven Hydrographic Ships less than 25meter long.

– The remaining 14% of these thirtyseven Hydrographic Ships are between 95 and 100meter long.

– The human resources qualified to perform hydrographic work have been prepared by national institutions.

– As far as professional development and updating are concerned, our Hydrographers have attended a large number of courses offered by the IHO, in the old Maritime Academy of Trieste as well as in partnership with the UKHO.

– The staff of the Cuban Hydrographic Office presently comprises of 35 experts at university level.

– 50 assistants have elaborated a syllabus which will allow us in the long run to continue preparing university degree Hydrographers in national institutions equipped to teach this expertise.

– On the other hand the geodetic methods employed to perform hydrographic surveys comprised the use of appropriate Position Fixing, Long Range Radio Navigation and Global Positioning System employed in both autonomous as well as differential modes.

– The positioning systems are used for carrying out hydrographic surveys throughout the country waters, employing classical navigation receivers and cards inserted directly into personal computers during campaign for hydrographic survey in the country.

– As a result of the analysis of data collected in the hydrographic surveys performed in Cuba, the hydrographic areas under the responsibility of the Republic of Cuba have been divided into three different depth zones:

Band 1 – Less than 50 meters

Band 2 – Between 50 and 200 meters deep

Band 3 – Over 200 meters deep

– Surveyed Areas: Band 1 (Approximate surface of 53,720 Km<sup>2</sup>) – 70% of it can be considered appropriately surveyed and the remaining 30% needs to be updated. Band 2 (Approximate surface of 53,720 Km<sup>2</sup>) – 80% of it can be considered appropriately surveyed and the remaining 20% needs to be updated. Band 3 (Approximate surface of 30,000 Km<sup>2</sup>) – 90% of it can be considered appropriately surveyed and the remaining 10% needs to be updated.

As far as the cartographic activity is concerned, the Cuban representative highlighted the following points:

- The cartographic activity within Cuba has undergone a considerable reduction lately as well as the human resources in charge of performing it.
- This is partly due to an internal conflict in the Hydrographic Service of Cuba.
- We have been taking appropriate administrative and technical actions so that we can gradually and proportionally make up for this reduction in a harmonic fashion, by incorporating new technologies which can improve the quality of this whole process.
- Our aim is to incorporate this into the topic of transference.
- We are aware that this process should start to be applied in Cuba next year.
- The Cartographic Production Scheme includes the purchase of specialized equipment for surveying and processing data with only one line of production, until we are able to fully implement it.
- A circular letter was sent by the IHO last year to its Member States asking the support of those countries which would be willing to cooperate with the Hydrographic Office of the Republic of Cuba for the transference of technology, the means and the equipment in order to improve it while they are building their own capacity.
- This process shall be materialized through the direct transference of technology by providers as well as by bilateral arrangements made with other hydrographic offices in such a way that an international introduction of our products and official nautical publications can take place.
- We currently have seven cartographers and one editor and the strength that the resources from the Cuban government will provide in order for us to print the nautical charts, in color and black and white, assuring the printing of a small number of issues.
- The official catalog of nautical charts is comprised of 144 titles.
- 13% or 5 titles are represented at a smaller scale 1 and 300,000.
- 19% or 7 titles are represented at a scale between 1 and 300,000 and 1 and 100,000.
- 59% or 85 titles are represented at a scale between 1 and 1,000 and 1 and 95,000.
- 19% or 28 titles are represented at a scale larger than 1 and 95,000.
- We are aimed at producing a series of official nautical publications which are periodically updated through the data obtained from hydrographic surveys and the compilation of the data collected as well as the updating system which monthly issues notices to mariners.

The Cuban Representative stated that, based on the information he had presented, the following conclusion could be reached: *“The length of hydrographic responsibility of Cuba of approximately 322,900 Km<sup>2</sup> does not have an area which has not been surveyed under a hydrographic perspective. The zone of hydrographic responsibility is 83% has been appropriately surveyed in compliance with the requirements of the IHO and according to their usage bands. The remaining 17% are basically concentrated in the areas of new geodesic interactions. The indicators of the Hydrographic and Cartographic capacity of our services show an outstanding development”*.

He mentioned to the participants the celebration of 140<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the beginning of the War for the Independence of Cuba on the 2<sup>nd</sup> of October, 2008. He then thanked the participants for their attention and finalized his presentation.

As accorded at the beginning of the meeting, the representative of Cuba, after his the National Report presented the ISPWG Report.

#### Report on ISPWG Activities and Status

Lieutenant Commander Angel Acanda Reyes read MACHC.906ISPWG Paper describing:

- The proposed Terms of Reference.
- The sequence of ISPWG work.
- The results on ISPWG face to face meeting.
- Next steps of ISPWG.

He concluded saying ISPWG work constitutes parameters of reference for a possible MACHC activities plan and highlighted that ISPWG has been very pleased with the response it has been able to get from some hydrographic offices such as Brazil, the Netherlands as well as private companies such as CARIS.

He encouraged the mutual cooperation among all the Member States of MACHC and finalized the presentation on the activities of the ISPWG.

The Decision agreed during the discussions on this Agenda item was:

- MACHC approved the proposed ISPWG ToR and strongly ask Members States to contribute with Cuba work.

#### Honduras

The next country to present its National Report was Honduras. The Chairman introduced Mr. Oscar Delgado, who told the participants that he was going to speak on behalf of Carlos Portillo, the Honduras representative. He said that he worked for the Honduras National Company of Ports and remarked that it was the organization in charge of the hydrographic surveys in Honduras.

He pointed out that the Honduras National Company of Ports was decentralized from the government, operated under its own resources and, therefore, enjoyed relative autonomy.

He told the participants that Honduras needed a lot of their support in order to train staff. He said that they were engaged in a joint project with NOAA. He highlighted the following points:

- NOAA helped Honduras with the equipment for the larger and more demanding surveys.
- In 2007, an agreement was signed the UKHO and the Honduras National Company of Ports for the exchange of hydrographic data for the updating of nautical charts for the Caribbean Sea as well as the Pacific Ocean.
- Honduras in engaged in a cooperation project for the production of the Cortes Port Chart.
- The Honduras National Company of Ports is developing a team to survey the area of the Honduras project.
- The beginning of the survey in the area of the Cortes Port is expected to take place in February 2009 as part of the hydrographic surveys planned within the context of the Gulf of Honduras Project for the production of navigation charts.
- Specific hydrographic surveys are going to be performed in the Honduran Caribbean area.
- This department has also been appointed to supervise the dredging of the Port of La Seiba and the Cortes Port and this enterprise is expected to be brought to completion in the middle of 2009 with the expansion project that is being carried out in the Cortes Port.

He finalized his presentation and thanked the participants for their attention.

#### Suriname

The next country to present its National Report was Suriname. The Chairman introduced Mr. Freddy Delchot, who highlighted the following points:

- The Maritime Authority of Suriname is responsible for its hydrographic activities and it is also in charge of the pilots' service, shipping and shipping traffic control.
- It is important for Suriname to have hydrographic data of the coastal area and the rivers because the ports are situated along the rivers.
- We have been surveying the coastal waters until the depth of 10 meters as well as the inland waters.
- We have recently performed a baseline survey (between June and July) in order to determine maritime borders according to the UNCLOS regulations.
- We have also performed a coastal survey recently and a river survey in the most important river of Suriname, the Suriname River.
- We make use of two vessels, one with the length of 35 meters and the width of 7 meters is used for the coastal surveys. For the inland surveys, we make use of a vessel with the length of 44 meters and the width of 4.7 meters.
- In order to collect these hydrographic data, we make use of two single beam echo sounders, one RTK Base Station and two receivers on the vessels, one portable single beam echo sounder, GPS for positioning and hightech software package.
- Regarding chart production, the MAS (Maritieme Autoriteit Suriname) has been producing coastal and river charts with the support of the Hydrographic Service of the Netherlands and so far we have produced only paper charts.
- Nevertheless, we are aware of the changes in the world and the intention is to make use of the opportunities to come to the production of ENC's.
- Regarding Capacity Building, the MAS has improved capacity by training staff. We have trained people in MSI and hydrography and we also try to improve capacity by purchasing equipment.
- The future plans are LAT determination, ENC compilation, extension of the tidal stations in the

coastal area, extension of the baseline around the coastal area and the river banks, the purchase of new equipment to meet the IHO standards such as side scan, GIS, multibeam and the baseline determination.

- The MAS also has plans to monitor dredged areas periodically because of the plans we have to dredge the Suriname River which belongs to the maritime authority.

- The MAS is also going to provide training for staff in dredging.

The Suriname representative offered to host the 11<sup>th</sup> MACHC Meeting. He then finalized his presentation and thanked the participants for their attention.

Captain Hugo Gorziglia (IHB) stated that he wanted to ask the Suriname representative a question. He asked him if the MAS was involved with the training that Suriname and IMO were coordinating for November 2009 where a “Basic Hydrographic Surveying Course” was going to take place. He remarked that he found it a very important opportunity for the region and added that if he had some further information on this course it would be important for the MACHC members to learn about it.

Mr. Freddy Delchot replied that he did not have further information concerning the training course but assured the participants that the information on that matter was going to be handed out to them very soon.

Captain Hugo Gorziglia stated that from the IHB side, what they knew was that the training course was going to be 5 days long. He remarked that it was a very intensive course and was going to be held in Suriname. He added that the course was being funded by IMO. He remarked that the IMO, through its national representatives, was finding out the appropriate participants. He added that the course was obviously going to be ideal for those Caribbean Small Island States that would like to make good use of that opportunity. He then highlighted the following:

- IMO and IHO have put a lot of effort in trying to bring together the interests in this course.

- IMO started this initiative within its internal analysis and then IHO came in the room to identify the program as well as the trainers, the instructors.

- Some difficulties are being faced due to time constraints.

- Suriname has been doing its best to host the course. However, it is still uncertain whether there are going to be students or not.

Captain Hugo Gorziglia encouraged the participants to go to their countries, see the documentation required to attend the course and apply for it; otherwise, there might be a huge infrastructure for offering a course with more teachers than students.

He repeated to the participants that it was a “Basic Hydrographic Surveying Course” and said that he had some more details of it with him which he was willing to share with whoever was interested in it.

Mrs. Kathryn Ries from the United States offered to post the information about the course on the MACHC Website if she could get it electronically.

After that, the Chairman, RearAdmiral José Jesus Ocaña García, invited the participants to stop for a break and stated that they were going to go on with the Agenda when they returned. He said that they were going to be informed on the activities of the Committees of ENCs and INT Charts.

## 7. Report by Electronic Chart Committee

After the break, the Chairman greeted the participants and resumed the meeting. He moved forward to the following point on the agenda, the presentation of the reports on the activities of the ENC Committee and gave the floor to Mrs. Kathryn Ries (USA). She informed the participants that he was going to give the report of the Task Group 1, which was under her committee and that Rafael Ponce was going to give the report of the Task Group 2. She mentioned both Task Groups met before the official beginning of the MACHC Meeting.

She then told the participants that she was going to provide them with a little background context, especially for those who were new to that meeting or who had not been involved with it. She then highlighted that the Electronic Chart Committee was established to pursue the goal of facilitating the use of Official Electronic Charts to support safe, efficient and environmentally sound maritime navigation in the region, facilitating the production and use of ENCs, particularly for key ports and major shipping

routes, helping to identify sources of equipment training and also trying to increase the awareness of the benefits of using electronic chart data not just for safety of navigation but also multiple other purposes that hydrographic information is useful for.

She remarked that while that had been the overall purpose for which the committee had been established when she became the Chair of the committee about 5 or 6 years before, it was very clear from the members of the Committee that, while it was a worthy goal to be focusing on advancing Electronic Charts for the region, given the disparities and capabilities among the participating countries that there needed to be a parallel effort to try to build capacity for countries that are just beginning to acquire the ability to conduct surveys to produce Paper Charts much less advanced to Electronic Charts.

Two Task Groups were established under the committee. She (Ms. Kathryn Ries) is the Chair; Mexico has served as the ViceChair of the Committee. The Technical Coordinator of the Committee is Rafael Ponce.

One Group, Task Group 1 is focused on Capacity Building in a pilot area which initially has been the Gulf of Honduras Project and the second group, Task Group 2 is focused on ENC production and related regional coverage.

She pointed out to the participants the members of Task Group 1 and stated that Panama had been very active in the past but unfortunately they had not been able to be represented at the past few meetings. She added that Panama had been very instrumental in the earlier stages of Task Group 1.

#### ECC Task Group 1

She remarked that she was not going to talk about the Gulf of Honduras Project in much detail because Mr. Edas Muñoz Galleano, the engineer in charge of the project, was going to be talking about it but she was going to provide the participants with a brief overview of it. She highlighted the following points:

- The overall project objective are:
  - To prevent and control the pollution that drains into the Gulf of Honduras which is a water body shared by three countries.
  - To prevent pollution both from shipping sources as well as land based sources of pollution.
  - To improve navigational safety to avoid groundings and spills. – As it has been happening everywhere in the world, this region is experiencing increased volumes of traffic, vessels are getting larger and larger and they are carrying more and more hazardous materials. – Due to the oceanographic characteristics, the flow of the currents in the Gulf of Honduras, a hazardous spill could spread across the coastlines of the three participating countries in this regional project.

- The MACHC, as a collaborator and contributor through its Task Group 1 under the Electronic Chart Committee has been primarily focusing its efforts on Component 3 of the Gulf of Honduras Project which is to enhance navigational safety in shipping lands.

- The MACHC had helped early on with an analysis of the existing charts in the region.
- Much of the data is quite old, some of it going back to the 1800's.
- With recent events, natural events, like the hurricanes, even more recent data is affected and changed and for this reason, the quality of the data has certainly been an issue for an object like this, to improve navigational safety.

- The quality of the data and the ability to update navigation charts is critical.

She shared with them another excerpt from the Gulf of Honduras Project Plan related to Component 3 which indicated that it was focused on improving the hydrographic as well as other oceanographic cooperation in the region to prevent groundings, spills and support safe and efficient marine transportation operations. She added that the MACHC was a project partner and collaborator.

She presented to the participants what she called as a “high level summary of the ways in which the MACHC and also the IHO Capacity Building Committee had supported the project over the previous 5 or 6 years”. She highlighted the following points:

- The support began in the preparatory phases of the project and now has extended through the official initiation of the project which was in 2005 but it is ranged from IHO visits to the Central American countries which were emphasizing the importance of hydrography and trying to raise that level of awareness of how hydrography could contribute to national and regional priorities.

- The Task Group 1 also developed a hydrographic activity implementation plan which is now beginning to be executed and the INT kind contributions have been substantial from whether it is the

funding from the IHO Capacity Building Committee, the contributions from the countries themselves, the other collaborators within the MACHC and the INT kind of contributions which have been documented already are almost a million dollars just over the past 5 years.

- This support has been substantial.

- Through the Capacity Building Committee, the support has been made available for Hydrographers to visits to the countries to do detailed survey planning.

- Now there is going to be training that will be made available with CBC funding support to train the countries on the hydrographic equipment which they are about to receive via the project.

- There also has been a lot of support. NOAA has provided this support expertise on particularly sensitive sea area designation which the Gulf of Honduras Project is actively working on as a submission to the IMO.

- There are workshops that have been held.

- There was one done early at the MACHC Meeting in 2006 and then this year in January and September there have been meetings that we have helped facilitate to educate the countries on the process of how an IMO PSSA proposal is put together.

Finally, she stated that the Task Group 1 had been the regional execution arm, helping to execute and implement the hydrographic activities in the plan. She added that the plan was available on the MACHC website.

She showed the participants a broad overview of the plan containing detailed activities, detailed budgets as well as an executive summary of the contents. She then highlighted that Part of the vision, when the plan was under development and the countries were discussing ultimately what they would like to see as a result of their efforts related to the project was the vision of the Gulf of Honduras Marine Highway which could be part of a PSSA designation to have internationally recognized shipping routes that would help guide where maritime traffic is in the region and to help avoid doing inadvertent damage to the MesoAmerican Barrier Reef System.

She pointed out that the image she was showing was just a graphic and that there were not specific geographical positions or anything that had been delineated yet for that vision but the hydrographic surveys which were about to get underway as a result of the equipment that the countries were receiving and that could begin to initiate and help delineate that type of marine highway for the area. She then pointed out that what she had just presented had been just the elements of the plan and that there had been an extensive amount of regional planning and coordination which had taken place in order to put the plan together. She then highlighted the following:

- The plan also addresses needs for Capacity Building.

- There are specific activities that begin with the production of Paper and Electronic Navigation Charts and it is widely known that the Charts are only as good as the information that appears on them.

- An early focus was to identify the need to improve capacity to do hydrographic surveys and that is what is just beginning to be executed now.

- With funding from the CBC, a hydrographic expert was able to visit the countries a couple of years ago to do some detailed planning to initiate surveys.

- Those detailed plans for the surveys are in the annex of the hydrographic activity implementation plan.

- They are now serving as the basis for the countries to build their survey efforts on those plans. They may be slightly modified but that is the foundation.

- As part of the vision of bringing environmental protection awareness to the mariner, there is the goal of creating an environmental data layer that could be displayed in conjunction with the Electronic Navigation Chart so that the mariners can help better protect the MesoAmerican Barrier Reef System as an INT kind contribution of the UKHO.

- They are producing free based Electronic Navigation Charts that would be the foundation for such a layer to be developed in the future.

- Another significant contribution from the UK Hydrographic Office is the bilateral agreements that they have with the three countries to produce both the Paper and the Electronic Navigation Charts and, for this reason, they are an active partner in making sure that, when the data that is generated from the upcoming surveys will get transferred, updated charts will be available to the mariner for the region.

She then showed the participants a graphic displaying the Electronic Navigation Charts that were in process that would be the foundation for an environmental data layer that then could depict the Meso-American Barrier Reef so that the mariner could make more informed decisions on how to route their voyages. She then highlighted the following:

- Not only has the Gulf of Honduras Project had a vision for establishing a particularly sensitive sea area but a sister project which has been underway for many years to protect the MesoAmerican Barrier Reef System. It includes the same three Gulf of Honduras countries but also Mexico.
- Back in June or July of 2006, the four countries renewed their commitments to protecting the Reef and as part of that commitment said that they also wanted to pursue PSSA designation.
- The two projects now are working together to develop a joint PSSA proposal because there is obvious overlap in interest to work together on that designation for the entire region.
- This agreement has been signed at the ministerial level, the presidential level of the four countries.
- The Gulf of Honduras Project is also authorized at the highest levels of the ministries of environment and transportation for the three countries so there is a high level of visibility and commitment to pursuing these activities.

She provided the participants with the URL for the MACHC website (<http://www.ihomachc.org/>) where they would be able to download a copy of the Hydrographic Activity Implementation Plan and also find a link to the Gulf of Honduras Project website and further information in case they were interested in getting it.

She informed the participants that she was going to provide them with the results of the meeting of Task Group 1 which had taken place on Wednesday afternoon. She highlighted the following:

- The three countries are each receiving a set of hydrographic equipment that will allow them to do check surveys to be able to verify that surveys that are done either by themselves or done contracted through the private sector or from other sources to be able to verify that those surveys are being done to IHO standards.
- Those sets of equipment have been delivered to each of the three countries.
- The company that is providing the equipment is going to be providing training to the three countries in the installation of the equipment, and will provide a week of installation training to the three countries during this month.
- There are responsible focal points who have signed the contract for the utilization of the equipment and the maintenance of it.
- The points of contact are responsible for coordinating internally with all of the organizations and agencies that have an interest in hydrographic activities because the idea behind providing this equipment is that it is supposed to support a national capability, not just the capability of a particular sector.
- As a followon, there will be two additional weeks of training provided by NOAA and Navy Hydrographic Experts and their travel to the countries has been supported by money from the IHO Capacity Building Committee.
- The countries will also be provided with two to four weeks of training that will occur probably in the January/February time frame when the weather conditions are most conducive.
- There will be a few days that will be spent in the classroom but the majority of the training will be actually conducting a survey, collecting the data, processing it and then transmitting that in the appropriate format to the UK who then will provide draft versions of the final products for the countries to verify and then the charts will be updated.
- The Task Group worked through a number of questions. There is a lot of detail planning that has to occur before those surveys take place.
- There are a number of actions that have to happen before the end of November in order to be ready to conduct the surveys in the January/February time frame.

She told the plenary that they were delighted to have with them Mr. Edas Muñoz Galleano and that he was going to provide them with a broader view of the Gulf of Honduras Project. She pointed out that the hydrographic activities made up just one slice of a much larger effort that they were engaged in. Before turning it over to Mr. Edas Muñoz Galleano for his presentation, she stated that he was going to be followed by Rafael Ponce who was going to present the results of Task Group 2.

She finalized her presentation and thanked the participants for their attention.

After that, Mrs. Kathryn Ries introduced Mr. Edas Muñoz Galleano, the engineer in charge of the Gulf of Honduras Project. He said that he was going to complete some of the overview provided Ms. Kathryn Ries. He highlighted the following points:

- The Gulf of Honduras Project is financially funded basically by the Global Environmental Facility, managing the resources of the InterAmerican Development Bank.
- It is executed in cooperation with the Central American Commission of Maritime Transport,

COCATRAM and the Central American Commission on Environmental & Development, the CCAD and the countries benefitted, the ones which make the decisions concerning the execution of the projects through the annual operational plans, the nations of Belize, Guatemala and Honduras.

- It is obviously a regional project within the context of the Gulf of Honduras.
- It spans the five most important ports in the region: Two in the Belize City, Big Creek and two in Guatemala, Santo Tomas de Castilla and Puerto Barrios and one in Honduras, Puerto Cortes.
- The general objectives are to reverse the degradation of the coastal and marine ecosystems within the Gulf of Honduras.
- To enhancing the prevention and control of maritime transport-related pollution in major ports and navigation lanes.
- To improving navigational safety to avoid groundings and spills.
- To reduce landbased sources of pollution draining into the Gulf.
- The last objective which we consider to be of fundamental importance is to define strategies for the financial sustainability for the execution of the strategic plan which shall be one of the main objectives of the project.

He remarked that he was going to focus on the meaning of the work for the confirmation of a proposal to establish a particularly sensitive sea area in the Gulf of Honduras. He then highlighted the following points:

- He was going over the original objectives of the project, establishing the requirements in order to meet the eligibility criteria for particularly sensitive sea areas.
- For that purpose, the project was obviously in the process of executing a series of studies, the most relevant of which would be the Transboundary Diagnostic Analysis which should take place along with the study of navigation risks, communication strategies and the constitution of a technical scientific database to provide the foundations for a consistent and coherent proposal which would be eventually presented by the countries engaged in the project to the IMO.
- Another purpose of the project is to update the technical scientific database of other projects within the region.
- In addition to that, it is essential to provide the countries with equipment and training so that they can build capacity while helping others to build and consolidate capacity within the region.
- This project is not only intended to supply equipment. The delivery of the equipment is meant to be the beginning of a process, which implies capacity building, training staff, generating data, managing information, sharing information within the region, updating the navigation charts of the region and other elements which shall allow us to build the technical scientific database proposed by the PSSA.
- The equipment has already been delivered to the countries through an instrument called "commodatum agreement" (loan for use agreement) in which the terms of use are set, the applications it is supposed to have, the commitments made by each of the countries, the information that is going to be generated through it as well as the format which is going to be used for sharing those data within the region.

- Studies to be performed:

Navigation Risks

- It is advancing in the establishment of regional boundaries for maritime navigation.
- The full database of port activity, navigation routes, maritime traffic and ballast waters has been compiled.
- There is a matrix which pinpoints the risks found in the studies.

Boundaries

- The analyses for the definition of the national and regional geographical boundaries of how to apply and to manage the legislation and the regulations within the area of the Gulf of Honduras.

Communication

- The analysis of how the communication network within the five ports of the region should work.
- It is the primary part of a much more comprehensive report which is going to be ready by the first quarter of 2009. He showed the participants some statistical data displaying the traffic flow within the area of each one of the ports comprising the Gulf of Honduras. He highlighted the following:

- The statistics are uptodate.
- They have been presently used to infer some data and also recommend some future actions.
- The visits made to the countries engaged in the project have been very proactive, very dynamic and very pleasant.
- The Member States have been consulting us a lot. We have been frequently contacted by the Member States, the Key Members, civil servants as well as private workers, are part of this consultation and the dynamics of the project.
- The development of the technical scientific database is going to comprise the performance of tests and simulations, mainly of oil spills. It shall provide us with consistent information to make a proposal.
- As far as the Transboundary Diagnostic Analysis is concerned, we have made considerable progress.
- An implementation plan for monitoring the area has been designed.
- A preliminary report has been made on the monitoring of the area.
- The limits of the Transboundary Diagnostic Analysis specifically focus on four dimensions: biogeochemical and physical; socioeconomic; legal and specifically concerning pollution.
- All the technical scientific information has been generated by an international consortium which was hired by the project through the mechanisms set up by the InterAmerican Development Bank which is in charge of managing the financial aspects of the projects.

He showed the participants a series of slides portraying the biogeochemical and physical framework of the project, the macroeconomical aspects, and important economic activities within the region, the national and international treaties which regulate the hydrographic activities within the area, pollution levels and specifically the areas which had been more largely impacted by pollution. He highlighted some of these areas in Belize, in Honduras and in Guatemala. He said that those were the areas of influence which drained into the Gulf of Honduras. He remarked that that exercise was going to define the sensitivity map of the region, update the navigational charts and support the existing technical information data of the area.

He then showed the participants a timeline which displayed the deadlines they had planned to perform some specific actions and described the status quo of the project. He remarked that they had delivered the equipment to the countries so that they could perform the surveys and that they had been assessing and building capacity in the area. He stated that once they had accomplished that phase, they were going to perform the surveys which were going to provide them with the data to make a preliminary analysis and remarked that in 2010 they intended to make a concrete proposal to designate it a Particularly Sensitive Sea Area. He said that they might get some important news concerning the viability of the proposal by 2011.

He remarked that, in order for their plans to materialize, it was going to be necessary to work with the highranking political decisionmakers in order to lead them through a process of education and awareness so that they could endorse the proposal and support its approval.

He finalized his report and thanked the participants for their attention.

Mrs. Kathryn Ries remarked that she wanted to add that the timeline mentioned by Mr. Edas Muñoz Galleano was an outcome of the meeting which had taken place in Cancun where they had laid out the steps of what had to happen in order to get a PSSA designation. She added that the schedule was an aggressive one and that there was an enormous amount of information which needed to be collected in order to submit a proposal that would be acceptable to the IMO.

She remarked that she wanted to reemphasize that what Mr. Edas Muñoz Galleano had pointed out: hydrography, hydrography and hydrography was a common thread all the way through the process because that proposal was going to the IMO. She highlighted the following points:

- The IMO is concerned primarily with safety of navigation.
- Unless there is good solid hydrography to underpin that kind of proposal, it will have a lower potential for success.
- There are other kinds of information but just as that process goes forward, it will be extremely important for the affected countries to be very engaged and ensure that the hydrography is be a fundamental part of the proposal throughout development of it.

She then remarked that it was very exciting, very ambitious and that there was a lot of work to be done over the next couple of years. She added that the support which had been provided by the MACHC was essential to the success of their plans. She finalized her words by telling the Chairman that the report of the Task Group 2 was going to be presented by Rafael Ponce and added that that presentation was

going to conclude the Electronic Chart Committee report.

The Decisions reached during the discussions on this Agenda item were:

- a) Discuss the side scan specifications with RESON to determine if they can meet IHO specifications and if so, under what restrictions?
- b) Side scan will be replaced with one that better meets the IHO and Gulf of Honduras Project requirements.
- c) The responsible national focal point must establish an internal integrated team of representatives from all agencies and organizations with national hydrographic interest to plan and use the hydrographic equipment.
- d) Confirm the national points of contact that will coordinate directly with the NOAA/Navy trainers.
- e) Put Belize focal point in direct contact with NOAA hydrographer; put Honduras and Guatemala focal points in contact with the Navy hydrographer.
- f) Countries to provide existing tide gauge and geodetic network information directly to the NOAA or Navy hydrographers; UK and NOAA also to provide any related information they have.
- g) Countries ensure availability of vessels and personnel.
- h) Countries should produce and provide a list of navigation hazards to be proved or disproved in the surveys to the respective NOAA/Navy hydrographer as part of the survey planning.
- i) The survey plans in the Hydrographic Activities Implementation Plan will be the basis for the surveys but may need to be modified or updated (i.e. to encompass the new cruise ship pier in Belize). Country contacts will discuss modifications directly with the NOAA/Navy hydrographers.
- j) During the surveys, if new Dangers to Navigation are indentified, the countries should be sure they are immediately reported to the UKHO ([Navwarnings@btconnect.com](mailto:Navwarnings@btconnect.com)) or Nav Area 4 Coordinator ([MCDWWWNWS@nga.mil](mailto:MCDWWWNWS@nga.mil))
- k) Countries to provide the survey data in XYZ format, with a PDF of the final survey sheets, and copy of survey report to the UKHO. UKHO will provide copies of the chart compilations to the relevant countries for review before publication
- l) Provide a common format for the survey report to the three countries.
- m) Countries to provide preferred dates for the surveys to trainers
- n) Travel arrangements for the trainers communicated to the IHO Bureau so that plane tickets can be purchased at the best price and other arrangements can be made for per diem, etc.

#### ECC Task Group 2

Mr. Rafael Ponce that on the previous day they had started with the Electronic Chart Committee Task Group 2 and revised the status of ENC cells production and remarked that he had received five countries' excel spreadsheets on the current status of ENC production sent by Brazil, Colombia, the Netherlands, the United Kingdom and the United States. He added that he had also received the Cuban ENC cell production that day and that he was going to incorporate it into his presentation.

He shared with the participants an action item from the previous MACHC Meeting and pointed out that it had been intended for the creation of MACHC Regional ENC Production Scheme including not only what was available but also what had been planned to be produced and when it was going to be available. He then reminded the participants of the Usage Bands or Navigational Purposes for the ENC Cells. He mentioned that they had six navigational purposes based on the S55 production guidance, some of the WEND principles which had to be taken into account to build the Regional ENC Scheme and he highlighted the ones which he had found to be of crucial importance concerning some of the issues that he had found with those five countries which had sent him the information prior to that meeting. He highlighted the following:

- ENC duplication should be avoided.
- A single ENC producing country should exist in any given area.
- It is one of the main things the Member States are to focus their efforts on because there are a few examples of overlapping areas.

He showed the participants a screenshot of what had been produced within the MACHC Region:

- The US NOAA Charts;
- Colombia;
- The Netherlands;
- Brazil;

– The UKHO.

He highlighted overlapping cells and showed them an example of ENC Cell, an overview cell produced by the UKHO overlapping with another cell which was going to be produced by the US NOAA. He showed another example of a Colombian cell overlapping with a UKHO cell, both within the same usage band.

He remarked that he had just picked out those examples as a sample of the work that they needed to do in the region and identify where they had those overlapping areas with products in the same usage band. He added that it was pretty much what really needed to be done. *First of all, to get all the available data to put in the system and identify the overlaps.*

He said that some countries had provided information which was going to be ratified and others had provided information which was going to be rectified in the scheme and encouraged the Member States to provide them with updated information so that they could have the scheme up to date. He highlighted the following:

- All the ENC Cells have to be organized by usage bands.
- Next time, they will be color-coded by usage bands provided that the countries supply the necessary updated information in order for it to be done (He committed to accomplish that task provided that the countries supplied the necessary information).
- Identifying the overlapping cells.
- The Member States need to resolve those issues, come up with a plan and report their progress to the next MACHC Meeting about what has been decided.
- Define the criteria to select the prevailing cells, the ones which shall be officially issued by the countries.
- Those criteria will be pasted to the WEND Guidance and it will be taken as a baseline for decisions.
- Exchange of source data and Metadata to identify which cells have the more accurate data.
- Identify the most accurate products with the updates.
- The producer nations should communicate with each other and agree on validation processes for data available and combine it if it is convenient.
- Decide who is going to produce the cells in the end.
- Define the cell boundaries.
- Edge matching of the cells (A very difficult issue) horizontally and vertically.
- Establish the final production plan.

He then finalized the presentation of the report of Task Group 2.

Mr. Erwin Wormgoor (The Netherlands) remarked that he was going to address the same delicate matter which had been addressed that morning during the presentation of his national report as well as during the task meeting. He proposed that, at the end of that they, they should take note about the present concerning situation and highlighted the following points:

- Venezuela offered its services a few years ago to produce two ENCs.
- Time is pressing and in 2010 there will need to be a Paper Chart equivalent coverage of ENCs.

He then stated that due to exceptional time pressing circumstances, he would like to ask the Chairman to summon Venezuela to respond to the originally agreed scheme and if Venezuela should not respond to it, the Netherlands would like to offer to produce two ENCs waiting for the Venezuelan response in due time. He then remarked that the offer of the Netherlands was to look for a temporary solution of that pressing problem. He remarked that, if Venezuela was able to take over again, the Netherlands were going to leave it up to Venezuela.

He highlighted the importance of addressing that concern to Venezuela and proposed that the plenary should do it with a letter from the Chairman on behalf of MACHC, expressing the concern and the intermediate solution.

He thanked the participants for their attention and finalized his comments.

The Chairman remarked that actions were going to be taken to address the issue and that the letter to Venezuela was going to be written. He added that immediate response from Venezuela was expected in order for the presidency of MACHC to provide a solution to the problem within the shortest time possible.

Captain Wesley Cavalheiro (Brazil) asked about the numbers of the charts they had been talking

about.

Mr. Erwin Wormgoor replied that the two charts were the following: ENC 4023 (1 to 1,000,000) and ENC 4108 (1 to 300,000).

Captain Wesley Cavalheiro from Brazil – He remarked that the second point on the agenda was item number 3 and then informed the participants of the contents of it: To come up with a plan and report progress to the next MACHC meeting.

Captain Wesley Cavalheiro suggested that the issue should not be left up to just the Member States to coordinate the issue. He proposed that the Work Group should list all the cases and take the initiative to contact the Hydrographic Service responsible for each situation and coordinate their efforts in providing solutions to them.

Mrs. Kathryn Ries supported Captain Wesley Cavalheiro's proposal and highlighted the following points.

- All the overlaps are expected to have been identified by January 1<sup>st</sup> as well as the individual countries responsible for them.

- It is the responsibility of those countries to engage with each other to come up with a plan to address those.

- Of course, the Chair and the Technical Coordinator will be monitoring the situation and reminding countries that they need to be engaged if they are not.

Mr. Erwin Wormgoor (The Netherlands) remarked that he would agree with that approach as outlined by the US and added that, when nations who are listed as having overlapping data resolve those issues between them, they should then let the Chart Committee know so that they can be extracted from the list of unresolved.

Ms. Kathryn Ries agreed with Mr. Erwin Wormgoor's suggestion and pointed out that they could add what he had suggested in order to be explicit.

Captain Hugo Gorziglia (IHB) stated that he believed it was the right time to make available to the participants a communication that he had received the previous day from Venezuela. He remarked that that communication had been addressed to him as the Director of IHB.

He stated that he had replied to Venezuela that that matter was of concern to the MACHC Meeting and that the MACHC Meeting had Chairman who was beside him and he was going to pass a printed copy of that information. He said that it was he had to say about it.

He then pointed out that he believed that Regional Coordination was a subject of the Regional Hydrographic Commission and not of the IHB. He added that as an IHB representative at the meeting, he was an observer who was trying to contribute to it and pass on the experience he had obtained from other Regional Hydrographic Commissions in order to enrich their discussion.

He stated that the IHB was not to take any position on the MACHC decisions. He highlighted that The letter from Venezuela contained four points: two points referring to INT Charts, INT Chart 4022 and INT Chart 2001. He said that because there was going to be a report on INT Charts after that Electronic INT Chart, he was going to talk about it later. He then added the following:

- Another point that they made, the third point, refers to Capacity Building matters: *“Venezuela reaffirms the commitment to offer the practical hydrographic surveying and basic elements of nautical cartography to be delivered, starting the second week of March 2009”*.

- This information has been provided in order for the MACHC Members to consider that which was included in the Work Program for 2009.

- *“If you so agree, the CBC can postpone the provision of the resources if you feel that these activities are still important for MACHC. In that case, MACHC should reply to Venezuela that these activities are still within the agenda for 2009 and that MACHC will provide information to the CBC to ensure that resources will be kept for the next year”*.

Mr. Erwin Wormgoor remarked The Netherlands, in reference to the Electronic Nautical Charts 300, 200 published by the Venezuela Republic, has requested permission to accede to the data contained in the charts for their internal exclusive use. Due to the contents of the Netherlands waters, Aruba, Curacao and

Borneo, the Hydrographic Office of Venezuela has agreed to authorize the ICENC to make free access of this information to the Netherlands Hydrographic Office. He remarked that he was not sure whether the information he had just shared with them would make any change about what they had been discussing. He added that it probably just referred to a particular point between the Netherlands and Venezuela; however, if they needed to make any decisions with regard to that information, the Chairman was going to be able to lead them through it. He thanked the participants for their attention and finalized his words.

Having no more comments on the issue, the Chairman moved on to the next point on the agenda, the report on International Charts and invited Captain Wesley Wandermurem Cavalheiro to present it.

The Decisions reached during the discussions on this Agenda item were: a) Revise the Regional Priority List of Ports and Routes Plan that was prepared in previous MACHC meetings, it will be upload in MACHC website by mid November 2008, UKHO will update its data and ECC will make the complete list available. All Countries will revise and validate their data in the list by the end of November, if a MS don't send a revised list of ports and routes it will be considered updated. The final list will be available at MACHC website in January 1<sup>st</sup>. 2009. b) To use the IMO definition of "adequate ENC coverage" (current paper chart catalogues) in making the MACHC ENC Regional Scheme. c) The 1:1 000 000 ENCs: i) The UKHO will discuss with Cuba, Venezuela, Colombia and Mexico the 4011 ENC in order to redefine its boundaries based on existing ENC data in the same Usage Band. ii) The UKHO will discuss 4017 ENC with Cuba and US to consider if an existing ENC cell can be adopted instead, redefining its boundaries accordingly. iii) To send a letter to Venezuela asking its intention producing charts nb 4023 and 4108. Netherlands offered to produce 4023 (1:1 000 000) and 4108 (1:300 000) ENCs if Venezuela accept it as an interim solution or until there is a bilateral agreement between both nations. iv) Other 1:1 000 000 ENCs in the expanded MACHC region, will be identified based on the INT Paper Chart scheme and its boundaries proposed by the ECC to MACHC Member States. These additional ENCs should be reflected at the MACHC web site. v) UKHO will look at existing ENC coverage to be used in the interim. vi) MACHC web site will reflect the ENC 4022 is produced by France. d) To coordinate the overlap of cells between involved Member States, listing the existing cases and come up with a plan and report progress to the next MACHC meeting.

#### Report by the International Chart Committee

Captain Wesley Cavalheiro (Brazil) stated that the issues concerning International Charts had been discussed the previous day and that the International Chart Scheme had been displayed on a slide for all the participants to see it. He then showed them a slide with the summary of the discussion that they had had then. He highlighted the following points:

- The UK and the US were going to send the necessary data for Cuba in order to produce Charts No. 4154, 4158, 4166, 4170, and 4149.
- There are five charts in all and the USA and the UK have decided to set a deadline for Cuba to deliver the data and they are waiting for the response.

Mrs. Kathryn Ries (USA) replied that she could provide it written down to the Committee. She then highlighted the following points:

- They had just discussed it the previous day.
- They were going to provide each other with updates every six months.
- They were going to coordinate the communication between the three countries on a biannual basis.

Captain Wesley Cavalheiro thanked Ms. Kathryn Ries and resumed his presentation moving on to

the next point in it:

– MACHC took note of IHB Letter Number S3/4230/B dated 13 Jan 2006, Venezuela email dated 15 JUL 2008, and Venezuela letter Ref 1000 dated 8 OCT 2008, and supported the following agreement between Venezuela and France regarding Chart 4022:

- Venezuela took the responsibility for the paper chart.
- France took the responsibility for the correspondent ENC Chart.

There was an agreement for the coproduction of the INT Chart. – To ask IHB to change information about INT Chart 4022 at Pub. M11 regarding responsibility (remove France). – To ask IHB to change the information about INT Chart 4154 at Pub. M11 regarding scale (change to 1:500.000). – Mexico should confirm if the MACHC web site INT Chart data base is updated and should take action to update

it in case it is not. – The INT Chart Committee should produce an INT Chart Plan. – MACHC took note and ratified the following proposal of new numbers for the following INT Charts:

- INT216, to INT407
- INT2002, to INT4071
- INT2104 to INT2107, to INT4194 to 4197
- INT2001, to INT4070
- INT2100 to 2103, to INT4190 to 4193

He highlighted that the proposed changes had been based on the extended area of MACHC. He added that the CHRIS Committee had already agreed with them. He remarked that the renumbering of the Charts had actually been proposed by CHRIS, had been discussed the previous day and had just been brought to the table in order for it to be ratified. He then moved on to the next point:

– The UK in consultation with Cuba and the US will investigate the possibility of an alternative solution for the interim coverage of charts 4017 and 4021.

– MACHC accepted the UK's proposal to be responsible for INT Chart 4176.

MACHC accepted the US proposal to have its national charts 4015, 4016, 4145, 4146, 4147, and 4148, serve as

interim products until the INT Chart version can be produced.

The Decisions agreed during the discussions on this Agenda item were:

- a) UK and US will send the necessary data for Cuba in order to produce Charts nb 4154, 4158, 4166, 4170, and 4149.
- b) MACHC takes note IHB letter S3/4230/B dated 13 Jan 2006, Venezuela email dated 15 JUL 2008, and Venezuela letter Ref 1000 dated 8 OCT 2008, and supports the following agreement between Venezuela and France regarding Chart 4022:
  - Venezuela takes the responsibility of the paper chart.
  - France takes the responsibility of the correspondent ENC Chart.
  - The establishment of an agreement for a coproduction of the INT Chart.
- c) To ask IHB to change information about INT Chart 4022 at Pub. M11 regarding responsibility (remove France).
- d) To ask IHB to change information about INT Chart 4154 at Pub. M11 regarding scale (change to 1:500.000).
- e) Mexico should confirm if the MACHC web site INT Chart data base is updated and should take action to update it in the case it is not.
- f) The INT Chart Committee should produce an INT Chart Plan.
- g) MACHC take note and ratify the following proposal of new numbers of INT Charts:
  - INT216, to INT407
  - INT2002, to INT4071
  - INT2104 to INT2107, to INT4194 to 4197
  - INT2001, to INT4070
  - INT2100 to 2103, to INT4190 to 4193
- h) UK in consultation with Cuba and US will investigate possibility of alternative solution for interim coverage of

charts 4017 and 4021.

i) MACHC accept UK proposal to be responsible of INT Chart 4176.

j) MACHC accept the US proposal to have its national charts 4015, 4016, 4145, 4146, 4147, and 4148, serve as

interim products until the INT Chart version can be produced.

#### 8. Report on MACHC Forum (8th MACHC Action 2)

The Chairman, RearAdmiral José Jesus Ocaña García (Mexico), moved on to the next reports scheduled: The report on activities of the Virtual Forum Work Group, the Report of the Work Group on the MACHC Statutes Revision as well as the Report of Work Group on Council Representation. He invited Captain Wesley Cavalheiro (Brazil) to present those reports.

Captain Wesley started with the report on activities of the Virtual Forum Work Group and read the MACHC.909Forum.pdf paper and stated that he wanted to hear the participants about the proposal which had been brought up for discussion.

Mrs. Kathryn Ries (USA) stated that, from the US perspective, the UK's proposal made sense to them and added that they wanted to avoid duplication. She remarked that she believed that using the forum mainly as a way to communicate and express views would be appropriate but not posting documents. Posting them just to the website to avoid confusion would be the way to go.

Captain Hugo Gorziglia (IHB) stated that there were several Hydrographic Commissions that had selected that tool for discussing a particular topic and that the webpage was for the normal affairs. He pointed out the following:

- When there is a topic that needs interaction, it calls for the forum to be activated and they start discussions on Monday at two o'clock, for example, and they start exchanging views. Then, when they finalize the discussions, the final document goes to the web.

- The forum is activated each time it is necessary to discuss a particular topic.

He remarked that those were the impressions they had gotten (what they had sensed) from the IHB.

Since there were no more comments on the topic, they moved on to the next topic: Status Revision.

The Decision agreed during the discussions on this Agenda item is reported above, at item 3.

The web addresses of the mentioned tools are:

MACHC Forum: <http://groups.yahoo.com/group/machcforum/>

MACHC contact form: [http://www.ihomachc.org/about/MACHC\\_Comment\\_Form.pdf](http://www.ihomachc.org/about/MACHC_Comment_Form.pdf)

#### 9. Report on MACHC Statutes revision, including Region Limits change (8th MACHC Action 3, 6, and 9)

Captain Wesley Cavalheiro read MACHC.910Statutes.pdf paper. The mentioned paper covered Action 3 and 6 of the last meeting.

After that Captain Wesley invited the participants to make comments on the proposal he had just submitted to the plenary.

Mrs. Gwladys Theuillon (France) pointed out that she had a remark on Article 5 e: "The incoming Chair shall take office one month after the conclusion of an ordinary Conference".

She stated that she believed that that period was probably too short and should be increased in order for the Chair who would be leaving office to have time to finalize the conference report so that the Member States could have time to reply to the resolutions. She proposed that that period should be increased.

Captain Wesley Cavalheiro asked Mrs. Gwladys Theuillon from France, how long she proposed that the period should be extended to.

Mrs. Gwladys Theuillon remarked that she had talked to the UK representative about it but they had not been able to come to terms. She had thought of 6 months and the UK of 2 months.

Captain Wesley Cavalheiro remarked that he believed that 6 months was too long a time for that.

Mrs. Marguerite Danley (USA) remarked that she had been rereading the terms for the Chair and the ViceChair which read that “Under normal circumstances, the maximum term for the Chair and Vice Chair will be two years”. She remarked that that meant there could be situations where the Chair could be there for longer than two years, to what Captain Wesley Cavalheiro replied that it could also be less than two years.

She then pointed out that there was not a specific time limit for the ViceChair. She suggested that it was necessary to specify that somewhere in the document as well.

Mr. Erwin Wormgoor (The Netherlands) replied that he believed that issue had already been covered by the item 5c where it was assumed that the ViceChair was supposed to take over from the Chair at the end of the term.

Mrs. Marguerite Danley brought up the concern that if the Chair was there for more or less than two years, it did not specify whether or not the ViceChair would then continue for that period of time. She said she understood the implications and that the matter in that case was that they wanted to be more specific.

The Chairman, RearAdmiral José Jesus Ocaña García, stated that he believed that the time length of the term of the ViceChair was going to be dependent upon the time length of the term of the MACHC Chair because the ViceChair is expected to provide continuity to the issues and works performed within each of the Commissions which take place throughout the length of his or her time in office. He added that for that reason, the term of the ViceChair depended greatly upon the time in office of the MACHC Chair.

Lieutenant Commander Angel Acanda Reyes (Cuba) expressed his views on the length of the term of the MACHC Chair and highlighted the following:

- The maximum term for the Chair and Vice Chair had been established and it would be two years.
- Nevertheless, the way it is was not clear how long the term would last, whether it would be six months or one year or a different amount of time.

He proposed that it should not the length of the terms of the MACHC Chair and the ViceChair should not be left open but rather, it should be clearly specified in the MACHC Statutes.

Captain Wesley Cavalheiro remarked that due to the inexistence of a fixed date for conferences, it would be very complicated to establish a fixed period of time for the terms of both the MACHC Chair and ViceChair. He illustrated his point talking about the date of the next scheduled MACHC Conference which was going to take place in October. He said that perhaps the next conference, following the one in October, could easily fall in a period of time which would prevent them from being able to comply with the time limit proposed for the terms of the MACHC Chair and ViceChair to come to an end. He said that it might well be impossible to comply with this proposed specific time length and emphasized that some flexibility concerning the issue was definitely required.

Captain Hugo Gorziglia (IHB) stated that he believed the way the item had been worded: “Under normal circumstances”, implied some flexibility. He highlighted the following points:

- MACHC might want to meet once a year, biannually, triennially or even more or less frequently (within shorter or longer time lengths) depending on the needs to be addressed.
- For this reason it is not possible to associate the chairmanship with the meeting dates once the meetings do not take place at a regular periodicity.
- Probably “Under normal circumstances” covers that situation.
- About the issue of the ViceChairman, it is not mandatory. It is just suggested that the Vice-Chairman might take over the position of the Chairman but the decision would have to be confirmed by the conference.
- With regard to the period of time that the Chairman should be provided with, in order for him or her to finalize the work, each Regional Hydrographic Commission has adopted a different approach.
- In some regions the Chairman is exempted from office at the end of the Regional Hydrographic Commission. Then, the Chair pronounces his farewell speech, reports what has been accomplished during

his term and hands it over to somebody else who is usually elected at the opening of the meeting.

- In your case, you have decided that this turn over shall take place after the meeting.

- It has some rationality that the Chairman will finalize his or her work with the minutes of his or her meeting. Fantastic!

- Maybe one month is too short a time to produce the minutes, but if you could agree upon a time ranging from one to six months and make a term of compromise, it would be convenient. Maybe three months would do. However, it is appropriate that you should come to terms with this period of time.

Captain Hugo Gorziglia Antolín then stated that he had more comments to make: about the minutes (probably Letter h of Article 7 of the Statutes) – He remarked that it read that the report had to be submitted to the Full Members twenty (20) days after the close of the Conference. He suggested that it should not only be submitted only to the Full Members but also to all the participants because some of the participants might want to make some observations to it and check whether their message was well recorded and clearly understood. He suggested that, for that reason, instead of limiting it to the Full Members, all the participants should have access to it.

Captain Wesley Cavalheiro (Brazil) remarked that the numbers the proposal was feasible due to the fact that, even the Full Members who were not present at the meeting would be receiving the report on it as well.

Captain Hugo Gorziglia acknowledged and appreciated the comments made by Captain Wesley and pointed out the following:

- The important thing is that participants should have an opportunity to review it.

- Article 7 Letter j / XI – It reads, “To prepare the final report and forward it to the IHO”. Instead of forward it to the IHO, it should be forwarded to the IHB.

He remarked that his observations demonstrated that he was absolutely attentive of the report and finished his comments.

Captain Wesley Cavalheiro stated that a decision was required for the period of time that the Chairman was going to be provided with in order to produce the minutes of his or her minutes. He told the participants that, whether it would be one month, two months, three months or even six months, a decision was required.

Captain Antonio Fernando Garcez Faria (Brazil) remarked that he had been waiting for the opportunity to speak and highlighted the following:

- Article 7 reads that 20 days are established for the report to be sent and another 10 days for the Members to be sent it back.

- If there is a proposal to postpone extend the period of time for the Chair to send his or her minutes, it must comply (be coherent) with Article 7. It is a major point to be considered.

- It is just a matter of voting the proposals of time periods between one and six months. Whichever period of time gets the most votes should be confirmed.

- Another possibility would be just to go for the threemonth period which is right in the middle of the extremes suggested.

The Chairman, RearAdmiral José Jesus Ocaña García, brought the proposal of the threemonth time period to the table and asked the plenary whether they would agree with that. The plenary accepted the proposal and the threemonth time period for the Chair to prepare the minutes of his or her meeting was confirmed and ratified.

Captain Wesley Cavalheiro showed (on the screen) the participants a part of the statutes which was likely to suffer alterations.

Mrs. Marguerite Danley (USA) asked for some clarification about the Letter j of Article 7 referring to the duties of the Secretariat. She pointed out that unless she had missed it somewhere, it did not discuss who the Secretariat was. She said she believed the obvious assumption was that the Secretary would be the staff of the Chair but she remarked it was just an assumption.

Captain Wesley Cavalheiro suggested the finalization of the issue of the time and the report before

going back to the topic brought up by Mrs. Marguerite Danley from the United States.

He said that the time established had been three months. He suggested that if a period of fortyfive days were set for the delivery of the first minutes, there would be fifteen days for comments and observations from Member States and participants and the Chair would have thirty days to come up with the final document.

Mr. Christopher Smith (UK) replied that he believed it would be desirable to try and get the minutes as early as possible after the meeting. He then voiced the following personal impressions:

- He would not like to extend those twenty days significantly.
- Giving slightly more than ten days for response time would be reasonable.
- There is quite a lot of work to tie up the loose ends once the report is finished and has been circulated.
- I would probably not extend the twenty days, maybe allow three weeks for the objections and comments to come in but leave the rest of the time for just tidying up an orderly transfer of functions across to the new Chair.

Captain Antonio Fernando Garcez Faria (Brazil) attempted to confirm whether he had understood the proposal correctly by rephrasing it the following way: the proposal was to keep to the first twenty days and increase the period for the Member States and Participants to send in their comments and objections from ten to twenty days. He was able to confirm then what he had understood of the proposal and thanked the proponent for confirming it.

Captain Wesley Cavaleiro (Brazil) observed that there was an alteration to be made and read the following: “In preparation for, during and between Conferences, the Chair shall be assisted by the Secretariat”. He asked whether they should use the term “Secretariat” or “Secretary” to which Mrs. Marguerite Danley from the United States replied that “Secretary” would be appropriate.

Mrs. Marguerite Danley remarked that her prior question had been concerning the fact that, unless she had missed something, she was not able to see anything addressing the issue of who was supposed to be that “Secretary”.

Captain Antonio Fernando Garcez Faria (Brazil) suggested that the “Secretary” issue could be resolved by rephrasing it the following way: “by a Secretary appointed by the Chair”. He added that, in that case, the “Secretary” would be from within the Chair’s staff.

He then suggested that they should go back to the twoyear period issue just to check whether it had been understood correctly by the plenary.

He then pointed out that even though they had been discussing the flexibility of the terms of the Chair and ViceChair, the end of Letter c read, “The Vice-Chair shall be elevated to the position of Chair for the next two-year period”. He then proposed that they could just set up “twoyear period between successive conferences”. He remarked that the proposed wording would be able to take care of whether it would be one and a half years, twentysix months or something around those lines.

Captain Wesley Cavaleiro proposed that “the next twoyear period” could be deleted and the wording would be shortened to “the next period”.

Words of Captain Antonio Fernando Garcez Faria from Brazil – He complied with Captain Wesley Wandermurem Cavaleiro’s suggestion and added that, in Letter b, they should change the text to something like: “The Chair and Vice-Chair will be limited to a two-year period between successive conferences” or something along those lines. He then asked for help from the UK and the US with the right wording of the sentence.

Mrs. Marguerite Danley asked whether there was a specific process for the election of the Chair and the ViceChair. She then highlighted that she realized that, generally, there were not people fighting for that position and therefore it seemed to be the case that usually whoever volunteered was usually selected. She then suggested that, perhaps, what was really needed was a proper election process. She then asked the plenary whether what her perception really made sense or not.

Captain Antonio Fernando Garcez Faria remarked that he did not know how to describe it properly and suggested that, perhaps the word that fitted better into the description would be “appointed” but highlighted that “elected” would sound better and more democratic even though there was usually one volunteer for the position.

Captain Wesley Cavalheiro remarked there seemed to be no consensus on the issue; he proposed to keep the initial wording and move on to the next issue on the program.

Lieutenant Commander Angel Acanda Reyes (Cuba) pointed out that as far as the specific wording for the “election process” was concerned and in spite of the designation of the position, it was ultimately an election because it was endorsed by the Member States of the MACHC present at the meeting. He remarked that he was not sure as to what the other participants thought of it but, for him; the term “election” seemed to be the most appropriate.

Captain Wesley Cavalheiro asked the plenary whether they agreed with the proposal to keep to the term “election” as suggested by the Cuban representative.

Captain Antonio Fernando Garcez Faria asked the plenary whether there were a suggestion for a better way of writing down the second paragraph of letter b.

Captain Hugo Gorziglia stated that he had a suggestion to delete the words “will be limited”. He proposed the following wording: “Under normal circumstances, the maximum term for the Chair and Vice Chair will be two years”. He added that in case the plenary was interested in deleting the word “maximum”, they might as well do that and then it would remain: “Under normal circumstances, the term for the Chair and Vice Chair will be two years”.

Mr. Rafael Ponce (ESRI) pointed out an inconsistency between “d” where it was written “selected” and “c” where it was written “selection”. He proposed that “c” should be changed to “regarding the election of a new Chair”.

Captain Antonio Fernando Garcez Faria remarked that he believed they just needed to define which word they were going to be using for both: “elected” or “selected”? He then asked the plenary who was in favor of the term “elected”.

Captain Hugo Gorziglia Antolín – He stated that he wanted to contribute to clarify the situation. He highlighted the following: The rules of procedures that IHO Member States have agreed upon within the new structure state are the following: “The Chair and Vice-Chair shall be a representative of a Member State. The election of a Chair and a Vice-Chair”. He then remarked that IHO had employed the term “election”.

Captain Wesley Cavalheiro asked whether the participants agreed with the final configuration of article 7 (update at the screen).

He showed the participants the new limits of the Commission which had been approved and remarked that they could update the diagram that they had on the Statutes. He then stated that if the plenary had no objections to the report, it could be considered approved. He added that there was two more subject to be addressed before lunch time and suggested that they should be rescheduled and reduced to fifteen minutes. He proposed that they closed the meeting for the time being and resumed it after lunch, at two p.m.

The plenary agreed with the proposal and the meeting was closed.

The Decision reached during the discussions on this Agenda item was:

– MACHC approved the amendments to the Statutes. The approved texts are in Annex to these Minutes.

#### 10. Report on MACHC Council Representation, including Hydrographic Interest (8th MACHC Action 4)

The Chairman, RearAdmiral José Jesus Ocaña García, greeted the participants and resumed the meeting. He informed the plenary that Captain Wesley Cavalheiro from Brazil was going to resume the

presentation on the activities of the Work Group on Council Representation emphasizing the Hydrographic interests of it.

Captain Wesley Cavalheiro referred to MACHC.911Council.pdf paper which the participants had received at the beginning of the MACHC Meeting. He pointed out that it referred to Action List No. 4 of the previous meeting. He displayed the report on the screen and read it item per item. After that he asked for the participants' comments.

The Chairman asked the plenary whether they had any comments to make concerning the proposal for the approval of the report just presented.

Mr. Erwin Wormgoor (The Netherlands) remarked that, in general, the Netherlands could agree on the proposal, as made by Brazil, and added that they could also agree to extend the MACHC Statutes with the provision, if the amendments of the convention were approved.

He then stated that their major concern was especially within the Annex A where they thought that for the oncoming years, the Hydrographic Interest limited to tonnage would be the most pragmatic way to proceed forward as it had been addressed in the Work Group. He added that he also believed that there were so many other important subjects on that floor to meet the IMO obligations that they should focus their attention on the core business of collecting Hydrographic data and producing the products.

He then stated that they would certainly agree that Annex B was a sensible way forward and said however that it was a very complex issue that was going to be considered again at the next conference in detail. He then remarked that he would agree that they have more important issues to consider in the short term.

He thanked the participants for their attention and finalized his words.

Captain Wesley Cavalheiro remarked that the conclusion of the Work Group had been to leave the contents of Annex A on standby and just request the participants of the meeting to approve the little amendment made to Article 3 of the current Statutes and include Annex B as the first guideline to that subject. He then proposed that the issue of Hydrographic Interest should be left on standby for the coming years when they would be able to collect more data.

The Chairman asked the plenary to voice their opinions as to whether they agreed on the proposal which had just been brought up concerning Annex B.

Mrs. Kathryn Ries (USA) remarked that it was practically selfevident that they would agree with the proposal due to the fact that they had taken part in the Working Group. She then stated that they agreed with the proposal as Captain Wesley Cavalheiro had presented it.

Captain Wesley Cavalheiro clarified that the proposal did not refer to the continuity of the Work Group but just to leave it on standby and just include that sentence in the Annex.

Ms. Kathryn Ries confirmed that it was what she had been referring to that they supported.

Mrs. Marguerite Danley (USA) pointed out that she understood the concern about the Hydrographic Interest and the interest of many countries to look at alternatives on that but she did agree that since the protocol of amendments had not been able to gather the necessary number of countries to ratify it, it would be something which they should have a little more time on. She also voiced her concern as to whether there would even be enough countries even by the time of the next conference.

She suggested that it was something that they really should put aside and spend the time between the conferences considering it and making sure that it was being covered the way they really wanted it to be covered. She added that they should get as many countries to endorse it as they could rather than struggling with at that moment when they had other important things to work on.

Captain Wesley Cavalheiro asked the plenary whether they had any more comments to make on the topic and whether they were the solution had been satisfactory.

As the plenary finally managed to agree upon the proposal, he thanked the participants for their

attention and finalized his presentation.

The Decisions agreed during the discussions on this Agenda item were:

a) Amend Article 3 as follows:

*“b) To identify the MACHC Representative(s) to the IHO Council, as outlined in the guidance provided in Annex 3 to the Statutes”*

(The writing of the mentioned Annex 3 is in the Annex to these Minutes)

b) Maintain HI subject stand by.

#### 11. MACHC Relationships with others organizations

(COI, IBCCA, FIG/OHI, PAIGH)

The Chairman Commander Raúl Martínez Sánchez (Mexico) and announced that he was going to present a report on the relations of MACHC with other organisms.

Commander Raúl Martínez Sánchez (Mexico) announced that the purpose of that Committee was to establish the relationship of MACHC with other organizations in order to be able to identify common objectives and use them for the optimization of resources so that they could bring about greater benefit for the region. He then highlighted he had found out that MACHC objectives were strongly connected to those of the Pan American Institute of Geography and History (PAIGH) through its Hydrographic Committee.

He then remarked that, comparatively, they had been able to find the following similarities between the two organizations:

MACH	PAIGH Hydrographic Committee
Member of the International Hydrographic Organization. Examine aspects of interest to the IHO in the region. Implement the International Chart Scheme in the region.	Cooperate with Hydrographic Organizations for the fulfillment of technical resolutions.
Promote technical cooperation and training for Hydrographic Surveys, Maritime Cartography and Nautical information. - Develop studies and projects through Work Groups. Develop a Hydrographic Committee and stimulate the exchange of Hydrographic data.	Develop training and build capacity.
Stimulate Hydrographic activities within the region.	Highlight the importance of Hydrography.

He remarked that he was going to present some comparative information of the Member States of each of the two groups and highlighted the following points:

- There are twelve countries with membership status in both organizations.
- For this reason, there is a great possibility to identify common points of interest for the development of joint projects.

He then showed the participants a list of 12 countries which took part in both organizations and pointed out some other countries that are not MACHC Member States are members of the IHO.

Summing up, he remarked that there were 31 countries that belonged to at least one of the three organizations:

- 19 countries belong to OHI;
- 20 belonged to MACHC; and
- 25 belong to PAIGH.

He then highlighted out the following common points:

- The countries which comprise the Hydrographic Committee of PAIGH are Argentina, Chile, Ecuador and Mexico.

- Even though, cooperation needs are the same between the MACHC and the PAIGH and there have

been precedent situations of cooperation between both groups, there is not a Committee or Work Group neither at the MACHC nor at the PAIGH to coordinate joint activities of cooperation.

– Presently, Mexico represents the Presidency and the Secretariat of the Hydrographic Committee of PAIGH and is not able to coordinate cooperation activities and joint projects.

– All the countries belonging to either the MACHC or the PAIGH or both, become Members of OHI.

– Coordinate joint activities among the Members of OHI, PAIGH, and MACHC, optimizing resources and originating greater benefits.

– Create a Work Group to coordinate joint activities between MACHC and the PAIGH Hydrographic Committee.

After that, Commander Raúl Martínez Sánchez announced that he was going to finalize with a report on the Multibeam Training which had taken place in June 2008. He said it had been a joint training project between the MACHC and the PAIGH for a training program on Multibeam on Board of a vessel run by the Hydrographic Administration of the Maritime Secretariat, Tuxpan, in Vera Cruz, Mexico. He highlighted the following points:

– The goal of the training program was to provide the attendants with experiences of planning and procedures of Multibeam operations as well as the processing of available data.

– The course was held by the Maritime Secretariat and supported by several organizations and institutions such as:

□ The Capacity Building Committee of OHI supported the training as part of their Work Program and funded the participation of those who attended it.

□ The PanAmerican Institute of Geography and History (PAIGH) supported the training through the Hydrographic Committee, funding the participation of those who attended it.

□ The Oceanographic Office of the United States Navy supported it by sending an expert in the area of Hydrography who was aboard the vessel during the Hydrographic Survey Operations.

□ The NOAA supported it by sending an expert in the area of Hydrography who was aboard the vessel during the Hydrographic Survey Operations, besides having donated the vessel which has been the greatest help of all for it was used to perform the Hydrographic Survey Operations.

– The Hydrographic Vessel Tuxpan was donated by NOAA in March, 2005 and it is the first ship of this kind operated by the Maritime Secretariat. It was equipped to be able to perform Hydrographic Surveys with Multibeam tools in areas up to one thousand meters deep. It is also equipped with manual echo sounders with capacity of up to seven thousand meters, side scan sounder, differential GPS system as well as programs for processing the collected data.

– The development of the Hydrographic Survey at Tuxpan was operated by the Maritime Secretariat 24 hours a day throughout the 4 days of the course.

– The intention was to create a realistic environment of Hydrographic Survey Operations with the collection of hydrographic data under the supervision of the experts from both the NAVOCEANO and the NOAA and relying on the support from the evolved companies (CARIS, etc.) which made for an outstanding learning experience.

– The countries that received the course included: People from Brazil, Colombia, Jamaica, Argentina and Mexico.

He then made a description of the training program to the participants and stated that the results of the course had been fully satisfactory and that the objectives of building capacity in the region had been achieved through it through the interchange of experiences among the participants.

He then thanked the institutions and organizations which had supported that training effort and pointed out that without their help they would not have been able to hold it.

The Chairman asked the participants whether there were any comments or questions they would like to make or ask.

Captain Hugo Gorziglia stated that in the honor of the truth he would like to make a statement that the organizers of that initiative of the multibeam course had been the Mexican Hydrographic Office. He remarked that they had requested the IHB and the Capacity Building Committee support for the event. He then said it was mentioned in the presentation that the CBC and the IHB provided support. He then pointed out that, unfortunately, because that request had not been channeled in the way as it was

expected, (all initiatives have to go through the Regional Hydrographic Commissions and then, after that, the Capacity Building Committee assesses it) it was impossible for the CBC to provide support to that initiative. He then remarked that the only support that they had been able to provide through the IHB had been to help in advertizing and in motivating that event to take place. He then said that, unfortunately, due to the procedures that they had in place, the CBC and the IHB could not take that initiative on board in their program. He emphasized that he wanted to clarify that since it was not proper for the IHB or the CBC to receive honors on that when, actually, there had been no contribution at all.

Lieutenant Commander Angel Acanda Reyes (Cuba) remarked that he felt he needed to make some comments on the matter and highlighted the following:

- Those who know the history of the PanAmerican Institute of Geography and History (PAIGH) will remember that the same occurred in Cuba in 1948, in our first Congress in 1958.
- This organization is dependent on the Organization of the American States (OAS).
- You know the position of Cuba concerning the OAS.
- It is coherent that we hold the same position concerning the PanAmerican Institute of Geography and History.
- For this reason, it is a very complex issue for us.
- We have had a relationship even with the previous SecretaryGeneral and accepted some invitations extended to us.
- We would not like to support this partnership.
- Our interest is taking part in the technical resolutions besides not feeling excluded.
- It would not be easy for us within the context of MACHC or the IHO if we are to vote in equality of conditions concerning the rest of the Members.
- Therefore, we must think whether we intend to keep on deepening this issue of the Committee of Hydrography of the PAIGH would prevent us from taking part in the courses and the training programs and it would not be fair.

He said that he was ringing the bell so as to call attention to the inconvenience that the theme could bring about.

The Chairman, RearAdmiral José Jesus Ocaña García asked the participants whether there were any comments they would like to make on the issue.

Captain Wesley Cavalheiro (Brazil) thanked the distinguished delegate from Cuba for his comments and highlighted the fact that there were three Hydrographic Commissions in Latin America, MACHC, SWAtHC and the EPHC. He added that there was also PAIGH which he described as a mix of the three Commissions. He stated that in their point of view, there was an overlap not of ENC Cells, but an overlap of duties and that he believed it was a matter of interest to the IHO to have some sort of agreement with other international organizations but, with regard to those organizations which had just been mentioned, some caution was really required. He justified his statement by reminding the participants of the last joint work which had been performed by the three organizations, the translation of the Hydrographic Manual. He highlighted the following points about it:

- It was a proposal made by Chile.
  - Chile requested some resources from PAIGH.
  - Chile, out of its own resources, practically sponsored the whole publication as well as the distribution of it.
  - The other organization contributed with a very tiny portion of the expenses involved in the project.
- However, since Chile had already committed to perform the work, it had to go on with the project at the point of practically sponsoring it all by itself.

He said then that he had attended one meeting of the previously mentioned organization which had been held in Brazil and what he witnessed there was mainly concerned with political matters and the major financial support they provided was focused on political projects.

He then remarked that Hydrography was practice, action, and added that Hydrographers were very practical. He then voiced his opinion that things should not get mixed up because there were Hydrographic Commissions which had already been working together mainly focused on Capacity Building. He reminded the participants that they had already been informed of the joint projects they had with three Hydrographic Commissions supported by the CBC and added that the work they were doing had been progressing and flowing satisfactorily.

He emphasized that if they were to split their efforts, they would lose focus jeopardize the success of

our work.

The Chairman remarked that it would be wise to establish a position concerning the duties and activities developed by the PAIGH in relation to the works and activities performed by this Commission because it would be a way to avoid overlapping as well as undesired political connotations that sometimes take place due to some minor support received by one group and whose impact will not bring about a quantum improvement to it. He remarked that, for the reasons presented, it would be important to consider the comments made by Captain Wesley Cavalheiro and focus their efforts on the CBC in order to achieve, through the CBC, the support for building capacity and work programs.

He then remarked that if there were no other comments to be made, they would move forward to the next point on the agenda, scheduling the next MACHC Meeting as well as its venue.

## 12. Date and Venue for the X<sup>th</sup> MACHC Meeting

He urged the participants to voice their suggestions and reminded them that they had already received a proposal from Suriname to hold the following meeting there.

Mr. Erwin Wormgoor (The Netherlands) remarked that he had had the impression that when the colleague from Suriname was speaking in the morning and inviting them to attend a Commission Meeting in Suriname, he had mentioned the 11<sup>th</sup> Commission Meeting and, therefore, a gap had been left for the 10<sup>th</sup> Meeting in 2009. He then stated that the UK, having spoken with their colleagues from Barbados was interested in offering to host the 10<sup>th</sup> Meeting in Barbados at a time convenient to the Commission, probably late October or early November of 2009 if that met the approval of the Member States.

The Chairman asked the plenary if there were any other proposals to host the next MACHC Meeting in 2009.

Since there were no other proposals, he asked the participants whether they would rather hold the next MACHC Meeting at the end of October or at the beginning of November (the first or second week of November).

The great majority of the plenary preferred to have it held in the last week of October, 2009.

The plenary finally approved to hold the 10<sup>th</sup> MACHC Meeting in Barbados, during the last week of October 2009.

The Chairman, then, moved to the next point on the agenda: The election of the new MACHC Chair and ViceChair.

The Decisions reached during the discussions on this Agenda item were:

– The 10<sup>th</sup> MACHC meeting to be held in Barbados, in the last week of October 2009, with the support of UK; and

– The 11<sup>th</sup>, in Suriname.

## 13. Election of Chairman and ViceChairman

The Chair asked the participants to voice their proposals to the election of a Chair and a ViceChair. Since none of the delegates would come up with a proposal, he asked them again to suggest names to take over those positions.

Ms. Kathryn Ries (USA) asked the Chair for clarification to learn whether he had been talking about the election of the Chair or the ViceChair.

The Chairman replied that first they were going to address the election of the ViceChair and then the Chair. After giving it a second thought, he proposed to start with the election of the Chair in the first place.

Captain George Fergusson (Barbados) appointed Brazil for the Chairmanship and the United

Kingdom for the ViceChairmanship.

Captain Steven Barnum (USA) said that he endorsed the nominations made by Barbados for both Chair (Brazil) and ViceChair (UK).

Mr. Erwin Wormgoor (The Netherlands) said that the Netherlands supported the proposal made by Barbados.

Lieutenant Commander Angel Acanda Reyes (Cuba) remarked that he felt there was substantial basis for the nominations. He added that that proposal seemed to be the most logical, the most equitable and the one which best acknowledged the work of those Hydrographic Services. He added that Cuba had also agreed with the nominations.

Lieutenant Maynor J. Cordón Perdomo (Guatemala) said that Guatemala also the proposal made by Barbados.

The Chairman remarked that Mexico also ratified the proposal made by Barbados because both Brazil and the United Kingdom held a very organized infrastructure which would help them to successfully accomplish those tasks. He then asked Brazil and the United Kingdom whether they accepted to take over those positions, the MACHC Chairmanship and the ViceChairmanship for the next term.

Captain Wesley Cavalheiro from Brazil thanked the participants and the Chairman and remarked that he felt pleased and honored with the nomination and the support received by the plenary. He stated that, if they had started the Commission with the main purpose of collaboration, then it would be just the continuation of the main purpose. He thanked all the Member States for the confidence they had invested in him and finalized his words.

Mr. Christopher Smith from the United Kingdom stated that the UK would be delighted to accept the position and felt much honored for that. He thanked the participants and finalized his words.

The Chairman stated that the issue had been resolved with the designation of the new MACHC Chair and ViceChair and invited to a brief break.

The Decision agreed during the discussions on this Agenda item was:

– Brazil and the UK were elected, respectively, Chair and ViceChair for the next period in compliance with the amended Statutes.

#### 14. List of Actions with deadlines and assigned lead

After the break, the Chairman greeted the participants and resumed the meeting. He informed the plenary that the following point of the agenda was an Action List and Recommendations made by all the participants during the development of that 9<sup>th</sup> MACHC Meeting. He then remarked that Captain Wesley Cavalheiro was going to present that list to them.

Captain Wesley Cavalheiro (Brazil) stated that with the contribution of all the participants (the notes received from the participants) he merged all of them into some sort of draft document showing it at the screen. As each item was shown, deadlines and attributions were stated, resulting in the draft Action List of the meeting.

#### 15. Any Other Business

Colonel Eloy Ortíz, (Cuba) remarked that he wanted to extend an invitation to the participants to attend an event that they were going to hold in Cuba, the [6<sup>th</sup> International Congress of Geomatics](#) and described the topics which were going to be presented at the Congress which was going to take place between the 9<sup>th</sup> and the 13<sup>th</sup> of February, 2009. The following topics will be discussed:

- 1 Education and training in geomatics.
- 2 Geodesy.

- 3 Digital cartography.
- 4 Remote sensing.
- 5 Geographical information systems.
- 6 Spatial data infrastructures.
- 7 Standardization in Geomatics.
- 8 Open source geospatial technology.
- 9 Geospatial semantics and ontology.
- 10 Location based services.
- 11 Precision agriculture.
- 12 Marine SDI.
- 13 Geomatics for sustainable development.

He also invited the participants to attend a [Congress on Marine Sciences](#), COLACMAR and MARCUBA in Havana city from 26<sup>th</sup> to 30<sup>th</sup> October, 2009. He said that that doublecongress, called ColacMarCuba 2009, would include the 13<sup>th</sup> Latin American Congress on Marine Sciences (COLACMAR) and the 8<sup>th</sup> Cuban Congress on Marine Sciences (MarCuba'2009) and that the venue of the meeting would be the Havana International Conference Center, Cuba. He told them that this Congress had taken place in the city of Florianopolis in Brazil, the previous year and remarked that it had been of a very high level and it had the largest attendance ever. He mentioned the main topics which were going to be addressed during the congress:

[Integration for development: The role of Marine Sciences](#)  
[Human impacts on the coastal zone and oceans](#)  
[Climate change, natural disasters and marine ecosystems](#)  
[Seas and Oceans as source of renewable energy](#)  
[Marine biodiversity, connectivity and conservation](#)  
[Biotechnology and Aquaculture](#)  
[Management of marine mammals in controlled environments](#)

## 16. Outgoing Chairman Words

### Official Closing of the IXth MACHC Meeting

After that, the Chairman, RearAdmiral José Jesus Ocaña García, remarked that, considering that they have addressed all the items on the Agenda and there were no other issues to be discussed, he wanted to thank all the delegates from the countries which comprised the Meso American Caribbean Sea Hydrographic Commission for their committed participation, for their enthusiastic efforts, their opinions and recommendations which were very valuable to come to terms with important issues as well as to come up with solutions to outstanding issues from previous meetings. He remarked that everything that had been accomplished during that meeting demonstrated that the participants were very knowledgeable on hydrographic, bathymetric and technological issues as well as on cartography in its different formats. He pointed out that, thanks to those efforts made by all the delegates, they had been able to achieve those good and productive results at the end of that 9<sup>th</sup> MACHC Conference. He remarked that, as far as he was personally concerned, he could say that it had been highly profitable to take part in that Conference. He remarked that it had been a great learning experience and it allowed me, as the Oceanography and Hydrography Director of the Maritime Secretariat of the Mexican Government, to fill in some gaps. He remarked that he committed before the plenary to make greater efforts in order to achieve better results and proactively contribute to the new coordinates provided by the new MACHC Chair. He stated that he was making himself available to cooperate and support all the initiatives intended for the better development and the better results of the organization. He thanked the participants for their understanding, wished them a good trip back to their home countries and finalized his farewell speech wishing the participants all the best. The plenary then burst into applause.

The Chairman then stated that he believed there were no other issues to be discussed and declared the closure of the 9<sup>th</sup> MACHC Conference hoping that he would have the opportunity to attend the next Conference with them. He remarked that he would be very pleased with that.

Annex: Amendments to the Statutes

Annex: Amendments to the Statutes

#### ARTICLE 5; OF THE CHAIR AND VICE CHAIR

- a) The Conferences of the Commission are conducted by the Chair and assisted by the Vice Chair.
- b) The Chair and Vice Chair of the Commission shall be from a Full Member State of the Commission, elected on a rotational basis. Under normal circumstances, the term for the Chair and Vice Chair will be two years.
- c) At the conclusion of a Conference, Members will offer suggestions regarding the election of a new Chair and Vice Chair. In order to assure the continuity, it is suggested that the Vice Chair be elevated to the position of Chair for the next period.
- d) If the Chair, or the Vice-Chair, is unable to officiate at the Conference, he or she shall be replaced by his or her representative.
- e) The incoming Chair shall take office three months after the conclusion of an ordinary Conference.

#### ARTICLE 7; OF THE CONFERENCE

- a) The Chair shall prepare the Provisional Agenda in conjunction with the Members at least two (2) months before its opening. The Provisional Agenda shall contain all standard items required by the IHO (e.g., National Reports, INT Charts and ENC Cell scheme). The first item shall be the Chair's report on the activities of the Commission since the

last Conference. All Conference Documents shall be made available on the IHO/MACHC web site at least one month prior to the meeting.

- b) Members' Proposals to be included on the Agenda of a Conference should be sent to the Chair for the next

Conference at least four (4) months in advance of the date agreed for the commencement of the Conference.

- c) The Agenda shall be adopted by the Commission at the beginning of each Conference.
- d) The Commission can modify the order of discussion of the different items of the Agenda during the Conference.
- e) Proposals of Members not included in the Agenda shall be submitted to the Chair and, with the agreement of the

Members, shall be added to the Agenda for consideration.

- f) Resolutions and decisions of the Conference shall usually be reached by consensus among Full Members. If

consensus cannot be reached, resolutions and decisions shall be adopted by a simple majority of the Full Members present.

- g) Each Full Member has one vote and votes shall be indicated by a show of hands.

- h) At the end of each Conference, the Chair shall present the Resolutions and Decisions taken in the working

language of the Commission. Twenty (20) days after the close of the Conference, the Chair will submit to the Full Members and Participants a report, (in the working language of the Commission) which will include those Resolutions and Decisions, as well as any supporting information submitted. Full Members shall report any objections of the report within twenty (20) days. Any objections to the report shall be made by electronic mail.

i) Between Conferences, if necessary, subjects may be discussed and decided by correspondence in the MACHC working language.

j) In preparation for, during and between Conferences, the Chair shall be assisted by the Secretary appointed by him/her. The duties of the Secretary includes the following:

i. To collate, three (3) months before the Conference, all proposals from the Full Members, to be included in the Agenda.

ii. To forward proposals and the provisional Agenda to the Chair and Vice-Chair at least two (2) months prior to the Conference.

iii. To prepare and distribute a list of participants at least one (1) month prior to the Conference.

iv. To receive and to forward any requirements from the Members to the Chair and Vice Chair as appropriate.

v. To prepare for the Chair, a report of the Conference within twenty (20) days following its conclusion, including the discussions resolutions and decisions taken, as well as any supportive information that was submitted.

vi. To prepare the final report and forward it to the IHB.

vii. To assure with the hosted nation, the nominal organization of the conference

**Annex 1:**

To change the picture in conformity to IHO publication M-3

**Annex 2:**

To change the picture in conformity to IHO publication M-11

**Annex 3**

**Council Selection Guidelines**

The duties of MACHC Representatives to the IHO Council are an important responsibility, as it is one of the primary means of communication and involvement by the MACHC in IHO matters. Thus, it is important that the MACHC be served by knowledgeable, willing and capable representatives to the IHO Council. The following provides guidelines and procedures for selecting the MACHC Representatives on the IHO Council.

Fundamental assumptions are:

1 The MACHC will be allotted two representatives for the Council (although this number could increase or even decrease for which adjustments may be required),

2 All MACHC representatives to the Council will serve a 3-year term (to coincide with the newly structured 3year IHO Assemblies), *[This is a commitment representatives and their sponsoring Member States must be willing to support, both in time required and financial expenses]*

3 The MACHC will meet at minimum once during the 3-year period between IHO Assemblies (to address MACHC representation on the IHO Council),

4 The MACHC Council representative must be from a Member State with full Member status in MACHC,

5 The MACHC will be informed as to the number of Council seats allocated 3 months prior to the Assembly, and

6 The MACHC must identify and inform the IHO of their Council representative(s) 6 months prior to the Assembly, the following selection process is proposed.

**The Method of Selection of MACHC Representative(s) to the IHO Council shall be as follows:**

1 At every MACHC Conference prior to an IHO Conference or Assembly, the MACHC shall place the  
“Selection of MACHC Representatives to the IHO Council” on its Agenda as a matter of procedure.

2 At the appropriate time, the Chair shall put forward a list of MACHC Member States who are eligible to serve as Council representatives.

3. The MACHC Chair shall entertain volunteers or nominations for candidates for each Council position, as allocated to MACHC by IHO, from among the eligible MACHC Member States who wish to serve on the IHO Council. Candidates and their Member States should be cognizant of the following:

a. The position of Council representative is for a 3-year term,  
b. In accordance with Article 14, paragraph (b), iii, of the “General Regulations of the IHO,” Member States who wish to put themselves forward for selection to the Council, must inform the Commission, with a copy to the Secretary General of the IHO, of such a decision 6 months prior to an IHO Assembly.

c. Member States’ Candidates must be willing to serve the full term of three years (to coincide with the Assembly schedule),

d. Candidates must have the support from their Member State and the resources to attend annual meetings in Monaco (or elsewhere)., and

e. No Member State can have more than one representative on the Council at any given time.

4. Once nominations have closed, a decision shall be made by consensus, or if necessary, votes shall be taken among all full MACHC Member States with each country having one vote, as follows:

a. Using separate ballots for each allotted Council seat, the candidate with the highest number of votes on the first ballot shall be the primary MACHC Council representative to the IHO Council.

b. On the next ballot, the candidate with the highest number of votes on the second ballot shall be the second MACHC Council representative to the IHO Council, should the MACHC be allocated two Council seats.

a. On the next ballot (if necessary), the candidate with the highest number of votes on the third ballot shall be the third MACHC Council representative to the IHO Council, should the MACHC be allocated three Council seats.

Should a MACHC Council representative be unable to fulfill the obligations for whatever reason, or miss two consecutive Council meetings, he (she) shall be replaced with an alternate representative selected by the Chair, MACHC, and confirmed by IHO, until the next MACHC Conference, when this issue can be addressed according to the procedures described in paragraphs 2-4, above.